



Anne McEnerny-Ogle, Mayor
Bart Hansen · Ty Stober · Linda Glover
Laurie Lebowsky · Erik Paulsen · Sarah J. Fox

November 15, 2021 - Vancouver City Council Meeting Minutes

WORKSHOPS

Workshops were conducted remotely over video conference utilizing a GoToMeeting platform. Members of the public were invited to view the meeting via the live broadcast on www.cvtv.org and CVTV cable channels 23 or HD 323, or on the City's Facebook page, www.facebook.com/VancouverUS, or listen via the GoToMeeting conference call.

4:00-5:00 p.m. American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) Funds Framework

Eric Holmes, City Manager

Summary

The City Manager provided an update and sought Council feedback on the framework for use of the City's prospective allocation of ARPA funds.

5:00-6:00 p.m. City Council Policy Updates

Jonathan Young, City Attorney, 360-487-8500

Summary

The City Attorney provided Council with an overview of proposed updates to City Council policies and procedures.

REGULAR COUNCIL MEETING

This meeting was conducted remotely over video conference utilizing a GoToMeeting platform. Members of the public were invited to view the meeting via the live broadcast on www.cvtv.org and CVTV cable channels 23 or HD 323, or on the City's Facebook page, www.facebook.com/VancouverUS. Public access and testimony were also facilitated via the GoToMeeting conference call.

Call to Order and Roll Call

The regular meeting of the Vancouver City Council was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Mayor McEnery-Ogle. This meeting was conducted remotely over video conference.

Present: Councilmembers Fox, Paulsen Lebowsky Glover, Stober, Hansen, Mayor McEnery-Ogle

Absent: Councilmember Lebowsky

Motion by Councilmember Stober, seconded by Councilmember Paulsen, and carried unanimously to excuse Councilmember Lebowsky.

Approval of Minutes

Minutes - October 18, 2021

Motion by Councilmember Paulsen, seconded by Councilmember Glover, and carried unanimously to approve the meeting minutes of October 18, 2021.

Minutes - October 25, 2021

Motion by Councilmember Fox, seconded by Councilmember Stober, and carried unanimously to approve the meeting minutes of October 25, 2021.

Community Communication (Items 1-2)

Mayor McEnery-Ogle opened Community Communication and received the following testimony:

- Kimberlee Elbon, La Center, Washington, stated an independent audit needs to be conducted of all City bonds and activities before the Council takes action on any items.

There being no further testimony, Mayor McEnery-Ogle closed Community Communication.

Consent Agenda (Items 1-2)

Motion by Councilmember Stober, seconded by Councilmember Paulsen, and carried unanimously to approve the Consent Agenda.

1. Renewal of an Interlocal Services Agreement between Clark County and the City of Vancouver in support of the Student Watershed Monitoring Network (SWMN) Program

Staff Report 170-21

Summary

Since 1998, the City of Vancouver has worked closely with interested classroom teachers (currently 44 in 23 schools) to offer training, equipment, and other essential support that allows them and their students to monitor chemical, physical, and biological parameters in and around streams, lakes, and stormwater facilities. This affords the students frequent hands-on opportunities to be in and learn about their environment. Near the end of each school year a culminating event(s) is organized that provides an opportunity for many students (selected from all those participating, currently 2,240) to meet with their teachers, parents, and environmental professionals to share details of what they've learned about their monitoring location and watershed throughout the year. Beginning in 2002, Clark County has helped make this program possible through an interlocal agreement to provide the City with financial support that extends the program to operate in schools located throughout Clark County. The most recent agreement will expire on December 31st of this year and needs to be renewed to allow for continued funding.

County funding in recent years has been \$60,000 per year and this amount has been allocated in the 2022 scope of work (Attachment A) as part of the new ILA. Direct City support for the program is currently projected to be approximately \$50,000 per year, however, the program also benefits from the City's "in kind" contribution of a full-time Water Educator who helps support other Water Center programming. The position was included in the 2021 budget as "limited-term", however, it had not been included in the adopted 2022 budget as the ILA was set to expire. Fund balance in 2021 is sufficient to continue the Water Educator position for the SWMN program through 2022 and the position is anticipated to be requested for an ongoing role as a part of the 2023/2024 Water Center budget. The new Interlocal Services Agreement for 2022 through 2026 includes a Budget and Scope of Work for 2022 (Attachment A), which can either be continued or adjusted as agreed to each year by the County and City Public Works Directors. The ILA and its scope do allow for other jurisdictions to join with Vancouver and Clark County in supporting the SWMN program as their funding becomes available during the term of the interlocal.

Request: Authorize the City Manager or his designee to sign the interlocal agreement with Clark County for support of the Student Watershed Monitoring Network program.

Rich McConaghy, Environmental Resources Manager, 360-487-7165

2. **Approval of Claim Vouchers**

Request: Approve claim vouchers for November 15, 2021.

Motion approved claim vouchers for November 15, 2021, in the amount of \$3,309,081.24.

Public Hearings (Item 3)

3. **Garbage, Recycling and Organics Collection Rate Increases for 2022**

Staff Report 168-21

AN ORDINANCE relating to the collection of solid waste, recyclable materials and organics, and amending certain sections of VMC 6.12 to increase or adjust rates and charges consistent with approved utility user taxes and rates and in accordance with current contracts for the coming year; providing for savings, severability and an effective date.

Summary

City Council is the rate-making authority for garbage, residential recycling, and organics collection services within the City of Vancouver. The City contracts with a private hauling company, Waste Connections of Washington, to provide comprehensive garbage, recycling and organics collection services to residents and businesses within city limits. The contract terms authorize Waste Connections to receive annual adjustments to customer rates based on changing operating conditions including:

- an inflation adjustment factor tied to a percentage of the CPI and fuel costs,*
- disposal tip fees,*
- the number of customers served and,*
- fees paid to the City to support solid waste related programs.*

All adjustments to rates are made in accordance with Exhibit D of the contract. Garbage rates also include the City's utility tax that is embedded

within them. The City's utility tax does not apply to recycling or organics collection services.

Consistent with the contract, the updated model for 2022 requires an increase of 2.3 percent for garbage rates, while recycling, organics and selected other fees not linked to the disposal tip fee or utility tax, will need to increase by 2.1 percent, effective January 1, 2022. Key reasons for this increase are a 3.29 percent increase in the CPI, a 4.75 percent decrease in the diesel fuel index, and a 2.6 percent increase in the disposal tip fees. For the most typical residential customer with 32gallons per week of garbage, every-other-week recycling and every-other-week organics collection (96gallons for each) this means a monthly rate increase of 0.2 percent, from \$33.27 per month to \$33.33 per month, or an increase of \$0.06.

Inflation Adjustment Factor

Under the contract, collection costs for garbage, recycling and organics adjust at 80 percent of a blended and combined CPI (92 percent) and diesel fuel index (8 percent) – Inflation Adjustment Factor (IAF), which leads to a 2.12 percent increase for the collection cost component, the City Fee and other miscellaneous fees.

Disposal Tip Fees

On January 1, 2022, the disposal tip fee is scheduled to increase \$2.49 per ton (or 2.6 percent) from \$97.39 per ton to \$99.88 per ton. In addition to the allowed CPI increase on the base tip fee (going from \$95.72 per ton to \$98.08 per ton), this tip fee includes \$0.37 per ton for additional work being done under the Clark County contract by Columbia Resource Company at the Central Transfer and Recycling Station (\$0.31 of this is new for 2022 related to construction access improvements for safety) as well as \$1.43 per ton for a surcharge approved by the Clark County Council in 2017 to make up for lost state funding for regional solid waste programs and planning.

Recycling Fees

The rates proposed for January 1, 2022, include adjustments to curbside (increasing from \$3.30 to \$3.37) and multi-family collection fees (increasing from \$1.33 to \$1.36) based on the Inflation Adjustment Factor (2.1%) detailed above as well as adjustments to the recycling processing surcharges which were added April 1, 2019 to recover costs associated with the local response to the global market issues and the ongoing need for supplying quality materials to these markets. Based on a review of operational factors, Clark County has indicated that the \$62.52 per ton processing fee in 2021 will be adjusted to \$48.56 on January 1, 2022. Through 2021, Vancouver residential customers paid recycling surcharges based on a \$68.11 "preliminary" per ton processing fee that was subsequently reduced by the County and Columbia Resource Company after City Council adopted the Vancouver 2021 rates. Also, during 2021 the contractor billed customers using the 2020 approved recycling surcharge

rates rather than the lower rates authorized for 2021. Both of these overcharges are offset through a “true up” with 2022 reductions in the amounts of these fees. As a result, the proposed rates reflect a net \$0.25/mo. reduction for single family customers and a net \$0.20/mo. reduction for multi-family customers. The processing surcharge for curbside customers will decrease from \$1.46 per month to \$0.81 per month. The processing surcharge for multi-family customers goes from \$0.70 per month to \$0.29 per month. The combined impact for recycling fee components is a 12.1 percent decrease (\$0.58 per month) in curbside recycling charges and a 18.7 percent decrease (\$0.38 per month) in multi-family recycling charges.

Organics Fees

The rates proposed for January 1, 2022, include 2.1 percent adjustments to the organics rates, which are tied to the Inflation Adjustment Factor. For the standard subscription service of 96gallons collected every-other-week, the current rate of \$7.88 per month adjusts to \$8.05 per month. Recommended 2022 rates at other levels of service, following the same every-other-week schedule, are \$6.97 for 64-gallon carts, \$5.88 for 32-gallon carts, and \$4.80 for 20-gallon carts.

Typical Residential Rate Impact

For 2022 overall, the typical residential customer rates for 32gallons of weekly garbage service with recycling and organics collection increases 0.2 percent, or \$0.06 per month, under this recommendation. This reflects a \$0.47 increase in garbage charges, a net \$0.58 decrease in combined recycling collection rate and recycling processing surcharge fees, and a \$0.17 increase in the organics charge. Households that have chosen different service levels may experience slightly different rate impacts.

Staff recommends adjusting customer rates as detailed in the Summary of Proposed 2022 Solid Waste Rates to meet the contractual obligations associated with the defined Inflation Adjustment Factor and to set the City Fee amount for the coming year. If approved, all adjustments will be effective January 1, 2022.

Request: On November 15, 2021, subject to second reading and public hearing, approve the ordinance.

*Julie Gilbertson, Solid Waste Supervisor, 360-487-7162;
Rich McConaghy, Environmental Services Manager, 360-487-7165*

Mayor McEnerny-Ogle read the title of the ordinance into the record.

Julie Gilbertson, Solid Waste Supervisor, provided an overview of the proposed rate adjustments.

Mayor McEnerny-Ogle opened the public hearing and, receiving no testimony, closed the public hearing.

Councilmember Fox asked whether the City has a sense of the number of accounts that became delinquent during and due to the pandemic. Ms. Gilbertson stated staff has tracked that very closely since the beginning of the pandemic and reported over the past 18 months, three accounts went past 90 days due. She stated the City's contractor has a process to recuperate debt, but during the pandemic, the City did not authorize suspension of service due to debt.

Councilmember Stober asked whether customers discontinued service during the pandemic. Ms. Gilbertson stated there was not a reduction in the number of single-family customers, but there were instances in changes of service, such as increased cart size due to people being home more. She stated there were fluctuations in commercial accounts due to a decrease of activity stemming from closures.

Motion by Councilmember Hansen, seconded by Councilmember Paulsen, and carried unanimously to approve Ordinance M-4353.

Communications

- A. From the Council
- B. From the Mayor
- C. From the City Manager

Adjournment

6:48 p.m.

DocuSigned by:

58CB15C0632E403...
Anne McEnerny-Ogle, Mayor

Attest:

DocuSigned by:

BCF6734E40E94AE...
Natasha Ramras, City Clerk

Meetings of the Vancouver City Council are electronically recorded on audio and video. The audio files are kept in the office of the City Clerk for a period of six years.

From: [Delapena, Amanda](#)
To: [Delapena, Amanda](#)
Subject: FW: Discontinuing Broadcasting of Community Forums
Date: Monday, November 15, 2021 11:50:15 AM

Amanda Delapena

[LEARN ABOUT VANCOUVER'S COVID-19 RESPONSE HERE](#)

From: Teresa Hardy <teshardy31@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 11:33 AM
To: City of Vancouver - Office of the City Manager <CMO@cityofvancouver.us>
Cc: Kennedy, Rebecca <Rebecca.Kennedy@cityofvancouver.us>
Subject: Discontinuing Broadcasting of Community Forums

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of Vancouver. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Below are some thoughts shared in emails about discontinuing broadcasting.

"there is broad latitude to change and improve the opportunities for Council members to connect with, and listen to, the community members we serve. "

The Community Forum has more value than simply Council Members "connecting with and listening to the community members they serve" which is a one way frame on this, community to council.

The value also includes community voices being heard by the community as well - eliminating this value to the community by eliminating CVTV coverage and broadcast does not "improve" the broader connection that includes community members with each other, as well as to their Council).

Whatever "problem" is driving this "policy" proposal ("discontinue CVTV") does not solve the collateral damage of less (rather than more) communication opportunity and access, preventing community access to shared voices as they communicate with our elected representatives.

Is the problem with "trepidation" or accessibility that hinders more public engagement. Several times it has been requested to extend the registration time period for people who wish to testify. When Community Forum time is at the end of meetings that start at 6:30 and have very long agendas and hearings, expecting people who work one or two jobs to wait to speak is limiting. If you review the " comments" in the minutes, they are brief and can lack the intent of the speaker so discontinuing broadcasting means relying on minutes.

Has anyone asked the people who feel trepidation how they view the problem? Is it feeling surveilled? Is it feeling ill-equipped in communicating their concerns confidently enough to speak publicly? What are they asking for, to get help to exercise their rights?

If trepidation is the concern, and a free exchange of ideas is sought, perhaps the solution would be to create a different venue, for example, a non-televised workshop, where a stakeholder community can connect, develop, and articulate their concerns, allowing people to feel more confident in expressing those distilled concerns publicly, and for the record.

Recognizing that it is difficult for community members or (“ particularly, members of historically marginalized communities”) merits consideration and support.

However, it seems discontinuing broadcasting coverage of Community forums doesn't seem the appropriate solution. It's only at the communication forum every other week that residents can address an issue not on the agenda. It prevents anyone who was not able to attend the meeting to listen to the concerns raised and/or review a speaker's comments.

CVTV City Council gets repeated during the week. This seems like an infringement on our rights to be heard, especially around ongoing issues, that are important to have as many residents hear.

From: [City of Vancouver - Office of the City Manager](#)
To: [Delapena, Amanda](#)
Subject: FW: For City Council and staff for the Policy discussion workshop - Policy 100-32, Section 5.7
Date: Monday, November 15, 2021 12:17:04 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

For council meeting tonight

Kerry Peck | Administrative Assistant



CITY OF VANCOUVER, WASHINGTON

City Manager's Office/Administrative Assistant

P: (360) 487-8616

www.cityofvancouver.us | www.cityofvancouver.us/socialmedia



[LEARN ABOUT VANCOUVER'S COVID-19 RESPONSE HERE](#)

From: Cathryn Chudy <chudyca@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 12:00 PM
To: City of Vancouver - Office of the City Manager <CMO@cityofvancouver.us>
Subject: For City Council and staff for the Policy discussion workshop - Policy 100-32, Section 5.7

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the City of Vancouver. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

To Mayor, Council members and staff,

re: today's workshop on Policy Review,
Policy 100-32, Section 5.7

I am concerned about the potential for discontinuing CVTV coverage.

I hope that a way of addressing the underlying problem/concern that prompted this suggestion can be accomplished in a different way.

I support problem solving to:

*"...facilitate the free exchange of dialog with community members
and
minimize the trepidation some community members face when*

*speaking
to their elected officials (particularly, members of historically
marginalized communities)"*

And, I understand this:

*"There is no legal requirement to host a community
communication forum, therefore there is broad latitude to change
and
improve the opportunities for Councilmembers to connect with, and
listen to, the community members we serve."*

Here are my thoughts on this: I believe the Community Forum has more value than simply Council Members "connecting with and listening to the community members they serve" which is a "one-way" framework on this, community members to Council.

I strongly believe that there is immeasurable value in community voices being heard by other community members as well. Eliminating this value by discontinuing CVTV coverage and broadcast does not "improve" the broader connection that includes community members with each other, as well as to their Council.

There is an unintended but very real collateral damage to the community of **less** (rather than **more**) citizen communication opportunity and access with regard to shared voices in communicating with our elected representatives.

I am urging the Council to find another way to address the underlying issues that have prompted this potential "solution."

Thank you,

Cathryn Chudy