



City Council Meeting Minutes

Vancouver City Hall | Council Chambers | 415 W. 6th St.
PO Box 1995 | Vancouver, WA 98668-1995
cityofvancouver.us

Anne McEnerny-Ogle, Mayor • Bart Hansen • Ty Stober • Erik Paulsen • Sarah J. Fox • Diana H. Perez • Kim D. Harless

January 6, 2025

Workshops: 5:15-6:00 p.m.

Vancouver City Hall - Council Chambers - 415 W 6th Street, Vancouver WA

Workshops were conducted in person in the Council Chambers of City Hall. Members of the public were invited to view the meeting in person, via the live broadcast on www.cvtv.org and CVTV cable channels 23 or HD 323, or on the City's Facebook page, or www.facebook.com/VancouverUS.

View the CVTV video recording, including presentations and discussion, for workshops at:

https://www.cvtv.org/vid_link/37029?startStreamAt=0&stopStreamAt=2587

Waterfront Gateway Site Plan Update

(Approximately 45 minutes)

Chim Chune Ko, Principal Project Manager, ChimChune.Ko@cityofvancouver.us

Staff led Council through a discussion of the Waterfront Gateway Site Plan Update.

Councilmember Harless joined the workshop remotely.

Councilmember Hansen was absent from the workshop.

Council Dinner / Executive Session Re: Potential Litigation RCW 42.30.110 (1)(i)(iii) (30 Min)

Mayor McEnerny-Ogle announced the Council would be entering into executive session from 6:00-6:30 p.m. to discuss Potential Litigation.

Regular Council Meeting

6:30 PM

Vancouver City Hall - Council Chambers - 415 W 6th Street, Vancouver WA

This meeting was conducted as a hybrid meeting with in person and remote viewing and participation over video conference utilizing a GoToMeeting platform. Members of

the public were invited to view the meeting in person, 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 on Consent Agenda items and under the Community Forum were also facilitated in person and via the GoToMeeting conference call.

Vancouver City Council meeting minutes are a record of the action taken by Council. To view the CVTV video recording, including presentations, testimony and discussion, for this meeting please visit:

[https://www.cvtv.org/vid link/37031?startStreamAt=0&stopStreamAt=12254](https://www.cvtv.org/vid_link/37031?startStreamAt=0&stopStreamAt=12254)

Electronic audio recording of City Council meetings are kept on file in the office of the City Clerk for a period of six years.

Pledge of Allegiance

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 McEnerny-Ogle. This meeting was conducted as a hybrid meeting, including both in person and remotely over video conference.

Present: Councilmember Harless, Councilmember Perez, Councilmember Fox, Councilmember Paulsen, Councilmember Stober, Councilmember Hansen, Mayor McEnerny-Ogle

Absent: None

Councilmember Harless joined the meeting remotely.

Approval of Minutes

Minutes - December 16, 2024

Motion by Councilmember Hansen, seconded by Councilmember Paulsen, and Yes: 7, No: 0, Abstaining: 0, to approve the December 16, 2024, meeting minutes.

Proclamations

National Human Trafficking Awareness Month

Mayor McEnerny-Ogle read and presented a proclamation to Tom Perez, EPIK Project Member, proclaiming January 2025, as Human Trafficking Prevention Month.

Community Communication

This is the place on the agenda where the public is invited to speak to Council regarding any matter on the Agenda not already scheduled for Public Hearing. (Separate instructions are provided for offering testimony on Public Hearing when applicable.) This includes the option to testify about Workshops. Members of the public addressing Council are requested to give their name and city of residence for the audio record. Speakers are to limit their testimony to a total of three minutes for all items combined.

Mayor McEnerny-Ogle opened Community Communication and received testimony from the following community members regarding any matter on the agenda not scheduled for a Public Hearing:

- *Matthew Trevino, Vancouver*
- *Peggy Keith, Vancouver*
- *Katherine Whitney, Vancouver*
- *Israel Lopez, Vancouver*
- *Steve Herman, Vancouver*

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

Consent Agenda

The following items will be passed by a single motion to approve all listed actions and resolutions. There will be no discussion on these items unless requested by Council. If discussion is requested, the item will be moved from the Consent Agenda and considered separately – after the motion has been made and passed to approve the remaining items.

Council pulled items 4 and 5 for discussion.

Item 2 was pulled from the agenda to be presented at a future Council meeting.

Motion by Councilmember Stober, seconded by Councilmember Fox, and Yes: 7, No: 0, Abstaining: 0, to approve Items 1, 3, and 6-12 on the Consent Agenda.

Motion by Councilmember Stober, seconded by Councilmember Hansen, and Yes: 7, No: 0, Abstaining: 0, to approve Item 4 on the Consent Agenda.

Motion by Councilmember Fox, seconded by Councilmember Perez, and Yes: 7, No: 0, Abstaining: 0, to approve Item 5 on the Consent Agenda.

1. Professional Services Agreement - Columbia River Mental Health Mobile Medication Assisted Treatment Program

Staff Report: 001-25

Request: On Monday, January 6, 2025, approve the Professional Service Agreement with Columbia River Mental Health for the establishment and operation of a Mobile Medication Assisted Treatment/Opioid Treatment Program (MAT/OTP).

Jamie Spinelli, Homeless Response Manager,
jamie.spinelli@cityofvancouver.us

Motion approved the request.

2. Memorandum of Agreement - Vancouver Farmers Market Association and the City of Vancouver

Staff Report: 002-25

Request: On Monday, January 6, 2025, authorize the City Manager, or designee, to sign a Memorandum of Agreement with the Vancouver Farmer's Market for use of portions of Esther and 8th Streets for operation of the Market for 2025-2029.

Chris Harder, Deputy Economic Development Director ,
chris.harder@cityofvancouver.us

Item was pulled from the agenda and will return to a future agenda.

3. Resolution for the Adoption of the Grants from Public, Educational, and Governmental Capital Support Repair and Replacement Fund

A Resolution delegating authority for allocating funds for Public, Educational, and Governmental access equipment repair and replacement, and establishing a process for such allocations.

Staff Report: 003-25

Request: On Monday, January 6, 2025, adopt the Public, Educational, and Governmental (PEG) capital repair and replacement resolution.

Kerry Peck, Administrative Assistant, Kerry.Peck@cityofvancouver.us

Motion adopted Resolution M-4319 to approve the request.

4. Resolution for the Approval of Vancouver Housing Authority Bond for Fourth Plain Commons

A RESOLUTION providing approval, solely for purposes of section 147(f) of the Internal Revenue Code, of the issuance of revenue obligations by the Housing Authority of the City of Vancouver in the principal amount of not to exceed \$12,250,000, to refinance the existing Fourth Plain Commons multifamily housing project that provides 106 units of housing for low-income persons.

Staff Report: 004-25

Request: On Monday, January 6, 2025, approve the resolution indicating the City's approval of the issuance of the bond for the project.

Samantha Whitley, Housing Programs Manager,
samantha.whitley@cityofvancouver.us

Motion adopted Resolution M-4320 to approve the request.

5. Ordinance Establishing a Construction Sales Tax Deferral Program

AN ORDINANCE adopting a Construction Sales and Use Tax Deferral Program under chapter 82.92 RCW; enacting new section VMC 5.98.070; and providing for severability and an effective date.

Staff Report: 005-25

Request: On Monday, January 6, 2025, advance the ordinance for the creation of a new affordable housing incentive program, setting a second reading and public hearing on January 13, 2025.

Bryan Monroe, Associate Housing Project Coordinator, Patrick Quinton,
Economic Development Director, bryan.monroe@cityofvancouver.us,
patrick.quinton@cityofvancouver.us

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

Motion approved the request.

6. Condemnation Ordinance

AN ORDINANCE relating to redevelopment of the Heights District, transportation and streets and sidewalks, public plazas, public parks and associated public uses; declaring the public necessity for and providing for the acquisition by the City of Vancouver by eminent domain of a portion of an easement across real property located at 5411 E Mill Plain Blvd, Vancouver, WA 98661, for purposes of constructing street improvements, public plazas, and other redevelopment within the City of Vancouver, Washington; authorizing the City Attorney to prosecute eminent domain proceedings and to stipulate in mitigation of damages; providing for payment for such easement; and providing for an immediate effective date.

Staff Report: 006-25

Request: On Monday, January 6, 2025, advance the ordinance to acquire by eminent domain a portion of an easement across real property located at 5411 E Mill Plain Blvd for the purposes of constructing public improvements related to the redevelopment of the Heights District, subject to second reading and public hearing on January 13, 2025.

Amy Stewart, Real Estate Project Manager, Sara Baynard-Cooke, Assistant City Attorney, amy.stewart@cityofvancouver.us, Sara.Baynard-Cooke@cityofvancouver.us

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

Motion approved the request.

7. City Center Redevelopment Authority Board Appointment

Request: On Monday, January 6, 2025, reappoint Kenneth Anderton and Allison Reynolds to full-term positions on the City Center Redevelopment Authority Board, with a term beginning January 1, 2025, and expiring December 31, 2028.

Council Subcommittee 2

Motion approved the request.

8. Culture, Arts and Heritage Commission Appointment

Request: On Monday, January 6, 2025, reappoint Brad Richardson and Rebecca Percival to full-term positions on the Culture, Arts and Heritage Commission effective January 1, 2025, and expiring December 31, 2027.

Council Subcommittee 1

Motion approved the request.

9. Downtown Redevelopment Authority Appointment

Request: On Monday, January 6, 2025, reappoint Tom Donovan to a full-term position on the Downtown Redevelopment Authority Board, with a term beginning January 1, 2025, and expiring December 31, 2028.

Council Subcommittee 1

Motion approved the request.

10. Telecommunications Commission Appointment

Request: On Monday, January 6, 2025, reappoint Douglas Green to a full-term position on the Telecommunications Commission, with a term beginning January 1, 2025, and expiring December 31, 2028.

Mayor Anne McEnerny-Ogle

Motion approved the request.

11. Transportation and Mobility Commission Appointment

Request: On Monday, January 6, 2025, appoint Michael Moore to a full-term appointment to a position which represents the disabled community, with a term beginning January 1, 2025, and expiring December 31, 2027, appoint David McCune to a midterm position that represents neighborhood associations, with a term beginning January 1, 2025, and expiring December 31, 2025, reappoint Zachary Gatton to a full-term freight expertise position that would begin January 1, 2025, and expire December 31, 2027, appoint Isaac Hamann to a youth position that would begin January 1, 2025, and expire December 31, 2025, and reappoint Ken Williams to the full-term walking position with a term beginning January 1, 2025, and expiring December 31, 2027.

Subcommittee 1 and Subcommittee 2

Motion approved the request.

12. Approval of Claim Vouchers

Request: Approve claim vouchers for January 6, 2025.

Motion approved claim vouchers in the amount of \$32,373,762.85.

Public Hearings

The following item(s) are scheduled for public hearing. Members of the public addressing Council are requested to give their name and city of residence for the audio record. Unless otherwise announced by the Presiding Officer, speakers are to limit their testimony to three minutes for each public hearing.

13. Proposed Initiated Ordinance

Staff Report: 007-25

Request: The initiative petition proposed by Save Our Streets is contrary to the general laws of the state of Washington and the Vancouver City Charter

and is thus illegal. Under Washington law, it cannot be placed on the ballot for electoral consideration. Therefore, Council is requested to take no action on the initiative petition.

Lon Pluckhahn, City Manager, lon.pluckhahn@cityofvancouver.us

Lon Pluckhahn, City Manager, provided an overview of the Proposed Initiated Ordinance.

Mayor McEnerny-Ogle opened the public hearing and received testimony from the following community members:

- *Justin Wood, Vancouver*
- *Laurie Arndt, Vancouver*
- *Jason Cromer, Vancouver*
- *Matthew Barnett, Vancouver*
- *Graham Kendrick, Vancouver*
- *David Munroe, Vancouver*
- *Stephen Cline, Vancouver*
- *Alan Taylor, Vancouver*
- *Josh Harmon, Vancouver*
- *Rick Ackman, Vancouver*
- *Genevieve White, Vancouver*
- *Holly Williams, Vancouver*
- *Julia Trabert, Vancouver*
- *Ken Williams, Vancouver*
- *Janice Ritter, Vancouver*
- *Jackson Maynard, Olympia, WA*
- *Paul Sochacki, Vancouver*
- *Cathryn Chudy, Vancouver*
- *Don Steinke, Vancouver*
- *Kristina Barrows, Vancouver*
- *Scott Reed, Vancouver*
- *Marlainna Sullivan, Vancouver*
- *Alyssa Wheeler, Vancouver*
- *Michael Trabert, Vancouver*
- *Jonathan Wheeler, Vancouver*
- *Zack Gatton, Vancouver*
- *Kyle Herrlinger, Vancouver*
- *Ryan Ward, Vancouver*
- *Jan Verrinder, Vancouver*
- *Jason Hernandez, Vancouver*
- *Sara Schmitt, Vancouver*
- *Jeff Alexander, Vancouver*
- *James Berglund, Vancouver*

- *Melanie Katz, Vancouver*
- *Kenny Seppa, Vancouver*
- *Samantha Schechter, Vancouver*
- *Karrie Broner, Vancouver*
- *Tabor Kelly, Vancouver*
- *Kelly Hagerman, Vancouver*
- *Chris Ericksen, Vancouver*
- *Steve Herman, Vancouver*
- *Israel Lopez, Vancouver*

There being no further testimony, Mayor McEnerny-Ogle closed the public hearing.

Rebecca Kennedy, Deputy Community Development Director, and Kate Drennan, Transportation Planning Manager, provided a response and presentation regarding the Proposed Initiated Ordinance.

City Council briefly discussed the item with staff.

Jonathan Young provided the Legal Department's ruling on the initiative. The City Attorney stated the initiative petition proposed by Save Our Streets is contrary to the general laws of the state of Washington and the Vancouver City Charter and is thus illegal. The City Attorney recommended the Council take no action on the initiative petition.

The City Attorney discussed the legalities of the initiative with the Council.

Council continued discussion on the initiative.

No action was taken by the City Council to move forward on the initiative.

Communications

A. From the Council

B. From the Mayor

C. From the City Manager

Adjournment

9:55 p.m.

DocuSigned by:

Anne McEnerny-Ogle

6C69D9089EC5424...

Anne McEnerny-Ogle, Mayor

Attest:

DocuSigned by:

Natasha Ramras

493E940414AE4BD...

Natasha Ramras, City Clerk

The written comments below are those of the submitter alone and are not representative of the views of CVTV or the City of Vancouver, its elected or appointed officials, or its employees.

From: [ted gathe](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Safe Streets Initiative Public Hearing
Date: Tuesday, January 7, 2025 9:49:52 AM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

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.

Mayor and Council, I offer these comments as testimony in connection with the public hearing regarding the proposed Safe Streets Initiative scheduled for January 6, 2025.

Besides the practical difficulties and constraints that the proposed safe streets ordinance would place on administering the City's transportation planning and construction program, the proposed ordinance fails to meet the legal requirements to qualify for the ballot.

First, the subject the proposed ordinance addresses is administrative in nature not legislative. Second it conflicts with state law by legislating on a subject- street design standards- that are exclusively delegated by the state to the City Council. Third, the City Charter requires that any such proposed ordinance "shall be stated in clear and unambiguous language and so that its entire effect is apparent on its face." The proposed ordinance is neither clear or unambiguous.

Unlike state initiatives, local initiatives are not provided for in the state Constitution and are significantly more limited in their scope and nature. Some examples of local initiatives that have been struck down by the courts include the following: renaming city streets, prohibiting fluoride in a city water system, requiring voter ratification of city revenue bonds and an attempt to prohibit the use of red light cameras for traffic safety purposes.

For the above reasons, I urge the City Council to reject the proposed Safe Streets Initiative Ordinance.

Ted H. Gathe
City of Vancouver Resident
Former Vancouver City Attorney (1994-2014)

From: [J B](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Citizen Thought re 1/6/25 Transportation Safety Meeting Notes - Bike Lanes
Date: Tuesday, January 7, 2025 9:49:55 AM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

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.

Hello. As a 7 year Vancouver resident, property owner, avid bicycle rider/ commuter/ enthusiast, & member of the Vancouver Bicycle Club, I strongly request that urgent safety matters such as the planning, development & upkeep of dedicated bicycle infrastructure NOT be left to the whims & opinions of the general voting public.

Seeing as most people don't regularly ride bikes, whether it be for exercise or otherwise, and that we live in an unfortunately car-centric society, allowing infrastructure decisions like this to be made by general votes would be a disastrous proposition for your residents & visiting riders who do depend on safe, dedicated & well-planned bicycle travel.

Most of us also drive cars and pay our share for the roads to be safe & accessible for us, regardless of the mode of transportation we chose to take that day. Regardless of your driver status, however, safe bicycling, just like walking & driving - must be an obvious, undeniable & non-negotiable feature of our growing city.

Lastly, in my travels around the country & world, I've noticed that the best cities, bar none, just so happen to feature the best in bicycle, and multi-modal transportation infrastructure that allows & encourages people to get out of the car and enjoy & experience the area in a way unencumbered by the doors, roof & windows of an automobile.

Thank you for taking the time to read & share my thoughts at tonight's meeting!

Jarret Byrd

From: [Greg Stanley](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Support the Transportation System Plan
Date: Tuesday, January 7, 2025 9:50:03 AM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

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.

I don't support making public safety optional by putting it on the ballot. I want safe travel for all, so while I'm all in favor of asking citizens for our opinions, I want professionals to make the decisions.

The current planning process and timelines are more than adequate. Months of research gathering are involved. Outreach to the public with project options are presented at each step of the process and include mailings and even door-knocking to residents of involved streets. Projects are chosen by need and scheduled to coincide with other improvements for efficiency and funding realities. Bike lanes now are often referred to as mobility lanes because so many people are rolling at different speeds on analog bikes, electrified skateboards, scooters, and e-bikes. Planners consider the growing diversity of all road users, not just those who drive.

We do not want to have every transportation safety issue involving a bike lane on the ballot. The person in charge of our safety in that case, needs no professional background or knowledge of our street networks. They don't need insights into the needs of vulnerable road users. They need only a pen and less than 30 seconds to color in the dot to send their obsolete transportation ideas to be tallied and perhaps become municipal code.

Please do not vote for this initiative to put every planning project to a vote.

Thank you,

Greg Stanley

[REDACTED]

Vancouver, WA 98685

[REDACTED]

From: [Maruhn, Tawny](#)
To: [Dollar, Sarah](#)
Subject: FW: Important: Updated credentials for Vancouver City Council Meeting 1/6/2024
Date: Tuesday, January 7, 2025 8:41:36 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

I already responded to this person; can you please include their email in the written comments for 1/6. Thanks!

Tawny Maruhn | Senior Support Specialist

City of Vancouver
City Manager's Office/ Boards & Commissions
Office: 360-487-8621
Email: tawny.maruhn@cityofvancouver.us
She/Her/Hers
cityofvancouver.us



From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, January 6, 2025 9:16 PM
To: Maruhn, Tawny <tawny.maruhn@cityofvancouver.us>
Subject: Re: Important: Updated credentials for Vancouver City Council Meeting 1/6/2024

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

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.

This is very frustrating, I sat in the Goto Meeting session waiting for someone to activate my session, texted in the comments during the meeting and no resolution. Then as my name was called I went back and tried calling in, and while doing so, discovered another email - this one - with new instructions for joining.

To say I'm frustrated at not being able to express my comments is an understatement.

I listened to the staff summary, especially with regard to the efforts to communicate the plan with residents around McGillivray. There was no posting at any time that

came to my mailbox, nor was there an email or other forum where I was informed until I observed the Save Our Streets signs. This frustration is not something that should happen, especially with a meeting that is supposed to be a fully engaged forum of our constituents.

What I did see was an overwhelming representation by the biking community to argue that the changes outlined by the city transportation committee were fully supported by this community, yet, McGillivray already has a full bike lane in both directions which is more than can be said for other streets on the development plan. The Road Diet plan is more about safety in cross walks across undivided four-lane streets. McGillivray does not represent this model in any of its capacity or length.

Respectfully,
Mark Jones

On Monday, January 6, 2025 at 05:33:38 PM PST, Maruhn, Tawny <tawny.maruhn@cityofvancouver.us> wrote:

An issue occurred with the go to meeting, please use this one!!

Below is the **Go To Meeting** credentials for the January 6, 2025, City Council Meeting. Please share with staff as needed.

The City Manager has provided the following guidelines for the hybrid meetings.

If you or your staff:

- *Are presenting in workshop or have a hearing item, please plan to attend in person. This will support the most seamless engagement with council in policy discussion.*
- *Have an item under communications, you may present/attend virtually unless specified otherwise.*
- *Have a consent item that does not include a presentation but are present as the SME in case an item is pulled, may attend virtually.*

January 6, 2025 City Council Meeting

Jan 6, 2025, 5:00 – 11:00 PM (America/Los_Angeles)

Please join my meeting from your computer, tablet or smartphone.

<https://meet.goto.com/235030709>

This meeting is locked with a password: **2025-Jan**

You can also dial in using your phone.

Access Code: 235-030-709

United States (Toll Free): 1 866 899 4679

United States: +1 (571) 317-3116

Get the app now and be ready when your first meeting starts:

<https://meet.goto.com/install>

Tawny Maruhn | Senior Support Specialist

City of Vancouver

City Manager's Office/ Boards & Commissions

Office: 360-487-8621

Email: tawny.maruhn@cityofvancouver.us

She/Her/Hers

cityofvancouver.us



From: [Dollar, Sarah](#)
To: [Dollar, Sarah](#)
Subject: FW: Last nights council hearing
Date: Wednesday, January 8, 2025 2:01:09 PM

-----Original Message-----

From: Justin Wood [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, January 7, 2025 12:31 PM
To: City Council <council@cityofvancouver.us>; Council Clerk <councilclerk@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: Last nights council hearing

[You don't often get email from justin@fishconstructionnw.com. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

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.

First off I want to thank the council and staff for the hearing last night. It was a full room and not easy to manage.

I do want to call out one thing from last night to your attention.

Back in October after the changes to SE 34th I came to a council meeting with a simple printed picture of the backup created on 34th. I was told by the clerk that I would not be allowed to have that in the room as public signs were a distraction and not allowed. So in following what I was told I did not display it.

However last night many of the people in the room had signs and as a matter of fact one of them placed themselves and a sign in view of the camera on every person testifying. If the rules do not allow it then it should be applied to everyone.

Thank you,
Justin Wood

From: [Derek Kemppainen](#)
To: [City Council](#); [Dollar, Sarah](#); [Maruhn, Tawny](#); [Quintrell, Anna](#); [Young, Jonathan](#); [Worley, Steve](#); [City of Vancouver - Office of the City Manager](#)
Subject: Fwd: Video / Article / Public Hearing: City of Camas, WA Moves to End Fluoridation
Date: Thursday, December 26, 2024 2:12:14 PM

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.

Quick update on the City of Camas ending fluoridation:

The full [video of the Workshop](#) where the City of Camas decided to take the next steps to end fluoridation has been posted.

The workshop starts out with five speakers testifying in favor of removing fluoride, moves to the public works director's presentation on fluoridation, followed by the council's comments on fluoridation, and ending with the decision to move forward with notices to the public and DOH about ending fluoridation.

It's very interesting - I'd say it's definitely worth watching

Here's an article written about the event: [Camas City Council tackles water fluoridation issue](#)

Here is the [public hearing notice](#). The hearing is set for March 17th, 2025 at 7PM at the Camas City Hall.

Here are the [Presentation Slides](#) used by the Public Works Director

Derek Kemppainen

On Thu, Dec 5, 2024 at 1:37 PM Derek Kemppainen <derekkempp@gmail.com> wrote:
Dear Mayor & City Council,

On December 2nd at the City Council Workshop on fluoridation, the City of Camas council agreed that fluoridation was no longer appropriate for the City of Camas, and decided to move forward with issuing the notices to the public and the Department of Health as required to end fluoridation.

This is a huge victory for the City of Camas residents, ending the City's 58 year practice of poisoning / medicating their citizens without informed consent (Since 1966).

This will leave Battle Ground and the City of Vancouver as the 2 cities that continue to fluoridate in Clark County, with 5 cities choosing not to fluoridate.

Some of the thoughts that the Public Works Director, Councilmembers and Mayor shared in the workshop were as follows:

Steve Wall

The two largest industries in Camas have to strip the fluoride out in order to use it. Then they add fluoride back in for other processes

Per the September 24th, 2024 court ruling on fluoridation, there's not enough margin of safety at the levels that fluoride is currently being added.

There are options for EPA. The one thing EPA cannot do is ignore the risk

There's no deadline or timeline for the changes

What they require could be a warning label to a ban or revising levels

Will they slow play or slow lock the whole process?

If we are looking for regulations from the EPA, we may be looking for a long time

Jennifer Senescu:

I started researching fluoride and was blown away by the information on it.

We are shipping in a drug from overseas and putting it in our water system

Fluoride is a drug used to treat hyperthyroidism

People know how to get fluoride if they want it.

Infants - Their formula is made with our water, and they get dangerous amounts.

I started printing out the information on fluoride, but it was too much to print

I can't comprehend we've been allowed to put this drug into our water system

In 1960 it was generally held it was good to have it in our water system

I'm in favor of discontinuing fluoridation

Tim Hein

We've learned a lot in the last 60 years about fluoride

A lot of the fluoride is not going into the body

Should it be an individual choice? I think it should be

It shouldn't come for everybody through drinking water

I'm in favor of eliminating it

Leslie Lewallen

Great presentation by the Public Works Director

Fluoride is an overseas product

With tariffs in the future, that will increase the cost even more.

2 of our industries have to strip the fluoride out of the water we provide them in order to use it.

I'm all in favor of moving forward with ending water fluoridation

John Nohr

I'm in favor of moving forward

Bonnie Carter

I'm ok with moving forward

Marilyn Boerke

I concur

I have 3 grandchildren.

I am very careful with what I put in their bodies

Steve Hogan

Storm water is another factor - We are putting a lot of fluoride into the stormwater

Steve Wall

I will work with the city attorney and will talk with the DOH and will move forward with the required notices

Derek Kemppainen



From: [Derek Kemppainen](#)
To: [City Council](#); [Dollar, Sarah](#); [Maruhn, Tawny](#); [Quintrell, Anna](#); [Young, Jonathan](#); [Worley, Steve](#); [City of Vancouver - Office of the City Manager](#)
Subject: Fwd: Aberdeen City Council Votes to Remove Fluoride
Date: Thursday, December 26, 2024 4:08:53 PM

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.

Another City decides to discontinue the illegal poisoning of the water supply and the medical treatment of their citizens without informed consent following the September 24th, 2024 court ruling that fluoridation at current levels poses an unreasonable risk to children's IQ.

On October 9th, the Aberdeen, WA City Council voted 8-4 to prepare an ordinance to remove fluoride from the water, which will affect 17,000 residents. [Meeting Minutes here](#)

This vote against fluoridation indicated the Council did not believe the assurances of the dental community that fluoride has "no side effects at current levels, there's nothing to fear or worry about, it's awesome, and it's excellent for your people."

At the public hearing on fluoridation on September 25th, dental professionals all testified in favor of continuing fluoridation, while no one spoke against fluoridation: [Dental experts make their case on Fluoride](#)

One of the Aberdeen Council Members, Kacey Ann Morrison, posted the following on Facebook on October 9th

[Kacey Ann Morrison's Post](#)

The
Aberdeen
City

The Aberdeen City Council will be voting on whether or not to remove fluoride from our municipal water supply at tonight's meeting. If you are an Aberdeen resident, or a community member that gets your water from the City of Aberdeen, and you have strong opinions on this matter - tonight will be your last opportunity to share with the Council your thoughts on this issue.

You can also write to the Aberdeen City Council via email.

Please email me and I will be sure to share ALL emails to the entire Council prior to our meeting this evening.

☐ My email is: [REDACTED]

☐ Full transparency ☐

It has always been a paramount goal of mine to remove fluoride from our drinking water. The practice of fluoridation was not instituted in Aberdeen until it was done so by ordinance in the year 2000. Did you know that only Aberdeen and Montesano fluoridate their water in the whole of Grays Harbor County? Many cities are moving away from this practice, including many countries that have outright banned it - despite the hysterics of the American medical establishment that has and continues to opine it's "safety and effectiveness".

I have deeply held concerns about the lack of informed consent given our population by forcing what is essentially a chemical "medical treatment" upon them. If one wishes to use fluoride in the prevention of dental caries, as the Council has heard much about, there are a plethora of other sources to meet that need, including most all commercially sold toothpastes.

At the end of September, a federal court judge in the state of California determined that there was enough evidence of risk to children that the EPA must act on the matter. I will include that ruling and some articles below. In his ruling, the judge stated, "Plaintiffs have proven, by a preponderance of the evidence, that water fluoridation at the level of 0.7 mg/L—the prescribed optimal level of fluoridation in the United States—presents an 'unreasonable risk of injury to health or the environment, without consideration of costs or other non-risk factors, including an unreasonable risk to a potentially exposed or susceptible subpopulation under the conditions of use.'"

I will be voting YES to remove fluoride from the Aberdeen municipal water supply. The risk of continuing this practice is too

grave to our children and our community. At a recent meeting, one dentist that got up to speak in favor of fluoridation, chastised the Council by saying we are compelled to act on the wishes of our constituents, citing a survey done that had around 270 respondents, many from Aberdeen's 4th Ward. In that survey, the vote was split, with just slightly over half wanting to keep fluoride. However, Ward 1, which I represent, overwhelmingly indicated that they wanted fluoride removed. This is reflective of many of the conversations that I have personally had with residents in the first ward and across our city on this topic. Over the past couple of years, I would estimate that about 7 out of 10 residents I speak with have asked that this be a priority issue and that the Council remove this toxic chemical from our municipal water supply. I will vote to do so.

I want to thank Councilmember [David Lawrence](#) and Councilmember David Gakin for their tremendous persistence and dedication in ensuring that this issue was brought before the City Council. There was monumental effort involved to bring the process this far with all the hoops that the state and Department of Health put in the way of cities that even want to have the discussion of fluoride removal. I would also like to thank staff that put in the work to make sure the community was kept apprised of updates on this matter and helped the Council navigate the process.

Lastly, and importantly, I want to thank those from both sides of the discussion, that have shared their thoughts, opinions, and topical knowledge with us as we have deliberated on this issue over the past many months.

This evening's meeting of the Aberdeen City Council will be held at the 3000 Building at Grays Harbor College, 3rd floor, room 3322 at 6:30 P.M.

Federal Court Ruling: <https://fingfx.thomsonreuters.com/.../09252024fluoride.pdf>

Reuters article: <https://www.reuters.com/.../epa-must-address-fluoridated.../>

Derek Kemppainen



From: [Geri Rubano](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Cc: [Dollar, Sarah](#); [Maruhn, Tawny](#); [Quintrell, Anna](#); [Young, Jonathan](#); [Worley, Steve](#); [City of Vancouver - Office of the City Manager](#); [Driskell, Cary](#); [Wilson, Brian E](#); [Ofstedahl, Matt](#)
Subject: Camas City Council to Discontinue Fluoridation of the City's Municipal Water
Date: Friday, December 20, 2024 10:59:11 AM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

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.

Good day,

Please be aware that the Camas City Council is considering ending water fluoridation. I think it is imperative that the City of Vancouver consider the same as water fluoridation poses many risks to public health and little to no benefit.

NOTICE IS FURTHER GIVEN that **the purpose of the Public Hearing is for the Camas City Council to consider an ordinance change to Discontinue Fluoridation of the City's Municipal Water Supply**. This practice began in 1966 under City Ordinance 1059 and is codified in Camas Municipal Code Section 13.16.020. Discussion of a potential ordinance change will be heard at the Regular Camas City Council meeting scheduled for Monday, March 17, 2025. The City Council will consider all public testimony and may take formal action at a future meeting. This notice is being provided to City of Camas water system customers and the Washington State Department of Health, as required by law in HB 1251 and RCW 70A.125.210;

Thank you,

Geri Rubano
Camas resident

On Dec 19, 2024, at 1:43 PM, Derek Kemppainen <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Dear City of Vancouver,

I hope this message finds you well.

I just watched an interview with the late Dr. AK Susheela. She was a world

renowned fluoride and fluorosis researcher in India, having studied fluorosis for over 30 years. [Dr AK Susheela Interview on Fluoride on Vimeo](#)

I recommend watching the 18 minute video, but I wanted to share some key points with you:

The video discussed findings related to low birth weight in infants born to mothers with low hemoglobin levels. Despite being given iron supplements, the mothers' hemoglobin levels did not improve. Initially, healthcare providers suspected non-compliance with iron supplements, but upon investigation, the mothers had been taking them as directed.

The issue was traced to fluoride ingestion, which was found to interfere with the body's ability to absorb nutrients. Here are some critical points from the video:

- **Fluoride's impact on digestion:**

- When ingested, fluoride reacts with hydrochloric acid in the stomach to form hydrofluoric acid, a highly corrosive substance, (capable of eating through materials such as concrete, glass, and steel)
- Hydrofluoric acid damages the stomach lining and destroys the mucus membranes and microvilli in the intestines, which are essential for the absorption of nutrients, including iron and folic acid.
- Damage to the body of this type is considered Non Skeletal Fluorosis - damage to the soft tissues of the body by fluoride.
- Additionally, fluoride inhibits over 150 enzymes, including those that create the protective mucus layer for the digestive tract, preventing healing and leading to further damage.

- **Recovery through fluoride elimination:**

- After removing fluoride from the mothers' diets, their hemoglobin levels returned to normal within weeks.
- This change also led to babies being born at healthy weights, addressing the previous concerns about low birth weight.

It's noteworthy that countries like China and India actively remove fluoride from their water, adhering to the philosophy that "the lower the fluoride levels, the better."

This is one of AK Susheela's many research articles published in the Indian Journal of Practical Pediatrics which discusses the impact of fluoride exposure on the gastrointestinal tract.

[Fluorosis-and-Associated-Health-Issues.pdf](#)

The visuals in this article are definitely worth reviewing. You can see how the microvilli responsible for nutrient absorption have been decimated in the intestines of those that consume fluoridated water, compared to the healthy microvilli in the intestines where fluoride has not been consumed.

This is a list of her 79 published peer reviewed research articles . [AK Susheela - Fluoride and Fluorosis Reprints](#)

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I am happy to provide more information or discuss this further.

Sincerely,
Derek

Derek Kemppainen



From: [Derek Kemppainen](#)
To: [City Council](#); [Dollar, Sarah](#); [Maruhn, Tawny](#); [Quintrell, Anna](#); [Young, Jonathan](#); [Worley, Steve](#); [City of Vancouver - Office of the City Manager](#); [Driskell, Cary](#); [Wilson, Brian E](#); [Oftedahl, Matt](#)
Subject: Non Skeletal Fluorosis in the intestines and Nutrient Absorption
Date: Thursday, December 19, 2024 1:44:25 PM

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.

Dear City of Vancouver,

I hope this message finds you well.

I just watched an interview with the late Dr, AK Susheela. She was a world renowned fluoride and fluorosis researcher in India, having studied fluorosis for over 30 years. [Dr AK Susheela Interview on Fluoride on Vimeo](#)

I recommend watching the 18 minute video, but I wanted to share some key points with you:

The video discussed findings related to low birth weight in infants born to mothers with low hemoglobin levels. Despite being given iron supplements, the mothers' hemoglobin levels did not improve. Initially, healthcare providers suspected non-compliance with iron supplements, but upon investigation, the mothers had been taking them as directed.

The issue was traced to fluoride ingestion, which was found to interfere with the body's ability to absorb nutrients. Here are some critical points from the video:

- **Fluoride's impact on digestion:**

- When ingested, fluoride reacts with hydrochloric acid in the stomach to form hydrofluoric acid, a highly corrosive substance, (capable of eating through materials such as concrete, glass, and steel)
- Hydrofluoric acid damages the stomach lining and destroys the mucus membranes and microvilli in the intestines, which are essential for the absorption of nutrients, including iron and folic acid.
- Damage to the body of this type is considered Non Skeletal Fluorosis - damage to the soft tissues of the body by fluoride.
- Additionally, fluoride inhibits over 150 enzymes, including those that create the protective mucus layer for the digestive tract, preventing healing and leading to further damage.

- **Recovery through fluoride elimination:**

- After removing fluoride from the mothers' diets, their hemoglobin levels returned to normal within weeks.
- This change also led to babies being born at healthy weights, addressing the previous concerns about low birth weight.

It's noteworthy that countries like China and India actively remove fluoride from their water, adhering to the philosophy that "the lower the fluoride levels, the better."

This is one of AK Susheela's many research articles published in the Indian Journal of Practical Pediatrics which discusses the impact of fluoride exposure on the gastrointestinal tract.

[Fluorosis-and-Associated-Health-Issues.pdf](#)

The visuals in this article are definitely worth reviewing. You can see how the microvilli responsible for nutrient absorption have been decimated in the intestines of those that consume fluoridated water, compared to the healthy microvilli in the intestines where fluoride has not been consumed.

This is a list of her 79 published peer reviewed research articles . [AK Susheela - Fluoride and Fluorosis Reprints](#)

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I am happy to provide more information or discuss this further.

Sincerely,
Derek

Derek Kemppainen



From: [Jean Kent](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: opinion on Save Our Streets petition
Date: Friday, January 3, 2025 9:17:42 PM

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED] Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

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.

I am against this petition. I believe that the city transportation people who have studied transportation for years know a lot more about transportation issues than citizens do. I am in support of the Complete Streets philosophy and want to see it implemented where appropriate throughout the city.

Jean Kent
Vancouver WA 98683

From: [Cathryn Chudy](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Public Comment on Public Hearing on Council Agenda for Jan. 6, 2025 - #13: Proposed Initiated Ordinance
Date: Sunday, January 5, 2025 8:22:23 PM
Attachments: [ACE ltr to COV SOS Ballot Initiative.rev.pdf](#)

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.

Hello Mayor and City Council Members,

Please find attached a letter of support:

Alliance for Community Engagement (ACE) supports Council to take no action on the proposed initiative petition.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Cathryn Chudy and Heidi Cody on behalf of:

Alliance for Community Engagement SW WA (ACE)

January 6, 2024

Alliance for Community Engagement (ACE) SW WA

Dear Vancouver City Council, Clerk and staff,

Thank you for your ongoing work to reduce greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) and protect our community health and safety in accordance with Vancouver's Climate Action Framework (CAF), the City's Comprehensive Planning efforts, our [Transportation and Safety Plan \(TSP\)](#) and goals set forth by the new climate element in the state Growth Management Act (GMA).

Alliance for Community Engagement (ACE) supports the City Clerk not advancing the Save Our Streets ballot initiative for legal reasons.

Safety First

ACE supports the City of Vancouver's [Complete Streets](#) program to make our streets safer and friendlier for pedestrians and non-car transportation alternatives. ACE supports transportation freedom, not car dependence.

Car driver safety and efficiency will also be improved by Complete Streets. In his book [Walkable City Rules](#), Jeff Speck describes a study of 23 North American [road diets](#), which found **"the average volume of car traffic *increased* after 4-to-3 lane conversions**. Notably, this *increase* in traffic volume corresponded with a dramatic *decrease* in collisions and fatalities. If you want to drive faster while *not* killing people, 3-lane roads" provide these dual benefits.¹ "We now know that there is no reason for any urban street in America to have four lanes," Speck writes. "It cannot be justified."

Red Tape Would Cause Insurmountable Delays & Inability to Meet Climate Goals

This initiative would force everyone in Vancouver to vote on any street changes like adding a bike lane, transit stop, etc. This cumbersome delay would bring our Complete Streets program to a grinding halt, disrupt local road infrastructure projects, hamper the City's ability to respond to transportation needs and cause administrative challenges for City transportation planners.

¹ <https://sweetstreetsslc.org/news/why-three-lanes-are-better-than-four-even-for-cars>

The initiative would make it impossible for Vancouver to meet the state [Complete Streets](#) requirement to provide equitable alternatives to car transportation:

“...it is the intent of the Legislature that WSDOT must incorporate the principles of complete streets with facilities that provide street access with all users in mind, including pedestrians, bicyclists and public transportation users” and "integrate the state route into the local network" for “state transportation projects starting design on or after July 1, 2022 and that are \$500,000 or more.”

Similarly, the City’s own Climate Action Framework goal of reducing GHGs 80% by 2030 would be impossible to meet if the City is unable to incentivize people to transition to non-car modes of transportation. The initiative would undermine the City’s authority to adequately plan for climate resilience and reduce vehicle miles traveled (VMTS), as our CAF aims to do and as the state GMA requires. Reducing VMTS is one of the most important levers in reducing GHGs.

Equity

According to this study commissioned by the Washington legislature, [30% of Washingtonians don’t drive](#). As our population grows, and even more people move away from driving and into bicycles and public transit, our infrastructure needs to reflect and support these transportation alternatives. This ballot initiative prioritizes cars and ignores the needs of anyone who walks, bikes, or takes transit and those who are underage, elderly or disabled. A vote to prevent implementation of Complete Streets could subject the City to lawsuits for violating the American Disabilities Act.

In Conclusion

This ballot initiative would undermine the City’s work toward a safe, equitable, climate-resilient future. ACE supports the City’s efforts to keep its Complete Streets program intact. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Alliance for Community Engagement (ACE) SW WA

From: wizard.tech@yahoo.com
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Staff Report: 007-25 Comment Submission to City Council
Date: Monday, January 6, 2025 1:37:14 AM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

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.

Re: Staff Report: 007-25 – Statement in Support of Initiative petition proposed by Save Our Streets

The council was challenged by public input prior to the petition in question to address their position on changing several roads in Vancouver to comply with the “complete streets policy”. During these challenges members of the council were given feedback demonstrating public disagreement with their intent to change roads identified in the plan. We expressed that these changes would only make worse the problems being used to justify these changes. After reading through the NONDRIVERS: POPULATION, DEMOGRAPHICS & ANALYSIS and all of the supporting documents, a bias appears to be forming that does not actually fit the model being delivered under the Road Diet designs. Specifically, the roads selected are not high risk four lane undivided passages as defined by the Road Diet report and the supporting reports. Additionally, the NONDRIVERS report does not support the pursuit of these changes in Vancouver City, in the same manner that the changes to North 125th street in Seattle delivered which does not mirror anything we have here in Vancouver. The recommendations in Vancouver are not comparable to Seattle roads mostly because our city isn’t remotely now, or at any time in our reasonable city planning future, as large nor does it have the traffic density Seattle has.

We as voting representatives who already share the road with cyclists do not find the justification for these changes, namely, the carbon reduction, improved safety through slower speeds and converting drivers to riders to be realistic expectations resulting from the recommended design. Instead, as already demonstrated by the implementation on 34th street where sidewalks already existed and one block north less than a ¼ mile, SE 29th Street having lower speeds and full bicycle lanes, the design has not delivered the defined results. The situation has been made worse by increasing traffic congestion, adding higher risk to the drive for both riders and drivers and increased risks to any pedestrians who would decide not to use the designated sidewalks that already existed. Changing McGillivray, a road already posted 25MPH would not appreciably improve or satisfy any of the safety points made by the Road Diet report or its supporting documents. The NONDRIVERS Report additionally reports licensed density of Vancouver city is far greater than the state average with very few unlicensed drivers (less than 8%) inconsistent with the average unlicensed driver density in the rest of Washington which was used to represent a 30% unlicensed driver density for Vancouver.

Our community has already demonstrated support for cyclists and pedestrians with nearly all high traffic roads already having designated bicycle lanes, and a very complete sidewalk infrastructure. The Complete Streets and the Road Diet policies were not written for cities like Vancouver which already does more for cyclists than Iowa and many other cities in Washington.

It is expected that our representatives in their official capacity represent the voters with integrity especially with the fair distribution of tax revenues to the needs of our community. Far too many roads in our city are in need of repair or resurfacing which appears to be lower on the priority list than the actions being proposed by carbon reduction initiatives, and intent to make our roads safer for all forms of traffic. Where in these changes are you addressing the increased costs ratios for the maintenance of our existing roads resulting from these changes. Cyclists and pedestrians don't pay road taxes, so where will this revenue come from?

We are not anti-cyclist, anti-pedestrian or anti-transit as has been suggested by the Cycle Vancouver group. We pay taxes that support the continued development of our city where a vast majority of roads within the city have sidewalks, already addressing safe pedestrian traffic. The Road Diet report addresses unmarked crosswalks as a high-risk area for pedestrians when crossing four-lane or larger undivided roads. We have very few undivided four-lane or larger roads none of which are in the proposed road changes, so again, this report is not a good representation of Vancouver city. Drivers pay gas taxes which in turn pay for the maintenance and construction of roads, which already includes bicycle lanes in both directions. The Road Diet report suggested converting one lane in a four-lane undivided roadway to support increased bicycle and pedestrian traffic. Vancouver experiences very limited sustained bicycle activity which significantly declines in our winter months and during inclement weather. We propose that the cycling lanes as they already exist are sufficient to meet the needs of those riders and sidewalks are safer for pedestrians than mixing them with cyclists who are even now starting to use e-cycles under power more which will further impact safety for all especially other riders and pedestrians. Widening bicycle lanes will actually encourage riding abreast instead of single file, increasing the potential for social riding and increasing the risk of accidents just as it does with drivers.

The petition would not have been needed, or even successful if these views were not consistent and we would not be wanting to vote on all road changes if the road selections were not contentious in the proposed expectations being advanced. Please understand, we are not against road modifications, we just want them to be reasonable and consistent with intent which should be to serve the public and not micro-special interest groups.

The request by petition to pass an amendment to city ordinance Chapter 11.80 requiring a public vote on road changes which would reduce the lanes available to drivers demonstrates a need because we feel the council is not representing Vancouver city voters through its choices and use of our tax revenues relating to road maintenance expenditures. Using grant money only sets us up for monetary issues in the future when revenues are not sufficient to maintain the roads. This lack of

planning is dangerous for our budget and risks the already tenuous balance that is inadequate to maintain what we already have. This has been demonstrated in far too many different areas of government budget planning recently with lost revenues forcing reduction of educators from lost federal grants and more gas taxes in an effort to keep up with existing road maintenance expenditures. Let's not continue to follow the same pattern as we've done for so long expecting to change the outcome.

If you want to improve the driver compliance with speed restrictions, enforce those restrictions with law enforcement. If that isn't enough to get their compliance, increase the penalties associated with violations. Don't punish the rest of the community for something only a few are responsible for.

So, our position on this issue is that the petition must stand because we were not represented properly with decisions recently made by the Council's Transportation committee and until we are, we believe the voting public must have an appropriate level of input on change that affect us all.

All things considered, those who are advocating for these road modifications are not considering the needs of families to transport their children to schools, day care, sporting events. They are also not recognizing that a family needs groceries, and household goods that simply cannot be transported by transit alone or bicycles. Distances to retailers just are not in line with reasonable riding or walking considering the weather here in the Pacific Northwest. Where does 34th street, McGillivray or any of the other local roads being considered have businesses who are going to see improved traffic from riders and pedestrians? This is another area where these reports sadly do not fit our cities layout both now and in the proposed city planning future thru 2040.

There are approximately 150 members of the Cycle Vancouver group, who oppose this petition while the petition gathered more than 6,000 signatures – clearly demonstrating the majority view. Additionally, Jason Cromer, an avid cyclist, has stated openly that “He believes the initiative passing would undo the work the city has done to make roads safer and easier for pedestrians and bicyclists to use.” How does one undo with this petition and proposal what already exists? His statement makes no sense. Additionally, he presents “All of these roads are killing our small businesses,” Cromer said. “They're killing our culture because this car-centric environment isn't conducive to people walking around.” Again, the issue here is that without the roads, there would be fewer residents and businesses. Suburbs have the majority of Vancouver residents and businesses. We aren't in the city proper, downtown, where walking is how you get to a business. The logic in his challenge to the petition does not meet the measure of realistic observation or perception. Distances between the majority of residents and businesses in the suburbs is measured in miles instead of feet. Another comment, “If this initiative passes, it hurts everybody. ... It hurts people that just want to get out and be involved in the community but don't have the choice to drive.” We already have the infrastructure, we already have bicycle lanes and sidewalks, expanding the width of these pathways while reducing driving lanes does not mean they will be adequately used or even used at all for more than three months of the year. Drivers will just move to other roads causing more congestion and

increased safety issues. Without the changes, it hurts no one.

Respectfully,

Mark D Jones

[REDACTED]

Vancouver, WA 98683

[REDACTED]

From: [KAREN FRED GARMIRE](#)
To: [City Council; Eiken, Chad](#) [REDACTED]
Subject: Testimony (01/06) for Modification of Staff Report 007-25 regarding Initiative Petition for Street Modifications
Date: Monday, January 6, 2025 7:38:11 AM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED] [Learn why this is important](#)

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.

I am providing written testimony regarding Staff Report 007-25 for Initiative Petition on Street Modifications, requesting modification of the subject report to strengthen the City's position.

I am a licensed Professional Civil Engineer in the State of Washington and retired in 2023 as the Regional Chief of Engineering and Construction for the Corps of Engineers (Federal Agency).

Specifically, I am requesting that the staff report be amended to include 1) Life-Safety and 2) the requirement for traffic engineering to be done by a licensed professional engineer as detailed below. Including these additional reasons supporting the illegality of the initiative in the staff report will help the City defend their determination upfront and eliminate the potential need to address these later during the anticipated legal challenge.

1. RCW 18.43.010 requires engineering to be performed by (or under the direction of) a licensed engineer in the State of Washington. Transportation engineering is typically done by a licensed Civil Engineer with expertise in transportation. Traffic studies and interpretation of data related to traffic is a part of this process. There could be valid engineering reasons for reducing traffic lanes including lane revisions to meet stated intent of a street, improvements to meet safety criteria, etc. Allowing an engineering decision by vote of the citizens of Vancouver would not comply with RCW 18.43.010 Staff Report 007-25 should be amended to address engineering.
2. Life Safety. Sometimes lanes are reduced or eliminated for life safety, often for pedestrians and the result of this action is pedestrian use of the former traffic lane. An example is the elimination of the left turn lanes on SE McGillivray at the intersection with SE Village Loop. The elimination of these left hand turn lanes was done to improve pedestrian safety several years ago, and to my recollection was done as a result of a pedestrian fatality at that intersection. The pedestrian crosswalk now occupies what previously was a left turn lane (ie the former left hand turn lane is now used for pedestrians). As currently written, proposed initiative would require a vote of the people to make a similar modification. Life safety issues should not be decided by vote and would potentially put the City in a liable position. Staff report 007-25 should be amended to address life safety.

Thank you for your consideration
Karen Garmire, PE

Initiative Petition (provided for reference):

BE IT ENACTED BY THE PEOPLE OF THE CITY OF VANCOUVER

A new section is added to Chapter 11.80 STREET AND DEVELOPMENT
STANDARDS of the Vancouver Municipal Code which states:

The City of Vancouver shall not construct or contract for the construction of any project which results in the conversion of a lane or lanes of vehicle travel on any existing principal arterial, minor arterial, collector, industrial or access street to pedestrian, bicycling, mobility, or transit use without approval by a majority of voters in the City of Vancouver in an election for the project. This provision will apply to any applicable project approved after its enactment or to any applicable project previously approved for construction by the City in which:

1. the contract has not been awarded pursuant to a competitive bidding process or
2. funding has not been appropriated.

From: [Janice Ritter](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Proposed Initiated Ordinance Staff Report: 007-25
Date: Monday, January 6, 2025 7:55:55 AM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

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.

I do not understand how decisions that can directly affect the public cannot be influenced by the public. The transportation changes that have been done and are proposed do not make sense to me and many others. I assumed government is supposed to represent its citizens, but you are denying the opportunity to provide a voice on transportation that is greatly affecting the public. If the changes you have proposed were sanctioned by the public with a vote, then it would be easier to accept. But the City is making decisions without the voice of the people. Now you claim it is illegal to have the opportunity to vote on traffic changes. I don't understand the logic of laws that would deny the public the opportunity to vote on matters that directly affect their lives and safety. That should be unconstitutional. Traffic changes on Fourth Plain are confusing and dangerous. I hope it will not cause any additional accidents or worse, deaths. Fourth Plain is a good example of the City going backwards instead of making things better.

Please reconsider and accept the initiative by Save Our Streets.

Janice and Greg Ritter

From: [Jessica Townsend](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Comments for Jan. 6th City Council Meeting
Date: Monday, January 6, 2025 9:38:09 AM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

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 the City Councillors of Vancouver,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed legislation by Save Vancouver Streets requiring public votes for road modifications that accommodate non-vehicle travel. As a car driver, I understand the importance of maintaining efficient traffic flow and can understand the concerns of other citizens who drive when it comes to changes to the road infrastructure. However, I believe this measure presents significant drawbacks for our city.

Public transportation projects often require significant infrastructure improvements, such as dedicated bus or bicycle lanes. These projects would face substantial delays due to the mandated public vote process, hindering the development of a robust and equitable public transit system crucial for a growing city. There are already established mechanisms for public input on city infrastructure projects, such as public commission meetings and opportunities to submit written concerns online. The proposed legislation introduces an unnecessary and potentially burdensome layer of bureaucracy.

City planners and transportation engineers possess the expertise to design safe and efficient transportation systems that balance the needs of all users. This legislation undermines their professional judgment and replaces it with a potentially less informed public vote process. This legislation would also disproportionately disadvantage a portion of our population: those who do not or are unable to use cars. By requiring a majority vote for these particular road modifications, we risk prioritizing the needs of car drivers while neglecting the essential needs of non-drivers, including access to employment and healthcare. Expecting all citizens to pay \$400-\$500 monthly to own and operate a personal vehicle is not a solution.

This legislation perpetuates a car-centric approach to transportation, while a truly sustainable city requires a diverse range of transportation options. Delays in public transit development could cause an increase in car usage, which is unsustainable and will exacerbate traffic congestion as our city continues to grow.

Instead of restricting the development of alternative transportation options, the city should prioritize the creation of a multimodal transportation system that includes robust public transit, safe and accessible cycling and walking infrastructure, and efficient traffic management strategies. I urge you to reconsider this measure to ensure a more sustainable and equitable future for all residents of Vancouver.

Sincerely,

Jessica Townsend

From: [Cody Olson](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Public Comment for 1-6-25 meeting / Save Our Streets petition
Date: Monday, January 6, 2025 10:02:18 AM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

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.

Good afternoon,

My name is Cody Olson, I am a lifelong Vancouver resident. I am asking that the City Council take no action on the initiative petition proposed by Save Our Streets. Not only is the petition directly contrary to State and City laws, it would also create a massive administrative burden for the city to make routine quality of life improvements while alienating city residents that do not drive. The city is very effective in building public engagement regarding infrastructure projects and provides our community's residents ample opportunity to connect with city planners and express concerns. The proposed petition would result in significant administrative costs for the city while adding nothing to the public conversation about the future of transportation in Vancouver. As our city grows, alternative and more efficient forms of transportation are and will continue to be a necessity to accommodate an ever-increasing population. Infringing on the city's ability to administer its street planning program would harm residents who rely on alternative forms of transportation while simultaneously increasing traffic congestion on our neighborhood streets. Ultimately, poor transportation planning will damage our local economy as the inflation of overhead costs outpaces customer traffic for businesses much like what has happened in Portland since the pandemic. For all of these reasons I hope the City Council will see fit to take no action on the initiative petition.

Respectfully,

-Cody Olson

From: [Bill Foote](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Cc: [Pluckhahn, Lon](#)
Subject: Transportation System Plan / Save Our Streets
Date: Monday, January 6, 2025 9:56:14 AM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

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.

Hello.

The following is input for tonight's council meeting, agenda item 13.

I'd like to express opposition to the "Save our Streets" initiative petition. I understand that it is argued that the petition is illegal and thus cannot be placed on the ballot. Perhaps the council meeting tonight is only considering this narrow legal issue, which rests outside my area of expertise.

With that said, I would like to express support for the city's Transportation System Plan, and for improvements to bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure more generally. In my experience, these sorts of improvements make a city more livable for all. I have experienced this in San Luis Obispo, West Los Angeles, Strasbourg, France, and in The Philippines (where I was a Peace Corps volunteer). As a cyclist, I can further attest to the need for improvements on McGillivray Bl.

On the subject of the petition, I further believe that the attempt to micro-manage decisions that require substantial study, such as the Transportation System Plan, is a abuse of the intended purpose of the initiative process.

Thank you for your consideration.

William Foote

[REDACTED]
Vancouver, WA

From: [Charles Shaw](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Safe Streets
Date: Monday, January 6, 2025 10:31:05 AM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

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.

I want to thank the city for continuing to re-shape our streets to make them safer for all modes of transportation. I am most happy with how the changes have slowed traffic down. The difference on streets like Fourth Plain is notable. In my opinion we are giving up a few minutes to save lives.

Charles Shaw
[REDACTED]
Vancouver, WA 98661
[REDACTED]

From: [Don Steinke](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: Agenda Item #13 re Save our Streets
Date: Monday, January 6, 2025 11:14:49 AM

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.

From Don Steinke

Hello everyone, my name is Don Steinke.

I applaud your efforts for complete streets. As I understand it, Mayor Pollard started the safe-bike-lane effort about 25 years ago. The problem now is that bike lanes and sidewalks are not yet continuous. The more they are connected, the more they'll be used.

Personally, about 25 years ago, I tried to reduce my carbon footprint by riding my bike 9 miles from East Fourth Plain to Fort Vancouver HS where I taught science. By the time I got to work, I decided it was too dangerous to ride my bike back home and found another way. I had no choice but to own two cars.

We need to design communities so that people don't need two cars.

As a kid growing up in NE Portland, my bicycle was my ticket to freedom. I rode to school, to the swimming pools, and to work. But it wasn't very safe. Bike lanes give young people independence and freedom to explore safely.

They also provide access to doctor appointments and groceries for people who can't afford a car.

My brother-in-law is wheelchair bound. He has 11 miles of range on his wheelchair battery. He can get around in his neighborhood because it has side-walks and curb cutouts.

Forcing everyone to use a car, or rely on someone with a car, is not fair and restricts people's freedom. Vancouver is going in the right direction. I support your commitment to complete streets. I support the staff recommendation of the No Action Alternative.

Thanks for all you do.

Don Steinke

From: [Ruth Romer](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Subject: City council meeting tonight Jan 6
Date: Monday, January 6, 2025 11:39:46 AM

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

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.

I would like to express that the initiative proposed by the Save our Streets group to require a popular vote on any transportation improvements is not a good idea. I am an avid bicyclist and know that the city needs to have many improvements in bicycle lanes and safety and this initiative would only impede progress in that area and NOT enhance it. It would make it difficult for any improvements to move forward.

Ruth Romer

[REDACTED] Vancouver, WA 98682

From: [City of Vancouver - Office of the City Manager](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Cc: [Delapena, Amanda](#); [Dollar, Sarah](#)
Subject: FW: No On Petition
Date: Monday, January 6, 2025 11:25:42 AM

Hello!

We received this in the CMO inbox.

Amelia Pilipchuk | Support Specialist
City Manager's Office | Information Desk
P: (360) 487-8101

-----Original Message-----

From: Carole Dollemore [REDACTED] >
Sent: Sunday, January 5, 2025 2:12 PM
To: City of Vancouver - Office of the City Manager <cmo@cityofvancouver.us>; Transportation and Mobility Commission Agenda Calendar <tmc@cityofvancouver.us>
Subject: No On Petition

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

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.

I don't support putting street safety on the ballot. I would feel much safer leaving it in the hands of planning professionals at the city.

Carole Dollemore
[REDACTED]
Vancouver, WA 98664

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Urbane Streets](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Cc: [Pluckhahn, Lon](#)
Subject: 2025.01.06 CoV - Council Mtg - Public Comment - #13 Proposed Transportation Ordinance
Date: Monday, January 6, 2025 11:59:54 AM

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.

Dear Council members and staff,

Here are my public comments for the record in regards to today's agenda item #13: Proposed Initiated Ordinance from "Save Our Streets"

- Request that the council take no action on the initiative petition.

Furthermore:

- In light of the Staff Report findings (007-25) on state GMA requirements, City Climate policy objectives and council adopted transportation plans that Council needs to continue infilling active transportation facilities for new and retrofit projects;
- And given the City's very high injury and fatality rates for active transportation users MUST double down on making transportation safety investments AND traffic enforcement; and
- City staff MUST release the 2024 traffic data (all modes, speed and volume) from the Columbia Street corridor project, as the 'SOS' members - during past public meetings - kept stating that the Columbia Street project [and any proposed projects] was a 'failure' in that they 'never see any bicyclists' or other multi modal users using it. [I live on the corridor and can say that it is very well used...often there are more cyclists using it versus drivers.]

Best regards,

Todd Boulanger
Vancouver WA

From: [City of Vancouver - Office of the City Manager](#)
To: [City Council](#)
Cc: [Delapena, Amanda](#); [Dollar, Sarah](#)
Subject: FW: No On Petition
Date: Monday, January 6, 2025 11:25:42 AM

Hello!

We received this in the CMO inbox.

Amelia Pilipchuk | Support Specialist
City Manager's Office | Information Desk
P: (360) 487-8101

-----Original Message-----

From: Carole Dollemore <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Sunday, January 5, 2025 2:12 PM
To: City of Vancouver - Office of the City Manager <cmo@cityofvancouver.us>; Transportation and Mobility Commission Agenda Calendar <tmc@cityofvancouver.us>
Subject: No On Petition

[You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. Learn why this is important at <https://aka.ms/LearnAboutSenderIdentification>]

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.

I don't support putting street safety on the ballot. I would feel much safer leaving it in the hands of planning professionals at the city.

Carole Dollemore

[REDACTED]
Vancouver, WA 98664

Sent from my iPhone