

C'cid = BACC
Planning Comm.
Orjako
Schroeder

Friends of Clark County
PO Box 513
Vancouver, WA 98666
friendsofclarkcounty.org



September 10, 2015

Clark County Planning Commission,
Community Planning Comprehensive Plan Alternatives
Clark County Councilors
PO Box 9810 Vancouver, Washington 98666-9810

Dear Sirs and Madams.

Please submit these comments to the record

**Subject: Comments on the DSEIS 2016 Comprehensive
Growth Management Plan Update Alternatives.**
comp plan@clark.wa.gov

I am a rural resident of Clark County I own 65 acres, much of which is timberland I have been raising organic vegetables and fruits for many years, selling produce in the farmers' markets and directly from the farm. I have 4 wells on the property One puts out an adequate supply of water for my food production for now, one has dried up completely, 1 is very marginal, meaning they run out of water easily, and one is adequate for residential use

Although I own many acres, only 4 are suitable for food production Food production requires relatively flat land, electricity available for processing, roads for harvest and transport, and sunlight Soil is also a major factor, but modern agriculture can

amend many soils by means of organic compost and cover crops

As most people realize, ample water is essential for food production here. Farmers cannot afford to buy water from a utility and expect to remain in business very long. Their well water is essential. Many studies reveal that the water table in Clark County is very limited. Here is a statement from Focus on Water Availability *Lewis River Watershed, WRIA 27* p. 1 (Publication Number 11-11-031 August 2012) accessed on Nov. 12, 2014 at <https://fortress.wa.gov/ecy/publications/summarypages/1111031.html>

“Factors affecting water availability

There is limited water available for new uses in WRIA 27, especially given that river levels need to be maintained to ensure adequate water quality and fish migration. Additionally, Pacificorp has senior water rights to maintain reservoir levels in Lake Merwin and Yale Lake, and as a result, much of the water in the Lewis River Watershed has already been spoken for. Increased demands from population growth, low summer and early fall streamflow levels, and impacts from climate change add to the challenge of finding new water supplies in WRIA 11, especially during the summer months.”

The attached is a cross section of the aquifers that Clark County residents use for their water sources, available at <http://www.clarkpublicutilities.com/clarkpublicutilities/assets/File/crossSection2008.pdf>

I’m concerned that this is not being given adequate consideration when the county is planning to add more residential lots to rural areas.

I heard one argument submitted by Carol Levanen, of Clark

County Citizens United, that water availability is not an issue in Clark County since "PUD supplies 93% of water to county residents already I have looked into this matter since it didn't seem to ring true to me The figures I have gathered indicate that Clark PUD supplies water to about 18% of Clark County Residents Here is my information:

Clark Public Utilities has 185,000 meters in Clark County We can assume that that means approximately the amount of residences and businesses that use electricity They supply water to 33,000 customers Adding up water supplied by the cities, Washougal, 5000, Camas, 7,652, Ridgefield, 2081, Battleground, 5500, La Center, 1014, and Vancouver, 68,000, that comes to 122,247 on public water systems. The remaining 62,753 must be private wells.

It's those private wells that will be in jeopardy if the county allows as many as 10,000 more wells to rural areas Who will be responsible when the wells start to go dry? How will farmers grow food for our community?

Water availability is certainly the most important problem that adding more home sites to rural Clark County will bring

I've also heard Clark County Citizens United claim that Clark PUD will supply water hookups free for residents in need of water That too is incorrect Here are the current fees for hookup →

The DSEIS does not address the water issues in any depth, in spite of the fact that water is an essential need Nor does it discuss septic issues, also essential for protection of our ground water supply

The DSEIS does not address the potential number of additional road trips that will occur under Alts 2 and 4 nor does it examine



WATER SERVICES

INSTALLATION FEES – EFFECTIVE 07/14/15

Meter Set Only

(Lots in subdivisions that currently have boxes)

Size	Current Charge	(Breakdown)
5/8 x 3/4	\$3,255	\$355 meter + \$2,900 SD
3/4"	\$4,540	\$370 meter + \$4,170 SD
1"	\$7,890	\$460 meter + \$7,430 SD
1 1/2"	\$17,380	\$670 meter + \$16,710 SD
2" Meter	\$30,820	\$1,130 meter + \$29,690 SD
3" Meter	\$68,290	\$1,480 meter + \$66,810 SD
4" Meter	\$121,110	\$2,320 meter + \$118,790 SD
6" Meter	\$271,030	\$3,760 meter + \$267,270 SD

Meter Set and Service (\$2,200 for 5/8, 3/4, & 1)

(1 1/2" & larger = time and materials)

(1 and without meter box but water main in the street)

Size	Total Charge
5/8 x 3/4 Meter	\$5,455 total cost
3/4" Meter	\$6,740 total cost
1" Meter	\$10,090 total cost
1 1/2" Meter	\$17,380 plus T & M
2" Meter	\$30,820 plus T & M
3" Meter	\$68,290 plus T & M
4" Meter	\$121,110 plus T & M
6" Meter	\$271,030 plus T & M

x

Hydrant Meter Fees

Installation	\$75 00
Daily Charge	\$4 00
Consumption	\$1 85 per 100 cubic feet

EFFECTIVE 08/01/06 OWNERSHIP AND OPERATION OF THE LA CENTER SEWER SYSTEM WAS TRANSFERRED TO THE CITY OF LA CENTER

the effects of stormwater from additional rural homesites that will affect rivers and streams or the impacts on resource lands As a board member of Friends of the East Fork, I am extremely concerned about the health of our rivers, especially the East Fork Lewis River

Poor county road maintenance is another already many roads are not wide enough to stripe so that residents can see the center line in winter months

The schools, especially in Battle Ground, are already stretched to their limits with added students, with no plans to house the new influx of children The Columbian ran an article about that <http://www.columbian.com/news/2014/nov/17/crowded-classrooms-growing-battle-ground-district/>

Alternatives 2 and 4 are violating the terms of the Growth Management Plan and will be challenged if adopted, thus adding a huge financial burden to the taxpayers of Clark County We deserve better

Tim Trohimovich of Futurewise has submitted a letter explaining many other reasons for limiting rural expansion I hope you will take his advice seriously and choose to stay with Alternative 1 – no action

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Val Alexander', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Val Alexander, Board member, Friends of Clark County