



May 15-16, 2024 Council Agenda

5765

1900 SW Fourth Avenue, Room 2500, Portland, OR 97201

In accordance with Portland City Code and state law, City Council holds hybrid public meetings, which provide for both virtual and in-person participation. Members of council elect to attend remotely by video and teleconference, or in-person. The City makes several avenues available for the public to listen to and watch the broadcast of this meeting, including the [City's YouTube Channel](#), the [Open Signal website](#), and Xfinity Channel 30 and 330.

Questions may be directed to councilclerk@portlandoregon.gov

Wednesday, May 15, 2024 9:30 am

Session Status: Recessed

Council in Attendance: Mayor Ted Wheeler

Commissioner Carmen Rubio

Commissioner Dan Ryan

Commissioner Rene Gonzalez

Commissioner Mingus Mapps

Mayor Wheeler presided.

Commissioner Ryan arrived at 9:34 a.m.

Officers in attendance: Naomi Sheffield, Senior Deputy City Attorney; Keelan McClymont, Council Clerk

The Consent Agenda was adopted on a Y-5 roll call.

Council recessed at 11:20 a.m. and reconvened at 11:28 a.m.

Council recessed at 12:14p.m.

Communications

369

[Request of Michael Andersen to address Council regarding housing development](#) (Communication)

Document number: 369-2024

Disposition: Placed on File

370

[Request of Kalpana Krishnamurthy to address Council regarding Rose City Self Defense](#) (Communication)

Document number: 370-2024

Disposition: Placed on File

371

[Request of Rob Galanakis to address Council regarding transportation users](#) (Communication)

Document number: 371-2024

Disposition: Placed on File

372

[Request of Sonja Boyce to address Council regarding housing, discrimination, and disabilities](#) (Communication)

Document number: 372-2024

Disposition: Placed on File

373

[Request of Lisa Friedman to address Council regarding public park idea](#) (Communication)

Document number: 373-2024

Disposition: Placed on File

Time Certain

374

[Amend permit fee schedules for building, cannabis, electrical, enforcement, land use services, mechanical, noise, plumbing, signs, site development, and land use services fee schedule for the Hearings Office](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 191723

Introduced by: Commissioner Carmen Rubio

Bureau: Development Services

Time certain: 9:45 am

Time requested: 30 minutes (1 of 2)

Disposition: Passed to second reading

Passed to second reading May 22, 2024 at 9:30 a.m.

375

[Revise transportation fees, rates and charges for FY 2024-25, amend Transportation Fee Schedule, and fix an effective date \(amend TRN 3.450\)](#)(Ordinance)

Document number: 191724

Introduced by: Commissioner Mingus Mapps

Bureau: Transportation

Time certain: 9:45 am

Time requested: 30 minutes (2 of 2)

Disposition: Passed to second reading as amended

Motion to substitute Exhibits C and E: Moved by Mapps and seconded by Gonzalez. (Y-5)

Passed to second reading as amended May 22, 2024 at 9:30 a.m.

376

[*Amend grant agreements with organizations that serve youth for programming and employment support in partnership with Portland Parks & Recreation not to exceed \\$640,000 in FY 2024-25](#) (Emergency Ordinance)

Document number: 191714

Introduced by: Commissioner Dan Ryan

Bureau: Parks & Recreation

Time certain: 10:15 am

Time requested: 20 minutes

Disposition: Passed

Votes: Commissioner Dan Ryan Yea

Commissioner Rene Gonzalez Yea

Commissioner Mingus Mapps Yea

Commissioner Carmen Rubio Yea

Mayor Ted Wheeler Yea

377

[Proclaim May 2024 to be Jewish American Heritage Month](#)

(Proclamation)

Document number: 377-2024

Introduced by: Mayor Ted Wheeler

Time certain: 10:35 am

Time requested: 20 minutes

Disposition: Placed on File

Consent Agenda

378

[Accept amended recommendation of the Chief Procurement Officer to award on-call services contracts for capacity building and training, community engagement, and strategic communication services](#) (Report)

Document number: 378-2024

Introduced by: Mayor Ted Wheeler

Bureau: Management and Finance; Revenue and Financial Services

Disposition: Accepted

Votes: Commissioner Dan Ryan Yea

Commissioner Rene Gonzalez Yea

Commissioner Mingus Mapps Yea

Commissioner Carmen Rubio Yea

Mayor Ted Wheeler Yea

379

[*Pay property damage claim of Alfred Kostenko for \\$14,126 resulting from a motor vehicle collision involving the Portland Police Bureau](#) (Emergency Ordinance)

Document number: 191711

Introduced by: Mayor Ted Wheeler

Bureau: Management and Finance; Risk Management

Disposition: Passed

Votes: Commissioner Dan Ryan Yea
Commissioner Rene Gonzalez Yea
Commissioner Mingus Mapps Yea
Commissioner Carmen Rubio Yea
Mayor Ted Wheeler Yea

380

[*Pay settlement of William Erickson Jr and Ashley McGraw property damage claims for \\$39,897 involving the Portland Bureau of Environmental Services](#) (Emergency Ordinance)

Document number: 191712

Introduced by: Mayor Ted Wheeler

Bureau: Management and Finance; Risk Management

Disposition: Passed

Votes: Commissioner Dan Ryan Yea
Commissioner Rene Gonzalez Yea
Commissioner Mingus Mapps Yea
Commissioner Carmen Rubio Yea
Mayor Ted Wheeler Yea

381

[Authorize Letters of Agreement with City of Portland Professional Workers Union and American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, Local 189, to consolidate certain Hearings Clerk and Hearings Officer classifications to the Auditor bargaining unit](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 191720

Introduced by: Mayor Ted Wheeler

Bureau: Management and Finance; Human Resources

Disposition: Passed to second reading

Passed to second reading May 22, 2024 at 9:30 a.m.

382

[*Grant revocable permits to the Portland Rose Festival Foundation to perform activities relating to Portland Rose Festival annual celebration from May 24 through June 9, 2024](#) (Emergency Ordinance)

Document number: 191713

Introduced by: Commissioner Mingus Mapps

Bureau: Transportation

Disposition: Passed

Votes: Commissioner Dan Ryan Yea
Commissioner Rene Gonzalez Yea
Commissioner Mingus Mapps Yea
Commissioner Carmen Rubio Yea
Mayor Ted Wheeler Yea

Regular Agenda

383

[*Authorize Letters of Agreement with Professional & Technical Employees, Local 17 to create new specialty classification of Mental Health Crisis Responder II - BHU and new standby rate for employees assigned to standby appointment with the Crisis Negotiation Team](#) (Emergency Ordinance)

Document number: 191716

Introduced by: Mayor Ted Wheeler

Bureau: Management and Finance; Human Resources; Police

Time requested: 10 minutes

Disposition: Passed

Votes: Commissioner Dan Ryan Yea
Commissioner Rene Gonzalez Yea
Commissioner Mingus Mapps Yea
Commissioner Carmen Rubio Yea
Mayor Ted Wheeler Yea

384

[*Authorize Director of the Bureau of Environmental Services to execute and amend permits and agreements with railroad companies and their observer entities for construction of storm and sanitary sewer projects](#)

(Emergency Ordinance)

Document number: 191715

Introduced by: Commissioner Mingus Mapps

Bureau: Environmental Services

Time requested: 10 minutes

Disposition: Passed

Votes: Commissioner Dan Ryan Yea

Commissioner Rene Gonzalez Yea

Commissioner Mingus Mapps Yea

Commissioner Carmen Rubio Yea

Mayor Ted Wheeler Yea

385

[Amend Public Improvements Code to reflect reimbursement policies for sewer and drainage improvements and update sewer connection requirements \(amend Code Chapter 17.32, replace Code Chapter 17.33\)](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 191725

Introduced by: Commissioner Mingus Mapps

Bureau: Environmental Services

Time requested: 15 minutes

Disposition: Passed to second reading

Passed to second reading May 22, 2024 at 9:30 a.m.

386

[Authorize competitive solicitation and contract with the lowest responsive and responsible bidder for construction of the Water Pollution Control Laboratory Facility & Site Renovation Project for an estimated cost of \\$3,800,000 \(BES Project E10902\)](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 191726

Introduced by: Commissioner Mingus Mapps

Bureau: Environmental Services

Time requested: 10 minutes

Disposition: Passed to second reading

Passed to second reading May 22, 2024 at 9:30 a.m.

387

[Authorize competitive solicitation and price agreements for root control services not to exceed \\$2,500,000 over five years](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 191717

Introduced by: Commissioner Mingus Mapps

Bureau: Environmental Services

Second reading agenda item 366.

Disposition: Passed

Votes: Commissioner Dan Ryan Yea

Commissioner Rene Gonzalez Yea

Commissioner Mingus Mapps Yea

Commissioner Carmen Rubio Yea

Mayor Ted Wheeler Yea

388

[*Authorize competitive solicitation for a pedestrian hybrid beacon at W Burnside St & St. Clair Ave and traffic signal rebuilds at N Rosa Parks Way & Greeley Ave and SE Foster Rd & 111th Ave/Dr](#) (Emergency Ordinance)

Document number: 191718

Introduced by: Commissioner Mingus Mapps

Bureau: Transportation

Time requested: 10 minutes

Disposition: Passed

Votes: Commissioner Dan Ryan Yea

Commissioner Rene Gonzalez Yea

Commissioner Mingus Mapps Yea

Commissioner Carmen Rubio Yea

Mayor Ted Wheeler Yea

389

[Authorize Bureau of Transportation to acquire certain permanent and temporary rights necessary for construction of the 82nd Ave Major Maintenance Project through exercise of the City's eminent domain authority](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 191727

Introduced by: Commissioner Mingus Mapps

Bureau: Transportation

Time requested: 10 minutes

Disposition: Passed to second reading

Passed to second reading May 22, 2024 at 9:30 a.m.

Wednesday, May 15, 2024 2:00 pm

Session Status: Recessed

Council in Attendance: Mayor Ted Wheeler
Commissioner Carmen Rubio
Commissioner Dan Ryan
Commissioner Rene Gonzalez
Commissioner Mingus Mapps

Mayor Wheeler presided.

Officers in attendance: Linly Rees, Chief Deputy City Attorney; Keelan McClymont, Council Clerk

Council recessed at 2:49 p.m. and reconvened at 3:00 p.m.

Council recessed at 4:54 p.m. and reconvened at 5:01 p.m.

Council recessed at 5:37 p.m.

Time Certain

390

[Approval of the FY 2024-25 Budget for the City of Portland \(Mayor convenes Council as Budget Committee\)](#)
(Report)

Document number: 390-2024

Introduced by: Mayor Ted Wheeler

Bureau: City Budget Office

Time certain: 2:00 pm

Time requested: 2 hours

Disposition: Placed on File As Amended

Mayor Wheeler Amendments

1) Motion to update Attachment A to reflect the correct State Shared Revenue amount of \$26,997,152 for FY 2024-25: Moved by Wheeler and seconded by Mapps. (Y-5)

Motion to consider the changes to the Proposed Budget as described in the memo, "Approval of the Budget for the City of Portland": Moved by Wheeler and seconded by Mapps. (Y-5)

2) Motion to add attachment I with corrected Tax Levy Computation table: Moved by Wheeler and seconded by Gonzalez. (Y-5)

3) Motion to restore funding for one People & Culture position and one recruiter position in the Bureau of Human Resources: Moved by Wheeler and seconded by Mapps. (Y-5)

4) Motion to make a technical adjustment to recognize beginning fund balance in the Public Elections Fund: Moved by Wheeler and seconded by Mapps. (Y-5)

Mayor Wheeler - Commissioner Rubio Amendment

1) Motion to add funding to the Bureau of Human Resources to support expedited hiring for the Portland Clean Energy and Community Benefits Fund: Moved by Wheeler and seconded by Rubio. (Y-5)

Commissioner Gonzalez Amendments

1) Motion to replace budget notes "Public Safety Budget Monitoring" and "Portland Fire & Rescue Budget Governance and Monitoring" with "Oversight and Governance of Public Safety Spending.": Moved by Gonzalez and seconded by Ryan. (Y-5)

2) Motion to evaluate organizational structure and relative staffing of City Administrator, City Council, and Mayor's Office: Moved by Gonzalez and seconded by Ryan. (Y-5)

Commissioner Ryan Amendments

1) Motion to direct the City Budget Office to work with the Interim Deputy City Administrators to compile a listing of direct and indirect costs for all services associated with the range of programs developed to address homelessness and its impact on Portland communities: Moved by Ryan and seconded by Gonzalez. (Y-5)

3) Motion to direct the City Budget Office and the Bureau of Human Resources to analyze the bureau-by-bureau impacts of the recent change in the methodology for developing rates charged to bureaus for employee health benefits. Moved by Ryan and seconded by Gonzalez. (Y-5)

4) Motion to direct the City Economist to modify the Current Appropriation Level (CAL) for FY 2025-26 to add \$7 million to the Portland Parks & Recreation General Fund Discretionary base for purposes of calculating annual increases in CAL in perpetuity (or until the \$7 million GF is restored to the bureau): Moved by Ryan and seconded by Gonzalez. Motion withdrawn.

5) Motion to restore Portland Parks & Recreation General Fund for 5% reduction on Park Rangers: Moved by

Ryan and seconded by Gonzalez. (Y-Ryan, Gonzalez; N-Mapps, Rubio, Wheeler). Motion failed to pass.

6) Motion to restore Portland Parks & Recreation General Fund for 5% reduction on Park Rangers: Moved by Ryan and seconded by Gonzalez. Motion withdrawn.

Commissioner Mapps - Commissioner Ryan Amendment

1) Motion to provide one-time funding for the LGBTQIA2S+ program in the Office of Equity and Human Rights: Moved by Mapps and seconded by Ryan. (Y-5)

2) Motion to forecast inflation in multi-year PCEF allocations: Moved by Mapps and seconded by Rubio. (Y-5)

Motion to approve updates to the change Memo: Moved by Mapps and seconded by Gonzalez. (Y-5)

Motion to approve changes to the Proposed Budget as presented in the Memo and Attachments B, C and D as amended by the individual floor amendments: Moved by Mapps and seconded by Gonzalez. (Y-5)

Motion to approve the Budget as amended: Moved by Mapps and seconded by Ryan. (Y-5)

Motion to approve Tax Levies: Moved by Mapps and seconded by Gonzalez. (Y-5)

A public hearing will be conducted by the Tax Supervising & Conservation Commission on the Approved Budget on June 11, 2024 at 9:30 a.m.

The Budget Adoption hearing will be June 12, 2024 at 2:00 p.m. time certain

391

[City Council convenes as Prosper Portland Budget Committee to approve the FY 2024-25 Budget](#) (Report)

Document number: 391-2024

Introduced by: Commissioner Carmen Rubio; Mayor Ted Wheeler

Bureau: Prosper Portland

Time certain: 4:00 pm

Time requested: 1 hour

Disposition: Placed on File

Motion to accept the report: Moved by Mapps and seconded by Gonzalez.

Record is kept by Prosper Portland Budget Committee Clerk.

Votes: Commissioner Dan Ryan Yea

Commissioner Rene Gonzalez Yea

Commissioner Mingus Mapps Yea

Commissioner Carmen Rubio Yea

Mayor Ted Wheeler Yea

Thursday, May 16, 2024 2:00 pm

Session Status: Adjourned

Council in Attendance: Mayor Ted Wheeler
Commissioner Carmen Rubio
Commissioner Dan Ryan
Commissioner Rene Gonzalez
Commissioner Mingus Mapps

Mayor Wheeler presided.

Officers in attendance: Beth Woodard, Deputy City Attorney; Rebecca Dobert, Acting Council Clerk

Council adjourned at 3:11 p.m.

Time Certain

392

[Authorize competitive solicitation for Portland Clean Energy Community Benefits Fund Climate Investment Plan Strategic Program 3: Clean energy improvements in single-family homes not to exceed \\$140 million over five years](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 191728

Introduced by: Commissioner Carmen Rubio

Bureau: Planning and Sustainability (BPS)

Time certain: 2:00 pm

Time requested: 45 minutes

Disposition: Passed to second reading

Passed to second reading May 22, 2024 at 9:30 a.m.

393

[*Authorize Letter of Agreement with the Portland Police Association to expand the Retire/Rehire Program](#) (Emergency Ordinance)

Document number: 191719

Introduced by: Mayor Ted Wheeler

Bureau: Management and Finance; Human Resources

Time certain: 2:45 pm

Time requested: 1 hour

Disposition: Passed

Votes: Commissioner Dan Ryan Yea

Commissioner Rene Gonzalez Yea

Commissioner Mingus Mapps Yea

Commissioner Carmen Rubio Yea

Mayor Ted Wheeler Yea

394

[Direct Bureau of Planning and Sustainability to develop land use approaches to address the impact of warehouse and distribution facilities on residential neighborhoods and schools](#) (Resolution)

Introduced by: Commissioner Carmen Rubio

Bureau: Planning and Sustainability (BPS)

Time certain: 3:45 pm

Time requested: 1 hour

Disposition: Referred to Commissioner of Public Utilities

Portland City Council Meeting Speaker List
 Wednesday, May 15, 2024 - 9:30 a.m.

Name	Title	Agenda Item
Ted Wheeler	Mayor	
Keelan McClymont	Council Clerk	
Rene Gonzalez	Commissioner	
Mingus Mapps	Commissioner	
Carmen Rubio	Commissioner	
Naomi Sheffield	Senior Deputy City Attorney	
Michael Andersen	(Communications)	369
Dan Ryan	Commissioner	
Kalpana Krishnamurthy	(Communications)	370
Rob Galanakis	(Communications)	371
Lisa Friedman	(Communications)	373
Jillian Schoene	Chief of Staff, Commissioner Rubio's Office	374
David Kuhnhausen	Bureau of Development Services, Interim Director	374
Kyle O'Brien	Bureau of Development Services, Budget & Finance Manager	374
Jeremy Patton	Group Director, Business Services, Transportation	374
robert butler	(Testimony)	374/375
Sarah Radcliffe	(Testimony)	374/375
Darin Campbell	(Testimony)	374/375
Rabbi Michael Z. Cahana	Senior Rabbi at Congregation Beth Israel	377
Marc Blattner	President and CEO of the Jewish Federation of Greater Portland	377
June Bass	Community Partnerships Manager	376
Andre Middleton	Executive Director, Friends of Noise	376
Noah Bunker	Freelance Audio Engineer	376
Lisa Moscinski	Capital Project Manager	384, 386
AnnMarie Kevorkian Mattie	Labor Relations Coordinator	383
Glen Laube	Analyst II	385
Adrienne Aiona	Engineering Supervisor	385
Matthew Kelly	Capital Project Manager I	388
Ashley McLay	Right of Way Agent III	389
Nicole Peirce	Capital Project Manager, Transportation	389

Portland City Council Meeting Speaker List
 Wednesday, May 15, 2024 - 2:00 p.m.

Name	Title	Agenda Item
Ted Wheeler	Mayor	
Keelan McClymont	Council Clerk	
Dan Ryan	Commissioner	
Rene Gonzalez	Commissioner	
Mingus Mapps	Commissioner	
Carmen Rubio	Commissioner	
Linly Rees	Chief Deputy City Attorney	
Ruth Levine	Interim Director, City Budget Office	390
Brenna Bell	(Testimony)	390
Kevin Machiz	(Testimony)	390
Emily Stebbins	(Testimony)	390
Crystal Potter	(Testimony)	390
kelly lanspa	(Testimony)	390
Debbie Caselton	(Testimony)	390
Alyson Berman	(Testimony)	390
Robert Cheney	Analyst, Budget Office	390
Donnie Oliveira	Deputy City Administrator, Community and Economic Development	390
Sonia Schmanski	Deputy City Administrator, Vibrant Communities	390
Todd Lofgren	Deputy Director, Parks and Recreation	390
Vicente Harrison	Health, Safety & Emergency Manager, Parks and Recreation	390
Santino Juarez	(Testimony)	391
Nickeia Hunter	(Testimony)	391
Jesus Saucedo	(Testimony)	391
Kimberly Branam	Director, Prosper Portland	391

Portland City Council Meeting Speaker List May 16, 2024 - 2:00 p.m.

Name	Title	Agenda Item
Ted Wheeler	Mayor	
Rebecca Dobert	Acting Council Clerk	
Dan Ryan	Commissioner	
Rene Gonzalez	Commissioner	
Mingus Mapps	Commissioner	
Carmen Rubio	Commissioner	
Beth Woodard	Deputy City Attorney	
Eric Engstrom	BPS Interim Director	392
Sam Baraso	PCEF Manager	392
Kris Grube	PCEF Coordinator	392
Faith Graham	Principal Director, West Coast Strategy and Development at Elevate Energy	392
Jason Benfit	General Manager, Neil Kelly	392
Tim Miller	Director at Oregon Business for Climate	392
Indi Namkoong	Testimony	392
Babs Vanelli	Testimony	392
Heidi Brown	Chief Deputy Attorney	393
Bob Day	Chief, Portland Police	393
Dan Handleman	Testimony	393

Portland City Council Meeting Closed Caption File

May 15, 2024 – 9:30 a.m.

This file was produced through the closed captioning process for the televised city Council broadcast and should not be considered a verbatim transcript. The official vote counts, motions, and names of speakers are included in the official minute

Speaker: Good morning everybody. This is the Wednesday, may 15th, 2024, morning session of the Portland City Council. Good morning. Keelan, please call the roll. Good morning. Ryan Gonzalez here.

Speaker: Maps here. Rubio here.

Speaker: Wheeler here. Now we'll hear from legal counsel and the rules of order and decorum.

Speaker: Good morning. Good morning. Welcome to the Portland City Council. To testify before council in person or virtually, you must sign up in advance on the council agenda at [Portland.gov/council](https://portland.gov/council) agenda information on engaging with City Council can be found on the council clerk's web page. The presiding officer preserves order and decorum during City Council meetings. The presiding officer determines the length of testimony. Individuals generally have three minutes to testify unless otherwise stated. A timer will indicate when your time is done. Disruptive conduct, such as shouting, refusing to conclude your testimony when your time is up, or interrupting others testimony or council deliberations will not be allowed. If you cause a disruption, a warning will be given for the disruption will result in ejection from the meeting. Anyone who fails to leave once ejected is subject to arrest for trespass. Additionally, counsel may adjourn and reconvene virtually. Your testimony today should address the matter being considered. When

testifying, state your name for the record. Your address is not necessary. Disclose if you are a lobbyist and if you are representing an organization, please identify it. For testifiers who are joining virtually, please unmute yourself once the council clerk calls your name. Thank you.

Speaker: All right. Thanks. First up is communications. First individual please Keelan. Item 369 request of michael anderson to address council regarding housing development.

Speaker: I'm michael thanks for being here.

Speaker: Hi. Thanks very much, I'm here to respond to something that you said, mr. Mayor, that was quoted fairly widely back in January, in friendship or politeness. But the, I thought it raised an issue that I thought was useful to talk about. So I'm just going to share a few thoughts that may be obvious to all of you, but as an outsider to me has helped me understand politics of housing in Portland a little bit. You had said that that, back in the central city plan, you burned a lot of political capital, doing what developers asked to get spot up zones in the downtown. This was in the context of the bird glazed conversation you all had at the time, one thing that that and I think there's definitely an element of truth to that. I just wanted to say, as somebody who I work for, a sustainability think tank, sightline institute, we think that people should be able to live closer to each other if they want to, and that includes being able to afford to do so as you all look for the systemic change that I think you all each want on in Portland's housing market for lower prices, for, affordable development, to be able to build a greater numbers and for market prices to be lower. Generally speaking, I don't observe real estate developers advocating for systemic changes that reduce those costs. Generally speaking, their incentive is to advocate for specific targeted changes to whatever projects they have in their pipeline. That's how developers make money is by making good bets.

That is not to say the developers are wrong, or that you should never take their advice about what is or isn't useful. You're about to hear from my friend Sarah, who will give you some advice about specific projects that I think is a good idea. But, it is to say that as you hear requests for change to the housing market, you should think about, is this something that is going to make a systemic cost reduction to the process of creating housing? Is this something that is going to help this particular project? And where do you put your political capital when you're faced with choices like that? I think I would obviously argue that you should think about what are the systemic cost saving changes we should make, I don't have a problem if that helps. People who are building useful homes make money, but that should not be the primary goal for you all as the government. Thanks very much. Yeah, thanks.

Speaker: Thanks, Michael. And I appreciate you being here. And I think you're spot on, first of all. And second of all, you know, Central City 2035 better housing by design, rip all of those things were, from my perspective, systemic changes. But they also made a lot of sense. I mean, we love Oregon because it's a spectacular state. We're very, very blessed with natural beauty just beyond the borders of our beloved city, but there was a trade off implied, and I feel like people gave lip service to the implied trade off until it became absolutely necessary that we do it. And what we needed to do was build higher and more densely within the urban core in order to continue to protect those areas. Because our population was growing, our city was growing. And I was surprised, honestly, how much blowback there was to the idea of increased height and density in the urban core, even if it meant protecting everything outside of the urban core. And so that's really what I was referencing when I, when I was saying we had to burn a lot of political capital, I'm honestly kind of surprised that we did. You know, that that there was as much blowback, I also agree with you that that's, you know, at least in theory, it creates more supply in a

constrained area. And therefore, one would presume that it would also help with the affordability factor. The truth is, it's still a pretty expensive place to live, but at least it was a good start and also forgot about the. It was the architect, I think, who brought forward the adu legislation that ultimately we passed as a city that made it much easier for people to put at least a standard sized auxiliary dwelling unit in the backyard of their house. And we thought that might have an impact, too. Of course, then along came airbnb, and I'm not sure what the net impact is ultimately been, but I thought that was really good thinking on the part of not only the architects, but the builders as well. So a long way of saying, I think you're spot on.

Speaker: Thanks. Thanks very much. As a former resident of adu, I completely agree.

Speaker: Yes, and I hope you'll come back, I appreciate it. It's good seeing you, michael.

Speaker: I just wanted to thank you for being here today and for your comments. And I just wanted to lift up to you that you were, you know, very, very, impactful and essential in the role around inclusionary housing calibration. So I want to thank you for your work there because, because of the work you put into it, it really shaped the direction that it went. So I want to lift that up and all the work that you're doing to support our housing initiatives, but since you're here, I just wanted to ask, you know, you study models across the country, are there systemic models that look promising to you that we should be looking to? I think that it's there are different, you know, it's like a pipeline.

Speaker: Right. So and there are different pinch points in every city's pipeline. And I think you all have been working on some of the permitting process ones. That's a big one in Portland's, ultimate alley. That comes down to the number of rules there are. The more checklists there are to check the you have nonlinear costs for each of

those things. You need to check. And they're all going back and forth with the plans and so on. So that's one example of like every single rule accrues a lot of costs that are invisible until somebody is waiting for the permit and trying to hit catch the market, catch the grant that they're looking for. I've got a list of ideas I'd be happy to send to you. Yeah.

Speaker: Thanks so much, commissioner Gonzalez.

Speaker: Yeah, I would just, thinking about central city. The old fights to me. I'm not surprised there was resistance to height restrictions in that area. That's, from my vantage point, an old fight in the city of Portland that goes back a couple generations, really, about how high we want buildings downtown. Ultimately, we have to bet on density if we want to address affordability. You know, so i, I disagree with the folks who oppose height. Who opposed further density in those areas, but I'm not shocked that there was opposition at the time. I guess one additional editorial, I think, you know, as a council and certainly in the next council is going to have to confront whether we taking dramatic enough steps to sperm both market and affordable housing, and, i, I'm concerned that we may be too incremental in our approach and mostly just looking to production, as the primary, metric for assessing our performance in what we're doing, and again, as we went through in that debate that there are many, venerable policy initiatives embedded throughout our city code, including our building code, but they have a cost and, I think it has curbed, development in the region. And as a result, all Portlanders pay more for housing than would be optimal. And I guess I would just submit that I hope we continue to make space for more dramatic exploration of what we can do to stimulate, both market and affordable housing. That's it. Thanks, commissioner.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: Yeah, michael, I'm just want to apologize. I think my four years in this role, I've been never been late, but I was four minutes late. And I've also never experienced a testimony starting at 934. So I had really bad luck this morning. I learned a lot from you. And I will watch. I will watch this later. So thanks for being here. I look forward to hearing what you had to say.

Speaker: Thanks so much for the nice words.

Speaker: Great. Thank you. Appreciate it. We'll see you again soon, we hope, item 370. Next individual, please request of kalpana krishnamurthy to address council regarding rose city self defense. Good morning.

Speaker: Thank you, commissioner Mapps, yea. Rubio, Gonzalez Ryan and mayor Wheeler for your time today, my name is kalpana krishnamurthy and I'm a volunteer self defense instructor with rose city self defense. I'd like to start by thanking the mayor for restoring our funding in the next year's budget. And all of the council members for committing to keeping that funding in place through what I know will be a tight budget process at rose city self defense, we teach basic personal and community safety skills through workshops in community centers hosted by nonprofits, in schools, we teach skills like listening to your intuition, assertive communication, situational awareness, escape options, and physical self defense skills. Since 1975, we've reached more than 110,000 youth and more than 45,000 women and girls. The most common question I'm asked in a self-defense class is if I've ever actually had to use my self-defense skills, and most of the time, I used to answer that as a way to kind of flip it and talk about how I've used my intuition, and I've used my sort of, skills to keep me safe. But on September 8th of 2022, I had to use my self-defense skills when an individual barreled through my front door. It was the height of the pandemic, and my husband and I were working from home in southwest Portland when a person literally ran into our house as

they raced around my kitchen, looking out the windows, talking incoherently about someone following them and trying to hurt them, I knew two things with absolute certainty one, I could physically take this person down if I needed to because of the physical self-defense skills that I had learned, and two, I needed to de-escalate the situation. So while my husband talked to 911 dispatch, I worked on calming this person down. I took I did what we teach in our classes. I took a deep breath. I tried to ground myself and I started talking to them. Eventually we sat at my kitchen table and they drank a glass of water. As we were sitting at the table, though, I realized that the unused cutlery from breakfast was sitting on the table and that there were knives in front of us. So I took my hand and I put it down on top of the knife to cover it, so that that knife couldn't be used against me or grabbed. I kept talking and eventually they were calm enough to hold a conversation with me. I knew that it would be better for all of us if this person was not in my house when the police arrived, but I didn't want to risk having my husband and I drag them out of our house and escalate the situation again. So taking a deep breath, I used assertive communication. I said, my kids are about to come home and I need to turn into a mom, so I need you to come with me outside. They stood up, they came with me, and by the time the Portland police arrived, an hour and a half later, we were sitting in front of my house. All of this sounds a little fantastical, I know, but this is the impact of self-defense classes. I was able to pay attention to this person's behaviors and see that they weren't violent or threatening, that they were scared. I used the skills we teach like breathing, keeping myself calm, noticing my surroundings and what could be used as a weapon. And then I waited for an opening and kept talking. This is what we teach at rose city self defense. We teach de-escalation, verbal skills, and physical skills. This is why the program is critical and

it never should have been on the cutting block. I'm grateful to you all for committing to restoring the funding and appreciate your support.

Speaker: Thank you. I appreciate it, commissioner Rubio.

Speaker: Oh no, I just, had my hand up from before, but i'll take the time to say thank you. And I know this program. It, you know, the origins were at university of Oregon when we were students there. And it's hugely impactful. So thank you. And I'm glad that those skills came in at a critical time. Yeah

Speaker: Harrowing story, thank you for sharing it. And and, I'm glad that you had the skill sets. You had. And obviously during that time in particular, police response was severely challenged, as you mentioned, and so I think it is a good message to people, I'd like people to be able to rely on our police bureau at all times, but there may be times when that's not possible for whatever reason, or you're just not in a place where you can reach a phone. And so having the skill sets critically important, and I appreciate you giving us a, frankly, a harrowing narrative, but an important one. Yeah. No coming in.

Speaker: Thank you. Mayor Wheeler. I think a lot of people, it's important when we think about self-defense to remember and talk about all of the ways that we keep ourselves safe in relationships, dating. But self-defense is also being able to keep ourselves safe on the streets and in our homes. And so the skills we really look at, look at the behaviors, understand, you know, have a situational awareness, breathe. Ground yourself. Those are going to be critical skills in any situation that a city of Portland resident faces. And the fact that we bring these workshops into community, I just taught at african youth organization on Saturday. I'm teaching at the q center, so we go into organizations, work with folks in the communities, with the organizations they trust in order to embed these skills. And that's why it works.

Speaker: I appreciate it very much. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you for your time, commissioner Ryan, did you have a I just wanted to thank you for such a compelling story and our meeting that we had a couple months ago, and we're all happy that the funding has been restored.

Speaker: I think those meetings with each commissioner's office, had a lot of impact. I know it scared the most of my staff because I didn't know we were going to make so much noise, but other than that, I really wanted to thank you for that. When we're in the meeting, though, it felt like you, your organization felt like a nonprofit in a good way because you have so much community support, and I hope that we can figure out how you can also supplement your budget with some private gifts. And so I hope whoever is overseeing that, we'll look into that. Great. Thank you. There's a lot of support for your organization.

Speaker: Thank you. We would be happy to do that. And we see ourselves as a free, city funded program where we are the front end of a pipeline that also funds domestic violence shelters and that funds victim services and investments in these areas by the city to make these free are a part of deterring the later investments that we might need. Spot on. Thank you for your time. Thank you.

Speaker: Appreciate it very much. Next individual please Keelan.

Speaker: Item 371 request of rob galanakis to address council regarding users robins online. Hi rob.

Speaker: Hello everyone. Good morning, mayor Wheeler. Portland commissioners, my name is rob galanakis. I'm actually going to talk to you today about a trip I just got back from, city I visited was dynamic and vibrant, but just five years ago, its story was different. The city had, so to speak, run up a bill over previous decades. And that bill had come due for housing during boom years, led to astronomical housing costs and a homelessness crisis. The city had multiple years of record traffic violence, infrastructure backlogs were massive, transportation maintenance

backlog was the size of the entire city budget. Most of these issues had poor land use and transportation policies. At their core, almost 50% of the urban surface was paid for automobile use, with 20% being for off street parking. Lots in prime areas were often vacant and underdeveloped. The city was in a vicious cycle. Expenses rose, maintenance was deferred, service delivery got worse, and revenue declined. City leaders faced overwhelming disapproval and clung to a status quo that no one was happy with. But five years ago, in the depth of crisis, leaders decided to pursue solutions they could implement immediately and work with the city strings rather than simply mitigate weakness. The first thing the city did was level with motorists about the cost of maintaining sprawling car infrastructure. For example, the budget for pavement maintenance was only enough to repave once every 300 years. This conversation led to a network of car free streets using inexpensive modal filters. This eliminated wear and tear directly on those road surfaces by shifting more trips to walk. Biking decreased crashes, and maintenance costs. City also piloted a program that trained volunteers and dispatched them to traffic safety complaints using planters, paint and barrels. Thousands of intersections were daylighted and crosswalks painted by residents at minimal cost. Walking in the city felt comfortable and encouraged to stimulate more housing and increased revenue. The city eliminated barriers to allow for floors and corner stores in core neighborhoods. Second, it created a variable property tax mill rate similar to a land value tax to discourage speculators from sitting on vacant land and parking lots. Third, the city vacated and sold low utility streets, which also reduced their maintenance liabilities. This all seemed to work. I didn't see a tent anywhere. Okay, so what is this great city? It is, of course, Portland, Oregon. But in the year 2029 and unfortunately, my time machine was for single use to deliver the future. Portlanders want. You need to engage residents on fiscal realities, harness our time and energy to improve the

physical environment. Believe us when we say we want more housing within the urban core, connected by a cohesive all ages bike network and speedy transit commissioners, I would ask that each of you think about one new program or innovation that would improve this city, and do it before your terms expire. Let this lame duck term be a learning experience for our incoming council. Our city cannot afford five more years or even five more months of the status quo. The people of our city are resilient and creative, but we need you all to lead with urgency. I look forward to engaging with you and your staff if you need any ideas. Thank you.

Thanks rob.

Speaker: Appreciate it very much. Next individual, please.

Speaker: Item 372 request of sonia boyce to address council regarding housing discrimination and disabilities. Sonia boyce. Doesn't look like they're here.

Speaker: All right. Very good. Next individual 373 request of lisa friedman to address council regarding public park idea.

Speaker: Welcome.

Speaker: Thanks for being here.

Speaker: Okay. Hello council. I'm excited to be here today, I want to tell you about an idea I've had for more than 20 years. It's a super simple idea and I'm actually shocked it doesn't already exist just because of how good it is and how easy it would be to implement. I truly think this simple idea could be revolutionary in a small way, to bring some extra happiness and connection to people. I've told this particular idea to various people over the years friends, clients, random strangers, occasionally everyone. I've told has thought this would be a fantastic idea. Not one person has said they don't like it. I actually have lots of ideas that I think would be successful, but I don't have the skills or ability to make them happen. This one though, I think you all can make happen because it falls under a city's jurisdiction in

a public park. So I want Portland to build us a park. My big idea is basically just a public park, similar to the many beautiful public parks we have already, but this one would be for adults only, so it will have adult size equipment, a huge jungle gym, a giant slide, big fun things for us to climb and play on. I've already got a lot of great ideas for different rides and equipment for it, and when I tell other people about the adult park idea, they usually start thinking of fun things for the park too. It truly has endless possibilities and there can be many of them. I think adult park should exist in every city and town. Why not have a beautiful, fun outdoor space that brings people together for the purpose of fun and play? I think many adults would still really love to play in parks. We're just too big for everything. This is an idea that's more than just about a single park. It's a way to bring people together. It's good for people. It gets us outside, gets us moving, laughing. It's good for our souls. I would love to collaborate with the parks department and be part of the team that brings the first adult park to Portland. Portland is the perfect place to start this. I know this would be a huge success and draw lots of people to this free, accessible, super fun attraction. What do you think? Can we do this? Is it possible?

Speaker: Great. Thank you. Yeah

Speaker: Is this a good idea? You think?

Speaker: Oh, you're all looking at me. We're all.

Speaker: We're all looking at. Dan, you're the parks guy. In the final days of the government.

Speaker: Yeah, just look at one person.

Speaker: Yeah, it's great, isn't it? Take it down.

Speaker: Yeah, yeah.

Speaker: Dan, what do you think?

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: I'll ignore the people to my right, there is someone here from the parks bureau, right? Yeah. Their their hands up high. Why don't you have a chat with her? So we could, begin the process of having a dialog about it, but at this time, I don't really want to have a public dialog about your big, exciting idea. Okay? Need to marinate on it for a bit. Okay. All right.

Speaker: And if I could jump in here, I appreciate this idea. And, and I want to say it's not as, outlandish as folks might initially think. I think even in the context of some council meetings that we've had over the past couple of years. This notion of or let's put it this way, there was, if you go back probably 20 years, there's sort of a design tradition in cities where, people or cities would add essentially workout equipment along running paths and whatnot, and it was very popular. I think I remember it being fairly common in the early aughts, maybe I haven't gotten out of town for a while. I don't know if that is still a thing, but it would be great. And as a guy who at least aspires to get out and run every once in a while, it would be wonderful if there were places that you could do sit ups or, chin ups, along the waterfront or something, very, I think a very practical idea and indeed it's kind of cheap now.

Speaker: I think the fitness conversation is one thing I heard, actually a different spark tonight.

Speaker: Yeah, yeah, yeah, there could be a lot of different iterations and I know there are fitness. We would. Yeah, that could be there too. But I I've got some other ideas for like you wanted structures.

Speaker: All right. So when I'm in a park I've, I've actually tried to use the equipment for exercise and then I realize, oh parents probably don't really like an adult. Like jumping in on equipment when their kids are there. Right. So, so I think the equipment thing here, you got me going. But anyway, there you go. Have a

meeting with, the person from parks. Okay? And we'll look into this. But what I heard from you is basically playground equipment for adults that are only for adults. Yeah. What your message was.

Speaker: Yeah. Because it would be probably too big and a liability for little kids.

Speaker: I just want to make sure you listen to. And your point was received. Yeah. All right. And thank you so much, parks, for your, meeting with our guest. Thanks so much.

Speaker: Yeah. Hold on. Thank you.

Speaker: Lisa. Thank you. Let's see, consent agenda. Keelan. Has anything been pulled off of the consent agenda?

Speaker: No, I am all right.

Speaker: Please call the roll on the consent agenda. Ryan, I yea. Rubio I Wheeler.

Speaker: All right.

Speaker: Consent agenda is adopted. One more thing on the parks and the giant swings, after dark. Those are mine. Okay okay. First time certain, please. Item 374.

Speaker: Amend permit fee. Schedule for building cannabis. Electrical enforcement, land use services. Mechanical noise, plumbing signs, site development and land use services. Fee schedule for the hearings office.

Speaker: And could you also read 375 please revise transportation fees, rates and charges for fy 20 2425.

Speaker: Amend transportation fee, schedule and fix and effective date colleagues.

Speaker: These items are to amend and revise fee schedules for bts and pbot. I'll first pass to commissioner yea. Rubio and commissioner Mapps to see if they have any opening remarks before we hear a presentation from staff commissioner Rubio, i'll let you go first.

Speaker: Thank you. Colleagues, today we have before us the proposed fee changes for the bureau of development services. Bts is responsible for administering and enforcing the state building code, as well as administering and enforcing the city's zoning code, title 33 and the regulations on floating structures, title 28 erosion control. Title ten, signed title 32 murals. Title for property maintenance. Title 29 portions of the tree code. Title 11 noise control. Title 18 liquor licensing. Chapter 14 b 120 and marijuana licensing chapter chapter 14 b one 3,097% of bts ongoing funding comes from permit fees charging for the work being done, bd's revenues and reserve levels have declined in the past year due to the downturn in the construction industry. While costs continue to rise due to the inflationary economic environment. Therefore given the downturn in the lack of diverse of a diverse set of revenue streams for this work, fees need to be set at a rate to cover the costs of providing these services. We of course, keep in mind how these fees impact our customers, which primarily are housing developers, small business owners and homeowners. The ability for us to provide timely, predictable services is essential to keeping construction workers on the job. Adding to the housing supply, supporting business development and attracting investment in Portland. The fee changes proposed today are necessary to continue its meaningful progress on permitting timelines and keeping up with ongoing cost inflation. These fee changes will help the bureau maintain staffing levels as a stable workforce is critical for positioning the bureau increases in demand for services. Bts is currently meeting goals in five of the six categories, and these fee increases help to provide some stability to get us to the other side of the construction downturn. The development of this fee change proposal was not done without the collaboration of stakeholders who are deeply invested in this process, and I want to acknowledge everyone that came to the table with us to really dig into this issue and provide

excellent feedback on how we can stabilize the bureau to make sure our customer service doesn't suffer. I'll continue to advocate for the general fund investments in the mayor's proposed budget and before anyone else's, anyone else says it? Yes. A long term fix to this bureau's financial streams as well. But for today, these fee increases are necessary to maintain services and permitting timelines. That said, today, as a first reading and I remain open to feedback from everyone and conversations about trade offs. If this bureau isn't able to maintain its staff. Now, I would like to introduce bts interim director david kuhnhausen and bts budget and finance manager kyle o'brien to share additional background and information about the proposal.

Speaker: Commissioner Rubio, can I can I read my item two or introduce.

Speaker: Sorry, I apologize mistake.

Speaker: High five to you. Commissioner Mapps. That's your war, right? That's what's supposed to happen.

Speaker: Okay, not a problem at all. Not a problem at all, commissioner Rubio did a great introduction to, this topic. Bts and transportation are bringing forward their, fee and rate schedules for the coming year, you just heard a preview of what bds is up to over at pbot. We also are introducing, updates to our transportation fee and rate charges for the fiscal year 2425. Now, pbot, reviews these fees and charges on an annual basis, basically, the changes that are proposed this year are largely driven by inflation, after we hear the bds presentation from staff, we'll hear the pbot presentation from staff. But before we get to staff, I need to, amend item 375 to fix some technical errors and the fee schedule, what seems to have happened here is in one of our exhibits, we rounded up to the nearest dollar, when we should have rounded up to the nearest cent, which is why I am bringing, this motion before us today, so therefore I move to substitute exhibit c and e of the pbot

ordinance with the updated exhibits. These new exhibits have been provided to the council clerk and should have been provided to your offices yesterday, may I get a second?

Speaker: Second commissioner Gonzalez seconds. Any further discussion on the amendment? Please call the roll. Brian I Gonzalez.

Speaker: Hi.

Speaker: Maps. I Wheeler.

Speaker: Hi. The amendment passes great.

Speaker: And now, what I think we should we're supposed to do is to all kind of hand it back to commissioner Rubio, who I think is going to throw it over to staff.

Speaker: Yes. Thank you, commissioner Mapps. And Rubio. Good morning, commissioners. Mayor Wheeler, my name is david kuhnhausen. I'm the interim director of the bureau of development services. I'm joined today by kyle o'brien, who is our budget and finance manager, as stated, we are here today to talk about the proposed fee increases for the development services bureau for fiscal year 2425. Next slide, please. As commissioner Rubio stated, 97% of bds's ongoing funding comes from fee revenue and charges for the services that we provide, with only 3% of the funding coming from the general fund. As everyone knows, the construction industry is extremely volatile, and our bureau's fee revenue is directly tied to those fluctuations in the market because permit fees are based on project valuation, large scale projects exceeding ten, 20, \$30 million and more make up the disproportionate share of our revenue. However, there are a lot of factors at play right now that are outside of our control that demand the or. I'm sorry that impact the demand for construction. This includes high interest rates, declining market values and low investor confidence in the city of Portland and specifically in the downtown core. These current trends create

obstacles in the development review process for our customers. Because of this, we're seeing far less demand for these large scale projects. We're seeing projects that are currently under review being put on indefinite hold, and we're seeing some projects being outright canceled because the developers or owners no longer have the financial means or the desire to develop within the city of Portland. Now, bds is fortunate to have the advice from our bds financial advisory committee to help us with our financial planning process. This committee is made up of local economists and development industry experts, and they provide us with their opinions and their feedback on the future of construction activity in the city of Portland. And in this case, we've asked them to help us over the next 1 to 5 years with those projections, we use their input to inform our own projections, and then they sign off on our models for of those projections on both our expenditures and our revenues with the construction industry being extremely volatile, this makes our job and their input extremely valuable. Or I'm sorry, our job extremely difficult and their input extremely valuable. Fortunately, we don't have a crystal ball to see what's going to come up, but we do. We, we go through a very rigorous process to make sure we have the best projections possible this year. The focus of the conversation with this committee was centered around how long this current downturn is going to last, and the feedback that we received from this committee is that we should be expecting this downturn, downturn to persist for the next 18 to 24 months, at a minimum. That's before we start to see any sort of meaningful construction come back to the city of Portland. Next slide please. The fees and charges that bds collects help support the services that bds, bds provides. So as you can see here, these are many of the services that we provide. And nearly all the services are funded by permit fees. Staff provide customer service in many ways, including assistance assisting customers who are seeking general information,

assisting customers who are going through the actual permit process, and by inspecting the buildings that are part of that permit process. Next slide. As bds is funded almost entirely by permit fees, it's vital that our fee schedule is reviewed annually to determine if those fees are sufficient to cover our costs. If changes are needed, a proposal is brought to council, who then vote on that proposed fee increase. As I already mentioned, our revenues can fluctuate significantly, and we rely on our staff. We rely on those fees to provide staff to provide the services is related to land use reviews related to the permitting process and relating to the related to the inspection process. This volatility makes the maintenance of our financial reserves especially important as well, so that we retain experience and knowledgeable customers through the ups and downs that the market goes through. Next slide please. So every year there are non-negotiable changes and increases to the cost that the bureau takes on these include mandatory pers contributions, pay changes for staff including cola increases and pay step increases for represented staff. And just like everyone else, we're dealing with inflation related to the materials and the services that we use to run our business. It's also worth pointing out that we collectively and this is mentioned in testimony earlier today, continue to add more layers of code and requirements to the permitting process. It's worth noting this because this requires additional time for our staff to learn these requirements. It requires additional time to help educate our customers related to these requirements, and it requires additional time to review the plans to make sure all of those requirements, both new and old, are showing up on those plans. Next slide. I think it's worth noting that we recognize that council and our customers have a desire to keep our fees stable, and that if we are increasing fees, that those fee changes are minimal. I say that because for six years, bts chose not to, propose across the board fee increases. And we actually even decreased fees by

3% in fiscal year 1617. During this time, there was a construction boom. And I believe that, don't quote me on this, but I think Portland had the most cranes in the city per capita in the United States. So we were able to achieve cost recovery during that time and build the reserves to support our numerous programs. Meanwhile, as I mentioned on the previous slide, our costs continue to increase year after year. So unfortunately, by 2019, those costs then exceeded our revenue and we had to go forward with additional cost increase or I'm sorry, fee increases at that time. Unfortunately, this past year has seen us draw heavily on our reserves and we're now in the process of gradually increasing costs to increasing fees to cover our costs once again. Next slide please. In order to in order to cover those costs, we are proposing to increase most fees by 8. There are a couple exceptions to this that would exceed that 8, though. Those include our accessory short term rental fees that were initially set far below cost recovery, and the bureau does not currently have the resources to meet the demand for that industry. The fee increase that we're proposing there is to make sure that those costs are covered. Similarly, with our field issuance remodel program known as fur, which is a very popular program for customers in that, in that program, we are increasing fees by 15% to, to make sure that that program is financially self-supporting. On this slide, it shows what a new single family residence valued at approximately 25,000. I'm sorry, \$275,000, what? That fee increase would entail. And the total to those fees would be approximately \$545. Now, should fee increases not be approved? And should we get to a situation where we see less staff available to answer the questions and assist customers with the permitting process? The actual cost there would far outweigh this additional cost that we would be that we're proposing today. Every single phase of the permitting process at that point would take much longer. And as we know, the permitting frustrations are not just around the actual costs. They're

around the timelines associated with that. We also fully recognize that for some customers, in our community, there may need they may need to make necessary repairs, especially when there's unsafe conditions and that even minor permitting fees can be cost prohibitive to some of those customers. We continue to offer a fee waiver process for low income customers to obtain reduced fees. Next slide. As you're as you are all aware, bds is in the midst of some very challenging financial times. We have needed to draw heavily on our reserves over the past year, and this last winter we made the very difficult decision to lay off 73 employees in the bureau. Despite these layoffs, the bureau continues to draw on our reserves and without intervention, we anticipate that we will fully deplete those reserves by fiscal year, by the beginning of fiscal year 2526. Should this happen, the bureau is going to have to significantly alter our operations. Bds would need to cut our expenditures through massive layoffs in order to achieve 100% cost recovery. Many of our services would be cut or drastically reduced, and our permitting timelines would grow significantly. Additionally, it would put bds in a position of playing catch up to the private sector in development in the development industry, when permitting picks back up and have to make us compete with them for the staff to perform these functions. This is a scenario that we need to avoid at all costs, because this is not just an 18 to 24 month process or project problem. Excuse me, this is going to impact this entire industry for years to come. Fee changes are an important facet to our bureau's strategy to continue to provide services during this downturn. We're doing everything internally. We can, most notably instituting a hiring freeze. We're also anticipating the attrition of approximately 30 employees over the next 24 months. Positions which we don't have any intention of filling in the near future. So to make things more concrete, the 8% fee increase that we're proposing today is the equivalent to us retaining 24 employees. However, if fee

increases are not approved, we will have to make some very difficult decisions in the very near term about our staffing levels. Next slide. And before we get into the questions, I do want to echo commissioner Rubio. We did significant outreach related to these fee proposals with our industry stakeholders, in March, commissioner Rubio's office and bds staff met with a group three separate times to talk about the options that we, that we could pursue related to this problem, the group was generally supportive of our fee increases as a way to retain staff who perform these functions, understanding that a reduced staff increases timelines for all of the projects that come through, we have communicated with our development review advisory committee known as drac, who are, is a board made up of representatives from the industry. We did that in April. We have also met with key stakeholder groups, all the managers involved in this, to inform them of this proposal. And we have notification on our website and have shared this via social media. And that concludes the presentation.

Speaker: I had a couple quick questions.

Speaker: Commissioner Gonzalez just, can you remind me for the filled issuance remodel program and the neighborhood inspection programs, who where are those triggered?

Speaker: When are those, I just want to make sure I'm looking at 15% and 22% increases for those two. Did you just tell me about who pays these when they're triggered?

Speaker: And so maybe i'll take the fir, so fir is a group within our inspections division that, allows contractors to apply to work directly with a single point of contact or a team, in residential remodel projects, it's basically a work as you go and customer and our inspectors go out to, to review the project as those developer or as those contractors are actually working. So it's initiated by the

contractors themselves is their primary residential that we're talking or exclusively residential, exclusively residential. We have a, facility permit program that deals with that has a similar process on the commercial side.

Speaker: And so what was the logic of raising that so significantly relative to some of the other fee increases?

Speaker: We've been, operating below cost recovery for years. Their program. Yes. But in that program and as I stated, that's a really popular program with our customers in order to continue to allow new contractors into that group and to continue to offer services that are, for those customers, we need to increase the fees there.

Speaker: So popular, it gives customers an opportunity to work with one point of contact, and that is really beneficial for those, to build basically collaboration and communication between the inspector and the contractor. They know who they're going to get. They're able to communicate with them outside of our regular process, that's, that's really the benefit of the program.

Speaker: And then on the neighborhood inspection program, kyle o'brien, for the record, the neighborhood inspections program increase, I think, on the impact statement, it showed 22, but that's actually it's 8% for all fees and charges, except the accessory short term rental increase that david spoke about in the presentation, so that the accessory short term rental fees are increased by by more because the services provided.

Speaker: We just don't have the funding to provide the services at the level that are needed, did that answer your question?

Speaker: I maybe I i'll repeat it back as I understood. So essentially maybe the same dynamic as the fir program we've been operating at well below cost recovery for some time. And are trying to play catch up. Or is it a different dynamic, it's, it's

similar to that in that when the, the accessory short term rental program was implemented, the fees were set below cost recovery.

Speaker: I think at a desire from council at the time, I think you've probably seen, you know, in the news in the last year that there's, issues with the, the program and needing to be able to provide those services at a higher level. So these fees, need to be right sized to provide the staffing and resources needed to do that work.

Speaker: And. So I think we had, substantial examples of folks just not complying with the rules, right. That circumventing the rules we had is that so is this essentially the folks that are, properly registering and getting properly inspected for the program? Is that is that what this is paying for?

Speaker: Yes. Registration for that program.

Speaker: I guess the one I here's sort of a concern in the abstract, right? If we dramatically increase the cost of compliance, will that discourage people from complying, because obviously there's essentially a black market of folks circumventing the system or there has been, in recent years. So I just that's a cautionary tale. If we make the cost of compliance too high, is it going to create the wrong mix of incentives and disincentives?

Speaker: I think that's a good point, we did study how these fees compared to other jurisdictions. The fee right now is, it's in the 100 to \$200 range for a two year license or I think we call it a license, this increases it in the \$300 range for the two year license. So it's in terms of dollar amounts, it's actually, I think, still pretty affordable, it's just that starting from such a low dollar amount, it makes a higher percentage increase.

Speaker: Got it. And then on the and on the fir program, what are typical perm you know fees. Right now in that area.

Speaker: It really depends on the amount of time the inspector spends. So if a smaller project if they're billing per hour, and so a smaller project bathroom remodel for instance, can be, you know, relatively nominal, a larger scale projects that actually fit within the fir program still fit within their criteria are going to be a little bit more, but it's going to be within a couple thousand dollars tops. But it also depends on the scope of work, and it depends on the number of fixtures that are added and making sure that other bureaus, you know, there are fees that other bureaus assess as well.

Speaker: Okay. I mean, i, I recognize that this is going to affect people across the income scale, but this is this is really going to affect everybody, right? Anybody who wants to do a remodel, that I don't know, I just have some concerns about further costs to the middle class that feels like they're getting hosed in the city of Portland.

Speaker: And absolutely, if it helps, the \$275,000 valuation is for a new house, that's significantly larger than a bathroom remodel or a kitchen remodel, cost would be, although probably not that much anymore. But a \$545 fee. In addition. Or is, you know, taking into account a \$275,000 valuation. So I don't have the figures in front of me, but if you're looking at a \$5,000 bathroom remodel, that difference is going to be, you know, \$75 or so.

Speaker: Is there any bathroom remodels that are \$5,000 anymore there?

Speaker: I mean, it's a great point.

Speaker: I don't even know. I mean, kind of talking 50,000, right? I mean, it's bathroom remodel, it depends on the bathroom remodel, obviously, but it should be right around 20,000, 25,000. I have a small bathroom.

Speaker: Yeah, okay.

Speaker: Okay, I I'm done for right now. Thank you. Commissioner Mapps.

Speaker: We can hardly wait.

Speaker: Oh, great.

Speaker: Well, thank you for the presentation, then, two quick questions, what's the plan or maybe even the process for developing a plan to update the financial model for bds. I don't know if that's for staff or commissioner Rubio or commissioner Rubio's chief of staff. Is that do we have a are you talking overhead? Yeah. Are you talking the whole the whole the whole thing? It's it seems like there's, you know, I want to compliment bds from watching them from a distance. I get the impression they have some of the most sophisticated folks at the table for developing their financial model. However, over every decade or so, the model seems to kind of collapse. And we're in this moment now. And, you know, we're trying to fill the hole or plug the hole in the bucket, is there a plan to reach sustainability? Yeah.

Speaker: You would ask me, not my. Yeah. Well, yeah.

Speaker: So, there is a plan. We're actively working on that plan. And, with the promotion of our dca, where we're very hopeful and we're active conversations also with, mike jordan as well. So we'll be hearing more about that when we talk about the spa.

Speaker: Okay, great. Well, I look forward to that discussion. I agree, I think it's some of the more important work that I hope that we can at least dig into before the end of the calendar year, and, can we go back to the slides and pull up the slide on the fee history very quickly? So, you know, and this is I maybe a question to staff, but really more of an observation to my colleagues on council, you know, we have some years where we didn't do fee increases or we even did fee decreases. And then a few years later, we find we find ourselves without enough resources to, to do our basic work, and I don't know your spreadsheets well enough to, to fully understand all the dynamics here, but in retrospect, when I take a look at the

patterns I see in this table or in this, slide, it makes me wonder about the wisdom of forgoing, fee fee increases. You know, I'm sure there's a way you can illustrate. You know what we would look like today if, we hadn't fOregone fee increases, or even decreased fees, you know, not that long ago. So that's something I put on the table. If we do have a council wide discussion about this, that might looking at that counterfactual, what would our what would the universe look like if we, had just kind of kept pace with inflation in this space, certainly some information that I'd be interested in knowing more about. That's it.

Speaker: Great. Thank you, commissioner Ryan, then we'll take public testimony.

Speaker: Sorry, I got myself to. What's that? Got my pbot people.

Speaker: Oh, sorry. Apologies commissioner Ryan.

Speaker: Okay, thanks. Hi. Good to see all of you. And because I was the commissioner oversight for two years and three months. I have some context here, and I understand why this is with us today, I do have some questions, though. Commissioner Gonzalez touched on some, and I just want to understand a little bit more and hear it from you directly about why those two are well over 8. And I know that people enjoy those programs. They like to utilize them and, and they can afford to utilize them. So we're also putting, we're taking advantage of that that people. It's popular and people will pay it, so just like companies that have the means, they hire a fte just to navigate our system. And we hear about that all the time. They wish they didn't have to hire that fte to navigate our system. So that's what it is, I do know that they also time is more important to the bigger projects, especially the money. So I get that. I get why the business interests said it's better to keep the fte in in total than to, have that be dismantled again. That's why in 2021, we were in a better big picture general fund. So we were able to, true up the, sustain the fte that way. We're also busier then it's a sad to see what's been

happening in terms of investment, there's a couple more that that stick out, especially the cannabis licensing program because that's not a permit. And I hear from small business owners who own cannabis shops that they're really getting hit hard and they've, they're they have some challenges already just because they're not, federally connected to the banking system, as you know. So they work with cash. The state, and olc has licensing on them. And what I hear is that our fees are now higher than the state's, so they're not happy. And I think we've all gotten some letters from them. So I'm just curious how that got into this mix. It felt like it was separate noise program two I know these came from, civic life, but I just wanted to single them out as a little bit different than some of the other ones. I had more knowledge about, so for the cannabis.

Speaker: And did you do outreach to small business owners in the cannabis industry who are reaching our offices about their concern with having yet more fixed costs make it difficult for them to stay afloat?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: The cannabis program manager did outreach to the industry on on the proposed fee changes. The cannabis program in particular, like you mentioned, this came over from civic life at the beginning of this fiscal year, it's operating below cost recovery, and 80, 80 something percent, I believe, so far this year, that means it's drawn over \$200,000 from the reserve this fiscal year. And for a small program, that has flat fees that aren't indexed to anything, that can be a problem moving forward, where as costs continue to increase, it's the same story really. Costs increase. We're, unable to support the program with the existing fee levels. So we chose to propose an increase of 8% that matches the rest of the, the bts fee changes. For that reason, to try to bring the program to cost recovery. And maintain the staffing and services that we're providing.

Speaker: And so there was extensive outreach.

Speaker: Yeah, our program manager, christina coursey, did outreach to the industry.

Speaker: I think that's it. Those programs are much lesser amount, but it's a similar story, yeah.

Speaker: Noise program. Their fee increase severely, did some restructuring of fees in that program, which some fees went up. Some fees actually didn't go up at all or went down because of that.

Speaker: And when we're in this space, I just want to put out how exciting it will be to figure out what to do with, this. There's got to be an opportunity with what's really some disheartening information. Big picture. And we are doing this. We're integrating the permitting system. The good news, maybe, is that they're not so busy right now, so they'll be able to lean into this and get it done. So I guess I'm interested in hearing about what will how will take advantage of a time where we have a lot of employees that are probably not as busy as they've been? I mean, that's what this is indicating. And so what will go on? Why we're doing something very important that I've worked really hard on my first two years when I had this assignment, which is to integrate this system. So I want to hear that that accelerates during this time and that we can continue to see that as our opportunity, why we're waiting for the big picture economy to improve and let's face it, the conditions in Portland that make us inviting to investors again. So it's on us as well in the city, which is why we have priorities in this budget to that are connected to this.

Speaker: Yeah, absolutely. This is an opportunity to, to look at these, programs and projects that are underway and figuring out what the highest priority is and how we can support staff through this transition, you know, in terms of how busy we are, we did lose 73 employees, and that work has had to be absorbed by the

remaining staff. So, you know, we are still quite busy, but there's a lot of, I'm happy to hear that the numbers indicate that.

Speaker: Yeah. It was. Yeah. To say that.

Speaker: Yeah. So there's still a lot of work to be done. And every time we work on an improvement project or we have, you know, suggestions on, on things to, to track down, it requires staff time to actually do that. And that pulls us away from our day to day work, so there is a balance there. Absolutely but like I said, this is an opportunity to relook at how the permitting process works, how we're funded, making sure that we're there to support this industry when things pick back up in two years, and that we have the staff in place to meet the demand at that time.

Speaker: Yeah, and I'm happy to hear that. And I think that, often we do continuous improvement change we it's too top down. And so I hope we use this as an opportunity to really include those on the ground to be a part of the system change and really listen to their voices and spend more time, including them in how we go about this. So I'm just trying to help think out loud with you about the silver lining of this.

Speaker: Absolutely. Thanks. Thank you, commissioner Rubio, I just want to say thank thank my colleagues. These are really good, questions. And so you're getting a sense of what we're having to grapple with are really hard. And, there are a lot of trade offs, but i'll speak to the all of it speaks to the need of why we need reform in, in the revenue structure so that we can have consistent, long term support for, our program and our staff. But I just wanted to reference to I just remembered this late. Commissioner Mapps an answer to your question to we do have an existing budget note. I believe that requires our overhead model to be presented to us by. Or we have a deadline by September 1st. So sorry, I didn't mention that. I just I remembered after. So that's it. Thanks.

Speaker: Great, why don't we go to public testimony? All right. I'm sorry. The presentation. We still got pbot here. Go for it. One more.

Speaker: All right. Good morning, everyone. Jeremy patton, business services group director at pbot. Joining me is will terry, who is our forecast analyst at pbot. And then I have some folks in the room in case there are specific program questions. I may have to call them up. And I think we're just waiting for the slides to pop up.

Speaker: Near me. It doesn't look like we have them, do you want to send them to my office and we can pull them up?

Speaker: I don't think we received them.

Speaker: What's your office? I'm sorry.

Speaker: Council clerk at Portland, Oregon.

Speaker: I can probably do one slide. Just. It's a notable fee slide. Maybe i'll just start there and then we can jump in when more detail shows up here. So most of the fee increases that you'll see before you today just reflect inflationary adjustments for rising staff materials costs. Like the commissioner mentioned before, the slides that will follow. We're going to highlight the fees rising at a higher rate than inflation. So you notice that there's a trend on many of these fees. They're on multi year paths to try to achieve full cost recovery. After holding many fees flat during the pandemic, back in 22, 23 we started kind of five year programs to increase all of these fees to get them up to full cost recovery. So many of these fees are in year two or year three of the projected increases over time. The large fees that we're going to be talking about today are around parking meter rates, Portland permitting, and development fees, system development charges, right of way permit fees and transportation network company fees. And all of these fees reflect changes that are included in the mayor's proposed budget. We can jump to maybe

slide three. Perfect. So parking meter revenues account for about 25 or 20% of our overall discretionary revenue base, or what we call gtr or general transportation revenues. We're increasing the rates by \$0.20 per hour. And 2425 is one element of our mitigation efforts to solve our \$32 million shortfall. Rates will be indexed to inflation moving forward, totaling about \$0.08 per year. And these increases will bring in an average of \$4.1 million per year over the five year forecast, along with parking, we have parking permit revenues, which are included in our unmetered districts and account for about 10% of our general transportation revenues. These rates are increasing by 10% as part of the five year plan to bring these permit fees to full cost recovery, and next year is year two of that five year plan. Next slide please. Development review fees are also on a five year plan to reach full cost recovery, with scheduled increases of 18% per year across most of the fees. We're currently in the third year of consecutive increases at that level. These fees will be collected by the new Portland permitting and development bureau, and just as a point of context, pbod development review fees represent a little over 1% of fees and taxes paid by a typical development system. Development charges are also increasing by 8% per city code. Rates increase or decrease by the average of the 20 city construction cost index, and due to holding rates flat last year, the 8% increase for next year is necessary to account for construction cost increases from fiscal years 23 to 24 and 24 to 25. Next slide please. And then finally right of way. Permit fees consist of utility fees which are applied to utilities that use the public right of way and temporary street use permits, which are paid by diverse users of metered and non metered parking spots. Our fee schedules include 17% rate increases across most of these right of way fees. This level of increase will achieve full cost recovery for the utility fees in next year, but temporary street use permits will remain well below full cost. Recovery in some cases. Transportation network

company surcharge fees represent about 80% of the budget used to regulate these companies. Regulation activities include background checks, ensuring vehicles meet safety standards, and addressing unpermitted operators. Our fee schedule increases the per ride surcharge assessed to users of ride services such as uber and lyft, from \$0.50 to \$0.65. This is the first increase, excuse me, in nine years and is necessary to account for inflation. We're also adding an accessibility surcharge of \$0.11 per ride, wholly devoted to funding initiatives that increase access and service levels for individuals that rely on private for hire, accessible transportation services. And this surcharge brings us in line with other cities to provide these services. Relatively quick presentation. We didn't have a lot of time, but happy to answer any questions.

Speaker: Commissioner Rubio, I have a quick question about, sdcs. So I recall that, we required scc to freeze last time. Can you tell me a little bit about, can you speak to that history and then also how this plays out with your budget this year?

Speaker: Yeah. So with the freeze last year it was a 4% increase that would have been in effect. But the freeze held it at zero. So what we're doing is trying to make up for the last year's increase of 4, plus this next year's increase of 4, which is why we're setting them at eight. So if we set them at eight, then it will make up for last year's freeze.

Speaker: All right. Good public testimony. We have, commissioner Ryan. Yeah, similar question. Commissioner Mapps you were asking commissioner Rubio about the conversations with stakeholders on what's the vision and the plan, pbot has been here before, so I kind of want to hear similar how you're thinking with your stakeholders on how to move pbot forward the vision.

Speaker: Well, that's a that's a complex question.

Speaker: I'll tell you, this particular fee schedule. Well let me can we sharpen the question. So for example, pbot faces many different, challenges in less than a week, we will be at an election day, our local gas tax may be renewed, may not be renewed if it's not renewed, we take our the balance, the budget, which is currently balanced, that the mayor's proposal, which is in balance. But then we have to pull out about \$17.5 million. And ultimately, long term, we need to have a new strategy for funding transportation in this state and in this city. This is a conversation I look forward to having with, our next legislature. I think our next legislative session is going to be very focused on what the future of transportation funding looks like now, within the specific context of the fees and rates that we're talking about today, it's the proposal that we have on the table is shaped by three countervailing forces. I think on the one hand, we have inflation. On the other hand, we have a desire, which I think is shared by everyone on this council to keep fees as low as possible. And then, frankly, the third force at this table is my personal belief, as the commissioner in charge of transportation, that we should try to achieve cost recovery, for fee based services. This is particularly important in the context of a non-general fund bureau, where basically all the food that we all, all the resources we consume, you know, none of it comes out of the or very little of it comes out of the general fund. It has to be in balance with, with the fees and charges that we put on the table. You know, frankly, one of the things that, and this is one of the reasons why I asked on the bts, presentation to pull up that slide, which shows the history of increases and decreasing fees. You know, bts has we kind of, in terms of our approach to funding our bureaus, we share some things in common. Certainly, one of the things I see in the transportation space is that when we forego fee increases in the face of real expenses, that just kind of pushes your problem out into the future, and frankly, tends to make it worse. So I am trying to keep fees as

low as possible, while at the same time, putting us on a glide path to achieve, frankly, a balanced budget. And even with some of the proposals that we have, on the table today, i'll tell you, like, let's take our development review fees, which is, you know, 18. That's a lot, frankly. But even with that, you know, if I were to actually do a straight up cost recovery model, I'd have to increase fees by 67, which is obviously unacceptable. In order to avoid that, we developed a five year plan, where we're increasing fees incrementally. But even here, you know, I have to both cut costs in the bureau, and I have to subsidize this program, by the tune of about \$930,000, which is, a challenging space for the bureau to be in now.

Speaker: And I really appreciate your work on the measure that we all hope passes, in big numbers on Tuesday.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Please get your ballots in and give you a chance to say that, when commissioner Rubio mentioned the two checks and balance of groups that I know and I have that assignment, I really appreciated the budget advisory team and the track board. What similar like systems do we have at pbot that have that same type of dialog? Sure.

Speaker: Well, let me turn this over to jeremy, I think I was doing a count at some point recently. I think in pbot, I have maybe certainly more than a dozen advisory boards, I think closer to 18, some of them, some of them directly talk about, resources. Some of them talk about infrastructure. Jeremy, do you want to give us an insight of what multiple advisory boards we also go through?

Speaker: We have our budget advisory board, which kind of overlooks everything. We also go in front of the dirac development review advisory committee as well with these.

Speaker: So dirac also listened to this presentation.

Speaker: Oh yeah. Okay.

Speaker: That's first time I heard that. That's why I asked the question. Yeah all right. Thanks. All right.

Speaker: All questions.

Speaker: Commissioner Gonzalez are any of the advisory boards going to testify today that you're aware of on either side?

Speaker: Not any of our advisory boards that I'm aware of. Well just you might have some other folks from the community.

Speaker: Darren's on an advisory board.

Speaker: Oh, yes.

Speaker: Well, I was just kind of curious about the interplay with those going forward, you know, as we how best to leverage their feedback. It's one thing for staff to interpret their feedback. It's sometimes would be nice to hear directly from them, as a general matter, I guess maybe this is a question for our just colleagues in general. And then I do want to get to public testimony. You know, we took a pretty hard position last year on fee increases. And, and it feels like we're really reversing ourselves here on both of these. And I'm not sure we've had a meaningful conversation about that, and i, you know, I raised concerns last year on some of the fee, caps we were putting in place because you're going to pay the piper eventually, and so but I guess I'm just observing. This is pretty significant fee increases across the board, I understand the economic need. I'm just trying to reconcile, you know, with with the things council was saying a year ago, on on fees. And so it's an open ended question. I, i, I'm struggling to reconcile that.

Speaker: Commissioner Gonzalez. You know, I share your concerns, I share your concerns here, and I agree, I think this is a conversation that that we need to have, and i'll tell you, there is a, the math and dynamics of, balancing a budget for bureau

that's not in the general fund is kind of different from the dynamics for, general fund bureaus. So this is just one challenge. We kind of literally have to eat what we hunt, in this particular space, and i'll tell you, my goal is to keep fees as low as possible, while also achieving cost recovery and frankly, keeping the infrastructure bureaus out of the general fund. I think that once the general once the infrastructure goes into the general fund, which, you know, frankly, if voters reject our, fixing our streets, I suspect that before the end of this, budget process, I will be, you know, at this table kind of saying, you know, pbot needs to go into the general fund in order to kind of maintain our basic services. That's a bad place for the city to be in. I think in the, for the fee based bureaus, you know, there's no way for us not to, ultimately manage our fee schedule with the goal of doing cost recovery. And some programs can kind of subsidize other programs. But that's about the only move we have.

Speaker: I, I totally fall in cost recovery. I think we should be indexing fees as the default, not as the exception. I think that's just good governance on a go forward basis. But I mean, I want to be blunt, yesterday we heard that the corporate surcharge has, collected seven times its projected revenue seven times. And, continue to dump all of that into pcef at some point. That's furthering substantial imbalances in our, you know, collective budget. So, this council can change that with the stroke of the hand. And, but what we're talking about now is passing on substantial fees to our residents and our businesses at a rate that's above the rate of inflation. So i, again, struggling to reconcile it. I understand the math problem you're facing, but, I think we've been inconsistent in the two years I've been on council on this topic. And, and, and yet we continue to have these remarkable imbalances and resources and costs, and i, I hope we have more courage to confront. That is what I would leave it at, that I'm done for now.

Speaker: I appreciate those comments. All right.

Speaker: Public testimony, any Keelan we have two people signed up.

Speaker: First up, Robert Butler.

Speaker: Mr. Butler, welcome back.

Speaker: Mayor and commissioners, thanks for being here. I'm Bob Butler, resident of Portland. So I would like to before I start, I'd like to talk about a procedure which is we have two ordinances and I'd like to testify on each one.

Speaker: Three minutes on each, three minutes.

Speaker: Are we saying the same thing? I say three minutes on each.

Speaker: And you say, citing officer, and I'm saying three minutes. That means three minutes. Three times. 60s they're read together. So it's a package. Three minutes.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you.

Speaker: Well, this comes as a surprise because I'm not prepared for that. And I wish that the public didn't have surprises like that. So let me talk to you about the three p's, the three p's product, city, people and price and people. So on the productivity side, as far as businesses goes, they need to become more efficient. One of the reasons they're not efficient is because they're home at their little comfort zone. Instead of being supervised with close supervision at the office or at the workplace. Okay, so productivity, be, on that subject, I think I've covered it as to the, price. The price is, is really extremely important for Portland to recover. And it's not going to recover if we put a, obstruction to their creativity and guts to do anything in Portland. So the people thing is that besides getting people back to a work place is getting people back downtown, and Portland needs to lead the way to get people back to work. You should be the example of getting people back to work. Now. We have an important, employer in Portland that, has ten weeks given ten week notice.

If you're not back at your workplace, if you come back after that, you're not going to have a place to sit. That's what we need to do, is have that leadership to realize that the workplace is the best place for good work. As far as, more to the price, is the fact that we realize that any delay in, processing permits is extremely hard for developers to, to take the chance because it's a high risk chance. And we just saw that with the bull run project or those costs were going up \$1 million per day. So so on the subject of the, transportation, everywhere I see almost every corner, people standing with hips on their hands on their hips, doing all of these foo foo things all over the place, putting up pylons and blockades, closing streets. And it's it just seems like they're all finger painters and they're just trying to be busy and spend money. And I think there needs to be a lot of reduction in these foo foo activities that are going on in the in that department of pbot. Let's work to the basics and let's realize that property taxes are collected in Portland, and those typically would go to, I would guess, the general fund. And what is the purpose of property taxes. And you keep talking about, well, we don't want the general fund to pay for these things. Well, what are we paying our property taxes for? And then we have all this volatility because we have to change the rates, change the rates. Let's realize what property taxes are for and stabilize stable size things.

Speaker: Thank you thank you thank you sir.

Speaker: Next up we have sarah ratcliff.

Speaker: Welcome sarah. Thanks for being here.

Speaker: Good morning, mayor Wheeler, city commissioners, my name is sarah radcliffe, and I'm the director of government relations for habitat for humanity Portland region. And I'm here today to testify on behalf of habitat Portland region, as well as proud ground, which is the northwest region's largest community land trust, and Portland community reinvestment initiative. Pcri, which is a affordable

housing developer serving the Portland communities for 30 years, and housing Oregon, which is a coalition of affordable housing developers and advocates. Together we are requesting that affordable housing developments be exempted from increased permitting fees, ideally, our programs and our future tenants and home buyers would benefit greatly from a full or partial waiver of permit fees prior to November 2023, affordable housing developers could access waivers or partial exemptions from prevailing fees, and we need the city's partnership now more than ever. Our construction costs have increased substantially since the pandemic, and consequently, it's more and more challenging to build the affordable housing that our communities so desperately need. We've seen the cost of land, materials and labor rise 50 to 60% just in the past ten years, and affordable as affordable housing developers, we can't simply pass these costs along to our tenants and home buyers, I also wanted to add that while, that affordable housing developers are, the demand for the housing that we build is not impacted by the boom bust of the market, if anything is the economy struggles, the need for affordable housing only increases, and because of that, I mean, certainly we are impacted by interest rates and construction costs, but because of the demand for our housing, you can count on us to be regular customers of bts, we will continue to, to build housing, but what's difficult for us is to, budget for unforeseen increases. And just to give you a tangible example, we'll be pulling permits at habitat for humanity Portland region on a project this summer that we had estimated permit fees to be, \$745,000. So an 8% increase is about \$59,000. It's not an insignificant amount for a nonprofit to come up with. Thank you very much.

Speaker: Thank you. Appreciate your being here. Mayor

Speaker: Sorry. We have one more.

Speaker: One more.

Speaker: Thank you very much, darren campbell, welcome, darren.

Speaker: Thanks for being here.

Speaker: Morning, mayor Wheeler, good morning.

Speaker: Members of the council. My name is darren campbell. I am here today representing, radio cab is taxi industry, however, I also serve as the chair for the private hire transportation advisory committee, and in February of this year, we had a topic submission to increase the per ride fee that uber and lyft pays, from \$0.50 to \$1.50. There is a need seen by the committee. There was overwhelming support. And that did pass. However, the process, would slow that to get to this point. So I'm glad that pbot representatives have brought, some fee increases to that ride fee to the table. And I want to focus specifically on one. And that's the \$0.11 that's added to the per ride fee, specifically for the accessible transportation fund, that \$0.11 would be directed towards, increase availability for wheelchair vehicles, for those that need specialized transportation and this is something that I have been extremely concerned about for several years. We've seen, the cost and the availability of those types of vehicles, get more and more expensive, less available, yet the demand grows every year, especially with that baby boomer population. Aging. And, I'd like to say aging gracefully, but I'm seeing differently in the demand that we have for that specialized transportation, I would encourage you, if you're not in the rose parade this year, go find the dedicated, handicapped viewing area and talk to some of those people and find out one how they got down there and two, what their experience is, I think you're going to find a couple of things. One, it's going to be fairly empty, because people just can't get those rides. The industry right now is completely overwhelmed with required and important medical transportation. And there's no rides available for grandma to get down, to see her son play softball or go see his her granddaughter play, be in the recital,

those aren't an option. So, you know, I think the mental health aspect of our disabled community being stuck where they are without having that ability to get around town is something very real and very important, subject that we need to look at, I would say that that \$0.11, I think, is just not nearly enough, there's, there's so much need, and i'll give you just a quick example before I finish up, when the 50 cent ride fee was initially put into place in 2015, uber and lyft had a \$1. I'm sorry, i'll say uber. I'm not sure where lyft was. Uber had a \$1 surcharge per ride. They've now increased that to \$4, and that \$0.50 has stayed the same at. And I think if you compare those two, there's a great reason to be able to do more, and i'll leave it with that unless you have questions.

Speaker: Very good colleagues. Any questions? Thanks for your testimony, commissioner Ryan.

Speaker: Did you have a question?

Speaker: I just I want to make sure that I follow up with you. That was really good testimony. Thank you.

Speaker: Commissioner. Yeah.

Speaker: And darren, thanks for coming in here. And thanks for all of your service on our advisory boards.

Speaker: I appreciate commissioner.

Speaker: Thanks. Have a good day. All right. Any further questions on this one?

We've run quite over. Item number three, seven four is a first reading of anonymous agency ordinance. It moves to second reading. Item 375 is the first reading of anonymous agency ordinance. It moves to second reading, as amended. Colleagues, I'd like to shift the order briefly here since we are running over and we have some guests here, I'd like to move to three, seven, seven. Next, a proclamation proclaim may 2024 to be jewish American heritage month colleagues. Today we

celebrate Jewish American heritage month, a time to celebrate Portland's Jewish community and the indelible contributions that it has made to our community. Last week on Holocaust Remembrance Day, I stood in Pioneer Square, as I do each year and I read the names of Holocaust victims during a reading of the names, I was reminded of the atrocities of the Holocaust, which I know are especially painful memories for many right now. As anti-Semitism is on the rise across the globe, across the nation and indeed right here in the city of Portland. Let me be clear anti-Semitism has no place in our community. Jews in Portland, like people of all religions, deserve to feel safe and welcomed in our city. The Jewish people have a rich history in Portland, first arriving in the in the 1848 and continued to establish businesses and philanthropic organizations that have been instrumental in economic development, as well as charitable efforts. I'm pleased to celebrate Jewish American heritage month in Portland and to welcome here in person Portland Jewish Federation CEO Mark Blattner and my friend Rabbi Kahana from Temple Beth Israel. Welcome, gentlemen. Thank you both for being here today.

Speaker: Thank you, Mayor Wheeler. Commissioners good morning. I'm Rabbi Michael Cahana, senior rabbi of congregation of Oregon's oldest synagogue, right here in Portland, congregation Beth Israel. And I'm honored to speak with you today about the Jewish American heritage month. 370 years ago, in 1654, the first group of Jews came to North America as refugees. Jews fleeing the Inquisition, which had come to their community in Recife, Brazil. There in New Amsterdam, they found safely a small measure of tolerance in a colony where only members of the Dutch Reformed Church could practice their religion in public. Jews fleeing oppression, expulsion, forced conversion or death was a common theme throughout our 2000 years of wandering. This tiny group consisted of six families found on these shores

a new and different world. It was only 136 years later that the president of the newborn united states of America, George Washington, promised to the Jewish community of Newport, Rhode Island, a form of acceptance never enjoyed by Jews in any European nation. It is now no more. The toleration is spoken of, Washington wrote, as if it was the indulgence of one class of people that another enjoyed the exercise of their inherent natural rights. For happily, the government of the united states, which gives to bigotry no sanction to persecution, no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens in giving it all occasion. Their effectual support. My friends, this has been the promise of America to the Jewish community and indeed to all minority communities for over two centuries, to bigotry, no sanction to persecution, no assistance. Indeed, we know that in our modern era of rising anti-Semitism, this ideal of free exercise is not always reached, as it is not for many minorities. We are always striving to be a more perfect union, but no nation in the history of the world has been as welcoming a home for Jews of the diaspora. Today some 6.3 million Jews call the United States home. Jews came first, came to Oregon in 1858, and congregation Beth Israel was founded on First Avenue. Here in downtown Portland in 1858. Even before Oregon was a state, the Jewish community has been an integral part of this city ever since. Despite decades where white supremacy ruled, where Jews were restricted from full participation in the life of community, here we have thrived. Today. According to the recent community study commissioned by the Jewish Federation of Greater Portland, some 56,600 Jewish persons live in Greater Portland. I myself come from an immigrant community. My parents came to America before I was born, and like most first generation Americans, I am fiercely proud of this nation and of its ideals and proud to be a Jewish American. I thank the

city of Portland for recognizing Jewish American heritage month and the great history of our shared experience. Thank you, Mayor Wheeler.

Speaker: Commissioners, I'm Mark Blattner, CEO of the Jewish Federation of Greater Portland. Jewish American Heritage Month, observed each May, serves as a poignant reminder of the invaluable contributions Jewish Americans have made to the nation's fabric guided by profound ethical and moral principles rooted in the Torah, in a time marred by chaos and a disturbing rise in anti-Semitism. Celebrating this Heritage Month takes on an added significance, underscoring the importance of Jewish pride and resilience throughout American history. Jewish individuals have been pivotal in shaping the cultural, scientific, and social justice landscapes of our country. In the sciences, Jewish Americans have made groundbreaking contributions that have changed the course of history. Figures like Albert Einstein, whose theories of relativity transformed our understanding of time and space, and Jonas Salk, who developed the first successful polio vaccine, exemplified the Jewish pursuit of knowledge and commitment to bettering humanity in the arts. Jewish Americans have enriched American culture by expressing the complexities of the human spirit. Composers like George Gershwin blended classical music with American jazz, creating timeless pieces that speak to the country's cultural diversity. Writers such as Bella Abzug and playwrights like Tony Kushner have used their talents to explore and critique the societal issues of their times, advocating through their art for a fairer society and in the political arena has also seen significant Jewish influence, particularly in the fight for civil rights and liberties from leaders like Ruth Bader Ginsburg, whose judicial career was marked by steadfast dedication to gender equality and social justice. To activists like Rabbi Abraham Joshua Heschel, who famously marched alongside Martin Luther King Jr., Jewish Americans have been instrumental in advancing civil rights and fostering a more

inclusive society. And here in the city of Portland, Jewish families such as the Schnitzer and Zidell families, just to name two, have left an indelible mark. These contributions, however, are not just historical footnotes. They continue to resonate today as Jewish communities increasingly face the dual challenges of rising anti-Semitism and social division. Jewish American Heritage Month is a critical opportunity to celebrate the enduring strength and vibrancy of the Jewish community, highlighting not only its achievements but also its ongoing commitment to Torah's call for justice. The celebration of this month also serves as a rallying cry for the nation to stand against anti-Semitism and all forms of bigotry. Thank you, Mayor Wheeler, for speaking out so, so loudly. It is a time to affirm the contributions of Jewish Americans, reinforcing the idea that these achievements are not separate from, but integral to, the American story. By recognizing the breadth and depth of Jewish influence on American life, we reinforce the values of diversity and acceptance that are essential to our nation's spirit. Let this month be a beacon of hope and pride, illuminating the contributions of Jewish Americans as essential and enduring threads in the fabric of our national identity. Mayor Wheeler and the city of Portland, thank you for this proclamation and acknowledging Jewish American Heritage Month.

Speaker: And thank you, Mark, and thank you, Rabbi Kahana. We really appreciate you being here today on this important occasion. Commissioner Mapps, thank you, Mr. Mayor. I want to thank our guests for joining us today. And I also want to say that I am proud and honored to join this council in proclaiming May 2024 to be Jewish American Heritage Month here in Portland, Oregon. Now Jewish American Heritage Month has been celebrated every May, since 2006 during Jewish American Heritage Month, we celebrate the contributions that Jewish Americans have made to our communities, and we recommit ourselves to ridding our world of anti-

semitism, as we have heard today, the history of jewish people in America stretches all the way back to 1654, when a group of 23 jewish refugees from brazil sailed into a port at the city that we now know as new york city. This group, was the first of many waves of jewish immigrants who have come to these united states seeking religious freedom and economic opportunity. Those immigrants and their descendants helped build the nation that we all inherited today. And that is, of course, true in Oregon, jewish immigrants arrived in the Oregon territories as early as 1849, and by the 1860s, Portland emerged as a hub for Oregon's jewish community. And as we have heard today, more than 50,000 people in the Portland metro area claim jewish heritage. And sadly, I think, as we all know, the anti-semitism which drove many of our jewish ancestors to migrate to America also exists in America. And that is true of Oregon and Portland, too. Now colleagues, I will tell you, according to the adl, pacific northwest, the number of anti-semitic attacks in Oregon hit an all time high in 2022, and many jewish Portlanders tell me that they have experienced a dramatic increase in harassment since October 7th, when hamas launched its brutal terrorist attacks against civilians. The histories of jews in America is a reminder that, every generation has a moral obligation to oppose hate, which is why I want to take this moment to urge all Portlanders to observe jewish American heritage month by rejecting anti-semitism, respecting each other, and reaffirming our commitment to building a kinder and more inclusive city. So thank you very much.

Speaker: Thanks. Commissioner Mapps commissioner Gonzalez.

Speaker: Thank you, mayor Wheeler, for introducing this proclamation. Thank you. Rabbi, the jewish federation of greater Portland congregation beth israel, and all the Portland's jewish community for standing strong in these difficult times. I'm pleased to support may as jewish American heritage month. Freedom to exercise

religion is a founding principle of our country. But is certainly not always easy to protect or to respect. Here in Portland, we tend to associate anti-semitism with distant places like Europe, the deep south, or more recently, on college campuses across the country. But anti-semitism has also been a problem here at home. Portland, of course, once had the largest kkk chapter west of the Mississippi river. The kkk is anti-jewish and anti-catholic agendas is less publicized than their other agendas. But one of the group's sad legacies is anti-semitism here in Portland. As recently as the 1950s and 60s, some Jewish Oregonians faced anti-semitism through exclusion from country clubs, professional firms and educational institutions such as high schools and college fraternities and sororities. Gladly, we have addressed many of those dynamics, but certainly not all of them. So Portland also has a well documented history of organized anti-semitism that we have to recognize and confront. But fortunately, today, Jewish Portlanders are thriving in many respects and across here in Portland and across the country, making remarkable contributions to the arts, sciences, academia, business and the social fabric of our communities. I'm thrilled to celebrate our Jewish citizens here in the city of Portland. That's why I'm pleased to proclaim May as Jewish American heritage month, to not only raise awareness of continuing anti-semitism term, but to acknowledge the overwhelming, positive contribution Jewish Americans have made to our community. Thank you, thank you, thank you, Commissioner Gonzalez.

Speaker: Commissioner Ryan, thank you, mayor, and thanks for having this on the agenda.

Speaker: I am when I saw this on the agenda, I paused quite a bit and aid in reflecting. So I'm going to do this from the heart here and did a few notes. But first, I want to thank you so much, Rabbi Kahana, for being here today, for seeing you since I've been in office as a major leader for justice, your collaboration with other

faiths on the most challenging issues facing our city has really been helpful as an elected. I see it as a partner, and I want to thank you so much for talking about with me and others very difficult topics that many were almost afraid to find their voice for, and I want to acknowledge, of course, mark, and your leadership of the Jewish Federation of Greater Portland. What an outstanding organization. So it's great to see both of you, and like the mayor, I participate every year reading the names and I always sprint down there. You know how, as we all do, coming from meetings that are very different than what you're about to do, and I always feel so transformed after my pronunciation with the names. Forget about it. But it's like so important to feel, what happened during the Holocaust and to never forget that. And now that I'm getting older, I notice how important that is to keep reminding people this happened. And so it's always good to be included, we all know it's a tender time. I'm not the only one in this room that's a pacifist when it comes to war. And I also understand that leadership and government and the people are not always on the same page. I also know as a gay man, that's one of the only countries in that area that I could ever be married in. So, there's just you get to hold all of this. So when I went to Seder this year, we were holding this complexity as we did the readings, and it was very beautiful and transformational and I just think that the big topic that, all of us are trying to find words for is difficult right now because it's so complex and it has been for centuries. And so I just really am grateful that the mayor put this on the calendar so we can continue to lift. And thank you for the history lesson. That was so well done. I had no idea, that your congregation was started even before the state was established. So it was really great to also get this succinct history from you today. Anyway, I'm really grateful and honored that you're both here.

Speaker: Thanks so much. Thank you, commissioner Ryan. Commissioner Rubio, thank you.

Speaker: I want to thank the mayor for bringing this proclamation today, and I want to thank the guests that are here presenting today as well, I've also want to say I've had the incredible honor of getting to know the rabbi and his wonderful wife over this last year. And am deeply touched by your love for the community and for advancing peace and hope. And I really appreciate the conversations that we've had, we both share a history of immigrant families, and many, many immigrant stories, coming to this country, and have a shared, commitment to hope and justice as well, and Jewish Americans as everyone have said, have played a vital and profound role in the shaping of our country and in this city, as you mentioned, and I also just want to, say so that some of the most interesting history that I've learned is how much the Portland Jewish community and the Portland black community and other BIPOC communities in the past came together in coalition, work for social justice. And in fact, they were the ones to first establish an office of human rights for the city of Portland way back in the day and led by, prominent and active Jewish American Portlanders. So, so that you have truly shaped, you know, the fabric of the city and the direction that we have, come in that that social and civic ethic. So this month gives us that opportunity to reflect on that history and the heritage, which is so important, and inspiring us to learn about real stories from real people and also standing up to hate and anti-Semitism, as we've we've discussed today, when I worked for commissioner Fish, he had many traditions and so many relationships and one of one important priority, was maintaining his deep connection with, with the Jewish community, and one of the important, traditions for him, for him was reading of the names as well. And I remember that was something that was very, important to him and obviously to a lot of us here, in this

month, I too participated in my fourth reading of the names as an elected official in his tradition. And that's, you know, that's a special moment for me. It brings it full circle and also reminds me of how, deeply important and connected we all are to each other, and so, as the saying goes, you know, those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it, so this month, we really need to encourage everyone, to, remember the contributions of this, very, this very important community so that we can continue to work together in alignment for a brighter and stronger future. So more than ever, in this time, we need your leadership, we need your partnership, and we need your help. So thank you for being here. Thank you. Commissioner

Speaker: Thank you, again, I want to thank our guests, rabbi kahana and mark. I want to thank you as well, and I appreciate my colleagues comments. I think we all acknowledge that this is a challenging time for jewish Americans, but I want to reaffirm my commitment to keeping Portland a safe community for our people of all religions, and to state again, because we can't state it enough, that anti-semitism has absolutely no place whatsoever in our community. The jewish community deserves to be celebrated, and I am very honored to read this proclamation on behalf of the City Council today. Whereas since 1654, when the first jewish people landed on the shores of new amsterdam, that would become the united states, the jewish community is significant, contributed to the founding, growth and enrichment of our nation. And whereas president george w bush formally declared may as jewish American heritage month in 2006, recognizing the profound influence jewish Americans have had on American history, culture, and society, and whereas the narrative of jewish Americans is a pivotal chapter in the broader American story, contributing significantly to the religious, cultural, political, economic, and intellectual life of our nation. And whereas the jewish community

has been an integral part of the Portland metro politan area since the first arrivals in 1848, with a vibrant current population of approximately 56,000 people. Whereas Portland's jewish community has historically fostered strong interfaith dialog and cooperation, working alongside various religious and cultural organizations to promote peace and mutual understanding within our diverse city. And whereas, jewish cultural institutions such as the Oregon jewish museum and the center for holocaust education play a pivotal role in educating the public about jewish history, the holocaust, and the importance of tolerance and human rights, and whereas, jewish festivals and events such as the annual lighting of the hanukkah menorah and the annual reading of names of those murdered in the holocaust on holocaust remembrance day, both annually at pioneer courthouse square and the Portland jewish film festival, educate and enrich the cultural landscape of our city, bringing together people of all backgrounds to celebrate jewish heritage and contribute to the arts. And whereas, despite facing ongoing challenges of anti-semitism, schism, hatred and discrimination, jewish Americans strive for a more inclusive and equitable society. And whereas the city of Portland stands united with individuals of all faiths and backgrounds in denouncing bigotry and hatred, promoting values of equality, compassion and tolerance, and committed to committing to eradicating prejudice wherever it is found. And whereas the need to recognize that the safety of Portland's jewish community is in strictly linked with the safety of all Portlanders, and whereas jewish American heritage month offers a valued opportunity to acknowledge and celebrate jewish heritage, thereby fostering understanding and respect which are essential in combating anti-semitism. Now therefore, i. Ted Wheeler, mayor of the city of Portland, Oregon, the city of roses, do hereby proclaim may of 2024 to be jewish American heritage month in Portland and urge all Portlanders to recognize this observance so that the contributions of our jewish

community and continue to work towards a society that reflects the dignity and the worth of every citizen. Thank you, thank you, thank you. And before I forget, I also want to thank Shirley from my staff, Shirley Washington, thank you so much for your leadership on this as well. Thank you. Thank you.

Speaker: Yeah, there's a request for a photo shoot. Are you a good photographer?

Speaker: Okay. All right.

Speaker: Why don't we come over there to you?

Speaker: Okay, we're in recess. Back in session, let's go to three, seven.

Speaker: Six, please. This is an emergency ordinance.

Speaker: Amend grant agreements with organizations that are used for programming and employment support in partnership with Portland parks and recreation. Not to exceed \$640,000 in fy 20 2425.

Speaker: Commissioner Ryan. Yeah, thank you, mayor.

Speaker: And, you're already up here. That's great. Strong community partnerships are central to the mission and values of Portland parks and recreation. Simply put, we reach more people when we work together. Under Director Long's leadership and people's commitment to the parks levy goals, the community partnership launched in spring of 2022 to increase grant support to partner organizations. 20 grant partners were competitively selected across multiple program areas, including arts and culture, land stewardship, sports and aquatics, workforce development, and teen services. When we come together, we see that we are not. We are not doing this work alone. We break down silos. We build community, and we're strengthened by our shared purpose and common goals. Today's ordinance authorizes a one year extension to grant agreements with youth serving organizations for programming and employment support in partnership with Portland parks and recreation. This ordinance also authorizes a

one year extension to the grant agreement with Portland parks foundation to support their small grants program, which provides direct support financial support to community based organizations in Portland who foster equitable access to Portland parks and recreation, urban parks, natural areas, community gardens, and community recreation centers. By continuing our investments in these impactful programs, we will continue to weave the fabric of Portland's vibrant communities and now, I'd like to introduce and turn this over to June bass, the community partnership manager at vibrant communities, for a brief presentation, and you can introduce your colleagues. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, so my name is June bass, community partnership manager with vibrant communities service area, and representing Portland parks today. And with me is megan dirks, community partnership analyst with, vibrant communities. And then also joining us as guests are grantees from, our program here. And that is andre middleton, executive director from friends of noise. And noah bunker. So thank you. Thank you, commissioners and mayor Wheeler, for having us here today. We are excited to talk more about our grant program. And I was just looking to make sure our slides were up. So there they are, so first, I wanted to share information about the community partnership program and the teen collaborative initiative grants began beginning in 2015 as part of an overall expansion of investments in teen programs and are entered into grant agreements with youth serving organizations to provide programing and employment support for teens in safe, supportive environments. Next slide overwhelmingly approved by Portland voters in November 2020, the parks local option levy supports expanded partnership opportunities and supports prns teams to deliver services in alignment with the parks levy commitments, specifically, the levy calls out community partnership grants to provide prioritized services to communities of color and

household households experiencing poverty. Next slide please community partnerships strengthen partner services by filling gaps in program areas and expanding capacity to meet the community needs. They do not duplicate services or replace parks, programs. Next slide. The parks levy made it possible for Portland parks and rec to increase grant support to community partners and to build from the successful teen collaborative initiative and community partnership program grants. These focus areas expanded from teen grant programs to include greening activities, arts and culture, sports and workforce development. In March 2022, Portland parks and recreation conducted a competitive grant application process and selected organizations to receive grants. City ordinance number 190911 was passed in June of 2022 and authorized two grant agreements with select for select partners. Organizations were chosen on their readiness and expertise in engaging in underserved communities through programing, mentoring, and providing varied activities and experiences. These organization led positive activities and programing during outside of school time in the first year, grantees served 3494 youth, with 78% of the youth identifying as people of color or multiracial. Beyond the numbers, we have focused on building connections across partner organizations and increasing communication and collaboration across Portland parks and rec. Next slide please grant. Grant partners participate in an an ongoing youth serving youth service learning communities with pmr, which supports programing, program improvements, collaboration and networking. Throughout these grant programs and regular meetings, we are increasing awareness of services, encouraging partners to share resources and connect to their communities to their communities through partner services and programs. Grant partners include large nonprofits and partner has also focused on supporting and building the capacity of smaller emerging nonprofits. Support for these organizations include helping with helping

to obtain insurance, navigating governmental processes, breaking barriers, and leveraging additional resources. The community partnership program was designed to create and support a network financial support through grant funding is just one piece of that. The in-kind space use support and the network of strong connections across partner organizations are key to the program as well. Pmr and grant partners regularly come together to share resources, discuss challenges, and brainstorm ideas for better connections between various groups. Portland parks and recreation teams are focused on listening and learning in these sections, particularly from those who provide direct services to youth and families. Through these interactions, Portland parks and rec is adjusting services and supports to better match community needs. Next slide please. Through the community partnership program, a two year grant agreement with the Portland parks foundation was authorized through city ordinance number 691, passed in August 2022 to support the Portland parks foundation's small grants program. These grants. These small grants, Portland park foundation has committed to providing organizations supporting low income populations, communities of color, and other groups experiencing marginalization. Next slide please. Portland parks and rec grants supports has increased the foundation's capacity to provide direct financial support to community based organizations in Portland that foster equitable access to parks, natural areas, community gardens and recreation centers. Now, I'm very fortunate to we have with us, next slide please, we have with us, our one of our grantees from friends of noise, andre middleton, and we will turn that over for a few some brief statements about how the program has impacted their organization, good afternoon, mayor and commissioners. Thank you for having me. My name is andre middleton. I'm the executive director of friends of noise, friends of noise is an arts nonprofit that serves youth between the ages of 13 and 22, with

a focus on young people of color, members of our LGBTQ+ community and their allies. We serve youth musicians that love music, young tech heads that love to solve problems and piece electronic puzzles together. Since 2016, we have been creating safer spaces for youth to collaborate, plan and express themselves in the company of their peers by providing workshops and hosting all age music concerts, for teens to collaborate and I'm sorry by providing workshops and hosting all age music concerts and paying stipends to our roster of teen artists and sound engineers, we are transforming our music ecosystem so that it welcomes and values diversity of genres, ages and identities. Our young participants gain the experience and confidence that prepares them in pursuing their future goals, all while building a community that uplifts them long before they're old enough to buy and drink booze. At the heart of our programming. And why we do what we do is the joy and self-esteem that we get to see on stage and off in the youth that we serve, the grant resources provided by Portland parks and rec community partnership program has been invaluable to our sound squad supreme program and our overall programming by having the funds to pay living wages to industry tech, teaching, artists meals and access to a network of ppr community centers, our capacity to meet the professional development needs of the youth we serve has only grown. I'm thrilled to share that our live said alumni, current sound squad members and an assortment of emerging young musicians will receive compensation to run, sound and or perform at this year's waterfront blues festival. Reclaiming black joy pickathon montavilla street fair, pdx pop now, and many other opportunities with the support of the grants and resources from Portland parks and recreation community partnership program, we're helping to repopulate, economic sector of our arts ecosystem. Sound engineers and production service professionals help produce events that make Portland the vibrant city that we all

love. Join me today is the sounds is one of our current sound squad members.
Noah bunker.

Speaker: Hi, I'm noah bunker and I am a live set alumni and I currently work with, friends of noise, and they have been a great resource for me, I am under 21, and because of them, I've been able to learn and work in the music industry, and I now work full time as a freelance engineer, with many of the major audio companies in Portland and Oregon, such as rose city sound, horn audio and cascade sound, last year I was able to work with pickathon, and this year I will continue that with county fair, blues fest, and pickathon as an engineer. This year, and I think that this has been an invaluable resource to me in my career so far, and I love working there. Thank you. Thank you, thank you so much.

Speaker: And this is just one of the programs that's funded by the community partnership program and the teen collaborative initiative. And I thought, this is why it was so important to have some guests talk about the real impact and how parks is making this community of individuals come together, next slide please. So today's ordinance authorizes one year extensions to grant agreements with youth serving organizations for programing and employment support in partnership with Portland parks and recreation. The ordinance also authorizes a one year extension to a grant agreement with the Portland parks foundation through the community partnership program, to support their small grants program. We welcome questions or comments. Great

Speaker: Any questions? Comments thank you all for your leadership. Your organizations obviously engage people in a meaningful way, and I'm very happy that we support this. So thank you for that. Do we have public testimony on this ordinance?

Speaker: No one signed up. Call the roll.

Speaker: Ryan. Yes. Well, thank you, June and Megan for organizing this. And you're so smart to bring Andre and Noah here. I think most people learn more from these concrete, direct stories in partnerships. And you all told some great stories. Noah congratulations. You're getting a lot of gigs. That's wonderful with those kind of technical skills, I think you'll always find employment. I wish I had such skills. I look at people like Adam behind me that make sure this meeting runs and what would we do without them? So anyway, it's great to have that story be told, and I hope that I see some of you tomorrow night at, when we have our celebration for, Portland Parks Foundation Friends and Allies Summit. Something tells me you might be in attendance. And so this is a feel good for all the right reasons, building partnerships, that's what Parks is all about organically. But it's great to formalize it like this. So it's. Thank you, Director Long and your entire team for, really socializing this and making it a part of the culture of Parks. I vote yea.

Speaker: I just so happy to support this today. Have the opportunity to listen to the way Parks is facilitating engagement with the youth in our community, whether work opportunities or at least visualizing what a career might be like, and, just thrilled to support this I vote yea Mapps, I want to thank Commissioner Ryan for bringing this item forward. Really appreciate the staff presentation and Andre and Noah for being here today. I'm glad to vote. I on this item.

Speaker: Yea. Rubio, thank you, Commissioner Ryan, for bringing this forward, I really love this program, as a former nonprofit director that was a recipient of this program, I've seen the firsthand, you know, impacts of this on the community. So really excited to support it today. I vote yea Wheeler. Hi.

Speaker: The ordinance is adopted.

Speaker: Thanks very much. Appreciate you all being here.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Now you get to go enjoy the sun.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: We colleagues will move now to the regular agenda item number 3833.

Speaker: Authorize letters of agreement with professional and technical employees. Local 17, to create new specialty classification of mental health crisis. Responder to brew and new standby rate for employees assigned to standby appointment with the crisis negotiation team.

Speaker: Colleagues, as you know, ppb's behavioral health unit pairs officers with mental health clinicians to engage with members of our community experiencing mental health crises and to connect them to a variety of services through its service coordination team, the mental health clinicians working with the behavioral health unit possess specialized skills that distinguish them from the current job classification options. In the city's agreement with our labor partners at protech, this letter of agreement seeks approval of a new job classification that recognizes this distinct role here today. To tell us more about this agreement is anne marie kevorkian from the city's labor relations group. Welcome. Is she here? All right. We'll table this item. It's too bad. Next item, please. 384, an emergency ordinance.

Speaker: Authorize. Director of the bureau of environmental services to execute and amend permits and agreements with railroad companies and their observer entities for construction of storm and sanitary sewer projects.

Speaker: Commissioner Mapps, thank you very much. So let me check to make sure that lisa is here. I see lisa there. Great, you're about to be up, lisa. But first, colleagues, I want to say a few words on this particular item. This item comes to us from the bureau of environmental services. This ordinance authorizes the director

of environmental services to execute and amend permits and agreements with railroad companies for the purpose of constructing stormwater and sewer projects. Now, here's a little bit of background on this ordinance, in order to build and maintain some stormwater and sewer infrastructure, occasionally bts needs to access or build on land owned by railroad companies. In those situations, the railroad companies require the city to pull permits and sign agreements for the use of their property and right of ways in fact, biz faces this exact situation right now, the bureau needs to do some work at the columbia slough outfall 58, which requires biz to enter into a right of way agreement with the union pacific railroad in order to access their property and finish this project. The ordinance before us today, authorizes biz to enter into that agreement and gives the director of biz the authority to negotiate easements like this in the future. Now, this item before us is an emergency ordinance, because a delay would impact b's ability to finish the columbia slough outfall project during the dry season. In addition, a delay in granting the broader authority to execute such permits and agreements could impact future projects here to tell us more about this ordinance, we have lisa moshinsky, a project manager with environmental services. Welcome lisa.

Speaker: Thank you, good morning, I'm lisa moshinsky. I'm a project manager and our project management office at bureau of environmental services. And I've just got a few short slides to, tell you about the railroad permits and agreements. If you could go to the next slide, please. So we have environmental services has sanitary and stormwater sewer projects across, you know, the Portland area. And sometimes this requires access to railroad property. So one example of this is our columbia slough outfall 58 project. We need to access the railroad property basically just to drive across it to our, project site. You can see here in the exhibit shown on the slide with the red dashed line, basically how we have to cross the

railroad property to access our project site. So if you could, go to the next slide, please. So to gain access to the railroad property, we have to enter into agreements. And these agreements include indemnification often, from the city, which requires City Council authorization, next slide please. And, so this legislation here before you today authorizes our director of environmental services or their designee, to enter into these agreements, and amend them as needed. So it's basically delegating that authority to our director for, for various, environmental service projects across the city. Next slide please. So we're requesting an emergency ordinance because we do have a current project, our columbia slough outfall 58 project. It's supposed to start construction in June of 24. And we need to execute that agreement with the union pacific railroad to be able to access our project site, and the next slide, please. So fees will be assessed kind of on a project by project basis. And, we have a not to exceed \$500,000 per permit or agreement that's authorized under this ordinance. And next slide, I think is our last slide. Just happy to answer any questions you all may have colleagues.

Speaker: Any questions.

Speaker: Not seeing any public testimony. No. All right. It's an emergency ordinance. Call the roll Ryan. I i, I all right, the ordinance is adopted. We'll go back to 383. I believe we have anne marie here. Yes, there's anne marie. We've already introduced and teed up 383. Go ahead.

Speaker: Okay. Good morning. Thank you, commissioner. Mayor, I'm here to present the ordinance on behalf of Portland police bureau. Labor relations, to incorporate the mental health crisis. Responder to behavioral health unit, specialty classification, into the to incorporate that classification as part of the protect 17 existing agreement, this agreement is specifically related to those employees in the police bureau, as they perform a distinctly different responsibility, with the police

officers, in the assigned to the behavioral health unit than those, clinicians who are responding as part of Portland street response. All of the clinicians across the city are actually part of the protect 17 contract. This just distinguishes the behavioral health unit from the Portland street responders and, this agreement seeks to, create an individual letter of agreement outlining the terms and conditions of their employment. They will be subject to the same wage tables as the other crisis responder clinicians in the city under the protect contract, and allows them a premium pay for, a threat assessment training that they use as part of their responsibilities, additionally, they will be subject to a unique standby agreement that allows them to participate it as part of the crisis negotiation team, and so we bring this ordinance to you today to formally adopt, that letter of agreement, we don't have a police bureau representative present with us today, so I will do my best to answer any specific questions that you may have about the program, or about their funding. We anticipate that approximately \$69,000 of ongoing costs associated with this related to the standby agreement, as well as the, premium pay 22,000 of that, which is, assigned to fiscal year 2324 through the duration of June 30th. There is some retro, premium pay that will be assigned. And then any associated standby costs, happy to answer any questions you have.

Speaker: Commissioner Mapps, I can put this in the form of a question, but i'll i'll actually just make it a statement because I know we're getting late in the day, so there are some costs that are associated with this program, but it'll get, it'll get absorbed within the police bureau's regular budget. Is that. That's roughly correct, and marie.

Speaker: Yes, that is roughly correct. You are correct. Well i'll tell you, one of the things that jumped out at me as I was, reading the paperwork on this particular proclamation is that you guys pointed out that, even though there's some budget

implications here for the police bureau, we're not going to have to actually set aside dollars over to the police accountability commission.

Speaker: And, frankly, that this is the first time I've seen language kind of red flag language about, how, changes in the police budget also require us to do something in this new space for the police accountability commission. One of the things I want to flag for just my colleagues on council is that we're really entering a new, era in budgeting around public safety because of the need to set aside that 5% for police, doesn't apply in this particular situation, but it's notable to me that if you look at the background material on this, we actually kind of have to flag that, so stay tuned. I'm just beginning to wrap my brain around, what these new budgeting requirements will mean for the city as we move forward, otherwise, I'm very happy to with this ordinance. And I will certainly be voting i.

Speaker: Very good. Thanks any other questions? Do we have public testimony? Keelan we had one person sign up. Sarat hobbs. I don't think they're here.

Speaker: Could it be sarah? Possibly

Speaker: Ummms.

Speaker: No. On the on the sign up sheet, they did say sarat.

Speaker: Okay. I don't see them here, are they online? I don't see them online.

Speaker: I don't think so.

Speaker: All right. Call the roll. Ryan. Hi, gonzales.

Speaker: Hi. Hi, yea. Rubio. Hi, Wheeler. Hi. Thank you.

Speaker: And thank you, anne-marie, for your excellent continued work. I vote yea. The ordinance is adopted. Item three five, please. A non-emergency ordinance amend public improvements code to reflect reimbursement policies for sewer and drainage improvements and update sewer connection requirements.

Speaker: Commissioner Mapps, thank you very much, colleagues. This item comes to us from the bureau of environmental services. You might remember back in December of 2023, this council unanimously adopted the bureau's updated rate study, the ordinance before us today simply updates two chapters of city code, so that the bureau will be able to implement, the rate study that we all adopted, here today to tell us more about this ordinance, we have adrian aiona, an engineering supervisor, and we also have glenn lobb, an analyst. Two with environmental services. Welcome, everybody.

Speaker: All right. Thank you very much, commissioner. Good morning, mayor Wheeler and City Council. I'm glenn laube with the environmental services, code rule and manuals team. And as commissioner mazzotta said, I'm also here today with adrian aiona to present an ordinance regarding proposed changes to Portland city code chapter 1732 and chapter 1733. Specifically, we are proposing to amend the reimbursement policies for sewer and drainage improvements in chapter 1732 and replace existing sewer connection requirements in chapter 1733.

Speaker: Pick glenn. Sorry we're not seeing the presentation and presentation view or in slide show view.

Speaker: Get out.

Speaker: Well, it still works. Yeah I mean, that's fine if you can't try one more time and then if it doesn't work that other, we can still see the slides.

Speaker: Oh, this is embarrassing.

Speaker: Start it. You're good.

Speaker: Well, we can deal.

Speaker: That's fine. Yeah. That's fine. Fine. Okay it's fine. Okay.

Speaker: Now, I've thrown you off resume slide show.

Speaker: There you go.

Speaker: All right. I apologize, I've practiced this a bazillion times at figures. I'm doing great on project context. Can you see my screen project context?

Speaker: Yep, yep.

Speaker: All right. Here we go. Sorry about that, folks, the proposed code changes were prompted by council's action last December, which approved the elimination of certain sanitary sewer connection charges. As part of that approval, staff was directed to make corresponding changes to other policies and that is why we are here today. The proposed changes to chapter 1732 and 1733 represent the last phase of policy updates pertaining to the broader best rate study project, we do not anticipate any opposition to these code updates, and if approved, the changes would go into effect July 1st. First, I'll highlight the key changes to chapter 1732. This chapter regulates construction in connection, use and maintenance of the public sewer system. The changes proposed focused on reimbursement policies for public sewer infrastructure improvements. The new language clarifies that improvements above and beyond those required to serve the developing property are eligible for cost sharing reimbursements. This change replaces current policies that limit cost sharing eligibility to sewer line extensions that pass unserved properties. We've also removed existing language that limits reimbursement amounts to what would have been received through future connection charges. These charges have been retired and are no longer relevant, we are hopeful that these changes establish a framework that will leverage more cost sharing opportunities and partnerships between the city and property developers. The ordinance we have also proposes a full replacement of chapter 1733. This chapter regulates required connections to the city's sanitary sewer system. The changes proposed reflect a shift in the bureau's regulatory stance on existing connection mandates, which were established about 40 years ago in response to regional efforts to decommission

private sewer systems within densely urbanized areas. The most significant change requires the strict program specific connection mandates associated with the program, with the mandatory sanitary sewer connection program as proposed, the chapter promotes awareness by describing common situations that would require a property owner to connect to the sanitary sewer system, and acknowledges industry driven approaches to sanitary sewer connections. The result of these changes support voluntary compliance with reactive enforcement if necessary, the comprehensive updates to this chapter continue to support the bureau's responsibility to protect public health, water quality, and the environment. We're just doing it in a different way, and that's it. Short and sweet. I just want to reiterate again that, these changes represent the last phase of policy updates. Related to the broader comprehensive rate study effort and to acknowledge all those that worked so hard to see this project through, thank you very much for your time. I apologize for the screen sharing debacle there, and i'll turn it back to council. And adrian and I are here to answer any questions you may have. Thank you. Glenn the screen thing wasn't that bad, but a great presentation.

Speaker: But when you practice all right.

Speaker: Oh my gosh, I do it all day, every day, thanks so much.

Speaker: You're welcome. Thank you.

Speaker: Colleagues, any questions for my team or me?

Speaker: No. Thank you. Appreciate it. And I also appreciate your perfectionist. I thought it was just fine. Glenn

Speaker: Well done.

Speaker: Thank you. Thank you for your understanding. But my gosh, i, I even got zoom and practice it so many times. Like, I got this.

Speaker: Of course you did. That's that's the way it always works. Well, on its way.

Speaker: Okay. You're still.

Speaker: God name. No, it was great.

Speaker: Thank you, do we have any public testimony Keelan on this item?

Speaker: No one signed up.

Speaker: It's an emergency ordinance. Wait. Nope it's not an emergency order. It's a non emergency ordinance. Is a first reading. It moves to second reading. Thank you everyone. Next item.

Speaker: Thank you, thank you.

Speaker: 386 a non emergency ordinance.

Speaker: Authorize competitive solicitation and contract with the lowest, responsive and responsible bidder for construction of the water pollution control laboratory facility and site renovation project for an estimated cost of \$3,800,000.

Speaker: Commissioner Mapps, colleagues, this item comes to us from the bureau of environmental services. This ordinance authorizes the city's chief procurement officer to conduct a competitive solicitation process for the lowest, responsive bidder to make improvements at environmental services, water pollution control laboratory, the water pollution control lab building is owned and operated by bhs. This facility is a landmark in the saint john's neighborhood and is located at the east bank of the willamette river at the foot of the saint johns bridge. The lab is where b'zz conducts water quality tests. The lab also houses the boat that bea's staff use to test willamette river water quality, the water pollution control lab has outgrown its parking lot and storage building. And we need to make, some accessibility improvements in order to comply with modern ada standards, which is basically why this ordinance is coming before us today, the construction work that we're proposing will cost approximately \$3.8 million. And construction is expected to start

in the fall of 2024. Here to tell us more about this project, we have lisa moshinsky, a project manager with environmental services. Welcome back, lisa.

Speaker: Thank you. So for the record, my name is lisa moshinsky. I'm the project manager for our water pollution control laboratory facility and site renovation project, next slide please. So the water pollution control lab, it's owned and operated by the environmental services. You can see an image here, with the saint johns bridge and the willamette river, it's a lovely site, if you haven't been there, next slide, please. So the main drivers for this project are security and ada compliance. This is a fairly isolated site, and it's adjacent to the river and various trails. We've had dozens of security incidents at this site, including some pretty violent and trauma inducing events for our staff, as well as property crimes and damage to the boat used by our field operations staff. Graffiti campsite cleanup and theft from vehicles. So our project scope, includes construction of a new boat and storage building. You can see in the image here, kind of a mock up of what that might look like here when we construct it, resurfacing and expansion of our parking lot, perimeter fencing, new gates and lighting across the site, next slide please. So our estimated cost is \$3.8 million. We're planning to construct the project, I think starting in December of 24. We have to get our building permit this summer. And, and then procurement and then hope to start by December, next slide please. So I'm here today to request authorization from council for, competitive solicitation and contract for the lowest responsive bidder, and with that, the next slide. Just, happy to answer any questions you might have about the project colleagues.

Speaker: Any questions?

Speaker: Oh, thanks. Anybody

Speaker: All right. Very good. Do we have public testimony on this item?

Speaker: No one signed up.

Speaker: All right. First reading of an emergency ordinance. It moves to second reading. Thanks, lisa.

Speaker: Appreciate it. Yeah. Thank you. Thanks, lisa.

Speaker: 387 a second reading authorized competitive solicitation and price agreements for route control services not to exceed \$2,500,000 over five years. Colleagues, this is the second reading. We've already had a presentation and had an opportunity for public input. Any further business on this item? Seeing none, please call the roll. Ryan

Speaker: Yeah, I just can't get those pictures out of my mind. Right. Sorry. And then upstairs, some of the fourth floor, there was a conversation between two permitting people, from bhs and from, I think parks. And it was just great to see that in motion. Sorry for all that. I know we need to go to lunch.

Speaker: I vote yea I yea. Rubio I I'd forgotten about those photographs.

Speaker: Thanks. There you go.

Speaker: I vote I the ordinance is adopted. Next item 388 388. An emergency ordinance authorize competitive solicitation for a pedestrian hybrid beacon at west burnside street and saint clair avenue, and traffic signal rebuilds at north rosa parks way and greeley avenue and southeast foster road and 111th avenue drive.

Speaker: Commissioner Mapps, colleagues, this item comes to us from pbot. This ordinance authorizes the city to seek the lowest, most responsible bidder to make relatively small safety and maintenance improvements at three locations west burnside and saint clair avenue, north rosa parks way and greenlee avenue, and foster at 111th, here to tell us more about this ordinance, we have matt kelly, a capital manager with pbot. Welcome, matt.

Speaker: Thank you. Commissioner Mapps. Good morning, commissioners and mayor. My name is matt kelly. I'm a capital project manager at pbot. I heard a

reference to lunch. I understand everyone is eager to get to lunch. This will be a short presentation just to give you an idea of what we're expecting to put out to bid. So the council item before you gives us permission to bid out a set of signals projects at three intersections, which you can see on this map. Bidding these projects out as a package will help us deliver these improvements more efficiently. These projects have a lot in common. They are all adding or replacing traffic signal equipment. We're also taking advantage of this work to repair pavement and update our curb ramps to meet modern standards for ada accessibility. Our total budget for this work is a little over \$4 million. I'll take just a few minutes to describe what we're actually planning to build. The first project is a new crosswalk. This is on west burnside street at saint clair avenue. In case you're not familiar, saint clair avenue is between 21st and 23rd avenues. We'll be installing what's called a pedestrian hybrid beacon. This is a little wonky, but you do see them at these locations across Portland. This is different than a traffic signal, but it still gives people walking, the opportunity to press a button that then gives drivers a red light in order to cross safely. The image you're seeing on the screen is just a concept image that's actually just superimposing an existing piece of equipment we have on hawthorne boulevard. That's why there's a little graffiti there. But, but yeah, that is not exactly what we're intending to build. Just to give you an idea of what that signal looks like. Also, as part of this package, will be fully rebuilding the existing traffic signal at north parks way, know north rosa parks way and greeley avenue. The signal is past its expected lifespan. Replacing it will help ensure it operates reliably. We'll also take the opportunity to repair pavement and make sure it meets modern standards for accessibility. The last project this is another full rebuild of the existing traffic signal at southeast foster road in 1/11 avenue. This is another old signal that needs replacement. Again, we'll be taking the opportunity here to make sure the

pavement is in good condition and that the ramps and pedestrian push buttons meet modern Americans with disability act requirements. Thank you for your time this morning. I appreciate the opportunity to share a little bit about these projects, and I'm looking forward to getting construction started on them soon.

Speaker: Great.

Speaker: That was short and to the point, colleagues, any questions? Public testimony, emergency ordinance. Call the roll. Ryan. Yes I think you, matt, and I have to just say the north rosa parks and greeley one is quite familiar to me.

Speaker: So good luck with that, I vote i, i, I yea. Rubio a Wheeler.

Speaker: Glad to see it. I ordinances adopted. Thanks. Enjoy your lunch. Next item 389 a non emergency ordinance.

Speaker: Authorize bureau of transportation to acquire certain permanent and temporary rights necessary for construction of the 82nd avenue major maintenance road or major maintenance project through exercise of the city's eminent domain authority. Commissioner Mapps.

Speaker: Colleagues, this item comes to us from pbot. This ordinance authorizes the city to use its eminent domain authority in support of pbot 82nd avenue major maintenance project. This project will pave 82nd and construct crossing and single signal improvements at a quarter corner ramps, transit improvements and other safety improvements, and will include some tree planting. In order to complete all this work, pbot needs to access or build on some private properties, which is why this ordinance is before us today, here to tell us more about this ordinance, we have nicole pierce, a pbot capital project manager, and ashley maclay, a pbot right of way agent, so I will turn the floor over to them.

Speaker: Thank you, commissioner Mapps, my name for the record is ashley mcclay, agenda item 389 is giving pbot authority to compensate property owners

for property rights needed to construct the 82nd avenue major maintenance project, permanent right of way is needed to, construct ada and sidewalk facilities and temporary easements are needed to support construction for those facilities, I'm joined by nicole, who will give a brief overview of the project.

Speaker: Thanks, ashley, and thanks, commissioner Mapps, and good morning. Mayor and commissioners, for the record, my name is nicole pierce. I'm a capital project manager at pbob. I lead the large capital project delivery section, and I'm the project manager for the 82nd avenue major maintenance project, next slide, building a better 82nd is many projects. It's a huge, program that consists of lots of projects and planning efforts. The ordinance before you is regarding right of way for the major maintenance project. So I'm going to focus on that project today. But there is a lot of other stuff going on out there, including, a civic corridor planning project and a corridor wide lighting project and lots of other good stuff. So next slide. As anyone who's ever visited 82nd avenue knows, the safety and maintenance needs out there are enormous. As a pedestrian, it's hard to cross lots of the traffic signals are old and in need of replacement. It's dark, pavement is in terrible shape, full of potholes, a lot of the sidewalks and curb ramps are also in bad shape in some places there's no sidewalk at all, next slide. And as you probably know, 82nd is one of the city's high crash corridors. We have a lot of work out there to do to improve safety. And improving safety, especially for pedestrians, is the core of that work out there on 82nd avenue? Next slide. So this major maintenance project will start to address those maintenance and safety issues for two segments of the corridor, one from northeast fremont to schuyler and the other from southeast mill to foster, we chose those segments based on high safety need. And the areas in greatest need of paving, and areas serving equity needs and town centers and things like mcdaniel high school and eastport shopping center. Next

slide, so as commissioner Mapps mentioned, we'll be paving updating ada ramps at doing new signals, planting trees, etc. Next slide. And the team has done a ton of community engagement on this project, next slide, there are two, slides covering the community engagement activities. And I'm not going to read all of this, but I did want to emphasize that we did door to door canvassing to over 250 businesses, then met with one on one with over 50 businesses. And a lot of those meetings had follow up meetings as well, we held three well attended workshops last summer and next slide, and then had two more well attended in-person events in March of this year. We've sent over 30,000 letters and postcards. We send out biweekly email updates to around 2700 subscribers. And somehow this didn't make it onto the slide. I apologize, but we are working closely with the schools in the area, including mcdaniel high school and marysville elementary, next slide. So next steps and kind of the timeline for the project, I haven't mentioned the arpa funding for this project, but this project has a uniquely accelerated schedule because we need to spend all the funds before the grant deadline at the end of calendar year 2026, which seems far away. But in transportation in construction world, that's soon. So we are currently wrapping up design, we're going to get started on right of way acquisition as soon as this ordinance is passed, and then we will be back before you in July, looking for your approval for our guaranteed maximum price contract with our cmhc construction manager, general contractor, ramer construction. And then if all goes to plan according to plan, we will be starting construction as early as August of this year. So that's all I have for you today. Anyone have any questions?

Speaker: Colleagues.

Speaker: Tough to go.

Speaker: Last or not.

Speaker: Or it can be very good. Yeah. It makes a lot of sense. Do we have public testimony?

Speaker: No one signed up. All right.

Speaker: Good, this is a first reading of a nonemergency ordinance. It moves to second reading. Thank you very much.

Speaker: Thank you very much. I really appreciate it. We are adjourned

Portland City Council Meeting Closed Caption File

May 15, 2024 – 2:00 p.m.

This file was produced through the closed captioning process for the televised city Council broadcast and should not be considered a verbatim transcript. The official vote counts, motions, and names of speakers are included in the official minute

Speaker: This is Wednesday, may 15th, 2024.

Speaker: This is the afternoon session of the Portland City Council. Keelan. Good afternoon. Please call the roll.

Speaker: Good afternoon. Ryan here. Gonzalez here. Here, here, here.

Speaker: We'll start with item 390.

Speaker: A report o mayor, may the city attorney. Oh, yeah.

Speaker: I forgot the, message from our city attorney. I'm sorry, I forgot.

Speaker: Everyone looks forward to it.

Speaker: So, yeah, I do, I do, yeah.

Speaker: Welcome to the Portland City Council. To testify before council in person or virtually. You must sign up in advance on the council agenda at [Portland.gov/council/agenda](https://portland.gov/council/agenda). Information on engaging with City Council can be found on the council clerk's web page. The presiding officer preserves order and decorum during City Council meetings. The presiding officer determines the length of testimony. Individuals generally have three minutes to testify unless otherwise stated, a timer will indicate when your time is done. Disruptive conduct such as shouting, refusing to conclude your testimony when your time is up, or interrupting others testimony or council deliberations will not be allowed. If you cause a disruption, a warning will be given. Further disruption will result in ejection from

the meeting. Anyone who fails to leave once ejected is subject to arrest for trespass. Additionally, council may adjourn and reconvene virtually. Your testimony today should address the matter being considered when testifying. State your name for the record. Your address is not necessary. Disclose if you are a lobbyist. If you're representing an organization, please identify it. And for testifiers joining virtually, please unmute yourself once the council clerk calls your name. Thank you.

Speaker: Very good. Thank you, first item 390, please.

Speaker: Approval of the fy 20 2425 budget for the city of Portland.

Speaker: Good afternoon, everyone, and welcome. Today we will take a series of steps and votes as part of the approval of the fiscal year 20 2425 budget, as prescribed by the Oregon budget law. As the city of Portland's budget committee, we will hold a hearing on the uses of state revenue sharing, consider changes to the approved budget is filed and approve the tax levies for the fiscal year 20 2425. I'm now convening this meeting of the city of Portland budget committee. Keelan. Please call the roll. Ryan.

Speaker: Hi. Gonzales here. I'm here. Here, here we go. Here, here.

Speaker: I want to make sure we have enough time to get through our very full run of show. So I will not be giving my full budget message today. With that, I will turn this over to Ruth Levine, the director of the city budget office, who is facilitating our hearing today. Welcome Director Levine.

Speaker: Thank you. Good afternoon, Mayor and Council. My name is Ruth Levine. I'm the interim budget director, and I'm just going to give a quick overview of the hearing, as the Mayor mentioned, Council is convened in your capacity as the budget committee, and there are three distinct items that Council will be doing today. And they're all required by state budget law. The first is hearing on the uses of state revenue sharing. The second, and the item we'll spend the most time on is

to consider changes, to the approved budget as filed and to approve the budget. And the third is to approve the tax levies for fiscal year 2425, so the, when we get to the approved budget hearing, we're you're going to be considering changes to the proposed budget. So there are first, there are changes that are included in the approved budget as filed, which are in the, detailed in attachment b of the approved budget report. And then there will be, changes through amendments, and so when we get to the approved budget, the mayor will begin by asking for a motion to consider the approved budget as filed. And this puts the approved budget, on the table for council's consideration. Next, we're going to open the floor for amendments. Each amendment needs to be motioned and seconded. Public testimony will be taken on the on the amendments, changes to the proposed and the budget as a whole. Following public testimony, there will be a vote on the each of the individual amendments for their inclusion in the attachments of the approved budget. The then there will be the vote to approve changes to the proposed budget as presented in the memo. As amended. The mayor will call for the vote to approve the adjustments in attachments b, c, and d of the memo, as amended, and this is the vote on the package of all the amendments to the budget, and then you will vote to approve the budget as amended. The mayor will call, to entertain a motion a second and vote to approve the budget, as amended, amended. And then the last vote will be the vote to approve tax levies. And then following this hearing, the approved budget will be forwarded to the tax supervising and conservation commission, which has 20 days to review the city's budget. The trc will conduct a hearing on the city's approved budget on June 11th at 9:30 a.m. Here. This hearing will be scheduled under the, yes. Will be located here. Excuse me. The final budget adoption is set for Wednesday, June 12th at 2 p.m. For a first reading. And a second reading of the vote will follow the following week on June

20th. Public testimony can be received during today's approved budget hearing or the June 11th trc hearing and the June 12th budget adoption hearing. With that, I will turn it back to the mayor to open the first item, the hearing to discuss state revenue sharing.

Speaker: Great, and I hope everybody took copious notes. There will be a quiz later. I'm now opening a hearing to discuss possible uses of state revenue sharing. This hearing is being held by the City Council of Portland, Oregon in compliance with the provisions of the state revenue sharing regulations. Ins, ors 221.770. It is to allow citizens to comment on the possible uses of these funds in conjunction with the annual budget process. I have a technical amendment to update an error in the figure shared regarding the total state shared revenue. We need to vote on this amendment before we can proceed. So this is. Wheeler won a motion to update attachment a of the approved budget report. Update the attachment a to reflect the correct state shared revenue amount. Of \$26,997,152 for fiscal year 20 2425. Do I have a second, second, second, I motion commissioner Mapps seconds.

Colleagues, is there any discussion on this amendment before we vote? I take it we do not need to take public testimony at this point. Please call the roll. Diane.

Speaker: I, gonzales I Rubio I as proposed for council adoption the fiscal year 2024.

Speaker: The motion carries as proposed for council adoption fiscal year 20 2425 budget anticipates receipts. Totaling \$26,997,150, \$52 from state revenue sharing has as been the case in prior years. The proposed budget is the proposed aid. It is proposed that this revenue be allocated in equal parts to support fire prevention and police patrol services. Is there anyone here today who wishes to be heard on this subject? I'm not seeing anyone. I'm now closing this hearing to discuss possible uses of state revenue sharing. Now, i'll hand this off to director levine to describe changes in the approved budget as filed.

Speaker: Great. Thank you. The approved budget changes as filed, details the changes between the proposed budget and the approved. These are largely technical in nature. The largest of the changes is \$70.9 million. That is being budgeted to expected beginning fund balance. In the general reserve fund. The general reserve fund is required to maintain 10% of general fund discretionary and overhead resources, less beginning fund balance. These resources come from fund balance in the general reserve fund, other adjustments in, other adjustments in the approved budget as filed are adjustments made in bureaus, to account for charges, for the city's general fund overhead model. These charges were centrally budgeted in the proposed budget phase, and so they just had to be trued up within each of the paying bureaus in the approved budget phase. So that's a lot of the smaller changes there. And with that, I will hand it back to the mayor.

Speaker: Great colleagues. I'm seeking a motion to consider changes to the proposed budget, as described in the memo titled approval of the budget for the city of Portland. Can I? I'm moving it. Can I get a second? Second commissioner Mapps seconds, please call the roll.

Speaker: Ryan. Hi, gonzales. All right. Mapps I Rubio. Mueller here I mean I the motion passes and I am here colleagues will now here in second amendments for consideration and discussion for those which are co-sponsors please do note that in your motion, director levine, please remind us of the protocols and facilitate it as we put amendments on the table.

Speaker: Sure. So here's the process that we're going to go through.

Speaker: I will begin by walking through each amendment that has been provided, which were all included in the clerk's agenda change memo yesterday afternoon, and I will look for you to motion and second, as a reminder, at this stage, counsel is motioning and seconding amendments to put them on the table for discussion,

voting will occur following public testimony. As I go through this, I will call out the commissioner's name and the number of the amendment, and then I will hand it off to you to read the title motion and seek a second, detailed language for the amendments, as I said, was shared yesterday. So you only need to read the title of the amendment unless you're making a change on the floor. Once the amendment, each amendment has been motioned, motion and seconded. I will, we will open the floor for questions and discussion on that amendment. We will go one by one.

Once all of the amendments have been put on the table and discussed, the mayor will open for public testimony on the amendments and on the budget as filed. Any questions before we start? Nope. Okay all right. We have the first is Wheeler two.

Speaker: All right. Wheeler two is to update the tax levy computation table in the fiscal year 2024 2025 proposed budget. The fiscal year 20 2425 proposed budget book included a tax levy computation table with a clerical error at attachment I with the corrected tax levy computation table. Can I get a second please?

Speaker: Second. Second. Thank you.

Speaker: It's on the table okay.

Speaker: Any discussion on that item before we move on okay, Wheeler three, Wheeler three, restore funding for one people and culture position and one recruiter position in the bureau of human resources is the people and culture program in the bureau of human resources. Will receive \$162,000 of general fund, one time discretionary funds to restore the one position for fiscal year 20 2425. In addition, the bureau of human resources will receive \$138,506 for one record shooter position, to recognize these resources, we will increase the general fund beginning balance by \$300,506 on a one time basis, we will also update attachments b and c is appropriate item. Just read the title. Second commissioner

Mapps seconds, point of order. In this in this exercise, do we just have to read the title or should we read the description?

Speaker: I was just going to remind you, you can just read the title and then whatever, feel free to just whatever talking points you have.

Speaker: Fabulous. The less the better. Great okay. Any discussion on that item before we move on? All right. Wheeler for technical adjustment to recognize beginning fund balance in the small donor elections, fund, can I get a second?

Speaker: Second? Mapps seconds.

Speaker: Actually, can I pause here. I think would probably help. It would help public understanding if the mayor or staff could just provide an intuitive understanding of what this amendment does. Is that something we're.

Speaker: I'll go ahead and let you do that, ruth.

Speaker: Happy to. Yeah. This is just a technical amendment. Sort of similar to the general reserve fund. This is budgeting beginning fund balance in the public elections. Fund because they're their own fund, they sort of carry forward their balance every year automatically. And this is just a way to, recognize that in their budget starting July 1st.

Speaker: Okay. So this isn't this doesn't impact the match.

Speaker: It does not. It's all resources that were already assumed, as part of their 24, 25 budget. It's just the way of getting the money there. Great.

Speaker: Thank you for that clarification. Sure okay.

Speaker: Wheeler five, we're now on Wheeler five, as ruth just said in the proposed amendments document, with everyone's consent, we're going to rename this Wheeler slash yea. Rubio one. Is there any objection to renaming this amendment? No. Seeing none. The amendment is add funding to the bureau of human resources to support expedited hiring for the Portland clean energy and

community benefits fund. Can I get a second? Second? Commissioner Rubio seconds is on the table.

Speaker: Any questions on this one? All right, commissioner Gonzalez, we have gonzales one.

Speaker: Gonzales one consolidates two related notes that call for comprehensive reporting on response time, staffing and overtime utilization across the public safety bureaus starting in 2020. We began seeing substantial increases in demand for city of Portland first responders. We have also seen substantial challenges in retention, particularly in boec and Portland police. These combination have simultaneously led to increased response times and at times, very high utilization of overtime in the public safety bureaus. I'll now read the title of the note, this will replace budget notes, public safety, budget monitoring, and Portland fire and rescue budget governance and monitoring with oversight and governance of public safety spending.

Speaker: Second commissioner Ryan seconds. It's on the table.

Speaker: All right.

Speaker: There are no questions on that one. Then we will move on to gonzales. Two.

Speaker: Gonzales two speaks to the implementation of the 2022 voter approved charter reform, which is in fact led to substantial increases of ongoing cost of government. Additionally, it may take some time to determine the optimal relative investment in staffing at the city administrator, City Council, and mayor's office. This note calls for scoping of a state of work and three third quarter 2024 to evaluate the optimal relative investments across those three three areas of investment, as well as to determine whether further efficiencies can be, obtained in the senior level of the city administrator's office, with work to begin in 2025 under the new

mayor and City Council. Now, i'll read the note. Sorry nope. No problem, I'm reading the note. Evaluate organizational structure and relative staffing of city administrators. City Council and mayor's office. Second, second commissioner Ryan seconds, gonzales two is on the table.

Speaker: All right, commissioner Ryan, we have Ryan one.

Speaker: Yes. City budget office. Cbo is directed to work with the city of Portland service areas to compile a listing of direct and indirect costs associated with all services associated with the range of programs developed to address homelessness and its impact on Portland's communities. The amendment is homeless service budget. Note great, do I have a second, second commissioner Gonzalez seconds.

Speaker: Ryan one is on the table. Okay

Speaker: Ryan two.

Speaker: Yeah, I would like to pull that, one mayor and a communicating with you.

Speaker: Read it, then.

Speaker: Oh, I have to read it first, then pull it.

Speaker: Just the title is fine. Yeah. Cool

Speaker: I really had the pulling part down. Let's see.

Speaker: There you go.

Speaker: It's Ryan, amendment number two was deleted.

Speaker: It's right here. Great.

Speaker: But, Portland permitting and development cost recovery model. The mayor. I'd like to pull this amendment because, Portland permitting development cost recovery model and communicating with cbo. We feel that the proposed budget note already included in the budget will work, without objection. Great.

Speaker: All right. Ryan three. Yeah

Speaker: The city's budget office and bureau of human resources are directed to analyze the bureau by bureau impacts of the recent change in the methodology of developing rates charged to bureaus for employee health benefits. This change from charging different rates for one and two party plans and family plans to be blended rate had differential impacts on bureaus. These impacts were not addressed in current appropriation level targets. Cbo and bhr are further directed to recommend an approach for chewing up those impacts. For the 2024 fall bump and the 2425 budget and current appropriation levels targeted for fiscal year 2526. This is health benefits change budget note do I have a second second commissioner Gonzalez seconds and that is Ryan three okay Ryan four. Ryan four. With the understanding that 7 million of general fund is being swapped out of the Portland parks and recreation general fund and being replaced with Portland clean energy fund, pcef and noting that the general fund allocation would grow with inflation while the pcef allocation is fixed at 7 million. Council directs the city economist to modify the current appropriation level. Target methodology to add 7 million to the parks and recreation general fund discretionary base for the purpose of calculating annual increases in core in perpetuity, or until the 7,000,000 in general fund is restored to the bureau. Thus, while the 7 million is not allocated in the core, the increase on that amount is included each year. This is Ryan amendment for urban forestry piece f swap. Do I have a second second commissioner Gonzalez seconds Ryan for is I ask a question on that.

Speaker: Commissioner Ryan can you provide, the audience, our folks watching today an intuitive sense of what you're trying to accomplish here.

Speaker: Yes. Let me pause for a minute. So when we look at this swap, it's. It's multiple years. Commissioner and as you know, each year we experienced some big we experienced increases in the fte expense. So over time, we would have less

services and less fte. Being able to work on this because the flat rate wouldn't keep up with it. So it's just eyes wide open so that we have knowledge going forward that will have to chew that up to actually fulfill the requirement that we were seeking.

Speaker: Great. And can you remind me what service is being provided in this space.

Speaker: So like it's the one where it's the tree services for street trees. Many cities provide street tree maintenance. We have been able to do that. And so this is an opportunity especially for families that have the burden and can't afford to do that type of maintenance instead of being punitive. It's about offering those services so they can build a canopy throughout the city, especially in parts of the city where we definitely have a deficit.

Speaker: Okay, so you're kind of stuff was supportive of it. All right. Well, we can talk about this more when we get to get to this. Absolutely.

Speaker: But you have an understanding of what's on the table now.

Speaker: I think I have a sense of the broad policy space that we're in in a budget meeting.

Speaker: So we're talking about how the expenses would inflate over time.

Speaker: Absolutely. Looking forward to that conversation. Okay, Ryan five as part of our first responder continuum, park rangers should should also be excluded from the 5% cal reduction.

Speaker: As with police fire, Portland street response and boec, the result would be an additional \$375,298 funded to parks Portland parks and recreation to maintain current funding from contingency. This is Ryan amendment, park ranger amendment. Do I have a second? Second, commissioner Ryan, can I ask gonzales seconds? Apologize.

Speaker: Go ahead.

Speaker: Commissioner Ryan, can you provide an intuitive sense of what you're trying to accomplish with this one?

Speaker: Yeah, so the intuitive part would be actually pretty basic. It's that we're building, I think, a world class first responder system. And the key word is collaboration. And so I've been impressed as we've been doing this budget process. We've added others to this list beyond police and fire. And I think in that spirit, we should continue that progress so that we can focus on that collaboration. And, this has been talked about with people from from rangers. And we'll have, the leader of the rangers speak when we get to that amendment.

Speaker: So is this, sort of a policy, choice. You're asking us to make to kind of classify, park rangers as first kind of first responders, public safety.

Speaker: They're currently part of that first responder system in terms of the collaboration and the communication, which didn't exist when I was a part of this council in 2020, when I was sworn in. So it's wonderful to see that progress. So it is formalized ing them, just like we did with Portland street response in this budget process to be part of that system.

Speaker: And are there any budgetary implications to the amendment that you're putting forward?

Speaker: We're, we're getting into the details later, but I can tell you that this year, parks is helping out with the transition, but we want to make sure going forward that it is, will not be part of those cuts, those that they were protected. This year, the first responder system. And the mayor and I have been having conversations about this for a couple of months about wanting, the rangers to be a part of that. And so we're, formalizing that. So this is policy and of course, it has budget implications going forward. If the next mayor decides that they want to protect the public safety system from cuts, then rangers will be included.

Speaker: Okay, I think I understand, but if we have an opportunity to unpack this, and later discussion, I want to do that, but let's let's certainly move forward.

Speaker: I just make a quick note. The full time. I think commissioner Ryan didn't read the full title. Should he read the full title of Ryan five before we move on? Sure. Okay could you. Sorry. It's. Or I can read it. I don't know if it matters. It's the budget. Note restore Portland parks and recreation general fund for 5% reduction on park rangers.

Speaker: So read that one for Ryan.

Speaker: Five.

Speaker: Restore Portland parks and recreation general fund for 5% reduction on park rangers. Thank you. Sorry I had park rangers amendment.

Speaker: Yeah no problem. Yeah. Got it, okay Ryan six.

Speaker: Ryan six. Restore. Park rangers general fund for 5% reduction in park rangers.

Speaker: Same title.

Speaker: It's the same title, but I'm going to pull this one, as if we agree on the previous one on five. So this is this was about making it true for this fiscal year. Correct. Staff has been editing this in the last half hour with me right now. What's that? Okay. We'll go ahead and put it on the table to discuss. It'll make more sense when we get there. This is to pay for it.

Speaker: Did we read the title? I'm lost.

Speaker: Restore. Parks and recreation. General fund for 5% reduction on park rangers.

Speaker: I guess I share confusion. So is it still being drafted?

Speaker: No, it's actually.

Speaker: You got it yesterday.

Speaker: Okay, so what I see here is what the amendment is. Okay, I thought I heard something differently a second ago. Thank you. Good, did somebody had sent the dialog about this one offline.

Speaker: And so if five goes well we will negotiate on six.

Speaker: Is there a second for six second commissioner Gonzalez seconds? That is Ryan six, point of order.

Speaker: Commissioner Mapps. Point of order.

Speaker: Commissioner Ryan, who are you negotiating with? I yeah, I think I don't understand the process on this one.

Speaker: If five goes well, I've had conversations with some commissioners on this one because it's really hard when you make a cut at this hour, you have to find the money for it. And so when we get to this, we'll explain how parks is once again being a great team player to figure it out for one year transition, and then we'll go forward.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Well, we had it in there. Because in five does pass and we do have a gap of money that needed to be restored into this year's budget, well, I appreciate that clarification on process. And, commissioner Ryan, should you have conversations about, about, six? I'd appreciate it if you include me. You and I have not had any conversations about, frankly, any of the items that you brought forward today, but, this is why we have public hearings. We can have this, we can have, open and frank dialog, I apologize to all the staff in our two offices. I've been talking quite a bit over the last 24 hours. Yeah okay, table. All right, okay. So the, is six on the table?

Speaker: Yeah, six is on the table. Commissioner Gonzalez seconded it.

Speaker: Okay, commissioner Ryan, again, just because I'm kind of catching up with the conversation, can you provide us with an intuitive understanding of what you're trying to do with, your amendment six?

Speaker: Well, if you think about what we talked about with five, and if that does pass and they become part of the public safety system, we had a concern this year that we would have to find money for that. And so that's what this is.

Speaker: And you're proposing to pull the money out of earp. Is that what I'm seeing?

Speaker: When there'll be more details later. But it's like we'd have to find the money to cover it. And what's awkward about this conversation is that, we will be able to move this one through if we pass. Number five is the one that I'm very focused on as a as a policy issue. And number six, we will have a dialog to see how we'll be able to cover that for this year.

Speaker: When does that take place.

Speaker: And we get to number six and we have dialog on it okay. This is our clarification.

Speaker: We can well there's time for additional discussion after public testimony. So yeah that's what I've experienced last four years.

Speaker: Yeah okay.

Speaker: All right. So I think the last one we have is, Mapps Ryan one, and I think that's me, colleagues, I will now read the title of this amendment, which I'm bringing forward with my colleague dan Ryan, the title is one time funding for the lgbtqia two s plus program. And the office of equity and human rights and the intuitive interpretation of this is we have a program that basically consists of two staff people. One of those staff, folk is, time limited. They were going to essentially

sunset at the end of this fiscal year, thanks to a partnership with commissioner Ryan. We are proposing to, extend that temporary position for one additional year.

Speaker: And you want a second? I second that since I co-sponsored it. Yeah.

Speaker: Thanks. Very good, that's commissioner Mapps commissioner Ryan one is on the table.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: There are no additional amendments that, you all want to introduce on the floor, then I think, mayor, I can hand it to you to open, public testimony.

Speaker: Yep. So we're back to public testimony. Keelan. Do we have anybody signed up? I'm guessing the answer is probably not, but do we?

Speaker: We have nine people signed.

Speaker: Nine people. Excellent. Okay that's good news. I'm glad to hear that, I didn't know people actually had the time to do that. So we'll hear from nine people. Keelan will call the names three minutes each, please. And we don't need to know where you live, but we do need your name for the record, please.

Speaker: Thank you, first up, we have brenna bell.

Speaker: Welcome. Thank you for being here.

Speaker: Hi. My name is brenna bell, and I am the forest climate manager for 350 pdx and the facilitator of the Portland shade equity coalition, which is made up of organizations across the city who work on urban forests, public health and climate justice. And I am really happy to be here. I had tons of time for this today, 1944. That is the year that Portland first considered paying for the maintenance of trees planted in the public right of way every decade since, advocates, city employees, and your predecessors on this council have discussed the importance of city funded street tree maintenance, most recently in 2018. The city highlighted this as a priority in its equitable tree planting strategy. So for 80 years, the city has known

that this was a priority, and for 80 years the city has not acted to meet this need. And that is going to change today. So thanks to the tireless work of urban forest advocates over many decades, and the growing understanding that the role of shade trees play in the climate emergency and the amazing public benefits from pcef this council is approved to, or is poised to approve \$65 million, or \$13 million a year for five years to launch a maintenance program for public trees. And this is a vital correction to decades of underinvestment in green infrastructure, especially in historically redlined neighborhoods, resulting in their heightened vulnerability to extreme weather events and the return on this upfront investment is greater than almost any other action the city can take in reducing the costs and money, community well-being and lives by mitigating the impacts of climate change. Because, as we learned in the 2021 heat dome, access to shade can be a matter of life and death. And today, with this vote, you are choosing life for current and future Portland residents. And finally, while we applaud your commitment to funding this essential new program, we also recognize that more funds will be needed in the near future to ensure that this program can serve all of Portland. The shade equity coalition will continue to work with the city to ensure all necessary funds become available. So this day has been a long time in coming and it's just the first step to fully investing in a more equitable climate. Just city. But thank you so much for taking that step today, and we look forward to continuing with you on the journey.

Speaker: Great. Thank you. And could I just ask one clarifying question? It sounds like you're supporting the base budget, not necessarily one of the proposed you're talking about. Very good. I should have said in advance you're sort of my, my trial here. If other folks are testifying specific to one of the amendments, could you also

just let me know that that I understand your base budget, \$65 million for public street tree maintenance.

Speaker: Good.

Speaker: Thank you for coming out today. We appreciate it very much, next up we have diana meisenhelder.

Speaker: Welcome, diana, it doesn't look like, diana has joined us. We'll go on to kevin. Matches

Speaker: Here's kevin. Okay. Welcome back. Thank you for being here.

Speaker: Thank you. I'm kevin matches. I'm a resident of Portland and I'm a cfa charterholder. And recent budget meetings. Many public comments have supported spending money on different programs. Some of the responses to those public comments have noted a dearth of suggestions for how to reduce costs. I'm here with a proposal to save the city of Portland \$2 billion. Imagine for a moment that someone walked in here and told you that you needed to save \$2 billion. What policies come to mind? Perhaps savage budget cuts to beloved city programs, massive layoffs of city employees? My proposal achieves all of its cost savings without cutting a single program or laying off a single employee. I propose that the city study and adopt a comprehensive actuarial funding policy for the Portland fire and police disability and retirement pension plan. Why are the potential cost savings so large? The reason is the ludicrously costly pay as you go funding policy currently utilized by the city of Portland, the only other place in the country relying on this type of pension funding policy today is puerto rico. While this type of policy was relatively common in the 1920s, everyone else in the country abandoned it. What I am proposing is not some heterodox policy or untested concept. See for yourself on table six of the mayor's proposed budget, over \$220 million of property taxes will be consumed by the fpdp bureau in this year's budget. I struggle with

how to even put that in perspective. That's more money than the entire budget of the Portland fire and rescue bureau. It's one third of total property tax revenue collected by the city. I'm not the first person to warn the city about its pension funding policy. In 2011, the plan actuary identified a rising risk of the pension plan, sending the city into a financial crisis. Since 2011, the city auditor's office has issued multiple warnings, but its advice was not heeded. In 2013, city administrative officer jack graham responded by acknowledging the fiscal challenges of increasing pension liabilities. In 2013, moss adams, the cpa firm that audits the city's financial statements, wrote a warning letter to council about the declining trend in the city's governmental net position. Independent national experts have also written about this. While the city's refrain is to point to a reform that closed the plan to new hires in 2006, all of the warnings I just mentioned came years after the passage of that reform. Here are some things you can do right now. Request the actuary provide an analysis of the cost savings of a comprehensive actuarial funding policy. Engage with independent national experts. Appoint an independent citizens commission with a mandate to study the Portland fpda funding policy reform and provide recommendations to council. The advisory committee approach has been successfully used by both the city and the 2006 era reform, and by former governor brown regarding Oregon pers direct the city, the city's office of government relations to advocate for access to state funding source to help address this issue, specifically, open the employer incentive fund that was established by sb 1566 in 2018. Thank you. Thank you.

Speaker: Next up we have tyler gilmore.

Speaker: Welcome, tyler.

Speaker: Tyler you're muted.

Speaker: All right tyler we'll move on and we can come back to you. Come back to tyler.

Speaker: Next up emily stebbins.

Speaker: Welcome. Thank you for being here.

Speaker: Thanks for having me, my name is emily stebbins, I'm a parent and a teacher, and I'm also a volunteer with 350 pdx. I've been working on shade equity for several years now, and I live in the same neighborhood. I grew up in, in southeast Portland, near 82nd avenue. So I really want to thank you. This is a general budget thing. I want to thank you for taking the first step towards funding the maintenance and care of our street trees, living where my family does. We really feel the difference between the neighborhoods where people can afford to take care of the trees and where we can't, and we really feel the difference. There's a huge microclimate around large canopy trees. As you all know. There's the fresh air, the coolness, there's difference in temperature and air quality, and there's also a mental health difference of just the noise absorption and the beauty of the trees that makes a difference in people's lives. And in my neighborhood and in neighborhoods east of me especially, there's a lot of places where there could be trees, but there aren't because people haven't had the resources, the time, the money to plant them or to care for them. There's also places where there are trees, but we fear that they will be destroyed because of poor health, lack of maintenance, or because there's no sidewalk yet. And we fear that when the much needed sidewalks are put in, the trees will be destroyed. This is a big problem, because those neighborhoods where there is a lack of trees are the places where people need the trees the most, where people depend on public transport and are exposed to the elements and where our health and safety would be most helped by a thriving forest canopy. I know none of this is news to you, so thank you again for

taking this important first step to take care of our trees. We also know that to truly care for the urban forest and the places that need it most, it will need to be fully funded in the future, so I'm asking that you let your vote today also feel that as a commitment to make sure that it is fully funded at the 20 million per year in the future. Thank you for your time, let's try tyler gilmore. Tyler, try star six. If you're on the phone. Okay. Let's move on to crystal potter.

Speaker: Hello, my name is crystal potter, and I'm here to testify about the general budget, not a specific amendment, I am here to respectfully ask that you reconsider funding the Portland bureau of emergency management. While public safety is the leading driver in this public in this budget cycle, one critical arm of the public safety service area is having its staff reduced by 25, which is the second largest proportional staffing cut in the city. It's difficult to look at the highlighted additional 1 million in funding proposed to the bureau of planning and sustainability for additional graffiti removal, and not see the seven missing staff positions at pbem. The 1 million for graffiti removal over and above. Bureau of planning and sustainability requested amount represents just over one half of 1% of that bureau's budget, but it would represent fully 10% of pbms, even half of that allocation. Moving to Portland bureau of emergency management would go a tremendous way to protecting public safety, extending community resilience, supporting more equitable responses to and recovery from large scale emergencies, and ensuring staffing levels that shore up much needed collaboration among bureaus in emergency response and planning. I sincerely hope you will consider a meaningful shift in budget dollars to meet staffing needs in the bureau of emergency management.

Speaker: Thank you, crystal, next up we have kelly.

Speaker: Hello, everyone, I'm Kelly Lance, and I am a resident of Portland and I am very active in a number of environmental and specifically tree related, nonprofit and volunteer work. I'm also on the East Moreland Neighborhood Association tree committee and I am here to urge the city to fully fund the new street tree maintenance program at a million of 20 million per year, this new program is it will deliver just the most basic pruning rotation that meets the industry standards. Anything less than this will mean that residents or business owners will not be served by the program, this helps to remove the primary barrier to shade access on public property and low and moderate income neighborhoods. As a very active volunteer for our tree committee in East Moreland, I see the impact of improperly maintained trees, the impact of trees having to be replaced, very expensive for our residents, and just thinking about low and moderate income neighborhoods. It is quite a hit. So I'm here to just share my, urging that you fully fund, this tree maintenance program. Thank you. All right.

Speaker: Thank you, next up, we have Debbie Castleton.

Speaker: Hello, I'm Debbie Castleton, I'm actually with Environment Services, but, in my volunteer time, I'm a member of the leadership of Queer Alliance, which is one of our employee resource groups. I'm very pleased to see the amendment on the agenda for the office of equity, LGBTQIA to plus position that would continue. I wish it was permanent, but I just wanted to really, one, thank you for adding it to the amendment, I sent a letter on behalf of the Queer Alliance, which is over 315 members at this time. And I don't know if you saw that in the letter. I had said that as of April 30th, the ACLU has tracked 489 anti LGBTQ bills in the US at this time, a couple of weeks later, as of yesterday, there's 26 more added for anti LGBTQ plus individuals. And it's specifically targeting trans youth and adults. We have now had we have a lot of people moving to Oregon and Portland specifically as a safe haven.

And I think it's critical to keep, at least two positions for this. So I just want to say thank you, and I won't take up any more of your time, so thank you.

Speaker: Thanks, debbie. We appreciate it, next up, we have allison berman.

Speaker: Good afternoon. My name is allie berman, and I'm the vice chair of the Portland parks and recreation advisory board, the Portland parks and recreation advisory board supports parks work to create a budget which maintains stable services, even when complying with the mayor's direction to implement a 5% general fund reduction and accommodating reduced revenue collection for the parks levy due to compression, as projected by the city economist, it's critical to note that this position is not sustainable and is only made possible because of the careful parks levy management over the last three years. Thanks to the levy parks operations have expanded, providing more opportunities to the public. During that time, revenues exceeded expenditures and the balance in the parks levy has grown. This accumulation was by intent to ensure that resources could keep up with the growing programs and subsequent years, with new constraints, including general fund reductions and parks levy compression that balance will be drawn down far faster than previously planned. The parks board is concerned about parks ability to maintain widely accessible and affordable recreation services. If these financial trends persist, I'd also like to note that the renewal of the parks levy will be critical to ensure continuity of services over the coming years, without a renewal, the city would expect to see a significant reduction in services that are immensely valued by Portlanders. We strongly encourage City Council to stay focused on the longer term goals of parks. Efforts to address several of the bureau's long standing issues. That includes a backlog of deferred maintenance, identifying dedicated and ongoing funding for street tree maintenance beyond what is currently allocated in this year's budget, and the Americans with disabilities act transition plan, which is currently

not on track and based on current funding levels. I will be dead before it sees its completion in 2085, nearly 100 years after the passage of the ada. We must ensure the ongoing care of our parks, recreation and natural resources both in the day to day and in addressing the growing 600 million deferred maintenance backlog. Action must be taken to identify a dedicated and stable funding source. Though we have significant concerns about our city's ability to support current parks, infrastructure and grow that infrastructure to meet the demands of a growing Portland, we recommend that City Council approve the mayor's proposed fiscal year 2024 2025 budget with commissioner Ryan's amendment to protect the park ranger program. The budget prioritizes those services and protects employees. It delivers on the promise of healthy parks in Portland, while trying to meet the maintenance shortfall of existing facilities to the extent it can, within the current budgeting environment. While police, fire and bureau of emergency communications have not seen a cut, the parks budget is being cut by \$375,000 because of the general fund dollars spent on the park, ranger program. Park rangers are an instrumental service supporting public safety. I'd recommend that park rangers be categorized similarly to other public park services. Sorry, public safety services and parks not get this budget cut. Thank you. Thank you, mayor.

Speaker: That completes testimony.

Speaker: All right. Very good. And did we try, the one individual who was not able to, to get on. Do we want to try him one more time? Yeah.

Speaker: One more time. Tyler, if you want to testify, go ahead and unmute. If you're on a phone, try star six. Yeah, they may not want to testify.

Speaker: All right. Good, so, colleagues, we're at the vote for the amendments, but I've had a request to take a brief recess, if that's all right. Yes. Okay. Why don't we, it's 249, 250. Why don't we reconvene? Top of the hour. We're in recess. Thanks.

For the session, colleagues, before we start voting is there any additional discussion on, amendments? Are there any additional amendments that occurred to people before we vote on the amendments that we previously mentioned and seconded, and, yeah, i'll just jump in if, if, if it's helpful, since we didn't do a ton of discussion earlier, maybe just bucket it and go, let's if there was discussion on any. Of the Wheeler amendments, let's . Ryan, i\$ i, I yea. Rubio I this is a budget neutral amendment to ensure the summer works program is staffed and the human resources received much needed support in their recruitment work.

Speaker: I vote yea Wheeler three is adopted. Please call the roll on. Wheeler four.

Speaker: Ryan. Hi, i. Also a technical amendment.

Speaker: I vote I in the amendment is adopted.

Speaker: Can I just make one quick clarification on that one. There was the title of the amendment is the public elections fund, I think the mayor said the small donor elections fund those are the same thing. I just want to be clear about that. Great

Speaker: Write that one down for the future trivia game. Okay

Speaker: You can go on, so, the next bucket is a standalone. This is Wheeler yea. Rubio one further discussion on this one. Please call the roll. Ryan. Hi, gonzales.

Speaker: Hi, pops. Yea. Rubio.

Speaker: I want to thank the mayor for being and the team for being really responsive to what was shared yesterday. I vote I Wheeler, I want to thank commissioner Rubio for her continued partnership in this space.

Speaker: I vote I in the amendments adopted. Next up are the gonzales amendments. Gonzales one and two. Any discussion on. Yeah. Commissioner Mapps, I have some discussion, I'm very sympathetic to both of these amendments, and I'm going to vote in favor of both of these amendments. Commissioner gonzales, I'm not sure if I fully understand all the nuance in gonzales one, kind of

looks to me just intuitively at the surface level, like this is what we'd be doing with the, deputy city administrator. Like, what are you trying to accomplish here? All of it sounds. Like good, like good ideas. I'm not quite sure if.

Speaker: That is response times across, public safety, depending on the bureau, have increased substantially at different times 2020 to date. And those two things are directly related response times and staffing. And so we just wanted to get a better line of sight on those pieces, and just keep them front and center. But sometimes the discussion about response time is had in isolation. And sometimes a discussion about overtime is had in isolation. We really need to be talking about those things together and more sustainably. You know, there's some other pieces to how we got here, some structural weaknesses in some of the various public safety bureaus. But just trying to keep a line of sight on those, those, thank you very much, that makes a lot of sense and explains some of those pieces. And i'll just reiterate what you just said. You know, I remember this from back in the days when I had boec you know, we'd have tables that we're talking about, response time and tables that are talking about budget. You're kind get these tables together. And because there is a continuum .

Speaker: Between those recommendations, I just want to make sure that this is really focused on governance, not broader service delivery. Is that correct with the refinement.

Speaker: And so, the there, you know, depending on how you calculate it, we went from 10 to 13 million ongoing costs for, the cost of government to 23 million. Again, i'll let ruth. Correct me on those numbers, but ballpark figures. I think I don't know if you got it right or wrong as proposed. I literally have no idea. I think we need some time in operation to really be able to assess that. The second part is just the relative cost of management in in the structure that we approved in November.

And, in conversations with the budget office, there was some thought, boy, we might want to start scoping that as early as this year to really execute on it next year. So we have it in time for the 2526 budget cycle. And so you have to start at least thinking about the questions you want to ask early, particularly when we're talking about that kind of c-suite positions. Do we have the right number of deputies and some of the other offices it it's just to start enough time for the oath 2526 budget cycle.

Speaker: And I think that clarification. So I'd like to just state for the record, since there will be work done in this fiscal year and presumably it will be done with my guidance and leadership, that while I do support focusing on governance, I do not want to in any way tie the hands of the future mayor or City Council with regard to service delivery, I think that should be their decision based on their budgeting and, frankly, their priorities. And how they choose to organize. But I think the first part of what you said, I agree with completely. So I will support it. But with that strong caveat, it's fine to me.

Speaker: Does that create any ambiguity for you?

Speaker: I don't know, I mean, I think to your point, commissioner, the I think the way the budget note is written is to have a draft, a draft scope of work, by September 1st, 2024. And so that's just teeing up the questions, and getting the, the ball rolling now. But you know, i, I imagine it would be a lengthier process.

Speaker: So it'll come back to council in September and we'll see where it is. And then we can look at it then.

Speaker: And the real work is contemplated. Begin after January 1st, 2025 for the new, for the new government. Just trying to get some pieces in place. Good.

Speaker: Any further questions on gonzales one or gonzales two? Keelan please call the roll on gonzales one.

Speaker: Ryan. Yeah. Good work. Hi Gonzales.

Speaker: Hi.

Speaker: Hi. Hi Wheeler, our public safety bureaus are definitely in need of better tracking and monitoring to understand the drivers of overtime and other expenses to help stay within budget. This is an ongoing issue. And so I appreciate that this budget note establishes a system and a process for reporting and recommending improvements to stay within budget. I think it's really good work, I support it, I vote, I in the amendment is adopted. Gonzales two please call the roll.

Speaker: Ryan. Hi, Gonzales. Hi Mapps I Wheeler I with my stipulations in place the amendment is adopted and now we have commissioner Ryan, one he withdrew two. Three four, five and six. Any questions on those?

Speaker: I will have some questions. We want to just take a do some just level setting remarks that might be helpful.

Speaker: Sure. Go ahead. I didn't get to do those earlier. Okay. Thank you. Commissioner Mapps, colleagues, I think we need to level set with Portlanders about what the city is investing in homeless services. As we respond with compassion to serve all Portlanders in this humanitarian crisis. This amendment directs the CBO to come back to this council with annual costs the city is expending. We need to know the number in order to budget for the future. This amendment directs CBO to fully articulate what our homeless services expenses are for both indirect and direct services around homelessness. Yes, commissioner Mapps I didn't have a question on one.

Speaker: I support one. Okay, it might make sense to can we vote on these in sequence? It might make sense some of these.

Speaker: Is that okay with you commissioner Ryan? Because they are meaty. Could we could we just go through them one at a time. And then you can give your

comments at the beginning of each, each one I was trying to do on the first one.

Perfect any further discussion on Ryan? One seeing none. Please call the roll. Ryan

Speaker: Yeah, I just want to say this is something that when I began serving in fall of 2020, looking out there, there were infrastructure bureau directors and at the end of the onboarding meeting, I just asked, is the homelessness humanitarian crisis impacting your bureau? And it went from a pretty jargony focused meeting to boom, everybody's hands went up and they had a lot to say. And then when I when the mayor gave me the assignment at that same time and I barely mentioned something like this to the county about these direct and indirect costs, we were experiencing, it just didn't seem to land very well in terms of ever expanding them. So I always wanted to bring something like this to true up to our budget process. And that's why I put this on here, and I put I Gonzalez, i, i, i, small nuance, I support this and I appreciate commissioner Ryan and his team for their diligence on this.

Speaker: I'm fully supportive of understanding the full financial impact of homelessness on the city, as the commissioner and I have discussed, there there are some information that is easier to track than other information. And and, some of and I just want people to be aware of that. There will be bureaus that are not tracking specific information for very specific reasons. And we may not have access to that information. Writ large, though I think it is important for us to have a better understanding of what those the costs are as best as we can measure them, one minor note, which is that it puts the budget office in the lead. Our budget office is very strapped. They will have a lot of work to do in this designated time period. Not related to this project, and, and frankly, the bureaus within these various service areas need to step up and do the work and provide that information. So I'm hoping that cbo at the end of the day, isn't running hurt. I'm hoping what cbo is doing is just compiling the data that the bureaus provide to cbo, and if that doesn't work

out that way, this may take a lot longer and be more complicated than we anticipate. But I think commissioner Ryan's instincts on this are spot on. I vote yea in the amendment is adopted and you withdrew Ryan two. Yes so, Ryan three.

Speaker: Is on health and health benefit change, colleagues were one city, and we need to, of course, act like one city and ensure that we're supporting every employee with a blended cost for health care. When I'm concerned about is creating a cliff with a policy change that's affecting our current budget, my amendment would build a slope, a bridge, if you will, to get us fully blended model by 2627. This amendment directs cbo to fully understand the cost implications of this policy change, and come back to council with their proposals to ensure that we have a smooth transition to fiscal year 26.

Speaker: So I have a couple of questions about this and pardon my ignorance. So we have gone through a process. I think I'm hearing you, commissioner Ryan. I just want to make sure I've got it exactly right. So obviously when we pool everybody in a health insurance pool and since we are moving to a single enterprise structure and form of management in the city as much as possible, we're going to be combining people into the same health care pool. And what that means is younger, ergo more healthy employees are probably going to be subsidized older. Ergo, like me, employees as health care issues arise or as people have children, it's my understanding, based on this that you support, that you agree that we should be enterprise wide as much as possible, 100. Okay, good. And so I'm trying to figure out what can you just walk us not in great length but in small length. Could you tell us how does this how does this stair step process work? I'm not sure I completely so if we had our budget advisers come up, it would be a very thorough and lengthy, explanation for this.

Speaker: And I respect that. So I'll try to get to the bottom line. When you oversee periods, we all experience this. We have these last minute internal invoices that are shocking, and they total millions of dollars and this is one where when I've had experience as the head of an organization and you're experiencing a big lift and a big change, I always just use the phrase you need to have slopes, not walls. And cliffs. And so there's been some big burdens on some bureaus with this change. And so I'm looking for a more elegant way to walk this forward for the next couple of years. So we true this up in the fiscal year 2627. But we give a little bit more grace to the steps and incremental, invoicing that's currently going on. So Claudio, I'm sure you wish I would have explained it with more detail, but I did the best I could to digest that.

Speaker: Well, that was helpful. And I, I want to also just state that the proposed budget includes a budget note already directing bhr city leadership and unions to develop recommendations to address rising health insurance costs by January of 2025. Are you thinking that would not have been included in that budget? Note Ruth, we can think of that.

Speaker: Do you have a thought on that, I mean, I think the, the budget notes, are responding to two slightly different issues. The one that's in the proposed budget is focusing on the health care benefit, cost increases in going into 25, 26. And this one is sort of a retrospective look at the change, at the impacts of the change to a composite rate citywide, and so it's it is a little bit different. I mean, I think they do, they are connected in some ways, but this one is, is at least my understanding of the intent is for it to really focus on how we, how we in cbo accounted for the changes in costs to bureaus in their current appropriation level, amount. That's based on the .

Speaker: Reduction. I have a related question, and Ruth, I don't know if you can most effectively speak to this or BHR or someone else, but can you just explain the difference in methodology that is being applied in the 2025 budget with respect to health care costs relative to prior years, or is it a continuum of same process, or is there a different allocation methodology being used for insurance costs?

Speaker: So if you're speaking specifically to the composite rate change that happened, and I believe, somebody else can correct me in 23, 24, possibly 2023. Robert, do you want to.

Speaker: Hello, Robert Cheney, City Budget Office, it used to be the case. I'm just going to provide examples, it used to be the case that, when a city employee elected benefits, they would elect either a single couple or family. So. And they were, they cost differently accordingly. Right. So a single might be like six grand for health care. A couple would be ten, and a family was 16. What BHR has done is every single employee now costs the same rate. So they smoothed all of it, me, you, everybody. No matter if we have a family or dependents or whatever, we're all paying the same rate. So there was a movement there, due to the equity in recruiting, and other things I would say, and, what we did was we did the analysis that showed that, if you were mostly for the general fund because the utilities, already baked this into their rates. But we did analysis that showed that, here's what it would cost each bureau, based on what their previous employees benefit elections were. And here's what it would cost the following year. And we did that in advance of the Cal file in advance of FY 2024 budget development. So, that analysis occurred. We adjusted the Cal file accordingly, and, we are currently in the state where the composite rates from a budgetary perspective are implemented. And for general fund bureaus or Cal's have been adjusted accordingly. It was not, huge movements. It was probably less than \$1 million across the board because it was

essentially averaging out and smoothing something. So, with that, I'll answer any questions. So actually, that was a different tribe of the delta, and I was assuming.

Speaker: So it doesn't relate at all to, for example, age of worker. It's really just they're essentially marital and child status. Essentially what level of coverage they're getting.

Speaker: The composite rates are health. Vsp and, a couple other things. But it's only looking at whether you're it's not looking at the relative age of workforce or in a or, you know, insured.

Speaker: It's looking at what elections they make for coverage, that's my understanding. Like if you're talking about like whether the insurance we're buying looks at the actual like actuarial analysis of, like, our workforce. I can't speak to that. All I know is that, the services, the benefits that we're buying from Kaiser and Moda, we used to buy them, like. Or we used to charge employees based on a really specific set of parameters. And now we all charge them the same, as for as to how the city negotiates health care rates and what the increases are there and how composite rates affect that, that's probably not that's a different conversation. But, that that does tie in to some of the, the kind of the language of the amendment that talks about the increases. But okay, I think that answers my question.

Speaker: I had slightly different assumptions as to what this budget note was trying to solve for, but I don't I don't know that I have strong feelings one way or another at this point. So thank you.

Speaker: And actually, may I jump in, commissioner, I'm still grappling with, maybe I share some of Gonzalez's confusion, I think I'm not exactly tracking what this amendment solves for. Can you give me your sense of what problem this thing is solving. Yeah, I can take a crack at it. I mean, I think the basic question is, at the point in time when we were developing the 2324 current appropriation level. So last

fall of 2023, we had to make projections that robert just described about how is this going to change? It's going to, you know, the cost will increase in one bureau and decrease in another bureau because it's averaging out across the city more or less. But the, you know, we had to make projections based on at that point in time, what were the, what what positions did folks have and in each bureau and what were the, employees costing, essentially. And I think the gist of this budget note is to go back and say, essentially, did we, how how correct were we in those projections at that time? Is the is the current appropriation level, essentially correctly adjusted for the actual changes in costs that the bureau saw related to their health benefit changes?

Speaker: I have a follow up question, just to make sure I'm tracking this completely. So you adjusted the cao file based on an update methodology and how does that flow through in a fiscal year? Is there is are they are bureaus billed based on the actual cost associated with their employees? Yes. And so what this budget note is really getting at is there may be a delta between the projections that were embedded in the cao file for each bureau and their actual billings during the fiscal year?

Speaker: Yeah. The only slight clarification I would make to that is they are now billed based on the composite rate for their employees and so what the adjustment to cao was, is saying, like the cao would have just gone forward with the amounts based on the employees, based on their previous benefit elections. Now we're going into this world where it's all composite rates. So let's change cao to try to estimate what that will look like and whether you know what the increase or decrease will be in a given bureau based on this change. And compensate them for that. And now this budget note is saying how do you do in that estimate essentially, is it was it off from, where the projections off from what in fact happened? Okay.

Speaker: Do you do you envision this is going to create substantial burden on your office to do this evaluation?

Speaker: No, I think it would be pretty quick. Okay I'm good, follow up question would the sort of true up or. Yeah. Or at least the evaluation of how we did in our projections happen anyway, is this or is this a unique.

Speaker: Not necessarily. I mean, no, frankly, I think, you know, we budgets are all estimates. And, the, the we, we, changed cal that change carries forward in an ongoing way. We wouldn't we wouldn't like go back every year and say, oh, should we adjust it again based on that change that happened two years ago? We wouldn't normally do that. I guess.

Speaker: So why are we doing it now or what's the.

Speaker: That's the concern from the budget note is that there may have been, that that in some cases it may have played out slightly differently than the forecast was indicating for the projection, rather.

Speaker: And I would note that, when we're putting together the file, we're doing point in time snapshots of employees in their elections. Right. So like I remember, for example, we learned a lot about city demographics. And there were some bureaus where they were paying more for health care costs because maybe their employees had more families or whatever, but yeah, to that point, there was, a like, a difference, a discrepancy in how bureaus are going to incur their costs. And part of the way that we, as part of the way the city economists inflates the file every year is he looks at for general fund bureaus, he looks at what percentage of their budget is personnel and what percentage is materials and services, and he inflates each one accordingly based on things like cola and other inflationary factors. So we just took the analysis and the math from that point in time. Snapshot when composite weights were rolled out, and adjusted it accordingly and then continued with the

file. And I don't know if that helped explain anything, but, can I ask a follow up on this, so you support that that strategy that you just described, that you look at enterprise wide and you allocate it presumably enterprise wide across bureaus based on personnel counts. Right?

Speaker: We did it based on fund 100, the utility, the general, the general fund, the utilities, like we incorporate those costs into the budget system. So bureaus are able to build their personnel budgets off those new rates. And the utilities use those costs to build their rates.

Speaker: Let me ask my question another way, so I am presuming that we're talking about one city, one workforce, because that is the direction that the voters have told us to go. Presumably all bureaus would support this strategy equally. Is that correct? Yes

Speaker: I think in effect, you know, there there are disparate effects. If you have a bureau that has a lot of single individuals on their plans, their, their costs would have gone, went up this year. Yes understood. On the flip side, there's there are other bureaus that had a lot of families. Their costs went down and the cao file said, okay, we project that this change is going to be \$1 million in this bureau, \$500,000 in this bureau.

Speaker: That's right. So that's not one city, one workforce that's breaking it up. Bureau by bureau. Some bureaus have younger employees, some bureaus have older employees. What I want to make sure is that what is implied in this amendment is that we are going to be doing this holistically. Enterprise wide, not bureau by bureau. Yeah.

Speaker: It's. Yes I think we would continue. We would absolutely continue that the only question is when we said your costs were going to go up by \$500,000, did they

actually go up by \$1 million? And you are owed \$500,000 ongoing of general fund. That's the question. Correct.

Speaker: And I would note that, doing this analysis, you might have some impediments, because the actual rollout of those composite rates has been delayed, I think they started building I think bhr started billing people for composite rates in the middle of this, this fiscal year. So around January, February, so there is a budget to actuals, kind of discrepancy in that sense. So analysis like this might trail a little bit because, we would have we would either have to extrapolate, you know, months a lot more and impute more or we, would otherwise have to, just wait for more data to come in.

Speaker: I have one more question.

Speaker: Are there any, implications here for our labor contracts as we get this information and act on it?

Speaker: No, it would really. It's really just saying, you know, should essentially would we take general fund dollars from bureau a and give them to bureau b, because our projections were incorrect at the time that we made them? That would be we would have to, we would probably what we would do is come back to council in the fall during the cao ordinance and just say, here's the result, here are the options. And you would decide in the fall how to adjust the cao. You would basically, tell us whether you want to adjust the cao file to, reflect that our findings from this and then we would and then the economist would build that in.

Speaker: Is that for the next fiscal year for 25, 26?

Speaker: Yes, and beyond. Right. It would, it would, it would and okay. So I would just say this we are doing this once and no more than once.

Speaker: I agree, I don't want to create make work for people here while we're already all in extremely overburdened with the transition to the new form of

government. So there is nothing here that is prescriptive other than an evaluation. And then the evaluation would come back to the City Council. Yes. Okay is there any reason why it wouldn't be delayed until the new year, when you actually have a new mayor and a new City Council that are going to be responsible for that budget, because we're not I mean, I think it's just a, it's, you know, as we said, when we came to you all with the cao ordinance in November of 2023, it's easier to make changes like this on the front end of the budget so that it gets built into the budget base, but there's nothing that would stop the future.

Speaker: Council and mayor from making the change at a later process. I mean, they could be here in a year making the change, but but it's a little cleaner and easier to build it in. In the beginning, as part of the base assumptions of the budget. Okay

Speaker: All right. That's helpful.

Speaker: Mr. Mayor, I have a question.

Speaker: Commissioner Mapps.

Speaker: It's actually goes to you, me, I appreciate the conversation, frankly, this is still about as clear as mud to me. Although I'm trying to track it as best I can. I feel like you probably have more experience in this space. In a broader sense of how this plays out across bureaus. Do you have any thoughts on this one?

Speaker: So I want my usual disclosure. I am not an attorney, nor am I a health care expert, and I'm especially not an expert on the allocation of health care costs across different employee groups, and so this is a very complex issue, and it's one that I will be deferring heavily to bhr since they actually have subject matter experts who do this work, this is not a raging problem from my perspective. To be honest. And I also, based on amendments, not a problem or the amendment is not based on what I've heard, it seems relatively benign in that it asks to come back to City

Council sometime in the fall, having completed an evaluation, and I assume that evaluation will be completed by air.

Speaker: I think we would have to. It would be our office and hr would have to work together.

Speaker: Very definitely. Yeah. So I mean, really the question is to the commissioner who proposed it, which is how strongly does he feel about it? I don't feel strongly about it one way or the other.

Speaker: I think it's a better practice. I'm just looking at this as improving a practice going forward. I'm not, I'm sure. I think a lot of people are discovering in this conversation, like perhaps what I have, and that is that we get the last minute invoices and they're kind of extreme. And so we're building in a practice with more eyes on the front end and I just think it's a smarter way to build it going forward. That's all my I've been in dialog with them to answering your question, bluntly, my gut tells me is we have nothing to lose from going forward with this process.

Speaker: And we'll reconvene on this process in the fall. And we'll ask lots of smart people what their opinion is. And hopefully people who are subject matter experts will give us their honest opinion on this, thank you, mr. Mayor. I appreciate your candid comments. And I'm looking over at my colleague commissioner Gonzalez, who looks pensive to you.

Speaker: Just had one follow up question on this. The rate making bureaus and everybody else is there. Is this going to play out at all differently for water and you know what? Share the bureau bts. Yeah pbot. Relative to every well, pbot a little bit different. Pbot different. I'm really thinking rate making bureaus and the different timelines they have for setting their rates, at least under our current schedule is there. I just am curious. Any thoughts on the differences in timelines?

Speaker: I work pretty closely with the utility bureaus and the other making bureaus to get personnel projections in in like August, September, getting those in early, those allow them to help start to build those rates. It's a great sequencing question. Ideally we know what the composite rates are so that bureaus can build their personnel budgets and then know how much they need to go out and, and build for. And I think that's the way the process is currently set up, is they have an idea of what their personnel budget is, and they build that out in August through November, and then they build their rate schedule accordingly. So I don't it's been, like I said, the composite rates from a budgetary standpoint, we did before fy 2324. So they're in the system now. We did it again this year, and as far as I know with the utilities, I haven't heard any concerns, but they do have some crack analysts that have really great analysts. So, so I'm going to keep going on this.

Speaker: Sorry. Because it's a complex issue and I don't fully understand it. I don't pretend to, does this go against the one workforce cost sharing model that we've all agreed to in any way?

Speaker: No. Okay

Speaker: And is it possible that at the end of this process, when you come back in September, that you will be making recommendations that we take money general fund out of one bureau and put it into another, for example, out of fire and into parks? Is that a possible outcome? Yes. Is it a likely outcome? I don't know, we'd have to do the we'd have to.

Speaker: I, I don't know, we'd have to do the analysis.

Speaker: Is it likely that there will be some bureaus that would be seen as winners and some that will be seen as losers?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: So why are we doing this?

Speaker: Well, do you can I ask a follow up question? Yes who do you have a guess of? Who the winners and losers are going to be right now? I mean, that's a well, I mean, and I want the lottery numbers and the answer you don't want it. If the answer is you don't know, that's that actually, I don't know.

Speaker: I truly don't know. I i, or ruth, you literally just got here for the sake of the integrity of the process. I hope that our projections were very accurate and that no adjustments are needed, but in the case that that there was a significant discrepancy, we'll come back and we'll tell you and that will tell you essentially, bureau a got more than maybe they needed. And bureau b got less than maybe they needed.

Speaker: And mayor, the reason I honed in on this and again, i, as commissioner Ryan was explaining this note to me, I thought it was doing something slightly different, that I was actually more concerned about because we do have different ages of workforce across our bureaus. And there is, you know, a one workforce mentality has led to blended rates, and there are most certainly winners and losers in that methodology, in the status quo. I mean, there are I mean, there. And if we were to you start peeling back that onion and there's some, you know, interesting questions that start to come up. And i, i, I had some concern about even, you know, opening that ball of wax. But this is actually a little different, a framing. I didn't realize it was really their elections that were the primary, piece as opposed to age of workforce. And, i, I so I don't know who the winners and losers are going to be. I could have assumed when i, you know, if it were based on age of workforce and health, then that's a little different, assumption is that you can make as to the winner and losers. I don't know.

Speaker: Well, let me ask. And I agree. So it would be you would be coming back in September. There are potential winners and losers. When would the decision be

made to transfer the actual general fund dollars from one bureau to another? I think I mean, my recommendation for the following fiscal year, right.

Speaker: My recommendation would be to do that in November of this calendar year for the 2526 budget development. So if the cal ordinance just is council directing essentially our office to move money from a to b, it doesn't, yeah. And in that case, and, and then if that passed, then we would do that and it would roll into their 2526 budget development.

Speaker: So it would not have any impact on 2425, correct?

Speaker: Yes, yes.

Speaker: And, we have you as our budget expert here. Would hr tell us that if we vote for this, this is consistent with best practice for the organization that we are going to be on January 1st?

Speaker: Yeah. I don't think it has any implication for that. Yeah. Okay. Any other questions?

Speaker: I spent a lot of time on health insurance recently. I know.

Speaker: Yeah, especially in the last hour. All right. Good, please call the roll on. Ryan three. Ryan.

Speaker: Hi. Gonzales hi, this is still kind of as clear as mud to me, although I do appreciate the conversation and the, instincts here. In the spirit of collaboration, all vote I on this, although I'm a little bit agnostic as to what we're doing.

Speaker: Yea. Rubio I Wheeler, I it's like a strange novel.

Speaker: I have to see where it ends. So i'll vote I in the amendment is approved. Great

Speaker: What are you watching on netflix?

Speaker: You don't want it?

Speaker: No, I don't, I'm very, very bad taste in television.

Speaker: Ryan, for discussion on this, commissioner. Go ahead.

Speaker: Yeah. Urban forestry, piece off, swap parks, first of all, is so grateful for the pcef investment in tree canopy and personnel. And more importantly, it's a service we want to provide for Portlanders. These investments will pay back 100 fold for generations to come, and clearly, from public testimony just this afternoon, this has been decades in the making. The 35 million investment in parks is not new. Programing this is about offsetting general funds for personnel. If this investment does not keep up with inflation, we will have diminished maintenance towards this incredible investment. That is why I'm proposing that the 7 million annual cost would be adjusted for inflation.

Speaker: So I have a lot of questions on this one, and I think I see where you're trying to go. And basically, this would include inflation in the tree program. Is that an accurate statement. Is that the core of what this is attempting to do?

Speaker: Yes. Okay.

Speaker: And what what is our typical policy? Ruth, I'm looking at you with regard to inflation in programs like this. Would this be normal or is this an exception? How would you describe it?

Speaker: So it's, this is how general fund programs are treated. So in the current appropriation level, we can talk more about cal, in current appropriation level, in the process, the, city economist uses sort of the, inflation factors that are put out by the bureau of labor statistics to inflate the ongoing expenses in every bureau going into the next fiscal year as part of the developing the base budget for that fiscal year. So that's, yes, that is normal.

Speaker: But this isn't general fund, correct?

Speaker: It is. Well, after, yes, as of the proposed budget that those fund sources were switched. And what happened is because sort of the way pcef has been

allocated thus far with their five year allocations, it's just slightly different than how we budget the general fund where we don't do those five year allocations, we do a year at a time, and then we grow that with inflation over the course of the five year forecast window, and in pcef, they just did a lump sum for the full five years. And, and it was and it's the direction to all bureaus that received pcef, you know, not just, parks in this case is, was to if you have if they had a pcef allocation where they were anticipating sort of annual expenses as opposed to one time expenses, they were it was sort of up to them to budget in the inflation, essentially, and typically in this case, the way people I mean, the parks bureau has the ability to account for inflation.

Speaker: It can use carryover. It can use frankly, it could use pcef funding, it could use levy dollars, it could use vacancies, could it not for the purpose in principle. Yes. Making up this difference. Yeah. And that just that that would be my preference.

Speaker: I have a question to commissioner yea. Rubio. So, parks was not the only one that got swapped out in terms of like for pcef funds. So are there other, is everybody else then would they be entitled to get an increase as well? Other bureaus and how much the, the other ones were mostly one time in nature, not ongoing.

Speaker: And so I think that's the main difference here, where the for parks, it was an ongoing general fund activity. So, and, and the others aren't there are just straight pcef allocations and other bureaus for ongoing activity. His and those, of course, are they have to sort of budget within their lump sum amount for those.

Speaker: But for example, prosper. They were going to, you know, they were set to get general fund from the boomerang and now they're they're getting psa for some of those funds, but just on a one time basis.

Speaker: So the inflation doesn't factor in there really if that. So it's just just for one for 2425. So they they won't experience the effects of inflation or they won't they won't have that issue into 25, 26 because it was just swapped on a one time basis.

Speaker: Do you believe parks has the ability to absorb inflation within this year's fiscal budget? The one we're currently proposed, in.

Speaker: So just to be clear. So this, would essentially start this this budget note would direct the economist to put it in for 25, 26 for the first time, as to whether they can absorb it, I mean, I think, I think it's that's more of a question about sort of long term, financial trade offs within parks, since they, you know, have the, the levy funding that they're spending down and they have, they can carry over their general fund. They have, you know, it's not a sort of liquidity issue, it's just, it's a trade off, frankly, doesn't pcef come with administrative overhead?

Speaker: Maybe. Maybe I misunderstood. I thought it did.

Speaker: Yes. I believe they're, going to, charge some overhead, but I'd have to. I'd want to hear from the bureau directly, but, yes, they can charge overhead.

Speaker: Donnie's here. Donnie, is that true?

Speaker: You have to say it. For the record, donnie, I hate to make you exercise, but it feels good. And if you. If you could say your name for the record, please. Hi, ruth. Hi

Speaker: Oh, goodness, donnie lavera, deputy city administrator. City service area. So, to answer the question of does pcef allow for administrative costs? The answer is yes. I want to acknowledge, I think the challenge that we're addressing here is that the allocation over five years is a flat line number at 7 million. And I think what parks is asking is for us to adjust to capture the inflation in the out years, which we haven't done at this moment.

Speaker: Can I ask a follow up question? Yeah, sure.

Speaker: You bet. I want to just make sure I fully follow the answer to commissioner Rubio's question. So are there other recipients of pcef dollars that our city bureaus that are multiyear awards? Yes yes. And who are they and what's and how are we treating them for this purpose, I think bts has 70. Is that correct?

Speaker: Yeah, yeah. And pbot has some ongoing ing, yeah. So within just within their pcef award, the direction is to sort of back out inflation and budget it themselves over the course of the five years. So, I mean, certainly cbo is willing to help any bureaus who want support when, you know, we can share our spreadsheets and the like. That's that's not an issue. It's just, it that the resource would come from that total number. So if b'zz has 70 million over five years and they want to say, okay, we're going to program, you know, whatever it is, I don't know, 20 people doing this work next year. And we know that their their costs are going to increase over the five year window. Well, we'd better allow for we'd better better project that out so that in year five we have enough money in our \$70 million pot to be able to afford the costs of that. But the direction to them is sort of plan for that in your program, in your budgeting for that program. And don't you know, I mean, which is what we do for the general fund, right? We say we know our expenses in year five of the five year forecast are going to be higher. We inflate the expenses and then ensure that we can pay for all of our general fund expenses by year five, based on what we're programing in year one.

Speaker: Okay, commissioner, can I offer an example here? So for the other allocations to the bureaus that were getting five years worth of funding when we programed it, we programed at the beginning of the budget. So the decision packages were built with the bureau. So for example using the bts example, we planned out the five years and that \$70 million allocation roughly captured the five

year costs for the program. At the beginning of the decision package. What we're talking about here with this park, 7 million was it was just sort of a trade out after the fact. So that programming didn't occur. It's sort of in in real time having the conversation that we had back in, let's say, December bts.

Speaker: So parks essentially had it is different than the other, even though it theoretically it's the same problem. Right? We have inflation that typically gets caught up in general fund allocations through the cal process. But parks is at a different place in this than those other bureaus that are recipient of multi-year, pcef awards.

Speaker: That's a fair, you know, assessment of this is my first instinct is why treat parks differently than anybody else who got multi-year, pcef awards?

Speaker: But it does sound like the process was different here.

Speaker: It was. It was or it just were different. It's the same process. We're just a different spot in the process. Right? So I guess what I'm offering is we probably can figure out in the out years how to solve for that inflation gap, but because you're solving for next fiscal year, it's not as it's not the issue that we're trying to address. I know you're dealing with a budget note right now. I guess I'm offering that between eps and parks, we could probably figure out for the out years, school years 50, 25, 26 and out how to make up that difference. With cbo's help, of course. That's right.

Speaker: Yeah. I mean, I think I think ultimately what this budget note is doing is instructing the inflation to come from the general fund on the 7 million that was swapped for parks, urban forestry. The other options are essentially, to go back to pcef and ask for additional funding or to sort of take it out essentially of the remainder of their, existing lump sum or existing five year allocation for, for street trees.

Speaker: But isn't that just to be crystal clear about the last scenario without that's essentially reducing the capacity to support the program with the existing allocation, right? I mean, if because inflation is real, I mean, the cost of service is going to be x amount more expensive next year than it is this year, the one, the one distinction, commissioner, is that with this additional 65 million that it's giving, it's a it's a generally unprogramed amount of money.

Speaker: Parks has given us a general plan. We know it's still roughly not ideal. What they were looking for to start. But there's I guess there's room within that 65 million to also work with parks to figure out what they're going to be programing. Now, we're sort of sort of building the bike as we ride it with parks on that one. So long winded way of me saying, I think we can work with parks to figure out how to capture some of that inflation with allocations that we already are aware of.

Speaker: Sonia and then commissioner Mapps, after you're done.

Speaker: You're happy budget day.

Speaker: Happy last budget day, mayor.

Speaker: I know I'm almost.

Speaker: You seem really happy. One more for sonia shymansky. June, I'm your deputy.

Speaker: Don't forget about that one. Yeah. That's true.

Speaker: Nothing happens in June. Deputy city administrator for the vibrant community service area, what donnie is saying is correct on the 65 million, which is a new investment for a still to be programed on the margins program. What differentiates this one is that this is the \$35 million over five year swap out for general fund, which supported an existing ongoing fixed cost, essentially program. The impact of swapping in the pcef is that it is a diminishing resource over time, as inflation occurs. So we are creating outyear cuts for an existing ongoing program

through the swap out and what the amendment seeks to do is account for that. And correct for that in future years. And my biggest trepidation to this is if we were treating other bureaus differently in a like swap out.

Speaker: That was my main. I don't, I don't want parks to be punished. I also don't want them to get special treatment. No, it's actually yeah, it's a very fair question about fiscal policy when we use pcef in this way.

Speaker: I don't know if parks is the only bureau in this situation of having received it as a swap for ongoing programming, if so much of it was for new things and projects, not ongoing programs.

Speaker: Pbot is that they have any examples of that?

Speaker: Well, I'll tell you, I'm getting texts from my, my budget people over at bhs who say that we essentially have the same problem that parks has in this space, can I just I think the, the difference I think it is true that the, the, the issue of inflation eating away at a five year allocation over the course of the five years is true for every piece of allocation that is made now, they could have given them, given them the same amount of money, but framed it slightly differently, and the impact would have been exactly the same. But that is true. However, the one difference for parks is the ongoing swap out of general fund. So I think where they're feeling it is they had an ongoing resource that would have been inflated over time. They no longer have an ongoing resource that would have been inflated over time. And so it feels like a reduction in a way that, it doesn't necessarily now, I mean, I think where the pbot, I guess there there is a bit of a similar situation. Pbot sorry, I didn't think of this right away. The street lights. Cal it's a little bit different because there that we're putting that, amount towards the creek settlement, the, ada settlement amount. But, the actual street lights work would have gotten general fund that was inflated over time, I don't know the impact of, there are some other differences in

the exact allocations between the general fund amount for street lights and the, the, pcf amount. I will also say the other thing to think about with with, cal is, of course, you know, we had reductions this year to, to most general fund bureaus, we had a constraint, a 5% constraint that could happen in future years. There's no projections that that will need to happen in pcef. So, I mean, there they are different resources. And in some ways they may feel like you're they're getting sort of a bad deal for it in other ways. They may not be getting a bad deal for it, so I think it's, it's yeah, this is just one way in which I think it feels like they're, you know, not getting as much as they would have if they had kept it as general fund. But there are other ways in which that may or may not be true going forward, so I think the pbot street lights cal is probably the best other example of a similar situation. There are some slight differences there, which I can talk about, but, it's yeah, okay.

Speaker: Well, today I'm not going to ask for special treatment from pbot, but I just have one more question on this particular question, is there any contingency associated with the these dollars that are on the table, on the 7 million or the five, the five?

Speaker: As in terms of how it would be funded or in terms of have you programed out all 7 million? Oh, yes. All right. Yeah. In terms of the how it would be funded. So just mechanically, how this works is, it would go into the calculation again that the city economist does in the fall for the 2526 fiscal year. And whatever that inflation number is on the 7 million couple hundred thousand or so, essentially that shrinks the remaining pie of general funds. So so that that's just how additions to cal work. They don't feel like a cut because you don't know where they're coming from, but they add to the known expenses that we have to pay, that we have to use our general fund revenues to pay for, I have one question then maybe to you, maybe to commissioner Ryan's.

Speaker: Could you maybe go back a step and just talk about direction with respect to cal and future years, because in one of my bureaus that actually caused a lot of pain, you know, a council some years ago made direction that I inherited on how you adjust cal. And in some ways, we just unwinded it. But it as a maybe just editorialize as a general matter, the use of direction to future year cal adjustments. When is it appropriate? When is it not appropriate as a as a financial policy?

Speaker: Yeah I mean I think that's a that's a good question. And I think frankly, I think it's something we should the city budget office and, and the dca for budget and finance should, should be looking at as we go into the new form of government because, I think, you know, there's a number of examples of where this type of direction has happened, right? The, returning tax increment finance, budget note from 2223, sort of pre directed the and maybe linly can help me out here. This council cannot tie the hands of a future council through a budget note. A budget note is not, binding, it's just direction. What the city economist does is, is builds the current appropriation level, which again, is not binding. It's just the starting point for the budget. But he doesn't just make it up right. We don't say like oh something is going to cost money next year. We better add that in, we try to go, we have to go off of direction from council, either through previously approved budgets or through other changes that have been made between the last budget and the next sort of, base budget. So, you know, this happens, with labor bargaining sometimes where something happens in the intervening time, so, so I think the, the understanding has been it's appropriate for a budget. Note to sort of serve that's been adopted, to serve as that direction, but, it doesn't sort of automatically appropriate those funds, if that makes sense.

Speaker: It totally makes sense. I would just now I'm going to editorialize sometimes the budget note though, is treated as gospel notwithstanding what you

just said. And sometimes people forget why we put it in and you have to go back in history and sort of recreate it, there in my much more limited experience, sometimes there's a presumption that you should carry out that budget. Note notwithstanding that a future council, has full authority to make a different decision. So it does sort of you don't start things at the 50 yard line, you start it somewhere else based on where a budget note is, I guess the question for you, commissioner Ryan, if we were to approve this note, would you be open to including clear direction that if there's across the board cuts with respect to this element, parks wouldn't be treated any differently than any other bureau for that purpose? Because I think the issue here was there are some implementations that would be, you know, so it's so it's parks doesn't get the worst of both worlds. It doesn't get the best of both worlds. It's you're treating those, for all intents and purposes, the way you would treat any cow. General fund allocation and if there's across the board cuts next year for 5, they're going to take it. The 5% here. Yep. Absolutely does that you follow that commissioner. No I mean it's I don't either.

Speaker: Are you saying they're going to take a cut in p f. Why would they know it's in the in the general fund number.

Speaker: So this happened this year right. With that returning tif budget note, the original budget note was for 8 million to php 8 million to prosper, and the those were subject to the 5% reduction. So they became 7.6 million, after the constraint was taken on them. So that's how that was treated. This year, which is to say, they're not different or special. They are expenses in the same way. Everything else is an expense. And if the mayor, directs, you know, constraints on those, those that there's no special call out for those dollars.

Speaker: What I'm proposing is trying to address what ruth was talking about, the difference between general fund and pcef pcef is theoretically a more stable

funding source. General fund is theoretically more volatile. You know, again, theoretically, that's the caveat. But and so, but general fund tied with cal, you're getting baked in inflation in a way you don't get with pcef allocations, at least theoretically.

Speaker: So I didn't answer that question because I asked about the overhead that comes with pcef and nobody knows. It's a big question mark, but that's my question to you.

Speaker: Then then why? Why not just true it up? Why do we need the budget now?

Speaker: We're planning for just one fiscal year. Yes, we've talked about years out for pcef funding, but in the budget next year's budget is just one year's worth of funding for the bureaus. You're talking about. When we go back for fiscal year 25, 26, we're going to have similar conversations with the bureaus about their next year's budget, their next year's costs. So we're always aware that we're planning we projected out what, five years we're going to be. But the reality is we actually talk about programing the budget. This is the question commissioner yu asked. The difference between the psa funds and the budgeting process. The budgeting process is going to dictate the costs associated with the programs, and we have to match those up with the revenues. So we're talking about hypotheticals here when we really aren't going to address the issue until next fiscal year's budget process, when we'll determine the cost of that 7 million plus inflation. And we'll have to we'll have to adjust the piece of revenues because we've committed those dollars, or you're going to potentially commit them now. But we haven't determined what the actual costs are. This is our dilemma here that we have that you're planning for future years out. But really this budget process is just for next fiscal year.

Speaker: And this budget note does not seek to obligate additional future pcef. This is about not creating a structural gap in out years by the swap. Pcf doesn't index over time the way general fund does. So what this does is it says for purposes of cal adjustment, pretend like this is general fund. So cal goes up appropriately, but it doesn't ask for future pcf, nor is it a new program for which we would be using the administrative aspect of that. This is seeking not again to create a diminishing buying power because we changed the source of funds.

Speaker: I have a false question. What mayor Wheeler is getting at. So how would the administrative component solve for the inflationary component? I'm not quite getting why that's a solution to that. The potential administrative component to pcef allocations. I'm not quite following how that addresses the inflationary concerns that are at the basis for, I think, this budgetary note. I think it all comes back to what is the source it if you want to continue this work at the levels they had planned, and we know there's inflationary impacts coming, then what is the source of revenue?

Speaker: Essentially that covers those. That's all we're really talking about. I don't I think there's again, you know, the options are I think pcef existing parks general fund, which maybe is what the mayor was getting at for his point about the administrative, charges or, or additional general fund through this cao process. Those are the broad strokes. Those are the options for how to deal with it. I think the I don't know that there's a right answer. It's a policy choice for you all to make.

Speaker: Mayor Wheeler, I guess the question is to you. I just want to make sure I'm drawing the dot, connecting the dots. When you brought up the potential administrative component for a pcef allocation, i, I'm not necessarily connecting the dots. Why that addresses how that would address the inflationary concern.

Speaker: I don't know how this is landing on my lap, but, I'm not tracking. And so we'll go all the way back if, if you want me to lead this discussion here. So I'd lead it. Let's go back. It feels like we're grasping victory from the jaws of victory. \$65 million has been allocated by pcef to the parks bureau to run a tree program. I believe there is overhead associated with that. Although a subject matter, experts can't tell me whether that is true or not. So we'll put that to the side for the moment. Although I believe it is there. So now the question is, sonia says, is the next fiscal year in the next fiscal year, there's carry forward, there are vacancies, I believe, in this bureau, are there not? Yes. How many?

Speaker: See all the □s now coming up as we dig deeper into parks.

Speaker: Who's I believe me, I don't want to go here, but you're not speaking. I was asked, so do we have vacancies in the parks bureau?

Speaker: I, todd lofgren, vibrant community support services. And so at the parks bureau with parks levy, we expend all of the general fund resources each year because the parks levy is an additive resource to enhance services. And so while we might have a vacancy in a year, all of the general fund resources are expended each fiscal year. There is no carry over unless there's a project, for instance, a contract that's encumbered\$ you are representing to this council that there are no vacancies.

Speaker: Is that what I'm.

Speaker: No, we may have vacancies.

Speaker: That's what I'm asking. There are any vacancies.

Speaker: There are no savings from those vacancies because we will expend all of those resources on our parks operating budget. About one third of it is paid by parks levy. But two thirds is general fund. Just wait, I hear you. And then, if you use the general fund that we have to pay for this cal adjustment, it'll be a reduction in

services somewhere else. So next year we do have reserves from the parks levy to pay for our our proposed budget that you propose. So we don't have any layoffs in this next year, the fifth year of the parks levy, we will have expended all of the parks levy resources. And so we do have a multi year gap closing effort that we're going to need to get to land a balanced budget in the for the fifth year of the parks levy. So when we start saying let's take more general fund to pay for this inflationary cost, which is existing already, the urban forestry program, which is \$7 million a year, we're swapping out pcef into those dollars that already has cal on it.

Speaker: Is this \$7 million include any administration or overhead?

Speaker: It's everything in the urban forestry program. Yes. Okay.

Speaker: That is cover the inflationary today.

Speaker: If that was general fund not in the proposed budget that you have but state general fund, it has cal that goes with it.

Speaker: So the answer is yes.

Speaker: That's right. But we lose that when it becomes pcef.

Speaker: Okay. No

Speaker: So we're talking about the inflation on 7 million. Is that correct.

Speaker: That's right.

Speaker: 7 million a year okay.

Speaker: We burned more staff time discussing this than we're actually going to save. I think i'll just ask one more question and it goes to you, ruth, I'm sorry to put you on the spot. Is this the fiscally responsible thing for us to do? I'll take your advice.

Speaker: I, I will say I don't think that. I'm not sure it's a matter of fiscal responsibility. I think it is just a choice about where the resources is come from. I think that, we I mean, I think our cbo will continue to work with the pcef team on

how to ensure that inflation is fully accounted for in all of the pcef allocations. That is required and that is fiscally responsible, I think whether in this case it is general fund or pcef for this amount of money is, I don't know what the, service level impacts will be one way or another from you know, it depends on what the reductions in general fund are in the coming couple of fiscal years and what, you know, the, the how the pcef resources get allocated, I think regards this. We need to account for inflation. I don't think from a fiscal responsibility standpoint, it frankly matters whether this comes from the general fund or from pcef. I what's the case to not have it come from pcef mayor are we can I be as direct as possible?

Speaker: We don't see a reason why it won't come from pcef.

Speaker: We'd be happy to have it.

Speaker: Yeah, I don't, I don't we don't know where this is from. My, our side. We always anticipated every fiscal year working with having this argument. Exactly I don't know that's that's why I came in.

Speaker: I was maybe I just missed something earlier. Commissioner Mapps, I'll just say a minute ago, I said I wasn't going to ask for any special treatment for pbot. Although we find ourselves in a fairly similar position. But, you know, since we've been having this discussion, I've had both pbot and bts reach out to me and say, we essentially have the same problem to the tune of about \$1 million over five years for both of those bureaus. So you know, frankly, if I read the room and go, this thing is likely to pass, you know, probably before we're done today, I would introduce a parallel amendment for bts and pbot and housing or housing.

Speaker: An alternative could be on that.

Speaker: I just so I'll be honest with you right now, I don't support this.

Speaker: I think there are other strategies that are available and I don't see why we would lock a future City Council into only one of multiple strategies that are

available to absorb inflation. Why would we do that, given that there are multiple bureaus experiencing this dynamic?

Speaker: I wonder if a more general budget note might be more appropriate that could speak to, or that could direct staff to work together to account for inflation from any source, most probably pcef or general fund, but which acknowledges the structural gap that is created by the swaps and directs us to figure out how not to have it have a service level impact.

Speaker: And apologies if this I mean, i, I mean, i'll defer to ruth on this one too. But throughout this whole process, when we were working with bureaus, we were solving for next fiscal year, right? We understood there was a five year projection, but we had to get this budget right first. There was never any commitments of the following years because we don't have those details yet. We don't understand cal adjustments, inflation, etc. So I think it's appropriate to say that regardless of the bureau, the funding source of pcef will address inflation. That's that's always been our working assumption. And I apologize to your bureaus, commissioner, if that wasn't clear. But I think that's been our expectation because we know costs evolve.

Speaker: Well, I mean, that could be the amended budget now, right? You know, I mean, to your point, we make this broader and you're getting a multi year award from, pcef. It's the expectation of this council that, you know, those awards will be adjusted annually, to reflect inflation. And if not, then we've got to find another solution to the problem. But I'd love it if it comes from pcef. That sounds great to me. I mean, that's, and then we treat all the bureaus that are impacted by multi year awards the same. It's not unique to, parks.

Speaker: If I might offer one suggestion. I mean, I think honestly the, numbers in the pcef awards were, were obviously not based on very, minute, calculations about exactly how much something was going to cost in each fiscal year. \$100 million isn't

by chance that it came out to \$100 million for a very specific plant, so I might suggest that, you know, the pcef that there if you're going to submit an updated budget, note that it directs, you know, the bureau's to work with the pcef team and the city budget office to update the totals based on their actual program expenditures over the course of the five year window, including inflation, even, and that may not mean it equals out to exactly \$100 million. And but I mean, I think if you're comfortable, donny, with it's going to be plus or minus some small amount, then I think that would be the most sort of logical way to solve the problem.

Speaker: Colleagues, I'd like to, suggest that I'd like to forward an amendment that basically says that, i.

Speaker: Second, thank you. I'm open to it.

Speaker: I mean, I am, too I mean, special treatment.

Speaker: We wanted eyes wide open. That's why we're having this conversation.

Speaker: Maybe we can have the i.

Speaker: How do I say suggestion?

Speaker: So we have a number of other amendments to still go through.

Speaker: Why don't you draft something?

Speaker: I was going to actually put it off onto somebody else. Perfect this is my idea. That's good, I think that if you could have if you or somebody on your staff could put into writing that simple thing, we could then have the commissioner offer a substitute council could vote to substitute it, and then we could move forward on that. That'd be great with me.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Great.

Speaker: It's good. All right, so we'll come back to, we'll come back to Ryan three. We'll move on to Ryan as Ryan four. I'm sorry. Correct. Dan. Thank you, we'll come

back to Ryan four. We'll move on to Ryan five. Okay colleagues, the next two amendments are more about policy decisions than actual dollar dollars associated with them.

Speaker: For months, I've been in conversation with the mayor that park rangers are an integral part of the first responder system. As such, they should have been outside of the 5% cal reduction. I understand that it's late in the process for this budget. If you support amendment five indicating policy direction that rangers are part of the first responder system, parks is willing to pull amendment six and parks will cover the cost this year. But first, I would be the one pulling the amendment. By the way. Not parks. But parks will cover the cost of this year. But first, I'd like to call vincent harrison up to talk about about the rangers on their part of the first responder system. And, vincent, are you still here? Yes. Oh, you're already up. They're already here. It's so good to see you. Thanks for being here. And your name for the record and title, please. Vicente harrison, health safety emergency manager with the vibrant community service area, thank you again. City Council, mayor Wheeler, so Portland park rangers are our vibrant community public safety ambassador. They play a crucial role in welcoming Portland citizens into our city parks and are responsible for educating and enforcing title 20 code in our city parks and facilities. Our program focus areas are community safety, resource protection, and community engagement to support our city core and service area values. These areas help us emphasize not only tangible, but intangible experiences of Portland citizens and visitors in our city parks. Some of those programs are summer free for all, work with office violence prevention, the leave no trace center for outdoor ethics and neighborhood association meetings that we regularly attend. And our program thrives to uphold our core values of collaboration. The city core values of collaboration and communication as an example of this

collaboration, most recently, it was with the city of Portland's community safety team and conjunction with Portland police bureau, Multnomah County and the sheriff's office. Oregon state police pbem Portland fire and rescue, as well as a host of other outreach partnerships. In response to the Portland fentanyl declared emergency with our daily rapid needs assessment task force, some standout statistics from our program during this time frame. In the 90 day fentanyl emergency, there were 7442 downtown out of hours park visits, 7442 park visits while still responding to 1146 citywide calls for service. Within this 90 day period, there were two narcan reversals. Those are saving the lives of individuals affected by this crisis. Three reversals outside of that 90 days happened this week alone in pettygrove park and two in waterfront park, as well as the north park blocks. Excuse me, one in pettygrove, one in waterfront, one in the north park blocks. These. There's been over 12, narcan saves in the past ten months. Park rangers have referred 177 during this 9890 day period to shelter referrals and have made two treatment referrals in the collaboration of the fentanyl emergency crisis, task force assessment. Our security leadership works directly with the street service coordination center and city outreach teams to coordinate outreach efforts in our parks. Collaboration with Portland fire and wildfire hazard response zones, and assessments with mitigation outreach services is critical in our natural spaces. Recent collaboration includes Portland fire and rescue, wildlife wildfire preparedness weekend, others that were involved in this was Portland fire, Oregon state fire marshals, Oregon department fish game and wildlife, forest park conservancy, as well as others. Finally, we've established a strong partnership with Portland police bureau, engaging in regular strategic meetings with their command staff to effectively coordinate public safety response to demonstration activities. Both downtown and citywide. This collaboration effort has provided us with

valuable insight on how to effectively use utilize our combined resources to better serve the community and enhance public safety throughout the city. So with that being said, these proposed cuts would impact our ability to respond to these needs that our city wide. And, I will leave it there and turn it over to my colleagues, parks, service everything down.

Speaker: I think he covered the programs.

Speaker: Since you have a question, commissioner Mapps.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: You just referenced cuts, which cuts are we talking about in this space? Sure.

Speaker: Maybe I can talk to that, so the 5% general fund cut across the board for all general fund bureaus, for parks, that's about \$4.6 million, the park ranger program is a little over \$7 million. And so the allocation is about a \$375,000 cut to the parks budget, commissioner Ryan's directed us to make sure that in this next year that we aren't reducing services in the park ranger budget. And that's what's in the mayor's proposed as well. However, that's an ongoing general fund cut. And as I mentioned earlier, when we go out one more year with the parks levy, we'll have expended all of our resources. So we're really moving into a multi year gap closing effort to reduce expenses or to find new places of revenue to have a balanced budget. And two years out in the parks budget, that's where we are.

Speaker: So could I jump in on that for just a second? I and I first of all, I don't very often get an opportunity to thank our park rangers for the incredible work they do and I see you out there. I see you talking to people. I see you giving assistance to visitors and others in the community, and I really appreciate it. I just want you to know, i, I think you're you're amongst our many, many very, very much valued employees in this city. So I want to start by saying that. Thank you. Mayor. So keep

up the good work. And if you could pass that on to your team, I think you're really doing phenomenal work, I was quite intentional in this year's budget, in the proposed in preserving all of the general fund park ranger positions. There are 31 positions that are funded. There were four that were not. The four that were not were not funded with the general fund. They were funded with arpa dollars. And it was clear from the get go that those dollars and those positions would go away. And they did. And so and I've had many good conversations with commissioner Ryan about the value of our park ranger program, there, there in the parks there, the eyes on the parks, they're often the ones who call fire or call police if there's somebody, in distress or if there's an emergency or if there's a law broken, and that's valuable. What I thought might come forward is a proposal to fund the four positions that were expiring, along with arpa, but what I think I'm reading here is this is an effort ongoing to reduce the exposure to proposed future mayors constraint reductions. And I want to be a little careful with that, because I picked the bureaus that I wanted to exempt from the 5% constraint very carefully because we had we knew we had a bad budget year. So we picked police, we picked fire, and we picked 911. The bureau of emergency communications. And we had some really tough conversations in my office because we excluded others. We excluded the bureau of emergency management. We heard testimony earlier today. They're an important bureau, and the people who are there doing incredibly hard and impressive work, we, also excluded the community safety division. And obviously I'm 100% committed to the community safety division, but it was excluded from that protection that was given to those other bureaus. And so my concern is, if we come in here and say, hey, in future years, we're going to hold the park rangers harmless. And I'd love to be able to do that. Frankly, the next question is going to be, well, what about emergency management? What about community safety

division? And so, you know, and there's one other just sort of I'll put this as a footnote, I was very explicit when we allocated the arpa dollars that it would be unfun when those arpa dollars went away. And we made it clear that all of the positions that we were expanding were subject to elimination. When the arpa dollars expired, that was explicitly stated. So I just want to be very clear about that. It's not fun. I don't appreciate it, don't like it. But we were very, very clear about what our budgeting procedures were at that time. That's that's my rant.

Speaker: Just so I can can I do a little bit of level setting commissioner Mapps, this is again, a little bit confusing, to me, when commissioner Ryan described this, amendment, it sounded like he was talking about policy, and in that what we're being asked to vote on is to essentially reclassify the park rangers as a first responder, organization, if I understand, if I remember what commissioner Ryan, similar to Portland street response within fire. Oh, all right. And although the presentation that I've heard today seems to be really focused on budgets and cuts and whatnot, and then we have the reality on the ground. I think if I remember the budget correctly, this fiscal year, we have 30, park rangers. I think the mayor's proposing 31 park rangers for the next fiscal year. So I'm having a hard time figuring out the where the cuts, commissioner Ryan, where when we talk about cuts of this. So, number one, should we be talking about cuts if this is really about a policy space.

Speaker: Yeah, that's I started off by saying this is a policy conversation. And the next one is about the money. So it is about truing up that this is a first responder system. And it should have. And going forward it would not be under it would be treated as such.

Speaker: Okay, thank you, for that, and actually, I should know this, but I've been removed from boec for a while, well, first, before I ask my question, I want to echo

what the mayor said about the good work that the park rangers do. I'll tell you, when we had the protest over at psu, I watched some video of how that all unfolded, especially in the park space. And I will tell you, your teams did really great, just one of those moments. I'm really proud to, work with and for the city of Portland, at the same time, I'm thinking back to my boec days. And I'm trying to remember if we dispatch, park rangers through 911 commissioner Gonzalez. Do you know the answer to that?

Speaker: The answer is generally no, I have to think about exceptions, but, they essentially have you all have.

Speaker: I think vicente probably knows them.

Speaker: Yeah. So we do. We are part of the 911 system when there's things that don't rise to the level of police. We are dispatched through. Boec. They contact us over radio or directly to our emergency management line to facilitate those resources.

Speaker: Yeah. There might be some nuances in the difference between how rangers and others are dispatched, but they're part of the system. There's no two ways about it. It's just the way a call gets processed and it would get allocated to them as a little different. Sure.

Speaker: And as long as we're, dialoging, you know, especially since you're the commissioner in charge of public safety, how do you think about the policy shift from park rangers as occupying whatever space they occupy now to, occupy switching them over to, to thinking of them and classifying them as a first responders, any sort of what nuances should we be thinking about in this space? Well, I think first responder versus part of public safety are kind of two different questions.

Speaker: And I appreciate mayor Wheeler speaking to pbem pbem had a really tough budget cycle. This this cycle. No two ways about it. They they were not held harmless the same way fire, police and boec were, and that's going to be painful. That's going to impact our community's resilience, in the coming years, no. Two ways about it, pbem and park rangers, from my vantage point, are part of public safety. And in, in many respects, as first responders. That's it's depends on how you, you know, define that that term. You know, it's pbem. It spends a lot of time planning for emergencies. So there's a lot of their work that's not right in the moment, but then emergencies declared and they are an extremely important front line bureau. Right? I mean, in supporting the mayor or whoever's in charge of the declaration. So it's, in park rangers, you know, Portland state's a perfect example. They were doing some of the hard work of clearing parks and, you know, in a tough situation. So I guess it depends. I certainly see deem them part of public safety, both, and, and, whether they meet the definition of a first responder, you know, I don't know, I don't have a black and white answer there, but we are absolutely getting into kind of the edge of you know, a real policy discussion about, you know, how far we go to protect those who protect us and, and so I don't i, I'm not sure I'm answering your question, but I do think this is a policy issue for us is how far we want to define that protection.

Speaker: Well, I'm going to, i'll take your, thinking in this space seriously, because of the unique responsibilities you have on this council and commissioner Ryan has kind of called the questions we're going to have to vote here in a couple of minutes on where we're going to go with this. Do you have a sense of how you're going to vote on this particular one?

Speaker: Well, I still have questions on five a little bit, because I'm not sure I 100% understand the mechanics of it. So the I get conceptually, we're trying to line up

park rangers big picture with the way we treated, like Portland fire response. The I'm just I'm sorry, I have to reread the language again just to make sure I'm understanding the direction for cal for future years. So yeah, maybe could give me the baby steps on the mechanics. Sure.

Speaker: So, in some ways not dissimilar from the previous conversation we just had, it directs the city economist to add \$375,298 into cal for beginning in 2526, so essentially it's, or the park rangers, into the we don't do it sort of at that subprogram level. We just do it for Portland park. So it would just, I mean, that's a decision for the bureau, but it's not specifically reserved for the park rangers. No it's not I mean, not not mechanically through the way we do. Cal. No it just goes into the line for Portland parks and recreation. It just gets added. And then going forward, that would be added to their to their base of, if somebody can tell me the parks gcf base, I don't know, roughly \$80 million, roughly, so, that it just gets added and it would be in there. Ongoing from there. So I'm not trying to interpret what you just said.

Speaker: Make sure I got this right. Let's say the parks budget was 100 million. For a second. They took a 5% cut. That includes the 100 million includes includes the cost of park rangers. So while we essentially held harmless the 30 or 31, I've kind of lost track of what? The 31. He's got it down to 31 positions, in that scenario, parks was still dealing with the \$5 million cut, correct? Yeah

Speaker: To cal their their cut in 2425 of general fund was roughly \$4 million a little more, 0.4.6. That number they've got and rounded up, so, so yes. So and that sort of and this calculation is basically backing out and saying, well, imagine for a second you had taken the park rangers out of that calculation, right of that of the roughly \$80 million that gave us that \$4.6 million constraint amount, then they would have gotten \$375,000 more in 2425.

Speaker: This is similar to the other conversation, right? This is it.

Speaker: Similar mechanism? Yes. It a little less convoluted because it doesn't require calculating inflation. But, yes.

Speaker: I hate to be giving parks so much stuff in one thing, but I get the logic of it at least. I mean, I get it, you're trying to protect those park ranger positions and. Well, let me be clear. Let me be clear. So you're trying to protect the appropriation associated with those 31 park ranger positions into future years. If you don't do the 375, it's really impacting parks as a whole. But but it's to reflect protecting the 31 park rangers.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: To the to the mayor's point, his proposed budget saves. Actually, we're not proposing any layoffs in the next fiscal year, but the fiscal year after that, we will be looking at reductions because the parks levy will be fully expended. That year.

Speaker: I find this to be a very interesting question.

Speaker: And, and this space of what's, first responder bureau or program, versus a regular public safety program, I think has important implications. I think about this a lot in the context of, psr. And I think I don't know if there's a wrong way to answer this or even a right way to answer this, but, you know, I do think there are implications for the choices that we make. So, for example, if parks is a first responder bureau, I kind of think, or if the park rangers are a first responder bureau, I kind of think that, it should be part of the community safety division and be overseen by the folks who are kind of pulling together and managing that, you know, police, fire, psr and whatnot, you know, if we're actually trying to build a coherent continuum of services, in this space, it seems a bit odd that we would have a public safety bureau, a public safety agency, which is actually not looped into, looped into, and managed by the commissioner in charge of, our public safety

bureaus somewhere our labor relations people are spinning, we should be very careful about what we're treading on. On areas of labor. Manager isn't that a lot of people care very, very deeply about. And we've spent a lot of time in these discussions as as we, created Portland street response, as we talked about the expansion of the park ranger program, the creation and expansion of the ps three program, I just want to be mindful that as we're discussing these things up here, we're sort of putting that aside for a moment, right.

Speaker: So, commissioner Ryan, help me understand the stakes here. So if we say Portland, of the park rangers are first responder bureau, but it's not managed by the commissioner of public safety. What are the. And this is not really about budget issues. What's at stake with this amendment?

Speaker: Commissioners, colleagues, since I've been a member of this body, we've had a lot of challenges collaborating amongst our first responder bureaus. We've come a long way. Sure and we have a chance to build the best first responder system in the country. If we continue to lean into this, all in collaboration, like Portland street response, the rangers show up unarmed. They often are. The de-escalation folks. They often handle things so that calls don't need to go from the public directly to 911. They attend the meetings. Now they're part of the system over the last couple of years. That's really accelerated. Thank you for your leadership and experiencing that from this group of people, hearing from others in public safety, how much they appreciate the fact that they are collaborative in this space. I think it's really wise for us to continue to build that momentum so that we have different first responders for different situations. And I just want to thank the rangers for the many, many instances that you deal with that aren't reported and how you constantly are the ones that report not just into the public safety system, but also to the homeless response system. You're one of the largest, agencies are

work teams that do first responder work, for those who are homeless as well. And so I'm lifting them at this time, and I thought that they were left out of being saved from the cuts. And that's the dialog that I've been having with the mayor. It's a little bit out of the box, but that's why we're here right now is to continue to be innovative, how we keep building the best first responder system in the country. And I think the rangers are part of that.

Speaker: I hear those words and I appreciate it. And I also heard the word cut. But one of the things I'm trying to square there is, I think we have 30 park rangers now. The mayor is proposing. Well, are you're proposing 31?

Speaker: I think we are funding all of the park ranger positions that are currently funded short. The four that were arpa funded that expired.

Speaker: Okay. So I guess the cut piece here is part of what's confusing me and I and frankly, with this amendment and the amendment, what we just heard before, it seems like, parks is frankly kind of posturing around some budget strategy as opposed to doing a great job of having innovative dialog with all of us right now, I think a couple of years ago might benefit from the last conversation we had.

Speaker: We're not looking for special treatment. That's a very offensive word. This is about best practices that do not having our eyes wide open as we keep building forward. And I just think these public safety ambassadors should be treated with the respect to be a part of that system is all similar to that Portland street response.

Speaker: And just to be clear, when you're referring to Portland street response, you're referring to the ongoing stabilization of the program that was received in the mayor's proposal that we swapped out. Yeah, they were, well, i, I'm on that. Yeah. I mean, I'm, I get conceptually what you're saying. I'm not sure it quite played out as saved, but they were they were given assurances of an ongoing, going forward. And, mayor, i, you know, I haven't really focused on the direction you gave in your

budget on the 31 positions is not my bureau. And, you know, I so i, can you provide any other color than. You're absolutely. On what?

Speaker: Yeah. Yeah, 100. Thank thank you for asking. So this falls under the general category of elections have consequences. I made a decision to prioritize public safety in this budget. I did not have the resources to prioritize all of public safety. We made some tough decisions. So police fire our 911 emergency response systems. They were all excluded from the 5% constraint during the budget process. We also chose to support the Portland street response program and its larger pilot format. In other words, they got exactly the same funding they got last year. Plus, we added a little bit of extra anticipating growth and costs between now and the end of the fiscal year. And for those positions that were not ongoing, we swapped out one time for ongoing resources, there were obviously, you know, there's pages and pages of other things that are included there, but basically the constraint was 5% for all of those bureaus, excluding the three that I mentioned. That was that was the overall guidance. There there was more to it. But that's well, in my really precise question was about park rangers, how they fit into that.

Speaker: So it was part of a bureau that took a 5% cut. But there yes, the parks bureau is still the general fund portion of the parks bureau.

Speaker: The non-levy portion was still subjected to the 5% constraint, but I chose in the proposed budget to hold harmless the park ranger program, specifically less the four positions that were actually funded through arpa. And that was my decision. A mayor next year could make a very different decision, and I acknowledge that. I mean, that's that's just the way it is different, different elected officials will have different priorities. That's democracy.

Speaker: Did you want to.

Speaker: Well, yeah. This is a little tangly, the park ranger program was not cut in the mayor's proposed, but the park ranger budget was included in the base on which the constraint was calculated.

Speaker: That is correct.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: So we are able then to backfill the general \$4.5 million cut with levy. So there will not be a service level impact in the ranger program next year. But we will have less levy money next year. And the following, the more we pull forward to backfill general fund, the less we have. So those are the mechanics of how it hits. And what you're flagging is the originating policy question or position that drew the circle around. Police fire 911, but not rangers.

Speaker: Colleagues, it's getting late, in the day, and I know we've had some people waiting very patiently, I'll just lay my cards on the table for this amendment and the next amendment. I'm going to vote no on this amendment, although substantively, there's some interesting questions or opportunities that are maybe raised here. But one of the reasons why I'm going to vote no is because, Ryan, amendment six, I believe, proposes how to basically builds off the amendment before us. And that amendment proposes to pull dollars out of the programs that we use, the dollars that we use to manage our houseless problem in order to hire, park rangers. That, I am frankly kind of mystified by that. I tell you, I've been in this room since 830 this morning, and I've had, members of the media reaching out to me all day wanting to get my understanding of what commissioner Ryan is trying to do in this space. And I don't understand, why, these particular choices, would be made given the challenges that we face on the street. Love the park ranger program. You know, if you come, with a proposal to actually increase funding, for the park ranger program, in most cases, I would actually support it. Certainly, I'm

not going to support pulling dollars out of urp in order to do that, which is why I'm going to be a no on this, and I will be a no on the next one.

Speaker: Well, we will I will be pulling the last one if this one passes. Okay. Well thought I would remind you of that. All right. So there's no need okay.

Speaker: So and don't let me forget to go back to the substitute on for. But do we have further discussion on Ryan five, commissioner, I just want to say I'm going to be supportive of it because I think it reflects the concept of protecting those 31 park rangers.

Speaker: It is complicated because within this budget, it feels like, though things are fungible. But I think five is consistent with the spirit of what you were attempting to do in the proposed and protecting the 31 positions, I don't know where I sit on six. I haven't gotten that far, but I'm good with five.

Speaker: All right. Please call the roll on amendment five. Ryan. Five.

Speaker: Yes, hi. Thank you for this great conversation. It was much needed.

Speaker: I know, yea. Rubio, I just want to say I really support it, the rangers, I think they do excellent work. I was so honored to get to work with them in my first two years, I fully support there being considered as part of the public safety, responder system, I do believe in that deeply. I wish that we had the opportunity to have more of a dialog about what those roles and responsibilities look like, or that this this was split into policy and then budget. So I'm still very open to that. But for today, since we're being forced to vote today, I don't feel ready that I know all the pieces, but I'm very interested in supporting and getting there. So I vote no Wheeler.

Speaker: One of the reasons that I supported the park ranger program specifically in the proposed budget, is the work is very, very difficult. Not only are you and your teams, the ones who are out there early in the morning and potentially late in the evening and enforcing our codes, which need to be enforced, and people aren't

always very nice about it. When codes are enforced. And sometimes those of us who work inside for the most part forget that you're out there in Portland, Oregon, when it's really, really hot. When it's really, really cold and everything in between. Thank lots of rain. And, I support that, this amendment falls short, however, of what I think is proposed. It could potentially protect the park ranger program going forward or not. And that's the problem with it is, again, it gets down to the choice of the proposed budget, whether or not that additional general fund support it goes to the rangers program or some other priority. It's not baked in. I'm also mindful of the fact that if we support this, then we're going to have some explaining to do to the community safety division, as well as the office of emergency management. And I guarantee you that both of those divisions do equally important and often very taxing work on behalf of the people of this community. And again, it was my choice during this proposed budget to fund the park rangers program. But on this amendment, given that it is a forward looking, budgetary item, given that it potentially ties the hands of future decision makers, I vote no in the amendment fails to. Ryan six.

Speaker: Yes, I will pull that. I'm glad we had a conversation about the rangers. This is a marathon and we will continue that dialog. And I'm proud that we spent some time on it today. Thank you so much for being here today. And to all the park rangers, for being a part of the first responder system and showing up. And commissioner and I will pull number six, without objection, thank you for bringing it forward, because this isn't a conversation we've had. And it's been a really good one. And and, I appreciate that. So thank you. Substitute for do we have really close it really close. Why don't we take a couple of minute break. Is that okay?

Speaker: How about we vote on Ryan maps? Ryan. Yeah.

Speaker: Can we get the other one done?

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Yes, I missed one. I'm sorry. Got maps.

Speaker: Right. It'll be quick.

Speaker: Oh, I apologize, yeah. Yeah we have the six is pulled, I forgot about maps. Ryan this is the lgbtqia to plus program, any further questions or discussions ?

Speaker: Colleagues, i'll just point out we're just restoring a position that was cut, and the mayor has proposed a two person program. One was a temporary position. We're going to restore that temporary position for one more year. And I very much appreciate, commissioner Ryan's, collaboration and support on this one.

Speaker: Good. And i'll just say, the reason it was eliminated was it was a limited term position, and I got rid of all the limited term positions per guidance. And, I know this is important to my colleagues, so I will be supportive of it. Thank you. Sir. Any further discussion on maps? Ryan one seeing none. Please call the roll.

Speaker: Yeah. I'm excited to support this. I wish it was a one time only, but we'll be able to tackle that hopefully soon.

Speaker: I vote i, I the amendment passes and, how much more time do you think you need linly.

Speaker: Five minutes. Five minutes. Okay. Why don't we take a break till 5:00? Straight up. And we'll we'll come back. We're in recess. For one. Point no.

Speaker: One. Point one. One point. One. One. One. One. One. One. One. One. One. One. No. No one. One. One. One. One. One. One. One. One. One one. One one. One one. One. One. One. One. Is the Portland City Council.

Speaker: And I believe where we left off is. We were looking at Ryan for possibility of an amendment or a substitute, mr. Mayor, I think I might be on point on this one. I think the clerk has a copy, a draft of the proposed amendment that was going to be thrown up on the screen, and, this reflects the conversation that we had earlier,

commissioner Ryan, you and i, and council need to decide how we want to proceed here, I believe, according to staff, we could treat this as a friendly amendment. Or you also could pull your amendment, and we could swap in this one. Do you have a preference in terms of how you want to proceed?

Speaker: I'm reading it with all of us at this moment. Okay. And I'm just pleased that, again, there was no special treatment with that. We were just wanted to have our eyes wide open for the future. And so it's great that you're welcoming that and you're joining this process. Great.

Speaker: Commissioner Mapps so i'll interpret that.

Speaker: And so that will probably be if I like this, it'll be Ryan and maps one. Right. Because it's still the same one. Right i'll defer to the i'll defer i'll defer to biko taylor in terms of how we should frame kind of getting used to it.

Speaker: But yeah, I think it's fine, but it would probably be Ryan and maps two, since there already is a Ryan and maps one.

Speaker: Mr. Yea. Rubio, would you want in on this one? No, it's all right. It'll be out, can I ask a question about it, or is it ready? Are we ready? Yeah. Go ahead.

Speaker: Yeah. Ask a question.

Speaker: Why do we need to address one time for inflationary factor? I'm looking at the sense is includes general fund discretionary resources both ongoing. One time is being swapped out.

Speaker: We could strike that. That's fine.

Speaker: Okay. Catch I propose unless I'm missing something, I propose that being struck.

Speaker: I don't think inflationary factor plays a role in one time.

Speaker: That's fine. Do we have to do that as a formal thing or can we, that looks like a scrivener's error to me.

Speaker: Go ahead and just erase it.

Speaker: It hasn't been read, okay.

Speaker: It it hasn't been introduced yet. Really. So or it hasn't been moved.

Speaker: All right, and by wordsmith it on the go and then we'll introduce it.

Speaker: I mean, I'm, I'm just generally speaking out loud. Is anyone see a problem with that because. Okay that's fine. I think you're right, okay. Commissioner Ryan, do you want or I see the clerk looking pensive.

Speaker: What's up?

Speaker: I'm just going to ask which part should be struck, in line to strike the.

Speaker: And one time.

Speaker: Thank you as well for the word both.

Speaker: Yeah. And both. There we go.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: And then I had a question about the last sentence in that paragraph. What's that trying to address. Is that to budgetary law or is that.

Speaker: No, no it's just a 1% was sort of on the fly. Honestly. It's just to say the exact number may be different from the actual allocation because we are programing large amounts of dollars and we are including inflation. And so this is just recognizing that there's a little wiggle room in the exact number. You don't have to make your dollars add up to exactly 100 million, but don't it's not this isn't like carte blanche to ask for tons more money. It's just to say we're just recognizing things are changing a little bit, it may end up that they program out to exactly \$100 million, or it may end up that that it's, slightly more because now they've realized they've accounted for inflation. It's just, a little wiggle room.

Speaker: But just so I'm clear, 1% is so much lower than anticipated inflation. Could that sentence be misconstrued to inadvertently put a cap on the inflationary factor? I'm just trying to be what is the 1, I guess, or what budget does it apply?

Speaker: It could be misconstrued because our team did, but I don't read it to cap the inflation. No, I read it to cap the underlying scope of what we're funding. And I think if programs wanted to propose additional investment, they would do it separately through the budget process.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: So it's sort of like the baseline budget may be adjusted like on rounding or what are the factors that are adjusting that baseline budget, I mean, I think inflation, but also just frankly, once you go to build a budget, you know, it's different than putting a proposal together, right? So it's just recognizing we're going from the proposal phase where bureaus said this is what we can do and this is how much we need to do it. And there were varying levels of detail baked into those proposals, nils and in some cases, bureaus are working on developing that detail right now. And in, in conjunction with the pcf staff. And this is just to say, come back with your full list with with those details. And that may mean it'll change a little bit. I think if your point is they should get more than 1% above what they were allocated, I don't know, maybe we could add a roughly. It's not it's not really intent. It's just intended to convey this isn't an opening to ask for a ton more money for anything.

Speaker: So you're and just so, so, I hope I'm not over wordsmithing this, but. So the prior census for all boroughs receiving pcf for multiple years should provide the pcef team cbo with details of the programmatic expenditures, and I'm going to skip the rest of that. So when we say the total budget, are we talking about the programmatic expenditures or what is the total budget in the final sentence mean? What's that referring to?

Speaker: The, the total budget for the program. That's is funded with the pcf dollar. So in the case that we were just talking about it would be the, the, sorry, urban forestry, program and what, what is all included in there and when you're looking at it over a five year time horizon, you would say, this is the amount we've calculated for inflation over that five year time horizon. So that would be one of the items.

Speaker: But although this mostly accounts for where an investment has been proposed or made and the programmatic building is not complete, still needs to be done. That does not apply here. We have an ongoing fully built out program for parks in our case, but this is broader and including for new investments where the work is not yet fully programed. So I think you're just trying to draw a circle around accounting for inflation does not open the door to doubling the scope and size of the program. Yeah, right.

Speaker: Okay. I again, I just didn't want this to be misconstrued to inadvertently undermine the intent of this entire budget. Note which was to account for inflation. And so, if folks don't feel like that's a risk, then I'm not sure I'm concerned. I just you read the sentence in the by itself, it it could be misinterpreted, I think.

Speaker: Can I ask a question?

Speaker: What happens if we just lose the sentence? Do we? Is this sentence doing any work here that is substantively important?

Speaker: I'm worried about losing the sentence, though. Okay. Shouldn't we just go? I mean, we had staff work on this for a long time. I feel like I don't care linly, if council wants to make the legislative intent clear that that is intended to do what both the staff appear described it, which is essentially a base budget, is probably not the right word, but the programmatic elements and not apply to the inflation factor.

Speaker: I think that's that's adequate. Is that correct, Ruth? Yeah I think I think it is just to say, you can make clear the amount of inflation you're expecting.

Speaker: That may mean that you are asking for more than you are initially allocated, but it shouldn't be a lot more. So I don't again, I if you could add roughly 1% I mean I'm not I'm it's not intended to say people. The point is people don't need to be like counting the pennies on their \$100 million allocation.

Speaker: Right. But I want to be clear.

Speaker: Yeah. Just to be crystal clear, though, inflation is 5% a year. We're talking the program 7 million in year one. Right. So you're talking 350,000 for year one inflation. And then that gets compounded each year. You know over five years you're talking well in excess of 1. So I just want to that that's why I with a fresh set of eyes, I'm just concerned about how that might be misinterpreted.

Speaker: Ruth, I wonder, rather than quantifying and saying 1% whether you want to instead draw a circle around, standard inflation factors as defined by whatever, whatever.

Speaker: Sure. What have you said, exclusive of inflation in that total budget should be within 1% or below the initial pcef allocation amount.

Speaker: That's fine too. Yeah.

Speaker: You're separately calculating inflation. That's going to do what it's going to do. And then you're. Sure

Speaker: Are we ready to move? My colleagues, I'd like to move right on maps two, two. Can I get a second? Second?

Speaker: So, do we want to introduce this as a substitute, or do you want to just add it as an amendment? And then, commissioner Ryan, we can either vote on his amendment or pull it, but we should do one or the other.

Speaker: I like efficiency, as you know. So I think we pull mine. And this evolved to bring along maps on his bureau's to have a similar situation. Please read Ryan. That was all displayed today.

Speaker: Thank you, parks, for providing that intelligence.

Speaker: Yeah. Sorry reed Ryan for please.

Speaker: Is this what we're looking the reed Ryan for the old Ryan for Ryan.

Speaker: The old Ryan for. Please read it. Okay, budget note parks, urban forestry. Pcef inflation. Perfect

Speaker: And you're withdrawing that, correct?

Speaker: Yes. Okay someone will handle it.

Speaker: Now, back to commissioner Mapps. Commissioner Mapps and those that didn't I move, Ryan maps to. May I get a second, second, second.

Speaker: Okay, so, Ryan and maps move. Commissioner Rubio seconds. This is it. Any further discussion, please call the roll.

Speaker: Ryan, I'm so glad we landed here. This is about having our eyes wide open. So that when we make an agreement with the community about doing services for street trees, we won't be cutting those services, in a year, 3 or 4, because we didn't have this conversation. And we didn't plan for the inflationary pressures. Like we do in cal. So this is this is where we are when we combine a new fund into our general operations. We just have to take these extra steps. I really want to thank parks budget team for flagging this and for allowing us to have this really smart conversation today and making it whole I vote yea I vote i, I Rubio I Wheeler love the collaboration.

Speaker: Thank you everybody I vote I and the amendment is adopted.

Commissioner Mapps, did you have another comment? No. Very good colleagues. I'm seeking a motion to approve these updates to the change memo. So moved.

Commissioner Mapps moves. Can I get a second? Second? Commissioner Gonzales, seconds, please call the roll. Ryan. Hi, Gonzales.

Speaker: Hi. Hi, hi.

Speaker: Hi, colleagues. It passes. Colleagues. We will now vote to approve the changes our individual floor amendments have made to attachments b, c, and d. The memo is associated with the budget. This has the effect of incorporating all of the changes so that the approved budget, which we will vote on next, reflects our amendments. Can I get a motion so moved. Commissioner Mapps moves. Can I get a second? Commissioner Gonzales seconds. Any further discussion? Seeing none. Please call the roll. Ryan

Speaker: Hi, Gonzales. Hi.

Speaker: Hi, Rubio.

Speaker: Wheeler. Hi.

Speaker: The motion carries, colleagues. I'm now seeking a motion to approve the budget, as amended. So moved. Commissioner Mapps moves. Can I get a second? Commissioner Ryan seconds. Any further discussion on the approved budget, as amended? Seeing none. Please call the roll. Ryan

Speaker: Yeah? I think I should say something besides eye on this. I just want to pause for a moment and thank the mayor and my colleagues and most of the thousands of city employees who are no doubt very involved in this entire journey. The past months, and it gets to our level. I know that you've all done a lot of work prior to that. So thank you. As a successful budget is one that successfully lines up with community values and needs. And I think we did that today. And we also put out some put out into the dais, some very important innovative conversations that we began today that will continue.

Speaker: I vote yea gonzales, first, I want to thank the truly collaborative efforts made by, in my office, the public safety deputy city administrator mike myers, fire chief Ryan gillespie, boec, director bob cozzie pbem, director shad ahmed.

Speaker: And in addition to the mayor and his team, as we all have recognized, this has been an incredibly tough budget year. I appreciate the mayor and Portlanders for supporting and prioritizing funding for public safety across the board in this year's budget. In public safety, we've been facing some major structural and financial deficits years in the making. This budget doesn't fix all of those problems. Of course, they will take a more concerted focus in future budget years, but it does make meaningful, takes meaningful steps to address them in ways that help carry this important work forward. We've avoided the closure of fire stations. We've avoided brownouts and other reductions in frontline public safety staff that impact emergency response times. When someone's life is literally on the line. We've continued to invest in the employment pipeline across the board, ensuring we have the resources we need to meet and overcome the challenges our first responders and local residents face every day. Now and in the future. We've also funded our alternative response programs at current operational level. Psr in particular with ongoing\$ ensuring no effective cuts, setting them on solid foundation for long term success. As a permanent part of the first responder continuum of care. We've effectively managed to balance the fix of these deeply rooted problems against voters, clear priorities to maintain and improve emergency response times, and restore a sense of safety to our common space. This has been due in no small part to the fact we went into the budget process this year as a unified service area, that the effective balancing of problem solving while maintaining our commitment to addressing the serious challenges currently confronting our city, speaks to the impact and potential our new form of

government can have in making Portland a city that works again, I vote I Mapps I Rubio.

Speaker: I Wheeler I the motion carries colleagues is the budget committee.

Speaker: We must also approve the tax levies. The city shall levy its full permanent rate of \$4 0.5770 per \$1,000 of assessed value, and \$32,589,672 for the payment of voter approved general obligation, bond, principal and interest, and \$243 million \$377,602 for the obligation for fire and police disability and retirement fund, and \$0.08 per \$1,000 of assessed value for the parks local option levy and \$0.4026 per \$1,000 of assessed value for the children's levy.

Speaker: Mayor, I'm.

Speaker: I apologize, but I need to interrupt you, read. Will you please reread the parks local option levy amount?

Speaker: The parks. Point \$8. Right.

Speaker: Correct. You had said .080, I did.

Speaker: Sorry. I'm sorry. It's late in the afternoon. .8000 per \$1,000 of assessed value for the parks local option levy and .4026 per \$1,000 of assessed value for the children's levy. Furthermore, the city shall levy the amounts listed in attachment e for urban renewal collections. I'm seeking a motion to approve the tax levy so moved. Commissioner Mapps moves. Can I get a second second from commissioner gonzales any further discussion, please call the roll.

Speaker: BRyan. Hi, gonzales.

Speaker: Hi.

Speaker: Hi, hi. Hi

Speaker: The, motion carries director levine back to you.

Speaker: All right. Thank you all, now that the budget has been approved by council, the approved budget will be sent to the tax supervising conservation

commission for review. As I said, they have 20 days to review the budget, and then they will conduct a hearing on the approved budget on June 11th at 9:30 a.m. So we will see you back here then. Final budget adoption is Wednesday, June 12th at 2 p.m. Testimony can be received at both of those hearings.

Speaker: Thank you, colleagues, this meeting of the city of Portland budget committee is now adjourned. And Keelan, please read item 391, a report.

Speaker: City Council convenes as prosper Portland budget committee to approve the fy 20 2425 budget.

Speaker: Colleagues, I'm now convening the prosper Portland budget committee for the purpose of approving the fiscal year 20 2425 budget. The prosper Portland budget committee received the proposed budget and conducted a hearing to receive testimony back on may 8th. The budget committee received the approved budget memo and exhibit a to resolution 7531 on may 10th. Now, I am convening the prosper Portland budget committee. Keelan. Please call the roll. Ryan here.

Speaker: Gonzales here.

Speaker: Mapps here.

Speaker: Rubio here.

Speaker: Wheeler here.

Speaker: The approved budget memo and exhibit a corresponds to the proposed budget received by the budget committee on may 3rd, 2024 and presented by prosper Portland staff on may 8th, 2024. Exhibit a to the resolution aligns to the total appropriations included in the approved budget for the city of Portland general fund recreation, cannabis tax, and American rescue plan funds appropriated to prosper Portland. This week, we will vote to approve the report, which approves resolution 7531 as well as exhibit a Keelan. Do we have any public testimony? Oh

Speaker: All right. Question.

Speaker: We do, we have one person. Oh no. Sorry. Three people signed up. Great, first up, santino juarez.

Speaker: Welcome. Thank you for being here. And thanks for your patience. I can go now. And name for the record, if you don't mind, santino. One second. There you go.

Speaker: Good afternoon. Or good evening. Whatever we're on now. My name is, tino. I'm a local carpenter that works in the Portland metro. And I figured since we're in a meeting talking about money and finances, I would love to share with you guys real quickly, if I may, the finances that go on on a regular worker that works here in our area right now, the Portland metro, the minimum wage, as you all know, is \$15.95 an hour. That means that an average worker monthly is making \$4,306 yearly. His annual income can be 51,678. And with the rise of inflation, what a low salary to make a living in the Portland city. I wish I can tell you that in the construction industry that this wage was even better. But I'm here to tell you what I normally see on projects that go on right here in the Portland metro area. I see workers that are working 9 to 11 hours a day. They're getting paid \$100, \$120 cash under the table. That's 720 a week. That's 3240 a month. If you do if you do that annually, that's \$38,880 times that by 20 workers. That's on an average job site. You're looking at \$777,600 of unreported income. And if now if you take that same equation on what minimum wage is supposed to be and what that worker is supposed to get, the difference is 200, \$555,000, 960. If I said that right. And with criminal contractors using a cash payment and under the tables to their advantage, this not only robs the worker of social security workers comps and much needed taxes that go for workers that bid on construction sites. But let's think about the big financial picture. Because if this man is being robbed of wages, and wages are

being un, unclassified or they're not being reported that that that is tax revenue that is missing for our fire department, our police, that response time, our roads, our homelessness, other things that you guys can be putting money to the lens area on southeast 92nd, it experienced the same thing right under prosper Portland's nose with pacific cap using illicit contractors like tmg wall systems that take practice in this. And I'm asking, as we hear talking about money this evening, let's not point to osha and bully that they are the answers and the proper place to report to, because they are way underfunded. I'm asking this group of leaders here, this evening as we are talking about money, what is in place that protects the worker and the local workforce that works here in the Portland metro area. Thank you for your time.

Speaker: Thank you. Tina next up we have nakia hunter commissioner Mapps.

Speaker: Did you have a comment?

Speaker: Oh, i'll hold. Okay

Speaker: Welcome. Thank you for being here. Thank you for your patience.

Speaker: Thank you for having me, mr. Chair, and that'll be some funny stuff, okay. Good afternoon. Well, actually. Good evening. Commission today, I want to highlight the critical importance of maintaining accountability and transparency on construction projects, especially when funded by the general fund. When public money is allocated towards these projects, the stakes are incredibly high. And not only in the terms of financial investments, but also regarding public trust and community welfare. First, the accountable accountability ensures that every dollar is spent wisely and effectively, and construction. This means adhering to budgets, meeting deadlines, and delivering high quality results. Expectations and deliverables must be defined from the outset to avoid cost overruns, delays, and substandard work. This is not just a matter of fiscal responsibility, it is about

respecting the taxpayers hard earned money. However, it has come to our attention that some contractors are misrepresenting our intentions. They suggest that we are pushing for prevailing wage standards to apply universally to every project. This is a misunderstanding. We truly advocate for the accountable, transparent measures for all projects we want to ensure that the work being done is performed by licensed responsible bidders, and that the and that distinction is critical to transparency, builds trust and confidence amongst stakeholders. When progress reports and financial statements are openly shared, it fosters an environment of trust and cooperation. Transparency ensures that all parties involved from project managers to the public, are aware of the project's status and any challenges that arise. This openness helps to prevent corruption and mismanagement, as every decision and expenditure can be scrutinized. Moreover prosper Portland's 2425 budget incorporates the returning tif decision package and transitions a significant portion of funding for programs and operations experiencing tif district experienced oh programs and operations for expiring tif districts to new returning tif general fund resources. The setup for accountability past the decisions to build the material to use and the developer agreements is lacking. At best, language is implemented in the general contractors requirements to oversee the projects, but the follow through we are finding is not there. Workers are being harmed to provide cheap and sometimes free labor. A subcontractor transparency ordinance would ensure after permits issued after permit issuance, but prior to the start of construction, lead contractors would be required to disclose information for their sub contractors working on the following project types and require building permits. Planning and development services and the right of way permits. Contractors and subcontractor should have no problem increasing the requirements for state contractor licenses. City business licenses, and worker comp

policy information, and any labor enforcement activity against the contractor to be disclosed. Let's protect our investments in the projects and the working class. Let's protect them like we hear today. Talked of protecting the trees. Thank you. Thank you, next up we have Jesus Saucedo.

Speaker: Welcome. Jesus.

Speaker: Good afternoon. My name is Jesus Saucedo here representing the working class folks in Portland, Oregon, speaking on items three, nine, one. Prosper, Portland's fiscal year 24 to 25 proposed budget. It supports interventions and investments in furtherance of advance Portland a call to action for inclusive economic growth. I have a similar a similar call to action for the local workforce. We want that growth and security for the working class as well, which is why we are here today to ask that as one of the largest organizations committed to growing quality jobs, advancing opportunities for prosperity, collaborating with partners to create an equitable city with prosperity shared by Portlanders of all colors, incomes and neighborhoods. Lead by the mission statement that your organization stands behind. Make your mission provide a wide umbrella of safeguards for everyone involved, from the planner to builder, and all in between. It would make my job that much more doable if we had a standard of expectation to ensure that the cheater who doesn't pay taxes, and who takes away from the community in multiple ways is held accountable, and the contractors who hire them are not afforded the opportunity to keep pretending to be unaware of this harm. This type of building does to our community. I urge you to adopt a contractor transparency expectation ordinance today. Now, every day I walk job sites in this in this city. It's disgusting to see what's going on out there, just like my brother and sister were just saying right now we live it every day. It's time for Portland to change this. It's gone too long that we've turned the other way, not wanting to pay attention to what's really going on

in the city. We talk about the trees, we talk about the homelessness. Everything is important. But let's talk about the workers that are building Portland, all this affordable housing. Who is it who can really live there? Not the people building it. I can assure you that I've ran into workers that are getting \$10 an hour, and they have no other choice if they get paid at all. We have the proof. We're willing to speak to any of you about it and show you this truth. And most, apparently most, most importantly, that transparency we need that Portland needs that. And you, as our leaders, can do make that happen.

Speaker: Thank you. Thank you. Appreciate your being here. Commissioner Mapps and commissioner Rubio, first, I want to thank the carpenters for their testimony today and your patience.

Speaker: I know you guys hung in there for the long run. I also have a couple of requests before we end today, I'd appreciate it if you could put some version of your testimony. He sent me a written copy of your your testimony so we could actually engage with you a little bit. And before you leave today, I hope that you folks can connect. Probably with my chief of staff, michelle, rodriguez right there, just so we can begin to open up some dialog about how we can work together to combat, wage theft and promote contractor transparency. Great

Speaker: Thank you very much. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, commissioner Rubio, I just want to also thank you for coming and for sharing the experiences of so many folks, particularly in, in black, indigenous latino communities, wage theft and exploitation of workers. It's a very serious thing, so I appreciate you waiting so long to say that important message to all of us. So thank you for that, I'm also really interested because you're referencing public dollars. And of course, that's obviously our responsibility to oversee that. So I actually have a question for, prosper Portland about what are we doing to make

sure that these things aren't happening, and, how could we be doing more? And we will look into your idea about the transparency. Thank you, commissioner Rubio.

Speaker: For the record, kimberly branam executive director at prosper Portland, so prosper Portland, has a like the city of Portland has a building, construction business and workforce equity policy, we comply with prevailing wage and all of the reporting and compliance that goes along with it. So that means that, we actually work with the city of Portland to track this through the city's contract compliance reporting system to make sure and to verify through, the, wage requirement that wages are, in fact, being paid if they're the crs system automatically flags any appropriate wage rates, and so, and then would report those to the bureau of labor and industry, we don't work with any debarred firms, to ensure that people that bully has debarred. And there have been complaints that have been verified. We don't allow them to work on our projects. And, you know, we follow boehly's lead, in a number of these elements, but we've had an opportunity to connect with the western states, regional, folks, and it sounds like, they're really interested in a larger conversation around the city's building codes overall, and so happy to take any questions about what we, what we do on our end.

Speaker: Thanks, kimberly. Dan, commissioner Ryan, yeah, I took it down. I would like to make sure, jill, that we have a meeting with the people that testified. So I can just try to understand this. And thank you so much, kimberly. Yeah I may be saying what what is already obvious, but if you have specific proof of, wage theft or fraud, go right to boli bureau of labor and industries.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: May I say something? Yeah. Of course, you bet.

Speaker: We have come up to the mic. So because there's people, believe it or not, watching.

Speaker: We have went to boli and we do work with boli, which is why we are coming to your body to ensure that you have the chance first hand, to be brought up to speed with what is going on with your community.

Speaker: Thank you. We appreciate it. Thank you.

Speaker: And I set the meeting and we'll be there.

Speaker: You were there for hours. Thank you. Oh no. No problem for your patience, all of you. Thank you.

Speaker: And mayor, if I might, I do want to just state for the record, because, the western states regional, folks also came to testify at a previous board meeting that the project that they're talking about is with a developer that we have another deal with. But the project that they have issue with is not a prosper Portland invested project. So, just want to differentiate that we did not there was no use of public dollars in the project in which wage theft was, considered the issue or was, alleged. Good. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you all very much, thank you for the testimony that completes testimony. Keelan. Yes. Very good. Thank you. Next I'm asking for a motion and a second to approve the report.

Speaker: So moved.

Speaker: Commissioner Mapps moves. Can I get a second? Second? Commissioner Gonzalez seconds. Any further discussion? Keelan, please call the roll. Ryan, thank you, prosper Portland for that report.

Speaker: Which feels like it was a long, long time ago, I just want to speak to the importance of building this small business office. I think we're really behind on that, as a small business town, and I look forward to hearing how we're nimble and really meeting them on the ground, literally, to be responsive to their needs right now. It's really tough for small businesses. They they, they didn't get to go home, especially

the bricks and mortar. They had to show up during covid. They trained to survive. And and, I'm really want to make sure that we continue to treasure them as we, are facing a lot of exits right now. And so I'm looking forward to hearing that concrete plan as it evolves, thanks.

Speaker: Very good. Gonzales, I maps I Rubio I want to give a tremendous, thanks and appreciation to director branam and our incredible staff, especially tony barnes, who's worked tirelessly on this budget, and tavo cruz for his leadership, and also, to, folks in the mayor's office, especially andrew fitzpatrick as well, I'm really glad again, as my colleague said, that we are ceding the small business office. I think it, will do untold things in this next year and in ways that the city has been waiting for a long time. So appreciate your leadership there, thank you for your hard work. I vote yea Wheeler, I vote aye, and the report is accepted.

Speaker: The meeting of the prosper Portland budget committee is now adjourned. Thank you everyone

Portland City Council Meeting Closed Caption File

May 16, 2024 – 2:00 p.m.

This file was produced through the closed captioning process for the televised city Council broadcast and should not be considered a verbatim transcript. The official vote counts, motions, and names of speakers are included in the official minute

Speaker: Let's go ahead and get started. Good afternoon. Everybody this is the 2020 session of the Portland City Council. Good afternoon. Rebecca, please call the roll. Ryan here.

Speaker: Gonzalez. Here. Mapps, here. Rubio here. Wheeler here.

Speaker: And I assume we're working on the echo. Great. Thank you, we'll now hear from legal counsel and the rules of order and decorum. Good afternoon.

Speaker: Good afternoon. Oh all kinds of issues.

Speaker: We're awake now.

Speaker: Welcome to the Portland City Council. To testify before council in person or virtually, you must sign up in advance on the council agenda at [Portland.gov/council](https://portland.gov/council) agenda info session on engaging with City Council can be found on the council clerk's web page. The presiding officer preserves order and decorum during City Council meetings. The presiding officer determines the length of testimony. Individuals generally have three minutes to testify unless otherwise stated, a timer will indicate when your time is done. Disruptive conduct such as shouting, refusing to conclude your testimony when your time is up, or interrupting others testimony or council deliberations will not be allowed. If you cause a disruption, a warning will be given. Further disruption will result in ejection from the meeting. Anyone who fails to leave once ejected is subject to arrest for

trespass. Additionally, council may take a short recess and reconvene virtually. Your testimony today should address the matter being considered. When testifying, state your name for the record. Your address is not necessary. Disclose if you are a lobbyist. If you're representing an organization, please identify it. For testifiers joining virtually, please unmute yourself. Once the council clerk calls your name. Thank you.

Speaker: All right. Thank you. First item is 392. It's a first reading of an emergency ordinance to authorize competitive solicitation for Portland clean energy community benefits fund.

Speaker: Climate investment plan, strategic program three clean energy improvements in single family homes not to exceed \$140 million over five years. Commissioner Rubio, thank you, mayor colleagues. In November of 2018, our community said yes to the Portland clean energy community benefits initiative on a nearly 2 to 1 basis. Portlanders want to see bold climate action that also addresses the critical needs of our community. And as all of you heard earlier this week, pcef has implemented multiple rounds of community responsive grants, launching the cooling Portland program, and most recently began implementing the climate investment plan that this council unanimously adopted in September of 2023. This ordinance before us today is just another one of the many actions that we've taken as we implement the climate investment plan, and this one focuses on the places that we spend so much of our times in our homes. While this program is focused on single family homes, rest assured that we also have substantial clean energy programs for our apartments and multifamily buildings. Now, strategic program number three, which is clean energy improvements in single family homes, is not going to grab the headlines for its title, but it showcases the best of what pcef can offer. It will create meaningful improvements to over 3100 homes that not only

allow for our community members to be more comfortable, but also significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions, reduce utility bills, improve indoor air quality and address critical life health and safety improvements for households across our city. In addition to all of this, all of that, this program will will be, will help Portlanders leverage significant federal resources available from the inflation reduction act. So I'm eager to get this program up and running. And look forward to hearing from staff and our invited speakers today. With that, I would like to introduce interim director eric engstrom.

Speaker: Thank you, commissioner. Good afternoon, mayor and council. For the record, my name is eric engstrom, I'm here as interim director of the bureau of planning and sustainability. I've been in this room and before council quite a few times, but this is my first time wearing that hat. Thank you, today we're asking you to authorize the Portland clean energy fund program to release rfps to seek program administrators for their strategic program number three, which is the commissioner just described, is about clean energy improvements for single family homes. After that, the program would work with procurement to follow their standard process and procedures to get that request for proposals out. As commissioner, yea. Rubio shared the strategic program was included in the climate investment plan, which was approved by council last year. And with that, it's my honor to turn it over to pcef program manager sam barrasso.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you all, good afternoon, commissioners. It's good to be in front of you all again this week, for the record, my name is sam barrasso. I'm the program manager for the Portland clean energy community benefits fund. All right. If you all bear with me for just a second, I'm going to cue up our presentation deck, that. There we go. Okay. Okay okay. So this, this afternoon here, we're going to walk you through, and we're going to I'm going to try to keep it brief because you've

heard this last week. You're going to hear this consistently as we come before you all. And we bring together programs around the climate investment plan that we're moving forward to implement. We're going to quickly give you all an overview before we turn it over to our colleagues, my colleagues and the team to describe the programs in more depth. So we'll walk through the climate investment plan. Then we'll pivot and turn to strategic program three and dive in more specifically around the need, the opportunity, the program description, the specific structure, roles, as well as accountability that's built into the program that will go out for as part of the rfp, we'll dive into some of the examples of the projects, the measures, the costs, as well as the outcomes and goals. Before we invite up our three invited speakers and then turn it to you all for questions. So first, again, we're going to continue coming before you all just to show as we're implementing the climate investment plan, how we're adapting the implementation to stakeholder feedback. And this is a program that has had a tremendous amount of stakeholder feedback as part that began in the development of the plan itself. And then as soon as we executed the plan, we immediately brought together a range of stakeholder groups, which Chris will talk about shortly, you'll see how this is really squarely in the pocket around how we see our investments in climate justice. And you'll get to see how we're thinking about measuring and tracking the potential and outcomes of these investments. And lastly, you just get a flavor of how this program will help this community, Portland, leverage the tremendous amount of inflation reduction act resources that are out there and being dispersed through our department of energy, energy trust of Oregon and many other partners. All right. So again, a tremendous amount of input went into the climate investment plan. And in particular, we brought together a range of technical experts around round table focused on this particular sector area. So there was you know, there was a really

strong roadmap within the plan itself that built out this program that's leading to the rfp that we plan to go out for here shortly. As we step back and think about the need you're going to hear, you know, there's a broad need. And we've showed this line to you many times. So I'm not going to go through it in detail, but collectively when we think about our overall climate goals, you know, this program is going to be roughly targeting about 600 homes a year. And we know that we need to get to ultimately, the scale of probably 2 to 3000 homes a year, in order to hit our overall goals. And so we know this is a key part to that. And this is a start. And you'll see how we're building that out. This program falls within that 63% of our overall allocation of funding. That's going towards renewable energy and energy efficiency within the plan itself, but it does touch on some of the others, notably the climate, jobs, workforce and contractor development, as that's a core component of this program. You'll hear more about. And then lastly, this is just a reminder I'm going to really we talked about this earlier this week. But as part of the plan we implemented really three primary pathways. As we move the resources through grants, which you'll get to hear more about later this summer through requests for proposals where we are leveraging our procurement infrastructure. And so this is that that that first step in that process. And then through interagency agreements as well as intergovernmental agreements. So we're here before you around this program, this month, next month, you'll see us come before you all to talk about our capacity building program and contractors. We seek to bring on board as well as our electric bike access and support program, and then we'll come back to you all in July and August to talk about our community responsive grants. So just to give you a sense of how many more times will be in front of you this summer. All right. So with that, I think you've heard enough from me this week. I'd like to turn things over to my colleague Chris Gruber, who's the clean energy project manager within

the program, and notably, Chris. Chris came to us from the housing bureau. But Chris has a long history in energy efficiency work, both as the previous president of the Home Performance Guild, but also as one of the core contractors that participated in Clean Energy Works Portland, which ultimately became Clean Energy Works Oregon, which then became Inhabit and was one of the core precursors to PCEF that led a lot of the groundwork that that that fomented and helped build the idea of PCEF up later on. So I'm excited to turn things over to Chris, given just the depth of expertise and experience she brings to this work. And, have you work through the rest of this presentation?

Speaker: Chris. Great, thank you. Sam good afternoon, Mayor Wheeler and commissioners, it's a pleasure to be here, for the record, my name is Chris Gruber. I'm a clean energy project manager with PCEF. So, as Sam mentioned, I come to this my work with PCEF with a 15 year career, providing home energy retrofits. So I've seen a lot of old homes in the city of Portland, and I know that there's a lot of energy to be saved out there. Next slide please. Clean energy improvements in single family homes. It's better than Strategic Program Three as a name, actually, we'll invest 140 million in home energy upgrades for 3100 income qualifying households over five years, reducing greenhouse gas emissions and decreasing energy usage and utility bills, and improving housing stability by reducing the risk of displacement. The work performed in this program will also increase the comfort, health and resiliency of the households served. Next slide please. The need is significant. 37% of all homeowners and nearly half of all renters are considered housing cost burdened. That means they spend over 30% of their income on housing related expenses. Now it's a significant subset of this group spends well over 50% of their income on household related expenses. One third of all homeowners in the city of Portland, 42,000 is an estimate I've seen. Are considered

low income with incomes at or below 80% of area median income. This program will not only not only lower energy bills and improve the comfort, resiliency, and housing stability of low income households in Portland. It will also provide an opportunity to serve renters and moderate income households. The program will also provide the opportunity, as you've heard, to leverage additional funding the ira, the inflation reduction act funds we expect to see those in early 2025, and we'll be working closely, with that program. Also, utility incentives and other state rebates. The program will also provide the opportunity to develop a workforce with the advanced technical skills needed to transform the energy efficiency of Portland's housing market. Next slide, please. My notes together here. So what's this going to look like? How is this program going to work, each home will receive a thorough assessment by a building performance institute certified contractor. The contractor will come into the home. They'll put a blower door on to test for air leakage in the house. They'll put a use a duct blaster to test for duct leakage. They will calculate they'll do a heat load calculation to make sure that the mechanical equipment that's installed in the house is actually sized properly, which is not always the case, they will also measure ventilation in the home to make sure that, that the home is left with healthy indoor air quality. Each home will receive energy modeling to determine which upgrades will provide the best greenhouse gas reductions, and also the best utility savings. So it'll be data driven life health and safety concerns in the home will be identified to ensure occupant well-being. These issues will be addressed as part of, or at least partially addressed. We're not going to be able to meet the full need, but at least partially addressed by the 30% of the project budget that is allowed. Allowed for deferred maintenance. Now, this is a really important point about our program. Lack of funding for deferred maintenance in most energy efficiency programs throughout the nation has

presented a significant barrier to participation in those programs by low and moderate income households. We did not want to perpetuate that problem. Next slide please. Sp three will fund deep energy and renewable energy improvements in low income, owner occupied homes at the highest investment level. The deep energy retrofits address the whole home from the shell or the envelope of the house where we air, seal and insulate to the mechanical systems, high efficiency heating and cooling systems, heat pump, water heaters, some homes will have solar renters and moderate income households will receive lower investment levels. These projects will focus on high impact measures. Some examples of that include ductless heat pumps, attic insulation. Heat pump water heaters. Again, these are the measures with the greatest utility bill savings and the greatest greenhouse gas reductions. We will also fund energy upgrades in in-home child care, homes, as well as congregate living homes. Next slide. As mentioned to administer this program, we will issue rfp seeking high caliber experienced, administrators for each of the following roles. Next slide. The central program administrator will provide overall program coordination, reporting, and management. They'll be responsible for marketing and outreach, customer application and qualification, as well as contractor management and support. They will also oversee the sp three workforce training and job retention programs. The next role next slide. Customer navigator. We will seek a provider to administer a customer navigator program, which will provide culturally specific customer engagement and support. They will provide occupant education in some cases, translation services. The goal is to provide a seamless and positive experience for program customers. Next slide. Finally, we'll seek a third party quality assurance provider. Each home energy retrofit excuse me, that will oversee each of the home energy retrofits to ensure occupant safety, as well as to ensure that the projected

greenhouse gas emissions reductions are actually being achieved. Next slide. In summary, the program will improve housing stability and climate resiliency for low income households, as well as for renters and moderate income households. Outcomes realized from this program will include 3100 single family households will receive energy efficiency and renewable upgrades, including 50 in-home child care and congregate living homes. Low income owner occupied households will save an average of 30% on utility bills. For moderate income households, 20, and renters around 15. In some cases, that will be quite a bit higher as renters, as the need is great in the end, the program will will reduce 120 to 150 metric tons of lifetime co two equivalent emissions. That's like removing 30 to 36,000 gas powered cars from the road for a year. Thank you. And that concludes my testimony. And i'll hand it back to sam. Thank you.

Speaker: So the ask before you all, and I suppose I should have been more clear about this from the outset, is that we're going to be seeking for you all to authorize us to go out for competitive solicitations. And so we expect to come back before you all on the other side of the rfp, as you get the report on who ultimately lands these these contracts. And so we expect to come before you all for the second reading on may 22nd. And so with that, I'd like to turn it over to our invited speakers before bringing it to you, for you all for questions. But I'm going to call forth our three invited speakers, and I'm going to hop over this way to bring them over to my, to my right, faith graham, principal director for the west coast strategy and development at elevate energy and a pcef committee member, jason benefit, general manager of solar energy at neil kelly and then tim miller, director for director at Oregon business for climate. Excuse me.

Speaker: Start with you.

Speaker: Great. Good afternoon, mayor Wheeler. Commissioners, thank you for this opportunity to testify, for the record, my name is Faith Graham. As Sam stated, I'm a principal director at Elevate Energy, and I'm also a PCEF committee member. I'm really happy to be here. I'm a long time resident of Portland and have spent my entire career working on housing stability and climate action, and I also am an original start up member of Clean Energy Works Oregon, where I met Tim, who will also be testifying in front of you all. So Elevate is a national nonprofit that's been working for nearly 25 years on this issue to ensure that everyone has access to clean and affordable heat cooling power and water in their homes and communities. We are centering equity in the climate conversation. I really only have two very succinct points that I want to underscore by being here and testifying in front of you, that is the importance of the program, which I think staff did an awesome job of detailing for you. But I'll just underscore that. And also, I want to stress that the reasonableness of the program design, according to all of the programs that we are implementing across the nation. So if I can stress briefly and succinctly the importance of this program, it really to address climate justice and the city's goal of getting to net zero, I think this program artfully addresses a multitude of needs. Some of them are very specific and obvious, like housing stability, energy security, job creation, health and safety. And then I think the other one that has been stressed in the presentation today, but one that I would underscore based on what I've been working on for the last year, is really creating an established channel for additional funds in the very large historic investment that the federal government is making into this particular market sector. And what we're finding around the nation, including here in Oregon, is the need to develop pipeline for those funds. And this is an awesome opportunity for us to do that. So I just wanted to highlight that as an opportunity for us and then I will say with my

second point, which is just the reasonableness of the program design, it really has those three core components that we think at elevate is best in class and what we try to implement everywhere, which is having a program administrator. It's very standard and utility type programs to have that kind of overarching program administrator. The really important key point of having community navigators, so that you actually get access to those people that you want to participate in this program, and then quality assurance, clearly to demonstrate that this program is effective, as far as the level of investment, it's very on point with what we're seeing in other places as well. This often takes \$50,000 per home to really do that.

Electrification and energy efficiency upgrades. And that is often not including the health and safety measures. Or if there's a there has been deferred maintenance that needs to be addressed prior to making these measures. So it is, it's generous for sure, but it's not overly generous. The need is greater than what's there. So again, thank you so much. I'm so happy to take questions when we get there if you have any. But that is what I wanted to share with you Day. Thank you so much.

Speaker: Thank you, mayor and commissioners, for the record, my name is Jason Bennett. It's working. Okay and I'm the general manager of the home performance and solar division at Neal Kelly and I'm here to testify on behalf of Neal Kelly, you know, the company itself has been around since 1947, Neal himself, the founder, actually purchased an insulation and window company, and we've been through many variations of different funding programs and policies, through the 70s, Jimmy Carter, the Whap, that definitely created a huge boom in the business, especially for our company, we had expanded our weatherization efforts to, doing solar thermal in the 70s as well. And what we've seen, between that in 2010 was a huge boom in business. And then a steep cliff and that cliff happens when the funds, run out and people lose their jobs and we lose all the momentum that we gained over those

times. And this is what makes it different. Pcef is definitely something I feel that is going to be. Yes, we have a five year budget, but it's something that can extend beyond that. And it's going to provide a longer runway for companies and businesses to be able to build up the workforce, develop the skills that they need to do this work and to have that be sustainable. And it just starts with this. I think over time, you're going to see a lot of other homeowners adopt, doing weatherization efforts in their home, not just low income, so you're giving the platform for businesses, to really have a great opportunity city, to be able to grow and expand and, and create jobs. And, you know, obviously, the benefits are are so great with low income families. And, you know, I've, I've personally been in the trenches or in the home performance world, the attics and crawl spaces, I got my start 14 years ago. I had a grant to get a bpi certified to be a building analyst and did energy audits and communicated with homeowners, made recommendations. And, you know, you see a lot of different things, especially with these homes, they've been neglected for a long time. It's not just, going in there and blowing insulation. It's a lot more than that. You know, we have to focus on making the home airtight. There's a lot of different energy saving measures. Even just to do insulation in the attic. We have knob and tube, so there's deferred maintenance, things that we have to take care of, that's why that \$50,000 amount is reasonable. And something that I see that is, is doable to be able to get these homes to be more efficient. So, you know, I think that over time, you're going to see especially the ramp up, you know, we don't really have the skilled labor to do these jobs. Right? Right now, this is going to take a collaborative effort, we're going to have to build our our team, our crews to vertically integrate and grow through this. So you're going to see a slow ramp as more people get on board. And then it will start to get get faster, so I'm obviously

open to questions and anything that you guys have specifically to ask, being that on the ground, doing the work myself. Great. Thank you.

Speaker: All right. We good to go.

Speaker: All right. Good afternoon, mayor Wheeler. And, members of the council. My name is tim miller. I'm the director of Oregon business for climate. But today I'm going to be speaking from my perspective as the former ceo of clean energy works, which you've heard about a little bit the energy works and inhabit, so I'm going to first briefly describe inhabits development work as context for the second part of my comments, which are going to be to which will be in support of the clean energy improvements and single family homes program, being presented today. So clean energy works, which became inhabit again was first clean energy works Portland in 2009 around the American recovery and reinvestment act. It was a Portland program. It was started just right across the hall from your regular chambers in city hall, it started with a, again locally in a Portland pilot and, eventually got 10 or \$20 million of federal money and expanded statewide and then got \$10 million more from from the state to continue those benefits across the state. We did about 5000 homes in Oregon in the period. And, we were doing deep energy retrofits, much like you're hearing about today, these are considered a whole home approach where you have insulation and air sealing and systems and all the work that you've heard about from these other experts already delivering energy benefits, but also health benefits, adding solar when it makes sense. Eventually we began to do work in seismic and other improvements that may make sense someday with, bolt on programs. Not this program, but in doing this work, we also worked with a lot of partners, and I'm sure those will show up in this work as well. We worked with energy trust. We worked with dozens of trade allied partners, contractors like you heard about, community groups, equity advisors, creative financing partners like

kraft three. We're going to see a lot of that come around in this program to where we're leveraging other funds from various sources, we created hundreds of good, equitable local jobs that could not be outsourced, they're all under a community benefits agreement. And the similar to the ethics preserved here in pcef, they ensured living wages and health care benefits for the women and men doing the work. I was involved for eight years as a coo and then the ceo from 2011 to 2018, and we wrapped up the organization and handed off all the program, assets. And some of the staff actually transferred as well to community energy project, which is a group that is doing work within pcef today and carrying forward some of that work. So, clean energy works inhabit primarily serve folks who who could afford to invest in their homes and could afford to take on some of that financing. But we also worked with some families. And, chris, as you heard before, was one of our lead contractors doing that work for folks who needed fully funded projects in their homes, and, you know, that's more like the bulk of the projects you're going to see in this program. And I'm really pleased to see that this program design recognize the additional investments that that are needed in these homes where there's some deferred maintenance and other issues, and that 30% you heard about. This is where you also get those bigger returns from the project where you get health benefits, energy efficiency, benefits, affordability benefits, housing stability benefits, long term asset value protection for the family. So you know, there are a lot of successes, but also a fall off like you heard about before, hopefully doing this through pcef will keep this program going for years and years into the future. So, you know, in doing a setting up a program like this, obviously there's a lot of work to design to handle the volume that this program will deliver. Having the systems and structures in place, having the right check points and balances of interests, somebody else to look at the project plans and scopes, somebody else to do the

quality assurance, working with the contractor to ensure there's a third party view on things, but also in doing that big design we learned and we made mistakes, that you have to avoid too much bureaucracy. So it's a really tricky balance to get that right, to ensure the responsibilities are all in the right place. And I'm really happy to see that the team has the right experience on board to manage that balance. It takes experience to manage that balance, and they also are drawing on the wisdom of the rest of the community. We have a strong community of practice here in Portland and in the region with energy trust and nia and our utilities and the regional technical forum and national standards and tools. This program will draw on all those things, all that wisdom to deliver a great program. So on this program, to me, there are three things that I really like. One is got a really smart structure. This idea of a central administrator, a customer navigator, and a quality assurance provider being separate in some programs that are all together. But having them separate allows for other involvement by other community actors and a good check on everybody's systems. That's really smart, also in designing this program, the team got feedback from experts. I was in some of those meetings. They evolved the program a lot. So what you're seeing today is not the program. You would have seen 18 months ago or a year ago. They evolved it in smart ways to make it a better program, more streamlined. But still preserving those checkpoints. Second point is, I really like that they have this scaled sensible levels of investments in scopes depending on income levels. Very smart way to do it. It's going to allow them to allow the program to leverage additional funding sources. As we heard, energy trust, federal money, odo money, all those other resources. And it provides for the deeper investment for those families that really need it, I also especially like the ability in this program where a family can say, yeah, I'd really like my navigator to come with me from day one all the way through versus another customer might be

able to say, actually, I got this. I've used the contractors a lot, just helped me get connected and I'll move forward. So that's an interesting, wrinkle to the program. Finally, my third point, the program design is really thorough without being micromanaged, the pcef team thought through all the issues. If you take a look at it, you'll see a lot of stuff in there that some of it you won't even understand unless you've been really close to this industry. But it all makes sense from my perspective, without being overly prescriptive, they've left room for the contractors who are going to actually do run the program to innovate and come up with good solutions. So I'm really pleased to support this program. I think it can carry forward a lot of work and a lot of efforts that have been done in the past move that forward in a bigger way and in a long term way, for Portland, thanks very much.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: That concludes our invited testimony.

Speaker: Very good. Commissioner Mapps did you have a question, sure, sir. Is there any if there's any public testimony I can hold off till then? I don't know if there is. I didn't check we have two people signed up.

Speaker: All right, why don't we hear from them first? Then we'll get to commissioner Mapps. Thank you. Thank you for your presentation here.

Speaker: First, we have indeed namcc.

Speaker: We might call you all back up. So just don't go too far. Welcome. Thank you for being here.

Speaker: Thanks. All right.

Speaker: Am I good to go? Yeah.

Speaker: Good to go. Thank you, thank you, good afternoon, commissioners. Mayor Wheeler, I'm indi namkung. I'm the transportation justice coordinator for verdi, representing our organization today. Verdi firmly supports pcef's continued

investments in climate action and resilience for our community. Like this one proposed today in conjunction with the climate investment plan strategic program three. It is incredible to see the work that this council approved in the climate investment plan 18 months ago. Ish continued to progress on the heels of the proposal approved just three weeks ago for climate resiliency upgrades for Portland's public schools. As a transportation advocate, I will confess that you are almost certain to see me back here with balloons to cheer on the e-bike program's kickoff later this summer, but today we are here to talk about energy efficient homes. This investment will expand pcf's reach to single family homes, while continuing to serve over 500 low income renters. Investing in these 3100 homes in total will not only lower carbon emissions from heating, cooling and power, it will also make many of these homes safer, healthier and more livable for people in our community who have been dealing with the consequences of older infrastructure and struggling with affordability of their energy bills. Instead of suffering and freezing or overheated homes, or worrying how they'll make it through the next utility rate hike, they'll be able to live comfortably. On top of that, we are excited that these investments will make homes more resilient for our community members in severe weather events, ensuring more people can remain safely in their homes during extreme heat or cold, rather than disrupt their lives or their work with evacuation to a cooling or warming shelter. This investment will also improve our green workforce by training up to 400 workers on green building and equipment installation, preparing them for good, stable careers in the green economy. We're here to uplift this program today because we've seen what investments like this have done for our neighbors in cully verde builds our social enterprise program, installs heat pumps, portable cooling units, and other home energy upgrades, as well as developing community solar installations in low income

communities and communities of color. We focus on creating more energy efficient homes because we see it as a crucial step in fostering a healthy environment, but also community empowerment and economic stability. Excuse me? For cully neighborhood residents, but we can't be anywhere. Nobody can though I think we're all trying and pcef is integral to making sure every Portland neighborhood can access similar investments, environmental improvements that are priority for their residents that reduce carbon output while lessening the threat of displacement. And people from of people of color from our city. At the same time, Portlanders want solutions like this. I saw how many of us were at the pcef work session on Tuesday. We must ensure that the city is not only able to mitigate the worst impacts of climate change, but to invest in solutions that help all of us thrive in the long term. We support pcef, and we must keep it going for now and into the future. Thank you. Thank you.

Speaker: Next we have babs fanelli. Babs was to join online but has not joined in. Looks like babs is not here. So that concludes next person. That concludes testimony. All right. Very good.

Speaker: Commissioner Mapps, I think you were up.

Speaker: Oh, thank you, number one, I want to thank staff for the presentation, and I want to thank our invited guests for their testimony to. I just have a couple of, background, why don't you why don't we have our. Do we have enough room for our invited guests for the whole panel? Can be here. And that way, if anybody has something to chime in on or is the merrier.

Speaker: I think my initial questions are going to be, largely targeted towards, city staff, although anyone who has insights, I'd welcome to jump in, I'll throw it to sam and sam can kick it over to someone else, if appropriate, so we're the city. This this council has adopted goals for reducing carbon emissions and a number of different

spaces. Transportation, as we just heard about, housing, so on and so forth. And even within housing we have multifamily and single family. So it's my understanding that today we're talking about focusing in on reducing carbon emissions. In the single family space. Do we have a sense of how much we hope to reduce carbon emissions by in the single family home space over the next five years?

Speaker: So in this program and it's going to be that and it is a range, but it's, 120 to 150,000 metric tons. Those are lifetime emissions based on the modeled, measures that we would be installing in this program. So for this particular program, that's that would be the range.

Speaker: So that's what this program does. But I think council's also adopted a larger strategic plan where we're trying to reduce carbons by I think getting getting us to net zero by 2050.

Speaker: Correct. Right, right.

Speaker: So, well here here's my, my instead of dancing around, I think if I'm understanding the planning documents that we put together, our goal is to reduce. And it's hard for me to know, but I think we're trying to if things have gone well over since 2017, I think right now we're trying to reduce carbon emissions in the single family home space over the next five years by about another 250,000 metric tons, or something like that, and this program today gets us, we'll cut that. We'll take care of a significant hunk of that problem, 120,000 to 150,000 metric tons, I guess I have two questions, one is where did we get that 120 to 150? Because given the goals that we've set, it seems like we should be shooting for that. 250 and if since we're not shooting towards the 250, what's our plan to fill to backfill that extra 100,000 metric tons or.

Speaker: I thank you, mayor Wheeler. Commissioner, I think I get the question. This program as part of I think even what Jason was sharing, there is going to be a scale up. We know that as our longer term goals, this program is going to do 600 homes a year. We know that we need to get closer to that 1500 2000 homes a year as a community. And that involves not just us as a program, but the contracting community, the private investments community members make in terms of leveraging IRA other resources. So this was what we felt was a reasonable start and ultimately what. And when we come back to you all for the next five year cip, we know those targets will be higher and we're going to have to do some more catch up on the back end, but we'll have the underlying infrastructure. I think the other piece is, is we're actively working with energy trust, the department of energy at state department of energy, and tracking the various here, the various programs from the inflation reduction act, which will do their part as well. So I think balancing I don't know that we were ever explicit that this would do all of the single family home work, but we know it will take a good chunk, particularly of our households. That'll be that'll be harder pressed to be able to make those investments. Yes, okay. I thank you for that, so how did we where does the estimate for the 120 to 150 metric tons over the next five years? Where did that how did you reach that number, mayor Wheeler?

Speaker: Commissioner commissioner Mapps, what we did is, as part of this, as you see, we have a range of different investment levels. And for each of those investment levels, we manage, we you know, we projected out and modeled what we're going to be, the expected emissions or measures that we would be implementing. So on the more moderate income households, 120 150% area median income, we expect that there's a \$15,000 contribution from the city, \$15,000 match from those entities. And as part of that, we know that you're going

to be able to tap a few different measures, hvac replacement, heat pump, water heater, insulation. And we modeled basically, we took the average profile of a single family home within the city. I don't know what the average vintage was, but 19 or something and said, okay, based on that, what is that going to look like? And that's why it reflects a general range in that we know there's going to be variability. But it was it is a modeled figure. And on the other side of that will obviously be tracking what measures did we actually install. What are the actual projected emissions reductions on that, okay. I'll pause here and see if my colleagues have any other questions.

Speaker: Yeah, I just put my hand up, first of all, thank you. Thank you. Sam. And congratulations on your new title. Eric. And hello, expert panel, I think what I want to do is go through three things. We hear a lot about shovel ready. It's a great term, and we know there's 3100 homes that are ready for this. What I couldn't get out of the presentation is. How do we find them? And are they clearly identified yet? And if not all good. I just want to hear what the methodology is to locate those 3100.

Speaker: That's going to be part of the program. The program administrator's role will be marketing and outreach. Obviously, there will be those customer navigators as well, which will be responsible for also doing some of that marketing or outreach. We will not have any shortage of homes that we'll be able to attract with this program, given both the incentive level and given just the volume of need. So the it is going to be about still appropriately marketing the program, but that is going to be one of the services that this, this central administrator role will be responsible for implementing.

Speaker: So we know that's our goal and that's fine. But today we don't we don't we haven't met yet to figure out how to locate those 3100.

Speaker: It's, today I'm looking to the group here. I chris, maybe i'll tap you as my lifeline here.

Speaker: I'm not trying to do a gotcha moment. I'm just trying to figure out if. Yeah, if we truly are shovel ready. Yeah.

Speaker: No, I mean, we don't have them identified, per se, but we definitely have a lot of connections that we've made in the community. And, and so we are thinking through, you know, what, that that outreach is going to look like, but, you know, let's take, for example, meals on wheels. You know, we connect with them. They've got connections with many, many people throughout the city. So that's one example of one avenue we could look at. But we also have got many, many partners that are, in the community that will bring it to the 3100, will rely on our partners who have relationships with households out there. Oh, no, it'll be it'll be a multifaceted approach. Couch. Yeah, absolutely. Absolutely

Speaker: Okay, and then when you had the goals up, maybe it was I wasn't looking at it. Right. It was one of the slides and it it had percentage with nothing next to the percentage. So I couldn't figure out what the goals were. Oh so what we have is we have overall program level goals.

Speaker: And then that slide, which I'm happy to share that again here. Let me go through it and pull up the slide really quick. And I think I saw you looking at that particular slide for a moment. So I think this is a slide you're talking about. This is the target benefit. You know the target numbers. As we break down some of the goals it'll be about 500 households. We're seeking to retrofits on that are going to be that's at the bottom of the chart that are where we're providing up to \$15,000 investments for high impact energy efficiency measures, 600 households for that sort of next lower tier house homeowners, between 81 to 100% area median

income provided up to \$30,000 investment for high impact measures. And then we move up. Move up the way.

Speaker: Yeah, that's but there was one that said goal measurements 31 single homes. Then it said percentage average energy usage reduction. Let's there.

Speaker: The percentage of savings for the households and utility bill savings. Is that what you're looking for?

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: There we go. I think we've got the slide up right now. And so this is going back to commissioner Mapps, point earlier. This is based on those measures that we just listed up, those number of households. And essentially if we're retrofitting to that tune to that level of investment, high impact measures, these are the overall emissions goals, reduction goals we expect to achieve. So 120,000 metric tons of oh, you're looking at the average reduction percentages. That's all I'm trying. Apologies, commissioner Ryan, I'm going to see if there is. We do have those details. And I know katie lister is on the line. If we want to speak to those percentages are going to be different for each of the segments, but I'm going to see katie if you want to chime in on the specific percentages.

Speaker: If you have those, that's where I was. That's why I was asking about I could figure out what that meant.

Speaker: Katie's waving. Yes

Speaker: Hi. Hi. Good afternoon, katie lister, deputy program manager for the pcef program. So in this context, those percentages are there. The measures that help us understand what our actual impact sort of that help us get to the goal of reduced greenhouse gas emissions reductions. So, for example, we know that if we have reduced from baseline consumption of electricity by 20, then that measuring that for each household gets us is an input that we use to be able to calculate if

we're close to our goal, which is really reducing greenhouse gas emissions. I can share that the assumptions that are sort of underlying our projected greenhouse gas emissions are around 15 to 20. Overall energy usage reduction in for the high for sort of the high impact, lower the lower dollar value investment per household for those that part of the table and then for the whole home energy efficiency retrofits were, sort of looking more in the 30 to 35% overall energy usage reduction. And that's a mix of electricity and gas, depending on what measures are implemented.

Speaker: So it is, commissioner. Right. It's variable. Those, those, those percentage reduction targets are variable depending on the category that the target category.

Speaker: Yeah. Thanks. And then workforce I think was this week Tuesday. We had a the work session. And for me this is our green economy stimulus plan. And so that's probably why I'm trying to figure out this is exciting. How long is it going to take. Because we know there's 3100 homes out there that are there's more than that. So I'm just trying to get to like when the action will start to take place and how exciting it is as a workforce issue, to have a big project so that some people can go from, like pre-apprentice all the way to journey, that's always what I'm using. My one note that I try to, remain on message about these types of investments, and I wasn't I just want to know more about that.

Speaker: Yeah. We're we're acutely aware and actually, this is one of the places where we've done active engagement with a range of groups, including the professional business development group. We've got them on standby as we come back. We expect once we award the contract, we're going to have, there's going to be a program development phase that will take that will take a good chunk of time. A few months before we start having projects for workers. So we'll come back to you all on the other side of this rfp. Fingers crossed. Procurement gods. Six months

or so from now, we'll come back, we'll award the contract, we'll then execute the contract, and then a few months in the program development phase, and then will the work will begin. And that's at the point where we actually do our active reach out to contractors is just so that we're not priming them too early without the opportunities right there. So we are sensitive to we work with the organizations so they know this is coming down the pipeline. But we were sensitive to engaging contractors until we have the actual job opportunities. There and we have them, we will have them with this program. Correct.

Speaker: I hope that we just a comment that we don't hold on to this too tightly and that we really let in those that can tell us where the homes are, those that can tell us where the workforce is. And I don't think we have that knowledge in the same way that we have it out in the community. So I just hope that this doesn't stay stuck too long. Trying to get us out of the plan, to plan, to plan. I think we have a plan. Let's go.

Speaker: Absolutely. Commissioner. This has been I would say this has been an incredibly well thought out plan. And I think, as the commenter said, we've been intentionally really cognizant of the fact that this is intended to be a scaled program. Scale is absolutely the objective here. And it's been clear from day one that this is about scale and delivery and speed of that delivery.

Speaker: Commissioner Mapps did you have some things?

Speaker: I'll pause.

Speaker: I'm not at the moment unless we're about to close out any.

Speaker: I think we're getting to that point. So if you have something else, I think we're ready to move this on the second reading, I think I'm fine.

Speaker: I appreciate the dialog with, everyone today, very supportive, supportive of the program. I'll tell you my engagement right here at this moment with this

program is really about making sure that we manage this and model this so that we're actually achieving our climate change goals, and i'll tell you, according to my back of the envelope, math, I think right now, the proposal on the table has us paying roughly about 900 bucks, to remove a metric ton of carbon in the air that doesn't pencil out for where we want to go in five years. You know, I think it might pencil out at \$599. Per metric ton. So, you know, I think the mix of programs that, one of the things I'm trying to figure out is if the mix of, if we had if we optimize the mix of programs, if we'd actually be able to reach our five year, carbon reduction goals. And I can't, given the information I have in front of me right now, I can't quite, do that algebra, and I think you're kind of saying we're not going to get there, but, you know, certainly the public holds us accountable for reaching our, reaching our carbon reduction goals, so as a manager, I kind of have to try to manage and solve for that problem.

Speaker: Thank you. Commissioner. It's a worthwhile conversation that we're happy to follow up, particularly as we come back to this and bring this to you on the other side. Okay thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, commissioner reinhart. Yeah.

Speaker: Real quick, commissioner Rubio, as you think about this and how it connects to the reform work we've been doing with permitting and knowing that usually something like this, we could all have some heartache about how hard it is to navigate our permitting system and what we'll be bringing in some people who might be foreign to it, and so i'll pause there. This is an exciting opportunity because we unfortunately don't have a lot of permitting going on at the moment. So how how can we marry these two? So this is almost like an opportunity to really see our integrated spas take off. And get to some proof points on improvements for how we do permitting with this program.

Speaker: I think it's a great idea, and it's something that we can talk to about how to integrate that productively.

Speaker: We just had to wax on about that for a minute. Thank you all.

Speaker: Great. Thank you. This is a first reading of a nonemergency ordinance. It moves to second reading.

Speaker: Thank you. Sorry. Excuse me, mayor, it looks like babs are testifier who wasn't able to join us. Has joined in all right, go ahead.

Speaker: Babs.

Speaker: Finally. Babs, are you online ?

Speaker: Hi. Can you hear me? Okay

Speaker: Yes we can.

Speaker: Oh. Thank you. Well, babs fanelli here, technically challenged, almost 76 year old. Yes. Baby boomer and i, I'm sorry that I wasn't zoomed in.

Speaker: Correct. Not a problem. Go ahead.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you. I've testified before you, previously. Thank you. I've lived in Portland my entire life, and I love my city of roses. I am here today because I am passionate about environmental justice and climate change. I support. Pcf 110. Thank you for supporting their first proposal on clean energy schools. After listening to all the testimony from the panelists, I took screenshots of the slides so I can review them, I'm even more in favor of moving forward with this plan, as you know, there are thousands of us, in numerous environmental groups throughout the city. And I know you have heard from us via email, public comment, written testimony, and we encourage you to not let us down to move forward with what pcf is proposing, I'm a little nervous because I messed up, but i'll just end by asking you all to imagine for a moment the planet that you want to pass on to your children, your grandchildren, your great grandchildren, and beyond your support of pcf for a

clean energy, Portland will become the legacy that you all passed on to future generations. Thank you.

Speaker: Thanks. Appreciate it. Commissioner Ryan, did you have your hand up? All right. Good. So this has already been moved to second reading. Thank you all. Thank you. Appreciate it. Thank you. Next up, item 393. It's a time certain emergency ordinance authorized letter of agreement with the Portland police association to expand the retire rehire program. Colleagues, as you all know, staffing up our police bureau has been a top priority for my administration. Public safety is leading concern in our community, and we're always working towards creative solutions to fill our ranks and expanding ppb's capacity as quickly as we can. Our nationwide recruiting of new officers is showing very positive results, with over 100 new officers in training as we speak, we successfully advocated for expansion of the state academy to clear a growing backlog and allow our new hires to start their extensive training as quickly as possible. Council approved lateral hiring bonuses for a time and successfully hired certified candidates who could hit the ground running. And for the first time in years, our hiring rate began to outpace our rate of separations, with nearly 200 sworn officers hired in the last two years. However, we've been bracing for retirements and working to assess and look for new pathways to retain our experienced workforce, while at the same time continuing to require or recruit new, hires. That's the aim of the letter of agreement that's before us here today. I'm pleased to have chief bob day and chief deputy city attorney heidi brown both here to tell us about this agreement. Welcome, both of you. Thank you, thank you, thank you.

Speaker: Mayor, commissioners, I will start and then i'll turn it over to chief day, if that's all right, just legally, i'll briefly explain what this does currently in the collective bargaining agreement with the Portland police association, we have provisions for

the rehiring of retired or retiring officers. And there's two ways we can do it, and, and this would provide a third option for the chief, currently, we have one program that lasts six years, and that's only if they come back as an officer. We have a second program that lasts two years where they can retain the rank they were in. And what this will do will give a third option, where the chief can bring somebody back at his discretion for a one year period. And then if the chief feels it's appropriate and the employee wants to continue for another year, they can do that and they can extend it for one additional year. All of these one year extensions for a total of three year period are at the discretion of the chief. And of course, of the, of the employee as well. So this just gives a little more flexibility to the chief to get us through this period of time with, retirements coming up. And i'll let the chief talk about the, the impacts of that and happy to answer questions if you have any. Thanks sergeant.

Speaker: Thanks, eddie.

Speaker: Good afternoon, council. Bob day, chief of police, city of Portland. And, just want to say, first of all, just thanks for the support and encouragement each of you have demonstrated, both in word and deed, along the lines of the budget as well as just your personal encouragement to me and to the police bureau at his notice. It's appreciated. I came out of the Portland building this afternoon around the lunch hour, stood on the street corner and said hi to a business woman standing next to me, and she looked and she said, you're the chief of police. I said, yeah, well, I'm also just bob. And we talked and she said, I just have one question. Are you getting the support that you need? And it was really a grateful, prideful moment to be saying, absolutely that the council is unified in their advocacy and belief in what we're doing and grateful for the mayor's confidence in me once again, to stand in this position for this time. It's not probably a secret, but staffing

for law enforcement, and certainly in the city of Portland, continues to be a challenge. But you have all made it a priority. I'm grateful for that. And this really program, as Heidi mentioned, is just an extension of what already exists. But I've made the decision in the recommendation to go to this model for a couple different reasons. One, it gives me a little bit more latitude, a little bit more flexibility, I do think that we are increasing our numbers of hiring. We are having success. So I'm hopeful that in 2025, we will start to see a leveling out and maybe even a growth in retaining our officers as the number of officers leaving has decreased, then we've seen in the previous couple of years. So officers are sticking around longer, that's encouraging. And I don't want to hinder that growth and development, both for new members as well as for, you know, people that want to promote and have aspirations for organizational growth and development. So this one year window, really gets us into 25, where then we can kind of assess and then, as I said, it gives another option for another year and then another option for another year. But that's all at the discretion of the chief. And we have a very robust review process that starts with the member making a request. And it goes through their chain of command. We do a thorough review of their internal affairs, history, work, performance review, all of that. And I've made it clear that every single supervisor has to give me their recommendation in writing, to be able to communicate that to the member. But ultimately, the decision is mine, and I'm committed to making sure that those that we do bring back into the extend will definitely be employees that would honor the work of the police bureau, and that members of the community and you all can be proud of, based upon their prior performance, I'm grateful for that discretion. So this is just an opportunity I see to kind of get us through, into next year, and then we'll evaluate. We have about 14 people that have declared they want to retire in June. Not all of them are eligible for this program

based on rank. And then, we know we're going to have some more retirements in the fall, so we'll kind of evaluate as we go. I don't intend to use this to fill up everything there. First of all, there's plenty of vacancies, but I am going to be very strategic and very intentional about those that we grant this opportunity to, because I want to continue to be able to, you know, recruit successfully and message to the community and to, you know, people coming into the profession that there's still opportunity. So appreciate your support. Thank you.

Speaker: Great. And so could I just, make sure I understood you so we have basically two more retirement cliff, if you will, here and then. Did I hear you correctly the other day? We've got a couple of years then of stability after that as far as retirements go. Yeah. So 2026 will be the next, you know, kind of, larger opportunity for retirement I think, that's why I'm predicting and it's, you know, really is just a prediction.

Speaker: But I'm predicting that this year we'll kind of level out. I don't think we're going to see much. I think our hiring will be on pace with our retirement, and, these will help offset that a little bit. But then in 25, I think we're going to have a chance to really make up ground. So we currently have 13 members that are in the former retiree hire program. So since 2020, we've had roughly about 30 folks apply to be a part of it. And some signed up and were accepted and then have separated from the bureau on their own, but we have about 13, right now, and they're in various stages because they, as heidi mentioned, under the former agreement, they could do six years or whatever. So some that were in the six year window are coming up on that fourth and fifth year. But, the majority will be, you know, timing out here in the next year or so. Great.

Speaker: Thank you. Any questions colleagues, do we have public testimony?

Speaker: We do in person. All right. Dan handelman hi dan.

Speaker: You're muted dan good afternoon.

Speaker: Mayor Wheeler and council members I'm dan handelman I use he him pronouns. I'm with the group Portland copwatch. And our group has testified before about the pitfalls of the retired rehire program. There have been at least two incidents where employees were rehired and then behaved in ways that, quote, unduly affected the bureau operations or unduly eroded public trust, as it says in the policy on professional conduct. One was sergeant greg lewis, who made a violent racist remark shortly after candace hayes was shot in 2017 and whose backpay the council had to pay even though he was terminated after being rehired. This new addition to the agreement seems to be crafted to expand the pool of who can be rehired and allow them to work three extra years on a year to year basis instead of just 2 or 6. And miss brown explained it well. But it's still very confusing to the layperson. What we do not see in the existing agreement is language that lays out the criteria for the chief to use when deciding whether someone is a good candidate for retiree hire, police review board reports, such as those from August 2020 and March 2021, reference officers who retire before they can have discipline imposed on them. It would be great to add a clause that says officer who had findings of misconduct, belittling or harming community members, or who retired while under investigation or after findings due to administrative investigations, will not be considered for rehire program. The chief may create other criteria as they deem appropriate. I did hear chief dave's assurance there would be a review of each officer as they apply, but I don't see that anywhere written down, one of our main complaints about this program, which should resonate with people who think the city is mis spending their scant funds, is that it allows officers to retire and collect their pensions and then go back to work doing the same job for the same pay. This is also known as double dipping. It's as if you're paying for two officers,

but only getting one. According to pbs's website, there are over 100 officers currently in training who are still not out in the streets. This desperate effort to pull officers back in just when they thought they were out, feels like payola and does not seem fiscally responsible. The last time this policy came before you, just two years ago, it was to make an exception for three officers who were tired but had let the time frame lapse so long they could not have otherwise rejoined the bureau. This time, the urgency seems to be that a lot of officers are taking advantage of a quirk in our society's calendars to retire when a six month period last 27 weeks instead of 26. For whatever reason, there are two such periods this year ending in June and November. Maybe a better option to avoid these mass retirements would be to fix that issue. And while I have a few extra seconds, I just looking forward to seeing the new code about the oversight system and will repeat what I said in court yesterday that we need to be assured the community input will be seriously considered when that comes to council, and we'll talk more about that next week, I'm sure. Thank you very much.

Speaker: All right. Thank you dan. That completes public that completes testimony. All right. There's an emergency ordinance. Please call the roll. Ryan thanks for being here today.

Speaker: Heidi. Good to see you.

Speaker: I vote yea gonzales.

Speaker: I'm glad to see you. This agreement come before us today as the city addresses real concerns around public safety. No investment is more important than an experienced law enforcement professionals. We've seen real progress in recent years and rebuilding our pipeline, but concerns around attrition is substantial. And police department, and intelligent investments such as this one that will lessen the rate of retirement, I think is not good. I want to thank chief day,

chief deputy attorney heidi brown and ppa president aaron schmutz for coming to the table and doing what is best for the city. I also want to be crystal clear. I have strong objections to giving extreme groups like copwatch the right to dictate when the police chief chooses to hire retirees. I will also like to say that with this ordinance today, I hope we can adequately address the retirement that ppv sees on the horizon. With that, I gladly vote. I thank you, thank you maps.

Speaker: I want to thank everyone for today's presentation. Really glad to see this program move forward. I vote I yea. Rubio I thank chief and heidi for all your great work on this, it's really important. Wheeler

Speaker: Yeah, well, thanks again, both of you, for your presentation in chief. You're probably getting fairly tired of seeing me, this is multiple times over multiple days, but you haven't aged a bit. That's the good news, thank you also for the strong work. Pb is doing to recruit high quality candidates, as you know, I try to attend each and every one of the hiring ceremonies, and I'm continually impressed by the caliber as well as the diversity of the individuals who are choosing to work at the Portland police bureau. It frankly gives me a lot of optimism about the future of the bureau. Like, nice. I want to thank the many good men and women who are nearing the end of their careers with the bureau. Your service is greatly appreciated, regardless of whether or not you choose to return as part of this program. Even so, I hope you stay for just a little bit longer in this program. Might help us do that. I vote I the ordinance is adopted. Thank you. Thank you, thank you mayor. Council and our third item I have a question, my understanding is going to be withdrawn. Do we actually have to wait till 345 to withdraw it?

Speaker: Oh, god.

Speaker: Please tell me. No I said it's withdrawn.

Speaker: Good.

Speaker: Okay. Do we need to read it?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: All right. Can you please read. 394 resolution.

Speaker: Direct Bureau of Planning and Sustainability to develop land use approaches to address the impact of warehouse and distribution facilities on residential neighborhoods and schools.

Speaker: Mayor, I'm pulling this back to my office.

Speaker: Wonderful! Thank you. With that, then we're adjourned. Thanks, everybody.