



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

July 26, 2021 - Vancouver City Council Meeting Minutes

WORKSHOPS

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

Workshops were conducted in a hybrid environment, with Councilmembers, staff and guests participating in-person at City Hall and over video conference utilizing a GoToMeeting platform. Members of the public were invited to view the meeting at City Hall or via the live broadcast on www.cvtv.org and CVTV cable channels 23 or HD 323, or on the City's Facebook page, www.facebook.com/VancouverUS, or listen via the GoToMeeting conference call.

Councilmember Paulsen absent; Councilmember Lebowsky arrived at 4:58 p.m.

4:00-5:00 p.m. Pearson Field Airport Status Update and VMC Amendments

Jennifer Belknap Williamson, PE, Public Works Director, 360-487-7131; Guy Lennon, Airport Manager, 360-487-8619

Summary

Staff provided Council with proposed amendments to VMC Chapter 10.05 related to the operations of Pearson Airfield.

5:00-6:00 p.m. Vancouver Climate Action Plan

Aaron Lande, Program and Policy Development Manager, 360-487-8612; P.J. Tillman and Tristan Smit, Cascadia Consulting Group

Summary

Staff and consultants from Cascadia Consulting Group provided Council with an update of the process to develop a Climate Action Plan for the City of Vancouver.

COUNCIL DINNER/ADMINISTRATIVE UPDATES

6:00-6:30 p.m.

COUNCIL CONSENT AGENDA MEETING

This meeting was conducted in a hybrid environment, with Councilmembers, staff and guests participating in-person at City Hall and over video conference utilizing a GoToMeeting platform. Members of the public were invited to view the meeting at City Hall or via the live broadcast on www.cvtv.org and CVTV cable channels 23 or HD 323, or on the City's Facebook page, www.facebook.com/VancouverUS, or listen via the GoToMeeting conference call. Public access and testimony on Consent Agenda items and under the Community Forum was also facilitated in person and via the GoToMeeting conference call.

Pledge of Allegiance

Call to Order and Roll Call

The Consent Agenda meeting of the Vancouver City Council was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Mayor McEnerny-Ogle.

Present: Councilmembers Fox, Lebowsky (via video conference), Glover, Stober, Hansen, Mayor McEnerny-Ogle

Absent: Councilmember Paulsen

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

Community Communication (Items 1-8) - see general protocol above

Mayor McEnerny-Ogle opened Community Communication and, receiving no testimony, closed Community Communication.

Consent Agenda (Items 1-8)

Council requested Items 1 and 6 be pulled for discussion.

Regarding Item 1, Councilmember Fox asked what the timeline for construction will be. Pete Capell, Facilities Capital Project Manager, stated construction is planned to start in October and will go toward the end of the year. It will be kept open for a marathon planned in September, and there will be extensive public outreach regarding the closure, as it is a popular pathway.

Regarding Item 6, Councilmember Fox noted there would be a decrease in funding for the PeaceHealth family housing project and asked what that means for the City and whether fewer units will now be built. Peggy Sheehan, Community Development Programs Manager, explained that project has received funding from other sources. The project is not changing, including the number of units, but PeaceHealth will be using less funding from the City because it has acquired it from other sources. As such, the City is able to reallocate those funds to other projects.

Motion by Councilmember Hansen, seconded by Councilmember Fox, and carried unanimously to approve the Consent Agenda.

1. Bid Award for Land Bridge Paving Renovation, per Bid # 21-22

Staff Report 105-21

Summary

The Confluence Land Bridge, completed in 2007, utilized Decomposed Granite for much of the walking surface. The Decomposed Granite has eroded and requires replacement. The Decomposed Granite will be removed and replaced with architectural pavers. In addition, the Confluence Project received donations to renovate the Kanaka Village Overlook just north of SR14, including the removing the portion of curbing that extends into the pathway.

On June 22, 2021, the City received 4 bids for the subject project. The bids ranged between \$349,266.93 and \$480,980.50. The low bidder was responsive. The bids are as follows:

SUMMARY OF BIDS	
BIDDER	AMOUNT
<i>Golf Construction, LLC, Vancouver, WA</i>	<i>\$349,266.93</i>
<i>Allcon LLC, Brush Prairie, WA</i>	<i>\$406,061.25</i>
<i>Lee Contractors, Battle Ground, WA</i>	<i>\$444,578.75</i>
<i>Keystone Contracting, Ridgefield, WA</i>	<i>\$480,980.50</i>
<i>Engineers' Estimate</i>	<i>\$380,000</i>

No apprenticeship goal was established for this project as the contract amount falls below the \$500,000 threshold in the City's apprenticeship policy.

Request: On July 26, 2021, award a construction contract for the Land Bridge Paving Renovation project to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, Colf Construction LLC of Vancouver, WA, USA at their bid price of \$349,266.93, which includes Washington State sales tax; authorize the City Manager or designee to execute the same, and authorize the City Manager to approve any legal action necessary to enforce the terms of the same.

Pete Capell, Facilities Capital Project Manager, 360-567-7543

Motion approved the request.

2. **Pearson Airfield Taxiway and Apron Rehabilitation - construction acceptance and release of retainage.**

Staff Report 106-21

Summary

Lee Contractors of Battle Ground, Washington, has satisfactorily completed the subject improvements in accordance with the plans and specifications. The original construction contract bid amount was \$1,180,262.45. Final construction contract costs were \$1,167,059.80, a reduction of approximately \$13,200 or 1.1% from original bid amount. The cost savings was attributed to minor quantity variations between as-designed and as-constructed in some bid items.

Request: On July 26, 2021, accept the Pearson Airfield Taxiway and Apron Rehabilitation Project as constructed by Lee Contractors of Battle Ground, Washington, and authorize release of retainage subject to receipt of all documentation required by law.

Dan Swensen, Construction and Engineering Manager, 360-487-7754

Motion approved the request.

3. **Acceptance of Federal Aviation Administration Airport Improvement Program Grant for Pearson Field Airport**

Staff Report 107-21

A RESOLUTION authorizing the City of Vancouver to accept a Federal Aviation Administration Grant for Pearson Field Airport to fund reconstruction of Taxiway A2 and authorizing the City Manager to accept the grant on behalf of the City of Vancouver.

Summary

The City of Vancouver is receiving an AIP grant from the FAA to fund the reconstruction of Taxiway A2 at Pearson Field Airport in 2021. The project includes construction of the taxiway and drainage, striping the new taxiway, taxiway lighting and guidance signage as required. The total construction cost of the project, including contract administration and inspection, is estimated to be less than \$444,444. The FAA AIP grant, and funding allocated under American Rescue Plan Act of 2021, will pay for 100% of the project. The FAA requires a resolution indicating the City Council's authorization to accept the AIP grant.

Request: On July 26, 2021, adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to accept an AIP grant, and funds from the American Rescue Plan Act of 2021, for \$444,444 for the reconfiguration of Taxiway A2 from its current airfield location to the west to meet Federal Aviation Administration design standards at Pearson Field Airport.

Jean Singer, Capital Projects Manager, 360-487-7755

Motion adopted Resolution M-4137 to approve the request.

4. Bid Award: Pearson Field Airport Taxiway A2 (Project #PRJ100582)

Staff Report 108-21

Summary

The City of Vancouver owns and maintains Pearson Field Airport. The airport serves the local general aviation community. The previous alignment of Taxiway A2 offered a direct access from the apron to the runway, which was non-compliant with FAA safety regulations and airport design criteria. This project reconfigures Taxiway A2 from its previous airfield location to the west to meet FAA design standards.

The project scope includes the realignment and reconstruction of taxiway A2, the installation of lighting and signage, re-striping, drainage, and other work.

Invitation to Bid #21-13 was issued on March 5, 2021. The City received 5 contractor bids by the bid solicitation close on April 6, 2021. City staff and

key stakeholders reviewed the bids and provide a recommendation for award.

The bid results are as follows:

SUMMARY OF BIDS (Includes WA Sales Tax)	
BIDDER	BIDS
<i>Granite Construction Vancouver, WA</i>	<i>\$314,872.75</i>
<i>Tapani, Inc. Battle Ground, WA</i>	<i>\$320,717.32</i>
<i>Colf Construction Vancouver, WA</i>	<i>\$341,039.37</i>
<i>Thompson Bros Excavating Vancouver, WA</i>	<i>\$405,277.88</i>
<i>Lee Contractors, LLC Battle Ground, WA</i>	<i>(bid was withdrawn)</i>
<i>Engineers' Estimate</i>	<i>\$300,000.00</i>

Granite Construction was determined to be the lowest responsive and responsible bidder for the project. The contract with Granite Construction is written for \$314,872.75, which includes Washington State sales tax.

Federal Grant funding rules do not allow for the utilization of local apprenticeship programs. Therefore there are no City of Vancouver apprentice utilization goal requirements for this project.

Construction work is scheduled to take place in September of this year.

Request: Award a contract to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, Granite Construction of Vancouver, WA, and authorize the City Manager, or his designee, to execute a contract for the Pearson Field Airport Taxiway A2, in the amount of \$314,872.75, which includes Washington State sales tax.

Jean Singer, Capital Projects Manager, 360-487-7755

Motion approved the request.

5. **Intergovernmental Agreement for Public Works Equipment and Services**

Staff Report 109-21

Summary

The City of Vancouver worked cooperatively with other agencies for years

to realize efficiencies and provide better service. In 2005, the City and other participants in the Pacific Northwest Interagency Cooperative formalized this cooperation by entering into a five year intergovernmental agreement commonly known as the "GEM Agreement. ("GEM" stands for grounds, equipment and maintenance). A prior version of the GEM Agreement was authorized by the City Council with an effective date of January 1, 2011, and it was administratively extended by the City through December 31, 2020. An oversight led to the City's participation in the Agreement lapsing when it was not further extended prior to January 1, 2021. Out of an abundance of caution, this GEM Agreement is being brought back for approval by the City Council on the same terms and conditions as existed prior to January 1, 2021. If approved again, further extensions can continue to made administratively in the future.

The attached updated GEM Agreement allows the City to continue to make the most efficient use of its resources by enabling the City to contract with other signatory agencies to receive or furnish labor, equipment and materials on a reimbursable basis. This saves the receiving agency time and money, plus helps defray the cost to City of owning and maintaining equipment that duplicates what other agencies are willing to share.

The agreement does not obligate the City to give aid nor to contract for services, but allows it to do so when it is beneficial. The agreement specifies the owner agency will always have first use of its resources.

Request: Authorize the City Manager or his designee to sign the Pacific Northwest Interagency Cooperative ("GEM") Agreement to provide a mechanism to share equipment and services with other regional agencies.

Bill Bjerke, Operations Superintendent-Grounds and Cemetery Maintenance, 360-487-8245

Motion approved the request.

6. Funding changes for CDBG, HOME & AHF

Staff Report 110-21

A RESOLUTION relating to the adoption of the proposed project funding changes to 2019 and 2020 CDBG/HOME Annual Action Plans; authorizing the City Manager to execute agreements on behalf of the City of Vancouver consistent with the amended Annual Action Plans, providing for severability and an effective date.

A RESOLUTION relating to the adoption of the proposed project funding

changes to the 2020-2021 AHF approved allocation plans; authorizing the City Manager to execute agreements on behalf of the City of Vancouver consistent with the amended allocation plans, providing for severability and an effective date.

Summary

City Council approved funding recommendations from the 2021 CDBG & HOME, CDBG-CV and AHF application process following a public hearing on April 5, 2021. Since that time additional funding has become available and existing projects have requested an increase in dollars due to the significant increase in construction material costs. See attached spread sheet for details.

Summary of proposed funding changes

- *Approve use of CDBG-CV funding from the State for MESO Small Business Technical Assistance and Loan Program - \$368,556 to cover a portion of the total project cost of \$431,834.*
- *Approve use of 2020 & 2019 HOME funding for Second Step Acquisition to support the acquisition of six duplexes. \$300,000*
- *Approve use of 2020 Affordable Housing Funding for Community Roots Collaborative CRC Development (Phase 2) construction of 20 tiny homes. \$350,000 to a total of \$850,000. The funding would come from the unused Affordable Housing Funds allocated for Mercy Housing.*
- *Approve use of 2020 CDBG funds for Proud Ground Permanently Affordable Homeownership - \$250,000. Staff proposes shifting funding source from 2021 AHF to 2020 CDBG to allow for less restrictive income requirements for homebuyers.*
- *Approve use of 2020 CDBG funding for the City of Vancouver Homeowner Rehab Program \$118,556 of 2020 CDBG funds from MESO to support the Homeowner Rehab Program. CDBG is more appropriate funding to use for this program.*
- *Cancel the \$199,977 of 2020 HOME funding that was awarded to the Homeowner Rehab program. The funding will be used to support Second Step Housing's Acquisition project.*

Request: 1. Adopt a resolution approving project funding changes to the 2019 and 2020 CDBG/HOME Annual Action Plans;
 2. Adopt a resolution approving project funding changes to the 2020-2021 Affordable Housing Fund approved allocation plans;

3. Authorize the City Manager or designee to execute agreements consistent with the proposed funding changes.

Peggy Sheehan, Community Development Programs Manager, 360-487-7952

Motion adopted Resolution M-4138 related to CDBG and HOME and Resolution M-4139 related to the Affordable Housing Fund and approved the request.

7. Section 108 Loan - Fourth Plain Commons

Staff Report 111-21

Summary

Fourth Plain Commons is a future new-construction, mixed-use project located in a low-income census tract (427.00) on the Fourth Plain Corridor. The development is a partnership between the City of Vancouver and the Vancouver Housing Authority and consists of two separate components: the Commons Community Center on the first floor and 2220 Norris, a 106-unit affordable housing development, located on floors 2-6. The CDBG funds will be used to support the community center, plaza and shared space only.

The Commons Community Center will consist of a 9,758 square foot community space and is envisioned as a flexible area where people from the Fourth Plain community can gather, hold events, and access services. This space will include a commercial kitchen, office space for nonprofits to provide supportive services, a community gathering space, an outdoor space with infrastructure for farmers markets and food carts, and a space for business incubation for food entrepreneurship. Construction on this project is scheduled to begin in September 2021.

In July 2020, the City identified the potential to use funding from Section 108 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (the Section 108 Loan Guarantee Program or "Section 108 loans") as a funding source. The Section 108 loan provides Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) jurisdictions the opportunity to leverage up to five times the jurisdiction's annual CDBG grant allocation. The loan is low-cost, flexible financing for economic development, public facility, and infrastructure projects. Currently, the City of Vancouver is eligible to borrow up to \$4,234,145 in Section 108 loan funds.

The Section 108 loan will be used to support the build-out of the Commons Community Center including construction and infrastructure. The funding will be used as payment towards the purchase price, either in the form of reimbursement to the VHA, for construction costs including architect fees and a percentage of onsite infrastructure including sewer, water, sidewalks, the foundation, etc., or as a lump sum payment at Closing. Any revenue generated from the leasing of the Commons Community Center after

expenses will be used to pay back the Section 108 loan. Additionally, the City will set aside CDBG funds up to \$300,000 annually to make payments. The City anticipates servicing \$245,000 of Section 108 project debt annually.

Community and Economic Development staff have drafted the application for Section 108 loans for HUD. It is on the city web site at www.cityofvancouver.us/CDBG. Once approved by Council, HUD has 45 days to review and approve the application. If awarded, the City anticipates using the Section 108 dollars in the first quarter of 2022. The projects will begin construction in September 2021, and the City is using other dollars for the first phase of the project.

Request: Approve moving forward with the Section 108 loan application request of up to \$4,234,145 to support the construction and build out of the Fourth Plain Commons Community Center and authorize the City Manager to execute the necessary agreements to move forward with the Section 108 loan as approved by Council.

Peggy Sheehan, Community Development Programs Manager, 360-487-7952

Motion approved the request.

8. Approval of Claim Vouchers

Request: Approve claim vouchers for July 26, 2021.

Motion approved claim vouchers for July 26, 2021, in the amount of \$6,304,263.25.

Unfinished Business (Item 9)

9. I-5 Bridge Replacement Project - Resolution Stating City of Vancouver Desired Outcomes

Staff Report 112-21

A RESOLUTION supporting the replacement of the Interstate 5 Bridge between the State of Washington and State of Oregon, guided by the principles herein.

Summary

Studies to enhance safety and mobility on and to the Interstate 5 corridor in the Portland-Vancouver region through design that addresses seismic resiliency, congestion relief, and better multimodal access have been conducted over the past two decades. From 2005 to 2014, the Columbia River Crossing (CRC) program identified several alternatives for safe bicycle, pedestrian, roadway, and transit improvements. The CRC program was closed out in 2014 due to lack of funding commitments. Following close-out of the CRC, regional partners proposed revisiting improvements to address identified needs. Vancouver City Council adopted Resolution M-3975 on August 6, 2018, in support of this effort.

In 2019 a Memorandum of Intent was signed by Oregon and Washington Governors Brown and Inslee and a bi-state legislative committee was established to provide guidance and oversight on an Interstate 5 Bridge Replacement Program (IBRP). The Program, led by the Oregon and Washington state departments of transportation, is charged with developing options for improvements that account for identified safety and mobility needs plus environmental and demographic changes since the CRC program.

To date the IBRP has established advisory committees and groups comprised of legislative and elected leaders from Oregon and Washington, community members, equity-focused leaders, and planning and technical staff. These groups are currently engaged in the planning and environmental phase of the program. Options to address identified needs will be developed over the next 8-10 months, with a goal to identify a preferred alternative for improvements by spring 2022. Final design is scheduled for 2022 - 2024 with construction beginning in 2025.

Staff has presented updates periodically since 2019 to Council on progress of the IBRP. On June 21 and July 12, 2021, staff presented a list of potential desired outcomes for the City of Vancouver from the IBRP. At the June workshop staff presented a list of potential desired outcomes based on prior discussions that happened during the Columbia River Crossing program as well as subsequent City initiatives and programs aiming to enhance community assets and livability. Based on feedback from the June workshop, a draft Resolution was created for Council review and discussion at the July 12 workshop.

During the July 12 workshop Council expressed general support for the draft Resolution with some revisions. Two primary issues discussed as needing further definition in the Resolution center on tolling and the number of travel lanes to be defined in the program's design options.

With regard to tolling, the draft Resolution presented on July 12 stated one

potential desired outcome as “Incorporate a variety of transportation demand management measures, including tolling...”. During discussion, Council conveyed that transportation demand management and tolling could mean different things and asked for clarification around different types of tolling programs and the intent for tolling within the IBR program. In follow-up conversation with IBRP staff, it was verified that the intent of the IBRP is to implement tolling to pay back the cost of constructing IBRP elements. Attachment A outlines some of the tolling strategies that could be implemented for this purpose. Attachment B, an updated draft Resolution, aims to address this issue with revised text in Section 3 that notes that tolls implemented through the IBRP are intended to fund construction of the replacement bridge and associated elements.

As noted above, a second issue discussed during the July 12 workshop was the number of travel lanes to be included in a design solution. The selected alternative for the Columbia River Crossing program included three through travel lanes each direction for the full length of the Interstate 5 corridor within the program area. In portions of the corridor two additional auxiliary lanes per direction were also included. Based on traffic analyses, three through lanes each direction were required in order to provide adequate capacity and minimize congestion for projected travel demand and are reflected in current regional transportation system plans. The additional auxiliary lanes were included to meet the Program’s Purpose and Need. Auxiliary lanes provide safety and operational benefits by reducing weaving and merging movements that would otherwise happen in through travel lanes, which supports more efficient movement of people, freight, and goods.

Updated traffic, land use, and socio-demographic data will inform development of IBRP design options. That process will include modeling the number of lanes required for the roadway network to safely and adequately function. Based on this, staff recommends Council consider the following new language be added to Section 3 (“Mobility”) of the draft desired outcomes Resolution: “Include three through travel lanes per direction and auxiliary lanes as determined to be warranted for safe and adequate functioning through updated analyses.”

There were additional items raised by Council members during the workshop that have also been addressed in an updated version of the draft Resolution (Attachment B).

Request: Adopt a resolution stating the City of Vancouver's desired outcomes from the Interstate 5 Bridge Replacement Project.

Katherine Kelly, Senior Policy Advisor, 360-487-7947

Katherine Kelly, Senior Policy Advisor, provided a summary of the proposed

resolution and the revisions incorporating previous Council feedback.

Council proposed revisions to the specific language in the resolution as following:

Councilmember Stober requested all references to "Interstate 5 Bridge" be updated to read "Interstate Bridge" and the reference in the fourth recital specify "two" existing Interstate Bridge "spans" for clarity.

Councilmember Stober also requested the 12th recital be updated to specify the Interstate Bridge Replacement Program will aims to construct a "replacement" bridge.

Councilmember Stober requested section aa read: "Proactively mitigate construction impacts to Downtown Vancouver businesses, residents, and visitors".

Council concurred with these proposed revisions.

Councilmember Fox stated she appreciated how staff had de-coupled language pertaining to demand management from tolling but requested specific language be added regarding equity and mitigation for commuters who do not have the option of riding transit across the Interstate Bridge. She stated it is important the Council call this out specifically at this stage in the process, even though the IBRP advisory group on equity is developing a framework for desired outcomes.

Council concurred a new section that specifically states the City's desire that tolling be implemented equitably and that mitigation programs be included should be added.

Councilmember Hansen stated he wants to see a 10-lane bridge as a result of this project. Council spoke at length regarding potential lane designs. Councilmember Hansen stated section x of the resolution is worded in such a way that he can support the resolution.

Motion by Councilmember Stober, seconded by Councilmember Glover, and carried unanimously to adopt Resolution M-4140 as revised by Council.

Community Forum

Mayor McEnerny-Ogle opened the Community Forum and received the following testimony:

- Christine Lamb White, Vancouver, expressed concerns about available affordable housing options for senior citizens, and asked the City to require future housing developments to dedicate at least 10 percent of units to

seniors with low income.

- Glen Yung, Vancouver, urged the City to increase the percentage of required electric vehicle infrastructure for all future developments.
- Don Steinke, Vancouver, strongly agreed with the Council's direction regarding the Climate Action Plan to set goals as soon as possible. He also thanked the City for the climate solutions included in the Renaissance Boardwalk development agreement.
- Alona Steinke, Vancouver, urged the City to adopt a green building policy that includes the replacement of gas heating with electric as soon as possible, and urged the City to retrofit City buildings and operations and partner with other local agencies in expanding electric vehicle use.
- Heidi Cody, Vancouver, thanked the Council for directing staff to set high goals for the Climate Action Plan, and urged the City to require replacement of gas appliances in developments.
- Jean Avery, Vancouver, thanked the Council for directing staff to set high goals for the Climate Action Plan and to act with urgency.
- Jaynee Haygood, Vancouver Parks and Recreation Advisory Commissioner, spoke regarding the role of parks and the tree canopy in offsetting climate change. She urged the City to work closely with community partners to promote and enhance climate action policies and educate the public regarding personal efforts that can be made to increase sustainability.
- Martha Wiley, Vancouver, spoke in support of the Council's direction regarding the Climate Action Plan, and asked the City to consider requiring electric vehicle charging stations for all new development and add infrastructure for some on-street parking.
- Jennifer Wallenberg, Vancouver, spoke in support of the Council's direction regarding the Climate Action Plan.
- Cathryn Chudy, Vancouver, urged the City to take all measures to move away from natural gas and require electrification. She thanked the Council for showing leadership in directing staff to develop leading edge goals for the Climate Action Plan.
- Dan Serres, representing Columbia Riverkeeper, thanked the Council for its work on the Climate Action Plan and moratorium on large-scale fossil fuel facilities. He urged the City to reach out to Portland regarding a compatibility analysis pertaining to oil trains traveling through the region
- Phillip Englund, Vancouver, thanked the Council for its direction on the Climate Action Plan but requested increased urgency in taking actions as soon as possible.

- Teresa Hardy, Vancouver, spoke in support of the City moving forward with the strongest Climate Action Plan as possible. She urged the the City to preserve as much open space and tree canopy for the Vancouver Innovation Center as possible.

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

Executive Session re: Potential Litigation; City Manager Performance Evaluation

At 7:42 p.m., Mayor McEnerny-Ogle announced the Council would be entering executive session for approximately 30 minutes to discuss potential litigation, and also to discuss the City Manager's annual performance evaluation.

At 8:02 p.m., Mayor McEnerny-Ogle announced the Council would be extending the executive session.

Council re-entered public session at 8:27 p.m. No action was taken.

Adjournment

8:29 p.m.

DocuSigned by:

58CB15C0632F403...
Anne McEnerny-Ogle, Mayor

Attest:

DocuSigned by:

BCF0734E40E94AE...
Natasha Ramras, City Clerk

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

July 24, 2021

Mayor McEnerny-Ogle
Councilmember Hansen
Councilmember Stober
Mayor Pro Tem Glover
Councilmember Lebowsky
Councilmember Paulsen
Councilmember Fox

On Monday, July 26, 2021, the Vancouver City Council will be conducting a workshop related to Pearson Field. Prior to the meeting I would like to provide you with some background information. Thank you in advance for your consideration.

I write this to you as a member of a group who, on request of the mayor and city manager, has provided input and advice on various matters pertaining to the airport since the Aviation Advisory Committee (AAC) was disbanded by the city in 2018. The city has informally referred to us as the "Kitchen Cabinet." Three of us are former full-term AAC chairs, one a former full-term vice chair, and one a former member. All of us are longtime residents of this community with significant collective backgrounds and networks in related businesses, nonprofits, public agencies, education, airport management, air traffic control, airspace design, and military and general aviation. Two of us are non-tenants. Two of us have histories with the field that go back to the 1960s and the remainder have been involved with Pearson since the early 1990s. For over 25 years our involvement with Pearson has included representing the city in airspace design, significantly contributing to the airport's financial self-sufficiency, and providing both capacity and capability to augment city staff in a variety of other safety, operations, planning and finance matters. Our first priority is and always has been to ensure that the city's interest in maintaining a safe and sustainable asset, Pearson Field, is providing the highest possible value to the community.

During the meeting, you will be presented with several documents for discussion, including updates to VMC10, a new Rules and Regulations document, and draft AAC bylaws. **While not endorsing any of these documents as to their current content, we completely support the long overdue update.** This work was first advocated for by the AAC in 2013, deprioritized by the city until 2018 when it was restarted as part of the airport audit response, stopped again by the city in 2019, and restarted in January of 2020. That it has taken 8 years to get to this point is worthy of some process reflection on the part of the city. A similarly scoped exercise, updating the airport's Commercial Minimum Standards document, was collaboratively completed in a few months' time and approved by city council with little discussion in March of 2015.

While there are several topics in these documents that we have concerns about, both in content included and excluded, two will be presented to you on Monday for specific discussion. In both these instances we believe that the city's interest in maintaining a safe and sustainable asset is not served well by the wording currently proposed.

Topic #1: Rules and Regulations Article 8(B) "Fly Quiet."

First, and this has to be said, no responsible pilot knowingly and intentionally engages in actions contrary to safe and courteous operation of their aircraft. This is an explicit expectation in the certification of pilots at all levels and FAA rules provide for enforcement action if pilots engage in careless or reckless operation. None of the comments to follow should be interpreted differently. If the

airport manager believes there are patterns of inappropriate behavior he has the ability, through the FAA, to request investigation and follow up. With that said: **We recommend the city remove bullets (a)-(e) from Article 8(B).**

Recognizing that Pearson is located in an increasingly dense urban environment, and that previous rules and regulations did not contain language regarding fly quiet, the Kitchen Cabinet actually authored the opening two sentences of Article 8. *"Fly Quiet' procedures may exist through cooperative agreement of airport users, the community and the city. Where these procedures exist, they are intended to be a voluntary effort on the part of airport users to be good neighbors in the community."* This language was provided to allow for the collaborative creation of such procedures, **not** that the procedures would be created unilaterally by city staff and inserted into the rules themselves. This is in keeping with what happens at general aviation airports across the country. Bullets (a)-(e) citing specific expectations added by the staff create a number of significant issues that the city should think through very carefully:

- **Authority:** The city has complete authority to regulate and enforce, consistent with FAA rules, actions and uses at the airport. The FAA retains authority for regulation and enforcement for use of airspace. The Kitchen Cabinet, along with input to the city from the Washington Department of Transportation Aviation Division and from the national Airplane Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA) have expressed concern about including voluntary fly quiet procedures in the Rules and Regulations document.
- **Liability:** Today, all of the rules associated with airspace around Pearson have been developed, validated, and authorized by the FAA. We believe that the city's creation of rules limiting use of airspace, otherwise permissible by the FAA, whether by authority or not, places risk on the city.
- **Safety:** Vancouver's airspace is one of the most thoroughly studied in the country, with special regulations uniquely developed to ensure safe operation in the shared Pearson/PDX airspace. Multiple FAA sponsored Safety Risk Management Panels have been conducted with participation by the FAA (local, regional, and headquarters), Portland tower, Port of Portland, several air carriers, and representatives from Pearson (three of which are on the Kitchen Cabinet.) I would be happy to forward the most recent 96-page 2013 study on request. Any changes to airspace rules over and around Pearson need to be considered in the context of this report.
- **Precedent:** Codifying rules regarding overflight of certain areas of the city opens the door to future safety, intra neighborhood environmental justice, and other issues that need to be carefully considered before moving forward.
- **Discriminatory:** As written Article 8(B) is discriminatory in that Article 17 only cites enforcement applicable to based pilots, not the 18,000 annual itinerant operations at Pearson.
- **Ambiguous and selective enforcement:** As written, and stated in your workshop presentation material, the city intends selective enforcement around unspecified criteria. In effect the fly quiet rule is voluntary, until it is not.

To summarize, the Kitchen Cabinet believes that it is in the best interest of the city to allow for the creation of fly quiet procedures in the rules and regulations but not to include those procedures in regulation. This is consistent with general aviation airports across the country. Collaboratively created voluntary procedures developed from shared data, and well communicated by the city, are the best way to go. For decades, Pearson based pilots have been notified by the airport manger of upcoming events

both at the Fort and Esther Short Park so that discretionary flights could be limited and/or areas avoided; this practice should be continued.

Topic #2 Aviation Advisory Committee Composition, Count and Bylaws

City staff has proposed reduction of the AAC count from 9 to 7 members, restricting membership to no more than two tenants, and a proposed set of starter bylaws. **From experience, we believe that all of these changes, weaken the ability of the AAC to perform its assigned duties, and we do not support what the staff is proposing.**

In 2018 [the city committed](#) to complete a "*comprehensive assessment of the governance, operations and management of Pearson Field including a review of the role and responsibilities of the Aviation Advisory Committee*" when the Council "*temporarily suspended the operation of Aviation Advisory Committee pending the completion of that assessment.*" After 3 ½ years no such assessment has taken place and none of the current airport related staff has ever attended an AAC meeting. Proposals in the current documents appear arbitrary and/or connected with experiences other boards and commissions have had. None of the staff proposals address issues related to the original suspension of the AAC.

Rather than diving down into the details here, we believe the city would be well served by stepping back on this topic #2, clarifying with the Kitchen Cabinet specifically what issues need to be addressed, and jointly developing a solution that meets the needs of the airport.

To close, we believe as part of the workshop it would be in your interest as policy makers and in the public's interest, to know what the staff's answers to the following questions are:

- What feedback have you received from recent public, tenant, flight school, outside agency, and Kitchen Cabinet input? How has that feedback been incorporated into the draft documents being presented? What was excluded and why?
- What data are you relying on and under what authority are you making the recommendation to regulate airspace due to noise concerns? How have you considered the last Pearson/PDX Safety Risk Management Document in your recommendations? What other options have you considered? What risks do you see in your proposals and how will those risks be mitigated?
- What specific issues are you attempting to address with any changes to historic policy, practices, or structure being proposed for the reconstituted AAC? Having never attended an AAC, or committee meeting, what sources of input are you relying on? What alternatives have you considered? How do the proposals address those issues?

Thank you again for your consideration. On request I would be happy to answer any additional questions you may have.

Sincerely,

Paul Speer on behalf of
Ron Frederickson
Mark Masciarotte
Bill Frost
Frank Lambert

Cc: Eric Holmes

To: Vancouver City Council and Staff
Citizen Forum/July 26th, 2021/Cathryn Chudy

The Columbian editorial staff rightly recognized the steps you are taking that “altered the dynamics of development in the city” by insisting on higher building standards for sustainability, which they say builds trust and demonstrates leadership. The Updated Work Plan and Early Action Package reviewed at the workshop today is encouraging. There are now three GHG Emissions Target Pathways under City Consideration, adding Leading Edge to Stretch and Bold options. Action steps to meet Leading Edge strategies should be identified by Cascadia for Council’s informed decision making. Rather than seeing this as a choice of one pathway out of three, perhaps a more dynamic and flexible approach might choose the most impactful strategies from all three, as the community has called for Vancouver to be more ambitious in sustainability and Climate Action, and evidence of the urgency to aim higher and move faster is all around us.

It is clear that getting off fossil fuels is the core of the “emissions reduction” framework Vancouver must undertake, sooner rather than later. This requires not being deceived or distracted by “false solutions” like the “promise” of renewable natural gas (RNG) and understanding that barriers to electrification will slow Vancouver down. Just as EV readiness has become a key component for a healthy, resilient, and economically viable Vancouver, the City can ensure that new buildings no longer are approved with gas hookups. This is consistent with the identified Bold strategy: “Eliminate natural gas in new construction.” This should be incorporated into the Interim Green Building Policy; another key way to demonstrate leadership.

For you and for your partner Clark PUD, leadership means re-thinking the “business as usual” framework of relying on a polluting gas plant to help meet our energy needs and allowing the local gas utility to persuade us to continue using gas when there are more viable and healthy alternatives that reduce emissions and ensure a safe and resilient future for our children. Consider this: “New research shows that renewable electricity can move Washington, Oregon and British Columbia off of fossil fuels, do so at an affordable price, and create jobs along the way...Innovation and mass production have made wind and solar power installations cheaper than most fossil-fueled power plants. The key to moving Cascadia’s economies away from fossil fuels is to make renewable electricity the region’s go-to “fuel.” The new research highlights three mutually supporting strategies that squeeze out fossil fuels:

- increasing energy efficiency to trim the amount of power we need,
- boosting renewable energy to make it possible to turn off climate-wrecking fossil-fuel plants, and
- plugging as much stuff as possible into the electrical grid.”

(Peter Fairley, Investigate West, 4/22/21: Studies: Renewable Electricity Can Slash Cascadia Pollution)

The Columbian points out: **“The Spector of climate change cannot be ignored, and reducing carbon emissions meets the very definition of leadership.”** The deadly heat dome we just experienced, and the news each day of wildfires in the Pacific Northwest as extreme weather and drought change our landscape, defy “business as usual” thinking and acting. Momentum is on our side, if you continue to steer a genuine course of leadership. Our young people are counting on you for their healthy and safe future. Don’t let them down.

Peter Fairley, Investigate West, 4/21/21: Studies: Renewable Electricity Can Slash Cascadia Pollution

<https://apnews.com/article/technology-climate-climate-change-washington-utilities-0c6efe1cd61065e55500041f59cbb172>

New research shows that renewable electricity can move Washington, Oregon and British Columbia off of fossil fuels, do so at an affordable price, and create jobs along the way.

After decades of disinformation from fossil fuel producers and utilities, this may sound like a wishful vision. But building a cleaner and more equitable economy — and doing so in just a few decades to head off the worst effects of climate change — is backed by a growing body of regional and international studies.

Innovation and mass production have made wind and solar power installations cheaper than most fossil-fueled power plants. The key to moving Cascadia's economies away from fossil fuels is to make renewable electricity the region's go-to "fuel."

The new research highlights three mutually supporting strategies that squeeze out fossil fuels:

- increasing energy efficiency to trim the amount of power we need,
- boosting renewable energy to make it possible to turn off climate-wrecking fossil-fuel plants, and
- plugging as much stuff as possible into the electrical grid.

Recent studies in Washington state and British Columbia, and underway for Oregon, point to efficiency and electrification as the most cost-effective route to slashing emissions while maintaining lifestyles and maximizing jobs. A recent National Academies of Science study reached the same conclusion, calling electrification the core strategy for an equitable and economically advantageous energy transition.

However, technologies don't emerge in a vacuum. The social and economic adjustments required by the wholesale shift from fossil fuels to renewable power can still make or break decarbonization, according to Jim Williams, a University of San Francisco energy expert whose simulation software tools have guided many national and regional energy plans, including two new U.S.-wide studies, a December 2020 analysis for Washington state, and another in process for Oregon.

Williams points to vital actions likely to rile those who lose money in the deal, like letting trees grow many decades older before they are cut down so they can suck up more carbon dioxide, forgoing quicker profits from selling timber. Or convincing rural communities and conservationists that they should accept power-transmission lines crossing farms and forests.

"It's those kinds of policy questions and social acceptance questions that are the big challenges,"

said Williams. And without policies to protect disadvantaged communities from potential energy cost increases, some could be left behind.

By 2030, the path to decarbonization shows Washingtonians buying about \$5 billion less worth of natural gas, coal and petroleum products, while putting even more dollars toward cleaner vehicles and homes. No surprise then that oil and gas interests are attacking the new research.

Charging up

Key to decarbonizing Cascadia are computer simulations of future conditions known as models. Researchers run dozens of models, tinkering with different variables: How much will energy demand grow? What happens if we can get 80% of people into electric cars? What if it's only 50%?

What most drives Cascadia's energy models toward electrification is the dropping cost of renewable electricity.

Take solar energy. In 2010, no large power system in the world got more than 3% of its electricity from solar. But over the past decade solar energy's cost fell more than 80%, and by last year it was delivering over 9% of Germany's electricity and over 19% of California's.

Once prohibitively expensive, solar's price now beats nuclear, coal and gas-fired power, and it's expected to keep getting cheaper. The same goes for wind power, whose jumbo jet-sized composite blades bear no resemblance to the rickety machines once mocked by Big Oil.

In contrast, cleaning up gas- or coal-fired power plants by equipping them to capture their carbon pollution remains expensive even after decades of research and development and government incentives. Cost overruns and mechanical failures recently shuttered the world's largest "low-carbon" coal-fired power plant in Texas after less than four years of operation.

Innovation and incentives are also making equipment that plugs into the grid less expensive. Battery advances and cost cuts have made owning an electric car cheaper than conventional cars, fuel included. Electric heat pumps -- essentially air conditioners that run in reverse to push heat into a building -- may be the next electric wave. They're three to four times more efficient than electric baseboard heaters and save money over natural gas in most new homes.

Merran Smith, executive director of Vancouver-based nonprofit Clean Energy Canada, says that — as with electric cars five years ago — people don't realize how much heat pumps have improved. "Heat pumps used to be big huge noisy things," said Smith. "Now they're a fraction of the size, they're quiet and efficient."

Simulating low-carbon living

The computer simulation tools take an economy-wide view. Planners can repeatedly run scenarios through sophisticated software, tinkering with their assumptions each time to answer cross-cutting questions.

Evolved Energy Research, a San Francisco-based firm, analyzed the situation in Washington. Its algorithms are tuned using data about energy production and use today—down to the number and types of furnaces, stovetops or vehicles. It has expert assessments of future costs for equipment and fuels. And it knows the state's mandated emissions targets.

The model finds the most cost-effective choices by homes and businesses that meet the state's climate goals. Modelers then account for uncertainty by throwing in various additional constraints and rerunning the model.

That probing shows that longer reliance on climate-warming natural gas and petroleum fuels increases costs. In fact, all of the climate-protecting scenarios achieve Washington's goals at relatively low cost, compared to the state's historic spending on energy.

The end result of these scenarios are net-zero carbon emissions in 2050, in which a small amount of emissions remaining are offset by rebounding forests or equipment that scrubs CO₂ from the air.

But the seeds of that transformation must be sown by 2030. The scenarios identify common strategies that the state can pursue with low risk of future regrets.

One no brainer is to rapidly add wind and solar power to wring out CO₂ emissions from Washington's power sector. The projections end coal-fired power by 2025, as required by law, but also show that, with grid upgrades, gas-fired power plants that produce greenhouse gas emissions can stay turned off most of the time. That delivers about 16.2 million of the 44.8 million metric tons of CO₂ emissions cut required by 2030 under state law.

All of the Washington scenarios also jack up electricity consumption to power cars and heating. For example, in 2030 Evolved Energy's optimal case for Washington foresees sales of electric cars, SUVs and pickups roaring from 7.3% of sales in 2020 to 85.2% in 2030. By 2050, electricity is providing 98% of the state's transport energy.

By 2050, the high-electrification scenarios would create over 60,000 extra jobs across the state, as replacing old and inefficient equipment and construction of renewable power plants stimulates economic growth, according to projections from Washington D.C.-based FTI Consulting. Scenarios with less electrification require more low-carbon fuels that cut emissions at higher cost, and thus create 15,000 to 35,000 fewer jobs. Washingtonians earn over \$7 billion more in 2050 under the high-electrification scenarios, compared to a little over \$5 billion if buildings stick with gas heating through 2050 and less than \$2 billion with extra transportation fuels.

Rocketing to 2030

Evolved Energy's electrification-heavy decarbonization pathways for Washington dovetail with a growing body of international research, such as that National Academy of Sciences report and a major U.S. decarbonization study led by Princeton University.

The challenge is accelerating the transition. Action by 2030 is needed across Cascadia to deliver

on societal demand to fight climate change and to lay the tracks for the difficult, long-term task of squeezing out nearly all carbon emissions a few decades later.

Growing electrification of cars, buses, buildings and more, requires infrastructure such as charging stations, some quick growth in electricity generation, and power lines to carry it.

In Oregon and Washington, such investments may catch a tailwind if Congress backs President Biden's \$2-trillion infrastructure package. But building transmission lines requires tough negotiations with affected communities, which can be time consuming.

The race to start cutting emissions also introduces an economic speed bump around 2030. Economic growth would slow due to increased energy costs as economies race to make a sharp turn toward pollution reductions after nearly a decade of rising greenhouse gas emissions.

"Meeting that 2030 target is tough and I think it took everybody a little bit by surprise," said Nancy Hirsh, executive director of the Seattle-based NW Energy Coalition, and co-chair of a state panel that shaped Washington's recent energy supply planning.

Economic analysis for Washington state by FTI Consulting projects 10,000 to 15,000 fewer jobs to be created in Washington in 2030 relative to the climate-be-damned growth scenario. The state's current employment is about 3.3 million.

Embracing the messengers?

Burning less gasoline, diesel and natural gas produces cleaner air — something that's not factored into most economic forecasting. The cost of decarbonization in 2030 looks even more affordable when one considers avoided air and water pollution from burning fossil fuels.

Avoiding climate damage, meanwhile, would pay even larger dividends in the long run. Scientists expect action by Cascadia to help slow impacts of climate change, reducing future costs for damages to property and infrastructure from megafires, larger storms, and sea level rise.

For Smith at Clean Energy Canada, electrifying is also a potent business opportunity for Cascadia. Smith points to BC's aluminum, which, thanks to BC's near-total reliance on hydropower, is gaining advantage as one of the world's least carbon-intensive suppliers.

Companies like Tesla and BMW are looking for low-carbon aluminum, notes Smith: "I don't think that most British Columbians realize that we have a nearly 100% emissions free electricity grid, nor what a competitive advantage it is."

With more renewable power, the province can decarbonize all of its natural resource exports, including forest products and other metals such as copper, cobalt and nickel. "Branding BC that way, rather than as a fossil fuel exporter, will attract more investment," she said.

Washington and Oregon could build toeholds in clean-energy manufacturing, such as the Daimler plant that makes electric trucks in Portland.

But not everyone embraces an electrified future. Fossil fuel interests in Washington have called the modeling biased and are raising the specter of electrification-driven blackouts.

Resistance to action toward accelerated electrification has been on full display in recent months as Washington's Legislature considers an array of policies to encourage or mandate a transition to cleaner energy. One proposal backed by Washington Gov. Jay Inslee to restrict delivery of gas to new buildings by 2030 died early, under assault from the gas industry and some unions.

During a hearing on the Better Homes & Clean Buildings Bill, gas distributors raised the threat of energy shortfalls, citing a 2019 study suggesting that power demand could soon outstrip supply as the region's coal-fired power plants shut down.

Environmental advocates point out that oil and gas producers and distributors have a vested interest in opposing rapid reductions in petroleum and natural gas consumption. Grid experts say the best way to ensure reliability is to get cracking on power system upgrades needed to support a larger supply of wind and solar power.

Spencer Gray, the Portland-based executive director for the Northwest & Intermountain Power Producers Coalition, which represents many renewable energy developers, says ensuring Cascadia's power supply is "solvable" without slowing decarbonization. What's crucial, he says, is to strengthen the grid.

Gray is among the many experts working toward creation of a regional power market for the Western grid, which interconnects all of the electrical systems in the U.S. and Canada west of the Rockies. They are also working to accelerate expansion of power lines so that Cascadia and its neighbors can access more low-cost renewable energy, such as the excellent wind resources in Montana.

"Five to 10 years from now is when we need it," said Gray. "We need to start getting the stuff financed and sited now."

From: [City of Vancouver - Office of the City Manager](#)
To: [Delapena, Amanda](#)
Subject: FW: Climate Action Plan workshop July 26
Date: Friday, July 23, 2021 9:11:24 AM
Attachments: [image003.png](#)

For city council on July 26.

Kerry Peck | Administrative Assistant



CITY OF VANCOUVER, WASHINGTON
City Manager's Office/Administrative Assistant
P: (360) 487-8616

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



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

From: Peter L. Fels <plfels@gmail.com>

Sent: Thursday, July 22, 2021 9:34 PM

To: City of Vancouver - Office of the City Manager <CMO@cityofvancouver.us>; Lande, Aaron <aaron.lande@cityofvancouver.us>; ACE <alliance.swwa@gmail.com>; Don Steinke <crvancouverusa@gmail.com>; Alona <alonakotkasteinke@hotmail.com>; Cathryn Chudy <chudyca@gmail.com>; Coal-WA-SW-Leaders <Coal-WA-SW-Leaders@lists.sierraclub.org>; felget <felget@comcast.net>

Subject: Climate Action Plan workshop July 26

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.

Peter Fels
5121 NW Franklin Street
Vancouver WA 98663
telephone: (360) 737-3154 • plfels@gmail.com

Dear Mayor and City Council,

Here are some thoughts on the draft Vancouver City climate action plan to be presented at workshop on July 26, 2021:

Staff and the consultants should be applauded for moving the timeline forward and proposing interim strategies while a final plan is developed. For the most part, they have presented excellent ideas.

I note that the consultants' format continues to show up with the title "Redmond Environmental Sustainability Action Plan". I commend them for borrowing from previous materials and hope they are giving Vancouver a discount.

Below are ten items I hope you will add to the current proposed interim steps.

- 1) City Council should require consultants to provide steps to meet "Leading Edge" strategies so Councilors will at least have the information to make informed choices. Citizens want you to reduce GHG emissions as much as possible as soon as possible.
- 2) In addition to proposed interim steps for buildings, City should give preference in permitting to builders and developers not otherwise covered by these steps who propose to meet LEED Gold or equivalent or better standards.
- 3) Interim standards should require all parking to be EV ready, which means cable laid or installed for each parking space before completion of surfaces. As noted by Ty Stober, major manufacturers are saying they will produce all electric fleets. Buildings not EV ready will be more expensive to retrofit and less desirable for tenants.
- 4) All buildings should also be solar ready.
- 5) City should upgrade/increase tree canopy standards and all new and upgraded/repaved roads and developments should meet new standards.
- 6) School districts should be included in electric fleet and transit actions; e.g. allow school districts to participate in fleet charging infrastructure.
- 7) Broadband accessibility should be included in all City building and road upgrades/retrofits, new buildings and as part of evaluation of new DAs.
- 8) Staff and official travel should be included in environmentally friendly purchasing efforts, i.e., use the method that emits fewest GHGs.
- 9) Continue to allow citizen communication by electronic means in public meetings. Seek funding to improve telecommunication technologies.
- 10) Do not exempt leaf blowers or other machines from electrification. All equipment should be replaced with electric engines when such equipment is reasonably available.

Thank you for your consideration,

s/Peter Fels

From: [City of Vancouver - Office of the City Manager](#)
To: [Delapena, Amanda](#)
Subject: FW: Written comments for City Council meeting
Date: Monday, July 26, 2021 9:00:53 AM

Kerry Peck | Administrative Assistant

CITY OF VANCOUVER, WASHINGTON
City Manager's Office/Administrative Assistant
P: (360) 487-8616
www.cityofvancouver.us | www.cityofvancouver.us/socialmedia

LEARN ABOUT VANCOUVER'S COVID-19 RESPONSE HERE

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

From: Tina Brakefield <tinabrakefield@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2021 8:30 AM
To: City of Vancouver - Office of the City Manager <CMO@cityofvancouver.us>
Subject: Written comments for City Council meeting

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 City Council,

My name is Tina Brakefield and I live in Vancouver. I am writing this in place my testimony to the meeting tonight. Originally I signed up to testify virtually but had forgotten about prior plans I had committed to. So I will not be able to attend tonight.

I am writing to show the council my unwavering support to your plans for emissions reduction that will match state goals. Please be completely committed to this as we move forward. Thank you.

Tina Brakefield

From: [City of Vancouver - Office of the City Manager](#)
To: [Delapena, Amanda](#)
Subject: FW: Written comments for City Council meeting
Date: Monday, July 26, 2021 8:29:45 AM
Attachments: [image003.png](#)

Testimony for council meeting tonight

Kerry Peck | Administrative Assistant



CITY OF VANCOUVER, WASHINGTON
City Manager's Office/Administrative Assistant
P: (360) 487-8616

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



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

From: Sharon Sollenberger <sollenbergersharon1@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 26, 2021 8:27 AM
To: City of Vancouver - Office of the City Manager <CMO@cityofvancouver.us>
Subject: Written comments for City Council meeting

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 have been a resident of Vancouver, Wa for the last 11 years. I have severe asthma and so am very concerned about air quality. I am excited about Vancouver developing a Climate Change Policy . I am urging the City Council to develop a policy that will equal state goals for climate change policy. It is important for the health and safety of our community to move away from developing infrastructure for fossil fuels and devote all resources toward reducing emissions to decrease the impact of climate change. Sharon Sollenberger, 6306 NE 87th Ave., Vancouver, WA