

At the second Scatter Creek Aquifer Project Community Workshop, held on April 23, 2014, residents were asked to provide their comments about the best outcomes for the project. We received 15 forms which are tallied below. The Citizen's Committee considered this input as they developed recommendations.

1. Are the projected future conditions something that needs to be addressed?

67% Yes 20% No 13% Not sure

Through future monitoring

2. What issues, ideas, or options should the committee consider when developing recommendations?

- Costs
- Best methods to protect the aquifer
- Funding since we are in a low income area
- Population growth: up or down
- Possible contaminants
- Usages
- How our town/area interacts with others
- Sewer and water should be considered when going into problem areas. Costs are cheaper in the long run.
- Clean up problem areas first, i.e. those areas that have contaminated areas. High population areas should be done first
- My proposal is that the Scatter Creek should be fenced in so that all the animals can not go in the creek. The water should be kept clean – not allow the animals to relieve themselves.
- No one can predict the future or weather. None of your studies were convincing or overwhelming done with proof that we have a severe problem.
- Reduce the number of units per acre. Make it 1 unit per 5 acres to reduce septic and protect ag.
- Drug content monitoring and projections
- Is there an effect from increasing use of treated wood in decks collecting chemicals in water system?
- Limiting development (housing)
- Consider septic treatment plant for wider area
- Encourage organic farming/agriculture
- Preserve open space for recreation
- County should institute stricter lot size in the future for well/septic – at least 1/ acre. More information needs to be made available thru meetings like this one i.e septic upgrades, change in lawn care, farming, etc. Individuals need guidance from committee and education.
- Look at wells having problems for specific issues at that site.

- The rural/ag environment that drew many of us to this area seems doomed to dense housing as platted lands show. As stated, the soil types here and relatively high water levels cannot absorb the probable densities. So, it seems that this area will need to go off wells and onto a public water system. This will be expensive and drive up property taxes – as would city sewer if it came to that. These increases could make the lower cost of housing that is now attractive will go away and potentially send current residents out of the area. Try to keep a balance of development and rural/ag.
- It appears like the past actions have provided more than adequate protection. It is apparent that no further action is needed except possible continued monitoring.
- Livestock grazing & effects on groundwater

3. The best outcome will...

- Protect the aquifer, develop immediate and long range actions to ensure that expensive water treatment plants are never needed.
- Less regulation
- That we will have enough and quality water for all now and in the future.
- ...be if you can get grants to help pay the costs of change.
- Keep monitoring as you are doing!! Best thing to do!
- Limit development to 5 acre parcels. No mass development apartment housing projects.
- Do not overreact! Remember this is America!
- Check septic systems! New technology
- Keep people healthy in spite of how long they live.
- Be clean, clear water free from contamination by bacteria, harmful chemicals, and pesticides.
- Water that is drinkable and safe.
- Preserve rural/ag lifestyle with some controlled growth of small lot homes. Public water system(s) at some time in the future, but delay sewer systems as long as possible – too expensive and where's it going to go if not back into our land as is happening with Tenino's sewage treatment system.
- Keep a watchful eye on where people drill wells, not stop development. The Tenino Wastewater adds half of the projected nitrates = nothing you can do about that. Even at worst the levels were not alarming.
- Be to monitor wells in the area periodically.

Recommendations should err on the side of:					
Caution					Reaction
1	2	3	4	5	6
(14%)	(29%)	(14%)	(7%)	(7%)	(7%)

Note: Staff is not sure if folks were consistently applying the same meaning to the continuum scale. Use results of this scale with caution.