

Pacific Groundwater Group submitting for KCWD 90

Please indicate main role.

Hydrogeologist

Do you work in Eastern or Western Washington?

Western Washington

Is your work primarily in an urban or a rural area?

Both

Are you interested in the guidance from a:

Statewide perspective

How familiar are you with the groundwater protection requirements of the Growth Management Act?

Somewhat Familiar

Does your county or city employ a hydrogeologist or other groundwater professional?

Not sure

Does your county or city map Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas?

Yes

Please share any concerns or opinions about the Guidance revision - What would you like to see changed or added? To provide more detailed answers, please use this excel [spreadsheet](#).

Attached comments provided on behalf of King County Water District 90.

(Did you know your upload feature doesn't include .xls files as an accepted option? This seems an odd choice when providing an excel spreadsheet as a tool to offer responses...)

Question Number	Topic	Question	Answer
1	Challenges	Have you encountered issues complying with the Growth Management Act for Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas? If yes, what would you consider the top three to be?	KCWD 90 has one site of concern as there is an asphalt batch plant located within the wellhead protection area for its main wellfield. While low risk due to only indirect pathways for contamination, the District believes that the CARA requirements are not firm enough regarding allowing potential contaminant sources within sensitive areas.
2	Best Available Science	What are the challenges your jurisdiction faces for including Best Available Science for designating and protecting Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas. What would help?	The watershed could benefit by new groundwater-surfacewater modeling. There are no recent basin-level studies of the water resources in WRIA 9.
3	Permit Process	How could the guidance help with the review and approval process?	
4	Mapping	Does your jurisdiction map Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas? If not, what does your jurisdiction need to map them?	no. rely on King County
5	Data Resources	What data resources would be helpful to you?	
6	Implementation	How does your jurisdiction address groundwater protection beyond building permits?	N/A
7	Implementation	What are the challenges you see with respect to implementation?	KCWD 90 is a thrid-party in respect to CARA definition and implementation, so their challenges relate to communicating locations of concerns and levels of risk from local land use to the County and hoping for adequate response.
8	Implementation	What would you like to see addressed in the guidance revision with respect to implementation?	
9	Cross-jurisdiction	If your jurisdiction has a well or a well protection area in another jurisdiction, what has been your experience with dealing with challenges and solutions for the associated Critical Aquifer Recharge Area protection?	N/A
10	Funding	Please describe how your groundwater protection efforts are funded. If you do not have sufficient funding, please feel free to state what your funding needs are in order to meet the requirements of the Growth Management Act for Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas.	All efforts are included as part of the the District's Group A water system planning requirements under the Department of Health. Additional efforts beyong this are difficult to undertake due to costs.
11	Long Range Plans	When developing, or amending, long range plans does your jurisdiction consider the long term availability or protection of groundwater?	Only as related to 10, above.
12	Long Range Plans	Anything you would like to say about long range plans for the long term availability or protection of groundwater?	See 2 above.
13	General	Please share any other concerns or opinions about the Guidance revision – What would you like to see changed or added?	