



March 19-20, 2025 Council Agenda

5803

City Hall, Council Chambers, 2nd Floor – 1221 SW Fourth Avenue, Portland, OR 97204

In accordance with Portland City Code and state law, City Council holds hybrid public meetings, which provide for both virtual and in-person participation. Councilors may 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, March 19, 2025 6:00 pm

Session Status: Recessed

Council in Attendance: Councilor Candace Avalos
Councilor Jamie Dunphy
Councilor Loretta Smith
Councilor Sameer Kanal
Councilor Dan Ryan
Council Vice President Tiffany Koyama Lane
Councilor Angelita Morillo
Councilor Steve Novick
Councilor Olivia Clark
Councilor Mitch Green
Councilor Eric Zimmerman
Council President Elana Pirtle-Guiney

Council President Pirtle-Guiney presided.

Officers in attendance: Mike Porter, Deputy City Attorney; Keelan McClymont, Council Clerk

Item 2025-079 was pulled from the consent agenda and on a Y-12 roll call the balance of the consent agenda was approved.

Council recessed at 7:20 p.m. and reconvened at 7:36 p.m.

Council recessed at 8:34 p.m. and reconvened at 8:42 p.m.

Council adjourned at 10:42 p.m.

Agenda Approval

1

Council action: Approved as amended

Motion to amend the order of agenda items to hear item 2025-079: Moved by Kanal and seconded by Clark.

The agenda was approved as amended by unanimous consent.

Public Communications

2

[Public Comment](#) (Public Communication)

Document number: March 19, 2025 Public Communications

Time requested: 15 minutes

Council action: Placed on File

Time Certain

3

[Amend the Comprehensive Plan Map and Zoning Map for properties at 3508 NE 11th Ave and 1123 NE Fremont St at the request of Derek Metson, Greenbox Architecture \(LU 24-073674 CP ZC\)](#) (Ordinance)

Ordinance number: 192034

Document number: 2025-026

Neighborhood: [Sabin](#)

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Permitting & Development

Time certain: 6:15 pm

Time requested: 15 minutes

Previous agenda item.

Council action: Passed to second reading as amended

Motion to amend directive A in the ordinance and the attached findings to reflect Council's tentative vote: Moved by Green and seconded by Koyama Lane. Aye (12): Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Kanal, Ryan, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Zimmerman, Pirtle-Guiney

Passed to second reading as amended April 2, 2025 at 9:45 a.m. time certain

Consent Agenda

4

[*Authorize City Administrator to negotiate and execute a lease for District 3 Council office space for an estimated total cost of \\$63,000](#) (Emergency Ordinance)

Ordinance number: 192027

Document number: 2025-088

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Bureau of Fleet and Facilities

Council action: Passed

Aye (12):

Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Kanal, Ryan, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Zimmerman, Pirtle-Guiney

5

[Appoint Susan Trexler and Jonah James Jensen to the Portland Historic Landmarks Commission](#) (Report)

Document number: 2025-079

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Permitting & Development

Council action: Confirmed

Item was pulled from the consent agenda for discussion.

Motion to accept the report: Moved by Smith and seconded by Kanal.

Aye (12):

Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Kanal, Ryan, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Zimmerman, Pirtle-Guiney

6

[Approve Council Minutes for February 5-20, 2025](#) (Report)

Document number: 2025-089

Introduced by: Auditor Simone Rede

City department: Auditor's Office; Council Clerk

Council action: Approved

Aye (12):

Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Kanal, Ryan, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Zimmerman, Pirtle-Guiney

Regular Agenda

7

[Accept the Government Transition Advisory Committee Final Report](#) (Report)

Document number: 2025-090

Introduced by: Councilor Dan Ryan; Council Vice President Tiffany Koyama Lane

Time requested: 90 minutes

Council action: Accepted

Motion to accept the report: Moved by Kanal and seconded by Smith.

Aye (12):

Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Kanal, Ryan, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Zimmerman, Pirtle-Guiney

8

[Initiate foreclosure action on 11514 SE Alder St for the collection of delinquent City Liens placed against the property](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 2025-062

Neighborhood: [Mill Park](#)

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Revenue Division

Second reading agenda item.

Council action: Referred to Mayor

9

[Initiate foreclosure action on 10218 N Tyler Ave for the collection of delinquent City Liens placed against the property](#) (Ordinance)

Ordinance number: 192028

Document number: 2025-063

Neighborhood: [North](#)

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Revenue Division

Second reading agenda item.

Council action: Passed

Aye (12):

Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Kanal, Ryan, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Zimmerman, Pirtle-Guiney

10

[Initiate foreclosure action on 111 NE Killingsworth St for the collection of delinquent City Liens placed against the property](#) (Ordinance)

Ordinance number: 192029

Document number: 2025-064

Neighborhood: [King](#)

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Revenue Division

Second reading agenda item.

Council action: Passed

Aye (12):

Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Kanal, Ryan, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Zimmerman, Pirtle-Guiney

11

[Initiate foreclosure action on 4121 NE Grand Ave for the collection of delinquent City Liens placed against the property](#) (Ordinance)

Ordinance number: 192030

Document number: 2025-065

Neighborhood: [King](#)

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Revenue Division

Second reading agenda item.

Council action: Passed

Aye (12):

Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Kanal, Ryan, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Zimmerman, Pirtle-Guiney

12

[Declare property located at intersection of I-405 and SW Naito Parkway as surplus property and authorize Bureau of Transportation to dispose of property to Oregon Department of Transportation in exchange for accepting property at west end of Steel Bridge ramps](#) (Ordinance)

Ordinance number: 192031

Document number: 2025-066

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Transportation

Second reading agenda item.

Council action: Passed

Aye (12):

Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Kanal, Ryan, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Zimmerman, Pirtle-Guiney

[Declare actions concerning Zenith Energy Terminal Holdings, LLC, including placing communications into the public record, demanding the Mayor to investigate violations of the Zenith franchise agreement, and urging the Auditor to conduct an investigation into the competing statements and arguments heard by Council on January 21st, 2025, by City staff, Zenith, and members of the public](#) (Resolution)

Resolution number: 37702

Document number: 2025-070

Introduced by: Councilor Angelita Morillo; Councilor Mitch Green; Councilor Jamie Dunphy; Council Vice President Tiffany Koyama Lane

Time requested: 1 hour

Council action: Adopted As Amended

Motion to amend the fourth Resolved statement to add "and pursuant to the authority in PCC 7.12.030" and delete ", with independent review to ensure impartiality,": Moved by Dunphy and seconded by Koyama Lane. (Aye (12): Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Kanal, Ryan, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Zimmerman, Pirtle-Guiney)

Motion to remove Whereas statements 11 and 13 through 20 and attachments C1, C2, E, F, G1, and H: Moved by Zimmerman and seconded by Clark. (Aye (4): Novick, Clark, Zimmerman, Pirtle-Guiney; Nay (8) Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Kanal, Ryan, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Green). Motion failed to pass.

Motion to remove the Whereas statements 11 and 13-20 and attachment H: Moved by Zimmerman and seconded by Novick. (Aye (4): Novick, Clark, Zimmerman, Pirtle-Guiney; Nay (8) Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Kanal, Ryan, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Green). Motion failed to pass.

Motion to remove Attachment H: Moved by Morillo and seconded by Kanal. (Aye (9): Dunphy, Kanal, Ryan, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Zimmerman, Pirtle-Guiney; Nay (3): Avalos, Smith, Green)

Aye (11): Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Kanal, Ryan, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Clark, Green, Zimmerman, Pirtle-Guiney

Nay (1): Novick

Thursday, March 20, 2025 2:00 pm

Session Status: Adjourned

Council in Attendance: Councilor Candace Avalos
Councilor Jamie Dunphy
Councilor Loretta Smith
Councilor Sameer Kanal
Councilor Dan Ryan
Councilor Angelita Morillo
Councilor Steve Novick
Councilor Olivia Clark
Councilor Mitch Green
Councilor Eric Zimmerman
Council President Elana Pirtle-Guiney

Council President Pirtle-Guiney presided.

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

Councilor Smith arrived at 2:01 p.m.

Councilor Ryan arrived at 2:02 p.m.

Council adjourned at 2:35 p.m.

Regular Agenda

14

[*Ratify a Successor Collective Bargaining Agreement with American Federation of State, County, Municipal Employees, Local 189 related to the terms and conditions of employment of represented employees in the bargaining unit for 2025-2027](#) (Emergency Ordinance)

Ordinance number: 192032

Document number: 2025-091

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Human Resources

Time requested: 30 minutes

Council action: Passed

Aye (11): Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Kanal, Ryan, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Zimmerman, Pirtle-Guiney

Absent (1): Koyama Lane

[*Ratify a Successor Collective Bargaining Agreement with the District Council of Trade Unions related to the terms and conditions of employment of represented employees in the bargaining unit for 2025-2027](#)

(Emergency Ordinance)

Ordinance number: 192033

Document number: 2025-092

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Human Resources

Time requested: 30 minutes

Council action: Passed

Aye (11): Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Kanal, Ryan, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Zimmerman, Pirtle-Guiney

Absent (1): Koyama Lane

Portland City Council Meeting Speaker List
 Wednesday, March 19, 2025 - 6:00 p.m.

Name	Title
Elana Pirtle-Guiney	Council President
Keelan McClymont	Council Clerk
Candace Avalos	Councilor
Jamie Dunphy	Councilor
Loretta Smith	Councilor
Sameer Kanal	Councilor
Dan Ryan	Councilor
Tiffany Koyama Lane	Council Vice President
Angelita Morillo	Councilor
Steve Novick	Councilor
Olivia Clark	Councilor
Mitch Green	Councilor
Eric Zimmerman	Councilor
Mike Porter	Deputy City Attorney
Kacey Desantis	(Public Communications)
David Gray	(Public Communications)
robert butler	(Public Communications)
Amanda Rhoads	Planner II. City-Land Use, Design & Historic Resources, Portland Permitting & Development
David Kuhnhausen	Interm Bureau Director, Portland Permitting & Development
Staci Monroe	Senior Planner, City-Urban Design, Portland Permitting & Development
Jonah James Jensen	Appointee for consideration
Fred Neal	Government Transition Advisory Committee Co-Chair
Jose Gamero-Georgeson	Government Transition Advisory Committee Co-Chair
Jim Labbe	(Testimony)
Karen Chirre	(Testimony)
Destiny Magana-Pablo	Government Transition Advisory Committee Member
William Kinsey	Government Transition Advisory Committee Member
Amy Randel	Government Transition Advisory Committee Member
Terry Harris	Government Transition Advisory Committee Member
Juliet Hyams	Government Transition Advisory Committee Member
Kevin Foster	Foreclosure Prevention Manager
Robert Taylor	City Attorney
Michaela McCormick	(Testimony)
Khrizia Velacruz	(Testimony)
Keith Wilson	Mayor

Document Number	Session	Meeting Date
	Wed PM	03/19/25
2	Wed PM	03/19/25
2	Wed PM	03/19/25
2	Wed PM	03/19/25
2025-026	Wed PM	03/19/25
2025-079	Wed PM	03/19/25
2025-079	Wed PM	03/19/25
2025-079	Wed PM	03/19/25
2025-090	Wed PM	03/19/25
2025-062 - 2025-065	Wed PM	03/19/25
2025-070	Wed PM	03/19/25

Portland City Council Meeting Speaker List
Thursday March 20, 2025 - 2:00 p.m.

Name	Title	Document Number
Elana Pirtle-Guiney	Council President	
Keelan McClymont	Council Clerk	
Candace Avalos	Councilor	
Jamie Dunphy	Councilor	
Loretta Smith	Councilor	
Sameer Kanal	Councilor	
Dan Ryan	Councilor	
Tiffany Koyama Lane	Council Vice President	
Angelita Morillo	Councilor	
Steve Novick	Councilor	
Olivia Clark	Councilor	
Mitch Green	Councilor	
Eric Zimmerman	Councilor	
Linly Rees	Deputy City Attorney	
Tracy Warren	Bureau of Human Resources Director	2025-091, 2025-092
AnnMarie Kevorkian-Mattie	Labor Relations Coordinator	2025-091, 2025-092

Portland City Council Meeting Closed Caption File

March 19, 2025 – 6:00 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 minutes.

Speaker: Good evening. I am going to call tonight's City Council meeting to order. It is March 19th at 6:02 p.m. We have what I think is a pretty full agenda, but hopefully we can get through it pretty quickly. Council. The first item on our agenda is to approve the agenda and take any requests to reorder the agenda. We did have an item pulled off the consent agenda, items pulled off.

Speaker: She says to save.

Speaker: I'm sorry. Do we need to take roll first?

Speaker: Thank you. Council president.

Speaker: Could you please take roll?

Speaker: Yeah. Thank you. Avalos.

Speaker: Present.

Speaker: Dunphy. Here.

Speaker: Smith here.

Speaker: Here.

Speaker: Ryan, here. Koyama lane here. Morillo here. Novick here. Clark, here. Green here. Zimmerman.

Speaker: Here.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney here.

Speaker: And then.

Speaker: And could our city attorney please read the rules of decorum?

Speaker: Thank you, council president. Welcome to the Portland City Council. To testify before council in person or virtually. You must sign up in advance in the council agenda at Portland.gov/council/agenda. Information on engaging with council can be found on the council clerk's web page. Individuals may testify for three minutes unless the president presiding officer states otherwise, your microphone will be muted when your time is over. The presiding officer preserves order 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 should address the matter being considered when testifying. State your name for the record. Your address is not necessary. If you are a lobbyist, identify the organization you represent. Virtual testifiers should unmute themselves when the council clerk calls your name. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Apologies. So, councilors, we did have one request for a reordering of the agenda. We have an item that was on the consent agenda. Item number five, which has been pulled off the consent agenda. And the staff from our permitting and development department have asked if that could be reordered to the top of the regular agenda. Items pulled off consent are normally placed at the bottom of the regular agenda. If anybody is interested in making that change, I would accept that motion now and then. Okay.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Okay. We have a do we can we do unanimous consent on this? Okay. Is there any objection to moving item number five to the first item on the regular

agenda? Okay. Without objection, we will change the order of the agenda. Are there any other requests to reorder the agenda or move items to a later meeting before we accept the agenda? Okay, without objection, we will move to public communication. Keelan, could you call up our first guests, please?

Speaker: First.

Speaker: First up, we have injured and off. Next we have amy starkey. Make sure. Okay. Next, robert butler. Next. Casey desantis.

Speaker: Welcome. Thank you for being here this evening.

Speaker: Thank you. Hello. My name is casey and I am an organizer in Portland for palestine. I am here to bring to your attention the harassment and violations of first amendment rights that were exhibited by Portland police during an immigrants rights March and rally on February 23rd. During the March, security personnel were stationed on the perimeter and cars in the front and back of the crowd. This is done to protect attendees from oncoming traffic. Portland police lined the sidewalks on bikes, but failed to block traffic at intersections. Our own personnel took up this task, ensuring participants safety. Multiple times, police officers targeted and harassed an attendee in a wheelchair by blocking their path on the sidewalk with their bikes. Two of our female security members were verbally harassed when standing in crosswalks by officers. One of them was hit by a police motorcycle visor prior to being verbally harassed in the side in the crosswalk. This organizer put her body on the line to keep demonstrators safe, and for that, she was hit with a police vehicle that failed to stop not only for her, but for the crowd of Marchers behind her. Afterwards, both cars that had protected the March were pulled over out of sight of the concluding demonstration. Drivers were given fines for violations that they had allegedly occurred one hour prior. These fines exceed exceed cost of \$2,000. Given the clear presence of police throughout the event, it is disturbing that

citations were given after the March. Once drivers were isolated. Council. Today, I stand before you in unprecedented times. Every day we are seeing new threats to our democracy and our rights. Immigrants in this country, regardless of legal status, are being made to fear that their families will be torn apart. Historically, we know that in order to beat attacks on our civil rights, it is necessary to fight and not back down. It is necessary to March in the street and rally our communities together. Isolation and fear is what the current administration wants us to feel, so that we submit to their attacks and so that we give away our freedoms willingly. The American civil liberties union reminds us that we do not need a permit to March in the streets in response to breaking news, we did not impede traffic. On February 23rd. We kept the March moving and more importantly, we kept people safe. This is this. This is more than can be said for Portland police that day. Mayor Wilson, I know that you care about protecting immigrants in this city. You said so yourself, and you wish to maintain Portland's status as a sanctuary city. We know that you and your office are aware of this situation. There have been hundreds of calls from Portland residents to you and chief Bob Day's office regarding this matter. We demand that the fines be dropped and the citations suspended. We demand that Portland police stop harassing protesters and organizers across this city, and we want an end to the harassment and drop the fines. I repeat, end the harassment and drop the fines. Thank you very much for your time.

Speaker: It's harassment. Drop the phone and the harassment.

Speaker: Drop.

Speaker: The fine.

Speaker: We need to keep cheering down, please. Thank you. Thank you for being here with us. Keelan.

Speaker: Next up we have David Gray joining us online.

Speaker: Hello? Can you hear me?

Speaker: We can hear you.

Speaker: My name is David Gray. I'm here today representing the Stadium neighborhood. The Stadium neighborhood is a high density working class community. Most of us live in apartments, condos, and subsidized housing. We don't have yards. This means the streets and parks are our yards. They are our social spaces. There's nothing more important for Portland right now than making our city clean and safe. Businesses are leaving. Homeowners are leaving, properties are going vacant. And we see for lease signs everywhere. Our tax base is eroding. We are in a doom loop where they will be, where there will be less money to fix our problems as the problems are increasing. In 2017, we were ranked in third in the nation for real estate attractiveness. By 2021, we were below average and now we're at the bottom 80 out of 81. We are at a tipping point. If we allow the core to continue to erode, it will suck the entire city down with it and it will take 20 years to recover. We are a compassionate city, but we cannot let compassion get in the way of common sense. We need to get back to basics. We need to refund our police, prosecute our drug laws, and enforce the camping ban. This is simply a baseline to stop the tide of further erosion. The Portland Police Bureau is one of the most understaffed forces in the nation. We rank 48th among the 50 largest cities in the US, and police officers per capita. That's half of the average US city. Half? Let me say that again another way. The average US city has twice as many officers per capita as we have at any given time. There are 36 to 60 officers patrolling Portland in a city of 615 or 50,000, depending on how you count. We should have double that number. We cannot let the budget crisis be an excuse for further erosion of public safety. We need to decide on our priorities and put funding where it is needed. Police, fire, emergency services and basic city services that will make our

city livable again. We are a caring city. We're a compassionate city. But compassion without accountability is not working. There needs to be consequences for those who repeatedly flaunt the law and erode public safety. Every day we delay, the situation gets worse. Failing to act now means more crime, more victims, and a city in permanent decline. Fund our city. Fund our police. Protect our city. Act now. Please. Thank you. By the way, if you're wondering, like I was who's 81st in that real estate ranking below us, it's hartford, connecticut. So if you want to see where we are headed, have a look at hartford, connecticut. If we don't do anything, we're headed in the same direction. Thank you.

Speaker: For being here.

Speaker: And I'm going to remind folks again, I heard both positive and negative reaction there. If we want to be able to hear from everybody and get through the full agenda, we need to make sure that folks are keeping their responses silent. Hand motions are fine, thank you. I believe we had other folks join us.

Speaker: I don't believe so.

Speaker: I think robert butler may have joined during that last.

Speaker: Robert. Oh, there. Oh, great. Okay. Thank you. Yeah. You're up.

Speaker: Good evening. Over. Overworked and underpaid members of our community. This is robert butler. I'm part of Portland native. So ted Wheeler was a master at getting people to follow him or compelled to cooperate with him. And I remember when he was at Multnomah County and had his commissioners there were just terrible. But he was that's where he got his ability, I think. So what he's done now is made sure that his legend and his regime continues, and that one of those regimes was to make sure that the bull run sand filtration project would never be questioned, would never be analyzed or rethought. Even though this commissioners at the time said, we need to follow this, see when we're in trouble

and should turn back. So I understand that I don't understand. I know how the mayor was talked into it sort of talked into it, but I don't see why each one of you who I've contacted, you and you and you and you by letters, have hand-delivered them and not a one, not one of you. None of you have appreciated the fact that this is the biggest scam, probably in the history of the city, and we're losing the difference between \$3 billion project with interest and \$1 billion, not even \$1 billion project with with interest for \$2 billion savings. And not one of you has shown any interest at all at saving \$2 billion. So the way that works is that back in 2017, this City Council said untruthfully, that we could do ultraviolet for \$105 million, that we could do sand filtration for \$350 million at a major highest amount, 500 million. That was a lie. The minimum was a 500 million, not the maximum. That was a million. So now it's a difference between \$2 billion and \$850,000. And we are spending \$2 million a day out there. Now, while you're silent, who million dollars a day is being sunk. So we're about one third, one sixth of the way through this project, which means we're half \$1 billion in the hole right now. If we walk away from there, we can build a new one ultraviolet system for \$500 million. That's a half a billion. We're 350 million in the hole. So for \$850 million, we can build that thing. If you stop today, which you don't even want to listen to you. So that would be a savings of \$850 million versus \$1 billion. We can still save \$1.1 billion. Besides, despite your negligence.

Speaker: I don't know how.

Speaker: Thank you. And thank you for bringing that message to us. We appreciate it. I know that there are folks here who have received your communication. Thank you. Keelan do we have anybody else here for public communication?

Speaker: I don't believe so. Amy starkey injured and off. I think that completes testimony. Our public communications.

Speaker: Thank you. Counselors. Our next agenda item is a time certain agenda item clerk. Could you Keelan could you call that agenda item for us?

Speaker: Amend the comprehensive plan map and zoning map for properties at 3508 northeast 11th avenue and 1123 northeast fremont street, at the request of derek metson greenbox. Architecture lu 20 4-073674 cp zc.

Speaker: Thank you counsel. We first heard this agenda item, I believe in February at a land use hearing and have first read it. Today. Is the actual vote. Is that correct or is today our first reading? First today is our first reading. So today is where we see the amendments that were made to the item we had directed our attorneys to bring us the recommendations with no amendments. So it should look just like we're expecting, but we don't take a vote on it today. Is that correct?

Speaker: That's that's correct. I'm wondering if our land use attorneys, I believe that you may have been provided some information about voting to incorporate the counsel or the findings and conclusions.

Speaker: Okay. So we do need to move the findings in today as an amendment.

Speaker: Exactly. And there is a minor amendment to the ordinance directive a as well.

Speaker: Okay. And do we have any any of our land use attorneys here to talk about that minor amendment? Okay.

Speaker: If you'd like, I can say a few words.

Speaker: That would be great. Why don't you do that? Go ahead and introduce yourself. Thank you.

Speaker: Thanks. My name is supporting.

Speaker: The land use hearing. Last month, the only amendment to the ordinance is amending the first. Wrist recital. This the first sentence of the second section of the ordinance that basically states that you're incorporating the findings, the facts

and findings of the counsel rather than the recommendation of the hearings officer, because now we do have final findings for counsel.

Speaker: Perfect. Thank you very much. Is there a motion to amend these findings into the ordinance?

Speaker: So moved.

Speaker: Second, second.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Keelan, could you call the roll, please?

Speaker: Avalos.

Speaker: I'm voting on an amendment.

Speaker: So, counselor, this is the land use item that we heard about a property on 11th and fremont, and there were some requests to change the use allowances in the zoning map so that this could be commercial and residential mixed use. We are voting right now. This is, I believe, the first item like this that we've had. We heard a recommendation today. We adopt that recommendation into the ordinance and first read that ordinance. And then at our next meeting we will actually adopt that ordinance. So you are voting on an amendment to move the recommendation that we preliminarily showed support for at the land use hearing into the ordinance, so that we can formally consider it today and at our next meeting.

Speaker: Voting first is hard.

Speaker: You only have the rest of this month, and then we rotate.

Speaker: God, I vote i.

Speaker: I my mic is kind of being weird.

Speaker: Smith I canal.

Speaker: I Ryan. I koyama lane I morillo I novick I clark I green. I zimmerman.

Speaker: So because I was absent during this, I want to state for the record I have reviewed and have not had any ex-parte but I did review the record and although i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: With 12 I votes, the amendment is approved. Great, great.

Speaker: So counselors this will come back. Do we need to set a time certain for this to come back?

Speaker: We do have a time certain held on April 2nd at 9:45 a.m.

Speaker: Perfect. So this agenda item will come back at 945 on April 2nd for a second reading, at which point we will have the opportunity to pass the ordinance and move forward with this change to the comprehensive plan map and zoning maps. We are moving on to the consent agenda. There are two items left on the consent agenda. Are there any additional motions to remove anything from the consent agenda? Can we take that from the dais, or do we need to just move forward at this point?

Speaker: Yeah, I think you can move forward with the vote.

Speaker: Perfect. Is there any opposition to our consent agenda? Okay.

Speaker: Unless a.

Speaker: Dunphy i. Smith i. Ryan i.

Speaker: Koyama lane I maria. I novick I clark.

Speaker: I. Zimmerman i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney. I with 12 I votes the consent agenda is approved.

Speaker: Thank you Keelan. We are moving on to the regular agenda items on our agenda. The first of those is a final report from gtac. Keelan. Could you call the item please?

Speaker: Council president, we want to hear the.

Speaker: We are doing the we're doing the appointments first aren't we? Okay. Let's move on to agenda item number five. I apologize, colleagues, and let's move on to agenda item number five and Keelan. Go ahead.

Speaker: Thank you. Appoint susan trexler and jonah james jensen to the Portland historic landmarks commission.

Speaker: Welcome.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Just share my screen.

Speaker: I believe. This did not come through a committee, did it?

Speaker: This did. Yes. Yes. Okay.

Speaker: Did we hear this in governance? Okay.

Speaker: Or was it.

Speaker: So this item was pulled by councilor kanal off of consent.

Speaker: Yes. I'm just wondering if we need to turn to a committee to give us any information about it. Why don't you guys go ahead and get us started?

Speaker: Yes. Thank you. And good evening, councilors. For the record, my name is david kuhnhausen. I'm the interim director of Portland permitting and development. I'm joined today by stacy monroe. She's a senior planner in the design and historic resources team within the land use division in Portland, permitting and development. On behalf of stacy and those joining us online, susan trexler and jonah james jensen, I want to thank you for accommodating the request to move this up. The agenda tonight. One of the responsibilities of staff in this group is to provide assistance to commissioners, to enable them to discharge their duties. And stacy is the liaison to the historic landmarks commission. The hlc is a decision making body for historic resource reviews and an advisory body to council on some demolition reviews. This commission is comprised of seven members, all

of whom are educated, interested and knowledgeable on historic preservation. They provide leadership and expertise on maintaining and enhancing Portland's historic and architectural heritage, and they actively participate in the development of design guidelines for historic districts. Members are appointed by council for a four year term, with an option for a second term. Reappointment. In 2025. The hlc will have one member term out in June, and will have another member decline to seek a second term. They will term out in March. Pad recently ran a recruitment to fill those upcoming vacancies, and stacy and I are here today to seek final approval of susan trexler and jonah james jensen for appointment on the hlc. I'll now pass it over to stacy to conclude the presentation.

Speaker: Great.

Speaker: Thank you, david, and.

Speaker: Good evening.

Speaker: We're seeking two candidates for appointment for a four year term. Susan trexler will be filling the position. Sorry. Let me. My screen didn't advance.

Speaker: Click it again.

Speaker: Thank you. Susan trexler will be filling the position of preservation consultant. And jonah james jensen will be filling the position of architect. Both will bring valuable experience that is being lost with our two outgoing members. These appointments will ensure the historic landmarks commission will continue to perform their duties as a decision making body and an advisor on historic preservation matters. These candidates will bring a wealth of experience and expertise to the commission. Specifically, susan trexler is a consulting architectural historian with ten plus years of professional experience in historic preservation. She has six years of experience as a historic preservation urban planner, performing project reviews and a staff liaison to a preservation commission. She

also volunteers at architectural history groups and most recently at Portland's architectural heritage center. Jonah James Jensen is a licensed architect with 20 years of experience, including some historic rehabilitations and additions. He has led and facilitated a variety of stakeholders that required collaboration and participation with culturally diverse and multilingual groups. He has also served on a historic commission in the state of Washington for six years. If appointed, Susan's first term will run from April 1st of this year to March 31st of 2029, and Jonah's first term will run from June 22nd of this year to June 21st of 2029. With these appointments, the historic landmarks commission will have all seven positions filled. We appreciate your support in considering these appointments for approval. And as David mentioned, both appointees are available via Zoom. Should you have any questions. Thank you for your time.

Speaker: Thank you. And I'm going to turn to Councilor Novick. This went through your committee, I apologize, I should have started with you, but I was trying to figure out which committee it had come out of. Are there any comments that you would like to offer on the folks who we are being asked to confirm appointment of today?

Speaker: Yes. We were very impressed by these two candidates. I would like to ask Mr. Jensen to tell the council and remind the members of the committee about what your historic association was with the castle that formed the backdrop to the movie *Ten Things I Hate About You*.

Speaker: Mr.

Speaker: Thing. Thank you. I'd be delighted to. Yeah. So as mentioned, stadium high school was a project in Tacoma, Washington that actually started my career on as an intern way back in 2002. Spent the first five years, very formative years of my career working on that project and rehabilitating it to its pre-1979 state, if you will. It

was 1979 was a really bad renovation. And so it was an amazing project, very exciting project, and one that I ended up self-publishing a book on and distributing internationally for, you know, alumni and, and folks that were interested. So, yeah, but you get a chance to go visit it. It's still still holding up really well. And I'm delighted to have been a part of it.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. And counselors, you do have a committee staff summary that is attached to the electronic report of this agenda item as well.

Speaker: I confess I didn't look for that. Darn. Do we?

Speaker: We do.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: If you click on the agenda on the link in the agenda, it is there at the bottom of the agenda item. Keelan do we have anybody signed up for public testimony? No testimony. Okay, great. Counselor zimmerman thanks.

Speaker: Obviously, it's an easy choice. I would have voted for this in the consent agenda. So I think we should probably start with why was it pulled from the consent agenda? Is there a concern? Is there a problem here? What are we getting at? Because we just went through the I'm trying to understand what we're what we're doing here.

Speaker: Councilor kanal you had requested that this item be removed from the consent agenda. Would you like to respond?

Speaker: Yeah, sure. Thanks. I pulled it from the consent agenda because it's important for us to treat our advisory boards and commissions with the respect that they deserve, including analysis of those we appoint. I will be pulling every appointment to boards and commissions that advise City Council off of the consent agenda for the duration of my time in office, just so I made that clear before. So

because this is an advisory board to council on some land use decisions, that this is worthy of being considered in this fashion in the light of day. I have absolutely no concerns with the appointees and intend to vote as I did in the committee.

Speaker: Councilor green.

Speaker: I'm just curious why the veterans memorial coliseum is on the slide. Should I be nervous that that's going to be a national historic?

Speaker: No, it was just an it was an image that we selected that everyone would be familiar with. It is a it is a landmark. It is a city designated landmark to be protected. So we thought it would be a great image to put on there.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilors. Any other discussion? Keelan could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Council president? Since this is a report, would you like to ask for someone to accept the report and make a motion?

Speaker: That is a good point. This is a report, isn't it? And we're off consent. Do we have a motion?

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: I have a first.

Speaker: I see, so moved.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Avalos i.

Speaker: Dunphy. I smith. I. I Ryan I koyama lane. I morillo I novick. I clark a green. I pirtle-guiney. I 12 eyes. The report is accepted.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Good evening, good evening.

Speaker: Keelan. Could you please call our next agenda item.

Speaker: Item number seven, accept the government transition advisory committee final report.

Speaker: Councilor.

Speaker: We've heard a number of times before in different forums from our gtac, our government transition advisory committee. But that committee actually concludes their work at the end of this month. Is that correct? So we've asked them to come back to give us a final report with any last things that we should know from them. Many of them have offered to be resources as we move forward, but this is the final report to close out their work. I'd like to invite you up to share with us some of the takeaways that you want to make sure we have in mind as we continue our work. Thank you so much.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: And we have fred and jose kicking us off tonight. Perfect. And councilor koyama lane. We did hear this report is a little bit different from what was heard in committee, but we did recently hear in the governance committee from gtac. Is there anything you'd like to share before our guests get started?

Speaker: Into my opening remarks? Okay. Yeah. So colleagues, this is the final report from the government transition advisory committee, or gtac. The previous council appointed gtac in March 2023, and it sunsets this month. This important volunteer committee was tasked with ensuring effective and efficient implementation of charter reform, engaging the public and providing advice to the city. So last week, we welcomed gtac to the governance committee for a robust and targeted discussion on both policy movement and budget development and how

the community can participate in both. Today provides an opportunity for gtac to now give an overview of all of its work. The current show, the current co-chairs will present the final report, and then we will have ample time for councilor questions and discussion. And many gtac members are here to participate in this discussion. Will take public testimony at the end. We will vote to accept the report. We will vote if we're going to accept the report. With that, I welcome up. Well, you're already here, fred, neil and jose guerrero. George jorgensen, current co-chairs of the government transition advisory committee, to present the final report. Thank you so much for being here.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Go ahead and introduce yourselves and jump in.

Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, madam president. Thank you. Council. My name is fred neal and I'm here with jose guerrero jorgensen. We are the current co-chairs of the government transition advisory committee. Gtac. The gtac was appointed by the mayor and council in March 2023. And our term concludes this month. We were tasked with ensuring effective and efficient implementation of charter reform, engaging the public and providing strategic research, informed advice to the city. Gtac members represent a cross-section of Portland and we are united in involving Portlanders in the successful transition of our government. We hope that our work and our advice provides crucial community input, he into your elected positions and the new form of government. Next slide please. Jose and I will give a 20 to 25 minute presentation that covers our appreciations, how we did our work, advice to city transition, leadership, lessons learned, our recommendations for new city leadership and the guidance we have for the city going forward. We ask that you hold your questions and comments till the end of our presentation, when we will have time for questions and discussion. Many members of gtac are here today to

join the discussion. Next slide please. We want to begin by acknowledging that the transition to a new government has been remarkably successful. The signature features of the charter amendments a ranked choice voting election, new council districts, and the replacement of the commission form of government with a mayor, a city administrator and a legislative council have been implemented. Substantial additional work has been done, from the physical renovations of city hall to the collection of staffing code. Administrative and organizational changes made to support the new government. We recognize the early success of the salary commission and the independent district commission in setting up the basic parameters for the first ranked choice voting election of the entire suite of elected officials in the new government. Then the November 2024 election became a major focus. The development of election rules and processes was a remarkable collaboration across multiple jurisdictions and offices. In an incredibly narrow window of time, resulting in a technically flawless first ever ranked choice election in Portland. Members of the gtac deployed as community educators in voter education efforts, seen firsthand the excitement and enthusiasm building in the weeks before the election. By the first council meeting in January of this year, the transition had provided the council with the basic tools necessary to start legislative work in the new government, and where pieces weren't yet in place, the council followed many of our recommendations by increasing funding for staffing and creating and populating council committees. Meanwhile, in the executive branch, several budget reforms regarding community engagement were being implemented according to gtcs recommendations, and a new engagement officer was hired to adopt a citywide approach to community engagement. The complete reboot of Portland's government. In the two short years since the vote on the charter amendments is a giant accomplishment. Above all, the gtac recognizes and

deeply appreciates the enormous amount of thoughtful and collaborative work to launch the new government. Next slide please. Our committee is comprised of hard working volunteers and over 75 public meetings. We debated and deliberated how to ensure the city's transition is effective and efficient. We researched 20 peer cities to identify promising practices of good government elsewhere, from which Portland might learn. And most importantly, we served as the public engagement body for the transition. In a summer of focused community engagement, we asked community leaders, stakeholders, transition and bureau staff, and hundreds of Portlanders for guidance, feedback, and improvements to our recommendations. We then finalized our recommendations. Consistent with what we learned. We provided 141 presentations to community groups on the city's transition, including more than 50 neighborhood and business associations. 39% of our community presentations were in partnership with communities historically left out of city hall decision making. Over our almost two years of work, we've collectively contributed more than 4000 hours to the transition. Next slide please. Throughout the transition, the gtac gave constructive, informal and formal advice to city leaders in the transition. In public meetings, we evaluate. We evaluated the transition work plan, transition community engagement plan, revisions to code 3.02 on council organization and procedure, the voter education plan, the transition project budget, and how to evaluate the city's transition efforts. More formally, we issued recommendations to city transition leaders on four subjects first, council staffing. Gtac recommended expanding the number of employees the previous council did not follow. Tax advice. We appreciate this council quickly acting on this recommendation. Second district offices gtac recommended temporary low cost district offices while the city conducted robust community engagement to determine what programming Portlanders want in their districts. The previous

council initially agreed with temporary low cost district offices, but reversed course. The previous council also failed to allocate resources to engage Portlanders on what programming they want in district. We understand that tonight's consent agenda includes authorizing the city administrator to negotiate and execute a lease for district three council office space, and we are glad to see movement on this issue. Third, community engagement gtac recommended improvements to community engagement and an expedited process to hire the new citywide engagement officer. We are pleased that the new engagement officer began at the end of January, and we look forward to the adoption of a citywide approach to community engagement. Fourth, onboarding of new leaders gtac made a series of recommendations about the onboarding process for the new elected officials. Some of the recommendations were implemented, and we believe they strengthened the process. Some recommendations weren't implemented, such as partnering with gtac. Next slide please. Our nearly two years of dedicated service. Over that two years, we've reflected on our journey, identifying both significant challenges and meaningful accomplishments. We hope these insights offer valuable guidance for future efforts. Early in our term, confusion arose regarding the scope of the gtac advisory role and how its input would be applied to the broader transition project. The previous council excluded gtac from advising on the executive branch reorganization. This lack of clarity resulted in inefficiencies, protracted discussions of members resignation, and no significant community involvement. Oversight on a significant portion of the transition. The gtac convened six months after the charter amendments approval, placing it in a reactive position relative to the transition team's progress. Members faced the dual challenge of catching up on complex work and addressing the substantial scope of the project, leaving limited time to fully engage or effectively utilize the wealth of input

available. Tasked with educating and engaging the public about the government transition, the gtac faced significant challenges due to the city's lack of a structured or consistent outreach system, underscoring a systemic gap in the city's approach to community involvement. There were also clear wins the gtac very existence enhanced transparency in the transition process. Its meetings provided a platform for open dialog, enabling both the committee and the public to learn about key aspects of the transition. Participation in the gtac proved deeply rewarding for many members, fostering a stronger sense of civic duty and personal fulfillment while highlighting the value of engaged, informed residents. Our involvement underscores the long term benefits of empowering residents to take active roles in local governance. Next slide please. And i'll pass it to jose.

Speaker: Thanks. Thanks, fred. Again. Jordison, guitar co-chair. In addition to advising city transition leaders, gtac also leads recommendations for the new city leadership. Next slide please. Gtac has detailed recommendations for the new city leadership in five different areas. Engagement with city government, budget and budget engagement, council and council committees, city administrator recruitment and voter education. I'll give an overview of each set of recommendations, but we encourage you to read our final report for a full description of each one. Next slide please. I'm going to begin with probably the most common theme throughout gtac work, which is that charter reform provides an opportunity to redefine what community involvement looks like here in Portland, as well as shift the public opinion of the city itself to rebuild trust, engagement processes need to need to be much. Excuse me. Need to move much more from city government in the way of transparency, accessibility, reliability, consistency and clarity of purpose. The new government needs to take full advantage of the new government structures and take proactive care that does not

default to the bad habits and poor practices of the past. We have many recommendations related to community engagement, but our general guidance is this a thoughtful, unified, and well coordinated approach to community engagement is crucial to this work. Is the review and reform of the city's overall approach to advisory bodies in the context of the new form of government, district representation, and a renewed emphasis on system wide community engagement. Responsibility for the overall management of advisory bodies should be clarified, and standardization of proven and effective practices should be considered. It is also crucial for council to implement procedures and manners of communicating with constituents, and increase and improve district communications and constituent relations. We appreciate that the city has launched a new citywide newsletter. We also appreciate that 301 is working with both branches of government to adopt more consistent tools to respond to constituents, as well as the individual communications you're all sending out. We look forward to council implementing more inclusive, community informed decision making processes.

Next slide please. The transition to a de siloed city administration provides opportunities to identify redundant services that can be consolidated, thereby eliminating unnecessary costs. The mayor, city administrator and council should actively and publicly, through public meetings and public involvement, identify those inefficiencies and efficiencies and how they can be incorporated into the city budget process or taken out of it. We also want to ensure that our councilors are aware of a report produced last year for the city, called the budget and finance, staffing and budget process transition report. Immediate, concrete and coordinated steps need to be taken in both executive and legislative branches of government to move implementation of the report's recommendations along. Next slide please, because the roles of the legislative and executive branches significantly change

when it comes to budgeting, charter reform provides a unique opportunity to enhance community engagement in the city's new budget process. We believe the city can strategically build off the current and upcoming budget engagement opportunities. We want to thank the city budget office for already implementing several of our proposed reforms. Regarding budget engagement. We also appreciate the city administrator releasing preliminary budget recommendations in February. The recommendations are providing a tool for council and community based organizations to engage Portlanders on the budget. We hope that next year, the city administrator's recommendations will be simplified for broader consumption and be part of a more holistic budget, education and engagement strategy that includes advisory bodies and that the city will have a strategic plan in place to guide budgeting. A couple of items that we want to highlight that the city has in planning, in the planning stages is the need to reconsider advisory bodies for the budget. Our advice is to dissolve bureau specific budget advisory bodies, create service area advisory bodies, and assess and revisit the city wide community budget advisory board. In addition, primary responsibility for the design, coordination, and implementation of community engagement in the budget process should be centralized in the city administrator's office. Next slide please. Charter reform provides an opportunity for council to be more strategic and forward thinking, and to engage community in new ways. You need to appropriate resources to successfully implement your new roles. We appreciate the council voted to increase the supplemental office budgets for use at your discretion, including hiring additional staff, but we do remain concerned about your staffing levels and recognize that the funding for additional council operations staff hasn't been identified. We also appreciate that multiple opportunities existed for team building among councilors during your December onboarding. We hope that you

continue to find these opportunities. The early development of a city wide strategic plan is a priority for gtac. We understand that the city leadership team has discussed high level scope of work for this project, and is actively working on assigning a project manager and start date for this work. We ask that strategic planning remains high on your to do list. We also appreciate that you quickly created and composed council committees, and you did so in alignment with legislative priorities versus executive functions. We remain concerned that not all districts are represented on every council committee, especially because committees are going to be the place for significant budget specific discussions. There's still a lot of work to do to establish council rules and norms, and this work needs a champion to make it happen. We want to thank chair Koyama Lane and vice chair Ryan and their entire governance committee for inviting us to join the committee last week to dig into some of these issues. Finally, we do recommend that you create a code commission responsible for recommending necessary code changes to review, organize and update and maintain a moderate, modern and accurate city code. Next slide please. Our next recommendation relates to the city administrator recruitment. In short, we recommend the city implement a robust, well-designed, timely, community informed, transparent city administrator appointment process. We spoke in depth about our recommendations when the city administrator appointment was on your agenda. We appreciate that the council approved a resolution submitted by the mayor that established a nationwide recruitment. That will be in this spring, and a new city administrator appointed by January 2026. However, the city provided a written response to recommendations. This was the response we found the most dissatisfying. The city merely acknowledged gtac's recommendations. Rather than provide any progress updates on this, we hope that the council stays

ahead of the progress being made on the recruitment, and that is that the process remains transparent all the way throughout, with opportunities for community involvement. Next slide please. Our final recommendation area is for a future voter education efforts. As a reminder, charter reform included a mandate for the city to provide specific voter education campaigns to educate Portlanders about ranked choice voting in general. Our advice is for the city to invest in what worked in 2024 and address the identified areas of improvement for voters of color and voters in district one. We want to acknowledge that future voter education efforts will be led by the auditor's office, and we share recommendations with them as well. We want to thank the auditor's office and specifically the elections office on which you're here today for their partnership. Partnership with us over the last two years, and we know they are already planning on the next election. There are some elephant elements of our voter education recommendations that we want to highlight, because they are outside of the scope of the auditor's office. Council should define its role regarding voter education, with a focus on councilors from lower voter turnout districts. The city should also provide ways for the public to learn about the candidates, as that was one of the biggest things we heard. Finally, we believe that the voter education efforts done by the auditor's office should be implemented by city provided ongoing civics education, especially in lower voter turnout districts, and building trust with hard to reach communities between election cycles. We can go on to the next slide, and i'll pass it back to fred to close out our presentation. Thank you.

Speaker: We recognize that there are still many outstanding loose ends and open questions arising out of the transition, and it will be important for the city to follow through on resolving them. The gtac believes that the promise of the charter amendments extends beyond simply setting up a new government to realize the

full potential of the charter reforms. Gtac envisions the need for continuing commitment by both the executive and legislative branches to ongoing work in the following areas. First, commit to finding efficiencies in the new form of government during this budget cycle and continuing transition work. The gtac is very much aware of the severe budget constraints facing the city in the upcoming budget cycle. However, continuing the deep work on the government transition will help inform the budget priorities and trade offs. Finding efficiencies in a de siloed government, consolidating and restructuring areas of top heavy management and streamlining processes are essentially our essential parts of necessary ongoing transition work. We also recognize the difficulty of budgeting without a strategic plan in place. Second, commit to a city wide strategic planning process and schedule and begin work. There is wide acknowledgment that the city needs to embark on a strategic planning process to guide priorities for policy making and budget decisions in the new government over a longer term. But there's no clear path to do so in a comprehensive way. Council committees are separately discussing priorities, and the constrained budget will force some urgent decision making. But these are poor substitutes to planning broadly and comprehensively. A full transition to the new form of government cannot be considered complete until this planning process occurs. Third, commit to creating a citywide systemic approach to community engagement with an expanded district based City Council. Reorganized neighborhood coalitions and siloed bureaus, as well as a newly staffed engagement officer position. The time is ripe for an overhaul of weak and failed community engagement practices in Portland. A thoughtful, unified, and well coordinated approach to rebuilding relationships with community will be necessary, along with new approaches that emphasize trusted messengers and district level delivery. Fourth, commit to collaboration between the legislative and

executive branches and continued support of the council. The new, expanded legislative council still needs to develop more robust rules and procedures and accountability mechanisms to district residents to bolster its ability to function in the new charter reform government as inevitable frictions evolve, formal and informal mechanisms to foster collaboration will be increasingly necessary across districts, council committees, branches of government, and constituencies. Fifth, and finally, commit to a work plan to implement the recommendations. We appreciate that the city administrator responded in writing to many of the gtcs recommendations, and we hope a similar model will be used for many advisory bodies for the city. As the gtac sunsets, the city administrator should add the most recent gtac recommendations to this punch list and continue to make progress toward completion of them. The governance committee of the council should insist on regular updates. Next slide please. We appreciate that many detailed elements of the transition remain open questions as the new government gets underway, new practices and procedures, new norms and traditions, and new ways of governing will need time to develop the gtac would like to thank the many people who contributed to this effort, in particular the elected leaders who took the time to meet with us and engage in discussion. The transition team who provided us with information, guidance and important perspectives, and bureau leadership and staff who made themselves available to answer questions and offer solutions. And of course, the gtac superb and transformational staff team of julia meyer, June reyes and guillermo ribeiro salgado need to be thanked heartily. Finally, the gtac is honored by and thanks the countless Portlanders who came to a meeting, a community presentation, a listening session, or provided impressive and useful input in any number of ways. The government transition advisory committee concludes its service with deep appreciation for the work that has brought us so

far, so successfully. We hope our suggestions and guidance assist with the work that must continue, and individual members are here ready to assist you as needed. That completes our presentation and we look forward to any discussion you wish to involve with us. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, thank you both for the presentation and thank you to the entire committee. I know that you have put countless hours over years into this work and putting more time into a final presentation with very thoughtful recommendations for us to move forward on. It's really helpful and I appreciate it. I know many of my colleagues do as well, so thank you. Keelan. I believe we have public testimony signed up. I think we're going to take public testimony first, and then we will move to council discussion and invite members of gtac back up to answer questions from the council.

Speaker: We have two people signed up. First up, jim labby.

Speaker: Good evening, council pirtle-guiney and City Council. My name is jim labby. I'm a district two resident and I'm a board chair of participatory budgeting Oregon. Our mission is to support more just and participatory public budgeting for all Oregonians. So I wanted to follow up on gtex important presentation to make sure that you understood what participatory budgeting is and isn't. Now, it didn't make the top of the list in this presentation, but in the committee it was mentioned, and it's on page 28 of the report recommendation to explore participatory budgeting. And it's a topic that's important because it's been a topic of confusion for the past City Councils. And I've submitted a packet with a diagram and actually some polling data on city of Portland voters. But quickly, I think it's useful to describe participatory budgeting in the context or in relationship to the budgeting process you're currently in. As you know, when you adopt a budget in June, you won't be deciding how every public dollar is ultimately spent. Rather, you'll be

mostly allocating funds within broad categories or to bureaus that hopefully reflect your priorities and the public's you are effectively. In a sense, you're effectively delegating a portion of your budgeting power within parameters, mostly to bureaus, but also sometimes to nonprofits and businesses to advance the city's work. Now, while most bureaus and departments and nils do that most of the time, as you know, Portland has struggled with adequate transparency and accountability over how public funds are spent on the public's behalf. This is a problem that has, in many ways, increased and made a lot more Portlanders distrustful of their government. So instead of delegating budgeting power to bureaus and ngos to make the many budget decisions, you can't make, ppb basically delegates some of that budgeting power directly to the residents of the city, who are allowed to decide within parameters how a portion of the budget is invested on their behalf. So pb is a process that commits to radical transparency and accountability over a portion of the budget by a clear set of rules that outline the process and how people can get involved. The pb process allows residents to collaborate with each other and with city staff to develop feasible projects or short term programs that then are subject to a vote of all residents citywide or in your City Council districts. So. And this is so, so then, and this is crucial, the city implements the winning projects and evaluates the process and does it again the next year. And this is really critical because it is by doing that that you convince more and more residents to get involved in this process over time. It's a proof of concept that the city serious. And this is how city pb in places like new york has grown to hundreds of thousands of residents deciding how to spend tens of millions of dollars annually. That's my time. But thanks for hopefully, a continuing conversation about finally bringing participatory budgeting to Portland.

Speaker: Thank you for being here.

Speaker: Next.

Speaker: Next up we have karen cherry. Karen cherry.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Hello. My name is karen cherry. I'm a resident of district three, a business owner in district four and a member of stadium. And I'm here today to address the pressing financial implications of our current administrator slash councilor form of government, a structure that gtac was instrumental in setting up. While the intention behind this governance model may have been to enhance effectiveness, we must critically examine the significant cost and inefficiencies that have arisen. As it stands, our city is responsible for paying 12 City Councilors and mayor, a city manager, six deputy city managers, and at least 2 to 3 administrative staff for each of these positions. This substantial payroll, on top of maintaining offices at city hall places an immense burden on our budget. Currently, we also face a proposal for district three councilors to lease an office space at a staggering cost of \$36,000, plus additional property management fees. This raises serious concerns about our fiscal responsibility and resource allocation. Given our budget constraints, it is perplexing that we would incur such substantial expenses when a city owned building located at 4745 east burnside street offers ample space and parking. Utilizing this existing resource would not only save taxpayers dollars, but also streamline operations by consolidating our administrative functions. Furthermore, we must consider the importance of public accessibility with this additional lease space. Be accessible to the public for constituents to engage with their City Councilors. It is vital that the locations where councilors operate facilitate communication and interaction with the community they serve. If we can provide a space that is both cost effective and accessible, we would be better serving our constituents, leasing additional office space for the councilors while we have a suitable facility available exemplifies the

inefficiency inherent in our current governance structure. The financial burden of leasing, combined with the duplication of roles and responsibilities, only exacerbates our budget challenges and diverts resources away from essential services that our community needs. While we cannot change the framework of our government at this time, I urge this council to reconsider the leasing proposal and explore the use of city owned building at 4745 east burnside. By doing so, we can demonstrate a commitment to fiscal responsibility and the prudent use of taxpayer funds. It's imperative that we prioritize effective governance and accountability in our administrative practices. Let us work together to ensure that our city operates efficiently, responsibly, and maximize the resources we have at our disposal. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you for being here.

Speaker: That completes testimony.

Speaker: Councilors. I see a number of folks who are interested in discussion. Now. I do want to flag that at 720, we are going to take a 15 minute break to allow anyone who is observing ramadan to break fast. So we will start our discussion, hear from a couple of people, take that quick break and then come back to conclude our discussion. Fred and josie, if you'd like to come back up. And then if there are questions for other members of gtac, please feel free to invite up your colleagues to help you answer the questions.

Speaker: You bet.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor clark. Go right ahead.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president, just to start off, thank you so much for everything you've done. Fred. I know you've been a lifelong public servant and local government nerd. Really. So I appreciate all the time. And I had the privilege of

watching you actually make some presentations in the community, which was great. I just want to say I'm very proud and actually very humbled to be a part of what you all work to engineer, and I'm glad that we've taken advantage of many of your recommendations. But I know we have a long way to go. We're just beginning the cultural change that I think you had your finger on, particularly the tension between executive and legislative branch were just beginning to experience some of those things. But I also want to say that I appreciate your recommendation of a work plan. And I'll look at our council president. I think that taking up some of your recommendations, maybe after we get through the budget process is a great idea. I really appreciate some of that forward looking ideas that you have. And I want to say lastly, that I hate to see you go away. I just think that your work has been invaluable, and all the other gtac members I see in the audience that I know, how can we best keep you in the loop and keep you informed? Thank you.

Speaker: Well thank you. We've those of us who wish to continue this conversation with you as individually or as the council or with the administrative branch, have given julia staff our personal contact information. Obviously, our Portland email address is terminated as of March 30th, which is fine with me, but still, of course we are much more. I think we agree unanimously in our final meeting last week that we are all better citizens for having engaged in this process, and I look forward to a successful transition and a successful city that works better. And so feel free as individual councilors or in committees or the like to contact any number of us. There's great expertise amongst our entire committee.

Speaker: I know I've gotten a few phone calls from your staffers, so my phone number is out there. I'm sure others are as well. You feel free to continue to do that.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor smith.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I just want to say thank you for all the hard work that you all have been doing, and you've been doing this for a couple of years now. So kudos to you and the entire gtac folks who who comprise of your committee. And I feel just like olivia, how can we stay in contact with you? Because what you've done is given us some guardrails on how to and when to and what to do, and that gives us ideas on how we can maintain going into the future. One of the things that you talked about was community engagement, and I had a nice conversation today with our community engagement officer and to let her know that we were having district town hall meetings from from my office. And I asked if she could share that information with who she contacted for the budget office so that we're sharing information. And you had something very similar up there that we need to kind of have a holistic way that we reach out to the community. And I think it's so important that if one of us has a tool or has information that we should be sharing that information with each other, it doesn't matter if it's a citywide event or not. I think we still need to make sure that when we're having individual district meetings, that those meetings are well attended as well. And I think that your time and effort that you put forward, it is very much appreciated from councilor smith's office. And I know district one has enjoyed having you here too. So thank you, thank you, thank you. And if we can be ever of help to you or you want to deliver a report or you need to do something, don't hesitate to ask my office because we'd certainly bring you in. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor morillo.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I just want to say I'm so grateful and so heartened to see you here. I feel like the new form of government gave me so much hope. And I think that people have been so joyful. We just had our first

budget in district meeting, and there were, I think, around 120 people in person and then over 88 people there online. So just the way that people have been invigorated by the new form of government and the access that it's given people is really life changing. And I'm just very, very grateful for the work that you've done. I feel a little bit like where your kids and we're going off to college and we're like, no, mom, please don't, don't go away yet. And so I hope that we'll still get to come over for dinner sometimes and bug you guys and ask you questions. I'm just very grateful for all the work you do, and I hope to continue working with you in the years to come. Thank you.

Speaker: Just remember to pack overnight bags.

Speaker: We'll do.

Speaker: Be careful. Some of us might bring our laundry. Councilor avalos.

Speaker: I was excited to leave my house, so I can't relate. Thank you so much. I have so much that I want to say, but I think it really just boils down to my gratitude for all of the hard work that you did. And in particular, I feel like what you highlighted is super important. How we engage our communities, how we build up district trust, and especially around budget strategic planning. These are the kinds of things that I definitely want to continue to explore. And I was going to ask that same question that councilor clark asked about how you all, you know, as individuals, as citizens of Portland, wanted to continue to engage. I definitely consider my office very open to continuing to hear from you all and welcome any feedback about what you're seeing as we're trying to implement these various recommendations. I'm not on the governance committee, but I'm going to be whispering in governance committees ear just to, you know, make sure that as a council, we are really held accountable to implementing this. And partly it's because of the spirit of what you said, too, around advisory committees. Portlanders across

our city, they put in hard work doing research, engaging with other Portlanders, really providing valuable assets. And it is a shame that so often that work goes underutilized, unnoticed, underappreciated. I don't feel that way, of course, but I know that that is the history, and I really want to make that keep it in the past. I think that this is the moment to really show how we are implementing what our community is recommending to us, and through these advisory boards is one way, but also in the way that we just change our relationship with citizens of Portland. So thank you so much for all of your hard work. I know those long nights. I know those, you know, frustrations of feeling like you might be speaking out into a void. Know that I am in the void. I'm listening and I definitely plan to follow up with you all and keep in touch so that we can keep moving this forward, because this is going to take many years to implement. So I would encourage you all to stay engaged for sure. Thank you again.

Speaker: Councilor Kanal.

Speaker: Yeah, I will have some questions, but I do want to also start by saying thank you. Portland's volunteers in general who serve on committees like gtac. You're dedicated, you're committed. You make Portland better. You're willing to work for it. Portland is worth fighting for, and you do it every day. I'm grateful to everybody who volunteers on any committee and committed to making your services meaningful as possible. And even by that high standard, you've done a ton here for g tech specifically since you started your service two years ago. And so I want to express the city is in your debt, along with your colleagues on the independent redistricting commission, the salary commission, and the charter commission as well. And speaking of the charter commission, I want to also thank the staff. This is the second time we've had Julia Meyer here bring a big project to fruition successfully. Again, everyone who supports an advisory board citywide

have been in your shoes. I recognize how hard it is and the support you need, and it's uniquely difficult when you have a high profile time bound group. So thank you to June and guillermo, but but in particular julia for project managing both charter commission and the government transition advisory committee. I also just wanted to highlight that, you know, you mentioned about having limited time and not being provided with a community engagement framework and having insufficient time to talk about community engagement because of the way that community engagement has not been set up, like about how that should function. It's sort of sadly ironic and I think worth really revisiting for us as we talk about how advisory groups work. And that's sort of my intro comments, I had three questions. The first thing was about council committees, and if you could speak more as to the fixed scheduling or flexibility in scheduling and the sort of very, very strict time limits we've had and how that fits into your recommendations for it. And, madam president, would it be convenient if I just asked all three of my questions?

Speaker: You know, we have a pause in two minutes. So let's start with a quick response to this one, and then we'll pick up your questions when we get back.

Speaker: Great. Thank you.

Speaker: We I don't think we discussed exactly all the different parameters of how you're setting up your committees as far as time, I do agree that this is not a recommendation we gave, but having them at one time fixed for a certain period of time every day during the week will limit our community engagement. And we did talk about that. And when we're talking about the council meetings and things like that, if you're moving a lot of the things you're looking at into committee and take them out of council, then moving your council meeting around to make it more accessible, but then moving the things you have to talk about into committees that are not accessible is not going to go in the in the spirit of what our

recommendations were, even though we didn't specifically talk about timing for the committees, I don't believe it meshes up with what we did recommend. It doesn't allow for the most amount of people. You're still going to be limited to the people that can take off work, show up in the middle of the day. On a certain day. Probably a lot of people from this area. Et cetera.

Speaker: Hi, destiny paulo for the record district one. I think also it's important to talk about what your agenda is going to be. If we know, like as you're solidifying your committees, because it seems like there might be too many. And again, not every district is represented in each one. I heard a lot of like, how do we keep gtac around? And I think jose said this in a previous public meeting, but if you invite people, they will come. And so like while it's hard for working people to understand what your committees are and when your agenda is coming up again, I think that framework of community engagement and identifying your stakeholders will be helpful. And again, if committee meetings are all during the working hours, because we understand you do have that work life balance, that means a lot of energy and effort put into getting actual community engagement discussion that is transparent and accountable.

Speaker: I'm going to pause us here. We are going to go into a 15 minute recess to allow anyone who is observing ramadan to break fast. We will meet back at 735 to pick up councilor kanal on your line of questioning.

Speaker: And.

Speaker: We are reconvening tonight's City Council meeting. Thank you all for heading back to your seats. Filing back in, and as soon as our gtac leaders are back at the table. Councilor kanal. If you would like to continue with your final two questions, that would be fantastic.

Speaker: Yeah, thank you very much. So thank you. I think that's I'm good. On the council committees question, I want to ask sort of related questions related to advisory bodies, which is my thought has been and I've engaged with a couple of members of gtac on this that that having fewer, better resourced, more integrated advisory bodies would be better for policy making. And I'd like to ask what your broad recommendations are on those types of questions, which are kind of a little outside of the scope of what's in the document. And also, just relatedly, would you have supported eliminating bureau budget advisory committees this year if you had known that there weren't going to be service area budget advisory committees until next year?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: We would have. And in fact, we brought it up earlier, but it seemed maybe too early for that suggestion to be receptive.

Speaker: Clarifying you.

Speaker: Would have still supported the bureaus intact for the first half of the fiscal year, and then more or less or then in transition, whether they talk to their citizen budget advisory committees about that transition or not. We never heard. And it may be doubtful because our our research and survey of members of all, many of the advisory committees, not just cb citizen budget advisory committees, was that many of them felt that they weren't being utilized, they weren't informed, and that if they did have a discussion, it wasn't somehow institutionalized through the process. So they would get feedback and know whether their involvement was useful or not.

Speaker: We talked to a lot of people in advisory committees to make our recommendations. We did a lot of engagement, and the ones that complained the most about advisory bodies were people on budget committees and budget

advisory bodies. So that's why we talked about them. The biggest complaints I heard were from those people that they were there were all kinds of comments about how ineffective they felt they were.

Speaker: We talked about an advisory committee on advisory committees, but that seemed a little, you know, duplicate, maybe a little too bureaucratic. So as long as you standardize your recruitment efforts that you make sure that your efforts are diverse, considering the overall citizen makeup as well as the specific areas of expertise you're looking for advice on, whether it be legislative or administrative. And there's a difference there, too, I think. I certainly hope it occurred to me that because I haven't been following, I don't know. Some of us have been following your various committee meetings and attending quite a few of them. Are you getting does mr. Jordan's staff show up for those, and are you engaged with them in discussion and learning and getting advice and knowledge from them? Because they're they're they can be a conduit from a citizen budget advisory committees, from the bureaus. It's not budget advisory groups, but work service area advisory committees to you, to the council.

Speaker: Yeah. And just a related sorry, a related point on this is, you know, engaging accurately with the recommendations you mentioned. And I want to highlight the comment you made on the status update, in which a recommendation to accelerate the hiring of a city administrator, the next city administrator from the then scheduled June 2025, was marked as acknowledged with an explanation that it was actually being delayed by six months. I think it's important for us to just say we disagree when we disagree. I have concerns about one of your recommendations. I want to make sure I say that that's which is around being a one size fits all for community engagement around the city. I personally have a concern about that. I think we should be allowing that conversation to play out, but I won't belabor that

point. But my question, my last question on the city administration is we have deputy city administrators, which are not a position that has direct reportage or appointment with the council, has a very significant role that is higher than a bureau director, which was sort of explicitly in the charter outside of the scope of council. And so I wanted to ask if you had thoughts on what a deputy city administrator should be in terms of its level of substantive work with the content of the work of the bureaus? And if you think that council should have what type of role council should have in in the conversation around deputy city administrators.

Speaker: Well, let me let me maybe personal. We have talked about it some in a public meeting that we're sort of surprised that there weren't more bureau directors or managers that were then transposed to being service area deputy city administrators is there. And we made some reference in tonight's presentation about perhaps a top heavy administrative structure and budget constraints aside and the like is just does every bureau of the 26 that were preexistent, have any of them been folded into some other bureau, or are they just been congealed into separate six service areas and still maintain their hierarchy of administrators? And that doesn't seem efficient to any of us. We had some quite a bit of discussion about dc izing means being more efficient. And you've got certainly a deputy city administrator has got to bring those formerly siloed disparate bureaus. But they have like service functions into a particular service area to make them talk to each other, to collaborate, to coordinate, and to find out themselves. I guess this is the term used in the transition plan in the change management contract is future opportunities. Well, the future is here now and these opportunities are critical to you. I think setting the precedent for streamlining the government is evoking efficiencies and making sure that these bureaus are de siloed and are unified.

Speaker: Yeah, but let's be clear, as a as a committee did not talk about what these deputies, city administrators should be doing. So yes, we talked about efficiency efficiencies and making things more efficient and decentralize the government. But I don't want to get into my opinion on what they should be doing or whether or not we even should have an opinion on what they should be doing. I'm not necessarily sure that's up to us.

Speaker: Well.

Speaker: I'm asking you personally because and any of the other members because i, I noticed you you in the unclear committee objectives section, you specifically noted that gtac was restricted from discussing executive branch reorganization, which is a problem, because that and some of the colleagues up here and former councilors as well, have noted that that is one of the major parts of the charter and therefore of the government transition that you are the advisory committee to. It's in the name. And so I would love I'm asking largely to give you the opportunity to talk about something that I think you should have been allowed to talk about for the last two years, and I'm sorry to put you on the spot in this way, but if you happen to have something, I'd love to hear it.

Speaker: Pablo. District one. For the record, a lot of like the reorg part. A lot of the materials even like, you know, the what committee structures and all that. We were more reactive than proactive. It was very hard in the previous council and mayor model to really provide any input. And so again, like we I think we've created a, a norm and a rule to discuss, as we say, like that this council should model in committee discussions. And it's really hard because one of the things we did want to ask and why we pushed so hard on onboarding engagement, was because we wanted communication in some form to be understood and clarified and accountable and transparent, and we never got it. I think the closest we got was to

the hope of seeing the onboarding session of how councilors and the mayor were talking to one another, but we haven't heard any updates since. Personally, I will say as a gtac committee member and again, if you want to invite like gtac members for a future governance committee discussion regarding how do we streamline communications, because we did acknowledge you're going to get calls from constituents about potholes and services, and how is that going to be held in the executive branch? And, you know, we had these conversations, but they were not in a space to be fostered and provided good recommendations.

Speaker: And I will say that the one thread comment for gtac is that our conversations were nothing, not nothing, but were not recommendations. While some people are wondering why we didn't fold more people up, some of us, like myself, are glad that there are new people coming looking at things in different ways. Like you mentioned, one size fits all for engagement. I don't think that's what we meant at all with the recommendation, just with like with this, for me, having a person to oversee a plan means that you can think about this. We need to do it different in district one than in district three than in district four. It doesn't mean it should be one size at fault, but it should be that one person knows the entire plan. So we're not duplicating efforts and things like that. Just like with deputy directors, there might be some places where institutional knowledge is more important, but you might be able to get that not in the deputy, you might be able to get it elsewhere, and you want a deputy that can come in with fresh eyes because it's a whole different system. And so we don't just fall into old ways of doing things. I've been a big proponent of doing that in almost every respect. This is our chance to do things completely different. Take it as often as you can, bill.

Speaker: Thank you. Fred. Bill kinsey, member of gtac. I view the creation of the deputy city administrators as an effort to reduce the siloing of bureaus where each

bureau looks out for itself, and if one organizes the bureaus in service areas, there's the opportunity to identify some commonality and increase efficiencies.

Speaker: I'll stop here.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor green.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I just want to start by saying I hear directly from Portlanders pretty much every day, both in my in my district and citywide, frankly, a sense of hope and relief on how well the new government is. Off to a great start. I mean, we're we're not perfect. We're still figuring it out. But the common thread is they are just grateful that it seems like we are willing to take action with urgency in ways that a previous council would not, and that we know how to work together. And I just I want to say it's really, really important to get things right. And you guys have put a lot of work into showing us how to get it right. And so I just kind of want to thank you. So when those folks reach out, I say thank the gtac, you know, so thanks for your service to the city. I have sort of, I guess maybe a comment for my, my colleagues, but maybe also an invitation to weigh in on this comment. And it's on it's on how we use committees and how that intersects with community engagement. And you touched on it in your report. And one of the things I've been struggling with right now is this feeling that our committees are really just a reproduction of an old habit, where bureaus are briefing in a unidirectional way to City Councilors. And part of it is, is we have to change our norms. And we're still figuring this out and kind of how to decenter that a little bit and say, you're going to get some space in our committees. But really, our committees are also for the community to come on in and engage in a dialog with us directly, offer ideas that either are a fully baked policy or the germ of an idea. And we do this sort of discourse to figure out how we move that policy into action.

And so I'm, I'm wondering if you can comment on on what you think the balance of that might be. And you know, what a what a best model looks like.

Speaker: We were just reviewing this because there's so many recommendations that even we as members will not remember them all or we'll get them wrong. We folded. We talked when I talked earlier about I wasn't sure if we talked about council committees in time. We did. We folded into our councils. One thing we want out of council committees is your chance to have them at different times, not only at different times, but in different places. There are smaller committees. They're not the whole council. Why are there always here? Why can't if it's if you remain agenda item is something that affects east Portland, why not have it in district one? If your main thing has to do with forest park, then why not have it here or somewhere near forest park? Like be creative to get people to be there. The heart of our work in my mind is community engagement. You hear it over and over and you see it even in places where we're not talking about community engagement. Take that to heart and use your committee as a community engagement tool, not just another committee to hold hearings about bills that are just like every jurisdiction in the world.

Speaker: A critical factor, though, in council committees, is that you get the right knowledge and information to make your committee deliberations and recommendations to the full council. And that means finding expertise out there as well in the community. And that's where it kind of falls on either committee staff. If you have that, who knows how to reach out in a particular subject area, depending on the committee or your council, your individual councilor policy staffs, that may, since you're on a particular committee, certainly your staff is involved in that. Your your work on that committee to some extent. And they can tell you who's out there, maybe, or help you find those people to bring them in. So you get a broader

perspective, a community perspective on that particular issue at that particular time.

Speaker: It's really helpful. Amy.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Amy randolph.

Speaker: For the record, I don't know if this fits exactly to this comment, but I'm not sure if there's another time to say it, which is that at the heart of what the work we did was community engagement. We were the primary citizens engagement body. We weren't in charge of architecting the transition. We didn't write the charter reform. We were in charge of going out and talking to Portlanders and then bringing back their experience of dealing and interfacing with government and understanding how that goes into the new government. And what we heard overwhelmingly was that it's difficult to interface with the city of Portland, in particular, difficult to interface with the council. The website is hard to use. It's hard to find things. And when people reached out to their councilors, they didn't hear back. This was partially to do with the form of government, but also partially to do with poor systems on the part of the council. Despite their best efforts to be in touch with their constituents. So with regards to committees and getting input on committees, we invite you to think of all of these things as opportunities to improve engagement with the city, that somebody should have a positive experience when reaching out to their City Councilor and actually expect action, actually expect to hear back. And we have a lot of recommendations that are around specific logistics of that. And then also we have recommendations regarding. I forget what I was gonna say, fix the website is the point.

Speaker: Thanks.

Speaker: That's a really timely comment. I've been feeling that right now. I know that there are people trying to reach my office and you know, we're doing our best, but it's like, I would like to get back in a much more timely fashion. So I'll be looking very carefully at ways we can be pretty creative in that. And some of it's structural. Some of it's like prioritization. So thank you. I can't miss this opportunity to thank Jim for commenting on participatory budgeting, which is something I care a lot about. I know it's a piece of the report, and I bring it up because we're in the budget cycle. We're in the we're in the season where we consider the budget. And, you know, I was at a I was at the d3 budget listening session last night. And people have ideas about the budget and how we should use it. And I've been thinking a lot about this quagmire we're in with the structure of our revenue for our city, where most of it's restricted. We have a very, very, very small sliver of our revenue that's even open to negotiation. And I think if we want to move and I understand why, right. Like, you know, let's say a tax increment financing as an example, we use that so much because for some communities it's the only way that they can really earmark money for their community. But when you do that over and over and over again for various different things, what you're left with is a revenue structure that's pre-specified. And so if we ever want to move to a world where the public has trust that we can pass a general tax that is for general purpose, that we can adjust and change. I think participatory budgeting is how we get there, because that builds a practice that builds sort of democratic. If you're flexing your democracy muscles. And so I just would like our council to think about that as we move forward. And I didn't want it to get lost in this sort of broader we heard public comment and then Jim went away. So thanks for that. And I think I'll just stop talking. Thanks.

Speaker: Councilor Zimmerman.

Speaker: Thanks. I, I will start with just echoing some of the comments that were made at the beginning. It is an honor to sit up here on this side after the significant amount of work that you all and you all there, that I have the worst seat. I see you all but that you all did right. That that is not lost on me as a as a son of Portland and a person whose grandfather made a lot of ruckus in these chambers at different times over the decades. It is not lost on me that I am. I have a deep privilege here because a lot of the work that you all did, so thank you for that. I'm very appreciative of the work that went in and the collaboration with Multnomah County, Washington county, clackamas county to make sure that all Portland voters got through this system. And I think we did it well. And as the only guy up here who won because of ranked choice voting.

Speaker: I'm into it.

Speaker: So thank.

Speaker: You for sending that levity. So I just I don't want that to be lost. I have a couple of questions. And similar to mr. Canal, I'm just kind of interested in the thoughts from the committee on a couple of items. I'm going to come back to community engagement, but my first one is, was the tech able to discuss or do you consider the auditor another branch of the government, meaning we think of the executive branch, right. The mayor and the executive. We've got the council. Is the auditor another branch?

Speaker: Outside our scope?

Speaker: But we were actually informed that the reorganization of the administrative end of it, whether it involved the auditor as a separate elected official or the mayor as a separately elected official. Was that not part of the charter change that we were to advise on?

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: So it's.

Speaker: Were you aware in your studies, though, were you aware of any location where the presiding officer of the legislative body didn't have direct oversight over the enabling functions, like a clerk's office? Because here's why I'm asking it. Some of the challenges that we have is that we are we are also working in a handshake agreement about what is possible, where to hold meetings, how to hold meetings. And we have a unique structure here where our clerk works for another, another branch of our government. That is a challenge to meet some of those, because we are meeting a lot. We are stressing that team out in terms of its capacity, our contracts. We've had an uncomfortable meeting previously that was canceled due to a contract with the streaming service. So some of those things that this council is trying to do some work, but I'm not aware of any other government where we have that separation from the presiding officer. And I'm wondering if you learned of any in your.

Speaker: Studies here.

Speaker: Terry, is I wonder if terry.

Speaker: Is terry.

Speaker: Is online and has. Raised his hand. Would you like us to have him speak to this?

Speaker: Oh, there.

Speaker: He is. Okay.

Speaker: Hey, terry.

Speaker: Yeah? Hey. Thanks for having me on. And before I get started, fred and jose are doing an amazing job communicating our work. And I appreciate what they've done. We did a lot of research into how councils were structured, and most councils have some sort of clerk. The level of independence of the clerk varied and

supervision of the clerk varied. Most of them. Most councils are structured around the presiding officer having control of the of the staff structure, and it's because clerks aren't a separate entity of government. They are serving the legislative body. So I think that's the direct answer to councilman zimmermann's question. And I know, I know, you guys are struggling with it. I watched the council and auditor work session the other day, and it is something that we knew was going to be an issue. And it is something that you'll have to work through.

Speaker: Thanks, terry. I appreciate you coming in with that. My community engagement question, i, I've always thought of the 12 of us up here as, as a pretty significant part of the community engagement apparatus. I think that that is the intent behind districts. I see you nodding. I'm glad I wanted to check in with that. We had you know, it's not lost on me that most, most parts of government are not written down. Most are built on practice. A few things get codified over 200 some odd years, but generally we're in practice mode and a few things are written down. So we're creating frameworks. At the beginning of this experience, we heard some unfortunate things that I think set a weird tone. And I'm curious about your understanding of maybe why those tones could have gotten set. We had some staff who said we don't have a role in constituent relations. Just send those on to the bureaus. They'll take care of them. We don't have a role in the way that we conduct community meetings, that a community engagement officer will do that for us. I struggled to think that that's what this body and g-tech came up with. And so do you have any estimation where and how not lost in translation, but we got bobbed in translation somewhere from the community body that you all presided over through the staff and now into our practice. And we're just we're still working through some of those kinks. I would call them we've got we just got some some things to get moving a little bit. And I'm curious if you know where that came from.

Speaker: Well.

Speaker: I'm going to take the looks in the face for those who can't see it, the looks on faces in the audience as a were a little surprised to hear this. So okay.

Speaker: Yeah, I agree with you. You all should be a community engagement body just as much as anyone. But we agree that although we all know that you can't do it all, there should. And like I said before, there should be one person that oversees everything so that things aren't falling through the cracks. Right? And like you said, not everything is codified. But the problem is, what if three councilors are or two councilors in one district are actually doing engagement? One never does, which is a little bit what we talked about, why we need to have some person in charge or someone to oversee or rules in place, but it shouldn't be. Nothing should be that person that decides at all. Every district is going to work differently, and it's going to work differently. And the people best suited to know that are you?

Speaker: Well, the relationship between the council as a legislative policy making body and the administrator and mayor as the executive branch is, is so critical to this function, you've got to iron it out and you've got to be responsive to your constituents and to the knowledge that you're getting hearing from your community members to make sure that the bureau administration is hearing this as well, and that you have an ongoing collaboration or reciprocity as far as communication is so vital. And we said that tonight earlier, this is something you're all going to have to practice, as is mr. Wilson and mr. Jordan and mr. Jordan's. Successor and more power to you. But the standardization of making sure that there's a we talk about 311 and there's some way that if somebody asks a question, we knew who we know who asked the question, we know who they asked it of. Was it a counselor or a bureau administrator? And then what was the answer? And that

there's a record of that so that the citizen knows that they're being listened to and that they're being responded to?

Speaker: I think the key is collaboration, because just like the engagement officer is not going to know it all, especially by your districts, you're also not going to know it all. There's some places where just the regular town hall doesn't work. People don't show up. So you have to come up with different ways. And I spoke, we spoke to the community engagement officer specifically about that in a meeting with her recently, and she told me the things she did in previous positions she's held to raise engagement to that in the future. When they do have something like that, people do show up. So and we don't expect you to know all those different methods because you might not be an expert on all the different methods of engagement. So it really needs to be a partnership where you're working together.

Speaker: I see someone coming to the desk. I'm sure it's something good.

Speaker: Not with all the answers, but I may be echoing some of the comments. But if I'm understanding at least part of the question, I mean, I think you're identifying a tension between the executive branch and the legislative branch. The executive branch is going to want to explain what it's doing in terms of administering or executing the law, but the legislative branch is going to want to explain its policy and really be in contact with the constituents as an analogy, which I think many would say it's not working real well right now. The federal government, you have the executive branch doing various things, but you have a lot of congressional leaders. I mean, different, different views. But, you know, the congressional leaders have their tools for communicating with the public that doesn't specifically answer the question. Perhaps, you know, you know, the legislative branch needs to have, you know, organize, you know, a voice for how it goes out or it leaves it to the individual councilors or the districts. But that will be a

tension as to how much the exit you as the as the legislative branch want to have your own voice?

Speaker: Thanks. Yeah. You know, I've throughout your comments, throughout the presentation, I see that the public is very much centered. And then this body is very much centered in where you spend a lot of time. And that's not lost on me. And so I think of that as because then engagement was also this foundational principle that it is engagement between council and public which was desired. It comes off the pages that that was desired so much. And so for me, I take that as those engagement functions, if they're going to exist in the city, should be set up to enable the council to be responsive, to hear, to understand so that the policy can be directed or that our advocacy can be on behalf of. And so I think, you know, sometimes you get cramps and you get knots and you got to work them out. I think I think I'm learning through this a little bit, but I appreciate it. You know, my time at the county, I would say the constituent relations on this side of the river are not they've got to be at least tenfold what my experience was at the county. And so that is a significant level that I think we are 12 engagement officers. So thanks for your guys's work. I am so appreciative. And I also just want to say a government commission who has an ending date sure does seem motivated to deliver a solution. And I'm actually a fan of ending certain ones because man, you, you produced you, you exited and we beat. The old trope of government just kind of talks about itself. So thank you for your work. All the volunteers is great. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor koyama lane.

Speaker: I'll be quick. Since councilor clark was kind enough to shout out fred's amazing, amazing leadership, I feel at liberty to say thank you, jose, for your leadership, particularly as you're someone from district one. We know you wear a lot of different hats, and it's been really meaningful to have your guidance. As

someone who understands at a deep level the needs, hopes, challenges of a district that's been historically underrepresented in these chambers in many ways. So centering that through your leadership has helped make this process thoughtful and equitable. Thank you so much.

Speaker: Yay!

Speaker: Councilor smith.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I just wanted to go back and piggyback on what councilor zimmerman talked about. And I think that our guests kind of summarized it because there's the executive side where three, one one reports to the executive side of the government and the engagement officers, community engagement officers. They also report to the executive side. And so as us, we're the legislative side. You know, we have a we have a different mission. And you can't standardize that because we're individual elected officials. And so that is up to that elected official on how they want to engage or how how much they want to engage or how little they want to engage with their constituents and maybe to their detriment. But we need to understand that you cannot standardize districts because we have individual people. We're not voted in as districts, we're voted in as individuals. And so therefore we're creating something that we're we're trying to build a foundation for. And so we need to have access to all the information that the executive side has. And I have to tell you, it was like pulling teeth about getting information to do community engagement that, you know, they wouldn't give to us. And I'm still trying to get some of that information because they have tools, they have the emails, they have the organizations that they've reached out to, but they're only actually using that for city wide services. So I just think that is just unconscionable. But at any rate, so we have to understand who we are, where

we're at, and that we're elected individually. And you can't call us district one and assume that it is all going to be the same, because it's not i.

Speaker: I agree with you. Like I said, everything is going to have to change depending on who's working. And I do implore the executive branch and you guys to work together, especially at a time like this. Ideally, you would have your own engagement officer and you'd have certain resources that are yours. But we are in a money situation that that might not be tenable. So there's going to be a need for more collaboration. Maybe that can change in the future. But we talk about you having the appropriate resources to do your work. Those are the kinds of things we're talking about. You need to be adequately staffed and resourced to do all that. And we've heard public testimony that some people don't like saying you need more staff to do this, but in my opinion and experience, community engagement is how we get the city on track, and it is how we get the public engaged with everything you're doing. So where else are we going to spend the money?

Speaker: And remember, jose, resources don't always equal money. Resources means data and information that's shared between the different executive and legislative levels. That's what I'm talking about.

Speaker: And it.

Speaker: Goes back.

Speaker: And staff time.

Speaker: Yes, yeah. Thank you.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Did yeah I just want to speak to this a little bit because part of our mission was to reach out to Portlanders traditionally left out of city hall. And I don't know how well we did with that, but we spent a lot of time in conversation with communities that are very disenfranchised and upset. Frankly, they've had pretty

bad experiences dealing with city hall, and over and over we heard again that they simply want to be listened to and that if they are offering feedback to the city, that the city is acting on that feedback, those relationships have been burned over and over again out in community because of the city's disorganized way of engaging with the community. And this is a moment for exceptional leadership for you all to really see that on a meta level and really understand that the city can't go on engaging with communities like that, like asking, asking, asking and then not delivering. And then and then be surprised when it's difficult to do community engagement. So we invite you to recognize this moment of exceptional leadership, and that you guys are asked to think of this in a way that is exceptional to your roles as councilors. You are architecting a new government, and this is a really unusual thing, and we invite you to meet the moment at the grandeur that you are. You are. We're so excited to see you all doing that. And that community engagement is at the core of so many of our recommendations, because it is at the core of the city building trust with the people again, and building trust that you guys are going to actually deliver on what Portlanders are wanting.

Speaker: And to.

Speaker: Add to what you're saying is that a lot of people think that 311 is our offices and they have to engage via the, you know, email. And 311 is not us. And so they don't understand that. And so they send out an email and they correspond with three one, one. And all they want to do is talk and be referred to their, their elected person. And so the way it was set up was for them to go through three, one one and then three layers down, get to us. And that's not great. So I have changed the telephone number for me on the 311 that it doesn't go through that system, that it comes to my office if they want to talk to me. So thank you.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: It's the user experience details that you all are going to exceptionally need to be mindful of and think about.

Speaker: Thanks.

Speaker: This is Juliet James from the GTAC, and this is when I implore you to work with your neighborhood associations and coalitions. There is such a great resource. They're anxious to work with you. My neighborhood association has already met with all of our district four councilors, and they have gone through a lot and contorted themselves to fit in with this new charter. This is really the kind of the third really bumpy transition they've been through in the last probably 15 years. And I implore you, they're ready for your support and they're ready to support you back.

Speaker: This Pablo, again. Again, I think this goes back to why we recommended service aligned advisory bodies to really have a place where we can talk about service concerns and have the public engage with that. We also in our recommendations, we want we recommended that the standing committees reflect legislative priorities, but in order to have that be effective, we really then encourage creating a strategic priorities strategic plan. That way, when things come to attention and we need to make sure that the council and the executive are collaborating is because we as a city have agreed to certain priorities. I think as a council or as a committee, we did talk about that. We imagine that the city administrator and deputy city, city manager, city administrator, sorry, it's been a second since I've seen the org chart actually be present at some of these committee discussions because, again, while there is the distinction of the executive duties, you are setting and aligning to priorities and building legislation, and that's again, I think what's powerful about having service connected advisory bodies to help

funnel that. And I'm so sorry, councilor smith, that that was your experience. I think this is the beauty of having transparency and accountability in a committee session.

Speaker: Is other people's experience when they try to get connected with me. It's a lot of folks experience. And then people who know me, they call me on my cell phone and they say, I can't get to you through your through your office. They're sending me to an email.

Speaker: And I looked at the website, and it is great to have a website. I think this is when streamlined communications. This is again, not a one size fits all, but at least some level of coordination so that when somebody goes into your website, like the voting record is new, that's great. The district maps and who's where. And like some people have more information, some people have less, but at least having a landing space so that they can interact. We uplift the 311 because they were great in the voter education stuff. But I think again, this is where where the tension of where the executive and the legislative come out. We when I when we were talking about it, we assumed that that level of city administrator and inviting to the committees that that was where dialog could happen. And that, in my opinion, is what we were for, what we were for. And it's hard to capture that in a report. Those are, you know, lost in discussions.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor Ryan.

Speaker: Thanks. Thank you, madam president. I have had the pleasure of having a meeting with you before the committee meeting. Then we had the committee meeting, and now there's this. And I have to say, the third time was the best of all, because there were some great questions that were asked. And I really appreciate the last dialog we were having, because we're experiencing those growing pains in real time. On how the legislative branch and the executive branch work together. I think it's natural that this is happening. I really appreciate you being here. Andy von

berg, the assistant city administrator. It was noticeable that I didn't see anyone over there earlier. So I just want to thank you for being here this evening. It's really good to have someone in person in that in that box. I just want to say a few thank yous, because I've had the pleasure of experiencing all of you in the last highly regarded City Council. You can all like, say, laugh or whatever with all the praise that you were giving us on how you were dealt with. And so it's been very healing to have an opportunity to be with this group and to be in all these meetings with you of late. I did always see you. It was clunky at best, but I just like that you hung in there the whole time. And I also want to just say a few things like, you've been very helpful. Well, first of all, serving with you, chair koyama lane. You're like, so gracious in how you welcomed them and really included them in the early days of building the governance committee. So I hope you really noticed that, that we wanted to take your the artifacts of your intelligence and make sure that we use that as foundational as we were building this. And so I've had the pleasure of being a part of that, and it's been really wonderful. I also think you've been affirming because you've also just like, okay, check. We're doing that check. We're doing that. Like there was a lot of Marching orders you gave that. I don't even know if we were. We're conscious of this, but we were guiding. We were being guided along by a lot of your recommendations. I do think I'm a little bit of a critic of how many committee committees we have. I think it's going to be wildly inefficient in the future if we continue to have this many committees with the amount of staff we have on the admin side, because it just is, and we're stretching the auditor's office, we're stretching the admin side. So I think your recommendations were built on four. I'm not saying we have to go down to four, but I do think that you guided us towards rethinking that. And I hope that we do have some robust discussions about that, losing almost everybody up here with that thought, I just want to say thank

you so much for all the work that you've done. It's been a real pleasure to dive in with you the last month and a half. Thanks.

Speaker: Seeing no one else in the queue, I think we'll let you we'll let you go from all of the questions with much gratitude from everybody up here for all the work that you've put in Keelan.

Speaker: Thank you. I believe.

Speaker: This is a report. We need a motion to accept the report.

Speaker: So moved.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: I'm sorry. Who? Seconded.

Speaker: Commissioner smith.

Speaker: Councilor smith. Did. Did you get the original motion as well?

Speaker: Yeah. Councilor kanal.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Committee. Oh, well.

Speaker: Avalos.

Speaker: I need to be deferential.

Speaker: I just want to put on the record my appreciation, particularly for my personal staff who were part of the transition team and were the folks responsible for a lot of the praise that you all gave. My chief of staff ran the salary commission and the citywide practices community engagement project, and my senior aide, sophia, ran the independent district commission and the voter education efforts. And I'm going to use this time on the record to give them some praise, because they're also helping me integrate what you all have worked on. So thank you so much. And I guess I vote I yeah. Okay.

Speaker: Vote yea dunphy.

Speaker: Truly.

Speaker: Thank.

Speaker: You all so much for the amount of work the history books will remember it, I vote yea smith.

Speaker: I canal yeah.

Speaker: Thanks again for presenting the report, your extensive work the last couple of years. I want to cosign both councilor greens. Thank you to jim lobby as well, and my support for participatory budgeting for all the reasons he said. So ditto. I also want to thank councilor zimmerman and smith for sort of building out my concern. Really well on the conversation. We need to lead on engagement in this form of government. And this also relates to what councilor green talked about with getting fed information from bureaus. So we do need our own capacity for engagement. That's not filtered through the administrative side. And I say that here to say, I am sorry that we're spending more time on the disagreement point, because that's kind of how it works to some degree. But it does seem most councilors agree with most of your recommendations. And I also want to note that the fact that we're talking about the disagreement is actually a good thing, because normally the capital c city used to hide the disagreement with advisory groups through ignoring you. And I think it's really good if we're modeling actual engagement with your recommendations. And I hope you agree this is a historic time for the city. I appreciate you shouting out that this was a very successful election, and a lot of the transitions going really well. We couldn't have gotten here without your input along the way. The recommendations will be continually helpful as we go forward, and I think as we hold budget listening sessions, I think we'll continue to see the recommendations around that because the first one was very

successful. One other thing to think about as we work to embed community participation is sustaining that throughout the journey that an item takes. From first appearing in the filing system to appearing on a committee agenda, to being voted on by the full council, so that we're encouraging community input early in the process to shape the elements of an ordinance or resolution. And then when it arrives at a council meeting agenda, focusing our engagement there on soliciting testimony in favor opposition or on adjustments when it's kind of 95% baked. And I look forward to working with both council as a whole and hopefully with the code commission on this. So thank you. Thank you, julia, June and guillermo I vote yes.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: Yeah I just want to say jose. Fred, bill. Destiny, amy, juliet and terry. You've got yourself in there too. Thank you so much. It's been good getting to know all of you of late. And I vote yea.

Speaker: Koyama lane.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: I vote yea morillo.

Speaker: Thank you so much for everything. I won't repeat all of councilor green's statements, but I agree with the participatory budgeting aspect, and I'm excited to get community more engaged in that. I vote yea thank you so much.

Speaker: Novick.

Speaker: I add my thanks to everybody. And I also specifically want to thank fred neal, who's been a major force in Oregon civic life for as long as I can remember. Every once in a while I worry that am I just outliving my welcome? And should I consign myself to the scrap heap? But knowing that you're still in there swinging, swinging makes me think that maybe I still have something to offer too. Thank you. Hi.

Speaker: Clark.

Speaker: Ditto. Councilor novick as one of those old timers with fred. And thank you both jose and fred for presenting tonight and all the members of the I vote yea green.

Speaker: Thank you, members of gtac. You get the mitch green stamp of approval. I want to specifically thank bill for your service, both in the federal government and now, once a public servant, always a public servant, I vote i.

Speaker: Zimmerman i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: Adding my gratitude to what others have said. I also just want to call out that I know there are additional recommendations that didn't make it into your report that are also very important. We will be looking at those. There was information you highlighted for the governance committee that we didn't talk about tonight, that I know will be guiding the work of that committee. And as I go about the work as council president and think about the precedent that we set in every action we take, I try to make sure that I'm thinking about the values that you've uplifted and that Portlanders uplifted through your work and through the opportunities that you provided, and really try to think about the ways that we can make our work easier to follow, easier to understand, and more accessible to Portlanders. So thank you not only for your work, but for creating space for all of our neighbors voices through your work. I.

Speaker: The report is accepted with 12 I votes.

Speaker: Councilors. We have a couple of more administrative items now. Keelan, could you please read items eight, nine, ten and 11 together?

Speaker: Item eight initiate foreclosure action on 11514 southeast alder street for the collection of delinquent city liens placed against the property. Item nine initiate

foreclosure action on 10218 north tyler avenue for the collection of delinquent city liens placed against the property. Item ten initiate foreclosure action on 111 northeast killingsworth street for the collection of delinquent city liens placed against the property. Item 11 initiate foreclosure action on 4121 northeast grand avenue for the collection of delinquent city liens placed against the property.

Speaker: Thank you. And councilors. When we originally heard these items, we were told that on item eight, the foreclosure at 11514 southeast alder street would be removed from the list if the payment plan that had been proposed was agreed to and a first payment was made. That has happened. So we are referring item eight back to mayor wilson's office and will be discussing items nine, ten and 11 today. I believe there is not any more public comment accepted on these. So councilors, is there any discussion on agenda items nine, 10 or 11? We do have staff here. If there are any questions.

Speaker: Are we going to vote for all of them at the same time too?

Speaker: We'll vote for each one individually.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Councilor Ryan?

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: I have a question. Number 11. Let's see. Number ten. I voted on this before and that was like a year ago. And so I just want to know, will I have to keep voting on this every six months to a year? Could you please. And then we also passed the legislation that took this from a year to three months. This has been quite baffling.

Speaker: For the record.

Speaker: I'll state my name kevin foster, foreclosure prevention manager for the city. So this property it is it depends on whether you guys vote to approve it for it or

not. But we will proceed with foreclosure. We do have the current owner is in negotiations with the buyer, habitat for humanity, to purchase the property. And their goal is to demolish the property and build four townhouses, four townhomes there. So that's where we're at, and I will definitely keep you posted on the progress of that.

Speaker: Thank you. I appreciate that.

Speaker: Of course.

Speaker: Councilor kanal just a question for you, madam president. Do we have to vote separately on the referral back to the mayor's office?

Speaker: I have been told that we don't have to. I will look both to our clerk and to our attorney to make sure that we're getting head nods, saying we don't have to. Okay. Councilors, any other questions or comments before we move to vote?

Speaker: So moved.

Speaker: I think. I think we don't actually need a motion on this one.

Speaker: I'm just encouraging it.

Speaker: Keelan could you please call the roll separately? But we'll move forward on items nine, ten and 11?

Speaker: Yes. Thank you. Item nine.

Speaker: Avalos i.

Speaker: Dunphy. I smith. I now. I. I koyama lane. I morillo. I novick. I clark I green. I zimmerman. I pirtle-guiney. I the ordinances passed with 12 I votes. Item ten.

Speaker: Avalos i.

Speaker: Dunphy i.

Speaker: Smith i.

Speaker: I Ryan. I koyama lane. I morillo. I novick. I mark. I green. I zimmerman. I pirtle-guiney. I the ordinances passed with 12 I votes. Item 11 avalos.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Dunphy i.

Speaker: Smith i.

Speaker: I Ryan. I koyama lane. I morillo. I novick.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Park i.

Speaker: Green i.

Speaker: Zimmerman i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: With 12 I votes.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Our next agenda item is another second reading. This is a property transfer that we heard about at our last council meeting. Keelan could you read the title.

Speaker: Item 12 declare property located at intersection of i-405 and southwest naito parkway as surplus property, and authorize the bureau of transportation to dispose of property to Oregon department of transportation in exchange for accepting property at west end of steel bridge ramps.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilors, are there any comments or questions? I do believe we have staff available if there are questions. Okay. Keelan could you call the roll?

Speaker: Avalos. Dunphy.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Smith I canal.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: Yeah. I just want to say a couple of things. I'm just so excited that we're moving the old town skate park project forward after 20 years journey to finally come to fruition, transforming this underutilized area into a recreation destination will be a tremendous asset in helping activate old town, which is what our businesses, our families, our neighbors, our guests, and our nearby hotels desire. Because joyful activation equals revenue and public safety.

Speaker: I koyama lane. I morillo. I novick. I mark.

Speaker: Councilor Ryan. Let's just hope it doesn't take another 20 years i.

Speaker: Just want to also express my gratitude that this is moving forward. I look forward to attempting to shred myself and very publicly humiliating and breaking every bone in my body I vote i.

Speaker: I have no intention of ever setting foot on the thing, but i'll drink a beer while he falls on his, and I appreciate those in the back who made this happen. So thank you and I vote aye.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney district four councilors. I'm really looking forward to this ribbon cutting.

Speaker: I the ordinance passed with 12 I votes.

Speaker: Councilors, we are moving on to the final item on our agenda. Keelan. Could you please read item 13?

Speaker: Declare actions concerning zenith energy terminal holdings llc, including placing communications into the public record, demanding the mayor to investigate violations of the zenith franchise agreement, and urging the auditor to conduct an investigation into the competing statements and arguments heard by council on January 21st, 2025 by city staff, zenith and members of the public.

Speaker: Councilors. I just heard from staff that there's an ask for a brief recess. Are there any objections to taking a five minute recess? Okay, we are going to recess for five minutes. We will come back at 839.

Speaker: For.

Speaker: I'm going to call us back into council. If folks can take their seats, please. I apologize for that brief recess. There was some updated information about our current agenda item. That staff wanted to make sure counselors had an opportunity to check in about. So counselors, we have had a few agenda items come out of committee, but this is actually our first major policy item that has come out of a committee. And we are going to try something new tonight. We have a fantastic team in our council operations office, including our policy analysts who help to staff our committee meetings. And Claire Adams has prepared a committee staff summary of this resolution and is going to come up or is at the table to share pieces of that summary with us. The staff summary is attached to the agenda item. If any of you have that pulled up, or for folks who are watching online, you can see the full overview of the staff summary there. And Claire will go over just a few of the highlights of that with us now.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president and councilors. For the record, Claire Adams with counsel, operations and also staff to the transportation and infrastructure committee. The resolution before you document number 2025 070, declares the council's interest in evaluating prior actions related to Zenith Energy Terminal Holdings, LLC and in involving the public in decisions affecting human and environmental health and safety. It directs Portland permitting and development and the mayor to investigate potential violations of existing agreements and to evaluate compliance with applicable land use laws. It directs specified city bureaus and the city attorney to disclose all prior communications between the city of

Portland and zenith. The resolution also demands that the mayor pause any administrative actions related to zenith while an investigation is in progress. Finally, the resolution urges the auditor to investigate and report on the city's actions related to zenith's land use compatibility statement applications. The full impact statement on this item includes language both in the financial impact section, and it also describes community impacts and community involvement that's available online and in terms of public testimony in the committee. At the committee meeting on March 10th, there were four people who testified and seven people submitted written testimony. An additional sorry, four people submitted individual comments, and one person submitted a letter signed by representatives of 22 different community groups. And this was prior to committee action. I'll note that an additional two individuals submitted testimony after the committee committee meeting and before the full. This full council meeting was posted. And I want to note that what I just shared does not include the written testimony that was submitted since the council agenda was posted, which is at least 75 different pieces of written testimony. The general themes in the public testimony that the committee heard on March 10th were included. Transparency in the city's decision making processes related to the franchise agreement, investigating zenith energy's potential violations of the franchise agreement. Mitigating potential harm to communities along the willamette river caused by rail traffic, and the threat of a cascadia subduction zone earthquake, and ensuring that the city's actions are in compliance with the 2035 comprehensive plan and the north reach river plan.

Speaker: Thank you. Claire, if you can bear with us for just a minute. Councilors, I'm going to turn to the councilor who presided over the public hearings to see if there are any additions to that report. Will then let claire go, and i'll then turn to the counselor. The counselor who originally introduced the resolution to offer

comments about the resolution more broadly. Counselor clark, would you like to comment or would you like me to turn to councilor morillo, who presided that day?

Speaker: Thank you, madam chair. Councilor morillo presided that day, so I was not there at all. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor, is there anything that you would like to add from the committee discussion to the report that claire has brought to us?

Speaker: I think much of what we heard during the committee meeting is reflected in what we already heard at council sessions at large. I think claire's summary was perfect, and we heard that testimony over and over again in the broader meetings and emails and contacts to at least my office, and I'm sure lots of other offices. So no, I don't have anything new to add. I would say that the community has a very strong invested interest in pushing us to bring more clarity to this situation. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilors, are there any questions about the committee report for claire or councilor morillo councilor kanal? Are you in the queue with questions about the committee report? Councilor dunphy, are you in the queue? No. Councilor avalos okay, councilor smith, question about the committee report.

Speaker: Yes, I'm.

Speaker: Yes, madam president. I'm trying to get some clarification on what our action is going to be is it on voting on the report or.

Speaker: No, we will vote on the resolution. The report is to give us a taste of the conversation in committee, because we are moving toward doing much of the conversation around policy in a bill in committee. This allows us to get a taste of what the conversation was and have some of that background information. It also ensures that councilors, who have not been part of the creation of a policy from the

start, have their attention drawn to that committee staff report, which gives us a good summary of what is in the resolution.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Claire. Councilor green is the original introducer of this resolution. Would you like to speak to the resolution?

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I would love to speak to the resolution. Councilors. When Portlanders voted to change our form of government, they did so on the promise that it would do away with the government structure that was unresponsive to all but the most well connected Portlanders, and not amenable to taking tough questions of accountability, oversight, and transparency head on. We're we're in an historic moment where the actions we take or the actions we choose not to take will establish the precedent for this new government for generations to come. So it is with this obligation that I bring forward this resolution with co-sponsors councilor, morillo, koyama lane and dunphy, which calls on this body to address a number of issues that are urgent and related to zenith energy that present harms to our committee or community, to our city government and the public trust. So the resolution, I think claire did a great job of summarizing the main themes, but I want to highlight what it does. The first element in the meatiest element calls upon the mayor to exercise his authority and duty, given by charter to investigate the franchise agreement that zenas has with the city. It also demands disclosure of all prior communications between the city and zenith energy, and to place them in the public record. Third, it demands Portland permitting and development to evaluate whether its 2024 greenway review remains in compliance with land use laws. Following what we have learned from the deq regulatory enforcement action vis a vis the 2022. 2022 lux. It urges the auditor to investigate the facts and settle the record with respect to competing claims and statements

given to council members during the January 21st work session, between staff reporting in the public record and members of the community. And finally, it demands that the mayor pause any further administrative action to the fullest extent allowed by the law related to zenith energy pending the outcome of these investigations. And so I'd like to just take another minute, if I may, to motivate why the franchise agreement aspect of this is so important. The charter grants each incoming mayor both the authority and also the duty to investigate the franchise agreements that the city issues to its franchisees. This is really important because cities grant franchises to private companies that perform inherently public functions, usually with monopoly rights. So this franchise relationship carries with it an essential regulatory obligation that our charter empowers the city with. And so when there is credible evidence that a franchisee has violated that agreement, we have an obligation to act as the early parts of the resolution lay out, zenith energy appears to have violated its franchise agreement by failing to remain in compliance with the laws applicable state and local laws. For example, failing to disclose its unpermitted activities with the city and the deq, as well as violating local lobbying rules. So to restore the public trust, we must investigate this franchise agreement. The mayor alone has the authority and the duty to do this and provide counsel with the options for remedy if that agreement is found to be in violation. So failure to do so will send a signal to the city, send a signal to the community that the city is unwilling or incapable of exercising its due regulatory authority vested in its charter, and that any company seeking to do business with the privilege of the franchise is beyond account. The other parts of the resolution are designed to restore public trust by addressing issues of accountability, transparency, and inconsistencies in our own policies, and also exclusion of the public from public matters. So at this

point, I'd just like to offer, if I may, a moment for my chief co-sponsor, angela councilor morillo, to make some comments as well.

Speaker: Councilor go right ahead.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president, and thank you, councilor green, for that introduction. I feel like you laid out all of the policy parts really well, so I just want to take time to thank all the advocates who've worked on this issue for so many years. I'm going to name just a few of you, even though there's a million people that I could probably list here. 350 pdx mosquito fleet. The linton ladies, as councilor clark affectionately calls them, columbia riverkeeper, the human access project, breach collective, rose city, indivisible, and so many more. The education that you've done for both your community and the way you've empowered your neighbors to act, the way you've armed us as your representatives with information so that we can serve you better, is exactly how our government is supposed to work. We're at a crossroads here. This vote is going to signal how we do business as the city of Portland moving forward, whose voices we prioritize, and if we can stay true to our word. The public deserves transparency. Council also deserves to have all the facts in front of us when we make decisions, especially ones as massive as approving a franchise agreement with an oil company that operates alongside our delicate and sacred ecosystem. The goal of this resolution, and this investigation, is to give the public transparency, to give council all the facts and to lay to rest the questions community has had for years about how corporations engage with our government. I'm proud to have worked with councilor green on this, and to be joined by councilors dunphy and koyama lane for this historic vote. I'll now offer time to both of them if they have anything additional they'd like to add. With your permission, madam president.

Speaker: Happy to start with your co carriers.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I'm so proud to be introducing the resolution regarding zenith energy alongside my fellow councilors mitch green and morillo and jamie dunphy. And I want to go back to what we just heard earlier from gtac about ways we can improve transparency and accountability in this new form of government. It's so important, and I believe that this resolution follows in that spirit, I think this brings up important questions about who's able to directly intervene or play a role in city business and who is not. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor dunphy. I see that you're in the queue. Would you like to speak now or wait?

Speaker: I'd like to just make a very brief introduction, and then I will also have a conversation about an amendment. But very briefly, I'm honored to be joining my colleagues in co-sponsoring this resolution, even though this zenith is so far away from district one, this is still extraordinarily important to me. This climate crisis is the crisis that by which we will all be judged for all time. I have a request, though, of the folks here. I know that you all have been fighting for this for such a long time, and care so deeply. I ask that tonight. We don't use this as an opportunity to spend the next two hours bashing public employees. We understand that there are some credible accusations of things that have happened on the record and off the record. I ask that this not be the venue to voice that. You are welcome to criticize me by name. I ran for this job. I earned it, but I and there are there are systems we have in place to deal with this. A city employee violated a city policy. We have systems in place to deal with it. If someone broke the law, this is not the venue to disclose that. And public employees have exceptionally hard jobs coming to work every day. And I choose to, for the most part, adhere to hanlon's razor. Never attribute to malice what can be attributed to incompetence. So I ask just some grace from the folks here. Recognizing that we are in a new day. There's a new form of government and

a new leadership in town, and we are showing you what leadership looks like right now. So thank you all for being here, for continuing to show up, for continuing to care. And I'll turn it back. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. To the carriers. We're now going to move into council discussion. I see a number of folks in the queue. Councilor Kanal.

Speaker: Yeah. Thank you, madam president. My understanding is that normally at this point we'd be going to public testimony. And I wanted to raise the fact that I received information that public testimony was there was a problem signing up that when you went to try to sign up for verbal testimony, there was no ability to do so. I reached out to the clerk's office about that. I did not hear back. I have concerns about that, and I would like to know if there was a conversation about it, if it was a technical issue, or if there was a decision made on that subject.

Speaker: Councilor I'm happy to speak to that. We have been having a number of conversations in your governance committee about process around trying to encourage conversation, to move to committees. And on this particular resolution, there were a few folks who signed up to testify in committee, but not significant testimony. Everybody who had signed up to testify was heard from. And so there were a few conversations about whether additional public testimony today was needed and what the effect of additional public testimony at council would be as we try to create new processes and new culture of moving as much discussion as possible to the committee meetings. For that reason, we decided to keep written testimony open so that folks who had not had a chance to submit comments were able to do so, but to not take additional public testimony on the record. That is a decision that I made. If you have concerns with that decision, I will own that. It is a decision that I made in consultation with the original carrier of this resolution,

because it's not a decision that I should be making alone, but I will own the final decision making. I wouldn't put that on our fellow colleague.

Speaker: Can I inquire as to what statutory authority we have to limit public testimony at the full council.

Speaker: Resolutions, as I understand it, do not require testimony at the full council.

Speaker: So would I be correct in saying that that code, section 3.02 allows the presiding officer to choose not to take public testimony?

Speaker: I believe my understanding is that the code says that we need to take testimony in council on ordinances, but does not specify whether or not we take testimony on resolutions. My understanding, and I wasn't part of this body in the past, but I am operating under how we have been working since getting here. When resolutions come forward, I am asked if it is an agenda item that we will be taking testimony on or not by the clerk as they put the agenda together for us. I generally consult with the person who has brought that resolution forward and then respond to the clerk.

Speaker: Okay, so my understanding here is that we just had this conversation with gtac around expanding the opportunity for people to weigh in verbally. We have 18 meetings a month, one of which is in the evening, and that the goal of this was not to keep hearing from only the people who can take time off during the day. I also would observe that under code section 3.0, 2.030, under non-emergency ordinance, it says public testimony. It specifies it with very similar language to what it says under emergency ordinance, to what it says under resolution. So I would like to ask later on for advice from the attorneys on this. I know that under reports, it says the presiding officer determines whether public testimony is received. So I have I have major concerns about this, and I don't think that this is an expanding

power and how it's distributed throughout the city, which, ironically, is kind of the purpose of this document in the first place.

Speaker: Councilor kanal is that a conversation you'd like to have tonight in the middle of our conversation about the resolution, or is that a conversation that you'd like to have with the attorneys another time? We do have robert taylor here if you'd like to have that conversation tonight.

Speaker: I think that given that there were 100 plus public comments in writing, there was clearly an appetite to weigh in on this. So I'd like a clarification from the attorney on the record, and then I will leave it at that and not continue it for the interest of time.

Speaker: Mr. Taylor, would you like to introduce yourself?

Speaker: Thank you. My name is robert taylor. I'm the Portland city attorney. It's a pleasure to be here. And it's especially a pleasure to follow the presentation from gtac earlier. And to the specific question about whether public testimony is required on resolutions. The answer to that is yes. That's in the current council rules. I understand that the president and the governance committee have been talking about how to, in the future, structure the committees so that they hear the bulk of that public testimony so that they can be the engines and drivers of developing. Policy. As it stands now, this resolution would require public testimony, that is, in the rule. That rule may be suspended by a vote of this body, and it takes nine votes to suspend the rules.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: It.

Speaker: Appears that.

Speaker: There may be a disagreement between the practice that has been brought forward to me, and what we're hearing from the attorney tonight.

Speaker: Fair enough. Yeah.

Speaker: Madam president,

Speaker: So.

Speaker: Robert. Is your recommendation that we now take public testimony, or is your what is your recommendation?

Speaker: I would recommend that you take testimony on the resolution or vote to suspend that rule by nine votes.

Speaker: Councilor smith, did you have a comment?

Speaker: Yeah. I agree with attorney robert taylor. We cannot. You all follow the rules when it's when we don't like something. We have to be a part of the rule of law. And if it's a statutory rule that we have to take testimony tonight, then we have to take the testimony. So.

Speaker: Councilor, I don't disagree. And my apologies to all of you. I was led to believe that on this resolution, we did not need to do that. So we can recess for five minutes to provide an opportunity for people to sign up to testify, or we can take a vote to suspend the rules and move forward without public testimony.

Speaker: Can I ask you a question?

Speaker: Councilor morillo.

Speaker: Are we allowed to engage with the audience? Because. No, sorry, I just I genuinely have a question because I'm getting the vibe. Some people want to testify, some people here in the audience. I've already seen you five times, and maybe you've already said your piece and you just want us to vote tonight and get it done, and you would like to see that happen and not have to leave to go to bed. So the general vibe that I am getting is that people want us to move into the discussion and get it done, does give me a thumbs down like a hard thumbs down. If you're really against that and you want to testify.

Speaker: You'll do it again in the future. As long as you say just this time, because we didn't understand the rules. That's exactly the point. Yes, we're figuring things out, but next time we're going to follow the rules. Okay.

Speaker: And just to say the statement that someone else said, sorry, this is very unusual and I won't do this again, I promise. Council president, this whole.

Speaker: Situation is quite.

Speaker: It's very unusual. The person on the balcony said that they're concerned that this will become a pattern of suspending testimony, and we don't want to set that precedent, and I appreciate that. So I just wanted to see what the general audience here was feeling. But I completely agree with that, that that would not be a good practice overall. And I will stop talking now.

Speaker: I guess. I'm next.

Speaker: I would like to move that we accept public testimony, but that because I think councilor morillo, I think you've read the room very well, right? That a lot of folks are interested in action tonight, but because we don't govern by by hands up in an audience, I think it is 905. I think if we limit ourselves to no public public testimony up to 930, and if we have a large amount of interest, I think we cross that bridge at that moment. But if we only have one person in this room, I think it would be great to open that opportunity up. But I agree with councilor smith that this is a slippery slope if we do it now. So I would say I would propose, and I hope my fellow councilors will support a time certain end to that public testimony, at least for tonight. And if we think we need to go into another meeting for action, we do that.

Speaker: I am happy to add that to a recommendation that I was going to make, which is that we open this up for public testimony. And if the folks in the room are in the place that councilor morillo has agreed, then perhaps no one will sign up to testify. And if folks do want to take the opportunity to sign up to testify, perhaps we

can put a time certain end to it to make sure that we can get on to the other parts of the conversation and get you all home as soon as possible. So I think what we are going to do Keelan, are how quickly do you think that you can have folks, if they are interested in testifying, line up, give you their names and then move into testimony? What do you need for that?

Speaker: I mean, I'm I'm ready. I can take names.

Speaker: Is there any objection to taking a it is 906 four minute recess. Let's all stay in the room so that. Madam president.

Speaker: Could I actually, while folks are signing up, have a conversation about an amendment.

Speaker: Can we do two things simultaneously? Keelan.

Speaker: I mean, yes, but also I'm next in the queue. I'm sorry. I'd like to go. Sorry not to be that girl, but I would like.

Speaker: To jump ahead. We're not going to. We're not going to jump ahead of. You are next in the queue. Can we continue council conversation while you have people sign up to testify?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Okay, so we are going to open up public testimony. If you are in the room and would like to testify, please walk over to our clerk who will sign you up. If you are online and would like to testify. Keelan is there a way for folks who are online to send a message to you? I know we're set up. Differently.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: I'm not seeing anyone online at this time.

Speaker: Okay?

Speaker: If there is anybody who is online who wants to testify, please send a message to our clerk and councilor. Avalos, you are next in the queue.

Speaker: Thank you. Well, I what I was going to bring up when I first raised my hand was actually what councilor kanal raised. But I really do want to put a finer point on this, because for me, I was going to raise this because I think as we were, as I was hearing the logic of the committees being the place to have discussion, I just really need to strongly reject that. Personally, I think that the entire point of having a full council and having access to the public, this is the most accessible place the public can reach us committees at noon and on Tuesday is not, especially because there's only five of us. And you know, the report I thought was great. You know, I think that's a good practice in general for us to have some kind of report. But I really am strongly against that, and I want to put that on the record, because this is a perfect example of why I'm against that. I wasn't in that committee. I didn't hear those testimonies. And before I make my vote, I want to hear the public testimony. I'm making my vote by doing my research ahead of time and taking in what I'm hearing from the public at the moment. So this is a really critical process that we need to maintain. So I just want to name that and make sure that as we continue to discuss the governance process, that we are not losing that intent. The committee absolutely is the place where we should be workshopping the bills and take, you know, invited testimony, public testimony, have experts, all of that. And yet that is still not enough to not have it here as well. So I just want to name that. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor dunphy. Actually, councilor dunphy, before you go, it looks like we don't have a line anymore. Keelan did you get any signups for online or in person testimony?

Speaker: We have two people signed up in person.

Speaker: Okay, councilor dunphy, do you mind if we pause here and move to public testimony, which we generally take before councilor discussion?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Keelan.

Speaker: So you go ahead and call up the folks who are signed up to testify.

Speaker: First up, we have michaela mccormick.

Speaker: Evening. Thank you for your thoughtful consideration about public testimony. My name is michaela mccormick. The 2022 process that led to granting the lux to zenith was flawed and illegal. It included illegal lobbying by zenith, parts of which were false or meaningless concessions that allowed them to continue pursuing a catastrophic climate strategy. Deputy city administrator danny oliveira said that the conditions in the 2022 lux were, quote, based on conversations we've been having with advocates at the time, unquote, to the extent he meant the environmental and community groups who have been blowing the whistle on the backroom deal. This is a complete fabrication. Not only were advocates specifically not consulted during this process, it happened while the city was being sued by zenith over the 2021 lux, where columbia river keeper was involved in the litigation to defend the city. Instead, the city created a separate, secretive process to pursue its own agenda. Dca, oliveira and other staff also did not explain what made them decide to reverse their decision. In the 2022. In 2022, in spite of zenith's continued violation of the comprehensive plan and zoning in its presentation to the city, staff omitted key information, including that zenith has to acquire a new lux because it was caught doing illegal modification and use of piping, and did not have adequate permission to operate. Staff skewed its presentation to avoid mention of any past violations, including failure to report its 2022 lobbying and ongoing investigations. Staff declined to answer questions about the construction and modification that was the subject of deq's. November 2024 investigation. The only path forward to

correct for this bias and non credibility is to allow the public and experts to provide evidence into the record. Accordingly, the investigation proposed by councilors green and morillo needs to be pursued. Thanks.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Next up, next up we have krisha vila cruz.

Speaker: Thank you for being here.

Speaker: Good evening council. Thank you for your consideration as well to include public testimony. My name is chris de vila cruz. I am a district two resident and work as a climate justice organizer with oil and gas action network. I have never given public testimony around zenith before, as I'm new to the area and from what I'm learning, they're not good. I'm freshly freshly new, and I do add my voice to the chorus of folks to ask that you pass this resolution. I'm worried that if it's not passed, it'll set a precedent for other corporations to come in and parachute in and continue operating sneakily without due consequence. And I we urge for accountability and transparency from the corporations that are in our neighborhoods. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Keelan is there any other public testimony?

Speaker: No. That completes testimony.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Councilor dunphy.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. First, I want to apologize for interrupting councilor avalos.

Speaker: Oh.

Speaker: You're fine. I have a big mouth, and I need to stop. I would like to propose an amendment, and i'll share the language with the council clerk in a

moment. This is specific to the fourth. Where be it further resolved, I would like to propose that the we add and a single six words, and then also subtract a couple of words. I would like this to now read, be it further resolved under charter city charter section two, dash 402 investigation of and suits to cancel franchises. I would amend adding the language and pursuant to the authority in pcc 7.12.030, this council demands that the mayor investigate, and I would move that we strike the words with independent review to ensure impartiality. The reason for this is specifically that we have an enormous city government. We have people in this government whose job it is to do exactly this. The city is in a budget crunch and adding an additional cost to hire an external person at this moment does not feel like the most, the highest and best use of city of limited public dollars. So with the council's approval, I'd like to move that we remove that part.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: And councilors, I believe the reference you made there, councilor dunphy, is to the place in code that directs the mayor to investigate franchises when taking office, when a new mayor comes into office, is that correct?

Speaker: I believe so, yes.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you. I just want to clarify that for folks who aren't looking at it directly.

Speaker: Thank you. Keelan do you want a copy of this?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Councilors. Is there any discussion about this amendment? Councilor smith, are you in the queue on this amendment or.

Speaker: Okay, I have a question.

Speaker: My question is for the attorney that was up here, not Robert, but what was her name? It was not. Well, it wasn't you, Robert. I was talking about the council.

Speaker: Oh.

Speaker: For Claire, our council operations policy analyst.

Speaker: Oh. So she's she wasn't in the in the in.

Speaker: The she's in our council operations staff. She is the.

Speaker: Well then I do want you, Robert.

Speaker: Claire may actually be an attorney. I'm not sure. Okay.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: So I have a question. Since we're getting down to statutory, since we have already approved a permit for Zenith, do we have the ability right now to vote on something that will take that away?

Speaker: The council does not have the ability to revoke that approval. What? This this resolution does not revoke that approval. This resolution is directed at other requests that the council has of the executive branch.

Speaker: But I thought it said in there that anything else that they have been approved for that it's on hold.

Speaker: So what.

Speaker: So is that the permit or what.

Speaker: The final be it resolved says the council demands that the mayor to pause any administrative actions to the extent allowed by law related to Zenith, pending the results of the investigation. Pursuant to this resolution. So it's expressing the council's request, demand, desire that the mayor pause any further actions in the future.

Speaker: Okay, not actions that were given with the with the permitting of that. They they excuse me that they asked for previously because I just want to be clear,

because we've had a couple of public meetings and, you know, today is about the franchise agreement, which we are responsible for. Yesterday was about the permit. When people came in, they didn't want the permit approved. And I asked the same question, do we have the ability if the mayor and the and the city administrator approves that, do we have as this body the ability to say, no, they can't have it? And I was told no. So I'm asking the question again because I don't want people to be confused.

Speaker: I think this is an important point of discussion, and we have other councilors who can also respond to it, but we have an amendment on the table.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: That has been first and seconded, and we need to keep discussion to the amendment right now.

Speaker: Okay? Okay.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: I apologize. No no no no no thank you. But that's what I wanted to talk about.

Speaker: Councilor novick are you in queue for the amendment or for the okay. Councilor morillo. Are you in queue for the amendment? Sorry, councilor green, are you in queue for the amendment?

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I am in queue for the amendment. Councilor dunphy, i, I appreciate the intent. Here. We are in a budget crisis, and the amendment does reinforce pointing to the section of the code which derived from the charter and all that, that again, as I said in my motivation, the mayor has both the authority and the duty to investigate franchise agreements. Every mayor, in fact, has the authority and a duty to investigate franchise amendments upon taking office. That's what the charter says. And so if that's what's going to take to pass this

resolution, I will just say this. We're going to be watching, you know, I think the part that I put in there on the impartiality was to assuage concerns over a lack of transparency and public trust. But again, the charter grants those powers and that duty we have a new form of government. We have a very engaged public. We can come back again and try again if we feel like that wasn't impartial. So i, I'm, I'm open to I'm open to this amendment. I don't think it's deleterious to the main intent of the of the original resolution.

Speaker: Is there any additional discussion on the amendment seeing none. Keelan could you call the roll?

Speaker: Avalos i. Dunphy i.

Speaker: Smith i.

Speaker: Canal. I Ryan. I koyama lane. Hi morillo.

Speaker: We'll be watching to make sure that the intention of the resolution is followed through on I vote i.

Speaker: Novick i. Clark i. Green i. Zimmerman i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney I both appreciate councilor dunphy's I to our budget situation and councilor green's note that we will be watching to make sure this is impartial. I believe this language actually allows the mayor to either do an internal or hire an external investigator to do this investigation, and mr. Mayor would look to you to make sure that it's done impartially in whatever form you choose. I vote i.

Speaker: The amendment is approved with 12 I votes.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilors. Back to the original. The underlying resolution. And before we move on to other councilors, councilor smith, would you like to continue the line of questioning that you.

Speaker: Were on?

Speaker: Thank you, thank you, thank you for keeping me within the lines. So I want to go back. Attorney Robert Taylor, if this is approved today with the amendment, will that stop us from giving the permit that was previously awarded to Zenith?

Speaker: No, it will not.

Speaker: Okay. I just wanted folks to be clear of what we're doing here. So thank you.

Speaker: Councilor Morillo.

Speaker: Oh.

Speaker: I apologize, Councilor Novick.

Speaker: I just wanted to say I really appreciated Councilor Dunphy's comments about public employees, which relate closely to how I'm planning to vote. I would enthusiastically vote for a resolution that simply said, I'll want to get the language right, that the council asked the mayor to investigate potential violations of Zenith's franchise agreement. My problem is largely with the whereas clauses in this resolution, I feel like I can't vote for this resolution with these whereas clauses without effectively saying that I think city employees are knaves and liars. And I having looked at some of the allegations against them, I think in most cases it's shaggy dog stories rather than malfeasance. Like the city employee said that conditions on Zenith were based on conversations with advocates. Well, the advocates say that it wasn't the right conversations with the right advocates at the right time. And I think there's another other other examples where I think I can understand the feelings of the advocates, but I don't really feel that there's evidence that the city employees were deliberately lying. And also, the document repeatedly calls for investigations where I think that conversations are called for. So, again, I think this is going to pass without my vote. If it did not, I would definitely

support something simply to investigate violations of the franchise agreement. So I just wanted to explain to Margaret Butler, who I hate to disappoint, what my reasoning is. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor Morillo.

Speaker: Thank you. And thank you everyone for this is kind of a tense and difficult discussion to have, and I feel like I have kind of a direct response to what Councilor Novick has laid out. And I respect your opinion on the matter. This is a very serious franchise agreement that is going to impact people for generations to come. We are the oversight body. This is not anything that we are looking into with regards to city employees are people who are making over \$200,000 a year to \$300,000 a year, who are in charge of very serious matters at the city. So while they may not be elected officials, they are critically important, and it is very important that we ensure that they are engaging ethically and that they are, as someone said, if it's not malice and it's just incompetence that they are not being incompetent. So regardless of the matter, I think it's incredibly important that this does be looked into because we can close it. Either way. If it turns out that nothing had happened, then wonderful. We can all put an end to this story and we'll have our questions answered and it will be done for. And if it does turn out that something untoward was happening, then we will have our answers as elected officials and we can make informed decisions moving forward. And I think that, again, I want to point out that under this form of government, certain employees have a lot of power and influence. They are the gatekeepers of information. They can make sure elected officials can receive or not receive pieces of information before we make a vote on certain policies. And so we need to have the utmost trust in them and be able to know, with everything that we have in our hearts, in our minds, that this person is here and is accountable to the public and to us. And that is part of why we included

that in the resolution. These are these are very highly regarded employees who have a lot of responsibility. And as I've said before, with great responsibility comes accountability and we have to look into it. So thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor zimmerman.

Speaker: Thanks. I'm a little bit I'm going to throw this question out because I'm not really sure out of all the sponsors and staff and employees. So you tell me who wants to answer it. I'm a little bit confused if this is a double investigation. One encouraged that the auditor conduct and one conducted by the city administration slash mayor. What is the intent here?

Speaker: Councilor green, would you like to respond to that?

Speaker: Yeah, I have a direct response, and I think it actually is also a response to councilor smith, who raised good questions. So the way that I envisioned this was, is to separate a couple different types of oversight powers that the city has. In my reading of the charter. And, you know, thank thanks to the city attorney for helping me, kind of, you know, bring this together. The mayor is obligated to investigate solely the franchise agreement, which is a very specific question. And I started with the franchise agreement because it's not associated with the permit. It's not associated with a land use compatibility statement, which which we've heard a lot about. And I have open questions, and that's where the rest of the resolution tries to settle. But really, the power and authority that we can express on correcting the behavior with the company, I think is best through the franchise agreement. And it's the mayor who has this power. And so we we're sort of demanding, I think I originally tried to direct the mayor and city attorney says you can't actually do that. So this has been a conversation. But the other parts of it still have to address these lingering points of, of conflicts of, of, of the matter of, of the facts. Right. And that, that I've asked and urged the auditor to help us do in an impartial way.

Speaker: I think I'm seeing that more clearly, I appreciate that. Going on to the word demand. Similarly, you've probably seen my notes. I've crossed all of them out. So i, i, I guess i, you know, I look at my history and what I would expect of City Councils and I don't demand anything of mike jordan. I might request of him and I might I might direct him. But demand puts me in a subservient position to the city administrator, and I'm not. And so that word matters to me. I will not demand that the city administrator do anything. Words matter. I might not use demand with the mayor just out of politeness, but I certainly would urge, request, encourage. Et cetera. And so I am just offering that up, as I think we've chosen some words here that are setting this right off the bat in a way that is a little troubling for me. But if demand was used instead of directed, I want to offer that as a chance to say if there's a response or if it was just the word that was getting used a lot in the document. I want to be thoughtful here.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Keep going.

Speaker: Councilor green, go right ahead on this one.

Speaker: Thank you. It's an important question. I actually was uncomfortable with demand because I my feeling here is that we are an independent body with with oversight powers. And so I was wanting to direct x, y and z. I wanted to direct the city administrator. I even wanted to direct the auditor, which I can't do either. And so the city attorney said, these are some different verbs that you can choose from that would be consistent with the powers that the council has extort. Was one of them. Request was one of them. And demand. I felt fit with the urgency and the spirit of that kind of oversight relationship that I that we were trying to bring forward in this resolution.

Speaker: Thank you. I'm going to keep going. I'm sorry. I've got a few and they're very helpful. I want to find a way here. Mr. Attorney. Almost every City Council in the state of Oregon has the ability to direct their city manager and city attorney and city administrator. Do we have the ability to direct that person in this form of government?

Speaker: No.

Speaker: That's helpful. Regarding some of the attachments, I am curious who created attachments. H and e? They both seem unsigned anonymous documents and one I think looks like a letter, and one calls itself the fact checking sheet, but then mostly talks in feelings and things that look like opinions. And I'm just curious where these came from, given that they're part of an official document that might lead to an investigation, h and e.

Speaker: Councilor green, would you like to speak to the attachments on your resolution?

Speaker: Certainly. So attachment h, I received from a representative at 350 pdx by email following the work session. And the intention of this was to I cited it in the whereas clause, and I think I did say I received by 350 pdx and the whereas clause. And the intention here is to put it in the record. So not just I have the information. Right. So we can deliberate on this, this fact sheet and then attachment e let me pull that up here. This was a letter that was drafted to the mayor and City Councilors, I think in December, if I'm not mistaken, that that came from columbia. Riverkeepers. And it was written by kate murphy. That was just sort of the intention here was to say, this is what these advocates are saying. Let's bring it into the public record. We can we can take it for what it's worth. We can investigate it. We can do our due diligence on it. But now it's in the public record. That's really helpful. I, I agree with councilor maria that this is a serious action. This is a serious situation.

And I'm also similarly. And so given that I think that we are starting off this, this investigation or these two investigations off on somewhat of an unserious path by, I think, flooding the record with. Not necessarily factual documents that came out in, in, in records releases or something along those lines. So I'm a little bit troubled by that part of it, because if we truly are looking for a resolution to a question, which is, I think the point of an investigation, I hope we can. I actually think councilor novick suggestion offhand there makes more sense in in how we're approaching this, because this document right now reads to me like a witch hunt against some city employees that I find deeply, deeply inappropriate. I do think that there are a lot of questions about the franchise agreement and whether or not it it should continue. I do think that there are a lot of questions about how the permit came about, and I think councilor smith's going to go into more of those questions. But this document from this dais, as it reads now, is hard for me to support. I am near proposing an amendment to remove several of the attachments to clean this up and not create such a targeted document at a few employees that seem to have gotten the ire of members of our community in this dais, because I don't think that this dais takes the ire for over employees. Our job is to voice our deep concern with one of two people, I think only, and it's the mayor or the city administrator, because that's where our relationship, from an official standpoint, I think, is supposed to end. And so this is problematic for me that we are, I think, in this document, by putting these names in the way that they have been proposed, are putting at least a couple of key employees in the crosshairs for something that I think an investigation should uncover, but should not be presupposed. And so I'm not I'm not against the intent here, but the flavor and style is where I'm not sure I can support this tonight. And I truly mean I'm not sure. I'm curious to see where the rest of this discussion goes. So like I said, I may make a motion, an amendment to

remove a few of the attachments to keep this a little cleaner. If that seems favorable, I'd like to hear from folks and I'll stop there. Thanks.

Speaker: Councilor Novick.

Speaker: Madam president, I see that you're in the queue yourself. Since I've already spoken, I would defer to you to speak first.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: This is.

Speaker: A deeply important issue. Not only because of the concerns around safety that have been raised around Zenith's operations more broadly, but because when our community members lose faith in the work of our city, we lose so much. We lose so much of our ability to work with community to make things better for everybody who lives in Portland, and doing the work of looking into what has happened in the past so that we can all move forward together and really return our focus to where I would like to be able to spend my energy, which is making sure that Portland is the fantastic place I want to live in, which is something that I know the 12 of us can partner on, but that we can also partner on with everybody who's in city hall tonight. That is so important to me, and that's what we get to when we put to rest what has happened in the past. And when we come to a common understanding of it. I share the concern of some of my colleagues with the whereas clauses. I want to make sure that Portland is a place where our employees feel like we have their back, like the work that they do is valued. Now, when somebody does something in their work that loses the faith of the public, that's important and we need to investigate that. But I think the word presuppose was also important. I had somebody suggest to me that it doesn't matter, because whereas clauses aren't entered into the official record like therefore clauses are, but our words do matter. And so I just want to take this opportunity to say that while I am inclined to support

this measure, because I do believe that coming to a common understanding of the facts of what has happened is desperately important, I do it with some reservations, because I want to make sure that our staff know that this will be a fair investigation, and that there aren't presuppositions about intent. And I just want to state that for the record, because I think it's important. While this may specifically refer to actions of high level staff within the city, there are ripple effects. And I want all of our staff at the city down to our frontline workers, up to our managers, to know that we value the work that they do and that while accountability is incredibly important and is why I will be supporting this measure, we go into that accountability work. Fairly, without bias, without preconceived ideas. And I just think it's important to make sure that our staff have the faith in us as a council that will do that, just like we need the public, all of you, to have faith in the work of the city. Councilor novick. Thank you for deferring.

Speaker: I just want to return to something I said about conversations rather than investigation. I partly in response to what councilor morillo said. Yes, with great power comes great responsibility. And I think that high level public servants or any public servant should be prepared to answer tough questions. But I think when you call for investigating someone, that's basically an indictment and an accusation, you could sit down with danny olivera and ask him questions about the concerns people had about things that he said, and what he says doesn't satisfy you. Then you can say, you know, I don't think he's given satisfactory answers to these questions, but that's different from an investigation. And I'm not quite sure what an investigation even means in this context. So again, I another thing I just want to say is that the city originally denied the lux. So I think that sort of refutes the idea that the city was always in the bag for zenith. And also I have to say that my understanding is it was danny oliveira who had the idea of taking the conditions

that zenith agreed to, which people were concerned wouldn't be enforceable and putting them in the franchise agreement so they would be enforceable. So that's another thing that makes me not think that he's in the bag for zenith. So anyway, I just wanted to I mean, again, I support an investigation into the franchise agreement. I'm concerned about the whereas clauses and the impact on city employees. And of course, I mean, I know people, former and present federal employees who are probably about to be investigated by donald trump. And I think that, as councilor dunphy said, there are, you know, we do need to make city employees feel like they're not being there, that they're being treated with respect. And I know that a lot of people in the audience who think we should have daniel alvarez head on a pike, I just respectfully disagree.

Speaker: I'm going to ask that, folks, keep your reactions silent. Me too. Thumbs up, thumbs down, jazz hands. But let's try to allow business to move forward. Councilor clark, have you had an opportunity to speak yet? Okay, councilor smith, we're going to give folks a first turn first. Councilor clark.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president, I this has been an excellent line of questioning and excellent comments because I felt very uncomfortable with this resolution and my discomfort really revolves around what I would call a trust deficit. And I think to your comments, madam president, it's really important that we restore trust somehow here in this process. But the impugning of employees is very difficult for me. And per your comments, I really would like to see us become more future focused about the whole zenith issue. And I can say more about that later, but I would like to ask both councilor novick and councilor zimmerman, are you willing to make amendments to this? Because your line of questioning has been very helpful to me in elucidating the whys behind what councilor green and councilor morillo have have drafted here.

Speaker: We just had.

Speaker: A question to councilors. We do have other councilors in the queue in order to move to those comments. Can we just get a simple nod or thumbs up, thumbs down from the councilors who are addressed?

Speaker: I. I am willing.

Speaker: That's hard to.

Speaker: I'm willing. And I put my name in the queue toward the end of these comments if they look feasible.

Speaker: Okay, councilor morillo I know you gave initial remarks, but I don't believe you've had a chance to speak to the resolution since then, have you?

Speaker: Yeah, I think. I like how you use colorful language, councilor novick and I do that too. I don't think anyone here, including us, want anyone's head on a pike. And I say that because the point of an investigation is that you look into the issue and then you settle the matter. I there is a difference between discomfort and something actually harming someone. And this is an uncomfortable situation for us on council as decision makers. It's an uncomfortable situation for the community who's had these questions for years. That doesn't mean that because it's uncomfortable, we shy away from that. And while I appreciate that you should always have a conversation with someone first to get to the bottom of things, if you've had these conversations or if journalists have asked questions and they haven't found consistent answers, then what do you do after that point? Right? Because if a simple conversation cannot resolve the matter, then it has to go up to the next level. And I think that's the point where we have found ourselves at. And this is not when we're talking about being future focused. We're also talking about the future of the city, engaging in these sorts of agreements with corporations and how we are going to do that with integrity and transparency, so that this type of

confusion doesn't happen again in the future. And again, I'm going to say this one more time. If someone is making 2 to \$300,000 a year, they should neither be incompetent nor inconsistent in the truths that they are sharing with the council. Those are both issues that need to be resolved if they are coming forward. So I think that we should move forward with the investigation as it's been laid out in full. And if we are wrong, I will personally apologize to everyone involved. I'm happy to be wrong. I would be happy to be wrong about this, and I think most of us are just waiting to get answers. So the investigation will settle the matter. I think if we don't have some of the deeper investigative actions about how the city has engaged on this, then the community's never going to stop showing up. And this is going to be a matter that is just not going to be resolved. So I would like for these people to get to go home at some point and not have to bother us about this and maybe bother us about something else. I'm sure they would like to do that too, and I think that's only going to happen if we actually resolve the issues at hand. So for everyone's sake, including for the employees who we're going to be looking into this, let's clear it all up. Let's just get it out in the open and finish it once and for all. So I would really urge for people to just I feel like this is very pedantic and like picking apart language as a way of slowing down process. And I just want to get this done. This has been in the works for weeks.

Speaker: Councilor Kanal I believe that you have not had an opportunity to speak to the underlying resolution yet.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. Comparing people who are trying to create accountability and find facts and protect our climate to Donald Trump or Elon Musk is confounding and absurd to me. And saying that there's presupposition of an answer when we're trying to start by asking, asking a question does not presuppose an answer. So I just want to I want to just lay that out from

the beginning and also say that as the only person up here who has been a city staffer, I think that there is a that in the outside of city hall there, which is a slightly different context. Right? Sorry. There is a. There is a it's a different message when you're sending it, when you're investigating an administrative assistant one versus investigating a person who is in significant leadership roles. I, I understand and I'm not I understand some of the other questions I do. I think that there is a there we're talking about potentially setting a precedent here about entering into the record things that are coming from the outside. I think that's a really valid question to raise that, that councilor zimmerman raised. You know, here about documents that are coming from from advocates. And I think that's a worthwhile question to have. And everything we do here sets a precedent, and that's why we're slowing it down often to talk about public comment and things like that. I fully understand that, that that's frustrating. But because as the president put it, this is the first thing the first time we're doing it this way, it is important to get it right. And so I apologize that that what I brought up earlier may have caused that delay, but it is for that reason. So i, I do understand the conversation there and I'm looking through it. And I guess my question is are there amendments that don't that that don't undermine the intent that would actually get us closer to 12 to 0, maybe not all the way there. If that's the case, it's worth engaging on. If it's the purpose of this is to either change the intent of the document or to get us to not vote on it tonight, then that's different. And I assume goodwill. So I'm not I'm not implying that anyone's coming at it with with bad intent here, but that that's my concern. I the last thing i'll say is I do want to see this list of verbs at some point from the city attorney's office, because I think, you know, urging versus demanding that there are some precedents we'd be setting there, too. And I get that, and I'd love to do that in a way that that ideally would still yield an answer tonight personally. So that's that's where I'm at at this moment.

And I'm thinking as we go and I think we haven't since our very first meeting, had a conversation where the document or the decision was evolving as we went. And so I think that's that's a worthwhile or the first two meetings. I guess it's a worthwhile thing that that hasn't happened in a while, but might be worth doing.

Speaker: Councilor smith.

Speaker: Madam president, this is probably the most troubling agenda item that I've seen since we've been here, and I totally agree with you. I agree with the fact that I think that communities trust has been broken, and I agree with councilor zimmerman that in councilor novick that we can't be going on a witch hunt for this. So. I have a question for the mayor. Can I ask the mayor a question?

Speaker: Mr. Mayor, are you willing to yield a question? I'm hearing feedback from my fellow councilors that you can't say no when I ask it like that, but you can in fact say no. Go right ahead, councilor smith.

Speaker: And I'm really sorry about this, mr. Mayor, because I really don't want to put you on the spot like this. But we've been here for a long time, and I was very much in support of people testifying, because I believe that folks need to have their words heard in this setting. Attorney robert taylor has told us that even if we vote yes on this, you don't have to do it statutorily. So my question is, if we don't vote on this tonight, we table it. Will you investigate or will you only investigate if we compel you? Because you don't have to statutorily. So if you don't have to do it, we pass it and you say, I don't want no parts of it. Then what are we doing here?

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: No, I appreciate the conversation. To answer your question directly, I would honor your voice and set up an investigation. How that looks. You know, I appreciate the conversation, and I appreciate the spirited discourse. The one thing that I give pause to is, is defaulting to trust. It's our relationship is between council

and the administration, which is manifested based on the mayor and the city administrator. I would prefer that the outline be clear to direct me, to clearly determine where in the administration malfeasance, mistrust, misinformation may be found so we can find it and address it. So that would be. But to answer your question, to get back to it, yes, I will. And I've talked to councilors green and councilor zimmerman in past conversations and said I will follow the will of this vote.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Thank you so much.

Speaker: Councilor green.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. You know, I also appreciate the discourse and the engagement here. And I and I just want to clarify what this is trying to do, because it is important that we are not engaging in witch hunts. In my opinion, this does not engage in a witch hunt. I'll just direct your attention to the second to last, be it further resolved, and i'll just read it verbatim. It says be it further resolved under city charter section two, dash 109 investigations. This council urges the auditor to investigate the facts and prepare reports. So the subject of the investigation is the facts. It's not any person, it's the facts. And prepare a report detailing the city's handling of zenith's lux applications to bring clarity and transparency to the situation. Given many competing statements and arguments heard by council during that work session. Okay, to just summarize the rest of it, it is urging the auditor to look at statements made by staff, but also zenith energy and also members of the public. And so in some sense, it decenters the staff. The whereas clauses are are efforts to without allegations say here is evidence that has been presented to me as a duly elected official. This is what people have emailed me with. This is their summary of the of their experience as they've engaged with

this issue over the years. Attachment h, I believe, is the email I responded in I received in response to the work session where it was more more like, this is what we heard in the work session. It does not correspond with our experience. Urge you to look into this. And so I designed this resolution with this idea that I'm going to lay it all out there. I'm going to resist. I'm going to resist saying you did a bad thing in here. I'm going to say, I think this urges further investigation, but I'm not going to spin up a kangaroo court and engage in a, you know, a witch hunt. And I'm going to sort of ask for the assistance of a, of a body of this government that has the expertise to engage in a fact finding exercise. And so I think in that, in that sense, I'm also in the spirit of saying I want it to be serious. I want it to address the issues at hand and settle the question in the most expedient fashion possible. So I just lead with that. That's my clarifying piece here. And just, you know, to councilor smith's question, the mayor's part is just the franchise agreement, the auditor's part, if the auditor chooses to go along with this, is to just look at all the facts and say, what are we? What do we know and what kind of report can we provide? And so it doesn't even ask the mayor to go around to each bureau and say, you're wrong, you're wrong, you're right, you're wrong. So that's that's what the resolution does as written. So i'll just yield.

Speaker: And councilor green and so you know that we can't direct the auditor to do anything. Correct?

Speaker: I do, and that's why I asked it to urge. And i, and I would just say resolutions are a tool that the City Council has to make its collective will known. And that's what we're trying to do here.

Speaker: I believe that councilor morillo may have a response.

Speaker: Yeah. I just want to direct respond to that, because we know that resolutions are largely symbolic overall, yet we use them all the time for plenty of

things. So to use that as a talking point for not moving this forward doesn't make much sense to me, because that's all resolutions are. Unless you're bringing forward an ordinance, it's not a law change, right? I also think that it will be important for the public record and for the public to know how all of us voted on zenith on this resolution. So there is value in going through the process. And if you vote no, i'll, you know, honor your vote. Obviously, there's nothing I can do about it, but I think that there is value in just answering the question.

Speaker: Councilor zimmermann.

Speaker: This has been a very helpful conversation. I'm going to propose an amendment that I think maintains all the meat of this resolution. No changes to the be resolved and the furthers and all the things. That I think maintains the spirit and the seriousness. And i'll, i'll forego my concerns about words like demand or direct. But out of this entire document, there are 20, whereas paragraphs. And I have two amendments I'm going to read in and I'm going to read them together. So my first amendment.

Speaker: Councilor before you do that, if there are.

Speaker: On a.

Speaker: Roll.

Speaker: I'm sorry. I'm just wondering if we should get this up.

Speaker: It's easy. It doesn't.

Speaker: Need to be okay.

Speaker: It's easy. Okay.

Speaker: Go ahead.

Speaker: My first amendment is that no changes to the document in the first ten whereases. And so i'll just read out what the 10th one is. This is no change.

Whereas in 2000 in its 2022 luxe materials zenith excluded activities fuels dot dot

dot dot well tracking where we're at second page the whereases after that, and at the end of that it has attachment c1, c2 all the way through, whereas 20 which is the last, whereas which is attachment h and directly before the now. Therefore, my amendment is to remove all ten of those whereases. And the reason I am proposing that amendment is that I think this resolution reads incredibly professionally. Without them, and maintains the reasons why this is a serious topic and a serious resolution. That's my first amendment, my second amendment is to remove attachment c1, c2. E f, g1, g2, and h for all the same reasons, because they kind of corresponded there and I'm happy to field any thoughts.

Speaker: All right.

Speaker: Let's give everybody just a minute to read this.

Speaker: And then.

Speaker: We will see if there's a second on this amendment. If there is a second on this amendment, we will pause the cue on discussion on the underlying resolution. Second, we will move to okay, there's a second. So we'll move through folks who are already in the queue to see if you have comments on the amendment, and then move on to other folks who may have comments on the amendment. I'll give everybody just two minutes to read through this.

Speaker: How do we read it?

Speaker: If you look on our agenda online and you click on the title of this agenda item, item 13 declare actions concerning zenith. Et cetera. You should pull up the original text of the resolution, which has been slightly amended in one of the results, but we are only talking about whereases right now, so there shouldn't be a conflict in looking at this document.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Can I ask a clarifying question?

Speaker: Go ahead. Did you.

Speaker: Say to remove councilor zimmerman? Did you say to remove attachment d as in dog as well?

Speaker: No thank you.

Speaker: I'm happy to repeat, yes.

Speaker: Why don't you repeat it now that more folks have it pulled.

Speaker: Up.

Speaker: Starting with the attachments that I proposed to remove c1, c2 e. F g1 g2 and h, the spirit of that colleagues is that the ones that remain are email correspondence. A letter from dick. I would put them in the official record types of things. I removed the news articles and the unsigned documents that had been placed in there.

Speaker: Councilor can you repeat the whereas clauses that you would remove as well?

Speaker: Sure.

Speaker: The first whereas clause that I'm proposing to remove is the whereas clause that starts with. Whereas investigative reports from street roots and de smog. So that's the first one. If we're all there, I'm proposing removing all whereases thereafter and shortening up the document so that the next paragraph after the 2022 lux, whereas is the now, therefore be it resolved, City Council.

Speaker: Councilor novick. Are you in the queue to discuss the amendment or the underlying resolution?

Speaker: I support the amendment, don't need to say anything further. I was in the queue to discuss the underlying resolution. Councilor kanal amendment or underlying resolution amendment. Go right ahead.

Speaker: Councilor zimmerman, i, I understand what you're trying to do. I know I'm not raising the general question here. The reason I asked about attachment d is because the 12th whereas clause cites it, and it is the auditor's report. And I was curious if perhaps with a slightly different tweak, that clause could be retained. That tweak being starting the quote with the. Communications involved. To maintain the finding from the auditor, but avoid naming the staff. Given that you felt that the attachment was worth.

Speaker: Keeping councilor kanal, I would actually just venture to remove that from the list of excises, right entirely. The second one, the one that says. Whereas in investigating violations of local lobbying rules, I had proposed removing that, but I'd left the document in. I think leaving that in is fine given that that document. Thank you for the highlight.

Speaker: Thank you council.

Speaker: This is a friendly amendment to remove one fewer whereas clause. It sounds like you are okay with that. I believe councilor clark, you seconded the motion. Are you okay with that change as well? Okay. Councilor koyama lane are you in the queue to discuss the amendment? Councilor morillo are you in the queue to discuss the amendment?

Speaker: Yes, I am. Go right ahead. So I think that the reason that the whereases are really important is because it provides context in the public record about why this is happening in the first place. And I think that if we want to talk about trumpian politics, removing journalists, writing and investigations from the record on serious matters is kind of concerning to me. If we want to go that route, these are not we're acting like the some of the documents entered into the record are just from randos in the community and not experts that have investigated this for way more years than we have. And from actual journalists who have done public

records requests, who've done a ton of investigating into this. I, I think that it removes the entire context and the history of why we have gotten to this moment. And I think that that context is incredibly important for why we are at this point in history right now. So I feel very strongly that the majority of this does need to be kept so that generations coming after us can understand why we had to do this in the first place. I see this to remove all of that context when we're talking about accessibility to the public as well. I picture someone going and trying to find this resolution and just seeing the investigation and none of the context and none of the attachments, and just wondering, why did City Council do this in the first place? This puts it all in one spot, makes it easy to address. And I just, I don't I think maybe you could remove some of the attachments from the advocates, but I'm glad you changed your mind about the auditor's own investigation, because why do we have an auditor if we're not going to use her investigations anyways? But I also think the point of local journalists, and they're not always favorable to us either, is that they are actually doing investigations as well. So I think that this is just incredibly important context. And I feel like this is being just torn apart with a meat cleaver in a way that is completely removing a lot of the important integrity of this, of this resolution, actually. And I feel like some of the discussion that we're having about like, should we urge or direct the mayor or whatever are just semantic discussions to slow down process. And I think the public is tired of us slowing down the process on this.

Speaker: Yeah. So I'm going to ask folks to keep.

Speaker: Their support or opposition quiet.

Speaker: I'm responding.

Speaker: Councilor zimmerman, we need to get back to the queue.

Speaker: So I think, you know, first off, I'm not sure that impugning the motivations of why I thought that word was important or not is, is necessarily the right tactic here or or helpful. But I think that a lot of news agencies have reported on this topic, and only news from one publication and one reporter was included. And so I don't know that they were included to capture the entire record of what was included. I didn't see articles from our other papers of record in the community, and so I'm not sure that. Saying that by including those documents that we have, we somehow are going to miss the point in the public record. I think you made the point earlier. Councilor like the advocates, the folks involved, we have heard this the public record is out there. And I think the spirit of any investigation is important that it start from. And the reason most of the time when investigation has to happen, it has to happen from a person not involved is because it's supposed to start from a position that is neutral across the board, and that all of these documents that we're talking about, all of these, these experiences that councilors have who need to be interviewed in the future if they think that's the case, will come out in an investigation. I don't know that the spirit of a resolution to urge, one has to give all the documents that need to be looked at. Because what this says to me is that for some reason, this council believes that these two articles over any other article somehow carry more weight. And I don't think that was the intent. But by not including them, that's why I captured both of them and that's why I went with those. And it is not about I would like to put this to rest today as well. I'm not trying to delay this to multiple days.

Speaker: I'm sorry I implied that and I appreciate you clarifying. Look at us. We're working it out. We, me and Zimmerman always do, I think to direct respond about the news articles. I think it's because those journalists specifically did some public records requests that unearthed some things that were interesting to look at that,

frankly. Other publications like the Oregonian and stuff, they've reported on the issue at large, but they didn't get that same data. And so, I mean, I'm happy to add more articles. Why take them away?

Speaker: Councilor avalos?

Speaker: I'll start by saying I agree with councilor morillo. And let me take it a step further and a step up, because for me, what all of this, the whereas clauses, the attachments, this process that we're going through, I'm actually really excited about this because what to me it shows, is us legislating in a way that's actually reflective of the people that we represent and have worked hard with the councilors who crafted this resolution to bring some information, you know, bring resources, add context, add a perspective. You know, it's not the job of the resolution writers to include absolutely everybody's perspective. It clearly has a perspective, and it provided data to support that. And it isn't asking us do we agree with it? And that's why we vote on it. So I don't think we need to be adding a whole bunch of other things. I just don't think process wise, that doesn't make sense to me. And further, this is really important to me because I feel like we often discredit community voices as not being experts. That is something that I am strongly values against because it's rooted in process that has always excluded people like me, people like the communities that are impacted by this resolution, people who have brought this forward. And so I'm strongly against the amendment because I think it takes out a lot of context. I agree that the whole point of having a public record is that there's context in it. And if we take all of that out, if we look at this in ten years, it's not going to make sense to me if we cut all of those articles out or all of the attachments out. But I think my larger point is this is a good discussion for us to have, and I think there is more discussion to have around, like, how are we crafting resolutions, how are we bringing those together? But this is a really good example

to me of how this is different. This council is different. I am planning on bringing resolutions that are going to have the voices of the people I represent in them, and I'm going to reflect them in similar ways. And so I'm strongly against doing this because I don't want to set that precedent and make those kinds of assumptions that those voices aren't experts because they are community voices are experts. Thank you.

Speaker: I know that a few folks have asked about a delay, and I just want to say quickly to anybody watching online and to the public who's here in the room. It's my intent to let council finish this discussion and move to a vote, regardless of how long that takes. I know that may make it a late night, and I apologize for it being a late night, but the alternative would be to delay this to another day. Councilor green is this speaking to the amendment?

Speaker: It is speaking to the amendment. And thank you, madam president. And I just want to acknowledge i, I really I think that your councilor zimmerman, I think that you are really trying to offer a constructive path that makes you feel comfortable with the resolution. I take all the I actually take this amendment in very good faith. I would just like to offer a counterargument in favor of preserving the whereas clauses, and just sort of explain why why I structured it this way like the resolution does a lot and the burden of proof is pretty high. And how we convince our colleagues to take on these actions. And so for instance, for example, there on the street roots in desmog reference, and then later there's another citation attachment f to another street roots article. I go to those because that's where I got my glimpse into the public records request, because if it not for, you know, jeremiah hayden's reporting on this, I wouldn't know. And when I asked the question during the work session on January 21st whether or not zenith energy had, you know, did did staff have any knowledge of long run expansion plans at the

critical energy infrastructure hub on the part of zenith energy? I knew to ask that question because I read about it in a December 9th street roots article that was obtained through a public records request. And so I know it looks unusual to have all these, you know, there's no official seal and logo on these things, but this is the sort of basis of the argumentation. Without it, it's hard for me to say, urge the auditor to do an investigation if we haven't presented the basis for that. That feels like a witch hunt, actually. And so I feel unless unless we have a basis to ask that level of engagement, these things hang together that way. It is unusual. I will grant that it's not something we typically find, but this is actually a pretty highly unusual case, a very complicated issue. And so the intention here with all these whereas clauses, which are quite numerous, was to, to do citations to, to, to the stuff that I have seen. And street roots happens to be the earliest and just I think the best investigative reporting on this issue that goes to the source document, which is the public records request. So that's my motivation on this. That's why I think it matters. That's why I'm against the amendment. That's why I think it matters to keep it in its in its wholeness. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor kanal to the amendment.

Speaker: Thanks. I have two distinct questions and please take them in the in separately to councilor, zimmerman and clark. The same question I asked earlier. Preservation of attachment d earlier this time, attachment b as in boy was also not removed in your amendment and clauses. Clause 14 the 14th and 15th. Whereas when asked by City Council and whereas zenith did not disclose those relate to attachment b. And so my same question there, if those could be friendly amended back in. That's my first question. And then the second one relates to. Can you just.

Speaker: Say again which.

Speaker: Whereas whereas when asked by City Council and the immediate following one, whereas zenith did not disclose their the 14th and 15th, whereas. And then the. Sorry, i'll let you respond if you'd like before i.

Speaker: I acknowledge that they are attachment b, but i, I think that I wouldn't be open to those two coming out of my, my pole. Right. I think that they, they go a little far to assume or set a fact that I'm not sure we've determined yet. That was my reasoning there. Thanks for the question, though.

Speaker: Yeah. And then the same kind of similar, but not exactly the same question. It's the 18th one, whereas city staff presented and it's not about the whereas clause, it's about attachment g2 specifically, which is an email that is in the public record already. It's an email from staff to us before we took office that I think is helpful to have in the record. So it's not about the whereas clause, it's about the attachment itself. And i'll, i'll just leave it at that.

Speaker: You're always a very good detail, man. Councilor not to the whereas but leaving the document g2 that email is I consider it a friendly amendment.

Speaker: So just so that we're tracking correctly, we are now considering an amendment which would remove whereas clauses 11 and 13 through 20 and attachment c1, c2, e, f, g1 and h clark. Is that what you have written down as well?

Speaker: That's what I have.

Speaker: And I should have asked first. Counselor clark, are you okay with that amendment? Okay. Councilor I don't see anybody else in the queue to the amendment. Are there any other comments to the amendment? Okay. Keelan, could you please call the roll? And this is just to be clear, we're voting. Yes means we are amending the resolution to remove. Whereas clauses 11 and 13 through 20 and attachments c1, c2, e, f, g1 and h no is a vote to keep the resolution in its current form.

Speaker: Avalos.

Speaker: Community voices are experts. I vote no.

Speaker: Dunphy.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Smith.

Speaker: I believe that we need to continue to have our freedom of speech and to be able to use those tools that are not necessarily mainstream. So I'm going to vote no on this.

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: I like some of this. I, I don't like some of it. It's hard because I don't want to try to start getting into the question of, do we divide this and that? That just seems messy. So I'm going to vote. No thanks, Ryan.

Speaker: Yeah. Ironically, I might be the only one that's in those articles that's been discussed tonight. And I vote no.

Speaker: This is my first time voting no. I'm a little excited ever.

Speaker: And so. And I'm voting no.

Speaker: Morillo. No.

Speaker: I clark.

Speaker: This is very unusual and I appreciate the author's intent, but I'm voting yes.

Speaker: Green.

Speaker: I appreciate the spirited discussion I vote no.

Speaker: Zimmerman I pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: I appreciate councilor smith's comment about the voices of media that are not mainstream. And I hear that and feel that, and it is important, and it is

causing me hesitation in my vote. But I also was clear with the carrier early on in this process that while I wouldn't bring an amendment to change these sections of the resolution, if somebody else did, I would feel compelled to support it because of the comments I made earlier about supporting our staff at the city, I vote i.

Speaker: The amendment is not approved with eight no votes and four yes votes.

Speaker: So we are back to the queue to the resolution with the one previous amendment not amended with this most recent amendment. Councilor novick to the resolution.

Speaker: Actually, my comments are shamelessly personal. I want to say that councilor kanal is right. I should not have invoked donald trump. What I meant to say was that because of what trump is doing to federal employees, I'm especially sensitive to attacks on any public employees, but it came off like I was comparing people in the room to donald trump, and that was wrong. Second, I want to make it clear that I'm not insulting anybody when I suggest they want somebody's head on a pike. I don't think there's anything wrong with wanting people's heads on pikes. There's a number of people who not only don't want their head in the pike. I'd be proud to carry the pike, and I to quoted john, a character in a underestimated john steinbeck novel. Although I do not support your. I may not support your particular passion. I support passion, whatever its whatever its form. So again, I apologize and I hope, I hope I've offered a clarification. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor koyama lane.

Speaker: Colleagues, I want to say that I am proud of us. I feel like we're sitting in some discomfort while I am very tired. I do see some ways that we're finding where we're closer to each other than maybe we thought. I also am taking really seriously what I'm hearing from my colleagues about a desire to make sure that our city staff feel supported, and i, those who know me, know that I care deeply about our city

employees and working with them, making sure that we're collaborating. I also am sitting here. I was feeling a little confused and wanted to remind us that on February 19th, 2025, we unanimously passed a resolution to direct the city administrator to submit a report of unassigned funds. I didn't hear a lot of this. These same concerns there. I don't think that it's necessarily disrespectful or being unkind to city workers to talk about. I'm looking at that resolution right here that my colleague, councilor loretta smith, brought forward, and it talks about promoting transparency and fostering public trust. I see some some connections there. I just wanted to remind us of that.

Speaker: Councilor zimmermann.

Speaker: All right. I recognize the message of pulling the media articles out. I'm hearing that, and it was not an intent there. I move the same amendment, except the only change is only to remove attachments h.

Speaker: Councilor before I do the work, have you cross-checked and make sure made sure that you are not removing. Whereas clauses that refer to attachments that you are keeping in. Regardless those whereases I don't think should be in the document. The attachments can stand on their own.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: But I am moving to move remove the same whereases that we considered earlier, but I am changing the attachments just to remove attachment h, which I consider the most concerning of the attachments.

Speaker: So you.

Speaker: Are making a motion to amend the resolution to remove, whereas clauses 11 and 13 through 20 and attachments c1, c2, e, f and g1 with the second from councilor novick.

Speaker: I'm sorry, can you?

Speaker: Whereas clauses 11 and 13 through 20.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: And attachments c1.

Speaker: No, no.

Speaker: Only attachment h would be removed in my new document.

Speaker: Okay. Only attachment h.

Speaker: All other attachments is the original writers put forward the articles everything except attachment h.

Speaker: So removing whereas clauses 11 and 13 through 20 and attachment h.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: For consideration. And the second councilor.

Speaker: Councilor smith, are you in the queue to the amendment?

Speaker: Yes, yes.

Speaker: And I want to respond to. Councilor, sometimes you got to know when you're winning and you were winning before you said that I understood exactly what you were trying to do. But the issue is, is there's a difference in going after this. The city administrator and going after a, an employee that that's in a bureau. I'm with you when you write. And I've been sitting here listening to everything that that amendment was something that needed to take place for transparency around dollars that come into this community, that we do have the power of the purse for. We don't have the power to urge anyone to do anything. And that's the difference. If I put something forward, it's going to be because we have the power to do it. I understand why we're doing this, and I'm there. And so you just got to know when you're winning.

Speaker: Councilor morillo to the amendment.

Speaker: I accept just keeping that one or removing that one item from the record. That's fine. I still think the whereas clauses, that's like half of this thing. And I think it's just too much important context. Is there something specific about this that is so okay. I think the discussion that has come up is like, this doesn't look professional. I don't really know what that means because it's put in the whereas format. The clerk looked at it, the lawyers looked at it. Who is defining professionalism here? I thought we were all making up a government right now and deciding how things go. So I think I get to define what professional is, and I think professional is citing my sources and citing the context so that in 20, 30, 100 years from now, because we've saved the planet and we stopped donald trump from destroying our infrastructure, we are looking there's going to be some kid in elementary school researching the zenith oil train, and they're going to pull this up on the digital record and their magic screen that they have, and they're going to be like, dang, I didn't have to look up all the advocates that they talked to because it's already.

Speaker: Here, you.

Speaker: Know, like, honestly, that's genuinely what I'm picturing. We've saved the day. Some elementary school kids looking at this 100 years from now, I'm getting tired. I'm sorry. But, you know, like, I think that this is important. And I think that we get to define how these things are. We're making all of this up as we go along. So just because something's been done a certain way before doesn't mean that's how it has to be done now. So I approve removing the one attachment that you cited. I think the whereas clauses need to stay. Any other comments to the amendment? Keelan could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Avalos still a no from me.

Speaker: Dunphy no.

Speaker: Smith.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Canal for.

Speaker: The reasons councilor morillo said no.

Speaker: Ryan. No. Koyama lane.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Morillo. No novick.

Speaker: I hope that at some future time councilor morillo makes the elementary school kid argument again, because I would love to be able to rely on that and voting for something, but sadly, I still have to vote i.

Speaker: Mark. A green. No zimmerman. I pirtle-guiney. I the motion is or the amendment is not approved with eight no votes and four yes votes.

Speaker: Is there any further discussion to the resolution as amended? Not with that most recent amendment.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: I believe we have a first and a councilor morillo.

Speaker: Which attachment did you want removed? Zimmerman. H okay, I propose we remove attachment h and keep the rest of it as is. Can we vote on that?

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Any discussion? Keelan would you please call the roll?

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Dunphy. I smith.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Connell i.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: Hi. Koyama lane i. Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick i.

Speaker: Clark I green.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Zimmerman i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: The amendment is approved with nine yes votes and three no votes.

Speaker: We've now had two amendments adopted into the resolution. Is there any discussion to the is there any discussion of the resolution as amended? I'm struggling with words here.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Seeing none. Keelan I believe we have a first and a second already. Is that correct?

Speaker: We don't need a first and second. This is just.

Speaker: A roll there and ready to go. So do you please call the roll.

Speaker: Avalos.

Speaker: Colleagues I am voting yes on this resolution. And yeah I'm going to give you a speech. Deal with it. I am voting yes on this resolution because Portland City Council must have a role in shaping the land use decisions that impact our communities. Right now, there is disagreement about whether the land use compatibility statement for zenith is an administrative decision or a quasi judicial one. And that distinction is critical to me because it determines the level of oversight and accountability in this process. This resolution is about gaining access to information that can help us investigate that distinction, and hopefully leads to the opportunity to clarify who has the authority to make these calls, and ensuring that council has a say in land use decisions that shape our city's future. Land use decisions aren't just bureaucratic processes, they have long term consequences for

our environment, for public safety, for community well-being. And Portlanders elected us to be accountable stewards of these issues. And we need to ensure that that responsibility is clear. Beyond this resolution, I also plan to evaluate Portland's comprehensive plan to prevent situations like this from happening again. We need stronger policies that are going to align with our values and provide clear democratic oversight. And for that reason, I vote.

Speaker: I thank you.

Speaker: Thank you all for sticking around so late I vote yes.

Speaker: Couple of comments. I believe that we need to put this whole thing to bed, and I think there's a lot of support in this room to do just that. And what I want folks to understand is when the conclusion comes back, if it's not the way you want it. You got to be careful for what you ask for. And the reason why I'm going to vote yes for this is because I understand that the auditor will be investigating the actions of the bureau overall, not the conduct of individual employees. So I am voting yes for this.

Speaker: Sameer kanal.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Two quick notes before talking about the document. First on public comment. Again, apologies for any delay that that caused, but I will defend the rights of the public to give public comment at the full council meeting for as long as I'm in office. And that is never going to not be on my plate. The second thing is, I do think that this raises a question because there is a question about and I really don't like talking about individual employees, but there is a difference between someone in a bureau and someone who is a city administrator or the mayor. And where does a dca lie? And I raised this when we had the conversation about the city administrator. I don't understand what our vision is collectively about the dca role

as a city, and I'm going to keep coming back to that until we have that conversation, because it is a very important role, but it's not in the defined in charter that way. So setting that aside to the document, Portlanders have not seen the kind of transparency around the city's conduct related to zenith that they're entitled to. And frankly, this council has not received sufficient information either. As a result, the public has understandably lost trust in the city. In a previous document or a conversation, there was a gtac member who referred to the over and over and over aspect of community engagement waiting to be heard. And this this one is another example of a government being told what to what people want, and there being some bureaucratic reason why it can't be done. And Portlanders have made it clear they care about this issue. The very least we can do is ensure there's daylight on the process. And just as a side note, so much of what we're talking about today is really about one thing that you have the right to have expectations of the capital c city. You deserve a city that listens to you, and you're entitled to have your voice heard. And it's okay to have high expectations. We need to invite the community into this decision making process, because this is also a public safety issue and a public health issue, and the community is who's going to be directly impacted. And so I'm looking forward to sending that message that we need more transparency, involvement and clarity from here on out. And i.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: Thank you. I want to pause to recall the discussion at Monday's work session about the future of the cei hub. I asked, what does an acceptable solution to address the current cei hub look like? And specifically, where can it be located? The state of Oregon's resilience officer shared that it isn't a realistic strategy to relocate the cei hub as we know it, but we can anticipate that it cei hub will shrink over time. I advocate that we continue to partner with city, region and state as we

as well as the communities in the surrounding area and private industry, to develop a sound plan for the future of the cei hub and its resident fuelers. Insert pause to councilor dunphy, thank you for your thoughtful words earlier about basic decorum. I thought it kind of handled what needed to be discussed here at this body. I really appreciate it to this matter at hand. This resolution demands that the mayor perform an investigation, but I understand that this by city code, the mayor has the right to accept or deny requests made by the council. I'm not a fan of the word demand either, and I think an appropriate path would have been to process this through an independent city ombudsman. Okay, back to this up or down vote. I asked the mayor directly earlier this week. I'm sure you recall our conversation if he was supportive of this resolution and he affirmed he is. Well, I am too. I support the transparent investigation process, I vote I koyama lane.

Speaker: I genuinely appreciate some of the struggle from the discussion tonight about the process related to zenith's franchise agreement, and I feel it underscores the importance of an issue that councilor morillo said, well, it will impact communities for decades to come. Community members have raised these concerns for years. There have been there's been a lot of pent up frustration about lack of transparency, lack of public input, and I hope that moving forward, the public doesn't have to wait so long to have input and be part of the process. I vote, i.

Speaker: Morillo you've all heard me talk enough tonight. I'm losing coherency. I of course vote. I thank you.

Speaker: I want to say that I really appreciate the fact that folks have hung in here tonight until 1030. I think that validates the idea of having night council meetings, which councilor kanal fought for forcefully and I thoroughly agree with. I wanted to say that I'm pleased there is going to be an investigation of potential violations of

the franchise agreement. And finally, I wanted to say that I want councilor avalos to give more speeches. Nay.

Speaker: Clark.

Speaker: Well, I already expressed my discomfort with this and my thoughts about a trust deficit. I think that the resolution is very well intentioned. The demand for transparency. I support that, and I hope that trust can be restored with this resolution. In fact, I believe it's very important to our success as a council that we restore trust. At the same time. And I and councilor Ryan opened the door. So I'm going to walk through it. I want us to become more future focused when it comes to zenith and all of our conflicting policy goals, of which we have many. Zenith is supposed to be a part of the solution to the transition away from fossil fuels. So this means we're living with an uncomfortable trade off. We must invest in strategies to lower our use of fossil fuels like safe streets, transit, 20 minute neighborhoods, and at the same time, do everything we can to mitigate the threats posed by both oil trains and the sky fuel tanks in our midst. You know, we've been at this less than 100 days, guys, and I have to say, almost every day I learn about what was left behind for us to resolve mistakes of the past, decisions deferred, plans adopted but not implemented, city assets neglected, neglected streets, parks and other assets. And regarding zenith, we've neglected our fundamental responsibility to keep the public safe from the threats posed by the storage and transport of the state's fossil fuel. Through the linton neighborhood. We've neglected our own assets and the safety of our neighborhoods. So I will reluctantly cast an I vote and support for this resolution supporting transparency, and I hope that we can move away from what feels like the blame game to a productive focus on practical steps to safely transition from fossil fuels while keeping our communities safe. We are living with unpleasant trade offs.

Speaker: I vote yea green.

Speaker: I didn't prepare a fancy closing speech. I gave everything up front. But I want to say a couple of things. I have deep, deep admiration for my colleagues tonight at this, at this table, at this dais. I have deep admiration for the mayor. I think this is what voters envisioned. This is a very complicated issue with wide, sweeping histories and ramifications. And at the same time, it's something we must take on. And what I see here is everyone bringing their critical lens to bear on it with their principles. We're not always agreeing on how we're getting there, but we are engaging in a dialog that I think is in good faith and is trying to be responsive to the public. And so I just want to see more of that, and I hope we continue to do that across a range of issues, because that's what voters want. And thank you for bringing that tonight. And thank you to all of you out there who are still out here tonight, who fought so hard for this. I vote I Zimmerman.

Speaker: Thanks. I made a valiant effort. I hope I lost and I appreciate councilor morillo you saw the point that I think I was most concerned about. So I appreciate that amendment and being able to support it. What's unfortunate about this is that this action today doesn't do a darn thing to stop zenith, and that is what I think most of us heard throughout our campaigns. It's most of us have concerns in the zenith or excuse me, in the cea discussion. It's why folks are holding up signs right now. Oregon for a long time has bragged about our land use laws since 1972. We're we're creating some sort of frontier, and at the same time, we get waylaid by those same things that we've voted on or that we brag about because they back us into corners where we have a staff and a city team who says this is actually not a council action, it's an administrative action. You don't have no vote. And I don't think that's what Portlanders or Oregonians have tried to brag about when it comes to land use. And so. I appreciate some of the comments that this investigation

needs to be about the process, about the city, not an employee. Any investigation that we ever engage in when we find those issues that need to be addressed, those are a personnel matter. They should be addressed through the right channels and only in the most egregious of egregious situations would I expect to see names on records at this dais. And so I think the mayor's heard that. I think that most of you have indicated that. The resolution is still for me. A. It is presupposing some things that I don't think are going to be helpful. But I also have confidence that an investigator will take their duty seriously. Right. And so, because we were able to pull out what I thought was the most challenging attachment, I vote i.

Speaker: When people ask me what the job of a City Councilor is, one of the things that I often lead with because I think it's so important and so rarely highlighted, is our role in oversight and accountability. And this is who I have some concerns about the message pieces of it sent to staff, an opportunity for us to embrace that role, and an opportunity for us to highlight why having oversight and accountability for all layers of our government is so important. I hope, mr. Mayor, that this is a robust review and investigation, that at the end of it, regardless of what it shows, we can restore trust with all communities across the city. And then we can get to work. Then we can be future focused. Then we can get to to councillor zimmerman's point, looking at the future of our land use system and ensuring that we have a land use system that allows us to make sustainable choices as we move forward. I vote aye. Amended is adopted with 11 yes votes.

Speaker: Applause down, please. You are welcome to cheer when we close the meeting and you leave our council chambers. Counselors, we do have two items that were listed for tomorrow afternoon because we knew this meeting would run late even without them. So at 1042, I will recess this meeting. To tomorrow when we will pick up the agenda. Thank you all for being here so late.

Portland City Council Meeting Closed Caption File

March 20, 2025 – 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 minutes.

Speaker: Afternoon we are gaveling back into the council meeting that we began yesterday evening. It is March 20th at 2 p.m. We have two items on the agenda today. Both are approvals of labor union contracts. Keelan, could you please call the roll?

Speaker: President dunphy here. Smith. Canal present.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: Koyama lane morillo here. Novick here. Clerk. Green. Present. Zimmerman. Here. Pirtle-guiney here.

Speaker: And linly, could you please read the rules of decorum?

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: President. 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 council can be found on the council clerk's web page. Individuals may testify for three minutes unless the presiding officer states otherwise, your microphone will be muted when your time is over. The presiding officer preserves order 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. If you are a lobbyist, identify the organization you represent. Virtual testifiers should unmute themselves when the council clerk calls your name. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Linly. We are moving into agenda item 14 Keelan. Could you please read the agenda item?

Speaker: Ratify a successor collective bargaining agreement with the American federation of state, county and municipal employees local 189 related to the terms and conditions of employment of represented employees in the bargaining unit for 2025 through 2027.

Speaker: Thank you. And I believe we have anne-marie kevorkian, maddie and sarah daly coming up to present on this collective bargaining agreement. Is that correct? Maybe not. Okay.

Speaker: You also have me.

Speaker: Almost. Right. Thank you both for being here. If you can, go ahead and introduce yourselves and let us know what we need to know so that we can have some discussion.

Speaker: Absolutely.

Speaker: Thank you. Council president tracy warren, hr director. With me, I have anne-marie kevorkian, maddie, who is our lead negotiator. I'm going to pass it over to anne-marie, who's going to walk you through the afscme contract before you today for approval.

Speaker: I never.

Speaker: Feel so short until I'm near a. Phone. Good afternoon everybody. Council. As stated, I'm anne-marie kevorkian, maddie labor relations coordinator, and I'm bringing two ordinances to you today to seek council authorization to ratify the collective bargaining agreements for both afscme local 189 and the district council trade unions. Ctu, before I get into that, I just want to give some appreciation to the team that made the agreements possible. I had the pleasure of having an incredible team comprised of managers from bureaus across the city, operational support from bhr teams, the city attorney's office, and, of course, my colleagues in labor relations. The team came to the table fully invested in reaching an agreement with a collaborative spirit and a positive tone and dedicated long days and even some nights in reaching final agreements. And so I can't say thank you enough to all of them and their partnership. And then, of course, I'd be remiss to not give appreciation to our labor partners. In both teams. We had significant challenges ahead of us. And yet, despite the times in which we were far apart, we maintained composure and professionalism at the table with respect for each other and ultimately, the relationships cultivated over many years, and our commitment to reaching an agreement that focused on maximizing shared interests helped us cross the finish line. And so to those who sat across us from the table, from myself and the team, my thanks to all of them. So starting with the afscme agreement, just to give some background, afscme, this is afscme inaugural independent contract. Afscme and ctu made the decision to separate and bargain their contracts independently. The ctu contract is a decades old agreement. While contemplated and mature and generally speaking, doesn't require substantial changes on each successor negotiation. So afscme chose to use the existing contract as their baseline. And I'm happy to report that much of the contract remains unchanged. Bringing the mature contract into this new collective bargaining agreement for

them. However, with all negotiation, there are some changes. So I'll highlight those next slide. Just to give you some perspective, afscme is comprised of roughly 1040 to 1050 members across the city, represented in the bubbles here that you'll see many, many bureaus across the city. Next one, next slide and some of the highlights we made changes to wages, premiums, shift differentials and the cost of living allowance, including an increase in shift differential pay, a minimum of 1% increase in pay upon ratification, which for afscme will be March 5th, 2025, for the retro effective date, we provided a 2% longevity premium to employees who have ten consecutive years of service in the city. We added a new 5% premium pay for those who are in the police id tech classification, who work along, or who work in or in the jail. I mentioned the increased shift differentials already. We also provided a 1% across the board increase in July of 2026 and July of 2027. Additionally, we gave three additional personal holidays credited annually for employees required to be fully in. Person. We provided access to personal days and sick leave earlier, previously 90 day requirement. Now, 30 days of employment and employee can access those banks. We provided an opportunity for employees to cash out up to 40 hours of vacation per year, and then for employees that work in a hybrid or remote situation during a city closure where inclement weather may terminate their power or their internet accessibility, they'll remain in a paid status during those closures for up to 40 hours per year. Lastly, we also have have two full time equivalents that are able to now be out on union leave to perform work of the union. We've established a letter of agreement that will allow us to continue having ongoing discussions about the complexities of the business systems analyst classification and how that may be impacted during layoffs. We have allowed employees to be granted status when they promote or are reclassified into a higher level classification, and we've made some improvements to the language for

employees that suffer a layoff if they return to the city and how that impacts their pay. Another important highlight is that we had some agreement on pay parity for certain classifications that were shared between Portland city laborers and ctu, and we signed a letter of agreement to provide lump sum payments for those incumbents and those shared classifications. There was also a creation of six new classifications in the water bureau, and several targeted adjustments for premium pays in the water bureau as well. Next slide. The cost of the agreement is not insubstantial. Roughly \$20.9 million in new spending, with an additional 1.3 and one time investments for an overall total of approximately 22.2 million over the three years of the contract. Because the contract ends mid fiscal year in 20 26, 27, 27, 28. Excuse me, the total cost of the agreement is closer to 27.9 million. As we take those new costs into the full fiscal year. If there are any questions on afscme, I'm happy to answer those.

Speaker: We've actually only read this one contract, so I think we'll see if anybody has questions here and maybe open up the other do questions and then have general discussion. Before we get into questions, though, is there anybody signed up for public comment?

Speaker: No one signed.

Speaker: Up okay. So councilors, are there any questions specific to the afscme contract?

Speaker: Councilor kanal madam president, it's not specific to ask me. It applies to both. But because afscme is chronologically first, I think it might make sense.

Speaker: Yeah, go right ahead. If it's a technical question jump in now.

Speaker: Yeah. So I have two questions. The first is would an ordinance to ratify a labor contract normally come through the labor and workforce development committee, or is that the intention. And that's more of an internal one. And I have a

question for the presenters as well. It's okay if the answer is I don't know. I don't think we've.

Speaker: Had a well, we've we've had a number of conversations about paths and where things go because collective bargaining agreements are often discussed in executive session in iterations leading up to this vote, there's already been a lot of council eyes on it. So at this point we're bringing them straight to council. But certainly if the chair of our labor and workforce development committee wanted to request having them come through committee, we would absolutely honor that request.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Okay. Yeah. So thank you for clarifying. I'm not suggesting it. I just wanted to understand. Thank you, presenters for being here. My question that is for you is and I don't I mean this primarily around the non-economic parts, but I guess it could apply there to what is the process in your view for the city developing its strategy for bargaining? And how does council provide input to that outside of the context of an individual labor contract conversation?

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor Kanal happy to address your question. So our process has been that we work with the city management team, who has folks within their bureaus that represent the group that were negotiating the collective bargaining agreement with to gather feedback around areas in which they would like to see some changes in the collective bargaining agreement. And then what we do is we kind of vet those internally with city leadership, and then we typically start meeting with council and executive session to talk about what we're aiming towards and what budget might be appropriate to allocate towards negotiation process. And that's been the practice. I think, that we're still working through. What will be the practice with this new council, including your interests, and how you'd

like to see that process developed? I would like to envision a process where we are developing the citywide strategies, coming to council and making sure that we are all in alignment before we get to the bargaining table.

Speaker: Yeah, I just give two points of feedback on that. Is, is that the conversation around what budget to allocate is, I think, narrower in scope because there are non-economic things that I think may be of relevance to us as we try to think about what kind of workplace do we want this to be? What kind of culture do we want to have for our employees? So that's the narrower thing. The other clarification I wanted to ask is you said that after talking to the bureau management, you you said we kind of vet those internally with city leadership and then start meeting with council. In what way does city leadership not include council?

Speaker: So when I talk about city leadership, I'm talking about the executive branch of city leadership and our internal structure. I don't mean to imply that council is not leadership for the city. We just view that as the legislative branch and our elected officials.

Speaker: Okay. Yeah. Just maybe a technical semantic change, but I appreciate the clarification there. Thank you, madam president. Those are my questions.

Speaker: Are there any other technical questions specific to the afscme contract? Okay. Why don't we open up the other contract as well? And then I know there are some folks who have general comments or discussion on both, and we'll be able to do that at the same time. Councilor Clark, could you could you Keelan could you please read item 15.

Speaker: Ratify a successor collective bargaining agreement with the district council of trade unions related to the terms and conditions of employment of represented employees in the bargaining unit for 2025 through 2027.

Speaker: And anne marie, if you would like to move into the presentation on the dcu bargaining agreement, that would be fantastic.

Speaker: Perfect. All right. Well, the actu, we can probably move to the next slide. The actu is a trade focused coalition and they limited much of their changes and requests to wages and premiums, leaving a good majority of their collective bargaining language intact and bringing just a few articles of change where we had not made updates to reflect current practice or needs for several cycles of bargaining. Next slide. So the actu is a smaller or smaller union, roughly 200 employees with the vast majority out in fleet and facilities, water and permitting and development. And again, these are all these are the trade classifications. So electricians, plumbers, painters o operating engineers. One more. I'm missing someone. Apologies. Plumbers, painters, operating engineers. Oh my gosh. And the mechanics. Sorry, mechanics if you're watching. So next next slide okay. So we did make several revisions to this agreement as well. Starting with wage parity for the shared classifications with Portland city laborers, particularly for the facilities maintenance technicians. We have a minimum of a 1% wage adjustment for all classifications, retroactive to January 1st, 2025, and introduction of a 2% longevity premium for a total of ten years of service with the city. A new premium for 3% on an employee's base wage for a mobile vehicle and equipment mechanic. An increase to the minimum callback time from three hours to 3.5 hours. That's the first time we've seen an increase in that in that provision since 1988. And then we standardized the standby wages to 24 hours per week for seven consecutive days. That's up from 18. Additionally, we provided three personal holidays credited annually for employees required to be fully in person. That's three additional personal holidays. We made changes to citywide closure language to provide our for our deferred holiday during citywide closures. For those employees who are

required to report. And then some adjustments to the management and union rights language, particularly providing them 1040 hours of union leave. City paid time to conduct union business. We made improvements to the grievance language to keep a steady timeline, and also to confirm when grievances are advanced or are not advanced. And then we limited some of the essential employee deferred holiday language so that in the event of a sustained closure, we would have an opportunity to come together and meet and discuss how we would pay employees, you know, in case we had like an earthquake or something like that. We also I didn't highlight it here, but we had another pilot premium pay for some of our inspectors out in permitting and development who perform commercial work. And there is additionally one classification that we are doing pay parity, in addition to Portland city laborers, out of permitting and development through that classification is through afscme. And next slide. The cost for this agreement is roughly \$6 million in new spending and \$700,000 in one time investments, for a total of 6.7 million over three years. Like afscme, this contract will expire December 31st, 2027. So it's a half of a fiscal year for 2728. And so the full cost is roughly 8.3 million. When you talk about, you know, the expenditures moving into the last half of the fiscal year. I think that's a wrap up for the major highlights I'd want to point out. So happy to ask questions.

Speaker: Thank you. Keelan has anyone signed up for public testimony on this contract?

Speaker: No one signed up.

Speaker: Okay, councilors, any questions specific to the ctu contract? Councilor kanal.

Speaker: Thank you. Could you speak to the percentage of the costs that you just went through, or a proportion that our general fund versus not?

Speaker: Yes, but i'll need to bring it up. I don't have it right in front of me. Let me see if I can get that for you quickly.

Speaker: Sorry to put you on the spot.

Speaker: That's okay.

Speaker: Oops. I have that.

Speaker: It might take me a moment while I get this information. So I'm. I don't know if you'd be open to me answering a different question, and then I can come back to that.

Speaker: There are not other technical questions about the contract in the q.

Speaker: Fair point. Okay.

Speaker: But I appreciate the respect for our time. If there were. And councilors, if there are not other technical questions, we'll open it up to general discussion about both contracts. After this question or this question and any follow up that councilor kanal might have.

Speaker: Going.

Speaker: Why don't we move on to discussion while we're waiting for the answer? Councilors. Is there anybody who has general comments or discussion about both contracts? Councilor green?

Speaker: Thank you, madam president, and thank you for the presentation. I just would like to take this opportunity to note that, you know, as we looked at the cost of this contract settlement, I know that the numbers seem scary. They're in the tens of millions of dollars. But just as I just need a level set here, that when we look at these types of costs, we're talking about priorities. And, you know, City Council in a previous year made the decision to not return tax increment financing dollars back to the general fund, but rather repurpose them for other uses. And so we're always doing that type of work at this dais. We're always making choices on how we want

to use our public resources, and I'm happy to support contracts that invest in the work, the workers that make the city run. And so that's the lens I take as we as we look at this. It's I think it's a shortcoming to look at the cost side of this alone in isolation, without the benefits. And when we when we invest in our, our city employees, we give them the means to live in this city, to contribute to our economy. And it pays dividends. So that's just a comment I'd like to offer here at the dais. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Do we have an answer to councilor canals question or should we keep going?

Speaker: Keep going for now, please.

Speaker: Councilor kanal back to you.

Speaker: Thanks. I just wanted to note I've raised concerns about emergency ordinances in the past. And both of these are emergency ordinances. I don't think that this falls into that concern. I do think this is appropriate to use that possibility for, largely because we are we have expired contracts with both of these labor partners. And so just wanted to daylight that because it is a thing that we should highlight when we're using the emergency ordinance power and why. And I think this is one of the appropriate times to use it. Thanks. Thank you.

Speaker: While we are waiting for an answer, our colleague, councilor koyama lane, vice president koyama lane is not here today. She had an excused absence for a family commitment, but she did send a statement that she asked that I read for her during discussion. I'm going to read this in her voice because that's how she wrote it. So the eyes are councilor koyama lane Portlanders created and voted for this new form of government, one that allows for more diverse representation that we've never had before, representation that now includes someone like me, councilor koyama lane teacher tiffany, a rank and file union member serving on

council. I am proud to have helped bring a different tone to negotiations with our city workers. These contracts with afscme and ctu are the result of countless hours at the bargaining table. Trust is hard to build and easy to lose. I see this agreement as a positive step towards better labor relations and building trust, which will serve all Portlanders better. How are we doing, anne-marie?

Speaker: I'm only trying to circle through about 50 excel sheets, so apologies on the delay. I do know we have it in here, and I'm trying to work through teams as well to get that from someone.

Speaker: Councilors. If there's anybody who would like to move their remarks from their vote to a discussion portion, we could do that.

Speaker: I'm also comfortable. The answer to this question is, I think, good to make transparent, but it will not affect my vote. So I'm comfortable moving on and receiving this in writing later, but I would like it to be publicized just for because I agree with councilor green's point that, and I want people to understand that some of this is not the degree to which this contributes to the general fund is less than the total dollars we just saw. And I wanted to indicate how much that is for people who may have concerns at home, but I don't need the number right now to affect my vote. If so, that's more a note.

Speaker: To anne-marie sent it to you later so that it was in an email, and therefore a part of the public record. Would that suffice for you?

Speaker: Yeah, I think we could I could publicize it after that. Just to clarify. Yeah.

Speaker: Does that work?

Speaker: It works great. Yeah. Thank you.

Speaker: Okay. Seeing no one else in the queue. And as these are ordinances, we do not need a motion. So. And i'll note, as councilor kanal noted, these are emergency ordinances. So we are voting on them on first reading today at Keelan.

Could you please call the roll on item number 14. This is the afscme collective bargaining unit.

Speaker: Homeless.

Speaker: Thank you so much to everybody for working to get to an agreement. I think it really does show a new tone that we're trying to set as a council, and how we engage with our labor partners. And, you know, we know that we're in tough budget years, but when we invest in our workers who are making our city work, we're that is to the larger benefit of the city regardless of the budget. So I'm voting i. Dunphy.

Speaker: Thank you to all parties involved in this. This is a hard one.

Speaker: I smith. I canal.

Speaker: Thank you. We've had, I think, five broad labor conversations so far. Sorry if I forgot any one. Was the unfair labor practice conversation. Very grateful that that got resolved. One was the extension of protect 17. And then we have three unfinished conversations, two of which are up today, one with cp w. I'm excited to get those two to the next stage of approval, and look forward to hearing more about cp w of course, soon. To ask me specifically, I want to just observe. I pushed very strongly for the acp workers in the police bureau who work as id techs, who work in the jail to receive a premium for the work that they do as their counterparts do in other jurisdictions. And I really appreciate both the bhr folks for working on that and for and asked me for their adaptability on this particular point, because non-sworn employees in public safety have not always felt that they've been treated fairly or valued for the work that they do. And I'm excited to see the city adjust on this and committed to my role as co-chair of the community and public safety committee to support that valuation. So congratulations to me for achieving

a contract they can support. And thank you to bhr for achieving a contract that we can to I vote yea Ryan.

Speaker: Yeah. Good afternoon. It's great to see some of the labor partners here. I wish there were more. It's such a celebratory day, but you'll have to, you know, take it home to all of them. Right, rob I'm going to go ahead and read one comment for both of them. And I just want to make a few comments. I'm really proud that this council has worked to support labor to get to these collective bargaining agreements. It's not easy to get things like this to the finish line, and I experienced an all in effort from all of you. It was very refreshing to experience all of you arriving and moving this forward. I'm also really proud that this contract affords your membership good benefits and competitive compensation, which in our job market are family friendly. Health benefits are the envy of many and you deserve it. With this investment, we're building trust and loyalty with you, our public servants who interface with Portlanders daily. We are a team working together to improve our services, improve our services that Portlanders expect to be top of line. As many share with me, many share with me. The remaining in Portland is a tough choice. The bills from government have gone up and many say our services have gone down. As such, now is the time to shift our conversation to practices as a team. One city, one team. We must restructure as we move from bureau silos to the interconnected organization that we are and must become. In my experience, this organizational change to improve systems must include those who are closer to the delivery of services. We need the voices based on reality and their lived experiences. Simply put, management will need your members wisdom as we go through a charter driven organizational change. My hope is that our shared values will enable us to weather the challenging times we are facing as a city today and in future budget cycles. Relationships move at the speed of trust and today we are

moving forward. Together. We will ensure that Portland's best days are ahead of us
I vote I morillo.

Speaker: This is a really good day and I'm really grateful for all of the work that went into this from our city partners, from our labor partners. I hope that you take this as a sign that this is a different City Council that is ready to invest in you and have your back and take care of our city employees who do so much for us and who do so much for the city. So thank you so much. I'm so grateful for everything that everyone has done. I also want to specifically highlight councilor koyama lane in her absence. I know that she did a lot of work specifically to help out as well, and was very involved, and I think that her perspective on council and the role of the new government and having different voices here also made a big difference. And it's just very meaningful that we have people who are directly from the labor movement on council who understand that fight in a way that others might not be able to, or just feel it more closely. So I'm just very grateful for all the collaboration, and I look forward to working with you in the years to come.

Speaker: I vote yea novick.

Speaker: Congratulations again to everyone involved. I just wanted to say that I'm particularly pleased by the three additional personal days for fully in-person workers. I think those of us who've gone back and forth between in-person and virtual and back to in-person over the last several years have we maybe didn't realize when we were always working in person all the time how expensive commuting is, not just in terms of money, but in terms of time. And it clearly takes up more time than three days a year. But I'm glad to see at least this nod to equity i.

Speaker: Clarke.

Speaker: No speeches, just a very sincere gratitude for the teams that brought us here and your involvement with us in executive session. Appreciate it all.

Speaker: I green.

Speaker: No prepared speech, but I will speak. I just I would just say that this is what you get with an organized working class. When the rank and file can come together, have conversations, advocate for both their economic and also non-economic interests on the job. You can get to a point where you win a contract that you deserve, and I know that you you all on both sides of the table put in a tremendous amount of hours. And I really appreciate bhr human resources walking us through this and helping us understand big, complicated issues. So I vote i.

Speaker: Zimmerman.

Speaker: Thanks. I appreciated council president inviting me to the negotiating table. I think avoiding the strike was important. Appreciate everybody's work. Appreciate folks who leaned in.

Speaker: I pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: Bargaining well is hard bargaining. Well, when you're dealing with public dollars and public services is even harder. But it's an opportunity to evaluate our needs, evaluate our priorities, and find opportunities to do better, both for our workforce and for the Portlanders that we collectively serve. A lot of the conversations we had through this process were about culture and how to approach setting culture at the bargaining table that hopefully permeates through the workplace and through our city as a whole. Things like respect, partnership, commitment to problem solving, and excellence. Because, as my colleague said, when we provide fair compensation, we can retain the best and we can provide the best services for Portlanders. And I hope that that's what we showed this council is committed to, and the city as a whole, with our bargaining team represented here at the table, are committed to we're looking at some tough budgets, and we'll be asking a lot of our workforce, and we need to start from a baseline of respect,

partnership, commitment to problem solving and to excellence. As we approach that work together, I hope that we've shown we're committed to doing that with you. Thank you to our bargaining team, to the folks from our labor unions, both sides of the table. For all the work that you put in to getting to very fair and comprehensive contracts, i.

Speaker: The ordinance passes with 11 votes.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Could you please call the roll on agenda item 15? We have one more.

Speaker: I forgot.

Speaker: Disregard.

Speaker: Sorry.

Speaker: Still thank you though.

Speaker: Unless i.

Speaker: I smith.

Speaker: I cannot. Yeah just on this one. I also want to observe here that the point about supporting all public safety employees applies here too. There were eight ctu members noted who are Portland fire and rescue employees. And I want to make sure that even as we, of course, continue to support our firefighters, we're supporting them, too. I also want to piggyback off of councilor novick comment about three additional person personal days for fully in-person employees. I support this and also think that this is something we should be mindful of that as we move into broader conversations about in-person and remote work, that there are costs associated with it and that we should be, you know, having that holistically. So congrats to the ctu for achieving a contract you can support. And thanks again to bhr for giving us one. We can too, and I vote i.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: Hi morillo. I novick i.

Speaker: Clark i.

Speaker: Green i.

Speaker: Zimmerman i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: The ordinance passes with 11 yes votes.

Speaker: Thank you. Thank you very much, councilors. That concludes our work today. We will adjourn.