



City of Stevenson

Planning Department

(509)427-5970

7121 E Loop Road, PO Box 371
Stevenson, Washington 98648

TO: Planning Commission
FROM: Ben Shumaker
DATE: June 14th, 2021
SUBJECT: Increasing Residential Building Capacity – Public Involvement

Introduction

This memo acts as a placeholder for the discussion of public involvement related to the potential zoning text and/or map changes being discussed. At the May 10th, 2021 meeting the Planning Commission appointed Commissioner Jeff Breckel to head a public involvement subcommittee. The subcommittee consists of:

- Mike Beck (Planning Commissioner)
- Jeff Breckel (Planning Commissioner)
- Phil Crawford (Resident/Property Owner)
- Tracy Gratto (Resident/Property Owner)
- Brian McNamara (Resident/Property Owner)
- Julie May (Resident/Property Owner)
- Rick May (Resident/Property Owner)
- Pat Rice (Resident/Property Owner)
- Ben Shumaker (City staff)

The subcommittee has met via a series of emails (Attachment) and held a face-to-face meeting on Friday, June 11th at 5:00pm. At the time of this writing, the meeting has not yet occurred.

Subcommittee Recommendation

Verbal reports from the subcommittee will occur at tonight's meeting. If a written report is produced it will be made available at this meeting as an addendum to this report

Prepared by,

Ben Shumaker
Community Development Director

Attachment

- Subcommittee Emails



Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Public Engagement Work Group

Jeff Breckel <jeff.breckel@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Thu, May 27, 2021 at 4:11 PM

To: Phillip E Crawford <pcrawford@turbonet.com>, Gratto Tracy <tracymgratto@gmail.com>, rick@mayandassociates.net, julie@creatingspirals.com, easylivingpat@gmail.com, bmcsurfs@yahoo.com, Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

At its meeting on May 10, the Stevenson Planning Commission discussed the need to broaden public engagement in its current review of the city's residential zoning. I volunteered to work with those of you at the meeting who expressed an interest to bring the Commission a plan to engage the public in the City's residential zoning review.

Key questions we'll focus on include:

- What should be the goals or expectations for a public engagement process?
- What are the questions, problems or issues for which we're seeking public input?
- Are public workshops the best vehicle for obtaining the public's input? If so, how do we promote, prepare for and organize workshops? Are there other methods we should consider?
- How can we help ensure that we engage a representative cross section of affected interests?
- What information does the public need to provide informed input and how do we make it clear and accessible?
- What role, if any, should the current draft zoning amendments play in the discussion?
- How do we let the public know how their input was used in preparing zoning recommendations?

I am writing to confirm your interest in working on this plan. I'd also like to know your preference for meeting times, afternoon or evening. Once I hear back from you, I'll work to set up a workable meeting time and location.

If you have any questions or thoughts about how we proceed in putting together a plan for the Commission's consideration, please let me know. And, thanks for volunteering to help move this conversation ahead.

Jeff Breckel



Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Public Engagement Work Group

Pat Rice <easylivingpat@gmail.com>

Fri, May 28, 2021 at 8:16 AM

To: Jeff Breckel <jeff.breckel@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Cc: Phillip E Crawford <pcrawford@turbonet.com>, Gratto Tracy <tracymgratto@gmail.com>, Rick May <rick@mayandassociates.net>, Julie May <julie@creatingspirals.com>, Pat Rice <easylivingpat@gmail.com>, bmcsurfs@yahoo.com, Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Hi Jeff,

Thank you for including me in this group. I can confirm that I am highly interested in being part of this group. As far as time goes, being retired, I am somewhat flexible as to when to meet....so, of course, *pick a time that works for everyone else and just let me know*. The more advance notice I have the better, as then if I have a scheduling conflict, this allows me time to change the time/date of my other commitment (*because this is very important and is a priority for me*).

Thank you for taking this on. And yes, I do have some thoughts " about how we proceed in putting together a plan for the Commission's consideration" and I promise to get these thoughts to you by next Tuesday, June 1st.

Take care, Pat Rice

[Quoted text hidden]



Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Public Engagement Work Group

Rick May <rick@mayandassociates.net>

Fri, May 28, 2021 at 10:37 AM

To: Jeff Breckel <jeff.breckel@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Cc: Phillip E Crawford <pcrawford@turbonet.com>, Gratto Tracy <tracymgratto@gmail.com>, Julie May <julie@creatingspirals.com>, Pat Rice <easylivingpat@gmail.com>, bmcsurfs@yahoo.com, Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, "scott.anderson@ci.stevenson.wa.us" <scott.anderson@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, Robert Muth <robert.muth@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, Amy Weissfeld <amy.weissfeld@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, Paul Hendricks <paul.hendricks@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, "annie.mchale@ci.stevenson.wa.us" <annie.mchale@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, Dave Cox <dave.cox@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, David Ray <david.ray@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, Mike Beck <mike.beck@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, Valerie Hoy <valerie.hoy@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, Auguste Zettler <auguste.zettler@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Hello Jeff,

Thank you for the efforts to broaden public engagement. It is appreciated. I am available to meet at your convenience. As for the zoning change, for an increasing number of the folks in Stevenson, there are fundamental problems at play here. These issues include:

(1) The 2020 Housing Needs Analysis specifically stated the "Complete sewer and water master plan update before allowing major zoning changes." Why was the recommendation ignored? Why is this zoning change being proposed before this update?

(2) Why has there been a lack of discussions on how sewer will be economically brought to the areas where sewer hookup will be required by the zoning change?

(3) Why has there been a lack of adequate discussions or studies concerning the negative social and economic impact from the proposed zoning changes?

(4) Why has there been a lack of discussions and implementation on the recommendations from the 2020 Housing Needs Analysis, which will create significantly more density as compared to the proposed zoning change?

(5) Information from Planning was supplied to the public concerning such items as projected need and a lack of available land that do not match the facts from the Housing Needs Analysis and Johnson Economics Report. Planning used quotes from the 2020 Housing Study to support zoning changes, but did not provide information and statistics that clearly states another conclusion. Why was this information supplied and not corrected? Why is the zoning change being proposed when the facts do not show a need?

(6) Why has there been a lack of discussions of other methods which would substantially increase the available developable land in Stevenson without an unpopular zoning change? These include eliminating process barriers in the code, decreasing building setback requirements, decreasing setbacks for seasonal streams that flow only during rainy periods, allowing increased use of shared driveways and increasing allowable ADU units.

The Planning Commission makes good decisions when fully and accurately informed. In reality, we are dealing with larger issues than a zoning change here. We are dealing with issues of transparency, public response, reliability of information and adequate vetting of the issues. Again thank you for your efforts. I am at your disposal to discuss any issues.

Rick May
503-341-2932

On Thu, May 27, 2021 at 4:11 PM Jeff Breckel <jeff.breckel@ci.stevenson.wa.us> wrote:

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Rick May
Rick@mayandassociates.net
503-341-2932



Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

More ideas

Phillip E Crawford <pcrawford@turbonet.com>

Fri, May 28, 2021 at 4:18 PM

To: Breckel Jeff <jeff.breckel@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Cc: Gratto Tracy <tracymgratto@gmail.com>, May Rick <rick@mayandassociates.net>, May Julie <julie@creatingspirals.com>, Rice Pat <easylivingpat@gmail.com>, bmcsurfs@yahoo.com, Shumaker Ben <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Jeff-

You probably opened the door too far, at least for me, when you asked for ideas. But here's some more stuff related to public involvement.

Another thought to post on the wall as we look forward to meeting and generating ideas: we will likely need some funding (e.g., for gathering information and workshops) unless we want to do all the work ourselves (I don't). I think Ben mentioned some public engagement money might be part of the grant he is administering in support of the rezone. Further, the city has allocated \$4,500 for a contractor to conduct a diversity workshop so it might not be unreasonable to request funds if we need them.

2 attachments

 **Public Involvement Ideas for City.pdf**
45K

 **Stevenson Taskforce.pdf**
66K

Public Involvement Ideas for City of Stevenson

Communication with the community.

The city needs to begin building the case for change at the outset when facing a major problem or change that is likely to be important to the larger citizenry or to any substantial group of people. The problems needs to be stated in lay terms understandable to everyone. This is the first step in building support. Unfortunately, the usual way these things play out is the public does not hear much until the solution is presented, e.g., zoning change or huge new water/sewer bills

How can this be done?

Newspaper, online, newsletter, community groups and organizations, neighborhood associations (not yet created), stakeholder groups. After the problem is identified, periodic updates must continue.

It is critical to tailor information and involvement to the audience —generally simple, brief, and how the problem and solution relate to them. Much of what the city puts out is city government centric, not citizen centric. It's about what the city is doing to solve it's problems, not what the city is doing to solve the citizens' problems.

Another way to think about this is that city should begin by selling the importance of a problem to be solved not an action to be taken. If people are convinced there is a legitimate problem, especially one important them or their town, implementation of a solution by the city will go much more smoothly.

Procedural Justice

Often the people most affected by city decisions are the least likely to be directly involved in the developing those decisions. Current examples are increasing utility rates and zoning changes. What is involved here is something Indiana University Professor, Sanya Carley, calls *procedural justice*. Approaching decision making from a procedural justice perspective requires a “bottoms up” approach that involves stakeholders in an authentic way at the earliest stages of proposed changes, commonly by identifying an important problem facing the community. This approach paves the way for eventual consensus prior to implementation. Finding consensus after the decision has been made, or even somewhere along the way, is less likely to succeed and is much more difficult.

In Stevenson the proposed rezoning of a significant part of the town is an example where procedural justice was not applied. The process began with a study commissioned by non-elected people. The contractor who did the study involved a very limited group of stakeholders, primarily business, development, and government representatives. The city translated study recommendations directly into up-zoning a large area of single family residences as well as changes in the zoning code. The public at large, especially the residential property owners, were not invited to participate as stakeholders. Hence, this was not a bottoms up approach for a large

part of the stakeholders who would ultimately be affected by decisions that came directly from the results of the study.

The outcome? The city received negative responses, ranging from confusion to outright opposition. It is easy to attribute these kinds of negative responses to NIMBY behavior. However, Carley says, “There's this derogatory undertone of the concept of NIMBYism that suggests that people are somehow irrational. Like if it's near them, then they all of a sudden don't like it. But we find that it's not irrational at all.” What is actually happening is people are concerned about things that are very important to them. “It's the value of their environment. It's the value of their home and what it means to them, what it means to them culturally, what it means to them historically. Once we account for all these things, that irrational concept of NIMBYism just completely disappears,” Carley says.

Task Force Expectations

What can we expect to accomplish? What is our charter? Based on the results of the May commission meeting, it seems part of our task is to determine this for ourselves.

Our task seems to have two related parts.

1. What to do about the rezoning proposal in terms of public involvement.
2. Develop a broad public involvement proposal.

The first question for the rezone initiative is what do we expect to come out of a public involvement effort? What can participants expect as a result of their involvement? Are we asking them to contribute to solving a problem (also not yet defined adequately) or simply receive information about a plan that is complete or nearly complete. The options could range from:

- a. Continue as proposed in the latest draft from the city.
- b. Modify — many options here.
- c. Propose ways to meet needs with current zoning and ordinances
- d. Postpone work until COVID improvements allow better participation
- d. Make no changes. Allow things to continue as they have been.

One way to approach our task is to think about it as if we were a busy, unaware property owner who suddenly heard a rumor about an up-zone of the neighborhood. If I were that property owner what would I like to know and how would I want to express my concerns to the city or otherwise be involved?

The kind of broader public involvement process we propose may depend somewhat on the choices we make regarding the rezone initiative. Is the rezone possibly a starting point leading to the initiation of a broader program? Might consider raising the question there and recruiting interested people, assuming we get good participation and people are positive about the results.

Zoning Issue.

Scope of our task.

How do we approach the zoning issue with the public?

What we propose may depend largely on how we describe the problem.

Do we start with a problem/need question? Just exactly what is the problem? Who has the problem? Is there a problem for property owner/residents, renters, employers? Is it the same for everyone? Or is this primarily a problem for businesses and the low-wage employees who can't afford housing in the current market? Does the city have a problem with infrastructure costs? Are most property owners likely to benefit, or are they being asked to take risks and make sacrifices for the good of others, such as businesses and their low income workers?

Do we start with the assumption the problem is already defined by the studies the city has relied on to initiate the zoning change? Does the task then become selling the zoning proposal? Or modifying it? How much modification is on the table?

Can the needs identified in the studies be met with something different from the zoning changes proposed by the city? How far should we pursue that option?

How reliable are the results and recommendations of the studies? Who commissioned them and why did they do it? What was the stakeholder involvement? Are we saying deficiencies in the studies can be rectified by public involvement?

What is the relationship between the zoning initiative and the sewer problem facing the city? Will water, transportation, and other infrastructure needs become a problem soon?

Is the zoning initiative congruent with the comprehensive plan? Does the comp plan need to be updated to reflect the assumptions and conclusions of the studies relied on by the city for the rezoning initiative.

How will proposed changes affect existing qualities and property values?

Will the proposed up-zoning change property values? In what way and how soon?

Will any changes in property values be offset by other effects of the zoning change, i.e., is this a trade-off situation for property owners?

How will the up-zoning change quality of life factors such as who lives in various parts of town (more grouping of similar incomes, less diverse neighborhoods, etc.), open/green space, housing density, noise, parking, traffic, appearance, sense of community?

Current inventory of buildable property.

Does the city have an inventory of property available for construction of affordable housing? Does this inventory identify properties zoned for affordable housing, but not served with utilities? Are these properties mapped so that decision makers and citizens can better understand their relationships among variables such as schools and quality of life values? Does the inventory provide any information as to the suitability or practicality for builder/investors to construct affordable housing? For example, are some parcels too steep or unstable to be developed at reasonable cost?

How does the inventory match up with demand/need projections? How solid are these numbers? Rick May has worked on this.

Cost of housing. The city has taken the position in proposing the zoning change that it has an obligation to provide or promote more affordable housing.

What is the city's definition of affordable housing?

What are the main factors determining the availability of affordable housing?

Is it the city, the free market, business community, state, something else, or a combination of things that should be responsible for providing affordable housing? How big is the city's responsibility in the mix? Should more responsibility be focused elsewhere?

If a part of the population cannot afford adequate housing, is that due to income disparity rather than cost/availability of housing?

If the business community is concerned about lack of housing for the workforce it wants, does it have an obligation to do more than promote rezoning of residential properties? Is it reasonable to expect the community to provide housing for employees paid so little they cannot afford normal housing options? Could businesses offer a commuting or housing stipend to help solve this problem? It seems to be commonly accepted that a large portion of the working people of the county commute outside the county to work and apparently do so willingly rather than move closer to the job. What about the reverse? Is the difference due mostly to income disparity?

Can the city effectively influence the availability of affordable housing by changing zoning or other factors over which it has control?

Meeting the need. The city indicates that zoning classification and other requirements of the zoning ordinance are impediments to providing needed affordable housing both now and in the future. What evidence is there to support that position? Many factors influence the availability of housing, among them availability of land with necessary infrastructure, availability of builders willing and able to build what is needed, cost of construction, availability of funding for construction, wage rates, job availability and characteristics, cost and availability of utilities and other services, enough buyers/renters able to pay, etc. What part does the city play in influencing these to the extent it would make any difference? Is availability of suitable land a significant barrier to providing affordable housing both now and in the future? Has the city developed an inventory of currently available property and matched that with demand? Do potential builders say shortage of property is a significant deterrent to construction?

Growth. The results and recommendations of the studies, especially the EDC study, are about growth and what Stevenson and other Skamania County communities should do to accommodate it. Because these studies seem to be the single most important driver of the zoning changes, it might be worthwhile to identify the assumptions underlying these studies. For example, the studies focused heavily on meeting housing needs, but were silent on meeting quality of life factors. Should we review some of the common assumptions about growth such as: a) growth is inevitable, so just accept it; b) if you aren't growing you are dying; c) excessive growth is the realm of cancer; d) the free market should be allowed to control growth; e) government creates barriers to the free market; f) the role of planning should be to remove barriers to development or conversely, the role of planning is to manage growth based on public values g) property rights trump all other factors; h) growth increases the tax base so we all benefit; i) growth is an essential part of economic development; j) stable state economics is a myth, j) growth reduces the cost of services. Of course, many of these assumptions are either outright wrong or open to debate, but they often guide important decisions.

To what degree are citizens of Stevenson obligated to accommodate growth? Does it matter if this growth is being driven primarily by external forces, e.g., regional demand? Or by local businesses that hope to benefit directly from it? What is the role of zoning in controlling/managing growth? Should current residents be expected to sacrifice quality of life values to accommodate growth? How will growth affect quality of life factors? Does growth degrade or enhance the reasons most people give for choosing Stevenson as a place to live? What happens to these values if we do not accommodate the proposed growth? Again, the studies are silent on these matters.

Importance of public involvement. What will happen if the city adopts the rezone without additional public involvement? Is the city willing to scrap the project or significantly modify it if the public tells them that's what it wants? How far is the city willing to go to assure that the public accepts the changes it deems necessary? Just how high a value does the city put on public good will? Does it see building good will now as important for solving future problems such as water and transportation infrastructure?

Does the city see citizens as an untapped resource base or an impediment or distraction to carrying out the work they feel obligated to do?

Broader Public Involvement Initiative.

Our task is to determine the value and potential for a broad based public involvement program and to present one or more models that would be feasible for Stevenson.

A new public involvement program could apply to only the planning commission or could apply to city government as a whole. Yes or no?

The program needs to be citizen centric, not government centric. Think of it as the city operates at the will of the citizens, not the other way around. That requires a mechanism for knowing what the citizens want.

A citizen involvement program should be a permanent part of the administrative process so that it is always in operation rather than something that has to be cranked up or reinvented each time a problem or issue arises. That is, it should be something that both city government and citizens can use as a reliable, convenient, and low cost way for engagement. Does this mean that the current form of city government, assumed to be representative government, is not adequate or is not functioning as well as it could?

How satisfied are people with how things work now? Would it be worthwhile to go through a sensing process with citizens and city government people to find out?

Who in city government would be responsible to lead/manage a more robust citizen involvement program? Is the city prepared to do something like this? Has the time come for this to be necessary for the successful operation of the city?

What are some approaches/models we could consider for a comprehensive public involvement program?

1. Neighborhood based groups Portland has a long experience with neighborhood associations, and Tracy Gratto has much experience with their organization, structure, and function. This approach has many characteristics that seem to be appropriate in Stevenson. In order to be successful, this form of public involvement would need strong and continuing support from the city. What would be the minimum amount of support for a successful start? For example, are there already enough skilled people throughout the neighborhoods to get the process started? How long would it take to train additional people and who would do it? How formal would the structure have to be? Legal questions?

2. Enhanced relationship between city officials and their constituents. The current system appears to be somewhat passive in this regard. Are there ways to make it more active?

What about planning commission members? As appointed officials, are they even thought to have constituents? The current way meetings are conducted promotes citizen participation better than the more formal way the council conducts its meetings. However, both

situations are not the best for generating ideas, reducing barriers, and encouraging creative thought from the larger citizenry.

City council members and mayor? Do they perceive themselves as having defined, general, or any constituencies at all? Do they have any organized, proactive way to interact with citizens other than council meetings?

Is it reasonable/possible to expect any increased interaction of volunteer officials with their constituents given the additional time that might require? What are some ways to improve the process without unacceptable burdens on the volunteers?

3. Another model. Although used more often for conflict situations, an approach that uses key informants from the community can be effective for gathering ideas, developing solutions and arriving at consensus.

4. Community councils. Skamania County has some in operation, e.g., Underwood. Is this a useful model for Stevenson?

Activities for large group meeting.

a. Best and Worst

What are the best and worst outcomes if we do nothing? If we adopt the proposed zoning changes?

b. Many, many others.

Other things to consider. Procedural justice.

Physical arrangements for meetings. Most meeting room layouts favor an adversarial or power differential relationship and the usual process favors those with public speaking skills. Meeting agendas similarly impose limits that discourage public presentation, especially for those unable to prepare their comments in an efficient way to meet time limits. Meeting managers often invite guests to submit written testimony if they feel an oral presentation is not adequate. This favors those with writing skills. If the city truly wants to hear fully from all constituents, reducing these barriers could be helpful. An alternative is to have facilitated work sessions, designed to draw out and record contributions from all participants. Extending that intent could include seeking out and inviting people who would not ordinarily feel confident enough to participate in a formal meeting as currently conducted.

Phil Crawford
17 May 2021



Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

More ideas

Rick May <rick@mayandassociates.net>

Fri, May 28, 2021 at 10:52 PM

To: Phillip E Crawford <pcrawford@turbonet.com>

Cc: Breckel Jeff <jeff.breckel@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, Gratto Tracy <tracymgratto@gmail.com>, May Julie <julie@creatingspirals.com>, Rice Pat <easylivingpat@gmail.com>, bmcsurfs@yahoo.com, Shumaker Ben <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Wow Phil. That is the most well thought out and complete presentation of the issues I have seen. Thank you for the substantial time and efforts you took. Well done.

Rick May

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Rick May

Rick@mayandassociates.net

503-341-2932



Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

More ideas

Jeff Breckel <jeff.breckel@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Sat, May 29, 2021 at 11:14 AM

To: Phillip E Crawford <pcrawford@turbonet.com>

Cc: Gratto Tracy <tracymgratto@gmail.com>, May Rick <rick@mayandassociates.net>, May Julie <julie@creatingspirals.com>, Rice Pat <easylivingpat@gmail.com>, bmcsurfs@yahoo.com, Shumaker Ben <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Phil:
Thanks for sharing your thoughts. They will certainly help to frame the discussion when we meet. The folks who have responded seem to be fairly flexible with regard to meeting times. I'll try to get some options out next week after Ben gets back from some time off. I agree there will be a fair amount of work involved in preparing for and conducting workshops. Hopefully our little group will be able to develop a scope of work we can use to identify and request funding.

Thanks again for joining this endeavor.

Jeff

On Fri, May 28, 2021 at 4:19 PM Phillip E Crawford <pcrawford@turbonet.com> wrote:

[Quoted text hidden]



Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

More ideas

Julie f-May <julie@creatingspirals.com>

Sat, May 29, 2021 at 12:28 PM

To: Jeff Breckel <jeff.breckel@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Cc: "Julie@CreatingSpirals.com" <julie@creatingspirals.com>, "pcrawford@turbonet.com" <pcrawford@turbonet.com>, Tracy Gratto <tracymgratto@gmail.com>, Rice Pat <easylivingpat@gmail.com>, bmcsurfs@yahoo.com, Shumaker Ben <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, Rick May <rick@mayandassociates.net>

Hi Jeff~

My times that are not available are most Mondays and Weds. plus Saturday afternoons.

Open to most other times barring some appointments here and there and conference calls 12-1 every 2nd & 4th Tuesday.

Thanks for bringing this together~

~Julie

Julie -f- May

Cell: 503-201-9460

Julie@CreatingSpirals.com

~ connect & create ~

[Quoted text hidden]



Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

doodle poll ???

Tracy Gratto <tracymgratto@gmail.com>

Sat, May 29, 2021 at 6:51 PM

To: Rick May <rick@mayandassociates.net>, "to: Phillip E Crawford" <pcrawford@turbonet.com>, "cc: Breckel Jeff" <jeff.breckel@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, Gratto Tracy <tracymgratto@gmail.com>, May Julie <julie@creatingspirals.com>, Rice Pat <easylivingpat@gmail.com>, bmcsurfs@yahoo.com, Shumaker Ben <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Hi All, No once asked me to do this but sometimes it aids in getting a meeting together. I am open to other dates and approaches but thought I'd suggest this:

[doodle poll for scheduling](#)

I asked for 1.5 hours to see if we can accomplish as much as possible early on. If you can't make the entire meeting, pls still mark yes if you are comfortable attending part of the meeting.

--

Be well ~ Tracy

pronouns: she/her

phone: 503 702 9714



Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

doodle poll ???

Brian McNamara <bmcsurfs@yahoo.com>

Mon, May 31, 2021 at 11:42 AM

Reply-To: Brian McNamara <bmcsurfs@yahoo.com>

To: Tracy Gratto <tracymgratto@gmail.com>, Rick May <rick@mayandassociates.net>, "to: Phillip E Crawford" <pcrawford@turbonet.com>, "cc: Breckel Jeff" <jeff.breckel@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, May Julie <julie@creatingspirals.com>, Rice Pat <easylivingpat@gmail.com>, Shumaker Ben <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Hello to all,

As a local stakeholder in downtown Stevenson I have seen the city government move forward with unpopular zoning changes such as the recent "moratorium" aimed at increasing density in the "C1" area. The overwhelming majority of affected property owners were completely unaware of the City Council plan to make the 1 year moratorium permanent (Zoning Code Amendment: ZON2020-01). It took a grass roots effort to thwart that misguided zoning change and was only partially successful in retaining owners original property rights. We are almost exactly 1 year from that effort and we find ourselves facing another city government driven rezoning effort that few stakeholders understand and fewer want.

I hope the attached article solidifies our efforts to garner increased public engagement before the city government moves any further on rezoning issues. Strong city resident/neighborhood groups should have a seat at the table in the future. So when is the first meeting?

Best regards,

Brian McNamara

<https://www.king5.com/video/news/local/tacoma/residents-in-tacoma-push-back-on-plans-by-leadership-to-expand-housing/281-97b98c87-6998-4ba1-a88c-5bfeaff57ea3?jwsourc=em>

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

[Quoted text hidden]



Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

doodle poll ???

Jeff Breckel <jeff.breckel@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Mon, May 31, 2021 at 4:07 PM

To: Tracy Gratto <tracymgratto@gmail.com>

Cc: Rick May <rick@mayandassociates.net>, "to: Phillip E Crawford" <pcrawford@turbonet.com>, May Julie <julie@creatingspirals.com>, Rice Pat <easylivingpat@gmail.com>, bmcsurfs@yahoo.com, Shumaker Ben <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Tracy:

Your Doodle poll suggestion may well help us find a workable meeting time. Thanks for setting it up.

Jeff

[Quoted text hidden]



Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

doodle poll ???

Tracy Gratto <tracymgratto@gmail.com>

Mon, May 31, 2021 at 9:09 PM

To: Gratto Tracy <tracymgratto@gmail.com>, May Julie <julie@creatingspirals.com>, Rice Pat <easylivingpat@gmail.com>, Rick May <rick@mayandassociates.net>, Shumaker Ben <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, bmcsurfs@yahoo.com, "cc: Breckel Jeff" <jeff.breckel@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, "to: Phillip E Crawford" <pcrawford@turbonet.com>

I think many of us were on vacation so this isn't intended as a pushy nudge, but I do wonder if folks are comfortable replying by tomorrow afternoon or indicating if you are not intending to participate link for scheduling is below. I've got some plans pending on Friday but that looks like the winner so far!

So far we have Phil, Pat and Karen and Jeff.

Thanks all, Tracy

On Sat, May 29, 2021 at 6:51 PM Tracy Gratto <tracymgratto@gmail.com> wrote:

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]



Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Public Engagement Work Group Meeting - June 11

Jeff Breckel <jeff.breckel@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Fri, Jun 4, 2021 at 11:50 AM

To: Phillip E Crawford <pcrawford@turbonet.com>, Gatto Tracy <tracymgatto@gmail.com>, May Rick <rick@mayandassociates.net>, May Julie <julie@creatingspirals.com>, Pat Rice <easylivingpat@gmail.com>, bmcsurfs@yahoo.com, Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, Mike Beck <mike.beck@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Folks:

Thank you again for being willing to participate in our public engagement work group. Whether retired or working, I know you're all busy. I really appreciate that you're willing to give of your time to help us craft a process to more fully engage the public in shaping the future of our city. I want to thank Tracy Grotto for helping us to find a meeting time by putting together the Doodle poll. **Based on that poll, I'd like to schedule our group meeting for Friday, June 11 at City Hall from 5 to 6:30 pm.** I also want to thank Pat Rice for being willing to join us remotely while travelling.

I think our discussions are best served by meeting in person. We're a fairly small group and at City Hall we'll be able to maintain social distancing. If you feel more comfortable wearing a mask that's fine. Since we're setting up a remote link to allow Pat Rice to participate, you can opt to join remotely as well if you feel more comfortable doing so. You can find the Zoom link for the meeting below.

Our goal is to recommend to the Planning Commission a process to engage the public is the City's current review of its residential zoning. Through Ben's effort to solicit public input through questionnaires, we know that there is considerable interest in this issue. Our job is crafting a path to more fully engage the public and understand their interests and concerns. As I mentioned in my earlier email, I think we need to focus a several key questions, including:

- What should be the goals or expectations for a public engagement process?
- What are the questions, problems or issues for which we're seeking public input?
- Are public workshops the best vehicle for obtaining the public's input? If so, how do we promote, prepare for and organize workshops? Are there other methods we should consider?
- How can we help ensure that we engage a representative cross section of affected interests?
- What information does the public need to provide informed input and how do we make it clear and accessible?
- What role, if any, should the current draft zoning amendments play in the discussion?
- How do we let the public know how their input was used in preparing zoning recommendations?

I'm looking forward to our meeting, to hearing your ideas, and working together to shape our recommendation to the full Planning Commission. If you have any thoughts you'd like to share with me before the meeting, please email me or call me at 360-921-0955.

Once again, thanks for being willing to help.

Jeff Breckel

Ben Shumaker is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Topic: Public Involvement Work Group

Time: Jun 11, 2021 05:00 PM Pacific Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/6016331555?pwd=6DNHbUo3R051NWZlTlY2eU1FOUkz>

Meeting ID: 6016331555

Passcode: 076026

One tap mobile

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)

Dial by your location

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

+1 929 205 6099 US (New York)

+1 301 715 8592 US (Washington DC)

Meeting ID: 860 1633 1505

Passcode: 076020

Find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/kc8tYFXNVg>

Thank you,

[Redacted signature line]

[Redacted text]

[Redacted text]

[Redacted text]

[Redacted text]



Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Public Engagement Work Group Meeting - June 11

Brian McNamara <bmcsurfs@yahoo.com>

Fri, Jun 4, 2021 at 5:43 PM

Reply-To: Brian McNamara <bmcsurfs@yahoo.com>

To: Jeff Breckel <jeff.breckel@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, Phillip E Crawford <pcrawford@turbonet.com>, Gratto Tracy <tracymgratto@gmail.com>, May Rick <rick@mayandassociates.net>, May Julie <julie@creatingspirals.com>, Pat Rice <easylivingpat@gmail.com>, Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, Mike Beck <mike.beck@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Thanks Jeff,

See you there.

Best regards,

Brian

[Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android](#)

[Quoted text hidden]



Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Public Engagement Work Group Meeting - June 11

Rick May <rick@mayandassociates.net>

Sat, Jun 5, 2021 at 11:12 AM

To: Jeff Breckel <jeff.breckel@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Cc: Phillip E Crawford <pcrawford@turbonet.com>, Gratto Tracy <tracymgratto@gmail.com>, May Julie <julie@creatingspirals.com>, Pat Rice <easylivingpat@gmail.com>, Brian McNamara <bmcsurfs@yahoo.com>, Ben Shumaker <ben@ci.stevenson.wa.us>, Mike Beck <mike.beck@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

Hello Jeff,

Thank you for your efforts, it's appreciated. I will be along the MacKenzie River Friday afternoon and may have sketchy service. If I cannot call in Julie will speak for both of us. Thanks again. It is great to see this level of public outreach.

Rick May

503-341-2932

[Quoted text hidden]

--

Rick May

Rick@mayandassociates.net

503-341-2932