

---

**Fw: Public Comment – Sewer Ordinance Discussion**

---

**From** Jenny Taylor <jenny.taylor@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

**Date** Tue 3/17/2026 3:00 PM

**To** Daniel Pitariu <daniel@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

---

**From:** Pat Rice <pat.rice2056@gmail.com>

**Sent:** Tuesday, March 17, 2026 2:41 PM

**To:** City Council <citycouncil@ci.stevenson.wa.us>

**Subject:** Public Comment – Sewer Ordinance Discussion

Some people who received this message don't often get email from pat.rice2056@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

Members of the Council,

I am unable to attend Thursday's meeting but wanted to offer a brief comment regarding the discussion of the sewer extension ordinance affecting properties with functioning septic systems. Before homeowners are required to incur substantial costs to connect to the sewer system, it would be helpful for the public to understand the policy basis for the requirement. As someone who served on the Council during earlier discussions of this issue, I believe additional public clarification of the policy rationale would be helpful for residents. In particular, three questions seem important:

1. What specific public health or environmental issue is being addressed?

If there are documented septic failures, groundwater concerns, or regulatory requirements that make immediate connection necessary, it would be helpful to present that information clearly. If such findings exist, I would respectfully ask that they be identified in the record so residents can review the basis for the policy.

2. What financial analysis supports the policy?

If expanding the sewer customer base is necessary for long-term system sustainability, the public would benefit from seeing the cost-recovery analysis and understanding why this particular group of properties was selected.

3. Why was a mandatory connection requirement adopted as the primary approach, rather than alternatives used by many communities?

In some areas, septic systems are allowed to remain in use until failure, redevelopment, or property sale. Clarifying why those alternatives were not used here would help residents understand the reasoning behind the ordinance.

Given that the twenty-five property owners are directly affected by the ordinance, it may be helpful for the City to ensure those residents have had a clear opportunity to understand the proposal and provide input. At minimum, outreach or a dedicated discussion with the affected property owners could help ensure the Council receives complete information about the financial and practical impacts before making any further decisions.

For that reason, I would encourage the Council to focus Thursday's discussion on information gathering and clarification before taking any final action, so affected property owners have a meaningful opportunity to participate.

These questions are not intended to argue for or against sewer expansion. Rather, they are intended to encourage clear explanation of the policy rationale so residents can understand how the decision aligns with public health, environmental protection, and fairness.

Thank you for your consideration.

Pat Rice