

3/24/15 - Rec'd from Carol Levanen

cc'd - Booc
Oniako
O'Bonnell
Silliman

Clark County Board of Councilors
P.O. Box 5000
Vancouver, Washington 98666



CP 16# 0595

March 23, 2015

Re: Futurewise Letter of November 13, 2014

Clark County received a letter from Futurewise supporting Alternative 1, the do nothing choice. The letter claimed many things, but did not back it up with facts. Futurewise claims the GMA requires urban growth areas and limits their size to save money. Actually, the GMA allows expansion when infrastructure is adequate, but does not say the reason is to save money. Futurewise says "large lots and low densities increase water demand...leakage...and costs tocustomers." Logic says the more households using water, the more the demand. Leakage happens no matter how much is used and water costs are bore by each user, regardless of the number. Futurewise claims compelling evidence that reduced development in rural areas, results in increased construction in urban areas. If you stop housing in one area, it only happens in areas that allow it. But, this reduces housing options and is not a requirement in the GMA.

This letter uses King County as an example, but King County has had numerous court actions against it's land use planning, and is probably not the best choice. One so called study states, "it was too early to tell if it (GMA) was successful since it had only been in place for seven years...." The letter references agricultural lands of long term significance, then references sales of horses, ponies, mules, burros, and donkeys. These items are not GMA criteria for preservation of agriculture land. The letter says Clark County does not have water to provide for increased development. But, the county's proposal is to simply recognize existing parcels, already using water, so the increase would be minimal. In addition, septic systems play a major role in groundwater recharge, when water goes in and out of the systems. The letter references irrigation wells and claims residential development will suck wells dry. Irrigation wells tap much deeper than domestic wells and water usage is much higher for agriculture use than domestic use. The letter claims that smaller forest parcels have lower timber harvest rates, which is to be expected, but is not harmful to the industry. Futurewise says not to allow development, then says development doesn't allow for a house for a son or daughter. They spout there is not enough water but, a recent Clark Public Utilities survey states there is more than adequate water supplied by their systems, well into the year 2035 and beyond. In a recent *Executive Report - Best Available Science, Volume 1, February 2004 Chapter 6, Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas* it discusses water needs in Washington state as well as supply and demand. The report discusses septic systems design and recommends their use for one acre parcels or larger, but no mention of a lack of water.

Futurewise would do well to thoroughly research their data before they make claims to it. Taking information out of context does nothing for their credibility. Such an organization from Seattle has no idea what the community needs are for Clark County and it is a stretch for them to make an attempt to guess. That organization would do well to simply stay out of other people's business.

Sincerely,

Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
P.O. Box 2188, Battle Ground, Washington 98604