

5/24/16 - Rec'd from Sydney Reiskind  
cc'd - Bacc  
Orjiako  
Schroader

RECEIVED

MAY 24 2016

BOARD OF  
COUNTY COUNCILORS



To:  
Board of County Councilors  
County Planning Commission  
Community Development  
Kathy Schroader

Sydney Reiskind  
PO Box 339  
Ridgefield, WA 98642

For the Record for:  
5/23/2016 Joint Growth Plan Hearing re: Capital Facilities Plan  
General FEIS & GMP processes

Capital Facilities are the big expensive infrastructure projects that are needed to support the services of the county (roads, buses, schools, police and fire stations, jails, water, sewer, and stormwater facilities). Because these are big and expensive, buildings and structures need to be planned in advance for both finding funding and timing of construction.

By State statute, the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) must estimate the costs for the infrastructure necessary for the expected increase in population predicted by the Office of Fiscal Management. It must also identify sources of funds to pay for the infrastructure for 20 years, and show that it can pay for the 1<sup>st</sup> 6 years. The population increase and the infrastructure must unfold together as the county develops (concurrency). The CFP must be concurrent with the Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan). If funds are not sufficient for facilities to be concurrent with the Comp Plan, then one must change to be concurrent with the other.

**According to the Comprehensive Plan of 2016 to 2025 (Exhibit 2: "Estimating Rural Housing and Employment", page 3) the county needs to plan for up to 8,024 new parcels (added to the 2007 plan), which are estimated to contain 21,343 new rural residents.** Probably more, because rural families are usually larger, so this is a lowball estimate.

The Capital Facilities Plan of the Board of Clark County needs to be concurrent with this number of residents proposed by the Comprehensive Plan. **However, serving this number of new residents may not be affordable to the property tax, utility rate and bond interest payers - all the citizens of Clark County. (Note that renters also pay property taxes indirectly.)** The examples that I will site include transportation, fire protection and schools.

**Transportation:**

**Roads. The 20-year Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) includes 26 projects outside of (after) the 1<sup>st</sup> 6 years that are related to rural traffic.** These were added because of the rural rezoning in the Preferred Plan/Comprehensive Plan-to-be. When population is pushed into the rural area, more cars will drive on narrow rural roads along with increased

school buses with increased school bus stops and UPS/FedX trucks. More traffic from rural areas will also decrease service for heavily used arterial corridors with problems beginning further away from cities. (Appendix E of CFP Review, page 66).

**Corresponding CFP estimates for the 26 new parcels is \$850 million dollar after the 1<sup>st</sup> 6 years. There is no funding strategy after the first year. There is no funding strategy for 11 million per year over 20 years.**

**Paying this \$850 million depends on grants that we may lose, Traffic Impact Fees that have been waived for business development and the General Fund, which is supported by citizen property taxes.**

If we do not upgrade narrow rural roads while putting more people on them, we create congestion on rural roads as well as arterials. This adds to stress for already stressed people, affects road safety for citizens and access for emergency response.

**Fire Protection:**

**Fire Protection is funded almost entirely from the General Fund and Property Tax. The Capital Facilities Plan for buildings and equipment shows that costs for the 2007 Comprehensive Plan were about 13 million dollars. For the current plan, the estimate for serving the rural population expansion is about \$37 million. That is \$24 million new to the general fund and property tax. Figure that law enforcement will be similarly stretched, even though their equipment and stations are less expensive (ignoring justice and the need for a new jail).**

**Schools:**

Currently, with just the 2007 plan, we are already increasing school impact fees. Depending on the jurisdiction, the impact fee increase is as high as \$3,000. Schools are already struggling to keep up with the influx of new residents.

**Adding 8024 new families from the rural area will increase the problem. Issue paper 8.1 on page 11 shows the funding values of impacts for schools, including many new schools. With so many new schools needed and the corresponding increased support needed for their function, we the citizens are again on the line. We, the citizens of Clark County school districts, pay for the new school buildings including the interest on the bonds for new buildings. We also pay to supplement the WA State-funds to maintain the buildings and secure staff, supplies, heat etc. necessary for schools. Plus the increased buses, drivers and gas needed to collect the students scattered all over the rural area.**

**Thank you for accepting my comments for the record.**

**Sydney Reilsbick**

