

## Comments from New Shares' Member Poll, Sept. 2021

### Comments from respondents who support new shares

We have the water and should share with others in our area 2. long term health and stability of our system

We should manage the use of our water from this point forward. Owners who currently have water either thru WWA or by means of a private well don't need water. Undeveloped land that will be developed for homes in the future should be encouraged and want to join the Association. The Association as a whole will be a more effective steward of the water resources within its boundaries.

I support adding water shares.

I support the membership having access to more shares, but I do think we should allocate fewer shares in the first year, to learn how much demand exists, and measure water capacity.

Lack of water shares makes it difficult to build or expand housing to meet the housing need on Vashon. I trust that the WWA has done the diligence in regards to the impact this addition will have on the supply.

I support the addition as long as the cost to purchase are rolled into capital improvements. The increased property value of a share being tied to land must be shared amongst us all.

We have been paying for improvements and future needs, and lost ground must be made up by any new share.

I support the provision of additional shares so that water can be put towards beneficial uses such as ADUs [Accessory Dwelling Unit] to support multi-generational, affordable living, small homesteads/agriculture and for other purposes.

Supply is more than adequate to support adding shares.

It appears we have adequate water and additional revenue will help us in the long run.

I hope to purchase an additional share

i was the owner of the parcel that sold the Back Forty well, so... :-)

I like the idea of gradual over the years. How many shares did Back 40 get in exchange for the well. Did they pay?

We would like to purchase an additional water share.

If there is capacity, extra shares would be beneficial to existing customers wishing to expand/develop their properties

Need for residents of Vashon to have dependable water source. Prevent more private wells being drilled or used. Allow funds for improvements.

Because the board apparently already considered the issue and decided to add the shares.

If we have the water, let's sell some shares.

I support new shares so everyone has safe clean potable water

The Board and management have demonstrated a thoughtful and prudent approach in evaluating the benefits to be gained while considering the resources that are now available. This evaluation is in agreement with a considerable body of professional and regulatory engineering that favors such action.

As our world is changing so also family dynamics. We are once again becoming more nuclear with 2 to 3 generations, as well as siblings, gathering under one roof.

If we have the capacity, we should be providing the available shares, particularly given the long lived waiting list.

WWA has done an excellent job of stewarding and preserving our west side water. I trust them to make a decision to add more shares. It seems we have plenty of water to go around, especially if properly managed.

Better control of the aquifer.

Adding more shares is better than adding private wells.

If there s enough water we should welcome new members.

Because I do not like Not In My Backyard mentality. If the water is there, share it.

Water is life on this island.

Our water system should supply water to every property in our mapped area.

If the water supply is sufficient and I assume that it is then yes add the shares

I believe the board knows more about well capacity than I do. I believe the board has the interest of all of us who use that water, and I believe the board knows what it is doing. So I support their decision.

If we have room for more shares we should make them available.

I have confidence in the analysis that has been performed by the association board and DOH to support the additional shares.

Our understanding is that it's required to open new shares by the county. As long as there is enough water for all, we don't have a problem opening new shares.

No strong opinion, but I'm fine with more shares being added.

For those who would like to expand their property to take care of family or offer affordable rental housing. I m not a fan of AirB&B rentals though.

It sounds like with the addition of the Back 40 (adding to our capacity), the use of many private wells, and existing members wanting to add to their residences and requesting an additional water share, that making them available would be a good idea.

The WWA Board has laid out in detail good reasons for adding new shares.

### **Comments from respondents who do NOT support new shares**

We have very limited ground water—more frequent climate driven drought will increase this lack.

Our water supply may be adversely affected by climate change.

After many years of struggling to have adequate water in summer that does not contain excessive arsenic, it is great that Westside Water has purchased the "Back 40" well and now appears to have a better source for year round safe water. However, I am concerned that the addition of that well may not pan out as expected and issuing 24 new shares will put the WWA back in the position of being stretched for adequate safe water. I would prefer to see WWA function for two years with the existing shares and existing wells before adding new shares followed by a report from the board regarding the success of that experience and a recommendation regarding the number of new shares that could be safely issued based on that experience. We seem to be in a decent financial position. Why rush into a risky decision?

We don't feel that more development is good for the island and we already have water flow and quality issues that will only get worse as the climate continues too warm.

I don't have any confidence in how the data was gathered to make this decision. I think the decision was made by well-meaning individuals who don't appear to have the qualifications. I want to see a neutral third-party expert conduct a study. I want the board to submit a list of experts and their qualifications so a future report is as unbiased as possible. I want to see all the possible scenarios. The island has water shortage and climate change will further create water shortages. And we're adding new shares? As President Biden would say, "Come on, man."

I'm not sure we can withstand the impact of 24 new shares, if those who gain them are excessively high water users. I would like to know that we have explored options for encouraging water conservation (currently, as a member, I receive very little outreach on this issue) and that we have a system in place to evaluate cost increases for high use that is related to "beautification — lawns" compared to high use that is related to "food infrastructure & other essential purposes."

We already run low as it is. It impacts the rest of the island as well.

Climate change has made our weather unpredictable. Hotter summers, maybe drier winters.

Quality of water decrease with increase pressure on aquifer

Do not want any more buildings in the Westside Water District.

I support some new shares but fewer

The Back 40 well flow has not been proven reliable, is in close proximity to a private agricultural well drawing from the same source, and requires remediation to drink, hence maintenance. Our water resources are often in need of rationing due to climatic variation. Looming climate change impacts to our water supply are unclear. A biased approach to new water share distribution invites

legal action. Contact DOH Regional Planner overseeing King County, Richard Rodriguez @ 253-395-6771 for guidance.

Considering our very dry summer this year (we were asked to limit water use during the 100-degree temps), not to mention increased lack of precipitation in the future due to climate change, how is it we can offer new water shares? Climate change impacts are already resulting in water demand increases and it is up to WWA to meet those demands of the current members. I applaud finding additional water sources, but only to meet the demands of the climate impacts of current members.

The island has limited water and all islanders essentially draw from the same source regardless of water district or well location. All islanders should have a voice when and if we expand water shares on Vashon, not just WWA members. This should also be reciprocal for all water districts on the island.

I m not convinced it s necessary or advisable to add new shares considering the impacts of climate change on future water supply and environmental impacts of more construction and development the new shares would bring. The explanation of an obscure law that requires the water district to make them available seemed a little thin to me as well. I also fear that they would be sold too cheaply to speculative developers who just want to profit and run. We should absolutely not be making life easier for speculative developers.

Uncertainty regarding how future weather changes will change water availability

1.) New well doesn't have a track record. 2.) Announcing 24 shares may legally obligate despite well performance. 3.)I am not convinced that 24 new shares does not compromise capacity security. It is unclear how much water will be used by back 40. 4.) We were going to vote without knowing how the new shares would be allocated or having any input.

The system already has enough on it, why max it out? Seems the new wealth that moves to the Island wants to build HUGE homes and change the Island to be what they came from. I've lived

out here since 1985. I moved here from Friday Harbor, I have seen what growth/tourism can do to an Island. Enough said.

Maintain rural lifestyle.

Too much new construction on Vashon.

The new well does not yet have a track record.

Shortage.

Uncertainty of future water supply due to global warming = not a good time to put more demand on supply.

WW has wasted a lot of money on treatment that doesn't work and on wells and giving people who own the wells a lot of money for wells that don't produce.

Overburden for system long range

Currently, we believe selling shares is premature until the Back 40 wells are proven.

Severe heat coming — uncertain water reserves — more construction — lower quality of life

Water resource long term uncertain.

While the county thinks we have enough water, that seems to be temporary based on our changing climate. I don't see a reason to take even more water from the ground. I feel the water table is tapped out, and we are going to have issues in coming years.

I don't have enough knowledge on the matter, but adding shares right now with water levels down sounds concerning.

It will result in more construction and less trees.

My name is Theo Eicher, as a former water board member I am aware of how difficult it is to weigh all options for the benefit the association. Thank you for organizing this survey and for your efforts to reach out to all WSW members on this issue. I think it is valuable to share as much information as possible regarding WSW s stewardship of our liquid (water and financial) assets so members can make informed choices. Would you be willing to share the link with all responses to your survey that GoogleForms provides?

The longer I thought about your first question, the more I wondered if the answer options that were offered provided all possible/relevant options. I wanted to point to three areas that might be helpful to clarify: **I) Choices; II) Timing; III) Supply.** My sense is that it would help members to make better decisions if they had answers to the issues I touch on below.

#### **I) CHOICES:**

My impression is that the choice is not between selling shares or not. The choices are:

- i. selling shares
- ii. not selling shares
- iii. other forms of financing WSW s well purchase and other large, upcoming WSW expenditures.

I think it is important that, if members don t want to sell shares, members can also indicate whether they want to:

- 1) Get a loan and raise rates to repay it
2. Get a loan and impose long term assessments to repay the loan
3. Impose a large one-time assessment
4. Explore other forms of financing (detailed suggestions would be helpful)

#### **II) TIMING**

My impression is that the discussion is not just about whether WSW should sell shares, but when WSW should sell shares. The timing of possible share sales is important since it could be planned to meet the association s capital needs.

When I was on the board, the 2016 WSW Capital Asset Replacement (CAR) plan projected substantial WSW savings shortages for around 2030. [A link to the current CAR is on the WSW



website]. These projected shortfalls, which we published at the time, were not for lack of planning; they simply reflected the particular way our water system was originally built. Around 2030, large sections of pipe will reach the end of their useful life all at once. Since these replacements are now within the financial planning horizon of WSW, the discussion of IF WSW should sell shares could be combined with a discussion of WHEN shares should be sold.

### III) WATER SUPPLY

I have first-hand WSW well-drilling and new-well-supply experience, given my involvement in the development of WSW's Anderson 2 (A2) well. My experience informs my current thoughts regarding the supply of our new well:

- i. When A2 was first drilled, the first (rough) pump test produced a water estimate 3 times larger than the supply for which the well was eventually certified.
- ii. After that first pump test, A2's water supply was revised downward several times during the first year. (I don't recall how many times.)
- iii. Also within the first year, WSW learned that A2 was influencing the amount the Anderson 1 (A1) well could pump. The board had asked the water engineer specifically about this issue and the engineer had "proven" (with standard equations) that this was virtually impossible. Eventually, both A1 and A2's capacities had to be lowered to account for the fact that neither well could pump at full capacity when the other was running.
- iv. Most disconcertingly, over the next two years, I was unnerved to find out that the water table for A2 fell substantially. Lower water tables imply reduced water supply. This possibility had also never been mentioned/predicted by the water engineer.

My experience (which may not be representative) left me with a sense that there is no substitute for years of accumulated experience before WSW starts banking on a particular well's steady supply. Water engineers certify their paper calculations but (when pressed) admit they guessed WSW's geology. WA DOH [Department of Health] simply certifies water engineer calculations. But if water supply deviates from the paper calculations, it is only WSW's problem. Even if WSW members unanimously agree to sell shares, my experience would suggest that it may be prudent to wait a number of years to gain a reliable estimate of the water supply for the new well (which is only about 1/2 of a mile from A1 and A2).

There is one additional water supply dimension: Other water systems' bylaws feature, at times,

limits on water usage per member. I think there may be a motion to add such limits to our bylaws. Such limits may force restrictions on some of WSW's larger users in the summers. These limits could then guarantee water for new shareholders. Here I worry again about the financial implications. Since large users pay steeply graduated water rates, the large users' bills provide substantial financial support to WSW. If we turned off their water in the summers to serve new shareholders, the association would have to find new revenue streams to make up for the financial shortfall (since large users pay much higher rates per cubic foot of water than normal households). Also, water systems bylaws usually feature exemptions from water limits for commercial/agricultural enterprises. I am not sure if such exemptions are planned for the WSW change in bylaws, but it may not be difficult for WSW users to change their status to ag/commercial, negating any planned water savings to underwrite new water shares.

Concern for future availability of water.

Run short of water during summer.

Water only goes so far. We must protect it for future needs. I believe shortages are coming.

Already struggle with water availability (at times).

We are entering an era of unprecedented drought and global warming. It would be grossly irresponsible to issue additional shares, regardless of what current law allows or current estimated capacity might suggest.

I think we should offer shares but not that many.

### **Comments from respondents were Unsure about whether to support new shares and needed more information**

Water is a scarce commodity. I worry about straining the system. I also wonder about diluting my vote and influence.

Would be quite stressful on a system that seems to need repair on a daily basis.

I need to know more on how Westside Water feels they can sustain 24 new water shares. This is on the heels of a very dry summer with restrictions on our current water usage reiterated to houses a few times over the summer. Once the shares are supplied there is no going back. This decision should be driven by long-term thinking and whether it is sustainable.

I do not know what the long term implications are for additional shares re: property development and logging of forested areas among other possible ramifications. More shares bring more development and this has positives and negatives attached.

What will it impact current users?

I am concerned that if we continue to have increasingly dry weather here that our water resources will become more limited. I would be more comfortable offering fewer water shares over a much longer time period.

Is there a current list of those officially waiting for an available share? Are there any current inactive shares that should be bought back?

Sorry if I've missed info. I guess I need to see data around: how much water do we have? How much water can we spend each year? How much do we have left currently? Given trends in climate can we add any shares? Do trends in climate impact the aquifer we are using? Over what time periods, etc.?

It's worrisome, but I have no real information.

Unable to comment without additional info; advantages, liabilities or benign affects.

I am unsure about supporting the decision to add new water shares. Will this effect future water levels and quality in our wells? Will the addition of water shares effect the cost?

I need more information. See below: I probably missed the information regarding the cost of the new shares but will the current share holders have to pay to develop these shares. Will the addition of the shares mean our current equipment will be updated? How are the projections into the future? Is this sustainable?

I need to be assured that there will be plenty of water into the future to support additional shares.

Would like to learn how this played out with WDOH. Did they approach WWA or the reverse? What was presented to the agency? What water supply analysis grounds the decision?

Enough is enough.

I lean towards no, but I'm sure I don't have all the information. If there was info given with the pros and cons I must have missed it. Further development on the island is certainly a bad thing as is an increase in population. More shares seem to also expand the use of an already finite resource. Also not a positive.

It is reasonable for the association to understand the limits of water available for existing shares. This concerns me since we are now experiencing severe drought conditions, and expansion of use/users is risky.

I have no idea how much has been factored in for very dry conditions here in the NW that might last for who knows how long. I realize it's going to be a lot of guessing but that factor must be considered.

I'm sure it's in the literature somewhere but why these particular 24 shares? I understand there are quite a few private wells, considerably more than these 24 properties. Are those wells part of properties currently with WWA? And if not why aren't all those wells also being considered?

Selfishly, I only really care if it will improve or degrade my service and increase or decrease my bill.

Will adding shares increase cost or decrease quality and available supply?

I am concerned that we are not setting ourselves up for a future water shortage. How much capacity do we have?

I wonder about unforeseen consequences and support first gaining a couple years' experience with the new well to confirm that it flows as predicted in this changing climate. I'm also unclear about the varied consequences of priority distribution (question below).

My understanding is that if we have the water by law we have to add users. So it seems if we have to add some shares we need to do it carefully. Phased in over time with off ramps built in to stress test the system and make sure we really have adequate supply. My biggest concern is over allocating shares.

Can our water system support this many additional hook ups? Do we need additional funding to support our water system? Is this for the property that is being developed down the street from 153rd St.? If so, I believe that they should have checked with us before they built on the property.

I want more information about the long term outlook for water access from our sources.

I fear development and real estate speculation that would favor the wealthy.

Why are we asked to conserve water in the summer and proposing expanding?

Now that I've read some of the background information (thanks to the committee for forwarding those comments and emails), I would like to hear, in person, a discussion regarding adding new shares (or not) from Doug, the ad hoc committee, board members and WWA members like Paul and Jeremy before making a decision.

What are the consequences of adding new shares? Less water for others?

I would like to know how these new shares are being allocated and to whom they would go. Could one person get more than one share?

I am worried that with climate change, our rainfall will be reduced, and rainfall is what fills our aquifers on Vashon.

Sustainability should be a good guide. I missed the meeting (Sorry!), so feeling a bit uninformed.

The method chosen to distribute will determine my support.

I was out of town for a few weeks when the meetings about this were held. How can I find out more about pros and cons?

Does it mean more development? Do we have enough water? Is it for Low Income Housing?

I am concerned about long term viability of current WWA sources.

Seems we already have water shortages as it is and climate change is only going to make it worse in the coming years. Vashon's rurality exists partially as a result of limited water shares and I don't wish to expand growth on island beyond sustainable levels. **ESPECIALLY** when it comes to water. We are a sole-source aquifer on Vashon if I am not mistaken and if I am correct then we need to proceed with caution and regard to the entire island not just ourselves. I would vote **NO** now but feel that to make a more intelligent decision I would need more info. For instance, who and why is/are suggesting to increase shares?

As a standing member for more than 40 years I have deep concerns over this proposal and I have questions. I would like an opportunity to ask and have answers to those questions **BEFORE** any decision is made.

Who is proposing expansion?

Why are they suggesting it?

Can our system handle it?

What does it mean for our beautiful, fragile little Island, not just our water district?

Are any of the proposers of this plan real estate agents?

These are important questions to me and I would truly appreciate the opportunity to have them answered before proceeding further.

### **Additional Miscellaneous Comments**

Actually would prefer sharing between private well owners and existing members.

I do support well owners getting access to water shares but wonder how likely it is to decommission the well after the share is given.

To the last question, I would give priority to private well owners who are deemed to be using WWA water source, not simply being within the service area. Additionally, I am not in favor of someone being able to buy a water share every two years. That indicates development, not residential situation.

Are there constraints on ADU s? If this can be abused, it will. I do not see a good answer for the answer above although an answer is required.

Do private well owners use or (impact) the aquifer we are using? If yes, then it would be better to have them join the association. Do we want to encourage more development in our service area by giving water to undeveloped property? How does development of that property affect the aquifer? Are there positive feedback loops that are detrimental to the aquifer? In general I'd prioritize existing private well owners over undeveloped property, just to keep development slower.

I favor private well owners because they are already using water from likely shared underground sources as WWA and their inclusion could diminish pressure on those shared sources. I would support awarding shares to existing members next. I do not support issuing shares to owners of undeveloped property within the service area. his will lead to population increase and greater

pressure on local resources. Owners of undeveloped property purchased that property with knowledge that they did not have access to Westside Water. If they want to develop that property, they should take the risk and drill a well.

Let's just concentrate on continuing to improve the quality of our system and what we have. We have to stop the human mentality of continuing to grow and expand. It has to stop sometime otherwise we all fall into the ocean. What are the presumed positives to expanding our system?? I only see drawbacks.

I think that anything we do to make our association more sustainable is a good thing, but the "cost" of membership must be appropriate. I am not for just giving out shares, without a fair market value payment coming to the association.

I think that it is absolutely crucial that the Board and members hear from [the Department of] Ecology's Water Resource Program, water master for Vashon. He is incredibly knowledgeable and can share up-to-date information on groundwater levels, the health of the aquifer and why in fact there is sufficient water in our area. I am also curious to know how the Board plans to fairly allocate the new shares. It is important that the process be entirely transparent.

This was astoundingly bad proposal foisted upon us.

How we allocate is very important, and it would need to be a flexible system versus a hard and fast rule. If we proportioned automatically into 3rds, and two of the groups had no interest, it would make less sense to deny the other group access to water. However, existing members have been paying into the system's infrastructure, and if there is a belief that we've increased our water supply, they are partly responsible for that happening. They are also less likely to increase demand as significantly as occurs when undeveloped land becomes inhabited. With the changes to our environment and weather systems a huge unknown, I think decisions that are based upon a pre-determined time period, with revisits designed into them, are advisable.



I can see why this is a tough question for WWA to navigate, but having 24 shares to offer potential homeowners seems like a great thing for our part of the island community.

I probably missed the information regarding the cost of the new shares but will the current share holders have to pay to develop these shares. Will the addition of the shares mean our current equipment will be updated? How are the projections into the future? Is this sustainable?

It is always anxiety producing to talk about resource sharing. But for the sense of community, it is the right thing to do. I like the care you are taking. Keep doing that.

We should meet the needs of our current neighbors before facilitating additional development.

By law, provision seems unfair and inequitable and even opportunistic for use as resale value personally rather than benefiting all members of west side water. Think the proportion should exclude them,

Adding new shares might be okay, but we don't understand why the number "24" has been chosen. Also, what is the time frame over which the additions would be allowed? Immediately? As demanded? Over 10 years? If the additions are proportional, what would the proportions be and why? Can the system continue to meet the district's mission and principles after the addition? These are examples of the information we don't have that we would need in order to answer the question: "Do you support the decision to add 24 shares to the system?" We are pretty sure that the system's leadership has all of this information. We elected the board to represent us for exactly this purpose: to educate themselves so we don't have to and to make thoughtful decisions for us based on that knowledge. If leadership has considered the issue adequately, then leadership may make the decision without the results of a "let's be mindful of everybody's feelings" survey. We strongly encourage the board to do whatever it thinks is best for the system. And we strongly encourage folks who believe they need more say in the system's decision making to get themselves on the board.

This is a little bite concerning as, with virtually no rain to replenish our wells, adding shares seems like perhaps bad timing? Thank you all for the care of our water system!

Always emphasizing water conservation yet wanting to expand membership by 10% based on an unproven well invites many questions. A biased approach to new water share distribution may provoke legal action from outside or within WWA.

I don't understand how additional shares can be awarded to current members. Current members already have a residence with a water share. What happens if they are awarded an additional share? What is the definition of a WWA member? Can you be a member without a share?

Are there existing limits on water usage by private well owners? We are all tapping the same aquifer, isn't that right?

I think we should share the priority of who gets a share. Are there priority lists?

We are opposed to agricultural use of WWA water, other than for personal, residential vegetable gardens (no commercial/restaurant farm water use). Water has long been the limiting factor for new development on Vashon, and for good reason. If WWA needs more sources to provide water for its customers, it seems shortsighted to sell more shares and expand the number of users when our water supply is knowingly limited. If selling shares is primarily to fund purchase of the additional water source, we have bigger issues that must first be addressed.

I strongly favor community development of water resources rather than the ad hoc basis of doing so on an individual basis of well drilling.

We would like to know if well owners are sucking from the same water source as WSW.

We would like to acknowledge and thank the board for their hard work on this issue and appreciate the opportunity to participate in this important topic.

Although existing members should be given priority, provisions should allow for bringing private well owners into the system if their wells are decommissioned or given to the water district as it benefits the water district. An analysis of how shares would be awarded and benefits/negatives of each class of potential owner should be developed and shared.

Climate, climate, climate.

There s a lot of information to absorb coming from several different sources it seems. Is there a reasonably concise consolidated statement of the issues at hand that I may have missed or I can get my hands on? Thanks.

Also, regardless of what decision we make, do we have the money to install all of these additional hook ups? I ve not seen mention of that.

We should wait a few more years to see how well our sources perform.

Im open to more information, particularly the pros and cons of each option.

Communication regarding the Back 40 project before the fact was poor and inadequate.

I am tired of the growth, tourism, and wastefulness. Keep things as they are.

If the board believes that awarding shares which go beyond the existing bylaws, then the bylaws should be changed. I think that change should be institutionalized to avoid future ambiguity. I am far more confident that the board knows what is best for the system than do I. Please keep us informed. Thanks.

Would giving private well owners a share mean they would need to stop using the well? This would seem a necessary condition.

I trust the board to make the best decisions.

I would support issuing a limited number of shares to existing homeowners after the new well is operated for at least a year. Even then, 24 shares seems like a lot.

Are there limitations in place to keep individuals from buying all the shares? I need more information.

Money needs to be spent on reputable and professional help to address the issues above before taxing the water system further.

Past Association decisions have not always panned out, so I'm wondering about the certitude expressed about future water availability. Climate change is making itself felt in this region and elsewhere (see snow levels on mountains). Why are we so sure there will be ample water in the future?

I'm curious as to whether anyone behind the push to add shares has any skin in the game or other special interest.

I understand the thankless position of the Board members but I know the prospect of selling recreational (or subdivided?) property that now has the possibility of a water share must be hard to ignore. More time to parse the problem can't be a bad thing.

We see no compelling reason to add shares. Is the Back 40 well rated for agriculture use? If so, how many gallons per day?

How does this benefit WSW members?

Who are the five people who came up with this idea?

Why would an existing member have first dibs at another share? That is inherently wrong.

Not so sure we should have shares for undeveloped property. I think we should focus on current members and private well houses.

How is water shared? Does a person with a well get his or her own water in addition to the whole container/aquifer/stream that everyone else gets?

Some members have been expecting to get priority, as per the bylaws, for many years if and when new shares become available.

The proposed by-law changes may result in multi-family dwellings.

I have great concern as to whom these shares would go and who would be responsible for the allocation.

I believe that a person could apply for water shares every two years? I don't think it should be that often. Under what circumstances would I need a new water share 2 years later? Development? I don't think risking the resilience of the aquifer is a good idea to help developers make \$.

Any person who wants water should ask for permission at that time. Members could vote each time for "yes" or "no". That way we can monitor requests in the future.

I do understand that if someone has owned a piece of undeveloped property for over 10 years and would finally like to build, they should be considered. I don't want to see a lot more development and huge estates take over.

Please make the process of requesting an additional share for a parcel or property clear. I have written to request one, but some of the answers provided state that there is no list of requests and requests made have not been prioritized or dated. When existing members are notified that we can expand and add a water share, the process of being added to a list and given a timeframe should be clearly understood. Thank you.

Only current members who have built the system should have priority. Private well owners who are willing to remove/disable their well (and preferably who can show a documented health issue with their well) would be a distant second in priority.

Not liking the surcharge.