



April 21, 2025 Governance Committee Agenda

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

Monday, April 21, 2025 2:30 pm

Session Status: Adjourned

Committee in Attendance:

Councilor Elana Pirtle-Guiney

Councilor Dan Ryan, Vice Chair

Councilor Olivia Clark

Councilor Jamie Dunphy

Councilor Tiffany Koyama Lane, Chair

Councilor Koyama Lane presided.

Officers in attendance: Rebecca Dobert, Acting Council Clerk

Committee adjourned at 4:42 p.m.

Regular Agenda

1

[Adopt committee rules](#) (Resolution)

Document number: 2025-166

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

Time requested: 45 minutes

Council action: Continued As Amended

Motion to amend Exhibit A as shown in Avalos Amendments A, B, C, D, and E: Moved by Dunphy and seconded by Koyama Lane. Motion withdrawn.

Motion to amend Exhibit A as shown in Avalos Amendment D under Committee Actions A.2. to add "as a whole, not a majority of those in attendance at the time of the vote.": Moved by Koyama Lane and seconded by Clark. Motion withdrawn.

Motion to amend Exhibit A to add "appointed" under Committee Actions A.2.: Moved by Pirtle-Guiney and seconded by Ryan. (Aye (5): Pirtle-Guiney, Ryan, Clark, Dunphy, Koyama Lane)

Motion to amend Exhibit A in Committee Meetings A.1. to add "shall not deliberate,": Moved by Koyama Lane and seconded by Pirtle-Guiney. (Aye (5): Pirtle-Guiney, Ryan, Clark, Dunphy, Koyama Lane)

Motion to amend Exhibit A in Committee Meetings B.1.b.2. to strike "one or both of": Moved by Pirtle-Guiney and seconded by Dunphy. (Aye (5): Pirtle-Guiney, Ryan, Clark, Dunphy, Koyama Lane)

Motion to amend Exhibit A in Committee Rules B.1. to add "within the jurisdiction": Moved by Pirtle-Guiney and seconded by Dunphy. (Aye (5): Pirtle-Guiney, Ryan, Clark, Dunphy, Koyama Lane)

Motion to amend Exhibit A in Committee Actions B.1. to add "and impact analyses" and to add new Committee Actions B.3. "Impact analyses accompanying an item shall be completed by the Bureau, Service Area, or City Agency as directed in code or council rules.": Moved by Pirtle-Guiney and seconded by Ryan. (Aye (5): Pirtle-Guiney, Ryan, Clark, Dunphy, Koyama Lane)

Motion to amend Exhibit A as shown in Dunphy Amendment A: Moved by Dunphy and seconded by Pirtle-Guiney. Motion withdrawn.

Motion to amend Exhibit A as shown in Dunphy Amendment B: Moved by Dunphy and seconded by Koyama Lane. (Aye (4): Pirtle-Guiney, Clark, Dunphy, Koyama Lane; Nay (1) Ryan)

Motion to amend Exhibit A in Committee Meetings A.1. to change "testimony" to "presenter", to amend Committee Meetings C.1. to strike the words "attendance and", and to amend Committee Meetings D. to change "Recording" to "Minutes": Moved by Pirtle-Guiney and seconded by Clark. (Aye (5): Pirtle-Guiney, Ryan, Clark, Dunphy, Koyama Lane)

Motion to amend Exhibit A in Committee Agendas A.1. to add "Section", to amend Committee Agendas B.2.a. to change "posting" to "filing" and to add "The deadline to add an item to the agenda is noon on the preceding business day excluding holidays." Moved by Pirtle-Guiney and seconded by Clark. (Aye (5): Pirtle-Guiney, Ryan, Clark, Dunphy, Koyama Lane)

Motion to amend Exhibit A in Committee Rules A.1.a. to add "least": Moved by Koyama Lane and Dunphy. (Aye (5): Pirtle-Guiney, Ryan, Clark, Dunphy, Koyama Lane)

Motion to amend Exhibit A in Committee Actions A.4. to add "for consideration" and "Section", and to remove parentheses around "(D) (1)": Moved by Koyama Lane and seconded by Ryan. (Aye (5): Pirtle-Guiney, Ryan, Clark, Dunphy, Koyama Lane)

2

[Adopt procedure to establish what comes before Council and committees](#) (Resolution)

Document number: 2025-037

Introduced by: Council Vice President Tiffany Koyama Lane; Council President Elana Pirtle-Guiney

Time requested: 35 minutes

Previous agenda item

Council action: Continued

3

[Discussion about draft Council Rules for Code of Conduct](#) (Presentation)

Document number: 2025-167

Introduced by: Council Vice President Tiffany Koyama Lane; Councilor Olivia Clark

Time requested: 30 minutes

Council action: Continued

Portland City Council, Governance Committee
April 21, 2025 - 2:30 p.m.
Speaker List

Name	Title	Document Number
Tiffany Koyama Lane	Council Vice President, Committee Chair	
Rebecca Dobert	Council Clerk	
Elana Pirtle-Guiney	Council President	
Dan Ryan	Councilor, Vice Committee Chair	
Olivia Clark	Councilor	
Jamie Dunphy	Councilor	
Ashley Hernandez	Council Operations Coordinator	
Terry Harris	(Testimony)	2025-166
Candace Avalos	Councilor	2025-166

Portland City Council Committee Meeting Closed Caption File

April 21, 2025 – 2:30 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 afternoon. I call the meeting of the governance committee to order. It is Monday April 21st, 2025 at 2:31 p.m. Keelan. Will you please call the roll? Sorry. Rebecca, will you please call the roll? Of course.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: Hello. Here.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: Here.

Speaker: Clark. Here. Dunphy.

Speaker: Here.

Speaker: Koyama lane.

Speaker: Here. Ashley, will you please read the statement of conduct?

Speaker: Welcome to the meeting of the government's committee to testify before this committee in person or virtually. You must sign up in advance on the committee agenda at. Ed.gov. Slash agenda, slash government's committee. Or by calling 311. Information on engaging with this committee can be found on this link. Registration for virtual testimony closes one hour prior to the meeting. In person. Testifiers must sign up before the agenda item is heard. If public testimony will be taken on an item, individuals may testify for three minutes unless the chair. Otherwise, your microphone will be muted when your time is over. The chair

preserves order. This disruptive conduct, such as shouting, refusing to conclude your testimony when your time is up or interrupting others testimony or committee deliberations will not be allowed. If you cause 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, the committee might take short recess and reconvene virtually. Your testimony should be addressed. The matter being considered. When testifying, state your name for the record. If you are a lobbyist, identify the organization you represent. Virtual testifiers should unmute themselves when the clerk calls. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you so much, ashley and rebecca. I do know your name. I was just reading off my script earlier. All right. Today we have a lot to do. We're going to hear a resolution about committee rules. We will also hear a resolution to adopt procedures to establish what comes before council and what comes before committees. And then if we have time, we might have a lot of lot going on. So we might need to bump this to a future meeting. But we'll conclude if we have time with a discussion of council code of conduct. Just a draft kind of some first thoughts from councilor clarke who has worked on that. Rebecca, will you please read the first item?

Speaker: Item one adopt committee rules.

Speaker: Great. So we'll be discussing and voting on the recommendation of a resolution on committee rules to full council. I want to acknowledge that there is a council wide sense of urgency around getting rules to ensure that we have shared understanding of the role and responsibility of committees. At our April 7th committee meeting, we discussed the potential value of bringing this to a council work session before having a final draft resolution and due to budget budget season impacts on work sessions. We're not able we haven't been able to have that

happen yet. So at this point, we're just being just want to say we're balancing urgency with deliberation, and we bring the resolution to everyone today to work through to advance this important work. Acknowledging that these rules as a resolution per our city code may be revisited for refinement and adjustment. Yeah. So with that, I'd like to open the floor for discussion. And after discussion on the presented resolution, we will open the floor for proposed amendments. Do we have any public testimony? Signed up rebecca.

Speaker: We do. We have two people signed up.

Speaker: Great. Can we start there?

Speaker: First we have terry harris.

Speaker: Okay. Terry harris, for the record. Thanks for doing this. I have written comments that I've sent in that have some suggested amendment language. If you dig those up, I have a copy to hear if you need them. As always, thanks for the opportunity. I think it's a strong draft at this point, and it will provide clarity to your committees. I just a comment I appreciate very much councilor avalos and council councilor dunphy's amendments, being able to see them ahead of time and comment. I will do so. My testimony from the last meeting is all still relevant. Those are all still my issues, but I realize the urgency and needing to move this along. So I'm going to be pretty specific today on the quorum rule. I think you need to make it very explicit that. Councilors shall not deliberate. Okay. So the amendment should be shall not be counted for purposes of establishing a quorum. Comma shall not deliberate and shall not vote. The next thing is on the meetings. The problem with co-chairs is that you are sort of needing to assume that the co-chairs agree with each other. So when you come to the point where, in the absence of co-chairs, a designee of one or both gives two options that might contradict each other. I would suggest to say a designee of the co-chairs. I would go to committee rules, section b

under deliberations. For one thing, I don't think the avalos amendment is going to work. I think her language is both too broad and too narrow, and is just going to be too vague. What you need to do is track exactly the state code on the matter, and the language is basically shall not meet. And then you add in private for the purpose of deciding on or deliberating toward a decision on any matter. That's the state code. That's what you should be adopting. You go ahead and use that language.

Speaker: Finally. On.

Speaker: Who on committee action and recommendation. I think the avalos amendment is unnecessary because the majority of committee members is already distinct. The avalos amendment requiring unanimous votes for do pass or do not pass is too restrictive and not a common practice. Recommendations from this committee are just that recommendations. If you'll indulge me another 30s. I think the avalos amendment on committee process is also probably unnecessary and beyond the scope of what these committee rules are supposed to be doing. And just in general, the optional part of it where it says encouraged but not required to, those aren't rules. That's guidance. And so it's probably not appropriate for the rules. And in the mandatory ones, the councilor shall I think a lot of that is wrapped up in your council procedures and drafting manual. And you could just let that stand for itself. And then finally, the dunphy amendment, I appreciate it, and I think I support it to the extent that it's creating a mandatory scheduling of a hearing for legislation. And I think that's really important. So that's it. Okay. So a minute. It took me a minute. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you so much for being with us.

Speaker: Noah pelican. Noah. Pelican. They've not joined. That concludes testimony.

Speaker: Thank you. So I know we have a number of amendments that we're hoping to discuss today. A lot of our discussion will probably be around those. But before that, looking to see if there's anyone that would like to speak more broadly. Councilor pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: Thank you. Chair. I just want to start before we get into amendments, which can sometimes feel like. Like we're getting into the nitty gritty and tearing apart work that folks have done, which is not a bad thing, but can be hard. I want to express gratitude to our chair and our vice chair. This is something that is really needed for our continued operations. It's something that we all have spent a lot of time debating, as have others across council, in comments that they've made on the record in other meetings. And I think you both have done a fantastic job trying to capture all of that and boil it down to something that works together as a whole piece, as opposed to disparate interests popping up here and there. And as we enter into potentially making some changes to it, I just want to express my gratitude for the work that you both have done to get us here.

Speaker: Councilor dunphy.

Speaker: Thank you. Well, first, yeah, ditto to what council president pirtle-guiney just said. This is hard and often pedantic, and the details matter. And we also have some exceptionally strong opinions on our City Council about things that I don't have that strong of opinions about, which is surprising to me. I do still think that I think we're getting closer, and I think we're getting closer to a defensible set of rules, but I still think that there's going to be need for us to have a bigger debate about this as a body of 12, and whether that's a work session. I know that's hard. If we don't have a work session, this is going to inevitably take up an entire full City Council hearing. And it probably should, because this is really important work. So, you know, I don't we're it is clear to me that we will never land in a place where

everybody is happy. We just need to make sure that it is defensible, that it is in compliance with best practices with state law, and that we can govern. You know, I care less about process if the outcome isn't clear. And so making sure we are starting from a place where we can get to a defensible product at the end is the most important thing for me. And I think we're almost there. I think with some tweaking, we will get there to something that this body can stand behind. So good work everybody. So far.

Speaker: Thank you so much for all that. I hear that and know that we have constraints in how many meetings we can have and when. But one thing that we have thought about is if we can even turn this time at governance for our governance committee time and make it a work session if needed. At times, especially when we're talking about things that will touch and affect every councilor on this body. So we will definitely work work towards that. All right. So we have some amendments.

Speaker: Great. Well, if I may start, I'd like to start by moving the councilor avalos amendments, amendments a, b, c, d and e to the floor for discussion and consideration. These are five separate amendments that are to be voted on independently from each other. And I'd like to invite councilor avalos to come. My motion needs a second. Is that correct? So, second. Perfect.

Speaker: Can I ask a question while we're waiting for council to come up? Could you help me number those? You said there were seven.

Speaker: There are.

Speaker: Five a, b, c, d and e. If you open the attachment that says avalos amendments, it is actually broken out in slides. So.

Speaker: Dean pair down here. I think it'd be helpful if we had the on the screen the amendments so people can see what we're talking about.

Speaker: Great idea. Thank you so much. Is that possible to have those up?

Speaker: I probably would ask for it if I was there, but I definitely am asking for it being remote.

Speaker: I think that'll be great for everyone.

Speaker: Thanks.

Speaker: Thanks.

Speaker: As we look at amendment a in quorum councilor avalos, if you're okay with it, can I ask you some a little bit some questions? I'm wondering. Some of your thoughts behind. And do we have we have our attorney present okay. Great. So I appreciate being clearer about how any councilor can interact with a committee. I think it's important to have some clarity around that. So I see you added three under a quorum. The presiding officer has the discretion on how counselors not appointed to committee may participate, including inviting them to sit on the dais, sitting at the testimony table, or as a virtual panelist. And my question there was around quorum for our maybe for you and maybe for our attorney as well. I think I'm wondering what happens if you have multiple counselors that want to sit on the dais, and then you have more than seven? What happens there? And if I think the rest of it, besides the dais part, seems like something I can get behind.

Speaker: Yeah, I can kick it off. Hello, counselor. Candace avalos, district one, for the record. Thank you, councilor dunphy, for helping me introduce some of these amendments. Let me just quickly say what you got in paper is just a one page version of what I sent over email, which is my larger conceptual framework. And I wrote that up as a way to just give context for why these amendments that I'm asking, and then just in general, and I definitely want to second or third that a work session would be great. I would love to see that because it is grander than, you know, just the couple people on a committee. And I know that everybody wants to

talk about it, so we should create space for that, okay. That being said, as it relates to this, I think ultimately, you know, I don't have strong opinions about whether it's necessary that a counselor sit behind the dais. I agree that even though that person, if you were to invite them, technically doesn't have a vote, that it might be perceived in a different way. So I don't feel that strongly about it. But I just thought it was an opportunity to offer a couple of ways that a counselor could engage, because there might be a need for them to be behind the dais for, I don't know, I can't predict what that need is, but I wanted to make it available. So but I'm curious to hear what Robert has to say around. Like if there are physically people back there, if that initiates a quorum issue, or if it's just, you know, the fact that they technically have a vote or not. So I'll leave that to him to answer.

Speaker: Thank you. For the record, Robert.

Speaker: Taylor, city attorney. First, I'm glad you're having this conversation about this because I think it is good to have kind of clear expectations about how counselors who are not members of the committee interact with the committee. Under Robert's rules of order, it does. Sort of there's two principles that come out of that. The first is that. Any other member of the body should be allowed to testify to the committee and have the ability to do so at a committee meeting. And then the second principle that also comes out of Robert's rules is when the committee deliberates, that is, for the committee to do so. The deliberations of the committee should be limited to the members of the committee, not the non members. As far as where a non member sits in the room, you know, I don't think I don't think that is a huge deal. I think that is something that you could set by rule. Give them the ability to sit at the dais or not. In the legislative assembly it's very common for non members of the committee to come and testify, but they usually don't sit at the at the dais. And I think that's, you know, a reflection of the what,

what Robert's rules and the Mason's manual for legislative procedure. Try to get at this idea of treating the committee as its own deliberative body. The this question about if you have five members at the dais at a committee meeting, and then you have a couple of other members also in the room, that alone, I do not believe, is a violation of the public meetings law. You are convened as a and have given public notice as the committee you're meeting, as the committee, you're only acting as the committee. So having other people in the room doesn't cause a problem. You know, at some point, if you if you're convened as the governance committee and then you have 12 members up there and you're all talking about things and it starts to look an awful lot like a full council meeting, then I think that could raise some issues, and maybe that argues for keeping more of that separation between the committee and then the other non members who come to address the committee.

Speaker: Councilor Dunphy.

Speaker: I still have my hand up, but I wanted it anyway. Councilor Avalos could you tell me, I guess ultimately for this amendment, what is the problem you are hoping to solve?

Speaker: I think it is the fact that because we have committees for the first time, we're all still figuring out what our relationship is. And I know for me personally, like I'm doing right now, there are things that I want to bring to committees that I'm not a part of. And so in the absence of any clear direction, I just wanted to note that that is a possibility. And again, creating some options because I agree. I think, you know, it would really take some good chair management of if you had a bunch of us back there, because I think we would naturally probably be inclined to say stuff. So I think that's a, you know, would really rely heavily on a chair. So I think having a separation or a barrier makes sense for avoiding that. But yeah, I think I'm just

trying to make space for a discussion and an action we can take to make people feel like they're they can participate in committees they're not on.

Speaker: I'm definitely a big fan of that. I think that making it exceptionally clear in our rules that, you know, if I'm not on a committee, I can still have the opportunity to present in the same way that anybody else. But I do think that specifically the sitting at the dais as an invited guest makes it a little bit muddy, which at that point I wonder if it makes the, I mean, sitting at the testimony table or participating as a virtual panelist are the only two clear, obvious options at that point. So it makes me wonder if the amendment is necessary. I mean, if we were to say, strike the dais component of it, is the rest of it worth having in there as as a language?

Speaker: I do personally think so, because again, it's just there's nothing that says anything about how anyone can participate. And I think it will also just speak to some other future things too. So I would be down with like a friendly amendment of like let's see to committee may participate, including inviting them to sit at the testimony table or as virtual like just taking out sit at the dais like to avoid some of that murkiness. I would be okay with that.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: Yeah. Councilor avalos, I'm just wondering about your comment that there's not anything about how to participate otherwise because a to just above that does talk about the many ways that somebody could participate. So my initial assumption, which may have been wrong, was that a three was actually specifically about saying that somebody could sit at the dais because I had assumed that that without that the default would be that you would either be at the testimony table or a virtual panelist. So I'm, I'm wondering what. I want to make sure I understand what's missing in a two.

Speaker: That's fair. I do see how like removing that section in three would then kind of feel more like it's a default of two. So let me just look at it one more time.

Speaker: Can I offer a suggestion?

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: What if you just added in number two? Counselors not appointed to the committee may attend, present and or testify at committee meetings, including as invited testimony, at the discretion of the chair, but shall not be blah, blah, blah.

Speaker: I would be down with that.

Speaker: I think that might take care of it. No. Okay. Sorry.

Speaker: Sure. Go ahead.

Speaker: Councilor clark. I might be overthinking about this. I might be overthinking this, but I actually worry that saying the presiding officer has the discretion could limit things in the future. What if a presiding officer says, well, yes, you can be invited, but only in this way. Whereas if we leave out language about the presiding officer discretion, we're very clearly stating that counselors can attend, can present, can testify, can be included in these various ways. If we leave it to the discretion of the presiding officer. What if, for example, I wanted to bring a resolution forward and wanted to ask councilor avalos to join me in presenting it? And our presiding officer for this committee said, actually, no, it's up to my discretion. And I'm saying that person can't join you in presenting it. I wonder if we inadvertently limit ourselves. And I'm not trying to be pedantic that truly, when I first read this, I was worried about inadvertently limiting ourselves.

Speaker: I would just assume they inherently have that authority. We're just calling it out fair. Also fair.

Speaker: I when I read a three, it felt a little bit more like there's an encouragement or an invitation to come. I wonder if in a two, if we even change,

counselors not appointed to the committee may attend if they're like are invited to. I also do wonder. So these now that I'm thinking about it, how does a counselor bring a resolution forward? Do they have to have someone on the committee sponsor it and should? Do we have that clarified anywhere?

Speaker: I don't think it.

Speaker: Is anywhere. I can I speak to that, i.

Speaker: Think, and if anybody has a different understanding, please jump in. But because any councilor can bring an ordinance or resolution on any topic and then determine what committee it is referred to, if somebody wanted to bring an ordinance to this committee, they would just submit it. Any council that would be referred here. And then when that ordinance was on the agenda, they would presumably come. And I would hope that the presiding officer of the committee would then invite them to speak to the ordinance or resolution that they proposed. I think on the question of amendments, it's a little more complicated because you need somebody who's at the dais to propose your amendment. There. It's less clear, I know, that I would be happy to do the professional courtesy of introducing something, or opening something up for a colleague, even if I didn't agree with it at any point, just to make sure that they could have their voice heard. But I do think there could be a question of whether there needs to be something more there. But for introducing something, because you can file any council and direct a committee, anybody should have a path for any committee.

Speaker: Right? Okay. So yeah, that's in code. And so if a councilor who's not on the committee is bringing a resolution that would be under present. Okay. All right. Councilor Ryan.

Speaker: Yeah, this is kind of similar to the conversation you and I had earlier. I, I personally understand one and two. They they make sense. I don't see the value in

three after we had the dialog about not having people sit at the dais unless we have to spell that out in code, which I don't think is necessary, but I'm trying to figure out what the value is of number three right now and how it does anything to the council. President's point earlier.

Speaker: What about the piece as a virtual panelist? Is that something that automatically happens?

Speaker: Well, I'm experiencing that today. Like when you're a member of the committee, you can attend, present or testify whether you're there or like I am today. So i, I think that's a that's a standard operating procedure right now. The city in such meetings with the exception of executive committee.

Speaker: So I see a nod from.

Speaker: A believer in not adding a lot of details to policy, but put them in the standard operating procedures. And I don't see that as something that needs to be in this. But that's where I'm at.

Speaker: I see a nod from the council clerk, vice chair Ryan, you can't see them, but so councilor Ryan sits on this committee. So as a virtual panel panelist, if someone was not on this committee, but is a councilor, would they also automatically be a virtual panelist? Rebecca, do you know.

Speaker: Discretion of the chair?

Speaker: We allow.

Speaker: Automatically if they were invited to be a panelist, they could attend virtually. Their meetings will always have a hybrid, a virtual option. So whether that's for a council member or for an invited speaker, it's available to both.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: And if a councilor just wants to observe the meeting, for example, I observed a committee meeting a couple weeks ago. I was not a panelist member I

didn't see on my text messages. I was there was, I guess, a debate about me sitting in the room because I was there, and suddenly we had more than six people in the room, I believe, and it was ruled. While I was sitting there again, not looking at my phone, that I was fine sitting there observing the meeting. I wasn't testifying, I wasn't voting. So yes, as councilors, we get to come in and observe meetings anytime. So I would assume we should be able to have access to observe meetings, just like anyone from the public. But does that need to be in this legislation? I don't think so.

Speaker: Councilor pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: I'm wondering if I can ask.

Speaker: A question about another. Actually, it's a piece in two different amendments, but if folks can have more they want to say about amendment a, I'm happy to wait.

Speaker: Yeah, okay.

Speaker: That'd be great. If we get through a number, if we get through a.

Speaker: Yeah, I would, I'd like to. I am convinced that if we are sort of in agreement that sitting at the dais is not a best idea or best practice, that the, the additional component of this is not necessarily really necessary. And I would recommend that we table this specific amendment and move on to discussion around amendment b.

Speaker: Do we need a second?

Speaker: No, I believe because.

Speaker: We're just moving on.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: We can come back to it if we want to.

Speaker: I think.

Speaker: We opened all of the amendments so we should be able to jump around if needed.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Okay. Councilor avalos, do you want to talk about amendment b?

Speaker: Sure.

Speaker: Okay. Amendment b, you'll see the three fourths I'm sorry, three quarters language in a couple of them, which is I just changed to supermajority. I just think it naturally includes that. And it takes the math out of it I don't know. Again not big hill to die on. I just thought structurally it made better sense to say a supermajority. So that's included in b and you'll see it in c as well. But the next part of b is the section around. If the chair co chairs does not schedule an item for a meeting that was submitted according to the committee rules, any member may make a motion and upon the affirmative vote a majority members. Again, it was just like for me, it said it was just at comma. And then it said upon the affirmative vote. But it wasn't clear to me like, what does that mean? Like, do i, as a member, need like, am I supposed to get the floor in order to do that? And I wanted to make it more clear that essentially to this is a way to this to me, is also a fail safe in case a chair doesn't want to do what the committee members want to do. So it's giving the committee an extra like ability to be able to make a motion and, you know, challenge the committee to go a different way. So I just felt it was, for me, more than anything, a way to add another layer of clarity that councilors can make, motions that might go against what the chair might want. So that makes sense. Okay. That's be.

Speaker: Thank you so much. And I know councilor dunphy also brought forward an amendment about that same section there. I have a question about for our attorney about supermajority, because I had thought about that term earlier, but then from my research, could not find that that always meant a specific thing.

Speaker: Yeah. Robert Taylor City Attorney that that's that's correct. And the, the term supermajority is a label that is applied to any vote that is above a majority vote. So could be a two thirds vote, could be a 3/5 vote, could be a 75% vote, 9/12 a vote. All of those are supermajority votes because it's more than a bare majority. So I think my and having been in a position to have to interpret and apply rules like this, I think my recommendation would be to be specific in the number of votes that you need.

Speaker: Councilor Pirtle-Guiney.

Speaker: That's fine. I was going.

Speaker: To ask that exact question. I'll take myself out of the queue.

Speaker: So can I ask so what what do you mean by more specific?

Speaker: Well, so if you wanted it to be, it's if, for example, you wanted it to be. It's a, it's a little different with just five members of the committee because a majority is three, unanimous is five. You know, four is just sort of the that's the only other supermajority. But if you were going to have, let's say on council, for example, we have the 9/12 requirement. You know, that could be you could change that to 10/12, or you could change that to eight out of eight out of 12, which would be a two thirds vote. So whatever, whatever you would like to do, I think you just need to call out that number. So I think the way it was written before three quarters of the committee members to agree in practice for a five member committee, that means either four affirmative votes or five, because if you only have three, that's just a majority of the committee.

Speaker: So are you suggesting that we maintain the three quarters?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Any other discussion around amendment b? Councilor Dunphy.

Speaker: We will come to this a little bit later, but I will be introducing an amendment that also changes section b, two sub b, which reframes it a little bit. And would. Not it would actually my specific amendment actually would remove the section that we are amending. It's I think that it is a. A valid addition. However I have a little bit of a before we vote on this, I'd like to make sure we talk about my concept on it as well. I also am. Hearing our attorney saying that a supermajority is a little bit nebulous, and three quarters makes sense to stick with, so I would be. I'd like to I mean, well, I guess I'd like to hear from councilor avalos a little bit more about that.

Speaker: Not a hill I'll die on. I think that's fine. I was trying to add more flexibility, but I get that maybe flexibility isn't always best and maybe this isn't the right place for it. So I really I'm okay with that. Obviously I have thoughts about the second part, but I want to hear councilor dunphy's amendment later so we can talk about that later. Yeah, thanks.

Speaker: I'd like to move forward to conversation around amendment c, please.

Speaker: Do you want to tell us a little bit of your thinking, councilor avalos, especially around committee rules b under deliberations where you're adding proposing to add.

Speaker: Yeah. I'm sorry can i.

Speaker: Sorry, sorry, vice chair. Go ahead.

Speaker: I just want to make sure I don't leave something that I'm not settled on. We were having a three quarters conversation. Correct about a committee.

Speaker: Correct. We there was the conversation about changing the words from three quarters to supermajority.

Speaker: Now we're landing on keeping it three quarters. Correct. But here's my question. I also heard from our attorney that being really crisp and clear on

numbers makes sense. So three quarters would be times 0.75 into five. Right. Five members on a committee. So that's 3.75 humans. So is it 4/5.

Speaker: It's grounds.

Speaker: Up with five.

Speaker: I think we have we have the language at least three quarters.

Speaker: So we're back to like old times when there's five members of a body that you have to have 4/5 to be supermajority.

Speaker: Yeah. That's right. Councilor in your math is right. So 75% of five members would be three point. 3.5 anyway. But yeah, you'd have to have.

Speaker: 4.75.

Speaker: 3.75.

Speaker: So my point is, is that that seems to be more clear when we just say it like we did when we had five, which was there needed to be four.

Speaker: Yeah. And you can and you can draft it. I would say either way to say 75%, for example, or for affirmative votes, the, the, the benefit of the benefit of something that says three quarters of the committee is if, if in the if, if these committee rules are adopted and they endure for future councils and then future councils have committees with larger numbers, that three quarter threshold is still the rule. Even if the committee size for me.

Speaker: Okay, okay. Got it. I understand now why to keep it at three quarters and sorry to delay things. I just didn't want to have to come back to this when we were rusty on it. And so but in terms of right now, how we operate with this would be for majority with four supermajority in a committee. Okay. Got it. All right. Sorry folks. Now I can move on.

Speaker: All right. We ready to move to amendment c. Go ahead, councilor alvarez okay.

Speaker: Yeah. So forget the first part. With the supermajority. We've settled that. So as far as under be deliberations. So a quorum of the committee shall not meet privately to deliberate on matters. And I'm adding intended as agenda items on the committee, unless the reason I am being more explicit, partly is due to some conversations that I've been having with Robert Taylor as well, and like how we understand these new rules that we're operating under. And I felt it was important to be explicit that we're talking about agenda items, because that's like three of you can meet to talk about other things, but you can't meet to talk about an item that's on your agenda. So I felt that was important because I think in general we are really struggling to navigate this, like how can we meet when. And I have also asked, I'm going to get back to you. I am going to give Robert some scenarios that of things that have come up to just help us understand the interpretation of the law. Because, you know, when we got that training, it was December. We didn't know what we were doing yet. And so I think to me, adding this extra distinction just makes it easier for people to understand that interpretation of that law, and so that people don't feel afraid that, you know, the three of you, if you all end up at the bar together, I don't know, some place that you're not like, oh, we can't talk at all, right? It's just about the agenda item. So I just felt it was important to be explicit, given everybody's, you know, precarity around the new rules. That's that's it.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: Thank you. I want to understand legally the change here because the original language deliberate on matters of the committee, I thought kept it to topics that a committee covered. So, for example, if Councilor Clark and Councilor Koyama Lane and I were all sitting and chatting about something related to public safety, that had nothing to do with governance, and none of us sit on the public safety committee. My understanding was, and, Robert, please correct me that that would

not be considered a conversation. That is a quorum of the governance committee, but that if we were sitting and talking about an issue that was related to the governance of our own body or of the city, whether or not it was an item intended for the agenda of this committee, that would be considered a quorum of the committee, because it's a topic that this committee would cover. Is that the case under the original non amended language? And is that how we should be operating under the law, or am I incorrect about either of those assumptions.

Speaker: I, I do I do think it is true under the law that if you you should a quorum of the committee should not meet privately to deliberate on matters within the jurisdiction of the committee. So if it's a topic or a subject matter that the committee has authority over, you should not be meeting privately to discuss those. If it's something outside the jurisdiction of the committee, then I think those 2 or 3 people could meet and talk, and that's fine. As far as not having a quorum of the committee meet to talk about something within the jurisdiction of the committee. I do. So I think perhaps that's how I might phrase the amendment, just to say deliberate on matters within the jurisdiction of the committee, because I do think there is a potential problem of three of you meeting. We don't intend this to be on the agenda, but we've reached an agreement. I know that now this makes sense. Let's put it on the agenda. I think if that happens, we're probably running afoul of the public meeting law. So I would I would prefer that that language, say, shall not deliberate on matters within the jurisdiction of the committee.

Speaker: So I hear you saying that the original language was perhaps. A little bit too undefined, but that the new language narrows our restrictions too much, and we should consider this other language instead.

Speaker: I, I think the language I'm proposing clarifies and puts a finer point on the intent of how that was originally drafted.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor dunphy.

Speaker: Thank you. Robert, can you help me take that to another level? Three members of the transportation committee have a conversation about sidewalks. And then two months later, a an item about sidewalks comes to the agenda. Would that have been a violation proactively, even though there wasn't necessarily something that they were specifically reacting to or say, three members of the transportation committee attend a hearing somewhere else, or have a briefing or something along those lines if it's not already intended to be an agenda item, do we create bottlenecks or do we create problems or challenges for councilors just doing the work.

Speaker: The great question, and of course the law just changed on this. And so we're all trying to do our best to navigate this with some uncertainty. But it is. It's long been the concept under the public meetings law that you you you, the quorum of the body should not meet to receive information on anything that might come before it for decision. And so in your example, you have a quorum of the transportation committee. And they're out together getting information from a certain source. And that might reasonably come before the committee at some point in the future for decision. That is something that that they should try to avoid doing. And I think by changing this language so that it's clear that you're not supposed to deliberate on matters within your jurisdiction as a committee, that that I think gives pretty good direction to the committee about what they should and shouldn't be doing.

Speaker: Madam chair, can I just can I comment? So within the jurisdiction of the committee is much broader than the language that councilor avalos has recommended. To be clear, it's much more limiting.

Speaker: I do think that's correct.

Speaker: As I was fine with councilor avalos language. You know, tightened the noose here.

Speaker: I did read it and wonder, but how do you know it's going to be on the agenda or not?

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor avalos. Can I if you're interested, see what you think about changing on matters of to on matters within the jurisdiction of the committee.

Speaker: Yeah I can see that. I mean, obviously, you know, based on what I'm hearing from robert too, there's. Yeah, we need to adjust to make sure we're following within the law. A lot of this, y'all. I'm just like I'm putting out there. And that's why we got a lawyer to help us out. So yeah, I think that's a good way to approach it.

Speaker: Councilor dunphy, are you wanting to talk about amendments? We still or another area?

Speaker: No. I think this horse is beaten enough.

Speaker: And vice chair Ryan.

Speaker: Yeah. So if I'm following this, right, we're going to strike deliberations. Number one is going to go back to how it was written.

Speaker: Which is interesting.

Speaker: Right now there's conversation after we've gotten some advice from our attorney to.

Speaker: Based on that advice, I think we're just getting reminded that meeting together in a quorum that's outside of the public meeting laws, the sunset laws, then, is just not allowed, period. Because it's inevitable that you could end up

talking about an agenda topic. So I think that clarity was really helpful, and it seems what's that?

Speaker: What I heard was that the quorum of the committee shall not meet privately to deliberate on matters within the jurisdiction of the committee. We cannot three of us cannot get together and talk about governance outside of this space. But we could get together and have a coffee and talk about our pets, right? We can talk about other things.

Speaker: Correct.

Speaker: Or even a. Topic that is not before this committee, a topic of a committee that none of us sit.

Speaker: On. Really.

Speaker: Within the confines of. You can't talk to seven people about a topic because then it becomes a topic of council.

Speaker: Well, what would happen, I think.

Speaker: Sorry. Go ahead.

Speaker: I actually, I just want some clarification while you're here. Robert, thank you for being here today. I really was comforted in the two times I was elected before this, when I was on the school board and on the last council, that there was just a number like you couldn't gather with at the school board, with four people outside of a pub, because it just was a safe practice to avoid gathering unless it was something in the public that everyone could see. We were there in a celebratory form, but and then on this, the last one, it was never to be gathered. More than two of us. I'm having more challenges understanding how to do that with this current makeup. We have 12 people obviously total. So the rule book would be you could never have more than six meeting. I've heard that. But when there's six people gathered, they could be discussing agenda items or topics that show up in different

committees. And so I do think this is maybe put a pin in it, but if you could, i'll just say the caucusing that goes beyond like 2 or 3 makes me nervous, as in terms of our ethics and our I test as a body.

Speaker: Nice.

Speaker: Thank you, vice chair Ryan. Mr. Taylor, would you like to comment on if a group of six can meet if they're not on discussing specifics of a committee or. Yeah.

Speaker: So less than a less than a quorum of the full council. Could meet. The challenge is I think twofold. One is you want to be sure that those six don't otherwise comprise a quorum of a committee, and they're talking about things that might come before that committee. That would be a problem. I think the second problem, and it's and I think it's a bigger problem, is under the law, if, if, if six meet and then one of those six goes and talks to the seventh member of council, now we've got a serial communication, maybe with an intermediary problem mixed in. So it's something that I think councilor Ryan is correct to, to be thoughtful about how folks get together and, and talk about things.

Speaker: Councilor dunphy.

Speaker: Well, I'm still.

Speaker: I'm trying to imagine I mean, it's my job to poke holes here, but like, say, the city club has a forum on governance, and they invite three of us to talk about governance issues and the idea of governance. And then later that spurs conversations that turn into a policy is that would this be limited at that point, or does that mean that we couldn't be doing that, right, like.

Speaker: That wouldn't participate?

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Yeah, that that would be a problem.

Speaker: Yeah. And I'm not people aren't going to talk about governance much, but I can absolutely imagine a public safety or transportation or housing policies where it may just work out that more than two of us have to be on a thing. And I'm just if there isn't a specific item coming to a committee or specific conversation about legislation that exists in any sort of proposed way. I worry that this. New language limits us in our ability to communicate with the public in a lot of ways to. I'm just thinking out loud, I don't know.

Speaker: And would these deliberations, if we are simply sharing information of things that have happened in our committee and there are multiple of us like we're at an event, is there a difference between sharing information versus deliberating and doing actual committee work?

Speaker: Well, if it's there, if you're, say, at a at a gathering for social or ceremonial purposes, that's okay to gather. You're not deliberating or talking about anything related to the work of the committee or the council. So in that setting, if you can share oh, we passed this thing yesterday, I think, I think that type of discussion is fine. I do think I do think under the law, if you if you have a quorum of the committee, get together for purposes of. Hearing public testimony on an item that might come before your committee for a decision. You should think of that as needing to be a public meeting where you're going to hear testimony from the public, and you need to notice it and convene it and follow those rules for it.

Speaker: Councilor. Pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: We're asking you a lot of questions right now, robert, about the law. And what we're talking about is creating our rules. If we had a rule that said a quorum of a committee shall not meet privately to deliberate on matters within the jurisdiction of the committee and so on. Does that essentially parallel the requirements under the law, or does that create more space where there could be things allowed under

our rules, but not allowed under law, that we need to be careful of, or less space where we're actually limiting ourselves more than the law limits us. In your opinion?

Speaker: I believe if that rule says may not meet privately to deliberate on matters within the jurisdiction of the committee, that that would be consistent with what the law is today.

Speaker: So we're asking you a lot of questions that I think are important for us to have a better understanding of under the law. But the reality is for the purpose of deliberating our rules, these are legal questions that have to do with our compliance with state law, not questions about compliance with the rules. Okay. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, counselor clark.

Speaker: I'm just going to split a hair here and say, you know, what's the difference between discuss and deliberate?

Speaker: That would be the it's essentially the same.

Speaker: Same.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: All right. Thank you for your advice. Any comments on amendment d or e. Do you want to tell us anything about those, counselor avalos.

Speaker: Oh I'm sorry d or e is that what you said? Oh yeah. Yeah okay. D all right. So under da2, the reason I added under official action of the committee on an item may only be taken upon a vote of a majority of committee members. And I added as a whole, not a majority of those in attendance at the time of the vote is because my larger question is, if a quorum of a committee is three and two people vote, does that count as like it is a passed on? Right. So I wanted to be clear that it has to be of five, not of whoever's there, which could be a minimum of three because of

quorum. Yeah, i'll start there and then I can get into the other one, which is going to be a little bit more meaty.

Speaker: I saw that and wondered if that was necessary. I think that I would assume that even if someone's not here, it doesn't change the number of people. You need to get something to pass. But mr. Taylor, do you have any thoughts about that? If it would be important to specify?

Speaker: Yeah, honestly, I think that's an example of the previous language was probably good enough, but adding that clarifying language, I think that is helpful. And an example of what I was talking about before. Like if you want to be specific about the number of votes required, just spell it out. So there's no doubt.

Speaker: Great counselor clark.

Speaker: Okay, I didn't really have my hand up, but I will say that the way I read this, this is going to encourage more attendance at all committee meetings, right? Because, I mean, you need the full you need the full committee. It's not just. Or am I reading it wrong.

Speaker: You just need three. So that's what I'm saying. So like if three of you show up then to pass something out of it, it can't be two, which is technically a majority of three, it has to be three.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: So in a case where there's, you know, yeah, there's the politics of that. Right. Like if two of your people don't show up and you know what I mean? But I think it's to be extra clear that, like, it cannot be two. It has to be three.

Speaker: Thank you for that clarification.

Speaker: Vice chair Ryan.

Speaker: Oh yeah. Three is three. And I appreciate the conversation between counselor avalos and the attorney. So it looks like adding this will allow us to really make sure that we understand that. So I'm good with this edit.

Speaker: I'm supportive of.

Speaker: Adding more clarification. And now I can see where people might have been confused. Got it.

Speaker: So yeah. Do you want to talk about the rest of d.

Speaker: Yes. So I know this might look a little convoluted, but let me explain the theory of it first. So what I'm getting at here is this larger concept that I think will happen as we continue to talk about the role in committees and council, which is if three people, right, as of right now, you've got five, five of you, if three of you vote for something, you pass it forward. Is that and you all are saying with a recommendation of pass or adopt, a thing that you did is like, is that enough to say that's a convincing amount of people that are recommending something to the full council, right. Because already five to me is I mean, that's already less than a quorum, right? You can't vote for anything with five people at full council anyway. And so this kind of speaks into the larger philosophy that I have that we can talk about later. But ultimately, what I'm doing here is essentially the default then would be two. Right? So if you if the vote was not unanimous, then it's a referral without a recommendation, right? Because it wasn't unanimous. Not all of you agreed to recommend that you pass this thing. And so it's coming to the council neutrally versus if all five of you agree on it, then that could be reasonably understood as you all want it to. You want the council to take that certain action and then even further adding an ability to say, do not adopt as well, because what could what if, for example, I am introducing something to you all and none of you want it right? And that's okay for you all to say, but you all want it to go to full council because

ultimately anything you do is a recommendation anyway, right? And so even though the five of you might not agree, you don't know if seven other people that aren't on your committee might. And so also creating a little bit of room there to make sure that. So you just have a couple more tools as a committee to communicate what you are saying to the larger council when things move out of your committee. So that's the logic behind it and happy to answer questions.

Speaker: Go ahead. Yeah.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Just want to.

Speaker: Share that I have concerns with the idea that committees send things out with the do not pass or do not adopt recommendation, especially as a unanimous vote. If we are asking committees to do the bulk of the work and the vetting for us, and we have a release valve, if a committee is holding things back, that counselors on other committees want to see come forward, because four people can pull something from committee to full council, sending things to committee that five people don't want to have, move forward feels like we are going to be clogging up our council agendas with things that are very unlikely to have a majority. If we didn't have that other release valve, I might have a concern that a committee could squash the interests of the other seven members of council, but we already have another release valve, so I just want to share with my colleagues that I see some. Well, while I appreciate the intention a lot, I see a downside to it that I don't think I can move past.

Speaker: Councilor dunphy.

Speaker: Thank you. So if I'm reading this just correctly, what would happen? If something passed for 4 to 1 out of a committee? Would it not? If I do pass or do adopt with or without amendments requires a unanimous vote of all the committee

members. If there's one person who doesn't vote for 4 to 1 or whatever, what would happen to the legislation at that point?

Speaker: Well, I mean, I think to be honest, partly why I'm creating this extra section is because I'm responding to ea, and I tend to agree in general, though, that I don't think we should have a thing at all that says that it does or doesn't. I think probably anything that comes out of committee again, because it is a recommendation should probably just be a neutral thing. It doesn't say do this or do that. It's just we are we have vetted it, you know, four out of five of us or five out of five of us or whatever, agreed with it. But it's I would rather it be neutral. But I think I was adding that because I was looking at ea and trying to add a little bit more depth to what that actually means. So, you know, I think we could have a larger discussion on ea and maybe like suss out if that's even like if that has issues first. And then I think because I think f is really responding to ea, does that make sense? Yeah. Okay.

Speaker: Would you like to talk about ea?

Speaker: Oh I guess I did put five there. Yeah I forgot so. Oh well I just moved. So it was like the way it was structured right. F said do not pass or do not adopt. So I moved up that into five because I felt like e was showing all of the types of actions we could do. And so that's more like a logistical. I thought it went along with that. And then I added f, which is again, further kind of clarifying what those actions could be. Yeah.

Speaker: Sorry, I wasn't very clear. I meant do you want to talk about amendments.

Speaker: Ea oh I'm sorry okay. Yes yes yes yes okay okay. So on this one let me preface it by saying, you know I this some of this to me. Like I don't really know that it needs to or should live here, but I want to open the discussion about maybe

some of the things that could be here and then the like document that I created, a big part of what I'm trying to do and communicate to you all is I think we should be creating. We should have clear rules on what is the bare minimum we expect from counselors when it comes to moving legislation through. Right. I think we need to have a set of bare minimum. And then I think there's a larger like when I say the gold standard, I'm saying like, this is what you can do to maximize it, right? So the bare minimum is you submit it within the time frame of the clerk. But a gold standard is, you know, you give material, make sure you have materials ahead of time so your counselors can prepare ahead of the meeting. Right. So that's the difference between what I'm classifying. And so some of that kind of minimum versus gold standard document I have summarized into ea. Like I took the parts that I felt could be rules and put them into ea. But I do think a lot of this is up for debate, depending on like what is really a code thing versus a, you know, a culture thing. And I think in general, i, you know, I'm curious, like how you all feel about that concept as a whole. But that's my intention. So as you go through here, you'll see that I've got and also i'll say I added this section here because I just felt like I wanted a little bit more clarity in the rules on like the process. And I don't think that the full process that I've outlined should go in rules, but I thought these parts could. So policy development. So I put before legislative item appears in committee councilor shall so do kind of these basic things right. So working with council ops and checking with council clerk and then for two before legislative item appears, this is where it gets into the counselors are encouraged but not required to. And that's the gold standard stuff. So again I think that's up for debate. But I wanted to bring it into this discussion. And the same goes for b. Right. So I think that one is the mandatory and two is the gold standard. So at a minimum I would suggest I guess I would like fight for the minimum requirements and then the gold standard

requirements I think like I'm happy to like they're not as consequential to me as what I put in one for both of those. Yeah.

Speaker: Go ahead. Councilor.

Speaker: I appreciate you seeing this. And I think a lot of this is laid out in the policy drafting and filing process flow sheet that council operations put together for us, and when in my role not on the governance committee, but as council president, when I asked them to put that together for us, my hope was that that was something that would guide us for now, and then we would eventually come back to once we got some other rules on the books, figuring out if there were changes that we needed to make to that, and having a governance discussion. And this to me, feels like a good jumping off place for that discussion. Chair, I wonder if, rather than trying to do that today. As a committee, we could take amendment e and the flow chart that we have from council ops. And as you and your vice chair are making a list of the other items that we need to discuss, have this be a topic that governance fleshes out to figure out what's working, what's not, what's being proposed here that's different from what we're doing? What do we think about all of that at a future future committee meeting?

Speaker: I think that makes a lot of sense. And as I was looking over this, I can see there's a lot of great thinking going on here. And. Think that this is something that we could definitely continue to work on with council ops and the clerk to make sure that there's more clarity. And if you're open, it seems like you're kind of into this to playing a role in that, into.

Speaker: Like governance stuff.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Yeah. Like kind of the next steps with this. I think it would be great.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Agree.

Speaker: Can I add something? I just I just want to say that I really appreciated this, this work that you've done, and I appreciate the way you set it up, the gold standard or not. I want to say, though, that I feel a certain amount of resistance to being told what to do. The shells. I would prefer that it was urged or advised or something along those lines. I'm going to resist the shell, just so you know.

Speaker: Can I make a motion?

Speaker: We have amendments.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Apologies. A motion to hear the next.

Speaker: On a motion to amend exhibit a. Specifically under committee actions where, as shown in councilor avalos, amendment d to add as a whole, not a majority of those in attendance at the time of the vote. Am I able to do that or do I have to? Do you have to take something off the table or.

Speaker: I thought, we already have something on robert.

Speaker: I believe you have to take it off the table. And then we had amendments a through e to address.

Speaker: That.

Speaker: So.

Speaker: The amendments a through e are open for discussion and seconded, which means that I think what we're hearing from the clerk is we would need to take a vote on those, or have the people who motioned those remove them from the table so that we could replace them with a different motion. Is that correct?

Speaker: Yes. Thank you.

Speaker: I'd like to withdraw my motion for now.

Speaker: Same.

Speaker: So okay, so you're with withdrawing your motion for. Withdraw your motion for amendment a?

Speaker: I think you were looking at all of them.

Speaker: Yeah. I want to withdraw my motion on all five of the of avalos amendments.

Speaker: And then I'd like to motion.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Okay. Apologies. We need to take a vote.

Speaker: I need a second.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Any any withdrawals are just withdrawals.

Speaker: Any any member can withdraw the motion before. Yep.

Speaker: So now we're trying to. Someone has a new motion.

Speaker: Can I make a motion now? Rebecca, do you want me to wait a second?

Speaker: I apologize for that question. Oh, so we're finally the motion and.

Speaker: Chair mike, on.

Speaker: We need to have a vote to withdraw the motion. The motion or we're good to go. Robert.

Speaker: The I believe where we are now, counselor dunphy has withdrawn his previous motions to amend. He may do so as a matter of right. And now we are at a point where we might entertain a new motion to amend to add some language. Yeah.

Speaker: Well.

Speaker: We had a motion from koyama lane to make to add new amended language. Did we have a second?

Speaker: Councilor?

Speaker: Can you repeat your motion, please?

Speaker: Yeah, I have a motion to amend exhibit a, as shown in avalos amendment d. A two to add the language to specify as a whole, not a majority of those in attendance at the time of the vote.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Okay, so we have a motion and we have a second to amend exhibit a as shown in avalos d yes.

Speaker: Can you call the roll?

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Can we please place that on the screen?

Speaker: Are we having discussion or not?

Speaker: Councilor pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: Sorry.

Speaker: I'm struggling with the language as a whole and perhaps I'm being pedantic. It feels like it should say upon a vote of a majority of the members of the committee, regardless of the number in attendance or something. I'm not opposed to the concept, but a majority of the committee members as a whole is. I'm struggling with I'm struggling with the wording right now. I can get over it and not be pedantic if we're trying to move quickly, but I would.

Speaker: I appreciate us adjusting to do it well. I see councilor avalos would like to comment.

Speaker: Maybe you could do it instead. A majority of seated community committee members that to me still gets at that.

Speaker: A majority. If we say a majority of members of the committee, does that say what you're trying to say?

Speaker: I think so, yeah.

Speaker: Yeah. I think just to put a point on this and this and having had to interpret these things in the past, when you're talking about a majority vote, sometimes it is important to clarify. Do you mean majority of members present, or do you mean a majority of the committee members appointed and seated? Do you mean the just the number of committee members total, regardless of the number that are actually appointed and seated. So, and you can pick any one of those.

Speaker: Just make it explicit.

Speaker: A majority of appointed committee members. Would that be cleaner? Robert. Robert.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: So upon a vote of a majority of appointed committee members and then cross off as a whole.

Speaker: You still want to keep the other section as a way to bring further clarification.

Speaker: I'm open. Councilor.

Speaker: So I think what you just added, council president actually put a period after committee members seems to do everything. We've been talking about. Official action of the committee on an item may only be taken upon a vote of a majority of appointed committee members, period.

Speaker: Yeah, but robert does that. That seems to bring clarification. Correct.

Speaker: Maybe i, i, I think that that is sufficient to distinguish that from majority of members who are present, which is clearly not what the council wants to do. So if we say upon a vote of a majority of the committee members appointed, I think that makes it clear we're not talking about just those present.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: I'll second.

Speaker: I'll motion to withdraw my amendment.

Speaker: Okay. So i.

Speaker: Would okay.

Speaker: I would move if that's okay to amend committee actions a two to say official action of the committee on an item may only be taken by a vote of the majority of add appointed committee members, period.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Any discussion can we.

Speaker: Call I just I hope that we're doing what we intended to do. Okay I think so. Okay.

Speaker: Can you clarify what we're about to vote on?

Speaker: This is a vote to councilor. Pirtle-guiney moved to amend a two to read official action of the committee on an item may only be taken upon a vote of a majority of committee members. Period. Seconded by councilor clark.

Speaker: Actually, that.

Speaker: Was councilor Ryan.

Speaker: Oh, apologies. Ryan clark was the first. Was it the second on the original motion majority of the seconded by councilor Ryan members?

Speaker: Did she say I didn't hear appointed okay.

Speaker: Ready to call the roll. Okay. Can we call the roll?

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: It's a majority of appointed committee members.

Speaker: Majority of appointed majority of appointed committee members, period. Okay.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: We can call the roll now.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: Hi, Ryan.

Speaker: Hi, clark.

Speaker: I dunphy. I.

Speaker: Koyama lane i.

Speaker: With five ayes. The amendment carries passed.

Speaker: I motion to amend exhibit a. Under committee meetings and under quorum under one to add the language shall not deliberate, so it will read, but shall not be counted for purposes of establishing a quorum, shall not deliberate, and shall not vote second.

Speaker: Is there a discussion.

Speaker: Any discussion?

Speaker: I'm sorry, I'm a little bit lost.

Speaker: Yeah. Read the.

Speaker: Based on the testimony, public testimony given and the advice that we could add in. Under quorum, under under number. In front of me. At the very at the. Number two committee meetings. But shall. I'm going to look at what's this is from councilor avalos. Can we see the.

Speaker: Original looking for the original as opposed to the proposed amendments.

Speaker: Yeah. Where are we? I'm not sure. Okay.

Speaker: Yeah, it's right here. It's on number two. But where it says but shall not be counted for purposes of establishing a quorum. Comma. Shall not deliberate and shall not vote. So adding the language shall not deliberate.

Speaker: So that was a motion from koyama lane, seconded by pirtle-guiney, and is. And now we're at discussion.

Speaker: Can you read it one more time? I'm sorry.

Speaker: A quorum of the committee is a majority of its appointed members. Counselors not appointed to the committee may attend, present and or testify at committee meetings, including as invited testimony, but shall not be counted for purposes of establishing a quorum, and shall not deliberate and shall not vote.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: I just had. That the establishment clause.

Speaker: Can I take out an and I would say for purposes, for purposes of establishing a quorum, shall not deliberate comma, shall not deliberate comma, and shall not vote. Any discussion about that?

Speaker: It's already been seconded. Right.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Right. Can you call the roll.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: Clark.

Speaker: Dunphy. I koyama lane. I five eyes the amendment passes.

Speaker: Do you have a motion?

Speaker: Oh I'm trying to put my hand up. Look at that. I would move that under committee meetings. Be meetings one be two. In the case of committees with co-chairs, in the absence of the co-chairs, a designee of one or both of the co-chairs, that we strike one or both of, so that it says in the case of a committee with co-chairs, in the absence of the co-chairs, a designee of the co-chairs.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Is there.

Speaker: Any discussion? Rebecca, can you call the roll.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney? I Ryan.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Clark.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Dunphy i.

Speaker: Koyama lane hi.

Speaker: Five eyes. The amendment passes.

Speaker: I realize.

Speaker: Do you have a motion?

Speaker: Councilor yes.

Speaker: I would move that in committee rules be deliberations where it says a quorum of the committee shall not meet privately to deliberate on matters. We add the words after matters within the jurisdiction, and then it would continue of the committee. So adding the words within the jurisdiction to committee rules be second.

Speaker: Any discussion colleagues.

Speaker: I really don't like this, but I can't change state law.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Fair councilor are you comfortable with the motion given state law or should we?

Speaker: No, I'm comfortable with it, given state law.

Speaker: Rebecca, can you call the roll?

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Clark. I dunphy. I koyama lane. I and five eyes. The amendment passes.

Speaker: Councilor pirtle-guiney councilor.

Speaker: I don't want to jump the line because I know that councilor dunphy also has amendments to propose. But I did just want to flag for you and our colleagues that I had what I hope is seen as a very technical amendment, that at some point during this meeting, I'd like to be able to present. It got posted really late. I apologize, but it is up and I have paper copies. Could you just tell me when it's the appropriate time for that? And I'm happy to let councilor dunphy discuss his amendments first, if you prefer.

Speaker: That was fine.

Speaker: Are you comfortable with that?

Speaker: Councilor.

Speaker: So for folks online, this should be posted councilor Ryan. It went up just before the meeting started, I apologize, there are two places in the proposed rules. It is under committee actions b documents to accompany items and clerk disposition where we discuss impact statements. And as I got a crash course in recently, we have at the city both impact statements and impact analysis. Impact statements are written when a resolution or ordinance is introduced. And then there are two analyzes that are required to be performed by other entities, one by our budget office, one by prosper Portland. Presumably in the future, we could require analyzes if we wanted to, from other parts of our city government. But I wanted to make sure that our internal rules reflect that. So I am suggesting that on b one, where it says shall be accompanied by a committee, staff summary and relevant impact statements that we just add to the end of that and impact analysis that we add a new sub three which says impact analysis accompanying an item shall be completed by the bureau, service area or city agency as directed in code or

council procedures, which is where code is, where the two that are currently required are listed, and then current item three would become subsection four.

Speaker: Sending a second.

Speaker: If we want to move to discussion, it does.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: I have a question. Councilor pirtle-guiney. Looking at this whole section, does this mean that council staff can still. Write something in support?

Speaker: I believe we have.

Speaker: A proposed amendment that would specifically call out council staff. My assumption has been that where it says impact statements would be completed by city staff, that that would include council staff. But I'm not touching subsection two. I'm just adding in the portions about impact analysis. And I'm happy to have the conversation about what we want sub two to say separately, okay.

Speaker: I'm going to leave. Is that okay?

Speaker: Okay. Thank you, thank you. Appreciate you.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor avalos.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor dunphy, did you have a question about this amendment?

Speaker: Well, I just.

Speaker: We need a second. Yeah.

Speaker: Oh, sorry.

Speaker: A second then on the amendment.

Speaker: I'm sorry. Do we have a motion and a second on this one?

Speaker: I made a motion, and I'm waiting to see if any of my colleagues would.

Speaker: Like to. Second.

Speaker: I'll second this. So we're discussing number three now, right.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Councilor dunphy.

Speaker: Yeah. I just wanted to note that, you know, our current existing rules make reference to prosper Portland having to do parts of our impact analysis for the economic analysis. I'm glad that this language doesn't specifically call out prosper Portland. They are not part of our government. They are a separate government entity. And so it doesn't make sense for me that why we would send our policies to a different government for analysis. I think that this this amendment makes far more sense than what is currently in the books.

Speaker: Councilor clark.

Speaker: Thank you. So what's the difference between a bureau and a city agency?

Speaker: This actually gets at the response I wanted to give to councilor dunphy. Prosper Portland describes themselves as a city agency. If there is better language to include there. I am happy to have our attorneys or anybody else tell me what it is. I understand there are some concerns with prosper being that entity, and I think that's something we could address in the future. What I was trying to do here was just capture what is currently required in code, and make sure that that's also a part of our rules not to change what's in code. So I do want to make sure that this captures prosper. But I also I know that the prosper analysis right now is sometimes combined with analysis from other bureaus through the service area to give us a more full picture. And I wanted to make sure that that could continue to be our practice as well. And if we wanted to change it to something else in the future, we have rules that could allow that if we wanted.

Speaker: Can I continue? So don't we have a fiscal analysis also, where does that fall here?

Speaker: That comes through our city budget office, which would fall under a bureau of the city.

Speaker: Okay, thanks.

Speaker: Councilor Clark, did you have a question?

Speaker: Another question? I just asked it.

Speaker: Okay. Councilor Ryan.

Speaker: Yeah, I really.

Speaker: To discuss the current amendment. I really appreciate the clarity that it brings forth. My experience has been that it's always come from a bureau, the budget office, and sometimes with Prosper Portland. It seems since I've been on this new council, it's been outsized that it's just Prosper Portland, which has baffled me. So I appreciate the clarity that's been provided on this amendment. I'll be supporting it.

Speaker: So does this amendment change what we have been doing currently?

Speaker: In my experience, this is similar to what I but I did experience in the first council that we'd have objective sources, if you will, within the public servants that work at the city to provide objective analysis or impact.

Speaker: My intent.

Speaker: Which which is different than having a political office provide such things, I will. I have an opinion on that, and I am confused. If we're allowing council offices to provide impact statements, but I don't think there is getting at that. Perhaps two is.

Speaker: My intent is for this to capture current practice and not to change practice. If either our clerk or our attorneys think that this changes practice, I would

love to hear that. But the intent here was to capture current practice as simply as possible.

Speaker: And I affirm that that's what I read by this, which is why second and will be supporting it.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor.

Speaker: Mr. Taylor, are you able to chime in at all to that?

Speaker: I agree with councilor Ryan. I think this captures the current, the general operating procedure that we've been using. And would adding this require analysis or it's just outlining who they would be completed by.

Speaker: Well, as I read this, it does distinguish between the impact statement and the impact analysis. The statement would be completed by the city staff who is submitting the item to the clerk, and then the additional analyzes would be completed by bureau, service area or city agency. So that would be budget office prosper Portland. They would provide that additional analysis.

Speaker: Councilor Ryan.

Speaker: Sorry, I didn't know I had my hand up. Sorry about that.

Speaker: Councilor dunphy.

Speaker: Thank you. I want to talk to the specific phrase city agency. I think that our city has a really bad tendency, not even say tendency. A historic norm in which we outsource core government functions to nonprofits and other entities. Travel Portland is a city agency in a lot of ways. The regional arts and culture council was designated as our arts agency. It's not a tightly defined term, and I have a lot of problems with. Directing to require a process be involved in somebody who's not in our chain of command, who is not in our payroll and is not under our employ. We have a city economic, we have a community economic development service area that a dca that has staff. And then separately, the city has a separate government

entity known as prosper Portland that is not responsive to us, other than they receive an enormous chunk of money from us. I don't think that that's an appropriate relationship in general for the city, and I have deep concerns about that, and I can't imagine a situation similarly where we would, for example, need to wait on travel Portland to send us an analysis of an impact of some document as though that would impact our ability to legislate. I think that we need to rely on our city staff, our city experts. And so I worry about this phrase city agency. I know that is a it is a change because current practices are well reflected in this, but I just want to voice my concern about that.

Speaker: Councilor pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: Councilor. The reason I specifically added the clause at the end, as directed in code or council procedures, is because I wouldn't want this to allow another city agency to add in an analysis that we analysis that we didn't specifically direct. The two analyzes currently required are already written down in code. And if we changed where those pointed to in code, or if we took them away, or if we added something in code, this would then still allow us to follow whatever we have in code without needing to update our procedures.

Speaker: I'm comfortable with that. You're right, I it is my intention to change that section of code, directing our reliance on on prosper Portland for analysis of legislation, but that is a separate action from this. And in theory, a future council could act, could explicitly direct the regional arts and culture council to be an advisory body of this body. So that is certainly the right of a City Council. And I just want to be very clear where I stand on that.

Speaker: Are we able to look up that code, cite it or.

Speaker: I have the code written down in documents, not in front of me from past work that I did on this. I can try to find it quickly if you'd like. Like I said, I tried to

write this to be neutral to what we have and be something that just allows us to put in our rules what our practice is. But if that's helpful for folks, I can try to get my staff to grab it quickly.

Speaker: I don't need to see it right now.

Speaker: For discussion. Yeah.

Speaker: The it's in a resolution and we can pull that up.

Speaker: Rebecca, thank you for having that faster than I was going to be able to get it.

Speaker: Okay. So this is not technically code then.

Speaker: This one is not. Which is I think I had put in there code or rule because I believe.

Speaker: Or council procedures.

Speaker: I believe the other one might be in code and this one is not. If I remember correctly, this was like a solid two, three, two weeks ago at this point.

Speaker: Is it clear that council procedures also means rules to others? Or should we use the same language?

Speaker: I'd be happy to accept a friendly amendment to change the word procedures to rules so that it said code or council rules, if that makes folks more comfortable.

Speaker: So to clarify, this is meant to put in writing what we've been doing, but that there is an acknowledgment that there are some councilors that want to have a closer look or some clarity around which statements are required, which are optional, and that that's something that we could maybe spend some more time looking at at some point.

Speaker: And my intent in writing this, knowing that that was a conversation folks wanted to have, was to write it in such a way that if we made changes like that in

the future, we would not need to update this language. And if we don't, then this language would still work.

Speaker: Okay any more. Councilor Ryan?

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: I just want to say I appreciate this conversation. I appreciate the transparency that council president brought to this. And when we come back, put a pin in this. I think comparing some of these agencies prosper Portland and travel Portland. There's a difference. I don't know how to articulate it right at this moment, but I think we might want to have dca oliveira come and explain that to us when we get further along with this.

Speaker: That's all.

Speaker: I'll be supporting this amendment.

Speaker: Councilor pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: I chair, were you wanting to change the amendment to say in sub three as directed in code or council rules?

Speaker: If you're comfortable with that?

Speaker: I am I want to make sure that councilor Ryan, as the second on this amendment, is also comfortable with that.

Speaker: Yes, i.

Speaker: Am okay, thank you.

Speaker: Somehow I have a I can change I can edit this. I have no idea. You should take that off my clicker. I'm trying to be careful right now.

Speaker: All right. Any further discussion? Rebecca, can you call the roll?

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: Ryan,

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Clark. I dunphy. I koyama lane.

Speaker: I'm voting I knowing that this is something we will continue to talk about as we come back and have some clarity on what what is required, what is not. And I appreciate that this teases apart the difference between impact statements and impact analyzes. I think that's going to be helpful as we're moving forward. I vote i.

Speaker: Five eyes the amendment passes.

Speaker: Councilor dunphy.

Speaker: Thank you. Chair. I have two amendments that have been posted and available for consideration. I'd like to discuss. I'm getting my own documents open. Dunphy amendment. A specifically speaks to the timely scheduling of committee items. Right now, if a legislative item is if starting over. If my amendment were put in place and a legislative item that's submitted in accordance with the committee rules, the committee chair would now be required to schedule the item for a hearing within the subsequent 90 days from the date of submission. This amendment ensures that all properly submitted items receive timely consideration and cannot be indefinitely delayed. It limits the power of the chair, prevents gatekeeping, and enhances procedural fairness among councilors, and ensures reliable timeline for both council and the public. It promotes accountability, encourages legislative responsiveness, and supports more efficient and transparent governance. Specifically, my amendment as written would rewrite. Section. Under committee agendas, sub items. Section b item submission, subsection two. It would change item b. So we're now committee agenda b two sub b the chair or co-chairs. New language would read shall place items that meet the administrative requirements on an agenda in a timely manner, not to exceed three months. And I would appreciate a second if somebody is interested.

Speaker: I'll second so that.

Speaker: We can discuss.

Speaker: Councilor pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: Councilor.

Speaker: On the surface, I really like this, and when everybody is behaving well, I really like this. And I also wonder if we come to regret this at some point, or maybe not us, because the 12 of us are all fantastic and always behave well. But some council in the future comes to regret this. If you have people who are throwing a lot of spaghetti at the wall and committees that then need to schedule all of that spaghetti, and I had a colleague say, well, you could have a chair posted and quickly have the rest of the committee keep somebody in line by voting it down. But we open it up to public comment. The public takes time to be there. And I wonder if we come to regret it. I do think, as with all things, there needs to be a release valve so that we don't have a chair who is being dictatorial. And I thought that allowing the majority of members to pull something to committee helped with that. But I'd just be curious, your thoughts on that risk?

Speaker: I think that that is absolutely a valid risk. I think that there, as we've seen, for example, the state legislature, there were 4000 bills introduced and not every bill got a hearing. However, as we are talking about creating a deliberate and intentional and deliberative process that has a specific requirements for what must be done in order to get something, I do think there is a collegial obligation to give a to give time and to be able to vote down something if even if it's a bad bill. I don't imagine that this current council right now will ever have the capacity to introduce 4000 bills. And I hope that that stays that way. I do I can imagine a situation in which this were abused, but I worry that the opposite also invites abuse. So I think it's a judgment call of ours to make, whether or not we allow gatekeeping at the front or potential bad behavior on the back. And that's a choice.

Speaker: Councilor clark.

Speaker: Well, I appreciate that you brought this forward, councilor dunphy, but my sense is that there are already workarounds that we don't really need this. There are other ways to bring it forward. I think we're very creative people, and we can find other pathways without ensuring that the spaghetti gets gets air time. So I'm not inclined to support this right now. Maybe we revisit it, but I appreciate you bringing it forward.

Speaker: I'm sorry.

Speaker: When I first read this, i. Thought that we having the ability to have any four councilors bring something to the full council is an important lever. I was thinking maybe we could have something like that. Any four councilors could vote to get something on a committee agenda. But as I've been tossing it around in my mind, then thinking, realizing then that is giving other councilors some control over a certain committee's agenda. I think at the end of the day, I kind of thought, okay, you have like one person that keeps putting something weird or annoying on the agenda. That would be the concern. And I think i, I got to the place where I think that that would kind of self-regulate. And then the, then the committee could just deal with it quickly and vote it down. So I think I went from not being sure to I could, I could be okay with this. And I like the intention of just of thinking about ways to make sure that voices are heard and things are brought forth. That's that's where my thinking has gone.

Speaker: Yeah. You know, and I would say similarly, the four councilors can pull anything from any committee and have it heard by the whole committee or whole council is also an opportunity for abuse. It's a bigger bar, certainly, than an individual councilor filing over and over again. I mean, I see the argument absolutely that that there are other ways to pick something up that is dying. I think

that this creates some expectation on the part of chairs to have. To be actively involved in the agendas. But I absolutely also hear my colleagues concerns about this.

Speaker: Councilor pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: I want to make sure we don't have dictatorial chairs, and I like you trying to approach that. This morning I had a conversation with the dcas where I said to them, please file things as soon as they're ready so that councilors have enough time to sit with them. Even if you don't need us to put it on an agenda in a committee for a couple of months, get it in the queue so we know that it's coming. And I think that that might create a conflict with the scheduling requirement here. And I don't know that I can come up with a solution on the spot. But I just want to say out loud that if folks are worried about dictatorial chairs and we want to move forward today and we move forward with the original language, I am committed to working with you to figure out something that might still allow us to move toward a culture of filing things as soon as we're ready, so that folks can have more time to sit with them, even if we don't expect them to be scheduled for a little while, and making sure that we don't have chairs who are blocking people from moving policies with support forward.

Speaker: Sure. Okay.

Speaker: Councilor clark.

Speaker: Thank you. I just want to express my appreciation to you, council president, for saying that to the dcas because I'm feeling a tremendous amount of pressure in scheduling and not enough time for all the things that are being brought forward or proposed to be brought forward. In fact, I was hoping to talk to you about that later, maybe sharing some of the wealth, because I just there's so much coming at us that I really appreciate that you you did that. Thank you.

Speaker: Any further discussion?

Speaker: Talk about my second amendment. Since we haven't moved that one forward, I would like to also, I have a second amendment dunphy amendment be should i? Yeah, I will withdraw my amendment. Hearing hearing my good feedback from my colleagues. I will withdraw dunphy amendment a and if tyranny appears, we will change it later. Dunphy. Amendment b is specific to laying out specifically what a staff summary shall include, trying to reflect the best practices that we are building and the intention of having presentations in committee and a staff summary report at full council hearing. There are a number of specific things that I wanted to make sure to be able to share that I think are really important for colleagues to have that, including the number of testifiers and themes from public testimony. The rationale for any committee amendments and the final outcome of committee votes. I think that this helps clarify and give transparency to both the council members and the public, especially if folks aren't watching the council hearing, but are committee hearing, but then only are watching the main committee or main council hearing. It allows for easier understanding of our decision making process, and enhances public trust by documenting how testimony and debate are shaped in the final outcomes. And I would ask for the purposes of debate for a second second.

Speaker: Councilor clark.

Speaker: Thank you, madam chair. This is the first time I've seen this. I admit it, I didn't read it in advance, but I really appreciate it. I would like to have more information on those staff reports. I'm just wondering about their capacity to do all that. Just that we only have two committee people, committee administrators, and this adds to their workload. But I think it's really good stuff. I would like to know more. I'd like to flesh out those reports. How many people came, what the vote

was? I don't know, maybe they already have the vote. I'm not sure. But it's going to require a little more time on the part of those staff, I don't know. Did you run this by council ops at all or ask them about it, councilor duffy?

Speaker: No, I have not.

Speaker: Okay. Let's just I like it. I'm just concerned about the workload.

Speaker: That is a fair point.

Speaker: Councilor pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: Councilor dunphy, I'm wondering if you see this as a change from what we're currently receiving. Because I thought that these were items that we were receiving, in which case it wouldn't be an additional workload. But perhaps it's not. And I was also wondering if you intended this language to be the bare minimum or the whole of the report. I would hope that it's the bare minimum of the report, but I'd like to make sure that the language reflects that.

Speaker: My intention was to have set the floor, not the ceiling. Absolutely. And no, this largely does. I mean, our, our, our folks at council ops have been doing a phenomenal job. I've really appreciated when christopher or claire or any, you know, whoever's coming to the full council and reading it out, I think just putting a few bookends around it, making sure that if there's going to be a staff summary, it does include these things, which so far it largely has, as far as I can remember. Also, specifically, my amendment fleshes out the impact statements component of this, which may be an additional amount of work from somebody from city staff.

Speaker: I believe the impact statements piece just requires the addition of the authorship, right?

Speaker: Yeah. Mostly that.

Speaker: So it. Didn't seem too burdensome.

Speaker: To the clerk about that. Rebecca would, adding the author of the impact statement require a major technical change, or just an addition of a line in the in the current website code, like how how easily could your technology folks make that change? We're looking at b1c.

Speaker: It does need a technical change. That could take a few weeks, but it could be readily done.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor clark.

Speaker: Councilor dempsey, I don't remember the staff reports having all of that in them. The number of testifiers, maybe the themes. I'm not sure about the rationale. I mean, I'm not opposed to this. I don't I don't think they've been that complete.

Speaker: We've had a couple of different ones depending on the issue that have been more thorough. For example, I remember, if I remember correctly, claire, coming up and giving us a relatively detailed update about the ai algorithm and talking about how many number of folks testified in some of the general themes, but some of them have also been relatively brief. I think that this would provide, again, the floor of assuming if the staff is going to come up, we they are coming prepared with, at the very least, these three things. And I also, I feel like these are the three things that may directly impact council conversation and council votes.

Speaker: Councilor pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: Councilor. Would you be.

Speaker: Comfortable with this saying a staff summary shall outline at a minimum and then your three things?

Speaker: Yeah, absolutely. I would accept that as a friendly amendment.

Speaker: I don't know.

Speaker: Who your seconder was.

Speaker: But yeah, that's great.

Speaker: And colleagues, we've been approved to go over about 15 minutes if that is okay with all of you. Councilor vice chair Ryan, I texted you, I don't know if you saw it because I also have a few amendments from the clerk's very small things that I'm hoping we can run through also. Is that okay with everyone? I'm sorry. Pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Can I ask one other thing about this? I apologize in b1 a2 rationale for any amendments made by the committee. I am remembering that in the conversations I had with the council clerk's office with I'm sorry, with council operations, when they started doing the staff summaries that they asked that everything in that staff summary be very neutral, that they not be required to make judgment calls. And I wonder if that word rationale sets up our neutral staff for having to make a judgment call about why an amendment was brought forward and if instead it could direct them to provide the. The argument made for an amendment or something, that I'm not sure what the right word is, but something that allows them to stay in that factual space.

Speaker: You know, I assume that if this is coming forward at this point, you know, if it's coming out of a staff report, that means that it's been approved by the committee, and therefore it is the new text by which we are we are asking the question, and for me, just the name, the word rationale specifically just sort of meant like what was the reason why this was brought forward. And I think that if it is, you know, we're not talking about amendments that were not brought or were defeated or necessarily. Responding to something that was there before. But I think

that. I feel like rationale is a relatively neutral word, but I'm open to suggestions if folks have ideas.

Speaker: What about black background or.

Speaker: I worry that background is it gets into the same trap that if they're explaining the debate that happened over policy, that. It's. It could go into that realm, but more so it is a summary rather than an interpretation of it. It's a summary of what occurred.

Speaker: If you say that.

Speaker: Any amendments made by any amendments adopted by the committee and the arguments for and against them, or.

Speaker: That ends up being a large amount of work, and also, if there are no amendments against, then it's hard to require that maybe a brief explanation of any amendments made by the committee. I like summary.

Speaker: The summary.

Speaker: Effect of any amendments made by the committee.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: You're going to get into interpretation, I think. Summary. Just a simple summary.

Speaker: Summary of any amendments made by the committee.

Speaker: I would I would accept that.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: As a friendly amendment.

Speaker: Thank you for.

Speaker: Working with me. I'm sorry. I just I wanted to honor.

Speaker: That this is what we do.

Speaker: I just wanted to share that I had gotten a suggestion from another counselor that's not on this committee. I'm wondering if we could even go further and say that committee staff summaries shall include the unabridged and summarized text or transcript of all public comment received at the committee. That might be too much work, but wanted to put that out there as something I had heard.

Speaker: Is that not already available?

Speaker: Yeah, they can look it up.

Speaker: Yeah, it should be posted available, you know, hyperlinked on our. On our actual documents and on our public posting.

Speaker: I might be able to give some light on that. I know that for now, what we're doing for testimony, we're adding what is happening during the committee. So it might be written or verbal. So sometimes if it's added to the main agenda, it is still open for testimony. But we're not capturing those because it's outside of the committee time. So right now we're giving some type of brief description of what we receive. Again, trying to be arbitrary or not giving it necessary. Currently, when you see it in the website, it says in favor or or no or not, we are pretty much just saying how many and sort of like a message of what entails or what kind of information you can find in the testimony, and if that's helpful.

Speaker: So I don't see any more hands up. We are finishing our discussion on dunphy's dunphy be amendment.

Speaker: Yeah, and I accepted two friendly amendments to this language, which I hope we captured because i.

Speaker: Do you need any of that? Can can we reiterate?

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Would you.

Speaker: Like me to.

Speaker: Do that please.

Speaker: Since I offered them.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: 1aa staff summary shall outline comma at a minimum and 1a1 number of testifiers. Oh sorry. 1a2i apologize. Summary of any amendments made by the committee.

Speaker: Those are they. Thank you.

Speaker: Will you rebecca, will you call the roll.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney I Ryan?

Speaker: I I'm having trouble tracking those changes. And because of that, at this moment I'm going to vote no.

Speaker: Clark, i.

Speaker: Dunphy i.

Speaker: Koyama lane i.

Speaker: Four eyes. The amendment passes.

Speaker: All right. We'll see how quickly we can do this. We received some.

Amendments from the council clerk's office that I think could be helpful to look at.

If we could put those up. I printed them out for my colleagues. I'll jump right in.

Section one is about committee meetings and suggest that we change the change

the word testimony to presenter. So it would read a quorum of the committee is a

majority of its appointed members. Counselors not appointed to the committee

may attend, present and or testify at committee meetings, including as invited

instead of testimony, invited presenter. And the comment there is that we try to

discourage the term invited testimony when talking about councilors, because it

can be confusing for staff and community community members providing public

testimony. And then also in c under public access and public testimony. The words attendance and the document is locked, so we can't put it up. Okay. Is struck because they're not attending, they're streaming. So virtual testimony. And then in d instead of recording they changed it to minutes. We'll see if we can. Unlock that document. Councilor Ryan, did you receive those suggestions from the clerk?

Speaker: That came earlier from Keelan? Correct.

Speaker: Correct.

Speaker: Yeah, I saw those. They seem technical and fair. As I recall.

Speaker: Councilor pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: I move that we adopt the three amendments that you just went over, as proposed by our clerk, to ensure that we are consistent throughout our rules.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Can you call the roll?

Speaker: Is there additional discussion? Very good. Okay.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: Ryan. I clark,

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Dunphy.

Speaker: I koyama lane. I five eyes the amendment passes.

Speaker: Moving on to the next section of committee agendas. There is a suggestion to add the word section in between Portland city code and the numbers, and then also to change to a instead of saying agenda after the posting deadline to say filing deadline. And to add in a line saying the deadline to add an item to the agenda is noon on the preceding business day, excluding holidays. And I think that's it for that section. Councilor pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: I move that we adopt these amendments as proposed by our clerk, so that we are consistent with the rest of our rules.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Any discussion? All right. Can you please call the roll? Becca.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Clark. I dunphy. I koyama lane. I five eyes. Under I stopped.

Speaker: Under committee rules. There's a suggestion to add the word least. In front of three quarters.

Speaker: As a courtesy to have.

Speaker: I guess I think it's a typo.

Speaker: Great.

Speaker: Second. Oh, we first we move in this way. Yeah.

Speaker: I motion to amend exhibit a as shown in this example under committee rules to add the word least under suspension of committee rules. To clarify, at least three quarters of the committee members.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Any discussion. Right. Rebecca, can you call the roll.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: Ryan. I clark. I dunphy.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Koyama lane i.

Speaker: Five eyes the amendment passes.

Speaker: All right. And in the last section I make a motion to amend exhibit a, as shown in this document under committee actions. A for. So it shall read. All

motions require a second, and to insert for consideration per Portland city code, and then to insert the word section before 3.02.040, and then to add parentheses around d and one.

Speaker: Parentheses.

Speaker: Second remove remove parentheses. Yeah. Seconded by vice chair Ryan. Any discussion? Rebecca, can you call the roll.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i. Ryan i. Clark. I.

Speaker: Dunphy i.

Speaker: Koyama lane i.

Speaker: Five eyes amendments adopted.

Speaker: All right deep breath good work everyone.

Speaker: I know that we still have more work to do, but I think we took some good steps forward. We'll make sure to work on the stuff that had to get pushed off. We will work on that in the future. Our next meeting is on. Is this right? May 5th sounds so far away at 2:30 p.m. Thank you everyone who participated today. And with that, I adjourn the meeting of the governance committee.