

**Schroader, Kathy**

---



**From:** Sydney Reisbick <reisbicks@comcast.net>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 25, 2016 4:54 PM  
**To:** Boldt, Marc  
**Cc:** Schroader, Kathy  
**Subject:** FOCC Input on Capital Facilities Plan  
**Attachments:** FOCC Capital Facilities Plan 5 25 2016.doc

All Thank you for considering our electronic input Sent before 5 pm Wed 4/25/16  
Kathy This is input on a second topic

---

To: Board of Clark County Council, Honorable Marc Boldt, Chairman  
Clark County Planning Commission, Mr Steve Morasch Chair  
Dr Oliver Orjiako, Director of Community Planning  
From: Friends of Clark County  
Date May 25, 2016  
RE: Questions and Comments for Consideration on the 2016 Capital Facilities  
Plan For the Record

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 general sources of funds to pay for the infrastructure for 20 years, and show that it **can** pay for the first 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, 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 for this number of new residents may not be affordable to the citizen payers of property taxes, utility rates and interest on bonds, which include – all the citizens of Clark County. Note that renters also pay property taxes indirectly. The three examples that we will site include transportation, fire protection and schools.

**Transportation:**

Roads The 20-year Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) includes 26 projects outside of (after) the first 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 new roads are \$850,000,000.00 (\$850 million) after the first 6 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 costs for the 2007 Comprehensive Plan were about 13 million dollars. For the current plan, the estimate for serving the rural population expansion all over the rural area is about \$37 million. That is \$24 million new to the general fund and property tax. Figure that law enforcement will be similarly stretched, but their equipment and stations are less expensive, if you take out the need for a new/expanded 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 for urban-based schools. Issue paper 8.1 on page 11 shows the funding values of impacts for schools. Testimony for 5/24 from school representatives presented the large needs for the school districts for new/expanded 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

**Finally:**

There are sections of both the FEIS and the Capital Facilities Plan that either fail to supply estimates for the full 20 years (Stormwater) or completely leave out relevant documentation that has been submitted for the record (water)

**Water** In both the FEIS and the Capital Facilities Plan, water availability is presented and considered only for public water Rural wells in general are missing in both The studies by the State EPA presented by Dennis Dykes are missing These show north county ground water is critically low, so that an increase in private rural wells will result in loss of water in some current wells. This study, which is in the record (and which Val is resubmitting), should be considered It shows that there is not enough north county groundwater capacity for the 2007 plan, let alone the population increase created by the rural rezones in the Preferred Alternative. This is one issue on which the plan favors one group of rural landowners over another, because taking of water rights is a major taking.

**Questions.**

Will all of the infrastructure suffer if we cannot get this Plan in on time? Will both suffer if we submit a Plan that is not compliant with GMA and/or not concurrent with its Capital Facilities Plan?

Is the result of this rural expansion that both rural and urban Clark County citizens have to choose between being underserved or overtaxed?

This whole estimate of parcels seems to be based only on new parcels Are there enough already available to accommodate the estimated increase in population without dividing parcels to create new parcels? What is the count of total parcels available in the rural area? How many have derived from the over 30,000 acres thrown out by Judge Poyfair and declared rural by The BOCC of that time? Most of these immediately divided to help form the small lots that today impede function on resource lands Is there an inventory of unused parcels that are already available?

**Clark County Parks** are assumed to be citizen maintained in unincorporated areas. Thus, the county presents a low cost estimate and lists general sources without an amount from each source to compare to the estimated cost. The Capital Facilities Plan simply declares them adequate. There is no mention of using the levy we voted for maintenance of parks. But perhaps that would remind us that citizens are already paying for parks maintenance and should not have to do it ourselves. Why is there no mention under Roads that they are being paid for with the park maintenance levy?

The **Stormwater** section of the CFP is especially deficient. Under the "show how you will pay for it for 1<sup>st</sup> 6 years", it basically says that "the developers will do it". Under the 20-year estimate it says 6 years. There is no money for monitoring or oversight during construction of the structures, monitoring the water quality or quantity, or repairing deficient structures. Is it naive to say the developers will do it without oversight and monitoring? Or that they will voluntarily build systems, monitor them and repair or re-engineer systems that fail?

### **Roads**

Yet the estimated costs have been pruned from almost 1 billion dollars to just over \$500,000 00. That does not fund even the 2007 plan. Ask Community Planning what road projects were removed from the Transportation Capital Facilities Plan. Ask what effects these will have on concurrency for the areas served. Does the county depend on lower service criteria, such as long waits at intersections, when they cut these projects for the current plan? What will be the effect of keeping the lowered estimate of costs when the expected population increase in the rural areas arrives?

**Transit** There is no planning for multimodal transit in the CFP. What will you propose to replace the multi-modal transit part to make county rural transit concurrent with rural population estimates? Will you bring roads and transit into concurrence with funding of the Capital Facilities plan?