

From: [Kraig Chalem](#)
To: [JOSEPH TASKEY](#); [Dawn Peebles](#)
Cc: [Sonja Cady](#)
Subject: RE: West Olympia (24th Ave.) Plat, Hearing Follow-up
Date: Wednesday, April 24, 2024 2:53:44 PM
Attachments: [Response to comments letter_042224.pdf](#)

Good afternoon Mr. Taskey,

Thank you for your thoughtful remarks. The Examiner has issued post hearing directions. I am not at liberty to engage further than what I have been directed to do by the Examiner.

I am forwarding your message onto Sonja Cady, Land Use Clerk.

Respectfully,

Kraig Chalem | Senior Planner
 Thurston County Community Planning & Economic Development
[3000 Pacific Ave. SE, Olympia, Washington 98501](#)
 Phone (360) 754-4034 | Fax (360) 754-2939 | TDD (800) 833-6388
kraig.chalem@co.thurston.wa.us | [Permitting Home](#) | [Thurston County BDC](#)

This communication is a public record and may be subject to disclosure under the Washington State Public Records Act, RCW 42.56.

Please Note: County Staff strive to provide the most accurate and up to date information available. However information may come from a variety of sources and is subject to change without notice, express or implied. In no event shall Thurston County be liable for direct, indirect, incidental use or reliance of the information provided by staff. The burden of determining fitness for use lies entirely with the recipient.

From: JOSEPH TASKEY <j.taskey@comcast.net>
Sent: Wednesday, April 24, 2024 11:10 AM
To: Dawn Peebles <dawn.peebles@co.thurston.wa.us>; Kraig Chalem <kraig.chalem@co.thurston.wa.us>
Subject: West Olympia (24th Ave.) Plat, Hearing Follow-up
Importance: High

Good Morning Dawn and Kraig,

Regarding yesterday's hearing. As you might imagine, I was not satisfied with the developers response to my concerns, and the offer of providing a water stub-out would fall way short of a reasonable mitigating measure. But I was also disappointed that there was not any County validation or support for my legitimate points about the risk that we may be caused harm by the loss of use of my well due to the project's impacts. Having been in your shoes, I get that you believe that your codes have you hamstrung surrounding this unique circumstance. However, also having been involved in the ultimate resolutions of similar situations, I disagree with that assertion.

As an FYI, I did, in fact, have a lengthy conversation with Garrett Scheuerman, the Department of Ecology Hydrogeologist before the hearing. He asserted that, as the overseeing permit authority for the project and it's surface water management, it falls upon the County for jurisdiction. I did not feel that it was appropriate to raise this in the hearing, since he had not reviewed the details of the project, so he was not officially speaking for the DOE. That may turn out to have been a mistake, given the repeated statements to the examiner that it was suggested that I do so, possibly implying that I hadn't.

I also spoke at length with Zach Severs, as suggested, and I've attached my follow-up email to him. He had further referred me to Kevin Hansen and Mark Biever, who I cc'd, but have yet to receive any response from them. It's unfortunate that short review and response circumstances caused this to bump up against a hearing deadline, as it didn't allot adequate time to have an additional expert look at it with an eye on off-site impacts.

What is confusing to me is whether or not identification of wells in close proximity is a requirement? If not, then that is a huge shortcoming in your codes. If so, then what are the consequences of not satisfying the requirement? Also, if wells had been identified, what would have been the next steps required? I believe that you may be able to require monitoring wells during construction, but that falls considerably short of the standard practice of establishing a longer duration pre-construction baseline.

As I stated yesterday, this goes beyond just contamination concerns, and into the area of surface and sub-surface water flows and surcharging. Therefore the 100 and 200 feet criteria would be superseded to include any wells that could likely be impacted by altering those flows. As well, I don't understand how surfacing 50% of a watershed type area that currently flows to and out of the north boundary, and diverting the runoff to the opposite south end, would not be likely to alter the original flow volumes. As such, given that it appears as a possibility that the developer may not be required to, I would like to be afforded the opportunity to meet asap on-site with either or both of you, the County Hydrogeologist and any other staff you think might be appropriate, to assess and document existing pre-development conditions through my property, from the County's perspective.

I know that you are all very busy, but I greatly appreciate your expedient attention to this.

Thank You!

Joe Taskey & Moira Gray

206-714-8840