

Llanos Bare, Cheyenne

From: John Bower [REDACTED] >
Sent: Tuesday, June 16, 2026 3:15 PM
To: City Council; Harless, Kim
Subject: Comment on Change to VMC 7.04.020

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

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

Hello,

I am a community member who is concerned about the newly passed ordinance that criminalizes people occupying the medians of roads.

I do not think the city should have made this decision without stronger evidence that people occupying medians is dangerous. I did not see such data in the staff report given at yesterday's meeting, which only had more general data about pedestrian-vehicle collisions, and anecdotes from concerned residents. Concern from residents, and data that does not describe this particular behavior, should not be a sufficient basis to *criminalize* standing on medians. It could be the case that none of the fatalities involved lingering at medians at all. We simply don't know unless more in-depth analysis is done.

It is especially inadvisable as panhandling on a median is an effective method homeless people use to support themselves in their already desperate situation. We shouldn't use the criminal code to make things even harder on them.

I believe the council should repeal this ordinance, and only re-implement it if both of the following are true:

1. It proves to be the case that individuals standing at medians leads to harm, and,
2. Criminalization is the only way to solve this issue.

Sincerely,
John Bower

CryWolf / CentralSquare False-Alarm Program

Updated Questions by Stakeholder for City of Vancouver Review

Prepared for public submittal - June 2026 - Todd Boulanger

Summary request: Pull the CryWolf / CentralSquare contract threshold item from consent for public explanation, or condition any approval on a procurement, finance, performance, data-control, and customer-service review before the upcoming FY 2026-2027 RFP.

1. Basis for Updated Questions

These questions are based on recent City/VPD staff emails explaining the 2022 outsourcing process and the reason for the June 2026 contract-threshold item. The updated focus is not only whether the original contract was below the Council-approval threshold. The sharper issue is how the City is now asking Council to authorize continued payment after the threshold has been exceeded, without a prior committee process, staff report, or Council workshop on the program.

The staff history provided to date indicates that the City previously managed alarm processing in-house, that a program coordinator resigned in early 2021, that an RFP was completed, and that CryWolf was selected through a competitive process. Staff also stated that the 2022 contract did not require Council discussion/approval because it did not exceed the \$300,000 procurement threshold. On June 15, 2026, staff stated that the agenda item is to increase the contract amount because the City is exceeding its threshold and needs Council approval to continue paying CryWolf.

The questions below are organized by stakeholder so that Council and staff can identify who should answer each issue before the City relies on the existing arrangement through the next procurement cycle.

2. Priority Questions for Council Discussion

1. Should this item be pulled from consent because staff has confirmed that Council approval is now needed to continue paying CryWolf after the contract threshold has been exceeded?
2. What exactly is Council being asked to approve: a spending-threshold increase only, a renewal/extension, continued service authority, payment authority through May 31, 2027, or some combination?
3. When did the City first know the contract would exceed the \$300,000 threshold, and what internal escalation occurred before the June 2026 agenda item?
4. What are the known customer-service, payment, complaint, appeal, data, or operational issues that prompted VPD to say it is working internally on a solution?
5. What conditions should be attached to any threshold increase to protect the City before the FY 2026-2027 RFP?

3. Questions for City Council

- A1. Is Council comfortable approving this item on consent, or should it be pulled for discussion because this appears to be the first Council-facing review of the outsourced false-alarm program since 2022?
- A2. Is Council being asked to approve only a spending-threshold increase, or is the action also ratifying continued service, a renewal period, amended scope, or payment authority through May 31, 2027?
- A3. If the 2022 contract was executed administratively because it was expected to remain below the \$300,000 threshold, should Council require the original RFP, award record, threshold analysis, approval authority, legal review, and renewal history before increasing the threshold to \$500,000?
- A4. Should Council ask why the item is characterized as routine if staff now says Council approval is needed because the City is exceeding its threshold and must continue paying CryWolf?

CryWolf / CentralSquare False-Alarm Program - Stakeholder Questions

- A5. Should Council require a financial and performance summary before or as a condition of approval, including gross billings, collections, vendor share, City net revenue, refunds, fees, staff time, appeals, waivers, complaints, delinquencies, and suspensions/reinstatements?
- A6. Should Council require a future public update before the FY 2026-2027 RFP is issued, covering customer service, complaint handling, appeals, data control, public-records compliance, cybersecurity, bank-account control, and peer-contract benchmarking?
- A7. Should Council condition approval on a City-controlled data export and transition package so the upcoming RFP is competitively neutral and not dependent on the incumbent vendor?

4. Questions for City Manager's Office

- B1. What management review occurred between the 2022 outsourcing decision and the 2026 threshold-exceedance item?
- B2. Who was responsible for monitoring cumulative contract utilization against the \$300,000 threshold, and when was the City Manager's Office first informed that the threshold would be exceeded?
- B3. If staff's process is to bring contracts back to Council when they exceed the threshold during the term, why did the Council packet not include a fuller program history, performance summary, and procurement file summary?
- B4. What internal solution is VPD now working on, and does that solution include changes to contract oversight, customer service, data control, procurement strategy, or program governance?
- B5. Will the City Manager require an after-action review of the 2022-2026 false-alarm outsourcing process before authorizing the next RFP?

5. Questions for Vancouver Police Department / Chief Troy Price and Police Business Services

- C1. Chief Troy Price / VPD: Who within VPD is accountable for policy oversight of the false-alarm program, including appeals, waivers, notices, suspensions/reinstatements, customer-service problems, and vendor performance?
- C2. VPD has confirmed there have been no committee meetings, staff reports, or Council workshops since outsourcing in 2022. What internal VPD management reviews, dashboards, complaint reviews, or vendor performance meetings have occurred during that same period?
- C4. What performance metrics has VPD received from CryWolf/CentralSquare since May 2022, including registrations, renewals, false alarms processed, invoices, collections, complaints, appeals, waivers, delinquencies, response suspensions/reinstatements, call-center activity, and error corrections?
- C5. Does VPD have direct access to all records needed to administer the alarm ordinance, respond to complaints, support appeals, and meet public-records obligations, or does it depend on vendor searches/exports?
- C6. What role does VPD play in approving notice templates, appeal procedures, waiver decisions, account corrections, collection practices, and any suspension or reinstatement consequences?
- C7. Before the next RFP, will VPD publish or provide a clear list of program problems to be corrected, including customer service, data portability, audit rights, public accountability, and payment reconciliation?

6. Questions for Procurement

- D1. What was the RFP number, title, posting date, closing date, and procurement method used for the 2022 CryWolf/CentralSquare selection?

CryWolf / CentralSquare False-Alarm Program - Stakeholder Questions

- D2. Where was the 2022 solicitation posted: Bonfire, MRSC roster, City procurement page, supplier list, newspaper legal notice, business journal, or another platform?
- D3. Please provide the Bonfire posting record, vendor/planholder list, addenda, proposals received, evaluation committee records, scoring sheets, award recommendation, and notice of intent/award.
- D4. Was any advertisement or legal notice placed in The Columbian, The Oregonian, Daily Journal of Commerce, or another local/regional publication? If yes, please provide affidavits of publication, tear sheets, invoices, and publication dates.
- D5. What written threshold analysis supported handling the 2022 contract administratively rather than through Council approval?
- D6. When did Procurement first become aware that the contract would exceed the \$300,000 threshold, and what internal notification or escalation occurred?
- D7. For the upcoming FY 2026-2027 RFP, what safeguards will be used to avoid incumbent advantage, including required data export, transition support, neutral technical specifications, and disclosure of current service levels?

7. Questions for Finance

- E1. What exactly does the proposed \$500,000 threshold represent: vendor revenue share, gross collections, reimbursable costs, City expenditure authority, pass-through costs, or another accounting control?
- E2. If the staff report says "Budget Impact: None," why is Council approval needed to increase the contract spending threshold by \$200,000?
- E3. Please provide a year-by-year table from 2022 to present showing gross billings, actual collections, vendor share, City share, refunds, bank fees, credit-card fees, postage, certified mail, lockbox costs, staff time, and net City revenue.
- E4. Who controls the alarm-program bank account, lockbox, refund process, reconciliation process, and audit trail?
- E5. Does City Finance have direct read access, reconciliation authority, refund approval authority, and independent audit rights over the alarm-program account and payment records?
- E6. What invoices, payments, remittances, revenue-share calculations, and reconciliation reports supported the conclusion that the threshold is now being exceeded?

8. Questions for City Attorney / Risk / Cybersecurity

- F1. What legal review was completed in 2022 regarding procurement authority, contract approval, data ownership, public records, payment processing, indemnity, termination, and audit rights?
- F2. Does the 2026 Council action merely increase payment authority, or does it also approve or ratify any renewal, amendment, continuation period, or changed scope?
- F3. Has the City confirmed that the \$24,000 early-termination fee expired after the initial two-year period and is not revived by the 2026 threshold action?
- F4. Has the City reviewed the required SOC 2 Type 2 report, cyber-liability coverage, PCI compliance documentation, payment-gateway controls, breach history, backup/recovery procedures, and subcontractor controls?
- F5. Can the City independently preserve, search, export, and produce all alarm-program records for public records, litigation holds, audits, appeals, and ordinance enforcement?
- F6. What changes should be required in the next RFP to strengthen City data ownership, audit access, breach notification, record retention, transition assistance, payment controls, and public-records compliance?

9. Questions for City Clerk / Public Records

- G1. What alarm-program records are City records even when hosted, processed, or generated by CryWolf/CentralSquare?
- G2. Does the City maintain a complete, current, City-controlled copy of the alarm-program database, or must it rely on the vendor for searches and exports?
- G3. What is the process for responding to public-records requests involving alarm accounts, correspondence, call recordings, payment records, appeal records, complaint records, and vendor performance reports?
- G4. Are call recordings, customer-service notes, web-portal records, email templates, payment histories, refund records, and appeal-support materials retained according to an approved City retention schedule?
- G5. Before the next RFP, will the City require a data dictionary, schema, export procedure, record counts, retention mapping, and legal-hold process?

10. Questions for CryWolf / CentralSquare

- H1. Before the upcoming RFP, will CryWolf/CentralSquare provide a complete migration-ready City data export, including data dictionary, schema, record counts, transaction history, account notes, correspondence templates, CAD interface specifications, report definitions, payment records, and audit logs?
- H2. In what format can the City export all alarm-program data, and can another vendor use that export without CryWolf proprietary tools?
- H3. What records, fields, reports, business rules, call recordings, correspondence templates, payment records, or audit logs are not included in the standard City export?
- H4. What service-level metrics can CryWolf/CentralSquare provide for Vancouver since May 2022, including call volume, response time, complaint handling, payment processing, error correction, appeal support, delinquencies, collections, and service interruptions?
- H5. Who owns and controls call recordings, customer-service records, payment records, correspondence history, web-portal content, and report definitions created during the contract?
- H6. How would CryWolf/CentralSquare support transition to another vendor if it is not selected in the upcoming RFP, including timeline, costs, staff support, data-delivery milestones, and post-termination cooperation?
- H7. What security, privacy, payment-processing, backup, breach-response, and subcontractor documentation is current and available for City review?

11. Questions for Residents, Renters, Property Owners, and Small Businesses

- I1. Are alarm users receiving clear, timely, and understandable notices about registration, renewal, invoices, false-alarm fees, appeal rights, waiver options, delinquency, and any suspension/reinstatement consequences?
- I2. Is there a clear City contact for residents and small businesses who cannot resolve an issue through CryWolf/CentralSquare?
- I3. How many complaints, disputed invoices, correction requests, appeals, waivers, and delayed responses has the City received since outsourcing began?
- I4. Are renters, small businesses, property owners, non-English speakers, older adults, and people with disabilities able to navigate the outsourced process without unreasonable barriers?

15. Before the next RFP, will the City collect public/customer feedback about the current false-alarm program and use it to define service-level requirements?

12. Recommended Council Action / Requested Follow-Up

1. Pull the item from consent for discussion, or approve only with conditions requiring a short written follow-up before any continued payment authorization is treated as routine.
2. Provide the 2022 procurement and authorization record, including RFP number/title, solicitation posting history, Bonfire record, vendor list, evaluation/scoring, award recommendation, approval authority, executed contract, renewals, amendments, and change orders.
3. Confirm when and why the contract exceeded the \$300,000 threshold, what spending category is being increased to \$500,000, and whether that amount reflects City expenditure authority, vendor revenue share, gross receipts, or another accounting control.
4. Provide a financial and performance summary from 2022 to present, including customer-service metrics, complaint/appeal/waiver data, payments, refunds, remittances, audit controls, and known operational problems.
5. Confirm City ownership and control of all alarm-program records, including data export, public-records retention, audit logs, payment history, correspondence, call notes/recordings, and transition-support requirements.
6. Before the FY 2026-2027 RFP, require a competitively neutral transition package, peer-contract benchmarking, public/customer feedback, clear service-level expectations, stronger audit/data/cybersecurity terms, and a Council-facing update.

o CRY WOLF HAS POOR Billing Practices
Sample of Billing

Action Taken	Inc Dt Hrng Dt	Actn Dt Dt Sent	Case Number	Amount Charged	Amount Outstndng
<No Letter>		3/13/2026		\$0.00	\$0.00
30 Day Delinquent No	1st? Again	2/15/2026		\$0.00	\$0.00
90 Day Delinquent No	3rd	2/12/2026		\$0.00	\$0.00
30 Day Delinquent No	2nd	1/20/2026		\$0.00	\$0.00
60 Day Delinquent No	1st	1/13/2026		\$0.00	\$0.00
Late Penalty		1/2/2026		\$20.00	\$20.00
Late Penalty		12/12/2025	o no email invoice or mail notice sent	\$20.00	\$20.00
Expiring Manual		11/10/2025		\$20.00	\$20.00
Invoice currently marked as 'In Abeyance'					
Status Change		5/9/2024	o Cry wolf forgot -	\$0.00	\$0.00
Active		5/9/2024	to bill one year	\$0.00	\$0.00
Expiring		4/6/2024	then got things messed up.	\$20.00	\$0.00

Todd Boulanger

6/15/2026

Clark

2026.06.15 Council Regular Agenda - Agenda Item 11 - Pedestrian Interference Testimony:

Full Testimony (supplements on-line abridged submittal) :

I wish to comment on the supporting materials for the proposed amendment to **VMC 7.04.020, Pedestrian Interference**.

The staff materials identify a real pedestrian-safety concern. Vancouver has experienced a serious number of pedestrian-vehicle collisions, including 127 serious injuries and 48 pedestrian fatalities since 2016. The staff report identifies one specific fatal collision where a pedestrian had been standing on a narrow lane divider at Vancouver Mall Drive and NE Fourth Plain Boulevard.

However, the materials still do not fully establish the connection between the broader fatal-crash data and the specific ordinance mechanism being proposed.

The staff report states that 40 of 48 pedestrian fatalities occurred outside lawful crossing areas, but that does not necessarily mean those fatalities involved a person occupying or remaining on a median, traffic island, or roadway divider. A pedestrian fatality outside a lawful crossing area may involve midblock crossing, lighting, speed, impairment, roadway width, lack of safe crossing opportunities, driver behavior, or other factors unrelated to median occupancy.

Before Council adopts this ordinance, staff should take one additional analytical step: review the 48 fatal crash reports, and especially the 40 fatal crashes identified as occurring outside lawful crossing areas, to determine how many actually involved a traffic median, traffic island, roadway divider, or pedestrian refuge; whether the pedestrian was standing or remaining there rather than actively crossing; and whether that feature was identified as a causal or contributing factor. The staff report currently provides one compelling example, but one example should not be treated as if it explains the entire fatal-crash pattern.

The ordinance language also needs more precision. The staff materials refer to "narrow" medians and areas "not intended for pedestrian use," but the proposed code language does not define "narrow," "traffic median," "traffic island," "roadway divider," or "not designated or marked for pedestrian crossing." Medians and traffic islands are not inherently unsafe. In many roadway contexts, they are safety features, including pedestrian refuges that reduce crossing exposure. If the City intends to regulate only unsafe lane dividers or medians not designed for pedestrian refuge, the ordinance should say that clearly and objectively.

I also recommend replacing or clarifying the phrase "occupies and remains upon." "Occupy" is not a typical transportation-facility term and may be broader than necessary. The ordinance should use clearer conduct-based language, such as "stand, sit, lie, or remain upon," and should include explicit exceptions for lawful crossing, use of a designated pedestrian refuge, compliance with a traffic-control device or officer direction, emergency circumstances, roadway work, public-safety activity, maintenance activity, and other legitimate temporary uses.

Finally, because this ordinance is being placed within the Pedestrian Interference code, Council should ensure that the final language is narrow enough to address the demonstrated safety risk without creating vague or selectively enforceable authority. If the real safety problem is unsafe midblock crossing, lack of safe crossing opportunities, lighting, speed, or high-conflict arterial design, then a median-occupancy ordinance may be only a partial response. The safety record should clearly show that the proposed enforcement tool matches the actual crash pattern.

- Todd Boulanger

PO Box 61542, 98666-1542

Kent Breier

6/15/2020





Kent Breier 6/15/2024