

**STEVENSON PLANNING COMMISSION  
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES  
Wednesday, March 11, 2020  
6:00 PM**

**Attending**

**Staff: City Administrator Leana Kinley, Public Works Director Karl Russell, Community Development Director Ben Shumaker**

**Planning Commissioners: Chair Valerie Hoy-Rhodehamel, Mike Beck, Auguste Zettler, Jeff Breckel**

**Public audience member: Mary Repar**

**Chair Valerie Hoy-Rhodehamel called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.**

**Preliminary Matters**

- 1. Chair Hoy-Rhodehamel selected Public Comment Option #2**
- 2. Public Comment Period** (For items not located elsewhere on the agenda)  
No comments received.

**Business**

**Ben Shumaker**, Community Development Director briefly explained the purpose of meeting to Commissioners. It is intended to help prepare Commissioners and public to discuss the Comprehensive Plan Amendment proposal at the upcoming public hearing scheduled for April 13th. The format of this meeting is intended to allow questions/answers so the public hearing can focus on public input.

He directed everyone to the agenda, a staff report with information on the Biennial Comprehensive Plan Amendment and the following website containing information on Capital Facilities Planning: [https://deptofcommerce.app.box.com/cap\\_facilities\\_planning\\_info](https://deptofcommerce.app.box.com/cap_facilities_planning_info). He then turned the meeting over to City Administrator Leana Kinley.

**Kinley** described how during a Stevenson City Council Strategic Planning session the need to identify and synchronize the projects the City had scheduled became apparent. In order to better coordinate the work and reduce costs, the Council determined a Capital Facilities Plan was necessary.

The purpose is to align needed funds, work and improvements to the city's water system, transportation networks (roads/streets), and waste water/sewer infrastructure. In addition, a CFP would include planning to address future construction and repair needs of city buildings in order to begin setting aside funds for the projects.

**Kinley** commented that Council members referred to the idea as a "well, duh!" plan in that it was seen to be common sense to organize and prioritize projects.

Commissioners and staff then engaged in a substantial discussion regarding the details and intent of the CFP. During the discussion Mary Repar commented that planning for reduced growth was important to keep in mind when determining future revenue. She also noted the population of Stevenson was aging and often on fixed incomes.

Commissioners considered a number of topics, including growth projections for Stevenson and the surrounding area, population changes, utility rates, revenue forecasts and reserve sustainability, telecommunications/broadband, business development, and increasing public knowledge of city work projects. One concern expressed was getting residents to care about and understand the cost of maintaining or upgrading aging infrastructure in order to continue providing city services. **Beck** advised having Public Works look into incorporating a program known as PASER to evaluate street/road pavement conditions.

**Shumaker** asked for community engagement strategies for the Capital Facilities Plan. He asked the Commissioners if they felt Biennial Comprehensive Amendments made by private business would be addressed differently than City initiated amendments and no concerns were expressed.

A suggestion was made to change the order of several items in the plan (place 8B before 8A). Mary Repar recalled the large amount of public participation when the initial Comprehensive Plan was created. She stated the Capital Facilities Plan affects city residents in many ways and encouraged the PC to make it robust through community input.

**Zettler** pointed out that recent issues with local residents were a result of misconceptions and misinformation. He suggested creating a series of flyers to insert into local water bills to help residents understand the cost of providing clean, healthy water to their household. **Breckel and Hoy-Rhodehamel** agreed, noting recent rate increases were contentious, even though rates had been extremely low in the past. **Kinley** commented a city newsletter was being finalized and would be mailed soon.

**Beck** suggested attracting public interest and input by placing maps in the local paper and/or having pin board maps at the library whereby residents could identify specific needs they felt were important and send their comments to the PC. **Shumaker** stated he liked the idea of a hook, as it would help residents understand the 'why' of futures planning. **Breckel** advised making sure any language used was easy for the public to understand.

PC members were notified of a City Council retreat on March 28th.

An optional Consistency Review was not performed.

**Chair Valerie Hoy-Rhodehamel adjourned the meeting at 7:24 p.m.**

**Minutes created by Johanna Roe**