

#	Options & Recomm's	High/Med/Low OVERALL RANKING	Criteria- H / M / L				Comments
			Effectiveness	Cost	Ease of Implem.	Public Acceptance	

#	Options & Recomm's	High/Med/Low OVERALL RANKING	Criteria- H / M / L				Comments
			Effectiveness	Cost	Ease of Implem.	Public Acceptance	
1	Recommendation: Water Systems Associations for both Whidbey and Camano Islands	HIGH	High: 15 Med: 1	High: 1 Low: 15	High: 11 Med: 4	High: 12 Med: 1	-already formed -already underway
2	Option: Low-interest loans for small water systems	MED	High: 3 Med: 10 Low: 3	High: 6 Med: 3 Low: 6 (?): 1	High: 2 Med: 11 Low: 2	High: 11 Med: 4	-encourages debt and possible ineffective spending -probably costly -unknown market; difficult program to fund & operate -although low cost at state level, may be med. cost to county
3B	Recommendation: Develop public education program for water systems and homeowners true-cost water billing	HIGH	High: 10 Med: 5 Low/Med: 1	Med: 6 Low/Med: 1 Low: 9	High: 7 Med: 8	High: 9 Med: 5 Low: 1	-a must-do -should do -\$50K for staff position & materials (combine recomm's 3A,3B, 3C, & 3D) -needs attention -unclear of the effort necessary; lowered public acceptance for specific groups if increased costs result; incentives work

#	Options & Recomm's	High/Med/Low OVERALL RANKING	Criteria- H / M / L				Comments
			Effectiveness	Cost	Ease of Implem.	Public Acceptance	
3A	Recommendation: Develop effective public outreach program and educational materials	HIGH	High: 7 Med: 6 Low/Med: 1 Low: 2	Med: 7 Low/Med: 1 Low: 8	High: 9 Med: 5 Low: 1	High: 11 Med: 3 Low: 1	-success depends upon approach & acceptance -a simple add-on educ program will be ineffectual though easy; needs to be a full-blown educational campaign
3C	Option: "Education and Conservation Liaison" staff position	LOW	High: 1 Med/High: 1 Med: 13 Low/Med: 1	High: 8 Med: 4 Low/Med: 1 Low: 3	High: 7 Med: 6 Low: 2	High: 5 Med: 3 Low: 7	-effectiveness will depend on approach used -needs should be met by current staffing -could be more cost effective to support partner org's to pick up part/all of this effort

#	Options & Recomm's	High/Med/Low OVERALL RANKING	Criteria- H / M / L				Comments
			Effectiveness	Cost	Ease of Implem.	Public Acceptance	
3D	Recommendation: Develop partnerships with existing community groups	HIGH	High: 10 Med/High: 1 Med: 3 Low/Med: 1 Low: 1	Med: 1 Low/Med: 1 Low: 14	High: 6 Med: 9	High: 13 Med: 2	-effectiveness will depend on the groups themselves
4A	Option: Groundwater Wells (localized source)	<u>Remove from Option/Recomm. List</u>	High: 6 Med/High: 2 Med: 2 Low: 4 (?): 2	High: 4 Med: 2 Low/Med: 1 Low: 6 (?): 2	High: 7 Med: 4 Low: 2 (?): 2	High: 5 Med: 3 Low: 5 (?): 2	-vague -lacks definition -current -med effectiveness in protecting the resource; high for meeting demand -low/med direct cost to indiv; high for those impaired -no action needed; status quo is working

#	Options & Recomm's	High/Med/Low OVERALL RANKING	Criteria- H / M / L				Comments
			Effectiveness	Cost	Ease of Implem.	Public Acceptance	
4B	Option: Groundwater Redistribution	HIGH (long-term)	High: 11 Med: 3 Low: 2	High: 16	High: 2 Med: 1 Low: 12	Med: 3 Low/Med: 1 Low: 13	-very high cost -could be a tough sell -requires quasi-gov't action; PUD -meets demands and protects res. -plan for this, but move slowly and voluntarily -would require excellent PR with water assoc's & clear rules (i.e. triggers) -people don't like the water near them taken somewhere else

#	Options & Recomm's	High/Med/Low OVERALL RANKING	Criteria- H / M / L				Comments
			Effectiveness	Cost	Ease of Implem.	Public Acceptance	
4C	Option: Imported Water / Pipeline	LOW	High: 9 Med: 3 Low: 4	High: 16	High: 3 Low/Med: 1 Low: 11	Med: 3 Low/Med: 3 Low: 8 (?): 1	-very high cost -very low ease of implem -no water available to import -requires quasi-gov't action; PUD -meets demands and protects res. -very difficult to achieve -does not address local resource cond./limiting factors/conservation -not sure how to score effectiveness; may have scored too low
4D	Option: Emergency or small quantity water supplies	LOW	High: 3 Med: 4 Low: 8 (?): 1	High: 10 Med/High: 1 Med: 3 Low: 1 (?): 1	High: 2 Med: 7 Low: 4 (?): 2	High: 4 Med: 3 Low/Med: 1 Low: 5 (?): 2	-could vary greatly depending on situation -cost: compare bottled water with standard -low effectiveness for long-term -only as last resort or emergency -allowing bottled water due to contamination is a PROBLEM; not okay

#	Options & Recomm's	High/Med/Low OVERALL RANKING	Criteria- H / M / L				Comments
			Effectiveness	Cost	Ease of Implem.	Public Acceptance	
4E	Option: Desalination Plants	LOW	High: 2 Med: 6 Low: 8	High: 16	High: 3 Low: 12	Med: 3 Low/Med: 1 Low: 11	-very high cost -requires quasi-gov't action; PUD -high cost but possibly useful to supplement existing sources -has danger of appearing palatable, but does not address underlying resource man. needs
4F	Option: Reclaimed Water	HIGH (long-term)	High: 1 Med: 13 Low: 2	High: 10 Med: 2 Low: 4	High: 5 Med: 6 Low: 4	High: 4 Med: 8 Low/Med: 1 Low: 2	-need effective outreach campaign to raise effectiveness -requires quasi-gov't action; PUD -potentially very effective if implem. is easy & low cost -could be very effective & well received with proper and continuous O&M -public must be assured of safety; acceptance would then be high

#	Options & Recomm's	High/Med/Low OVERALL RANKING	Criteria- H / M / L				Comments
			Effectiveness	Cost	Ease of Implem.	Public Acceptance	
5	Recommendation: Establish blanket permit for WRIA 6, allowing rainwater catchment systems up to 25,000 gal/site	HIGH	High: 6 Med: 6 Low: 4	High: 1 Med/High: 1 Med: 1 Low: 12	High: 9 Med: 5 Low: 1	High: 134 Med: 1	-better if limit is set as a factor of land area affected (eg. 1/2 acre site different than 20 acre) -unsure on cost: low? -low effect.; few users -cost to state, \$25K; low cost for individuals -good alt. where applicable -build into LID options -effectiveness would be low at first; would ramp up over time
6A	Option: Update and implement the Island County Coordinated Water System Plan (CWSP, 1990)	MED	High: 10 Med: 5 Low/Med: 1	High: 3 Med: 8 Low: 4 (?): 1	High: 3 Med: 6 Low: 5 Variable: 1	High: 2 Med: 6 Low: 6 Variable: 1	-Plan update cost: \$100K+ -many factors involved -cost not an issue if grant avail; offers a tool not currently avail; public may be wary of more controls

#	Options & Recomm's	High/Med/Low OVERALL RANKING	Criteria- H / M / L				Comments
			Effectiveness	Cost	Ease of Implem.	Public Acceptance	
7A	Recommendation: Comment on County and State-wide resource planning/policy/management efforts	MED	High: 1 Med: 12 Low: 1 (?): 2	Med: 4 Low: 10 (?): 2	High: 7 Med: 6 (?): 2	High: 4 Med: 6 Low: 3 (?): 2	-who would comment: WRAC or BICC? -anything to simplify & liberalize current regs is welcomed -public likely expects this level of review from WRAC
7B	Option: Remove regulatory disincentives for consolidation	HIGH	High: 10 Med: 4 Low: 1 (?): 1	High: 1 Med: 3 Low: 11 (?): 1	High: 7 Med: 6 Low: 1 (?): 1	High: 10 Med/High: 1 Med: 2 Low: 2	-high cost: subsidized permitting -(?) ease of implem.: Low for systems, High for implementers -anything to simplify & liberalize current regs is welcomed -rational improvement towards inc. consolidation
6B	Option: Require request for existing water service before drilling new wells	HIGH	High: 9 Med: 3 Low: 4	High: 4 Med: 1 Low: 11	High: 5 Med: 7 Low: 3	Med: 8 Low: 7	-only wells within service areas should be required to give notification -provides option & prevents too many "straws" into aquifer

#	Options & Recomm's	High/Med/Low OVERALL RANKING	Criteria- H / M / L				Comments
			Effectiveness	Cost	Ease of Implem.	Public Acceptance	
7C	Option: Add value to State revolving funds for consolidating systems	MED	High: 6 Med: 4 Low: 4 (?): 2	High: 4 Med: 5 Low: 5 (?): 2	High: 3 Med: 7 Low: 4 (?): 1	High: 7 Med: 3 Low: 4 (?): 1	-unsure of cost: medium? -this resource should be tapped for system improvements -requires buy-in from DOH so implem. not clear
8A	Recommendation: Data collection and management efforts should continue to be a priority	HIGH	High: 15 Med: 1	High: 3 Med: 7 Low: 6	High: 12 Med: 2 Low: 1	High: 11 Med: 3 Low/Med: 1	-absolutely essential -important -how else will we know? -continue current efforts -necessary; people don't like to be monitored so will require good educ.
9A	Recommendation: Improve data streamlining & exchange between State DOH & DOE	HIGH	High: 14 Med: 1 (?):1	High: 3 Med: 1 Low: 11 (?): 1	High: 3 Med: 10 Low: 1 (?): 1	High: 8 Med: 5 Low: 1 (?): 1	-unsure of cost: high? -good exchange already -too many agency-related unknowns -great research aid -practical & relevant

#	Options & Recomm's	High/Med/Low OVERALL RANKING	Criteria- H / M / L				Comments
			Effectiveness	Cost	Ease of Implem.	Public Acceptance	
8B	Recommendation: Island County should maintain its Hydrogeologist staff position	HIGH	High: 16	High: 4 Med: 5 Low: 6 (?): 1	High: 13 Med: 1 Low: 1	High: 15	-very high; already funded? -very important -unsure of cost: no added cost? -maintain current position -invaluable position -relevant & necessary
9B	Recommendation: Data should be centralized and accessible to those who have need of it	HIGH	High: 12 Med: 4	High: 2 Med: 6 Low: 8	High: 8 Med: 7	High: 14 Low: 1	-unsure of cost: high? -med. effectiveness; already fairly centralized with Doug -cost unknown; how to implement?
8C	Recommendation: Secure stable funding source for ongoing surface water quality and quantity monitoring efforts	MED	High: 9 Med: 5 Low: 1 (?): 1	High: 6 Med/High: 1 Med: 6 Low: 2 (?): 1	High: 5 Med: 5 Low: 4 (?): 1	High: 4 Med: 3 Low/Med: 1 Low: 5 (?): 1 Variable: 1	-variable public acceptance: low if tax, high if outside funding -cost: \$100K/year -reasonable-ness and avoiding over-control is essential -absolutely necessary to justify BMP success, etc.

#	Options & Recomm's	High/Med/Low OVERALL RANKING	Criteria- H / M / L				Comments
			Effectiveness	Cost	Ease of Implem.	Public Acceptance	
10	Recommendation: Obtain dedicated monitoring wells	HIGH (long-term)	High: 15 Med: 1	High: 10 Med/High: 1 Med: 1 Low: 4	High: 6 Med: 7 Low: 2	High: 8 Med: 6 Low: 1	-very high long-term effectiveness -important -unsure of cost: high? -critical info, but costly -excellent indicator; how-to's are established -unclear how many wells are needed, and that would impact costs; also unclear of viability of using existing abandoned wells
11A	Option: Improve DOE water right processing and fees	HIGH	High: 13 Med: 3 Low:	High: 4 Med: 5 Low: 6 Variable: 1	High: 8 Med: 2 Low: 5	High: 8 Med: 7	-critical importance; increased fee income means low cost for taxpayer -important -variable cost: High to applicant, Low to community -Low ease of implem.: legislative fix -affected group is small, but impacts in IC are high

#	Options & Recomm's	High/Med/Low OVERALL RANKING	Criteria- H / M / L				Comments
			Effectiveness	Cost	Ease of Implem.	Public Acceptance	
12C	Option: Move Island County Water Conservancy Board in to county government	HIGH	High: 6 Med: 4 Low: 4 (?): 2	Med: 2 Low: 12 (?): 2	High: 7 Med: 6 (?): 2	High: 6 Med: 5 Low: 1 (?): 3	-critical importance; increased fee income means low cost for taxpayer -important -are there implications of cost and control that may not be obvious? -what is lost in Cons. Board losing its independence? Will it become subject to political pressure for specific results?

#	Options & Recomm's	High/Med/Low OVERALL RANKING	Criteria- H / M / L				Comments
			Effectiveness	Cost	Ease of Implem.	Public Acceptance	
12A	Option: County facilitation of water rights	HIGH	High: 12 Med: 2 Low/Med: 1 Low: 1	High: 2 Med: 8 Low: 6	High: 7 Med: 5 Low: 2 (?): 1	High: 9 Med: 6	-if fee based would result in low cost for tax payer -too much politics -important -Med. cost: \$50K/yr, for 2 years? -effected group is small, but impacts in IC are high -politically doable? -2 applic processes? DOE would still need review -seems that this is about assisting with proper filling,etc., not promotion of any particular water right application?

#	Options & Recomm's	High/Med/Low OVERALL RANKING	Criteria- H / M / L				Comments
			Effectiveness	Cost	Ease of Implem.	Public Acceptance	
12B	Option: Develop and recommend cost reimbursement program, administered by Island County	HIGH	High: 4 Med: 7 Low/Med: 1 Low: 2 (?): 2	High: 3 Med: 3 Low: 8 (?): 1 Variable: 1	High: 4 Med: 7 Low: 2 (?): 2	High: 5 High/Med: 1 Med: 6 Low: 1 (?): 2	-best to fix water rights process in the first place variable cost: High for applicant, Med. for county, Low for public -specifies a possible process -I did not find support in the paper for need to adjust costs related to challenging a water right; this would have LOW public acceptance and shouldn't be in the plan
11B	Option: Use Island County's "Early Action Plan" as policy guidance for DOE	HIGH	High: 7 Med: 8 Low: 1	High: 1 Med: 3 Low: 12	High: 6 Med: 8 Low: 1	High: 5 Med: 10	-public acceptance varies as to what area an applicant is applying -already underway -in process
13	Recommendation: Seek additional scientific data to support current and future allocations of instream water resources	LOW	High: 5 Med: 2 Low/Med: 1 Low: 7 (?): 1	High: 9 Med: 4 Low: 2 (?): 1	High: 5 Med: 5 Low: 4 (?): 1	High: 2 Med: 10 Low: 2 (?):1	-high cost: next level of study~\$100K -data valuable & relevant

#	Options & Recomm's	High/Med/Low OVERALL RANKING	Criteria- H / M / L				Comments
			Effectiveness	Cost	Ease of Implem.	Public Acceptance	
14A	Option: Use the newly developed "Combined CARA Scoring" map (Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas)	HIGH	High: 12 Med: 3 (?): 1	Med: 3 Low: 12 (?): 1	High: 4 Med: 10 (?): 1	High: 3 Med/High: 1 Med: 7 Low: 3 (?): 1	-policy -although low cost to public, high for a very few developments -good guide in combination with other considerations -offers flexibility; public acceptance will require good educ; boundaries for implem. may be difficult to determine
14B	Option: Continue current level of review for groundwater protection efforts	HIGH	High: 9 Med: 2 Low: 4 (?): 1	High: 1 Med: 3 Low: 11 (?): 1	High: 8 Med: 4 Low: 2 (?): 1	High: 7 Med: 6 Low: 1 (?): 1	-continue -already exists & works well -I don't think this provides improvement, just status-quo; those who want better will be less supportive
14C	Option: Encourage Low Impact Development (LID) practices	HIGH	High: 7 Med: 8 Low: 1	High: 3 Med: 5 Low: 8	High: 5 Med: 7 Low: 3	High: 9 Med: 3 Low: 3	-very highest priority; wide benefits -important -although unpopular and expensive, may have marginal advantages -perhaps partner org's could assist in implem.

#	Options & Recomm's	High/Med/Low OVERALL RANKING	Criteria- H / M / L				Comments
			Effectiveness	Cost	Ease of Implem.	Public Acceptance	
15A	Recommendation: Modify Island County's Seawater Intrusion Policy (1991)	HIGH	High: 14 Med/High: 1 Med: 1	High: 1 Med: 7 Low: 8	High: 6 Med: 9	High: 8 Med/High: 1 Med: 6	-policy -great step -necessary; eliminates false data
15B	Option: Uniform application of seawater intrusion review	HIGH	High: 12 Med: 2 (?): 2	High: 3 Med: 3 Low: 11 (?): 2	High: 6 Med: 6 Low: 1 (?): 2	High: 8 Med: 5 (?): 2	-great step -necessary; process is already established
16	Option: Future policy recommendations	HIGH (long-term)	High: 7 Med: 5 Low: 1 (?): 4	High: 3 Med/High: 1 Med: 4 Low: 3 (?): 5	High: 1 Med: 5 Low: 5 (?): 4	Med: 9 Low: 2 (?): 4	-can be rewritten to state that flexibility should be encouraged -could be easy to implem. & may be excellent policy -public acceptance will vary dep. on situation

#	Options & Recomm's	High/Med/Low OVERALL RANKING	Criteria- H / M / L				Comments
			Effectiveness	Cost	Ease of Implem.	Public Acceptance	

Comments received back from:

WRAC citizen members:

- Larry Bach (Effectiveness & Cost ranked only)
- Mike Belangie
- Barbara Brock
- Ralph Ferguson
- Bob Friedman
- Steve Frostad
- Sego Jackson
- Don Lee
- John Luechauer
- Sherwood Minckler
- Brian Peters

Former WRAC member:

- Greg Cane

Citizen Advisors:

- Dean Thiem
- Joe Waldrup (overall H/M/L ranking only)

Agency Advisors:

- Malcolm Bishop
- Karen Lennon

#	Options & Recomm's	High/Med/Low OVERALL RANKING	Criteria- H / M / L				Comments
			Effectiveness	Cost	Ease of Implem.	Public Acceptance	

- Geoff Tallent