

**Schroader, Kathy**

---



**From:** Tilton, Rebecca  
**Sent:** Friday, October 02, 2015 10:19 AM  
**To:** Orjiako, Oliver, Schroader, Kathy  
**Subject:** Comments RE: Comp Plan Update (9/29/15 BOCC Hearing)  
**Attachments:** Carol Levanen\_09-22-15 pdf, Susan Rasmussen\_09-22-15 pdf

Hello,

The attached written testimony was received from Carol Levanan and Susan Rasmussen during the public comment portion of the 9/29/15 BOCC hearing.

Thank you,  
Rebecca

Rebecca Tilton, Clerk of the Council  
Board of County Councilors  
1300 Franklin Street  
PO Box 5000  
Vancouver, WA 98666-5000  
PHONE 360-397-2232, ext 4305 | E-MAIL: [Rebecca.Tilton@clark.wa.gov](mailto:Rebecca.Tilton@clark.wa.gov)

cc'd - BOCC  
Silliman  
Orliako  
Schroeder  
Tue, Sep 29 8:34 AM

susan rasmussen

to jeanne.stewart@clark.wa.gov, tom.mielke@clark.wa.gov, david.madore@clark.wa.gov  
cc Carol Levanen; Jim Malinowski

Fw: Social Impacts need consideration

*Testimony for the Record, 2016 DEIS Comp Plan Update*

Sent from Windows Mail

**From:** susan rasmussen

**Sent:** Tuesday, September 29, 2015 8:20 AM

**To:** susan rasmussen

We have now lived over 20 years with the results of the County's comprehensive plan. The County decision makers, should have an understanding of the various social and economic consequences of the present plan prior to voting Oct. 20. A Social and Economic Impact Statement has never been integrated into the planning decisions of Clark County. Without question, various harmful impacts that make changes to social and economic well-being to rural communities have occurred as a result of the present plan. I'm asking this sitting Board of Clark County Councilors to be the first Board to recognize these impacts, assess them, and mitigate with actions to resolve many of them in this update of the county's comp. plan. I'm asking you to recognize the humanity.

Bear in mind, certain groups have been very active with input into the planning process since 1992. The rural communities and landowners who are equally or disproportionately impacted by the land use zoning changes, have been less vocal in expressing their concerns. In situations where disempowered communities are impacted by changes, it is important to make a concerted effort to involve them in the processes. This ensures a good & legal public participation process...a required element under GMA.

Recognizing social and economic impacts help to forecast negative impacts. When they are identified, ways to mitigate the adverse impacts also should be identified. Mitigation of social and economic impacts may include efforts to avoid an impact, modify an action, or reduce the impacts altogether through redesign of zoning policies. Across the state, you see where other Counties have implemented efforts to mitigate an overburdened population by grandfathering previous zoning and policies for that community...enabling options.

The rural communities, the landowners in particular, have never been given stakeholder status; yet they have carried the major burdens associated with the present plan. The level of effort devoted to mitigate the various social and economic impacts should be commensurate with the degree of loss this community has suffered. During the public hearings with the Planning Commission, a lead planner referenced, "our partners, the cities." Once again, an exclusive policy was employed, and the rural citizens were exempted during these proceedings.

include a scoping plan:

- Number of people of the community negatively impacted
- Duration of impacts (long-term; & short term)
- Relevance to present and future policy decisions
- Presence of controversy over issues (the County's plan was the most contested)

*mat similar to  
power loss  
to next  
functions  
of values*

- Estimates of future foregone conclusions; Determine what options would be given up irrevocably as a result of a policy or a plan (impacts on legacy farms, properties)

Analyze Impact Equity---identifies who will win and who will lose

- Recognize vulnerability of under-represented groups
- Impacts should be specific to affected groups and not just measured in general populations
- Recognize that no category of a community (age, gender, ethnicity, rural, urban, occupational) should have to bear the brunt of adverse social and economic impacts
- There is a duty to identify those adverse impacts and ensure they get lost in the overall population mix. It is essential that broad-based public involvement occur.
- What has surfaced the past 20 years?
  - Fragmentation of families
  - Forced generational migration of younger generations
  - Dangers of limiting resource-based economies
    - Directly effects the tax base for our schools
    - Rural well-being
    - Creates a brain-drain of our talented youth
    - Devalues properties
    - Degrades traditional rural culture and lifestyles
    - Downfall of legacy farms
    - Insecure real estate values..our major assets were depleted
    - Little diversity in lifestyle choices

This sitting Board has an opportunity to mitigate these impacts by weaving in elements of policy and land use design that incorporates a healthy respect for rural culture. Recognize what is important to this community, and what would enhance their quality of life.

There is a bigger issue of concern than the draft SEIS. The rural communities, the landowners have born a hefty expense for the present plan. I'm asking this sitting Board, on behalf of our 6,000 members, to recognize this, mitigate for it..recognize the human consequences.

Thank you for your considerations,  
Susan Kasmussen for Clark County Citizens United, Inc.

*Susan Kasmussen*  
Sent from Windows Mail