



June 10-11, 2025 Council Agenda

5810

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

Tuesday, June 10, 2025 1:00 pm

Session Status: Recessed

Council in Attendance: Councilor Sameer Kanal

Councilor Dan Ryan

Council Vice President Tiffany Koyama Lane

Councilor Angelita Morillo

Councilor Steve Novick

Councilor Olivia Clark

Councilor Mitch Green

Councilor Eric Zimmerman

Councilor Candace Avalos

Councilor Jamie Dunphy

Councilor Loretta Smith

Council President Elana Pirtle-Guiney

Council convened at 1:03 p.m.

Council President Pirtle-Guiney presided.

Officers in attendance: Robert Taylor, City Attorney; Keelan McClymont, Council Clerk

Councilor Dunphy arrived at 1:05 p.m.

Council recessed at 3:05 p.m. and reconvened at 3:19 p.m.

Council adjourned at 6:24 p.m.

Agenda Approval

1

Council action: Approved

The agenda was approved by unanimous consent.

Regular Agenda

2

[Conduct a Proposed Use Hearing on State Shared Revenue](#) (Presentation)

Document number: 2025-237

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: City Budget Office

Time requested: 30 minutes

Council action: Continued

Continued to June 18, 2025 at 6:00 p.m.

3

[Certify that certain services are provided by the City to establish eligibility for State Shared Revenue](#) (Resolution)

Resolution number: 37708

Document number: 2025-238

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: City Budget Office

Time requested: 30 minutes

Council action: Continued

Continued to June 18, 2025 at 6:00 p.m.

4

[Approve accepting funds from the State of Oregon under the State Revenue Sharing Program for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2025 and ending June 30, 2026](#) (Ordinance)

Ordinance number: 192069

Document number: 2025-239

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: City Budget Office

Time requested: 30 minutes

Council action: Passed to second reading

Passed to second reading June 18, 2025 at 6:00 p.m.

5

[Adopt the annual budget of the City and establish appropriations for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2025 and ending June 30, 2026](#) (Ordinance)

Ordinance number: 192070

Document number: 2025-240

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: City Budget Office

Time requested: 2 hours

Council action: Continued

Motion to adopt the changes as reflected in Attachments A through H: Moved by Kanai and seconded by Koyama Lane. Vote not called.

Continued to June 11, 2025 at 9:30 a.m.

6

[Approve levying taxes for the City for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2025 and ending June 30, 2026](#) (Ordinance)

Ordinance number: 192071

Document number: 2025-241

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: City Budget Office

Time requested: 30 minutes

Council action: Passed to second reading

Passed to second reading June 18, 2025 at 6:00 p.m.

7

[Authorize a temporary interfund loan not to exceed \\$50 million from the Portland Parks & Recreation System Development Charge Fund to the Fire and Police Disability and Retirement Fund to provide interim financing for fiscal year 2025-26 cash flow deficit due to the timing of property tax collections](#) (Ordinance)

Ordinance number: 192072

Document number: 2025-242

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

Time requested: 10 minutes

Council action: Passed to second reading

Passed to second reading June 18, 2025 at 6:00 p.m.

Session Status: Adjourned

Council in Attendance: Councilor Sameer Kanal

Councilor Dan Ryan

Council Vice President Tiffany Koyama Lane

Councilor Angelita Morillo

Councilor Steve Novick

Councilor Olivia Clark

Councilor Mitch Green

Councilor Eric Zimmerman

Councilor Candace Avalos

Councilor Jamie Dunphy

Councilor Loretta Smith

Council President Elana Pirtle-Guiney

Council President Pirtle-Guiney presided.

Officers in attendance: Robert Taylor, City Attorney; Keelan McClymont, Council Clerk

Council recessed at 12:58 p.m. and reconvened at 1:49 p.m.

Council recessed at 7:10 p.m. and reconvened at 7:27 p.m.

Council recessed at 8:06 p.m. and reconvened at 8:13 p.m.

Council recessed at 8:26 p.m. and reconvened at 8:28 p.m.

Council adjourned at 8:48 p.m.

Public Communications

8

[Public Comment](#) (Public Communication)

Document number: June 11, 2025 Public Communications

Time requested: 15 minutes

Council action: Placed on File

Regular Agenda

9

[Adopt the annual budget of the City and establish appropriations for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2025 and ending June 30, 2026](#) (Ordinance)

Ordinance number: 192070

Document number: 2025-240

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: City Budget Office

Time requested: 8 hours

Council action: Passed to second reading as amended

Motion to adopt the changes as reflected in Attachments A through H: Moved by Kanal and seconded by Koyama Lane. Motion withdrawn.

Appeal to sustain the Council President's ruling on the point of order: Morillo, Avalos, and Green. (Aye (5): Ryan, Novick, Zimmerman, Smith, Pirtle-Guiney; Nay (7): Kanal, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Clark, Green, Avalos, Dunphy). Motion failed to pass.

Motion to adopt Attachments B through H: Moved by Dunphy and seconded by Morillo. (Aye (12): Kanal, Ryan, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Zimmerman, Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Pirtle-Guiney)

Passed to second reading as amended June 18, 2025 at 6:00 p.m.

Portland City Council Special Meeting
June 10, 2025 - 1:00 p.m.
Speaker List

Name	Title	Document Number
Elana Pirtle-Guiney	Council President	
Keelan McClymont	Council Clerk	
Sameer Kanal	Councilor	
Dan Ryan	Councilor	
Tiffany Koyama Lane	Council Vice President	
Angelita Morillo	Councilor	
Steve Novick	Councilor	
Olivia Clark	Councilor	
Mitch Green	Councilor	
Eric Zimmerman	Councilor	
Candace Avalos	Councilor	
Jamie Dunphy	Councilor	
Loretta Smith	Councilor	
Robert Taylor	City Attorney	
Ruth Levine	Director, City Budget Office	2025-237 - 2025-241
Matt Nicholson	(Testimony)	2025-241
Jonas Biery	Deputy City Administrator, Budget & Finance and Chief Financial Officer	2025-237 - 2025-241
Karen Chirre	(Testimony)	2025-241
Loretta Guzman	(Testimony)	2025-240
Michelle Milla	(Testimony)	2025-240
Alan Comnes	(Testimony)	2025-240
Karen Chirre	(Testimony)	2025-240
Vadim Mozyrsky	(Testimony)	2025-240
Brian Owendoff	(Testimony)	2025-240
Marissa Wolf	(Testimony)	2025-240
Joe Jackson	(Testimony)	2025-240
Ahmed Alshamanie	(Testimony)	2025-240
Craig Bethell	(Testimony)	2025-240
Dilgash Amedi	(Testimony)	2025-240
Dahir Sheikh Ahmed	(Testimony)	2025-240
Nathaniel Hudson-Hartman	(Testimony)	2025-240
Angela Todd	(Testimony)	2025-240
Tiana Tozer	(Testimony)	2025-240
Talia Giardini	(Testimony)	2025-240
Eve Ashkar	(Testimony)	2025-240
Dave Crepeau	(Testimony)	2025-240
Tara Carlson	(Testimony)	2025-240
Anastasia Howard	(Testimony)	2025-240
Rob Martineau	(Testimony)	2025-240
Giles Gardner	(Testimony)	2025-240
Kai McMurtry	(Testimony)	2025-240
Benjamin Gilbert	(Testimony)	2025-240

Name	Title	Document Number
Jordan Lewis	(Testimony)	2025-240
Jeremy Smith	(Testimony)	2025-240
Jim Labbe	(Testimony)	2025-240
Yoko Silk	(Testimony)	2025-240
Jesse Hannon	(Testimony)	2025-240
Tim Larson	(Testimony)	2025-240
Nike Greene	(Testimony)	2025-240
Eric Knox	(Testimony)	2025-240
Todd Littlefield	(Testimony)	2025-240
Marie Tyvoll	(Testimony)	2025-240
Deian Salazar	(Testimony)	2025-240
Patrick Tran	(Testimony)	2025-240
Micah Meskel	(Testimony)	2025-240
Jacqueline Rivera	(Testimony)	2025-240
Henry Kaiser	(Testimony)	2025-240
Janet Parker	(Testimony)	2025-240
Jamie Partridge	(Testimony)	2025-240
Nikhilesh Desai	(Testimony)	2025-240
John Hollister	(Testimony)	2025-240
Misha Litvak	(Testimony)	2025-240
Darin Campbell	(Testimony)	2025-240
Jay Nicholson	(Testimony)	2025-240
Kevin Machiz	(Testimony)	2025-240
Emily Stebbins	(Testimony)	2025-240
Kate Phillips	(Testimony)	2025-240
Devon Casey	(Testimony)	2025-240
Justin Skolnick	(Testimony)	2025-240
Terry Parker	(Testimony)	2025-240
Christopher Olson	(Testimony)	2025-240
James O'Laughlen	(Testimony)	2025-240
Chrisopher Ward	(Testimony)	2025-240
Charlie Michelle-Westley	(Testimony)	2025-240
Babs Vanelli	(Testimony)	2025-240
Shelly Bigley	(Testimony)	2025-240
Corinne Frechette	(Testimony)	2025-240
Tony Gracia	(Testimony)	2025-240
Lydia Moges	(Testimony)	2025-240
Zuleyma Figueroa	(Testimony)	2025-240
Amie Wexler	(Testimony)	2025-240
Je Amaechi	(Testimony)	2025-240
John H	(Testimony)	2025-240
Lance Nippert	(Testimony)	2025-240
Ross Freeman Levin	(Testimony)	2025-240
Walter Valenta	(Testimony)	2025-240
Matt Nicholson	(Testimony)	2025-240

Name	Title	Document Number
Claudio Campuzano	Finance, Property & Technology Manager - Vibrant Communities Support Services	2025-240
Donnie Oliveira	Deputy City Administrator, Community & Economic Development	2025-240
Hayley Blonsley	Senior Project Manager, BFSA & COSA	2025-240
Sonia Schmanski	Deputy City Administrator, Vibrant Communities	2025-240
Bob Cozzie	Interim Deputy City Administrator, Public Safety	2025-240
Michael Jordan	City Administrator	2025-240
Sara Morrissey	Deputy City Administrator, City Operations	2025-240
AJ Jackson	Interim Fire Chief, Fire and Rescue	2025-240

Portland City Council Special Meeting
June 11, 2025 - 9:30 a.m.
Speaker List

Name	Title	Document Number
Elana Pirtle-Guiney	Council President	
Keelan McClymont	Council Clerk	
Sameer Kanal	Councilor	
Dan Ryan	Councilor	
Tiffany Koyama Lane	Council Vice President	
Angelita Morillo	Councilor	
Steve Novick	Councilor	
Olivia Clark	Councilor	
Mitch Green	Councilor	
Eric Zimmerman	Councilor	
Candace Avalos	Councilor	
Jamie Dunphy	Councilor	
Loretta Smith	Councilor	
Robert Taylor	City Attorney	
Addie Smith	(Public Communications)	
Terrence Hayes	(Public Communications)	
Noah Pellikaan	(Public Communications)	
Jordan Lewis	(Public Communications)	
Claudio Campuzano	Finance, Property & Technology Manager - Vibrant Communities Support Services	2025-240
Jonas Biery	Deputy City Administrator, Budget & Finance and Chief Financial Officer	2025-240
Michael Jordan	City Administrator	2025-240
Ruth Levine	Director, City Budget Office	2025-240
Lillian Nguyen	Analyst, City Budget Office	2025-240
Dave Crepeau	Service Dispatcher, Parks & Recreation	2025-240
Bob Cozzie	Interim Deputy City Administrator, Public Safety	2025-240
Jordan Wiley	Deputy Director, Emergency Management	2025-240
Nathan Leamy	Manager, Budget, Strategy, & Performance Unit, Public Safety	2025-240
Keith Wilson	Mayor	2025-240
Amanda Garcia Snell	Engagement Officer	2025-240
Annie Von Burg	Assistant City Administrator	2025-240
Owen Saïtes	Analyst, City Budget Office	2025-240
Donnie Oliveira	Deputy City Administrator, Community & Economic Development	2025-240
Lucas Hillyer	Impact Reduction Program	2025-240
Skyler Bocker Knapp	Director, Portland Solutions	2025-240
Aaron Rivera	Business Operations Division Manager	2025-240

Portland City Council Meeting Closed Caption File

June 10, 2025 – 1:00 p.m.

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

Speaker: Good afternoon. It is 103 on Tuesday, June 10th. I am calling our council meeting to order. We have a number of a number of agenda items that we are going to open today. Most of which we are not going to do a lot with today. But this is where we start to do more of the technical pieces of the budget. We're going to go through some of those technical pieces of the budget right now, and then we will hear public testimony, and then we will have time to do a little bit more with amendments on the budget. We will pick up where we left off tomorrow. Keelan, could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Canal here?

Speaker: Mr. Ryan here. Koyama lane here. Maria, here. Novick here. Clark, here. Green. Here. Zimmerman. Here. Avalos, here. Dunphy. Smith. Here. Pirtle-guiney here.

Speaker: And, robert, could you please read us our rules of decorum?

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Welcome.

Speaker: Everyone, to the Portland City Council to testify before council in person or virtually, you must please sign up in advance on the council agenda at w-w-w-what. Council agenda. Information on engaging with council can be found on the council clerk's web page. Individuals may testify for three minutes unless the

presiding officer states otherwise. Your microphone will be muted when your time is over. Presiding officer preserves order. Disruptive conduct such as shouting. Refusing to conclude your testimony when your time is up or interrupting others testimony or council deliberations will not be allowed. If you cause a disruption, a warning will be given. Further disruption will result in ejection from the meeting. Anyone who fails to leave once ejected is subject to arrest for trespass. Additionally, council may take a short recess and reconvene virtually. Your testimony should please address the matter being considered. When testifying, please state your name for the record. Your address is not necessary. If you are a lobbyist, please identify the organization you represent. Virtual testifier should please unmute themselves when the council clerk calls your name. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, mr. Taylor. Keelan, could you please read agenda items one through? One through six. There are seven things here, and my script says one through six.

Speaker: The first approval.

Speaker: Got it. Okay. Could you please read agenda item one?

Speaker: Yes. Item one. Agenda approval. Council will vote to approve the agenda, to reorder items on the agenda, or to add an item to the next meeting's agenda.

Speaker: Thank you. Colleagues. Are there any requests to amend or reorder the agenda? Okay.

Speaker: Item two conduct a proposed use hearing on state shared revenue. Item three certify that certain services are provided by the city to establish eligibility for state shared revenue. Item four approve accepting funds from the state of Oregon under the state revenue sharing program for fiscal year beginning July 1st, 2025 and ending June 30th, 2026. Item five adopt the annual budget of the city and establish appropriations for the fiscal year beginning July 1st, 2025 and ending June

30th, 2026. Item six approve levying taxes for the city for the fiscal year beginning July 1st, 2025 and ending June 30th, 2026. And item seven authorize a temporary interfund loan not to exceed \$50 million from the Portland parks and recreation system development charge fund to the fire and police disability and retirement fund to provide interim financing for fiscal year 2025 through 26. Cash flow deficit. Due to the timing of property tax collections.

Speaker: Thank you. Keelan. So, colleagues, before we start taking on each of these agenda items, which we will do some brief work on today here, some public testimony on, and then spend most of our time on agenda item five. Budget director levine is going to go over our process in a little bit more detail. Director levine, could you please do that for us?

Speaker: Sure. Thank you. And for the record, ruth levine, the director of the city budget office. Good afternoon. Council president, City Council. So as council president mentioned, we're here today for the next steps in adopting the budget for fiscal year 20 2526, following today and tomorrow's proceedings, the budget ordinance will pass a second reading, and council will vote on all of the budget items on June 18th. There are a number of procedural steps we need to go through, and as Keelan read into the record, we have six items in front of you that are part of this process. The first three items relate to the acceptance and use of state shared revenues in our budget. Revenue shared by the state of Oregon primarily consists of cigarette, liquor, and retail marijuana taxes. So first council will hold a proposed use hearing on the state shared revenue. Then you will consider a resolution certifying that the city meets the eligibility requirements of state shared revenue. And then you will consider an ordinance accepting the state shared revenue. The fourth and fifth items, number six and seven, on the agenda that council will consider today and tomorrow are or today are the ordinance levying taxes and an

interfund loan between the parks capital fund and the fire, police and disability and retirement fund, which addresses technical timing issues with the revenues, and the sixth and final item, which is item number five on the agenda that council will consider is the adopted budget ordinance. And that will be obviously the focus of your time today and tomorrow. So with that overview, we can begin with our first item, the state shared revenue hearing. Council president, you can open the state shared revenue hearing.

Speaker: Thank you. So we actually have all six of these open. So we are going into a hearing colleagues to discuss proposed uses of state revenue sharing. This hearing is being held by the City Council in compliance with the provisions of state revenue sharing regulations, which are in ORS 221.770 to allow Portlanders to comment on the possible use of the funds in conjunction with the annual budget process, as proposed for council adoption for fiscal year 2026, the budget anticipates receiving \$21 million from state revenue sharing under ORS 221.770. As has been the case in prior years, it's proposed that this revenue be allocated in equal parts to support fire prevention and police patrol services. Director Levine, could you provide an overview of the eligibility for state revenue? State shared revenue resolution?

Speaker: Certainly, council will consider a resolution to certify that the city meets the eligibility requirements for state shared revenue. State law requires that we provide a number of services to be eligible for this revenue, and this resolution certifies that we do so. The services certified by the city of Portland are police protection, fire prevention, street construction and maintenance and lighting, sanitary sewers, storm sewers, planning, zoning and subdivision control and water. The third and final step in accepting the state shared revenue is for council to consider and vote upon the ordinance to accept state shared revenue. Once you've

had a hearing and certified that the city is qualified, you need to take action to accept the revenue.

Speaker: Thank you. And director levine, because this is a new process for a number of folks up here. Could you just give us a brief overview of what the shared revenue comes from, what those sources are, that the state collects these funds from?

Speaker: Sure. It's just state revenues from cigarette liquor and cannabis taxes. So these are these are statewide revenues that are shared out based on population. And Portland gets our share.

Speaker: This is separate colleagues from the expenditures that we've talked about in the general fund from revenue that comes from the state. These are very specific funds that are collected from the purposes director levine named that are then distributed based on population across the state with limited uses. Keelan. Has anybody signed up to testify on the state shared revenue hearing, resolution or ordinance?

Speaker: Yes. One person has signed up. Loretta guzman.

Speaker: Great. And colleagues, these are agenda items two, three and four that we're talking about right now. Keelan, could you please call loretta up?

Speaker: Yeah. Loretta guzman.

Speaker: Thank you for a long time.

Speaker: Oh, okay. Are you signed up for the budget adoption one?

Speaker: Yes. You signed up.

Speaker: For the budget? I think there's some confusion. There was some confusion with the sign ups.

Speaker: Yeah. Okay. Yeah, I think that makes sense. We'll make sure you get called for the budget adoption.

Speaker: Yeah. Oh, geez.

Speaker: That completes testimony for those items.

Speaker: Okay, colleagues, these agenda items will come back up when we hear the budget on the 18th. But for now, we are going to. I'm making sure we're also closing agenda item four, which is an ordinance. I'm looking to you, ruth. Are we closing all three of them?

Speaker: That's right. You're continuing them to June 18th, and then you're going to close the state shared revenue hearing.

Speaker: Right. So for now, we are closing the state shared revenue hearing. And we are going to move. We're going to skip agenda item five colleagues, which is our annual budget, and move on to agenda item six, which is the tax levy ordinance. This is the action that allows us to levy property taxes that accrue to the general fund, the parks local option levy fund, the recently renewed children's investment fund, and the fire and police disability and retirement fund. It also includes property tax levies for general obligation bonded debt and our six urban renewal areas. Keelan has anyone signed up to testify on the tax levy's ordinance?

Speaker: Let me check here. We have two people signed up to testify on that item. Karen, ray and matt nicholson. Karen shearer, matt nicholson.

Speaker: And karen and matt. If either of you had meant to sign up for agenda item five, please let our clerk know and she'll make sure to move you over to the other testimony list.

Speaker: Oh. I'm sorry, I'm sorry. Council president matt nicholson is online. Let me go ahead and.

Speaker: Can you hear me?

Speaker: We can hear you.

Speaker: Okay. I just wanted to voice my support for the parks levy and. I feel that the community has a strong support for our parks. And I would encourage all councilors to put a robust levy on the November ballot to allow us to fully fund our parks and parks maintenance. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you so much.

Speaker: That completes testimony for that item.

Speaker: Okay. Councilors, is there any discussion on agenda item six? The tax levy ordinance? Okay. This is a first reading as well. So we will continue this agenda item to second reading on the eight out. Councilor smith, did you have something here?

Speaker: Yes, madam president.

Speaker: Go right ahead.

Speaker: I need to find out what is the normal process of doing interfund loans and those kinds of things.

Speaker: Director levine, is that something you can help us with? There's a question about the process for interfund loans, and I assume that's as it relates to this tax levy ordinance.

Speaker: Right. And how did we choose parks to get a loan from them versus any other agency?

Speaker: Councilor are you looking at agenda item seven.

Speaker: Let's see.

Speaker: Let's roll.

Speaker: And we can take the question. Now I just want to make sure that folks are all looking at the right thing.

Speaker: I'm so upset.

Speaker: So, director levine, there's a question. Agenda item seven is a temporary interfund loan from Portland parks and recreation system development charge

fund to fire and police disability and retirement fund. And there's a question about why that fund was chosen, or perhaps jonas would like to answer.

Speaker: Yeah. I mean, I guess to the process for this specific fund, this is the second year that we've done this this way. And I think we may have talked about this on the 21st a little bit, but essentially the it has to do with the very specific situation in the fire and disability disability retirement fund, the way it's created in charter and the timing of the tax revenues. So they don't get their tax revenue in until October, November, and they need to start paying out claims in August. And so they need the cash. And so this is just the simplest and cheapest way to do it for the city. And yeah, happy to turn it over to jonas as well.

Speaker: Great for the record. Jonas bieri, dca budget and finance and chief financial officer ruth is correct that this just addresses a cash flow mismatch between the language in the charter around the fire and police disability retirement fund, who collects those levy that levy receipt in November. So this bridges the payment requirements between the start of the fiscal year and November. I would add in the past, in prior years, we've achieved this objective by getting an external borrowing, either by issuing a short term bond or note, or having a loan from a bank and paying interest on that to an external party, an investor. This strategy utilizes that available balance in the parks. Sdc fund fully replenishes the fund from that tax levy in November, and returns the interest back to an internal partner at the city via that parks fund.

Speaker: Thank you jonas.

Speaker: Any other questions, counselor? Counselors? Does anybody else have a question about agenda item number six? Keelan. Did you send me a note that we have our second testifier available now?

Speaker: Yes. They arrived.

Speaker: Let's give them an opportunity.

Speaker: Great. Thank you. Karen. Shira.

Speaker: Can you hear me?

Speaker: We can hear you.

Speaker: Okay. My name is karen sherer. I'm a resident of district three, business owner in district four. I'm writing to express my strong disapproval of the proposed ordinance to levy taxes for the fiscal year beginning July 1st. While I understand the importance of funding city services, I believe that this ordinance is raised several concerns that warrant reconsideration. The financial burden on residents, the proposed tax levies represent a significant financial burden on residents, especially in a time when many families are facing economic challenges. Increasing property taxes constrain household budgets, making it difficult for families to meet their basic needs. There appears to be a lack of transparency regarding the budget process. The ordinance states that the budget was adopted on June 18th, 2025, but as of June 10th, 2025, it has not yet been approved. This discrepancy raises concerns about the legitimacy, legitimacy of the proposed tax levies and the decision making process involved is crucial to ensure that tax revenue is allocated effectively and efficiently. I'm concerned that the funds raised through these tax levies may not be utilized in ways that directly benefit the community or address pressing needs. I urge the City Council to explore alternative funding solutions that do not place an additional burden on taxpayers. This could include reevaluating existing programs, identifying areas for cost savings, or seeking additional state or federal funding. I respectfully request. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you so much for being here. Keelan. Is that the end of public testimony?

Speaker: It does.

Speaker: Thank you. Okay. Thank you colleagues. I am not seeing anybody else with comments. So I am going to. Close today's hearing on this bill, on this ordinance and move us to agenda item seven. So we are going to open our discussion on agenda item seven, the fpd and our interfund loan ordinance, which is where this funding that councilor smith was asking about takes place. Keelan has anybody signed up to testify on this agenda item.

Speaker: Signed up.

Speaker: Okay. Councilors, is there any further discussion on agenda item seven? Okay. This is again a non emergency ordinance. So it will move to second reading on the 18th. Councilor green.

Speaker: Thank you. Madam president. I just kind of want to put into the record. Yesterday we heard from kevin matches who provided testimony regarding this item. And he wanted us to flag that there is a different yield associated with this interfund loan relative to the previous one that we heard as well. And so I just I know, no action. I just wanted to flag and make sure we brought that discussion out of the finance committee. And before the full council. Thanks.

Speaker: Thank you very much, councilor. Counselor. Seeing no one else in the queue for discussion, we are going to send this to second reading on the 18th. The next item on the agenda is agenda item five, which is the adopted budget ordinance. And before we go to public testimony, I just want to take a moment to go over what to expect today and tomorrow for everybody who is listening. So we will start with another round of public testimony on our budget. We've set aside two hours, two additional hours for public testimony today after public testimony, the first thing that we will do is consider an amendment, which I want to get the language right here. So I'm trying to pull up the email that has it, but I may not get there in time. We're going to consider the language which an amendment which will

allow us to discuss carryover packages from council operations and council offices. These are the items that also are reflected separately in the overexpenditure ordinance that we have talked about. They've sometimes been called overexpenditure items will then talk about parks, then public safety, community engagement and equity, housing and homelessness. And then there is another category. And we'll take these categories like we did on the 21st, where everybody will have an opportunity to bring forward their most important, an amendment or package. If you have a few things that should be considered together. But we're separated for technical reasons after we get through everybody's most important piece in those categories, we'll go back and consider budget notes, which accept as they have been related to packages we've not yet considered, and then we will open up for consideration of additional amendments. So if you have something new that you have brought forward in a category that we've already considered, or if you have additional amendments that you want to bring forward in categories where it wasn't your most important item, we'll do those at the end. I suspect today we'll get through the council carryover package and the parks section, and probably not much further than that, but it'll just depend on whether we use our full two hours for public testimony or not, and how quickly debate moves. We'll recess at 6:00 and reconvene tomorrow at 930, and we are scheduled from 930 to 6 tomorrow. Obviously, if we get through everything, we could always end earlier.

Speaker: I appreciate.

Speaker: I appreciate the laughs, counselor. Clark, do you have a question on process?

Speaker: Yes I do, I just wondered on the oios are you grouping them or are we going to go through individually?

Speaker: I believe that we have a new amendment which grouped them, as we talked about at our previous work session, to help us move one thing a little bit more quickly. Any other questions on process? Okay. Then I would like to move us into public testimony so that we can hear from Portlanders about how they're feeling about the current state of our budget.

Speaker: And council president.

Speaker: Did I miss a piece?

Speaker: Yes. Sorry. We're supposed to talk about the changes to the budget as filed. So it's talking about the changes that are reflected in attachments b and c, and that basically just lets council have like the starting point for further adjustments to the budget.

Speaker: Okay. Here's what we're going to do. I'm going to say to the public who are here, feel free to testify not just on the budget before you, but the amendments that are filed. This is an opportunity for testimony on anything within agenda item five. So amendments as well, please. But before we do that, let's let ruth talk about some of the changes that we have here. I apologize, ruth, director levine, that I missed that part.

Speaker: No problem. So I'm just going to describe at a high level the changes in the adopted budget as filed, which are reflected in attachments b and c, these are primarily technical changes that were made in advance. And they're kind of a couple of buckets of types of changes. Some of them are cleanup from amendments that were voted for in the approved budget hearing. So just making sure those get into the right spots in the budget. A couple of them are updates based on sort of year end projections of revenues and expenditures. And so you'll see that in a couple of different places. There's also the largest adjustment is for the fpd loan that we just talked about. And sort of adjustments between funds,

particularly in our public works bureaus, adjusting contingency and revenues based on on that. So those that kind of covers it and essentially. Council you need to. Motion and second to adopt the changes as currently reflected in attachments a through h. And again that just kind of provides you with a clean starting point from which you will discuss further amendments to the budget.

Speaker: Director levine, would it be best practice for us to make that motion before we move into public testimony or after?

Speaker: I think it makes sense to do it just before you move into public testimony.

Speaker: Okay. Councilors, do we have a motion? Thank you, counselor canal.

Speaker: Seconded.

Speaker: Thank you, counselor koyama lane. So we are moving and seconding to accept the changes that are noted, in which attachments are we looking at? Director levine?

Speaker: Attachments a through h.

Speaker: Thank you. Attachments a through h. There we go. So if you're looking at the website l and j are the new proposed amendments. A through h are the changes that have already been proposed. We are discussing and then we'll vote on accepting those changes so that we are starting with a clean slate with any amendments that we bring forward. Counselor clark, are you in the queue for discussion? Counselors, is there any discussion? Okay. Keelan. Robert.

Speaker: Oh.

Speaker: This the motion? And second for this opens all of those items up, and now they can be amended individually as you move forward. And then at the end of that process, we will have a we will vote on this motion to adopt all the changes as reflected in a through h. So that'll be think of it as a nesting amendment. Now we're moving and seconding to opening a through h. You will then consider all the

individual amendments that make changes to a through h vote on all those. And then there will be one final vote on accepting all of the changes to a through h. That's similar to the process you went through with on may 21st.

Speaker: But we need to do that now before we start hearing additional amendments that we have not yet considered.

Speaker: Correct. You do the motion and second, now you don't vote on it. You hear all of the testimony on all of the amendments as filed, so folks can talk about all of the changes that are being proposed. Then you take the individual.

Speaker: You prefer that we vote on these at the end, correct? Okay, great. Then why don't we move now into public testimony and Keelan, if you could call folks up. 3 or 4 at a time so that we can hear from as many people as possible, that would be great. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. First up, we have loretta guzman, michelle miller, alan combs, and karen cherry.

Speaker: I'll just sit here. That's okay. Sure.

Speaker: Go ahead. Loretta.

Speaker: Hi. My name is loretta guzman. I'm the owner of bison coffee house. I live and work in district two. Before this budget is finalized and adopted with these amendments, I'm requesting that we are given the proper funding for public safety to pd so they can better serve our communities and businesses. We have standards as a business. We are held to. Safety shouldn't be compromised, but currently it is. Look around us as businesses are failing. Even big pink is up for sale. How much more damage has to occur before our city starts prioritizing people's lives? Big businesses have left. Small businesses have closed. Whole families have moved. We are. We are a city that we want to believe. It can come back and it will. But how long before this will happen? Yes, I understand that we are forever changed, but as

death is all around us, it's not normal. Yes, I have experienced it in the last few years. Death deaths that shouldn't have occurred unanswered. 911 calls and a life and death situation is something I think of every day. Thanks to our city that is crumbling with no accountability. The things that used to work are not an option, and this new form of ideas is destroying and killing people's people. Our streets are not what they once used to be. Public safety. Safety is compromised currently, when in reality it is a fundamental right which we are not given.

Speaker: Michelle.

Speaker: Good afternoon councilors. My name is michelle miller. I'm a parent and public safety advocate in the district four stadium neighborhood, where we've been doing the hard work of organizing, meeting with electeds and also coordinating with law enforcement because the city has left too many of us on our own. So I'm here to strongly oppose amendment three from councilor avalos, which would strip \$15 million from the police overtime budget and place it into a council controlled contingency fund. This is clearly a power grab. Councilor avalos and her progressive caucus allies are attempting to exert direct control over the police bureau by holding critical overtime funds hostage, and that's a dangerous precedent, and it directly contradicts the will of the voters who passed charter reform to remove operational control from individual councilors and place it under a city administrator. Police overtime is what keeps our neighborhoods covered when staffing is stretched thin. When there's a crisis, a shortage or a public safety emergency, those funds allow the system to flex and respond, and we need that right now. Putting that in a set aside will equate to less safety for the people who need it most.

Speaker: The misuse of your power, avalos.

Speaker: And I urge you to vote no on avalos three we ask you to respect the charter, your constituents and stop gambling with public safety. Thank you for your consideration.

Speaker: Alan.

Speaker: All right. Thank you. Thank you. Good afternoon, councilors and mayor. My name is alan combs, Portland resident for over 25 years, and I live in district three. I'm here today because I'm angry and disappointed that seven councilors, including all those from district three, voted to shift \$2 million from Portland police bureau to the parks based on a false choice and a lack of imagination that public safety must be cut to fund park maintenance. I support justice, equity and sustainability. Indeed, cities are key to realize these goals, but none are possible if the city isn't safe and livable. Portland has underfunded public safety for years and now has one of the smallest police forces per capita of major u.s. Cities. The mayor's requested budget for ppb is excessive. It's essential. What happens if you continue to defund the police? It means Portland street response will suffer. Psr needs police backup to expand safely into evening or indoor spaces. Recruitment and training will stall just as ppb is making progress on recruiting and training a younger, diverse force. And that will solve your overtime concerns. By the way, targeted missions to address sex trafficking, car theft and retail crime will be cut. Traffic enforcement will stall, despite being one of the most effective ways to reduce pedestrian injuries and fatalities. So how do you afford both parks and public? A little imagination? Yes, and by doing the hard work of identifying lower priority spending, I urge you to work with the mayor and city administrator to find a solution. Don't settle for simple false choices. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you all.

Speaker: Karen is joining us online.

Speaker: My name is karen ray. I'm the owner of the convenience store stadium superette in district four and a member of stadium hood. And yes, vice president. I have testified multiple times regarding the budget, but the squeaky wheel gets the grease. As a business owner in this community, I am deeply concerned about the recent challenges we have faced over the past two weeks alone, our security log has had over 25 new recorded incidents, including three arrests, repeated vandalism, employee threats, thefts and even drug deals. This level of criminal activity has taken a devastating toll. In the last two years, we have seen 18 businesses close or relocate from our neighborhood, and at least three more confirmed to leave by the end of the year. We are in a doom loop in our stadium hood neighborhood. These closures mean lost jobs, lost investments, and a loss of the community hubs that our neighbors rely on. We are in a dangerous, dangerous downward spiral, and I fear for the future of our small business district and residential district if drastic action is not taken. This is why I'm pleading with you. Do not let another business leave our neighborhood. We need more robust public safety budget to empower the police to work hand in hand with the community on solutions. Community policing, where law enforcement and residents collaborate toward the common goal of safety and livability, is the only way forward. When I call the police to report suspects from my store, I am doing my part to be a partner in public safety, but I need the police to have the resources and support to respond effectively with your commitment to funding. Thank you.

Speaker: Next up we have vadim mazursky, brian orndorf, marissa wolfe, joe jackson.

Speaker: Sir.

Speaker: Just a second. Just a second, please. Go ahead.

Speaker: Hello, counselors. I'm here to urge you to vote no on avalos three and to restore the 1.9.

Speaker: Million that was cut from the mayor's public safety budget request. Recently, the tribune noted that mayor. That the mayor believed that the funding cuts would hinder efforts to recruit officers and address critical missions like combating fentanyl and human trafficking. This was corroborated recently in a seven page memo from the next public safety administrator. But the mayor struck an optimistic tone. Thank you, mayor. Noting that he was hopeful that City Council will restore the 1.9 million when it considers the final version of the budget. I, too, am hopeful that City Council will work together to restore the public safety and oppose drug dealers and human traffickers. I'm hopeful because common sense leaders like councilor, zimmerman, smith, Ryan clark have noted that the city does not have to choose between parks and police. We have options to fund both. I'm hopeful, because the Oregonian editorial board advocated for restoring that same police funding. I'm hopeful because three recent citywide polls, one funded by City Council, one funded by the business community, one funded by a nonprofit show that the majority of Portlanders are against cutting the police budget. A vast majority felt that even non-emergency police services were essential or very important, and a large majority would actually support doubling the police force. I'm hopeful because many people in this room are taking time off from their jobs and their families to advocate for restoring that funding. I know sometimes politicians heed the loudest voice in the room rather than the two often silent majority. But I'm also hopeful that this council will act differently and listen to what people are asking you to do in your districts and citywide. Thank you very much, brian.

Speaker: Brian, thank you. Mayor, City Council, president, councilors live and work in district four. Rebuilding Portland requires a commitment to public safety. Law and order rooted in the rule of law is the cornerstone of any thriving society. It ensures treatment safeguards against individual rights, deters crime, and maintains the peace and stability that our community needs to prosper. In Portland, we're facing a stark reality our city has half the number of police officers as other comparable cities. Despite a \$318 million police budget, that funding only delivers 50% of the officers that we need. This shortfall has real consequences for residents, businesses and visitors. Portland's revitalization and its ability to generate revenue. Essential services for parks, roads, fire department depends on restoring public safety. The Portland police bureau strives to be a leader in policing that is respectful to all layers of our community. Entrepreneurs will not invest in neighborhoods plagued by break ins and vandalism. Workers and visitors will avoid areas of high drug use. District one experiences the highest crime yet. Councilors dunphy and avalos, representing that district, voted to cut an already lean budget by another 2 million. That decision directly undermines efforts to make our community safer. We need leaders that support effective law enforcement, not those that spread misinformation about police or whose ideological agendas interfere with practical needs of our city. Portland's problems are not due to lack of revenue. They are stemmed from bad policy decisions and misplaced priorities. Reducing the police budget now risks driving away more businesses, more residents and more taxpayers. We will remember who stood before the public safety and who voted to erode it. With district three and district four councilors up for reelection next November. Accountability is coming. Let's stop the decline, restore funding, restore order. Restore Portland. Thank you.

Speaker: Marissa. Hi.

Speaker: I'm marissa wolf. I'm the artistic director of Portland center stage. We're in district four, and I am here to support and ask you to support motion six greens, motion six, the one time \$450,000 funding for Portland center stage, and also want to lift up dunfee's motion number two, 1.5 million for city arts funding. So Portland center stage were the second largest theater in the state of Oregon. We serve 100,000 people, including 9000 students every year. We are a space to gather. We are more than a theater. We are a space to gather which is which has such a great need right now. We are a space for collective imagination to renew the investment in all people's ability to dream into democracy. We are an economic driver in our community. For every \$1 spent at Portland center stage, \$39 are spent in our neighborhood. When you consider the revitalization of downtown Portland, you must consider the arts and Portland center stage. We drive business to all of the local businesses and the pearl district, and we are a major part of safety in our neighborhood in bringing tens of thousands of people downtown and partnering with local nonprofits around the houseless community. We are in emergency campaign to stay alive. And this this one time funding is absolutely critical as a public private partnership in leveraging private gifts so that we can stay alive. It's a win for this incredible group of new council members and mayor that tens of thousands of people will benefit from this funding for generations to come. Thank you very much.

Speaker: Joe.

Speaker: President pirtle-guiney. Vice president koyama lane mayor wilson, members of the council. My name is joe jackson. I have been a rideshare driver in the Portland metro area for ten years. I've driven thousands of trips and amassed hundreds of thousands of miles on these roads. And I need your help to support our to support a fund for our driver resource center. Whether it's a ride to work,

the hospital, school, or just getting home after a night out, people depend on us and now we depend on the city to be there for us. We rideshare drivers are fighting for our rights, and sometimes we feel alone out there. Drivers need a place to go to get help. If we have questions or issues with the tnc's, the driver resource center could offer legal help at little to no cost for drivers worried about feeding their families. After deactivation, translation services for the culturally biased, english speaking ai chatbots that dominate the customer service of both of the current tnc giants, and outreach for the massive and diverse driver community with education on labor rights. This \$2 per trip fee that goes into effect without supporting drivers that so desperately need support. We understand that Portland has needs, but so do drivers. And without this, without us, this new funding wouldn't exist. So please, councilors, mayor wilson set aside just a small portion of this fee to fund a driver resource center so that we can get the assistance that drivers have needed. We continue to support the city, but drivers deserve to be included in these decisions. Thank you and we look forward to working together.

Speaker: Thank you all for being here today.

Speaker: Next.

Speaker: Next up. Next up we have ahmed craig bethel dilkash ahmed dahir sheikh ahmed.

Speaker: Thank you all for being here.

Speaker: Hi guys. My name is ahmed al-shamrani. I'm uber driver. Ten years I was in fox 12 news for uber karaoke and I was in the page uber for taxi driver in Portland. I have multiple vip ticket with uber. And then guess what? After that all this. I have over 4000 activation in 2020, in the pandemic and no one give me the reason what's going on for all that. And then guess what? I have a \$10,000 give me uber for I have over 2000 trips. So all this if you are the driver, how is the regular

driver? Is the activation. I'm here to share the story. What's going on for this company? This is a company is a slave driver. Don't care for driver. Don't care for the customer. He just hiring people, firing people. And then after two years, i. I my account back. Guess what. And then I go back again work. And then I work again and some customer have a one stop. And then I told them I can't be stopped. And then I call the support. Same. Okay, next day I find my account deactivation and after that I go to Vancouver. Vancouver have a support for pay for the activation and then pay fare. So guess what? I connect with the driver union and then guess what? My account back again. That's what I'm here. I want to drive a union because driver union back almost 1700 people in Washington. So why don't do it here in Portland to support the brother and sister. Thank you so much.

Speaker: Greg.

Speaker: Good afternoon, mayor wilson and members of the City Council. My name is craig bethel. I'm a fifth generation Oregonian and a resident of the Portland metro area for 68 years, and for the last eight of those years, a member of the rideshare community. I love my job. And serving the people of Portland. I am proud to call myself an essential service provider. Currently we have. We don't have any place to go to get help if we have questions or issues with the tncs. Uber and lyft refuses to pay us a living wage and they terminate us without any help of getting our jobs back. A \$2 trip fee is about to go into effect without supporting the drivers that don't have the protections available. Like other essential workers, we understand the city has needs, but we do too. But so do we. And without us, none of the funding comes in. So please, council and mayor wilson set aside a small 10% portion of this fee to fund the drivers resource center, a place that has experience serving our diverse community of drivers so we can get the assistance we need from an independent organization that has drivers best interest at heart. We want

to continue to support the city, but drivers deserve to be included in these decisions. We look forward to working together to make both of these things happen. Thank you very much.

Speaker: All right. Good afternoon, mayor wilson. Councilors, my name is and a central rideshare worker in the Portland metro area, going on eight years now. Drivers are working long hours for low pay without basic labor protection and driving. And uber and lyft keep deactivating us. Portland wants to raise the tnc fee to \$2 without supporting us, even though every ride we support the city please take just \$0.20, just 10% on each ride to fund a driver resource center so essential drivers, non-english speaking immigrant drivers can have a place to go and get support that they need. I was deactivated for 18 months with no reason whatsoever. If it wasn't for the drivers union, I wouldn't be reactivated. All it takes is a passenger to falsify some stuff, and they will not hesitate to deactivate a rideshare driver. So please, we need your help. And thank you very much.

Speaker: The here is joining us online.

Speaker: Good afternoon, mayor wilson and all members of the council. My name is dahir sheikh ahmad, and I'm the rideshare drivers union members. I was living in Portland 25 years, and I have been rideshare drivers over eight years. I'm happy to serve the residents and visitors of the Portland metro area. As you might be aware, or consistently reporting drivers to the city of Portland, or the council. Drivers are drivers, are working long hours and never earn or close to the minimum wage of Portland, Oregon. Drivers have no basic labor protection at all. Rideshare companies keep strong. The expectation with us without any notice or warning. Therefore, we therefore to double or continuous our essential service in Portland city and Portland metro area. Please. Drivers need your help and support to fund our driver resource center. Please just take take \$0.20 or just 10% in each right

from the new tnc fee of \$2 to fund driver resource center so the drivers have a place to go to get support they need, such as fair pay, necessary basic benefits, and protection of the activation, we hope and looking for word to work together to make those things to happen and make it of Portland. Great place to be. Residency or work or protect the rights of the labor. Thank you very much.

Speaker: Thank you all very much for being here.

Speaker: Next up we have yusuf fakih, nathaniel hudson hartman, angela todd.

Speaker: Okay, you guys are tough acts to follow.

Speaker: President, vice president, mayor dubya and company. I'm nathaniel hudson hartman, proud eight year rideshare driver and advocate with drivers union Oregon. The voice for fairness for rose city rideshare. As you can see, my merry band of largely low income black, brown and immigrant drivers and I are here back again to ask for your help. We support this city providing essential mobility services. And as our wheels turn, you all know millions are pouring into this city. But why is none of that supporting us? Impossibly long work weeks, jobs unfairly taken away, all thanks to uber and lyft. We need actual human beings, actual humans that have driver's best interests at heart without the influence of the tnc giants. As my brother said, great, great work that can serve our our diverse driver community in languages other than english and this place our community desperately needs, just like its Seattle counterpart that has already helped thousands restore their jobs and access countless benefits and have a voice is the driver resource center. This tnc fee was adopted without considering the negative impacts to our already struggling driver community. And as usual, uber and lyft are propagandizing this proposal. But we are offering an equitable pathway forward that solves both of those problems, and that is the driver resource center. We're eager to collaborate more to ensure drivers not only have a seat behind the wheel, but at the table. Remember, without

us, there is no rideshare economy, no tnc taxation without driver representation. That being said, councilor kanal, we are encouraged by amendment 17. Vamos a trabajar. Thank you.

Speaker: New topic. Good afternoon council and mayor. I'm angela todd with pdx rail. Last week this council approved an \$8.5 million settlement during a budget deficit. I'm here today because I'm aghast at that decision. You approved a settlement for 27 people claiming ancestral ties to a home in albina. In the court documents that I read, there's no proof their family wasn't already paid when the home was sold or that they lived at the property. This isn't equity. It's precedent. I'd like to explain, even though I recognize this is a tough topic, it opens the door to every other family in albina, but also every eminent domain claim in Portland's history, including the coliseum, the highway 405 to the mount hood freeway that was never built. Meanwhile. Present day. Right now, the city of Portland has seized two family owned nursery properties from the bull run filtration plant, and homeowners in rural Multnomah County are being harassed over new setbacks tied to that same project as we speak. Oddly, they're the ones who raised the money to sue the city. I keep hearing from this body that a budget is a moral document. Well, let's be honest. Symbolic justice won't fix what's broken today. This council should be confronting the real abuse that's happening now, not 70 years ago. Because the greatest injustice I see today is the one being carried out by the city of Portland against its own people through political muscle, inadequate public safety and policies that leave families and businesses crushed by financial pressure. With no relief in sight. It's time to show moral courage in the present, not just the past. Thank you.

Speaker: Yusuf. Okay, next we have tiana tozer, eve ashkar, todd littlefield, and talia giardini.

Speaker: I spent 60. Is it me? My name is tiana tozer. I'm a d2 resident. I'm concerned about the misinformation that has been floating around the police budget. Contrary to green and canal claims that the police budget is being increased by 21 million according to the ppb budget summary, taking away the 2 million is a 0.4% increase. Page four of the budget summary states, and I've given you all copies of it. Putting aside inflationary increases, ppb's general fund revenue would have increased by a total, including ongoing and one time of 861,379.3% in the proposed budget and decreased by 1.1 \$1,130,237. That's a 0.4% after the reductions in the approved budget. Where is the \$21 million increase? Someone needs to show me the math. I would also like to clarify how and why the \$2 million decrease will result in a decrease in services. The money from the 90 vacant positions is currently used for overtime to maintain a level of service. When a new officer is hired, they start being paid. New police officers have an 18 month training period during which they do not operate solo. That means a position is filled, but it takes 18 months for the staffing increase to take effect. In the meantime, to continue the level of service, the bureau needs the same amount of money for overtime. The result is a decrease in response times and services during your campaign. Councilor novick. On October 2024, you stated, if it's a matter of cutting public safety or parks, probably you would have to cut parks. Are you going to follow through on your campaign promise, or will you give in to the piratical bullying of councilor morillo? Portlanders want police and parks, and there are ways to fund them both.

Speaker: Yeah, and i'll remind folks that while I know folks have reactions to a lot of what we hear, we try to keep those reactions silent so we can keep moving. Thank you.

Speaker: Okay, sorry.

Speaker: I'm like deep breaths. Okay. Can I go? Go ahead. Okay. Hi, I'm talia giardini, I'm a registered nurse and a Portland native, taking away 2 million from police, which with inflation is actually a 0.4% decrease. This goes directly against what the majority of the public wants. This is not democracy. It's entitlement and abandonment. Our dsa councilors are in denial of the facts and frankly, dishonest. They're open about police abolition, which is ridiculous. I care for victims of gun violence, domestic violence, stabbing, and adult. And this includes children. The hospital is regularly on lockdown due to gun violence and surrounding areas and parks. We now have metal detectors at every entrance after security guard was killed on site. I myself am a victim of domestic violence, assault and car theft. We want and need police and to say anything different is a complete fallacy. It shows the progressive caucus would rather double down on their political ideologies than protect the public. I've heard no mention of cutting their own multi-million dollar security budget. We don't want to lose traffic enforcement, human trafficking missions, or psr support. We don't want delayed 911 response times, which are critical to the health of the community. I was at the 2020 protests and I'm proud of the reforms ppb has made, including an oversight board and community policing. Ppb, thank you for your service. I'd like to add we're on the stolen land of the kalapuya tribe, who have been invisible in this conversations regarding reparations, and you better watch out for them to sue. Next, I encourage all of you to support the mayor's proposed budget, widely supported by the public, and support our public servants. Thanks,

Speaker: For joining us online. Go ahead and unmute if.

Speaker: You.

Speaker: Hello. My mother and I own a small property management company that was started by my grandfather over 40 years ago in the lloyd center area. We have

a diverse group of tenants who work in various industries ranging from nonprofit community outreach. Gun violence prevention software, audio visual services, kids after school programs, and high end auto repair. We do our best to keep our three blocks of buildings clean and safe for all of our tenants and their clients and customers. Over the last few years, this has become increasingly difficult when our tenants clients arrive to drop off their children for classes or deliver vehicles for repair, they are met with the unpleasantness of mobile homes, unlicensed cars, dealing drugs and leaving trash and human waste along the properties. Often, camper vans are parked in front of our buildings for upwards of 6 to 8 weeks, and their presence deters people from wanting to use our tenant services, thus negatively affecting their businesses and income. We have heard from our tenants directly how some of their clients are no longer using their services, because they do not place in the area. Our tenants are not able to maintain their business income that will not only hurt them, but will hurt us. As the landlords who are financially responsible for these properties, we are aware that there are only about eight people employed with pbob to address parking and car camping, and given the state of the city, that is not enough. We need more funding towards pbob and the police that will focus specifically on removing people and vehicles who continue to cause issues for local businesses. I continue to observe the city leadership putting the needs of those individuals above the needs of property and business owners in the city. It is families like ours and people like our tenants, who make every effort to keep commerce going in our neighborhoods and generate tax revenue. It is time for the city to take significant steps towards resources for pbob and police to help business owners. Thank you.

Speaker: Todd littlefield, next up, we have kai mcmurtry. Giles gardner. Dave crapo, anastasia howard, rob martineau and tara carlson.

Speaker: Welcome. Thank you all for being here.

Speaker: Would you like us to start.

Speaker: Please, dave, for the record, my name is dave crapo. I am a chapter chair with ask me 189 and I'm the city's first park ranger dispatcher. I and my team, the dispatch team, are also in the process of receiving our layoff notices this week. So my job right now is to earn your vote in favor of budget amendments that will restore park park ranger dispatch for our funding, and then to place us under 311311. Management is prepared and ready to receive and support us in our work, and we believe that this is the best solution for everyone. If these amendments do not pass, our workflow will stop and there is no serious plan in place to take over our functions. Ranger calls will stop, will stack up and work queue, and they will be passed out to rangers as time permits. Frequently after problems have passed with no resolutions. So I have three observations about our work that I need everybody to understand. First, ranger dispatch lightens the load for pbem and boec by taking non-emergency calls and correctly routing them to safety resources around the city. Usually that's a ranger team and sometimes we partner with others. We are a force multiplier for Portland safety and security apparatus, and that helps with neighborhood livability. Second, we provide critical access to community services for people who are usually not comfortable calling city services. We help triage calls. We help people get social services, and we help people get health resources. Third, Portland is a union town. We are represented labor. We're the cheapest labor on the ranger team and we need your help. Please vote for our amendments.

Speaker: Hi, I'm tara carlson.

Speaker: Asked me 189, vice president and building plans examiner for ppe and City Councilors. We are deeply concerned about any proposed layoffs of workers at ppe and any mandated halt to honor reserves and waiving of sdc fees as we move

into peak construction season. Our bureau had no intention of decreasing our staffing levels this year because of a steady climb toward cost recovery. And yet, there is still an amendment that mandates ppe to reduce the draw on reserves and decrease bureau costs through employee layoffs. This action will cause our community to endure additional, longer wait times for critical construction, development and community services. Due to the 71 layoffs we already endured in January 2024. While waiving sdc fees will likely promote an influx of permits, we share pbot, bes, water and parks concerns that fee losses will continue to strain critical infrastructure with unintended consequences on our legacy of livability. Portland has fallen behind major city jurisdictions nationwide by not implementing a steady governance from general funds for our building department to manage the inevitable ebbs and flows of construction. We agree with councilor smith that the amendment to retain 31 jobs and reduce the drawdown of reserves did not go far enough. We stand by smith's proposal to provide a one time fund of 9.5 million to pd to preserve all staffing levels by amending pirtle-guiney amendment 101.

Speaker: Here's my part.

Speaker: Of the.

Speaker: Hello, I'm anastasia howard. I'm an afscme 189 chapter chair, and I have worked for ten years at the Portland permitting and development bureau in the property compliance division. Picking up where I left off. Management forecasts are management forecasts that layoffs will balloon permit services backlogs and increase program losses. That resulted from the 71 staff layoffs in January 2024. For example, on time plan reviews are down to 90%. Wait times for free appointments for customers to get help with their permit applications have increased to four days and will likely be eliminated. The residential building inspectors are averaging 295 inspections daily among 13 inspectors, which hasn't proved easy. Layoffs of

inspectors from 7 to 3 will decrease inspections from 70 to only 23 a day, hampering the mayor's initiatives toward new construction of affordable housing and business revitalization downtown. The property compliance division was forced to shut down yearly. Systematic. Inspection programs for multifamily rentals. Citywide. Demand for inspections for unpermitted construction, health and safety violations, and squatter houses is increasing. We currently have 889 properties in active code enforcement, alongside a backlog of 406 citywide complaints that are waiting for an inspector. We welcome the opportunity to further discuss how we can continue our mission to promote safety, livability and economic vitality in line with the city's compliance goals and our shared dedication to public service. We thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, Portland City Council. My name is Rob Martineau. I'm the president of AFSCME local 189 and a water operations mechanic in the Portland Water Bureau. The last 25 years, in addition to these cuts and permits and parks, which easily connect to housing and livability in Portland, there's an additional additional thing that I issue I'd like to raise. And that is the constant cutting of vacancies. That seems to be how all bureaus are forced to balance budgets. Those vacancies of my members are real work. Those are people that should be in the queue to be hired. Those are Portlanders that need good jobs, and we need to figure out how we put back these vacancies. I understand it may not happen in this budget, but it needs to happen in the next. The work will still need to be done. Another area that's easy to forget is Port Portland's 14th elected official, and that's the office of our auditor. As a result of this budget, the one person who does the training on records retention for all of the agencies and bureaus in Portland is being laid off. So where we talk about transparency, with which all of us at this dais have done it, it is antithetical to that, to unfund the support to the entire city of that

records retention. And you all have one hell of a task. You have gotten here halfway through a budget cycle, and it's always budget season in Portland. I am encouraged at the progress that this council has made, and I'm excited to. You all have a full budget cycle to really guide Portland forward as we move into our next budget season. Good luck.

Speaker: Thank you all for being here.

Speaker: May I also please share? I have a letter signed by 26 park rangers and also a fact sheet about our work.

Speaker: To our clerk, and she'll make sure that it gets to all of our offices. Thank you so much. Yeah.

Speaker: Thanks. Giles is joining us online.

Speaker: Good afternoon, council members. My name is giles gardner. I'm a Portland resident and an isa board certified master arborist. I want to express my clear opposition to council member zimmerman's proposed amendment, which will have devastating long term effects on Portland's tree canopy. I'm here to urge you to preserve funding for urban forestry permitting and regulation team, and to protect Portland's tree code. Cutting, staffing and weakening protections will dismantle years of progress at a time when our urban canopy is more important than ever. Mature trees are not easily replaced. While new trees can be planted, survival rates are low and it takes decades for them to deliver the same benefits. Large, established trees provide unmatched value and cooling neighborhoods, improving air quality, increasing property values, and reducing stormwater runoff. These benefits are especially vital in underserved communities already suffering from heat inequity and low canopy coverage. The urban forestry permitting and regulation team are not bureaucratic overhead. They're highly skilled public servants doing essential climate resilience work. Recent staffing improvements

have dramatically reduced permitting delays. Cutting that staff now will reverse this progress. This proposal will disproportionately harm Portland's most vulnerable communities and result in lasting environmental and public health costs. Please don't trade long term livability for short term savings. Preserve urban forestry. Protect the trees we still have. Once they're gone, we can't get them back. Thank you.

Speaker: Go ahead. Hi.

Speaker: Good afternoon, mayor wilson and councilors. My name is kai mcmurtry. I'm a resident of d-3. I appreciate you making this additional space to hear public testimony on the budget. I rewatched your discussion at the close of the may 21st marathon session. In response to avalos first amendment to, quote unquote, increase the ppb budget. As a Portland taxpayer, it is insulting to me to hear some councilors position that 1.9 million as somehow the make or break amount of a budget in excess of \$300 million, a budget that's up almost 8% is already the largest recipient of general fund dollars in the city. Those who opposed the redirection to parks wanted us to believe that it signaled some great concession to lawlessness. If \$2 million made us safe, then \$300 million should make us safe 150 times over, right? You know what many contribute? What else? Many contribute to a feeling of public safety. Litter removal. Lighting. Amenity repairs, ada barrier removal. All things that are being cut in our cherished public spaces by the current reduction in parks maintenance dollars. I am encouraged by avalos three. Koyama lane eight. Excuse me. Koyama lane eight. Novick two. Morillo seven. But I got to go to work and walk my dog and I cannot digest all that y'all are being asked to take on. So I have to speak to my values, which unfortunately leaves me open to interpretation because we are all using the word safety, but we mean different things by it. I don't think the state's threat of violence and incarceration can build a world of true,

holistic community and safety. In every year that we increase the police budget at the expense of alternative methodologies, including well-maintained parks and public spaces, we are choosing to delay real community harmony. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

Speaker: Next up we have benjamin gilbert, kevin christiansen. Marie tidball, jordan lewis.

Speaker: Thank you for being here.

Speaker: My name is benjamin gilbert, and I'm a tenant in district four and a member of the Portland democratic socialists of America. I'd like to voice strong support for green ten. We can we can afford to cut from the external material and services budget, which is funding overwhelmingly directed towards consultants and redirects work away from represented city employees. It also funds the necessary study to facilitate the expansion of Portland street response, protects tenants and funds the arts. We need to defend the increase. Don't give the police more than they need and more than they asked for. When I look at los angeles right now, I see what an overfunded and overfunded police department looks like. I also strongly urge councilors to support morillo 16, which supports tenants in the midst of a housing crisis. Also, vote yes on avalos three. We need accountability on police overtime. Just look at san francisco, where an audit found police overtime was rife with fraud and abuse. When my neighbor was injured in front of my northwest apartment, more than six police officers came and harassed them, making them feel unsafe. I, I bought my neighbor a bottle, a cool bottle of water to help with his head wound and walked him back to his apartment. This seems like an overfunded police department. It seems inefficient, and it seems like we can take care of our neighbors. Like Portland street response would be better served to do this kind of work, and we don't need six people showing up when one one gentleman has a

head wound who can just be walked back to his apartment, I did that. They didn't do that. Thank you.

Speaker: Jordan.

Speaker: Hello? City Council. I'm Jordan Lewis with Portland DSA. I also live in the state stadium hood as well. I'm here today thanking everyone who voted yes on the police increase. 90 unfilled positions don't keep us safe. And the move would save parks employees jobs while not a single officer would lose theirs. Police conspire with ICE and threaten cutting human trafficking work at the first whiff of accountability. I'm also here in support of the increase to TNC, Uber, Lyft fees, as well as canal 717 towards a driver resource center. I checked the Lyft app just now, and a ride one way from here to Kaiser Interstate East is \$15. Meanwhile, a TriMet ride costs less than \$3. The additional dollar 35 fee on rides would be a splash in the bucket for such a luxury convenience. To be clear, I support funds being used on a driver resource center. I'm really here against the apps themselves and asking you to take it even higher. The Uber and Lyft app sent out alerts telling customers to show up and stall this effort, not unlike in May, when they did the same thing in Illinois asking users to testify against a transit funding bill. This bill failed, pushing transit over the fiscal cliff and forcing Chicago to cut up to 30% of their transit service. These apps function by undermining public transit and union taxi services with exploited labor. This is not the behavior of a public servant. This is the behavior of a tobacco company. If climate change is a problem, if road fatalities are a problem, if traffic congestion is a problem, the fee needs to be higher. \$2 is a start, but please put it towards a driver resource center as well. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you both for being here.

Speaker: Checking on Kevin Christiansen Marie table. Next we have Jeremy Smith, Jim Labby, Yoko Silk, Jesse Hannon.

Speaker: Mr. I'm sorry.

Speaker: Good afternoon, councilors and mayor wilson, my name is jeremy smith. I've been following the coalescence of the district for coalition over the past year and a half. What I've seen is concerning councilor clark's amendment. Nine motions to increase funding for the district four coalition by \$80,000 to boost their newsletter reach. The newsletter does not need \$80,000 and can be grown organically at preexisting community events and utilizing social media to its full potential. Right now, it's only on facebook declining. It's a dying social media. We need to do better. At this June 2nd district four coalition board meeting, a \$3,000 celebratory dinner at the lan su chinese garden was planned. This option was chosen over a community picnic that would have been open to everybody. Coalition president jesse burke, who is also the chair of the old town community association, used their pulpit to speak about bottledrop concerns for over 30 minutes in the media or in the meeting, prioritizing the concerns of her neighborhood over the 31 other neighborhoods that they are supposed to represent. Zimmerman. Amendment eight motions to restore 130,000in funding to the district coalition office operations, and 180 k to the district coalition office. Grants. Any funds given to district four will be disproportionately applied to the old town community association, a neighborhood that just received \$30,000 from Multnomah County for the community vitality and economy opportunity grant. Over the past few days, ppb has been communicating with, aiding and abetting federal immigration and customs enforcement down at the south waterfront. Please vote no on clark amendment nine, zimmerman amendment eight, and the \$2 million Portland police bureau increase. Thank you.

Speaker: Good afternoon, mayor and City Council. My name is jim lavie. I'm a district two resident. I'm here to oppose zimmerman two and three and support

green amendment ten. From 2002 to 2016, I served as urban conservationist for the Oregon bird alliance and staff the east Portland office out at least botanical garden. And during that time I served on the citywide tree project stakeholder committee, and then subsequently, several years later, on the title 11 citywide tree code oversight committee. So I spent a lot of time with the tree code. It emerged that project emerged at a genuine grassroots movement across the city in 2007 to protect and safeguard the urban forest by revising very outdated city tree code regulations. Amendment four is four would basically got those efforts, those decade long efforts to try to improve those policies and their implementation. I get there's issues with the code, but the budget process is not the way to deal with with those code issues. Let's debate the code. Let's not gut the program via the budget. Urban forestry staff that we cut do more than inspection. They do education and information sharing, which is the critical part of that project. And I understand this is maybe a strategy to cut parks, to fund parks. That doesn't get us anywhere. A much better approach is green ten, which partially addressed the cuts to parks in the mayor's proposed budget.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Mr. Ryan.

Speaker: Go ahead ma'am. Oh, sorry. Go ahead.

Speaker: Yoko silk I'm a district two resident and a Portland parks employee. I want to say thank you to councilors morillo green, avalos. Dunphy, canal novick. Koyama lane for your yes. Vote for the redirection of \$1.9 million from police to parks. Councilor Ryan, I'm hoping that I can see you uphold supporting parks like you used to do when you were commissioner. When I'm also a parks employee under you. I cannot believe that this decision about 1.9 million redirect is being contested. Honestly, pb got exactly the budget they requested, plus some. And this

redirection is just slightly reduces their increase. While all the other bureaus are facing massive cuts, parks is still facing an \$8 million in cuts. Please stop spreading the false narrative that this is somehow defunding police. It is not. This redirection of 1.9 million is helpful for parks maintenance maintenance, but it isn't even enough. Please work to fund parks fully. I was a part time casual staffer for years ago and have been an fte union member for the past ten years. I know firsthand the incredible value of city nature programing, for example, that is still on the proposed cut list. These high roi programs that serve over 7000 youth a year are still posed to lose, poised to lose all funding for casual staff, which is over 100 positions. What makes these programs, which will make these programs impossible to run and reduces valuable job opportunities for Portland residents? The police bureau budget is 67% larger than it was ten years ago. More police don't keep crime off the streets, but engaging youth programs does. Healthy parks systems do programs that provide childcare like recreation, summer camps? Do. They are an investment in our city's welfare and Portland's future. Funding youth programs is funding public safety. Funding parks is public safety. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you all.

Speaker: Jessie hannon, tim larson, nike green, eric knox, glen.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilors. My name is jessie hannon. I've lived in Portland most of my life. I'm a district three resident. I'm honestly a little confused why we're even talking about this. My understanding is that the Portland police got the budget increase they asked for and Portland parks, even if they were to receive the \$1.9 million budget bonus, would still be looking at an \$8 million shortfall. I think we all understand that we, the Portland police bureau, is not underfunded currently, and the Portland parks bureau is especially youth programs are well known to reduce crime in the city, and we seem to have hit the maximum of how much police

funding will even do that. So I'm urging all the council members to please retain the \$1.9 million with the Portland parks rather than give it to the police department, which didn't even ask for it. Thank you.

Speaker: My name is tim larson and I've spoken to the your predecessors and City Council and dan before, and it kind of reminds me of speaking to an assembly at the deaf school in Washington, in Vancouver, without having a sign language translator. I hope that I have got your attention now because this is really important. What is defunding the police mean, or taking money away from the police budget mean? First, there's the extension existential crisis for business community in Portland. Downtown Portland property values have plummeted 57% since 2019, from 3 billion to just 1.3 billion. There was an article in the paper the other day that the old town pizza owner had purchased the merchant hotel building that he was in for \$2.5 million, while just in 2017, the previous owner paid \$12.5 million for that building. Then we have the human crisis. I'm a rideshare driver myself. In the last two years, I have given rides to a 78 year old man who was stabbed three times at an east Portland mac station, a 40 year old, 74 year old hispanic woman who was hit on the head by a 38 pound rock wielded by a homeless man, causing three life threatening cracks to her skull and sending her to the icu. By the way, this was the same mentally ill homeless man who just weeks before had critically injured a woman doctor who was jogging on northwest 23rd. We need more police. We need police to protect us.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: My name is nike green. I am the ceo and founder of triple threat mentoring, a 50 year plus resident. And in district two, we're a small, deeply rooted, black led organization which was recently awarded funding through the Portland

children's levy for mentoring mayor, madam president and council members. We're grateful for the opportunity to be here today and share our perspective, especially given that we were previously asked not to lobby or provide any testimony. So here we are, not just sitting in front of you, but in the room, the balcony and watching online. We are a coalition of organizations, including the ethiopian and eritrean cultural resource center, also mentors and triple threat that were significantly impacted by the decisions you made in the last council. Pcl remained. Our organizations work within black communities, within workforce development, science, education, college and career readiness, and intensive mentoring across all of our nonprofits. Over 90% of our board member, staff, mentor, and constituents identify as black, so we are disheartened by the decision to reallocate funds to previously funded organizations, many of them larger legacy nonprofits, at the expense of smaller, black led orgs that have long been underfunded and overlooked. So what is our ask? That you would fully fund all newly awarded grants for at least the first year to prevent gaps in our services? If review is necessary, we ask that you do a partial remand to the limited to only the specific hunger relief funding lane in question, rather than delaying the full cohort. Thank you for listening.

Speaker: My name is eric knox. I'm the executive director and.

Speaker: Founder of holla. I've been in Portland for 35 years. I've been in mentorship for 31 years. I live in the community I serve. I don't drive into that community. I fully embody this work because I believe, especially for my black and brown babies, you can't be what you haven't seen. I have the resources to not live there, but I do, because that's the heart and essence of mentoring. So today I stand with my sister nike and the other two black led mentoring organization, elso and ethiopian cultural and resource center, harmed by your recent remands of the pcl

Portland children's levy, which protects previously funded groups for another year while leaving thousands of black families and youth in limbo. We applied, we interviewed, we planned with integrity. Holla was recommended by a community led, equity rooted process for a reason. For over a decade, we've centered lived experience equity and delivered real impact. Now, we ask the council to honor that process and protect the progress. One fully fund all newly awarded grants for at least one year to prevent gaps in services. Two if a review is necessary. Limited to hunger relief lane, don't stall the entire cohort. Request a report from pcl outlining the safeguards and fairness measures built into the process. This is about community trust, continuity of service and the city's own commitment to equity. We're not asking for special treatment, just consistency. We're not asking for charity. We're just asking for respect. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Speaker: Thank you all for being here.

Speaker: Todd littlefield, appreciate.

Speaker: All.

Speaker: Todd littlefield I live in district one.

Speaker: Good afternoon. Councilors. Mayor wilson, thank you for your hard work, persistence, determination. Your budget is thoughtful, restrained, with the right priorities. After seeing the lawlessness and chaos which occurred Saturday night, which my neighborhood and many in Portland have lived with on a daily basis, going on a decade now, I googled, why do we have laws? They the ai generated response laws are crucial for maintaining order. They establish standards of accepted behavior, ensuring fairness. In essence, laws are the foundation of a well-functioning society. Without laws, society would be prone to chaos and conflict. They are essential for ensuring that everyone has the opportunity to live a safe, productive and fulfilling life. When Portland does not have enough officers to send

and stop anarchy. Saturday night at Lloyd center and several other locations, we have a major problem. It's a miracle no one was killed. Have there been any amendments to improve the budget, reflecting funding and mandating the hiring of hundreds of more officers immediately? The one meeting income is far below the other districts. We have 40% of the city's children, yet we have councilors who voted to dramatically increase the cost to play golf, thus robbing our children of the opportunity to learn or enjoy the game. What are the council's morals, priorities, standards and values? Thank you.

Speaker: Murray is joining us online.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Can you hear me?

Speaker: We can hear you.

Speaker: Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is Marie Table. As a person of white privilege, I applaud councilor Clark's comment about the 8.5 billion for displaced Black families, and that it only begins the process of making people whole. I urge you to vote no for councilor Clark and Zimmerman's budget amendments funding the district coalition neighborhood association system, Clark and Zimmerman apparently are determined to make people whole, but these are primarily white, privileged folks who will benefit from this inequitable system. For example, councilor Clark will donate \$2,000 each to the neighbor for district four neighborhood associations, whose past actions in the 90s contributed to today's segregated Portland, as documented in the 2019 report on our racist land use history. Councilor Clark also proposes \$80,000 of taxpayer funds for the district four coalition newspaper propaganda media that prohibits letters to the editor from the public. Last week, the taxpayer funded district four coalition announced they will start a neighborhood watch program with the police. Portland's neighborhood

watch program was dissolved in 2019, likely because studies show the program incites racial profiling and vigilantism. You may remember 17 year old trayvon martin was shot and killed by a neighborhood watch volunteer. Finally, last week, leslie hammond announced the district four coalition will spend \$3,000 of taxpayer funds for a celebration of success dinner held exclusively for board members and their significant others at longview gardens district four. Coalition may hold the distinction for being Portland's only taxpayer funded organization, currently flush with cash. Thank you.

Speaker: Next up, we have diane salazar, patrick tran, audrey caines, micah meskill.

Speaker: Welcome. Go right ahead.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilors I'm.

Speaker: Diane salazar.

Speaker: All right.

Speaker: District one.

Speaker: Tenant first. Quickly I support the rideshare.

Speaker: Union demands.

Speaker: Now, let me be frank.

Speaker: Councilors.

Speaker: I ask.

Speaker: You.

Speaker: Why are you so eager to.

Speaker: View department.

Speaker: Budgets as.

Speaker: Indispensable? Except for the police budget? If we need to plug gaps, then we ought to reject the notion that any specific department is solely the.

Speaker: One to bear that burden.

Speaker: That's not to reject police accountability, police reform, or say that the police budget is perfect. But at the current moment, this feels more like a Vendetta than a targeted move to sustain.

Speaker: Parks.

Speaker: Especially through targeting police recruitment funds. That's not good governance, that's grandstanding. I hope I'm proven wrong about this, but at this moment I voiced my concerns about this budget. I hope this does not become. A pattern. Milwaukee, wisconsin a diverse, progressive city, provides a better model through progressive mayor cavalier johnson, because accountability and fairness are what truly matters. That's what Portland believes in. Let's turn that value into our budget commitment. By adopting the mayor's budget and funding the auditor's office fully. Lastly, is a community advisory councilor. I oppose a top down budget reallocations. Thank you.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Thank you for the.

Speaker: Opportunity to.

Speaker: Be here today.

Speaker: Today I join my nonprofit colleagues from earlier. My name is patrick tran. I work with elsa inc, a nonprofit founded by two black women and led by the board, constituents and staff that.

Speaker: Are.

Speaker: All 90% black. I'm honored to speak today with their trust. I would like to address the integrity and equity of the pcl grant process. In my 15 years as a

nonprofit fundraising executive, this is the most inclusive and equity focused process I've seen. Public or private pcl brought a bipoc consulting firm to help hundreds of community voices and lived experience that this committee questioned. Last week, the citizen oversight committee leveled the playing field, giving new community groups a real shot and fixing flaws like outlier scores, equity and fairness in action. For a year, community rooted organizations went through an exhaustive, equity centered grantmaking process. We showed up, we followed the rules, and under pcl's well thought out process, no organization had any issues with the process. That is, until the recommendations came out. The decision now before this body risks undermining the process and sending a message that even when bipoc organizations meet the bar, their funding is still negotiable, especially when lobbying and bias comes into play by organizations with more resources and connections to city leaders. That is the core of what happened at last week's meeting, not the equity centered process that has been years in the making. That meeting and decision were not equitable. We urge you to honor the process, respect the recommendations, and restore the funding to the youth that we serve. Thank you.

Speaker: Micah.

Speaker: Mayor and councilors.

Speaker: My name is mike mescal, and I'm representing the alliance of Oregon and our 10,000 local members. I urge you today to not support councilor zimmerman's attempts to defund the urban forestry program or shift any of its capacity over to pnd. A letter submitted yesterday by over a dozen local health environmental livability organizations on why we collectively oppose zimmerman's attempts to defund the program. The mayor's proposed budget already included a nine fte reduction to urban forestry to align with the city's overall budget reductions, and

any additional staffing cuts to this team would severely impact its ability to meet the city's and community goals. We understand this is a tough budget year, but urge you not to further cut this program's budget, as it will have short term and long term impacts on the city's trees. Additional urban forestry regulatory or code compliance team, which protect our current tree canopy and is a valuable asset of our community. Valued at over \$9 billion. This this group, the code compliance group, educates the public on the importance of trees and supports urban forestry's entire scope of work. Any further defunding of this team could roll back much needed progress in managing this asset. And finally, facing our deferred maintenance problem. The community has worked for years with the city to align their urban forestry program capacity with demands for services, balancing robust and cohesive set of non-regulatory and regulatory tools, improved inner bureau coordination and accountability for the cuts would have dire impacts for longer term public.

Speaker: Health.

Speaker: So please oppose councilor zimmerman's attempts to defund. Thank you.

Speaker: Jacqueline.

Speaker: Hello everyone. My name is jacqueline rivera.

Speaker: And.

Speaker: I'm currently.

Speaker: 22 years old. I was born and raised here in southeast Portland, and I started working with Portland parks and recreation. When I was 15 years old. I got denied the first time and then reapplied and completely fell in love with this job. Portland parks and rec has given me so many amazing opportunities, so it saddens me to hear that we aren't going to receive enough funding. I specifically work with

the youth conservation crew, which this crew, I've loved it. I've been with them for like about 4 or 5 years, and I'm back now being a crew leader for a group, I will be I will be leading a youth group of nine kids from ages 14 to 18, and I believe it's really important to have these kids come out with us and explore parks. If it wasn't for Portland parks and recreation, I don't think I'd be outside doing all of this nature work. So I give a big thanks to everyone that has led me into this position. I did give a speech to mayor ted Wheeler back in 2020 for Portland parks and rec funding, and thanks to him, he was able to give us funding. And also thanks to my position with Portland parks and rec, I've inspired other people in my family to pursue careers outdoors, such as metro. My sister daniella, she's currently 16 years old, and she gives tours for metro at the Oregon zoo. I believe it's really important that we get more funding, so we get youth educated on why it's important to keep all these parks healthy and safe. Because Portland keeping Portland parks doesn't only make a healthier city, it keeps everyone happy. And we have beautiful parks and I hope we can continue to protect them. Thank you guys so much for listening to me.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: For being here.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Next up we have ernie munch, daniel barbato, anand. Anand jain and henry kaiser. Henry is joining us online. Go ahead henry. Henry, can you hear us? All right, we'll come back to henry. One more time. Ernie munch, daniel barbato, anand jain. Okay, we'll move on to carol orloff. Robert ball, janet parker. Okay, I see henry is connected. Go ahead. Henry.

Speaker: Is it my turn?

Speaker: Yep. Go ahead.

Speaker: Okay. I'm Henry Kaiser and I am co-chair of the health and safety. Committee of the city club of Portland. And I speak today to advise people of a July 23rd meeting looking at the issue of mental health for the homeless and access to it. There is a lot of myth and misinformation. If people come to this meeting, they'll find out what's possible, what can be done to overcome the challenges, to make it affordable and to make it effective. This will be take place from 6 to 8 p.m. At Cal's restaurant on second avenue. And if we can deal, bring mental health to the homeless, I think we'll do a lot to deal with the homeless issues that are challenging our community. Thank you very much.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: All right. I believe we have Janet Parker online. Janet you're muted.

Speaker: Can you hear me?

Speaker: We can hear you okay.

Speaker: Thank you. My name is Janet Parker I live in district four. The main thing I want to say today is that they don't want any budget cuts to anything to do with public safety in my neighborhood, and I'm nervous about recent news that at least two new homeless shelters will be opening in my neighborhood in the very near future. As a member of Stadium Hood and Friends of Couch Park, I've been impressed with and inspired by the efforts of my neighbors in drawing attention to the serious problems of the flagrantly open use of fentanyl all around us the homeless, mentally ill, and a chronic problem with tent campers, graffiti, vandalism, and all kinds of garbage on the streets and sidewalks. I live in the south end of the Alphabet District between Trinity Episcopal Cathedral and Saint Mary's Catholic Cathedral and school, in a four unit condo building built in 1884, which was a wonderful place to move to. When my husband and I relocated here for.

Speaker: The last 16.

Speaker: Years ago, she tried to sell our beautiful home last year, and though all who came to look at it couldn't believe it hadn't already sold, not one person made an offer on it because of the neighborhood. My now ex husband moved back to new york in late 2023, and I recently bought his share of the house because I still love this neighborhood for all the reasons we initially chose to settle here. I'm doing what I can to help keep this neighborhood from being.

Speaker: Destroyed by.

Speaker: All the stressors on it. We really can't do it without your help. Thank you for the time.

Speaker: Go ahead. Jamie.

Speaker: Greetings, councilor. And mayor. I'm jamie partridge. I'm a retired letter carrier and living in northeast Portland district two. I am speaking in favor of a number of amendments here. The current proposed budget increases police funding from the general.

Speaker: Fund.

Speaker: Bringing the police bureau's total budget to 318 million for the 20 2526 fiscal year. Portland police bureau is the city. The general fund 34% in 2425 and in 20 2526 would bring it to 38%. This. All the while, Portland is looking at a huge \$65 million budget deficit. Or maybe it's more. Mayor wilson is proposing to cut every other public service except the Portland police bureau in a time when we could be making cuts, should be making cuts to police, and investing in the services and programs that truly make our communities safe. In a time when white supremacists are in control of the federal government and targeting vulnerable communities, see los angeles. The historic connection and overlap between white supremacists and the police in this region. Specifically, it's illogical to prioritize police for crisis response, recently observed Portland police assisting the immigration and customs

enforcement, removing protesters attempting to defend our immigrant neighbors. It's a clear violation of our sanctuary city guidelines. So I support the green amendment to increase the police fund parks. Et cetera. And in favor of the green amendment ten for housing tenants, parks, arts and Portland street response. Thank you very much.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Okay. Checking for ernie munch, daniel barbato. And jain carol orloff, robert ball, megan murphy. Corinne frechette. Misha litvak. John hollister. Darren campbell.

Speaker: Good afternoon council. My name is nicholas desai.

Speaker: I live.

Speaker: In.

Speaker: District three.

Speaker: I'm a.

Speaker: City employee.

Speaker: However, I'm here today on my own time representing my personal views. I'm here to speak in opposition to the amendments to eliminate urban forestry, permitting staff and funding. I'm going to begin with a quote from william sullivan, a researcher at the university of illinois. Lack of green infrastructure in the urban environment is the greatest predictor of mortality among low income communities, like sewers and city streets, our cities trees across all property types function as infrastructure. Trees play a vital role in mitigating the effects of climate change and improving our public and environmental health. The city tree code is an implementation tool of Portland's urban forest plan. This plan reflects industry best practice for managing green infrastructure, and it was written to intentionally align

with the city core values. Together, the tree code and management plan work to protect and grow our urban forests so that all Portlanders will have access to.

Speaker: Shade.

Speaker: Clean air, mental, better mental health, cooler neighborhoods, and more trees are an investment in our future. If these amendments pass, they'll have a devastating effect on the livability of our city for generations to come. With immigrant refugee people of color and low income communities suffering the most, our most vulnerable communities. Thank you.

Speaker: Go ahead.

Speaker: My name is john hollister.

Speaker: I live in district four. In mid.

Speaker: 2020, City Council voted to defund the police by \$15 million.

Speaker: Then in November.

Speaker: 2020, City Council tried to reduce the police budget by another 18 million, but commissioner Ryan cast the deciding vote against this ridiculous proposal. Thank you dan, I love you very much. Five of you who publicly supported the defund the police campaign on their website would have voted to cut another 18,000,000 in 2020. Thank god you weren't in office at this time, one of you said, diverting \$1.9 million from the police wasn't a cut, that no one would lose their job. Last year, Portland had the highest number of police retirements in history. You're voting not to replace any of them. Nordstrom, multiple safeways, rei, walmart are all on month to month leases as they plan their departures because of safety issues. You think Portland has a budget shortfall now? Just wait. Oh one correction rei and walmart have already left. Commissioner novick, I campaigned for you because you put public safety first. I feel betrayed. This vote is on you. How do you want to be remembered in 2026 at reelection time and beyond? Commissioner

dunphy, I also campaigned for you. We discussed this. You put public safety as your number one. And I feel the same betrayal. I'm nick fish is turning over in his grave. He is cremated. But you know what I mean. This vote is on you. Actually, trump is hoping you vote to take all 1.9 million away because he'd love to send the national guard here. Like like when Portland can't handle the big next, next big incidents. Just like he's in la and new york.

Speaker: Very much.

Speaker: My name is michelle. I'm the vice president.

Speaker: Of afscme. Local 1790. Representing frontline behavioral healthcare workers in our city's homeless shelters. I myself.

Speaker: Am also a case. Manager working at one.

Speaker: Of the village model shelters. I've been here a.

Speaker: Couple.

Speaker: Times before now.

Speaker: So these. Cuts to.

Speaker: Our.

Speaker: Services, they they punished.

Speaker: The workers.

Speaker: This is like an.

Speaker: Austerity measure that punishes workers. It leaves us less able to do our jobs. I'm hearing all this about the police are not able to do their jobs and their budgets getting increased, or people are wanting to increase the budget. We don't get that same treatment right now. We are being punished for. I mean, basically policies and practices that are being enacted by people who will not be affected by this, these contractors, these ceos, they can they can sign up again, they can propose to run something else 2 or 3 years down the line, the people who work at

these programs, the people we serve, we don't have those options. We just faced our third round of layoffs since January 2025. It's going to leave us without peer mentors who are people who, you know, they show the way out. These are people with lived experience. Less budget is less staff, less safety, less services, and worse outcomes. I yield back the rest of my time. Thank you.

Speaker: Good afternoon.

Speaker: Council president pirtle-guiney vice.

Speaker: President and councilors.

Speaker: Mr. Mayor, mr.

Speaker: Jordan.

Speaker: My name is darren campbell. For the last three years I've chaired the pbot private hire transportation advisory.

Speaker: Committee.

Speaker: And I'm here to speak on.

Speaker: The. Increase to the ride fees of \$1.35.

Speaker: My personal belief is that it needs to be more than that. I've met with many of you. And I've spoken towards this. In since the time that uber and lyft have come.

Speaker: To.

Speaker: Portland, uber has increased their. Safety fee, their ride fee. From \$1 to \$5. And in that same amount of time, the city of Portland has increased to 50 cent ride fee to \$0.65. This is an overdue increase. I think it's too little. I think incrementally you can increase it an extra dollar every year until you get up to that \$5 mark. But more more than that, I think you're leaving money on the table. I think you need to include taxis and shuttles, and I also think you need to add the lime bikes and the and the other bikes. These are fees that people will not blink an eye

at paying. Now uber and lyft, they will come screaming saying that the number of trips are going to drop. They're going to see less trips per year. And I'm here to tell you they're absolutely right. They're going to have about 1.5 to 2 million trips. Go right to trimet because that's what they took early on when their trips were so inexpensive. So doing this increase, you're going to help trimet as well. I appreciate your time. Thank you so much.

Speaker: Thank you all.

Speaker: Next.

Speaker: Next up we have jay nicholson kevin matches, benson raby emily stevens. Go ahead.

Speaker: All right. Thanks. My name is jay nicholson. I'm here yet again to bring forth the concerns of representative shelter and behavioral health workers. And asked me local 1790 recent budget restrictions handed to some of our represented shelter organizations by Portland solutions have destroyed our client assistance funds used to help people afford necessary documentation, transportation, phone services, and housing costs. Additional cuts have been made to case management services, peer services, and the overall staffing of shelter programs. It's a critical loss and will have a disproportionate impact on clients with disabilities and those belonging to other marginalized communities. Many of the city's moves seem to draw from this narrative that people struggling with homelessness are apathetic. They need only to clean up their act and get a full time job. What about people who can't work a full time job can't save for housing? What about people who need the aid of peer services, case management, or assistance funds to address their obstacles to income or housing? Do you plan to keep them in purgatory? You can end unsheltered homelessness. You can push people out of sight and corral them to holding spaces with nothing else to offer. You can get them out of the way, but

where does that leave them? Years ago, a fellow colleague shared this metaphor with me that I will remember for the rest of my life. If you don't roll out to someone who's drowning and try to make them swim, you bring them to shore and offer support. With the acquisition of and ensuing cuts to these programs at the hands of Portland solutions, you, the city of Portland, are sending a clear message. If you can't keep up with the boat, just drown already. If any of you want to change this trajectory, the time to act is now. Reinforce funding for supportive services. Reexamine the budget decisions being made by Portland solutions. We aren't giving up, and neither should you. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Kevin is joining us online.

Speaker: Thank you. My name is Kevin.

Speaker: Matches.

Speaker: Counselors I'm concerned about.

Speaker: A pattern. Of misinformation being given to this body.

Speaker: In a May 14th, 2025, work session, councilor Kanal.

Speaker: Asked.

Speaker: Staff, quote, does.

Speaker: The SFPD.

Speaker: Money show up as an interagency.

Speaker: Into fire and or police and then an expenditure.

Speaker: There, or is the.

Speaker: Money.

Speaker: Completely separate from. Fire and police budgets? End quote staff falsely responded that, quote.

Speaker: It's completely contained within the SFPD system. End quote.

Speaker: This explanation.

Speaker: Was reaffirmed.

Speaker: By staff a second time. In fact, the sfpd bureau sole.

Speaker: Revenue sources.

Speaker: Its property tax.

Speaker: Levy, and.

Speaker: It does provide interagency revenue to opb in.

Speaker: Portland fire.

Speaker: The fpd bureaus expenditures include benefit payments to retired members in the city run pension plan, who were first sworn before 2007. As well as interagency revenue for opb in Portland fire to pay for 100% of Oregon pers contributions, covering members first sworn beginning in 2007, it is the responsibility of opb in Portland fire to send contribution payments along to Oregon pers, but they build these payments back to the.

Speaker: Bureau. I was.

Speaker: I emailed correction to councilor kanal and copied staff. Staff acknowledged the error and thanked me for the correction. On may 15th, however, I was disturbed to read a news article dated June 6th containing a link to a memo from staff repeating this same piece of misinformation. The memo falsely states that Oregon pers contributions are a cost subject to inflation, to be covered by the general fund. The bureau is a topic which has been subject to baseless speculation and outright misinformation in the public record. In my opinion, the lack of adequate discussion at.

Speaker: Councilor reform has contributed to this pattern. Thank you.

Speaker: Emily is joining us online. Please unmute.

Speaker: Hey, can you hear me?

Speaker: We can hear you.

Speaker: Okay, good.

Speaker: My name is emily stebbins.

Speaker: And.

Speaker: I know.

Speaker: You have a lot to talk about.

Speaker: So i'll.

Speaker: Keep this short. I want to urge you.

Speaker: Not to make any.

Speaker: Further cuts to urban forestry.

Speaker: I'm a volunteer with 350 pdx forest defense team, and I've been working on shade equity for several years. Trees provide us all with so many valuable gifts shade and cooling, clean air, water noise reduction, and well-documented mental health benefits. They are a public good, and it is unfair that the burden of caring for them should be shouldered by individual families. The effect of that unfairness is that only neighborhoods where people can afford to take care of trees get to have them. The equitable tree canopy program is just beginning to counter that effect, but urban forestry cannot implement it, or much of the other important work that they do. If the funding is pulled out from under them, please maintain the funding needed to protect our urban forest. Thank you.

Speaker: All right. Checking for megan murphy, corinne frechette. Benson rabe. Okay, we'll move on to kate phillips. John hassan, charlie michelle. Wesley. Devin casey.

Speaker: Hi, council.

Speaker: My name is kate.

Speaker: Phillips, and I'm an icu.

Speaker: Nurse and member of Portland dsa. Growing up in florida, I was accustomed to a lack of. Investment in parks with bathrooms often closed or dirty, and playground equipment that was in disrepair.

Speaker: When I moved.

Speaker: To Portland.

Speaker: I was impressed.

Speaker: With the beauty.

Speaker: Variety.

Speaker: And maintenance of city parks. I moved to my neighborhood and district two specifically to live near peninsula park, which is my favorite in Portland. Parks draw community.

Speaker: Members like.

Speaker: Myself to choose to reside in the city. I strongly assert that city parks are a higher priority than is expressed in this budget. Beautiful public spaces are incredibly important to a healthy community. I urge the council to fully fund parks. Thanks.

Speaker: Go ahead.

Speaker: Good afternoon.

Speaker: My name.

Speaker: Is devin casey.

Speaker: I am a case.

Speaker: Manager and.

Speaker: A union.

Speaker: Steward with 1790, and I work at a safe rest village for a culturally specific for queer and trans individuals. Right now. As it stands, us and our sister site for bipoc homeless individuals are facing severe budget cuts, including layoffs and

elimination of our client assistance funds. Our shelter, to put simply, is being set up to fail. This is a step backwards and a blow for our queer, trans, and bipoc community at a time when it's more and more difficult to be queer, transgender, and bipoc in this country, Portland should not be aiding and abetting the likes of the trump administration and rolling back services and safety nets for queer and trans and bipoc Portlanders. I implore the City Council if there is any way at all to restore funding to our necessary, culturally specific services. This is a chance to show up for queer and trans and bipoc Portlanders, not just in words alone, but with real action. Thank you.

Speaker: Okay. Let's see. Checking on. Amjad. Hassan. Charlie. Michelle. Wesley. Okay, let's move on to justin skolnick, terry parker, christopher olson.

Speaker: I'm here for parks maintenance. Please bear with me. My name is justin skolnick. I'm a graduate of the university of chicago divinity school. I enrolled because sketchy theological ideas had crept into American politics, and no one could tell me why. I have a booklet from the national council of churches examining the christian identity movement. It describes, quote, a theological stalking horse of the organized racists and anti-semites who have found it useful as a rallying symbol and recruiting tool. This is from 1986. Today, that movement's kissing cousins set the federal policy agenda. It is evident to the authors and to generations of religious scholars that personal behavior tends to overlap with metaphysical commitments. Behavior resists reform without a change of heart or a change of infrastructure. The plainly discriminatory patterns of local law enforcement are not the kinds of problems you can fix with money. You can't conjure safety, sacrificing everything else on the altar of policing if recruitment is down. Because critics of police brutality found popular support than what attracted people to the job was brutality. Without changing the heart of the institution, new recruits can only

reproduce the problems. So instead of feeding pb this little treat, please keep our parks clean.

Speaker: Terry parker district three at about 545 this past.

Speaker: Friday.

Speaker: Evening.

Speaker: I was in the hollywood.

Speaker: District when a police vehicle went speeding by eastbound on sandy boulevard, navigating around heavy traffic by traveling east in the. Westbound lanes. That was followed about four minutes later by another police vehicle. Doing the same thing. What became apparent after listening to the tv news, officers were heading to a location on 115th avenue in park row 70 plus blocks away, where a deputy sheriff had shot a suspect. Last month, a motorcyclist crashed into a parked car and was killed at 757 on 57th and tillamook. Had there been police presence in the neighborhood, just maybe the motorcycle would have been caught speeding prior to the crash or not speeding at all. The police were the last to respond to the scene. Police response times are unacceptably too low. If you want vacant storefronts along sandy. If you want to fill vacant storefronts around sandy boulevard with tax paying businesses, sidewalks that are more vibrant, where people can feel safe. And if you want to cut down on shoplifting, vandalism and graffiti, break ins and drug dealing, Portland needs more police officers patrolling the streets, law enforcement and faster law enforcement times. The common sense road to accomplishing these goals is to restore the original \$9.1 million to ppb, as proposed by mayor milson, by mayor wilson. And I would also like to see you fully fund the neighborhood. Our world renowned neighborhood association budgets. Thank you.

Speaker: Christopher is joining us online.

Speaker: Yeah. Can you hear me?

Speaker: We can hear you.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Hello, mayor, council president and council members. My name is Chris Olson and I live in district two. Today I'm speaking on my own behalf. First, I want to express my sincere gratitude to the members of this body who are which are all of you who voted.

Speaker: In favor of last.

Speaker: Week's \$8.5 million settlement agreement for displaced Albina residents. That was the right decision, both morally and legally. That being said, I'm concerned today about the increasing and increasingly disturbing and false narratives coming from reactionary forces in our city who claim to speak for the so-called silent majority. They call for more public safety, but define that almost exclusively in terms of expanding police budgets, rather than investing in social infrastructure that actually keeps our community safe. Let's be clear allocating \$2 million for park maintenance does more for our public safety than increasing the number of armed officers or their hours. For example, if an unhoused person does not have access to a public restroom in parks due to a lack of maintenance, where do we expect them to go? To the restroom? In doorways, in front of businesses, onto our streets. Public infrastructure makes our city safer and healthier for everyone. And on the topic of small businesses that we keep hearing that are disappearing and going away, that are justifying harsher policing and anti-homelessness policies, let's be clear. A lot of these beloved businesses like Rei, Sizzle Pie, Hot Lips, Shoofly Bakery. Why did they close? It's because in most cases, the workers attempted to unionize and were met with retaliation. It's very clear our our safest communities are those that are those with the most resources, and all the people of Portland deserve to be invested in,

not criminalized. So let's stop with the fear, marketing and fear mongering and build a city that works for everyone.

Speaker: Thank you colleagues, I know a few people are looking to have a quick break, so I think we're going to take a ten minute break now instead of waiting until the end of public testimony. Folks, when we get back, we will have about another 40 or so minutes for public testimony. So we should be able to get through all or almost all of the people who are left who have signed up. Colleagues, let's meet back here at 315. We will be on a ten minute recess.

Speaker: So.

Speaker: Welcome back. We are calling today's City Council meeting back into order. Thank you for everyone's patience. We are picking up about two thirds of the way through public testimony, and we should have 30 to 40 minutes left that we can do for public testimony. So I'm hopeful that we can get through everybody. Keelan could you call up our next panel, please?

Speaker: Yes. Thank you. We have henry hazleton, christopher ward, james o'loughlin, leah dawkins.

Speaker: Please go right ahead.

Speaker: Good afternoon.

Speaker: Council. My name is james o'loughlin. I'm a labor representative with liuna 403. I represent parks.

Speaker: Workers.

Speaker: Transportation workers, environmental services workers and basically everything the city does. First, I want to say thank you to everyone that has spoken on behalf of sufficiently funding parks and protecting our urban forestry workers. That work is it's so essential to protecting the city, especially moving forward through our climate crisis. I'm here today to speak about a less visible component

of our work, the environmental system development group in pbot. This group is funded by funding from beis that has been reduced in this budget cycle. That would lead to about 24 fte terminations. Nearly half of those are filled. These workers basically maintain and repair all the equipment that collects water throughout the city, redirects it to our wastewater treatment services plant. And bts has robust ability to fund these positions if they don't fund these positions. The alternative plan is to support emergency work that is likely to cost more. But with \$300 million in contingency and redundant supervisor positions that have been created, the 1.2 million to just keep the staff we have would be worthwhile investment around this council's priorities. Thank you for your time.

Speaker: My name is.

Speaker: Chris ward.

Speaker: Welcome.

Speaker: Councilors to your new role. I want to speak to you as a tree. Care provider in the.

Speaker: Portland metro.

Speaker: Area and.

Speaker: As.

Speaker: A citizen, and I want to urge.

Speaker: You to.

Speaker: Continue your support for urban. Forestry and all of its.

Speaker: Services.

Speaker: Including permitting and.

Speaker: Regulation, at full capacity.

Speaker: Now and in the future. We live.

Speaker: In a.

Speaker: Historic period characterized.

Speaker: By changing warming climate.

Speaker: The urban.

Speaker: Forest canopy provides important.

Speaker: Necessary services for human survival.

Speaker: The future livability of our city depends upon investments.

Speaker: In urban forestry.

Speaker: Now why is that? Consider the urban heat island effect, where in the absence of tree canopy in urban centers, equates to increase in surface temperature compared to the surrounding rural areas. Portland state scientists in a recent paper noted that Portland's annual temperature has increased by three degrees since 1940, and an average 4.6 degree increase in the summer temperatures in that period. They were able to show that surface temperature throughout Portland decreases linearly with canopy coverage. Let's look at this effect as seen in the various social strata in Portland. What about the homeless? Where do they go to escape the heat? That's right. In tents, under the trees, in the parks and the right of ways. What about you? Where do you go to escape the heat? That's right. In your house, under the cooling shade of the trees. This brings us up to a third point. Most of the tree canopy in Portland is on residential lots. You take away the tree code, and there's no end to the removal of trees and all sorts of reasons valid to frivolous and so forth. Having a tree code is an expression of Portland's public will. Don't cripple this institution. Make the wait times for permits up to three months. Private property owners, tree service providers, contractors, developers and many other interested parties depend upon the efficient and timely inspection regime for their tree pruning permitting needs.

Speaker: We appreciate you being here.

Speaker: Charlie. Michelle wesley has joined us online.

Speaker: Hi.

Speaker: Yes, charlie. Michelle wesley, northwest tribal member. I'm mainly here on behalf of Portland copwatch. The city budget is a police accountability tool that has been sorely underutilized. So we have Portland copwatch we're encouraged by the councilors of efforts to use it to require ppb transparency, closer oversight, investment, and safer proven, publicly supported efforts like psr. Thank you. However, until public safety for all is a case, we do not support any additional funding, nor do we believe the police budget should be exempt from cuts. Just a few weeks ago, the city paid out \$475,000 on two settlements for police brutality and violating constitutional rights. This is not accountability. Personally, for hours, I sat in overflowing auditoriums of community members, begging, pleading and rightfully so, demanding funding for their beloved parks and recreations. So many and many supportive services. We were so grateful for those few City Councilors that want went to bat for us, who listen to us, who value us to bring at least a minimum of 1.9 million funding to community while 21 million goes to cops. These councilors bring an anti-discriminatory conscience to this chamber versus those serving the privileged, powerful, and who are more willing to ignore these community members as collateral damage. When election rolls around, we will remember who broke promises versus those who fought for us and met our needs. Support our community, not policing. Let them figure out how quality over quantity is a solution. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Okay, checking henry hazelton, leah dawkins. Okay. Next up we have shelly bigley, babs benelli, tony gracia, rain. Tally. Go ahead. Babs. Hi.

Speaker: Thank you very much. I assume you can hear me. Okay. Correct.

Speaker: We can hear you.

Speaker: Thank you. Babs benelli, 77 year old lifelong Portland resident currently in district two.

Speaker: I've had.

Speaker: The privilege and honor of meeting all of you at various points over the last two years. While I sometimes disagree with some of the things some of you say, I have never doubted your commitment to improving things in my beloved city of roses. All right, I'm just going to highlight a few things. By the way, I am wearing my ruth bader ginsburg t-shirt today because that reminds me to never give up. Okay, as for me, I support parks, support expansion of Portland street response and the program through the fire department, community health access and treatment. I support city county collaboration on transition from shelters to housing, including mental health and addiction treatment as necessary, and help with applying for jobs. As in terms of the police, the piece that I do support is that allocated funding goes specifically to training, including training in sensitivity so that officers can get on the job as soon as possible. Ultimately, perhaps, we will be able to reduce overtime hours. Thank you so much. I appreciate all the members who have testified today. We are coming out in droves to make our voices heard and we know you are listening. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you shelly. You're muted.

Speaker: There we go. Hi.

Speaker: Oh go ahead shelly. Hi there.

Speaker: My name is shelly.

Speaker: Bigley and. I'm born and raised in Portland. I've been a restaurant owner.

Speaker: In Portland since 1991.

Speaker: And specifically.

Speaker: I would.

Speaker: Like to express to the council the importance.

Speaker: Of public safety. In my experience in district two over the last five years. My security costs have dramatically.

Speaker: Gone up.

Speaker: I've had to replace 12.

Speaker: Windows, been broken.

Speaker: Into several times, causing. Significant damages. I've had to buy a \$4,000 security door, hire private security, and remove my outside street patio due to crime and drug use. I've never made an insurance claim for fear of being canceled. So again, I just urge to continue police funding and adding the boots on the ground presence. In addition to the funding the police I would like to see programs continue to be funded to get people off of the streets for housing, treatment and job training. I applaud dan Ryan for all of his efforts for our business owners and Portland residents. Please listen to him and people like me that don't want to give up on our Portland. Thank you.

Speaker: Corinne frechette has joined us online.

Speaker: Hi.

Speaker: I hope you can hear me. Thank you so much for.

Speaker: Having us.

Speaker: My first comment is please keep on.

Speaker: Funding police.

Speaker: And law. Enforcement in.

Speaker: Old town. We suffer. From big. Issues with human trafficking.

Speaker: Drug interdiction needs. Please don't give up on that. We're working really hard for very little money and for.

Speaker: Some of us, we're volunteers.

Speaker: I'm also a resident.

Speaker: In district four. I witness a.

Speaker: Lot of crime.

Speaker: A lot.

Speaker: Of difficulties.

Speaker: For people, and we just beg for police. So if there's a way for you.

Speaker: Guys to actually vote for this, that would be great. It's also extremely difficult for working.

Speaker: People to testify. So just I appreciate the people that are here and that's it. Please fund.

Speaker: Our police.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Okay. I'm checking for tony garcia. Reign. Tally.

Speaker: Tony. Gracious. Here.

Speaker: Oh, great. Thanks.

Speaker: Would that be a.

Speaker: Good time for me to go?

Speaker: Yeah. Please. Go ahead.

Speaker: Okay. My name is tony grexia. I'm an owner of a business that has been around since 2013. We started in northwest Portland and then in 2020 moved to the st. Johns area where we operate now. We do fitness instruction, things like personal training as well as martial arts instruction. I'm a jujitsu coach and just like the previous speaker said, as a business owner, it's pretty difficult to carve time out of our day in order to be at something like this. In fact, I literally was just on a call with a mom who wants to get her kids into my jujitsu classes and had to excuse

myself from the phone call because I heard it was almost my turn to talk here. And I would also echo what the previous speaker said where the crime and the public safety is the top priority. For me personally, my business has had a ton of different issues, the most frustrating of which is we had one individual repeatedly vandalize our building by defecating on it, literally taking a poop in his hand and smearing it on our storefront windows on multiple occasions, urinating on our building on.

Speaker: Multiple occasions.

Speaker: And all of this is caught on high quality video camera. I reported it to police every time and nothing would happen. It wasn't until he tried to set our building on fire during business hours with our members inside of the building, that he finally got arrested and charged with something, and it's absurd that it should take this many instances for something to be done about it. And just a couple months ago, a different individual defecated on my storefront window again, and he was finally arrested and released the same day. And so I urge more funding for police and public safety.

Speaker: Lydia mugs amy wexler. Zulema figueroa. Emma darden.

Speaker: Good. Okay.

Speaker: Good afternoon, council members.

Speaker: My name is lydia mogus, and I'm.

Speaker: Here representing.

Speaker: The ethiopian and eritrean cultural and resource center and standing in solidarity with our coalition partners. Also mentors and triple threat mentoring that were significantly impacted by the decisions made in the last council remand for the Portland children's levy mentorship awardees. We are located in district one and serve in district one and two. We're grateful for the chance to speak today, especially after being previously asked not to provide testimony or lobby. But I

must speak honestly. The outcome of the sessions are deeply devastating, not just for ehrc, but for all of us who have spent the last five, ten and more years building trusted, culturally specific programs that serve Portland's black youth and their families. At ecrc. Specifically, our work centers on intensive black and black refugee youth, mentoring, career development, trauma response, and extensive education. The founder and executive director and 95% of our staff, board mentors and those we serve identify as black. We placed our trust in the pcl grant process one that centered equity, lived experience, and community voice. Your recent decision undermines that process. It sends the message that even when bipoc organizations follow every rule and meet every standard, our success is still negotiable. That is not equity. It is bias. Again, we urge you honor the process, respect the recommendations, and restore the funding our youth deserves. Thank you.

Speaker: Good afternoon, Portland City Council and mayor wilson. My name is elana figueroa. I'm a local 483 shop, store and utility worker to in the environmental service division and maintenance operations at pbot and a resident of district two st. Johns. I'm here in support of labor, brothers and sisters. Workers who day by day are in the field maintaining and repairing our sewer and storm water systems. We are essential employees who are in the field in hot weather, in freezing weather conditions. We work live from 8 to 12 hours a day whenever it is needed. My job consists with multiple tasks from traffic control, such as flagging, taking a lane in columbia boulevard for the operator to clean, catch basins, cleaning sewer lines or to for the tv truck to be inspecting and maintaining sewer lines as well. Additionally, my job is to inspect and clean stormwater like trash around the city. This service is super important in our community, especially during the rainy season. Our labor force makes sure that our stormwater sewer are clean and following. The impact of this budget could reduce the labor force and services. Sewer storm. A simple

example is like it will be, you know, when it's a rainy season, you know, can be flooding and debris and those catch basins. So therefore jeopardize the safety of the pedestrians also the drivers. So I'm here to ask for more funding from the to our division, the environmental services division, so that we continue with our essential environment service. Thank you for your time.

Speaker: Thank you both.

Speaker: Amy Wexler is joining us online.

Speaker: Thank you so much, Amy Wexler. And I'm the executive director for Alliance for Safe Oregon Mayor Wilson and City Councilors. It's my first time testifying in front of this new configuration. And I welcome all of you. I am a resident of district two. And if you're not familiar with Alliance Oregon, we are a statewide gun violence prevention group, and we work on across a number of areas, including. We have an equity table, which convenes community violence interruption organizations. And I am asking you to fund community violence interruption for the city of Portland. I'm sure you're aware there's great need for this. Black and brown community members are on the front lines of our gun violence crisis in the city, and we really can prevent gun tragedies by properly funding this work. Additionally, we ask that you fully fund Portland street response. An unarmed response is often what's needed, and police gun violence is also gun violence. So we are asking for community safety to be seen in the most broad sense possible. And that would also include funding parks. Respite areas for people are creates community safety and community. So thank you so much and I look forward to working with all of you in the time to come to make Portland the safest place possible for all and to prevent gun tragedies.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Emma garden. Okay, moving on to j ami g. John h. Lance. Nippert, ross. Freeman. Levin. Go ahead j hello.

Speaker: Mayor wilson.

Speaker: And members of council.

Speaker: My name.

Speaker: Is j. I'm the.

Speaker: Organizing director of.

Speaker: Unite Oregon.

Speaker: I'm here because the people we represent are tired. Tired of our essential services being starved. While the police budget consistently consumes resources meant for our well-being, the \$2 million to parks originally diverted from police represents a crucial step towards correcting that balance. Do not reverse it. For far too long, Portland's black, brown working class houseless communities have been defunded by the overwhelming priority of policing. Our social services have suffered chronic underinvestment as police budgets balloon. The \$2 million in parks and rec is no extravagance. It's a down payment in investing on what actually keeps us safe, healthy and resilient. Do not cave to the reactionary voices calling for law and order. These are the white moderates that mlk warned us about, who have always prioritized their own comfort over justice, and history has always proved them wrong. Police and their supporters stood against the Marches that gave us our civil rights in the name of law and order. In fact, they stood against every single movement, demanding dignity for poor and oppressed people in the name of public safety. They're panicked. Now is the same old song, one that sacrifices our community to prop up a violent, repressive system. And I hope that you have the wherewithal to see through it. Pouring money into police amid trump's authoritarianism is the farthest thing from safety. We've watched officers brutalized

disabled people to the point where the doj had to intervene, and recently we've seen them protect and work with ice as ice terrorizes our immigrant community. Make no mistake, overfunding the police fuels fascism and sensitivity training and hiring more local or black and brown police will not fix the toxic, racist culture of ppb. But on the other hand, parks and rec feeds hungry kids shelters, houseless and heat waves and gives youth alternatives to the streets.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

Speaker: Thanks.

Speaker: John.

Speaker: My name is john. Good afternoon. I'm here today to.

Speaker: Strongly oppose any new funding for the Portland police bureau. I'm also would let some clarification, because I know that last year it was 295. And then the proposed budget says like 316 or 318. So I'm curious what the actual proposed increase is going to be. They already have the largest budget in the history in the history. They do not need more since 2020, after a brief 5% reduction, their budget has increased by nearly 28%. Meanwhile, vital community programs continue to be cut. I want to challenge the misinformation driving the push for more police funding. One the claim that we need more police to reduce crime. This. This claim is not supported by research. Roughly, there's 30 independent studies showing that the size of police force has no consistent impact on crime rates. There's a study by y. Y j lee et al that put it policymakers who want police to have an impact on crime would be better suited investing resources into new, evidence based strategies than funding surges in police hiring. Wow. I'm going to just talk. I have four points. I'll just mention one other one. One of the main arguments this uses is around our police force being much smaller than like the average per capita. This this argument is absurd. If you look at the cities that have the largest police per capita, these are

cities dc wins chicago's second, baltimore's third, new york city's fourth, philly, detroit, memphis. These are all the places with the most police per capita. Obviously, those cities are not the safest cities. Those are some of the cities with the highest crime rates. And then other places like san jose are very low and they're very safe. So that's that argument just doesn't work. Well that's it.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: My name is.

Speaker: Lance nippert. I'm a resident of district one, beautiful.

Speaker: East Portland. Thank you. Portland police bureau.

Speaker: Has been documented on video aiding and assisting immigration and customs enforcement, otherwise known as ice. In deportation operations in the city of Portland. This is a clear and direct violation of Oregon state law, and aside from being morally repugnant.

Speaker: No further funding can.

Speaker: Go to Portland police until this matter is investigated and all funding must be frozen from them until done.

Speaker: The.

Speaker: Ppb are.

Speaker: Already underfunded according to them, and stretched too thin again, according to them, providing basic public safety to the citizens and businesses of Portland as it is diverting. The resources they already have to aid a fully funded federal agency in their operations is a double use of my tax dollars and is a misuse of Portland and Oregonian taxpayer funds. Portland is made better by immigrants. Our communities are more vibrant, more alive and happier. When immigrants are welcome and feel safe among us as a non non immigrant, in the sense that I was

born within the u.s, my daily life is easier, happier and better with immigrants around me. Thank you for your time. I yield the remainder.

Speaker: Ross is joining us online.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Can you.

Speaker: Hear me? We can hear you.

Speaker: Excellent.

Speaker: Thanks for the opportunity to address you. And thank you to all the people who spoke in ahead of me. I'd like to echo jamie partridge's comments, especially being a fellow volunteer at a local community access radio station in the past with mr. Partridge. His comments were especially. Right on spot for me, as were.

Speaker: Many of.

Speaker: The other peoples, about retaining services for transition for homeless people and supportive services for houseless and addicted people. I do not think that additional funding for law enforcement is going to address the mental health issues or the addiction issues that I witnessed on the street in front of my house every day, even though there is a drug house on my street. Actually two of them, and nonstop drug trafficking. I don't think law enforcement is prepared to address those issues effectively by arresting people and putting them in jail. I think we need more support services, parks funding, maintenance, funding for parks. I just don't think cutting social services is the right way to deal with issues of addiction and houselessness and crime. So thank you all for the opportunity and i'll just shut up and listen. Thank you. Walter.

Speaker: Hello.

Speaker: My name is walter.

Speaker: Valenti and I live.

Speaker: In Bridgeton in.

Speaker: District two. I'm speaking for myself.

Speaker: It took.

Speaker: Many years.

Speaker: For us.

Speaker: To create the situation we're in now.

Speaker: And it's.

Speaker: Really hard to try.

Speaker: To solve.

Speaker: Everything with this budget. So I believe what needs to happen is we've got to focus on the most important things and get them fully funded and get them to work and then build off from there. As we bring Portland back from the places that we've been, to me, it's those priorities need to be. Having Portlanders feel safe and having Portlanders see that major strides are being made in our resolution of homeless and people that are living on the streets. Now, anybody that knows me knows that I care a lot about parks. And I've been on the 40 mile loop land trust for over 20 years building parks. However, the most important thing the city can do to help the 40 mile loop right now is to make the trails we've already built safe to use. People don't feel safe on them, and people are using the trails as a place to live. So by solving those issues. We're solving things for parks. So when we change the city structure, one of the reasons why we did is that the old system created silos. And I hope I'm not seeing the new council creating a new set of silos that we're going on. I really implore you to find a unified voice as we tackle the most important things, get them done right, and move on to the next things next year. And to me, those are

fully funding people feeling safe with public safety and making sure that we make a dent in the real problems with homelessness. Thank you.

Speaker: Next up we have brittany gadberry, matt nicholson, rod such, tommy jarvis, bill crane. Go ahead matt, matt nicholson is joining us online.

Speaker: My name is matt nicholson. I'm an.

Speaker: Architect that lives.

Speaker: In district.

Speaker: Four in the reed neighborhood. I would. Like to urge the council to vote no on the zimmerman oh two amendment. This proposal.

Speaker: Is a bad faith effort to change policy via.

Speaker: The budget process.

Speaker: The tree code deserves our.

Speaker: Full support.

Speaker: Because trees are part of our city's.

Speaker: Essential infrastructure. The tree code is the tool for creating and protecting that infrastructure.

Speaker: Trees protect.

Speaker: Us from extreme heat by increasing shade and reducing the heat island effect. They increase our property values, make our streets more walkable, and provide habitat for wildlife.

Speaker: All of these benefits.

Speaker: Are key to what makes Portland special.

Speaker: In addition to the great.

Speaker: Environmental harm that this proposal would cause our city, it would also make the tree permit process less efficient. With or without a staff. The tree code will still be the law, and residents will still be required to abide by the code.

But without a full staff call back, times will go from days to weeks or months, and now is certainly not the time to make our tree permit process slower. Portland is facing an imminent mass die off of ash trees due to the arrival of the emerald ash borer. Cutting urban forestry regulatory staff will make it harder to implement the pest management plan. The tree code was adopted by the residents of Portland because it was a bold, long term plan for the future health and well-being of our city. It is worth standing up for because it provides huge benefits to all residents of Portland. It has taken decades to get us to where we are today. In our urban forests will quickly disappear if we don't protect it. Thank you.

Speaker: Okay, checking to see brittany gadberry rod. Such. Tommy. Jarvis, bill crane. That completes testimony.

Speaker: Thank you, Keelan, and thank you so much to everybody who is still here with us right now for listening to your fellow Portlanders share their thoughts and experiences with us colleagues. We are now going to move into. Adopting some amendments, or at least debating some amendments, and I had sent out a run of show to everybody, and also talked about this a little bit at the top of the hour. And I am pulling up. Not as quickly as I would like to. The amendment list. I'd like us to start with a bit of a housekeeping measure. We voted on a couple of carryover packages last time, and then had a discussion in a work session, which included the idea that in order to save time, we batch some of those carryover packages that were left into one. One amendment. And I am now looking for that number. 14 pirtle-guiney 14 is the council carryover package. It includes the carryovers from council offices that we had not yet addressed, plus a carryover from council operations to next year. The details are in the packet of amendments, attachment I and if there I would. I would like to start by moving this amendment so that our colleagues have some assurances that what they're hoping happens with the

remainder of their office budgets actually does. I would love to have a second, second. Thank you. Councilor Clark, is there any discussion about pirtle-guiney 14? Councilor Kanal.

Speaker: Thank you, madam.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president.

Speaker: I'm just.

Speaker: Going to start by asking.

Speaker: A couple.

Speaker: Questions, if that's okay.

Speaker: And maybe this is something that I'm not sure if CBO is the best responder to this or what. But how typical is it to use the EO for councilor office. Carryover into not next year's budget for the.

Speaker: For the same.

Speaker: Council office?

Speaker: That I think is a.

Speaker: Separate question, but over.

Speaker: Into the bureaus.

Speaker: Is that.

Speaker: Is that something that Director Levine sure.

Speaker: Yeah. Typically our policy is to do all carryover, whether it's council office or otherwise, in the spring technical adjustment ordinance. I think the since this was just the first year of you all going through that process and through the supplemental budgeting process, we there's no reason it can't be done in the EO. And so we said that was that was a fine practice. I mean, I think council has the authority to allocate general fund underspending or to any other purpose as long as. Yeah. So it's you know, I don't think there's an issue with sort of essentially

appropriating it in the current fiscal year and appropriating it for a different use next fiscal year, which is essentially what's happening here. Okay.

Speaker: Thank you. And then.

Speaker: I hope.

Speaker: That this will be taken in the spirit.

Speaker: Of just wanting.

Speaker: To provide.

Speaker: An opportunity to respond to.

Speaker: The comments that were made.

Speaker: About it.

Speaker: But I do have a question for councilor clark, because. There was.

Speaker: Some.

Speaker: Questions.

Speaker: Around \$80,000.

Speaker: For the.

Speaker: District for coalitions.

Speaker: Newsletter, reach. And I just wanted you to speak to that and.

Speaker: Maybe give a little more clarity.

Speaker: Sure.

Speaker: Thanks, councilor kanal.

Speaker: I think some of the people who spoke today misunderstood.

Speaker: What's in.

Speaker: The amendment. It's actually it is \$80,000 and I've identified 15,000 for voices, which is the district for coalition newsletter, to help with their fundraising to keep that going. And the remainder is divided up between the 32 neighborhood associations. So it comes to something around \$2,000 for each neighborhood.

Speaker: Association.

Speaker: Which should provide them funding for several years.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you for.

Speaker: That information.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor green.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. Looking at pirtle-guiney 14, that's what we're talking about right now, right? It is. Okay. Can you tell us how this is connected to what the finance committee dealt with yesterday? If there's any connection? I think that there's a little bit of an overlap here, but but not completely. Can you just explain that a little bit.

Speaker: When there are expenditures from this biennium that bureaus or offices wish to carry over into the next biennium? That requires two actions. It requires the appropriating the funds or I'm sorry I said biennium out of old habits fiscal year. It requires de appropriating the funds in this fiscal year, which is done through an over expenditure ordinance, which the finance committee discussed yesterday, and then appropriating those funds into next fiscal year's budget. The 2526 budget, which is what we do through our budget amendments. So many of the things on this list likely look familiar to folks who sit on the finance committee or who looked at yesterday's finance committee documents.

Speaker: Thank you. And so, like, for instance, green, whatever it was we dealt with on may 21st. So it's not on this in this ordinance, but it is in the eo package that the finance committee. So I just want to be clear, this pirtle-guiney 14 is just carrying forward the eo's that councilors had submitted that didn't get heard on the 21st. Is that right?

Speaker: Correct. We heard your amendment, and I believe one other and didn't have time for other councilors. We discussed grouping them in an effort to reduce time.

Speaker: I think that's my questions for now. Thanks, councilors.

Speaker: Any other discussion, councilor avalos.

Speaker: Yeah, I'm.

Speaker: At.

Speaker: I'm actually.

Speaker: Confused though. So what are you saying? Because yesterday.

Speaker: The.

Speaker: Eo had the council ops clerk, smith, koyama lane and green. This one has all of those except.

Speaker: For green. I don't.

Speaker: Understand why.

Speaker: We voted on the amendment to reappropriate those funds, as requested by councilor green on the 21st.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: We didn't get to these other requests at that time.

Speaker: And then.

Speaker: We're doing.

Speaker: It via.

Speaker: An amendment. Why?

Speaker: There are two actions that need to be taken. The eo had all of those amendments reflected in it, because that's the de appropriating of the funds from the 2425 fiscal year. We had only appropriated one of those sets of funds. The amendment that councilor green brought forward, this is the reappropriation of

the others that our colleagues brought forward, as well as carryover that council operations has asked to use next year. Okay. Councilor, you and I had had some conversation about what we thought of this practice. Generally, I see this this year, frankly, as a courtesy to our colleagues. Councilor Ryan.

Speaker: Yeah, colleagues, I'm trying to make a decision here that's principled for me. And one, I didn't vote yes on the amendment that we did, the vote that we took in January. I thought we went too far on our council funding. And so I wouldn't I'm not going to vote to re-appropriate and re-appropriate. I think these funds should go like they always have been traditionally, which is to be appropriated and then into the bigger picture funding. I'm just against the principle of using our office funds to do one time funding in next year. And so even though I like some of them and I don't like some of them, I I'm just going to make a decision to vote no on these. I just want to say that up front. Thanks.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor, councilor canal.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president.

Speaker: Thank you. Madam president.

Speaker: I just wanted.

Speaker: To ask if you could speak a little bit more.

Speaker: To the last.

Speaker: Thing you said a moment ago, madam president, which is that.

Speaker: You see this.

Speaker: Year as a courtesy to our colleagues, does.

Speaker: That imply.

Speaker: That we're going to have a conversation about what our communal, our community.

Speaker: Practice is.

Speaker: Here as a. Council going into next.

Speaker: Year's budget.

Speaker: Is, some of our colleagues have raised concerns, as councilor Ryan just stated about this practice generally. But because this was an option that was put on the table, and because we have already done so for one of our colleagues, while I do personally share some of councilor Ryan's concerns, I from my perspective, we should extend that same courtesy to all if we're going to extend it to one.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Colleagues, any other discussion on pirtle-guiney 14? Okay. Keelan, could you please call the roll.

Speaker: Canal I to.

Speaker: Share.

Speaker: Some of councilor Ryan's concerns, but I found that last argument compelling from the council president, I vote aye.

Speaker: Ryan. No koyama lane I morillo. I novick. I also share some of councilor Ryan's. Concerns and hope that we will come up with a overall policy before this time next year.

Speaker: I mark. I green.

Speaker: Are the concerns raised i.

Speaker: Zimmerman i.

Speaker: Avalos reluctantly.

Speaker: Voting I because I have a lot of those concerns to.

Speaker: Dunphy i.

Speaker: Smith i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: The amendment is approved with 12 yes votes and one no vote. Oh sorry 11 yes votes.

Speaker: I'm going to write down 11 one on my page. Sorry. Thank you. Keelan colleagues, we are now moving into something similar to the work that we were doing on the 21st, where we took amendments category by category, and everybody had the opportunity to bring forward their highest priority amendment or package, not meaning everything under the sun. But we know that in some cases, amendments were broken into a couple of different structural amendments, even though it was one concept. And we're going to pick up with the. The policy areas that we did not get to on the 21st. I know that there are many new amendments or policy areas where colleagues, you had a number of priorities that you were hoping to bring forward after we do this run through of all of the topic areas and then talk through some budget notes on the run of show, where it says additional amendments is where we will come back to those other things. So they are not off the table. We're just trying to do this, picking up where we left off before we are going to move into the parks policy area. Councilor zimmerman, are you in the queue to talk about an amendment around parks, or are you in the queue for something else? Fantastic. Would you like to kick off our conversation around amendments related to parks?

Speaker: Thanks.

Speaker: I appreciate this.

Speaker: The conversations around the dais that I've been.

Speaker: Able.

Speaker: To have.

Speaker: With many of. You regarding my efforts in the tree regulation work, and also just the public comments. Right. I think that there's been a lot of recognition in

terms of the importance of the urban forestry program in the city of Portland. One of the unfortunate aspects of the last few weeks has been even on this dais, at times a mischaracterization, that somehow my original amendment was removing all aspects of urban forestry. And I will own that with only it must have been the way I delivered it, and that I have always said that, that maintaining the outreach, the science, the tree planting, the tree maintenance programs in urban forestry was important and remains a priority for me. I also heard from my colleagues about a willingness to admit that we've got some problems in tree regulation and how we apply the code against Portlanders. And so I've developed two amendments, and I have sent those to many folks, and I'd like to read in the first one and then the second one, if that would be all right. And, and then have discussion. Council president.

Speaker: You'd like to read in both of them together and then discuss or separately. I'm sorry, I didn't understand.

Speaker: I, I guess I'm open I'm open to let me describe both. And if we want to discuss one at a time, I think that's fine. But let me introduce both. So amendment one, amendment one amend to move 100% of parks levy funds, which equates to about \$2.1 million from the tree regulation program within the urban forestry division, and reallocate the parks levy funding 2.1 to the parks maintenance program. This restores 2.1 million to the parks maintenance program that was reduced in the mayor's proposed budget. Parks levy funds are not intended to fund code compliance and enforcement officials, and their use is better aligned within parks maintenance. This is particularly sensitive as the city prepares to refer a levy to voters in November 25th, and the city should take every effort to ensure voters know that their support for the levy is dedicated to meaningful recreation and maintenance programs. The. This amendment does not make any changes to the

urban forestry division. Programs of science outreach, tree maintenance, and these are contained in programs in different parts of the urban forestry budget. So that's my first amendment. It's just the parks levy moving into parks maintenance.

Speaker: And councilor. To be clear, this is a change to zimmerman. One, you said not a new numbered amendment, correct?

Speaker: Thank you. I, I made it clear last time that i, the budget office, had me break up previous amendments into many steps. I'm going to go ahead and push back a bit against that and just deliver these in a little bit more clear message. And I've also adjusted them significantly. These are not just a repackaging of the old four. This is a significant change. And the biggest change coming is amendment number two, amendment number two, amend to move all aspects of tree regulation program and staff from the urban forestry programs in the parks and recreation bureau to the Portland permitting and development bureau. Code enforcement, permitting and compliance work requires evaluation and critical application skills and organizational culture to fairly and appropriately apply city code. The parks bureau is poorly positioned and untrained to be able to provide such a service to the Portland community, rather placing tree regulation inside of Portland. Permitting and development pnd allows a system of oversight, organizational culture, and holistic application of the tree code. Title 11. This amendment does not cut any funding from the tree regulation program. The bureau leadership of paddy will have the full authority to implement title 11 design of and work prioritization for the administration of tree regulation programs currently housed in the Portland parks bureau urban forestry division. So those are two amendments and significant changes in that to the previous amendments I had made about reducing the workforce that now just brings that workforce under a different oversight umbrella. Thank you, madam president.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor. I think we should take discussion on the two together, since it sounds like they moved together and then obviously vote on them separately. Does that work for you?

Speaker: I don't think they move together. I think that I would say to, to all my councilors that even if it doesn't move over to p and d, I think that the concern I have about having parks levy dollars inside the tree code enforcement remains regardless of where tree regulation is housed. So I don't want it to sound like they are one and the same. I'm just noting two changes because they're so different from my original amendments.

Speaker: Got it. Thank you. Councilor koyama lane, are you in the queue to discuss zimmerman one and or zimmerman two? Yes, go right ahead.

Speaker: I appreciate all my colleagues work. During this. First budget process.

Speaker: We're working hard, we're learning a lot.

Speaker: And we're figuring.

Speaker: Out at what level.

Speaker: Do we.

Speaker: Hold responsibility.

Speaker: For governance.

Speaker: And policy.

Speaker: And balancing that with managing.

Speaker: At a line item, budget level.

Speaker: Process for bureaus and programs. These amendments, brought forward by councilor zimmerman and to be fair, along with other various amendments on our very long list, appear to move to a level of management over governance. If there is an attempt to manage at this level through the budget, then I have been

clear with my colleagues that I am going to expect a high level of information to be convinced.

Speaker: That the.

Speaker: Councilors bringing it forward have done their due diligence and necessary collaboration. So since I'm saying these amendments for the first time today, I have.

Speaker: Some questions.

Speaker: That I would like to ask councilor zimmerman, if that's okay.

Speaker: Councilor zimmerman, are you open to answering some questions? Can you?

Speaker: Yeah. Can you clarify specifically what is the problem that you're hoping to solve?

Speaker: Okay, so.

Speaker: So I think that. One thing we've seen is that tree regulation has grown over the previous years significantly with the number of fte, while other code compliance code enforcement in the city has been cut. We heard earlier that there are 850 properties, I think 880 properties that are under current code compliance process, and they've got less than half of the amount of employees in the regular pmd world to deal with all the codes as it relates to property. I think that's partially in in what happens in government when a pet project gets to grow with little oversight. And I think we're in that situation. When the parks bureau presented to us early in this year and said that they were unaware of people being denied permits that then had trees fall in their homes, I felt that was pretty disingenuous when the parks bureau, just a couple of weeks ago, insisted that no levy funds were used in the parks bureau. Budget. Well, I want to just highlight that I gave every opportunity to that director to clarify that. But while folks have thought that the

parks bureau budget entirely was going to be cut with this change, I want to just highlight this is urban forestry. This one line is the 2 million from levy funding. But adina long told us that levy funds are not being used for parks levy. I think if Portlanders continue to read stories like they read in the willamette week, in the Oregonian, in the years as we go to a parks levy, I think we're going to lose that levy, and we might deserve to lose that levy. Given how this program is being administered in Portland. But when I go to Portland, permitting and development, I've learned some things over my time in the city. And those code compliance officers are applying a holistic approach of many codes, many safety regulations, and they're doing it in a culture that is trying to solve problems versus protecting one thing. So i, I think that the code compliance professionals that exist in our other bureau can probably save this program in the long term. I think that's going to be really important, because right now, I think they're out of line with the public. And I say again, this has absolutely nothing to do with the planting, the outreach, the maintenance of trees. I'm purely trying to make sure that we are not allowing a division of Portland city government to continue to, I think, run unchecked and fairly abusively against Portlanders as it relates to the tree code. Just as we were sitting here, I sent a message to my three colleagues in district four, one of our constituents who's had their tree code regulation bounced between p and d and city tree regulation code enforcement officers multiple times. And this weakened. That tree came down on their neighbor's deck, but they had been denied permits on Thursday. So I don't know that we have the oversight. That's that's serving the program very well. And if we want to keep it, we owe it to the oversight. And I think p and d is positioned to do that more effectively.

Speaker: And I want to.

Speaker: Understand your process used to develop these amendments.

Speaker: I'm wondering if.

Speaker: You can explain how deputy city administrators, city employees doing this work, community members were involved. Was there collaboration? We also know that at the end of this year, urban forestry program is leading a title 11 tree code amendment. How does that fit in with your decisions and amendments?

Speaker: Thanks. The we've asked multiple times for alternative packages and recommendations to come from the urban forestry division. We have not been given those types of alternative plans. In my original amendments, i, I asked for what is the right number because I preserved, I think, five fte. And I said I'm open to if there's other right sizes. So I didn't get any of that. But I'm also not cutting any of that either, because I've heard from colleagues a willingness not to not to cut that. So I'm preserving the tree regulation program, but placing it under a different oversight bureau. And so that part is significantly different from the original amendment. So there are no additional fte cuts in the movement to pnd. And I want to make that clear. Clear, clear. I will continue to feel very strongly that no Portlander voted for parks levy, which I think most of us think about when it comes to the maintenance of parks, kids having access to recreation, community centers, being open. I think I think looking at the practices that we're getting hammered for with the way code enforcement is going against the tree code, and when people have things like we'll save, you know, save people, save trees at the expense of people, I think that's a terrible thing to tie our levy to. And so I'm making a strategic and frankly, a cultural community based idea that I don't think we should be spending levy dollars in the regulation. So that was my decision process. I've worked with anything I could was able to get from the parks bureau, which wasn't a lot. I think that the braided funding model that they've used has been deliberate. I think that's made it very difficult. And so I'm going to not. Not take an action today

in these amendments that hurts the employees in that or the work of it, but instead sets some set some standards. Levy dollars are not going to be used for tree regulation and allows, I think, whether those code changes come later this summer from title 11 or for title 11. I think that the recommendations we get out of them will be much stronger under the guise and leadership of paddy, who I think is taking a holistic look about all of these types of things in Portland versus just the one thing. I think that's a big difference in perspective.

Speaker: I'm hearing your points and concerns. I would also want us to consider beyond the individuals involved, I'd also want to have an understanding of the structures and systems at play. What do we know about if and how these amendments would change the structures and systems? I'm willing to hear from you or that makes sense. I'm open to hearing from dca, or.

Speaker: So I think that within the parks bureau, you've got things like the help line, the program administration, the non-development permit, the development permit, those types of groups. None of those groups would cease to exist by these amendments. This aspect, right, is really important when it comes to the fact that all of the services that we expect of tree code remain intact. They may not be as full with general fund, but we're allowing pd to better evaluate and say, okay, I've got I've got 40 some odd million dollars instead of six, some odd million dollars to accomplish this. Where do I want to assign it? And in a place where we've got by the way, pd already has tree inspectors on their books. This is not a line of work. They're out of touch with. So I think that the worry that we were slicing one portion of this, of this division off and that was going to hurt us. I think we've delayed that in this because we're just moving it over to a new section.

Speaker: And what would be. The reason for. This being a council decision versus an administrative decision?

Speaker: Great question. I would have loved to have seen this come out of the proposed budget. We didn't we didn't see that. But in a place where I think we've got a city program who is being administered in either an unfair manner or in a manner that is not treating Portlanders well, I think we do have a duty to act, and we can do that through budget. I would have I would have preferred to have better recommendations come out of the bureau, but i, I do not think that the bureau, the parks bureau is really particularly interested in working on a solution here. And if Portlanders love urban forestry, which I think they do, but if we think tree regulation should be part of that, we may have to save tree regulation in spite of the bureau leadership on this topic, because they have gone to ground in terms of trying to find a solution here. And frankly, since January, their appearance at this budget committee as well as the finance committee, has been a series of months of gaslighting. Who would say, we don't have a problem? Who have said that we actually only we issue permits all the time, but I want to just kind of show folks, see this graft, see where the line starts to drop. That's our urban canopy. And so when urban forestry tree regulations went into place for the first time in 15 years, we started losing canopy. Something is wrong here. Something doesn't make sense. I would have loved a bureau who was willing to work on a solution, but instead we got a bureau who said there is no problem. There's no problem whatsoever. And this cut is getting up after the part that can hurt Portlanders. It is not getting after the part that is going to plant any trees in east Portland. It's not getting after the part that's going to make sure that trees are planted, continue to be watered and cared for. We're preserving the best parts, and we're giving the part that's struggling a new boss, to see if that new boss can figure it out. Because the fact that we turned urban forestry on and then started losing canopy should concern all of us.

Speaker: Councilor green.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I originally got into the stack to talk about other things, but the chart now gives me a comment to provide this relevant. If you show a chart like that councilor, you're going to get my comments on it. I don't know where I'm at on your amendments. I am interested in the balance of this debate and discussion today. I just want to note on the chart. You can't draw that conclusion on a causal basis. There was other factors happening, such as heat waves and pests. And so I think when we lose capacity, it's difficult to tease out the role of spinning up this program. And I know that's the argument you're making, but I don't think I don't think that's the strongest argument you have in your, your toolkit. I think the issues related to the parks levy is a little more compelling to me, but I just wanted to share my complaints with the chart. So that's that's all I have.

Speaker: Councilor novick.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. Just a few short points. I am sympathetic to many of councilor zimmerman's points. I'm just not prepared to support these proposals. Now, for one thing, on the move to rp, and I'm certainly open to considering that. But I confess I haven't asked rp and what they think about it. And it's okay. You have and they're fine with it. Yeah. All right.

Speaker: I'm not going to speak for them okay. But but they they got an absolutely. We can we can administer this and there's no change to the full program was the answer I got.

Speaker: Back okay. I mean that's something that I don't think I still want to hear from them. But I think that's something that doesn't have to happen in the budget process. That's something we could take up next month. On the issue of, I think it's perfectly reasonable to say that when we send out a levy, we can specify that the levy isn't spent for tree regulation. As to removing the \$2 million. Now, though, my

concern is that the tree regulatory people don't just go out and beat people up. They also process permit applications. And although it.

Speaker: May.

Speaker: Be that we should say that we reach the conclusion that you don't need to have a permit to remove a tree in your own property right now. You do. So I'm afraid that what effect might be that people will apply for apply for permits to remove trees, and there won't be enough people there to process the applications, so they'll take weeks and weeks for them to get a response, which is as bad as getting a no. So that's my concern about making a cut without knowing exactly what the immediate consequences would be.

Speaker: Councilor avalos.

Speaker: I think more than anything, I'm just this is really hard to follow. I mean, I'm seeing that there was some information that you gave other councilors to explain this. I'm reading what I see in the. Document that's been pre filed and it's on the website. That's not adding up.

Speaker: Like none.

Speaker: Of it's adding up for me. And I'm just feeling. Frustrated that I'm so confused. And i. Don't understand why I'm confused. If I'm supposed to be looking to this document to understand what these updates are and they're not reflected, I get that there's probably a floor amendment thing that's going on, but. Also I didn't receive any information. I this is really complex, and I wasn't given the opportunity to think that through with any new information. So definitely going off of councilor novick, I mean, I don't feel comfortable making any kind of decision on this right now because I don't have it in front of me. I was already not really, you know, I was already concerned with it even prior to these new updates. But now I'm even more concerned that i.

Speaker: Feel.

Speaker: Like I don't have the tools to make a good decision.

Speaker: So that's very frustrating. And i'll.

Speaker: Just.

Speaker: Leave.

Speaker: It at that.

Speaker: You councilor councilor kanal.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president.

Speaker: I just.

Speaker: Want to first start by saying I see a lot of the same problem statement, and I think there's been a clear effort here to try and narrowly approach this to resolve it. I have a. Couple questions. I mean, we did hear from director long and councilor zimmerman, right. He did follow up a couple times about whether or not levy funds are going to code enforcement, and I can't read the details of that graph from over here. So I just want to verify that probably with cbo about the use of levy funds going to. Code enforcement. The other question I have about the first part of this is. Basically is there and I know councilor zimmerman, you mentioned I'm going to get to part two in a second. That part two does not do anything in terms of the number of fte, but part one, \$2.1 million, I imagine, could theoretically be personnel related. So if you could speak to that a little bit more, I'd love to. And then i'll make a comment on part two.

Speaker: Sure. Thank you. And councilor avalos, I apologize for not sending I've sent it to you in terms of getting it to everybody and not bringing a quorum. I broke it up into different emails. It is on the way to you. You should have all the written text now in your email. Councilor kanal. Yes, in terms of the funding that keeps tree regulation alive, we get 3.2, I think million dollars in funding, another 780. It looks

like in general fund funding, 3.6 in pcf three and 780 in in general fund. So essentially it takes the program from 6.5 down to \$2.1 million because of the levy funding. I certainly think that when the ppe well, whomever the oversight is and the bureau director is of this at the end of it, if they have a program that has \$2.1 million less, they're going to they're going to reduce the footprint. What I'm not doing is dictating what section should survive employment or which section should take a full hit. I think that the bureau director of the bureau, wherever this lies, will have a four point million, four point something million dollar program instead of a \$6.5 million program. And they need to make the choices within their within their set to accomplish all the same things that exist in tree regulation. So I do think there would be some cuts, but it's a very different than the previous where I only outlined tree inspectors being sent over to ppe. And in my original amendments, I've changed that significantly so that all aspects of tree regulation survive in this amendment. Unless the bureau comes and says, well, given this new size of it, we would have we would do that, but that I'm putting that on the administration's side, not in the amendment side. I think that's I'm just I'm I'm happy that it evolved that direction. I think that's a better direction for amendments that that affect whole programs, because the ins and outs of how to accomplish the tree regulation with, with for some million dollars instead of six and a half, I think is best taken at that level with, with the administration.

Speaker: So thank you for.

Speaker: Thank you for that. So moving to the second part, I think, and i'll, i'll wait for more information on the first part here. But but moving on to the second part, I'm inclined to support it. And my rationale is simply that we have seen and I have had what feels like dozens of meetings with constituents complaining not only about code enforcement that protects the trees, that are clearly failing at the

expense of the safety of residents and their homes. But occasionally, and sort of the exception that proves the rule, the exact opposite in a way that is, is inconsistent. I think there was an article about there's a tree at 11th and siskiyou. I think that the idea that code enforcement makes sense in a singular place is compelling to me. I am going to check one aspect of this, which is that, you know, we would probably need to adjust the we might need to do a corresponding code fix to, to ensure that that makes sense. And that's not a reason not to do it today. In my mind, it's so that that part of it makes sense to me. And I do think, as you mentioned, it can stand alone. I'm not 100% clear on the on where I'm at on the first one, so I'm going to enjoy listening to what other folks have to say. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you councilor. I am next in the queue. And councilor zimmerman, I mentioned to you earlier today that I had been working on something similar because i, after hearing your presentation previously, where I had pushed back that I thought the numbers were too high. I agreed that the balance was off and that as I look at the cuts in parks and the growth in parks, and as a as somebody who is strongly in favor of expanding our urban canopy and someone who frankly believes that we must do more for our urban canopy, I also am strongly in favor of maintaining more of our parks maintenance, and I think doing something like this is important. I'm struggling right now because I was told by cbo that while there is. Funding in urban forestry from the levy, that there is only a very small amount of funding, specifically in this part of urban forestry from the levy. And I was told that when we were figuring out our numbers, because I didn't realize you were going to bring a slimmed down version. So I was going to try to today to reset the balance. So I was given different numbers. And I'm that's the.

Speaker: Story.

Speaker: Of the season. Madam president.

Speaker: I want to make sure that I understand what's on your chart, because what I saw under tree regulation. Showed something like \$4,000 in levy funds. So I don't know if we need to have the dca have sonia come up here or if we need to turn this to ruth and jonas to get an answer. But I'm hoping we can figure out why we were given different numbers.

Speaker: I would agree, and we were given these by cbo that last year was 1.58, and this year was 2.1. And continue to say that this remains part of the problem with this braiding of it.

Speaker: Jonas, can you can you help here?

Speaker: I will attempt for the record, jonas berry, dca budget finance and chief financial officer there is in fact, some confusion and I might lean to my colleagues to assist in the approved budget. There was, in fact, 2.1 million of what I believe is levy funded resources going into tree regulation and 3.6 of pcf seven, 80 of general fund discretionary. So, councilor zimmerman, exactly what you described at some point, and I don't know, I may need some help identifying how this occurred. There was an adjustment made into the adopted that that moved that amount out. And I believe that the information cbo referenced and pulled from the system was reflective of that change. And I can't tell you how that change happened, but I'd be happy to welcome anyone who can describe that to come join me.

Speaker: Jonas, given that any changes between the approved and the adopted, I believe, are supposed to be amendments from council, and given that we haven't touched this line, and given that there is no adopted budget yet, since we haven't adopted a budget, I'm really concerned with what I just heard.

Speaker: I agree, so let me try again to. So there's a there's a point in the system as this gets tracked. And so we don't have an adopted budget. But there's a entry in the budget system to start to track these changes as they're in motion, so that the

adopted budget can be ultimately produced. There are multiple multiple points throughout the year where those adjustments are made. And the, I believe, the information council president that you referenced, that cbo provided and pulled from the system, included a number that had been changed. And again, I'm saying I don't know how that number was changed, and I would welcome someone who does know how that number has changed to come join me and describe that, because I don't have that information.

Speaker: I see claudio coming up. Who does? For vibrant communities. Can you? I want to make sure if we're going to pass councilor zimmermann's amendment, that we can actually do it, and if we can't do it, I would offer you alternate numbers, but I so I don't want to.

Speaker: Yeah. We can go into budget make make believe bill if we need to.

Speaker: I don't want to move money that isn't actually real and isn't actually there. Councilor. So I apologize for doing this.

Speaker: But yeah.

Speaker: And claudio.

Speaker: Campuzano for the record, finance, property and technology manager for vibrant.

Speaker: Community support services.

Speaker: Yeah, this is a change that we had discussed with the city budget office a couple of days ago.

Speaker: I believe.

Speaker: That it was included in the approved change memo. Or is it in the adopted. Change memo? It's in the adopted change memo. So it's actually something that you have not voted on yet. And it was something that we did. Really as as something that was intended. To capture the spirit of what councilor

zimmermann. Noted earlier in the process. First of all, recognizing that the parks levy has paid for parts of tree regulation over the last several years, it does is it is an allowable use of the parks levy. We included that clarification in the in the response to council questions from last week. So I won't reread that, but those the. That over the last couple of years we've published that that use of parks levy in report for year one, two and three. But given the given the concerns raised by council, we had included in the adopted. So as I said, you have not yet voted on it. It is in the memo, though, the shifting of parks levy out of out of tree regulation. So we would only use general fund rather than the blended funding model. That said, I don't think that that from a technical perspective in cbo can can help clarify this. I don't think that actually changes the effect of councilor zimmermann's amendment. I think that that \$2.1 million is you you can reduce it from that program. It does save it does save parks general fund levy. It can be used to cover maintenance. So I think that really it was more a technical change that was intended to reflect the intent of councilor zimmermann from several weeks ago. So forgive us for sort of jumping ahead and ultimately then it would conflict with councilor zimmermann's amendment. So I'd say they were mutually exclusive. The chain. What's in the change memo versus this? But I don't know. It's not something that I was aware of that that that amendment until today. So I would look to cbo to determine whether they do conflict or not.

Speaker: Jonas. I think we need to answer that question. And it seems to me that because this amendment specifically calls out reallocating levy funding, there might need to be some slight wording changes. But once you answer that question, I'd also like to know if there are other changes in the memo that this council has not had the opportunity to talk about. Because I skimmed this over looking through my materials, but frankly did not look for the level of detail that I might have if I knew

that bureaus were making changes between the approved and the adopted that they hadn't brought to council. So I just.

Speaker: Jonas answers that I would like to respond specifically for where we got this number, if that's okay.

Speaker: Absolutely. Councilor.

Speaker: Yeah. So the first answer I'll give is that the actions that have that this council has taken are on the approved as, as discussed previously. So the amendments that you're discussing should be amendments to that document. And ruth can correct me if that's if that's incorrect. But for purposes of making amendments, you're making amendments to the next step in the process, the prior step in the process, which was the approved budget. So I think the question that came up was the gap in information that was provided, the gap in the numbers that were in the adopted versus the numbers that were reflected that cbo mentioned to you, council president, and I'll pause for a second before we talk about the change memo.

Speaker: Counselor zimmermann.

Speaker: Yeah, I just want to i. This feels like a big boo boo. But I also want to give a little bit of grace to the fact that in terms of how we have allowed general fund and parks levy to get used, and I think this sentence will help. This is a conversation between one of my staffers and one of the central budget office employees.

1,582,931 is budgeted as parks levy revenue for tree regulation in 20 2425. Yes, the amount will likely be smaller, depending on how their actual spending ends up.

Parentheses they only transfer as much as is needed to cover actual expenses. I think for me, that kind of highlights this idea that the because they have authorization to use levy funds, they kind of run the credit card, so to speak. Or maybe it's the debit card against the levy funds. I think that's a practice we should

call out. What makes it difficult, though, is to apply. If I say in my amendment to save \$2.1 million from the tree regulation, then if that same practice is used, can we really say that 2.1 million could go to parks maintenance? I think the answer is yes, that that is accurate, because I think about we're spending a lot of time talking about tree stuff, but I also want to on the other side of that, we also know what's going to be lost on the maintenance side, and I do want to add that into it. Right? I'm if I have to make priority choices, I'm being very clear with everybody in the public, particularly within my district. I am prioritizing better ongoing park maintenance over a code enforcement program I think is beneficial, but probably not hitting the mark right now. But the bathroom cleaning and the playground cleaning is I'm saying I'm saying I'm picking winners and losers. I'm asking you to help me pick a winner and loser in this. It's not fair. But this use of these funds is making this complicated, which I think the reason I'm highlighting this is it has been very difficult to get straightforward numbers to all of you, not because I was playing hide the rock under the red cup, but because it literally might exist in four different ways in four different documents. You've got to work. We've got to work on that, I think.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor.

Speaker: So I believe the second part of your question, council president, was on the change memo, and I'll move to ruth to address that.

Speaker: Sure. So the change memo, as I briefly went through earlier, is should does contain only things that are either like technical changes that just align the adopted budget to things like the year end revenue forecasts and year end expense forecasts and technical changes that correctly budget the amendments that were voted on on the 21st.

Speaker: Plus this.

Speaker: And then there's this. So yeah, I think I think it was just a miscommunication in this case. And i, I it is not I think we need to be a little tighter going forward. Now honestly, I think this is just a change in the form of government and how we budget differently going forward. So yes, it should be very closely tailored to only very minor technical changes or things that are meant to align it to what you all voted on on the 21st, so that it's just correct, because it's the last chance to make those technical corrections. So that is what the technical what that is what the fund change memo attachment b is supposed to line item. And there are two pages of lines that kind of explain that. And then attachment c actually has more detail than attachment b.

Speaker: Thank you director levine. Sonia, I want to make sure that I wrap up and get to other councilors. But did you have something you wanted to add here?

Speaker: Not in a. Pressing way. Thank you.

Speaker: Okay. Colleagues, as I said at the start, before we uncovered this very interesting budget twist, I believe very strongly in protecting our urban canopy. And I actually have a district where I hear more often from people who are upset that trees are coming down than people who are upset that they can't take trees down. It's a very different incoming on these regulations than I think. District four sometimes receives. I also think that on balance, as we are trying to weigh difficult decisions, there was in my mind a little too much cutting in parks maintenance, and I think we could have taken a little bit more from the part of parks that has grown significantly. So at this lower level, I'm willing to support a change like this. I still am a little bit confused, frankly, as to whether the funds that are in councilor zimmermann's new amendments are available. If our budget folks are saying they are, I am willing to trust that for today. And if they are not, then councilor. I'm happy to partner with you on something where we can find the funds.

Speaker: I think we heard they are available and they would make it to park maintenance today if we made the first amendment, and we got a solid up and down from the staff on that.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Councilor clark.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Madam president. This has been a very interesting budget discussion. It really changes what we're going to be doing in the future. But I don't want to speak to number one. I want to speak to number two. Number zimmerman. Number two makes perfect sense to me, given what's happening to the parks bureau anyway, in the mayor's budget, we're breaking parks up into pieces. One goes here, one goes there, and this is just another piece that it makes absolute sense to me that the regulation goes into paddy, because paddy is actually a blending of eight other bureau permitting processes already. This is just another adding another one to this to the regulatory soup. So it makes perfect sense to me and I intend to support it.

Speaker: Councilor koyama lane.

Speaker: I hear councilor zimmermann statement of the problem and these complaints being outlined are very valid. I believe they need to be addressed, and I still question whether or not this is the best way to fix it here as council. It seems clear to me that there is an interest from councilors to make sure that this program is hitting the mark better, and I believe it is an expectation that we're working on this with the executive branch. And just to be clear, in general, I value giving ourselves the time and opportunity to build strategic, collaborative relationships with the executive branch. That will take more time than this budget process. I also invite all of my colleagues up here to not refer to our city staff by name, and instead

by title, because this isn't about individuals, it's about positions and function. At this point, I can't support these amendments because I haven't had much time to fully understand the structures and systems at play.

Speaker: Councilor smith.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Madam president. I am glad that we had this discussion today. I'm glad that we were able to find out information. About items that were not language in, items that were not put in, that we didn't have information on. And I feel confident that. The civic life folks are saying that they have the 2.1 million. Is that correct?

Speaker: Yes, yes.

Speaker: Vibrant community,

Speaker: You apologize? Absolutely. Take make reduction to urban forestry \$2.1 million. Move it to move it to maintenance.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you so much. I wanted to make clear that we had that because I don't want us to come down to the 11th hour and then we're short, especially because we didn't transfer over information. Thank you very much.

Speaker: Councilor. Canal.

Speaker: Yeah. Let me start by asking a question about the change memo in general. And this is about attachment c at the bottom. The citywide total goes down by \$12.851 million from 8.651 to 8.638. Can can I get a little information on what that aggregate total represents?

Speaker: Sure. So. Hold on. Sorry, I'm just trying to get the right attachment up. I mean, I think if you look at the individual lines, it's just it should just be a sum of the individual lines. So if it, you know, so for example, the fireplace disability and retirement fund, there's a reduction of 44 million of bond and note proceeds to reflect the shift from tax anticipation note revenue to interfund loan revenue. So

that's a reduction in appropriation. All all of these are from the perspective of how much money are you appropriating for these particular purposes. And so what is the maximum they can spend. So it's just aligning those appropriations based on the adopted budget as filed.

Speaker: So sure.

Speaker: I guess let me put it another way. When we approved a budget at 8.651 and that was considered a balanced budget, and now we're coming back and being told that we are through this memo, we've appropriated 8.638. Given these changes, should we not therefore have \$12.851 million to play with? The way that you've written this.

Speaker: It's all funds and all sources of money. So for example, in that particular that that particular \$44 million example I just gave, it's just it had budgeted money for bond and note proceeds that we're not going to receive and therefore we don't need. But it doesn't free anything up because we're just not issuing those bonds. We're not receiving that revenue. So it just is a it's just a technical correction to the appropriations schedule based on the actual budget as filed.

Speaker: Okay. I look forward to that being clearer next year. And because I had some certainty, then I got some confusion through this process.

Speaker: Sorry, counselor, can I just jump in because I think it may help a little bit to provide another example of what's included in the in the budget, so that 8.5 million or 8.6, whatever it is, includes things like transfers between funds. Right. So money goes from one fund and it's appropriated from that fund, the.

Speaker: Double count, because there's about \$6.5 billion.

Speaker: You'll see a small adjustment. I mean, it's not small, but in the context of the budget, maybe there's a resource from golf fees, right, that are coming in that were adjusted. I'm just picking on it on a sort of example. So that increases that

amount and reduces the amount of fund transfer that needs to come to offset that. And so some of those balancing activities are what's happening in that scale of adjustment. And it's not a release of new revenues. It's just realigning the new version to be balanced with the decisions that council made to move dollars around previously.

Speaker: Right. Okay. Thank you. And I guess just to for those who may be listening at home, not following along with this, the one thing that maybe isn't relevant to this, but is relevant perhaps in general, is there's not \$8.5 billion in our budget. There's something closer to six between 6 and 6 and a half, if I recall correctly. And money gets double counted when it's in one bureau's budget, gets paid to another bureau's budget, and then is expensed there. And that's, I think, something that isn't necessarily the most well known fact. No, it hasn't come up yet. So I figured I'd say it. Yeah, I guess I am open to the argument about winners and losers, and that our job is in large part to pick winners and losers. That is a compelling argument to me about our. Not just ability, but frankly, responsibility to make a decision like this and not solely defer to the administration about it. Because if we don't do this, it's not as though the conversation will continue while both the park maintenance staff and the urban forestry staff are both going to be funded with the same \$2.1 million, it's that some of these people are going to lose their jobs while the conversation may continue, and then we might be hiring some of them back if over time the money is moved around between these. The only other thing I wanted to mention is that in the event that this second amendment does pass, I do think I did want to just confirm the thing. I speculated earlier that there would need to be a small update to code to just replace references to the parks bureau, and we've done this before several times over the course of the last council did it in the second half of last year, updating code to fix the references to

bureaus and service areas that did or didn't exist at the time it was created. But I just wanted to flag that. Yeah. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor novick.

Speaker: Is dc de oliveira here?

Speaker: I believe he's in the back of the room.

Speaker: Good afternoon, dc oliveira. And this might be an unfair question. Sort of sort of like answer as you see fit, but do you think that p and d is how much time is paddy had to study whether the concept of absorbing the tree code regulation, and how easy do you think it would be for them to do so expeditiously? Thanks for the.

Speaker: Question.

Speaker: Councilor daniel. For the.

Speaker: Record.

Speaker: Councilor, about a year ago then worked with infrastructure.

Speaker: Bureaus to.

Speaker: Contemplate a.

Speaker: Merger at the time of a 30% staff reduction.

Speaker: So not too.

Speaker: Dissimilar from the.

Speaker: Moment we're in today. So I think, is.

Speaker: There a.

Speaker: Culture and a will.

Speaker: To support.

Speaker: Council direction? Something like this?

Speaker: Of course, I would say.

Speaker: For this. Particular amendment.

Speaker: Have we.

Speaker: Contemplated how it would be integrated?

Speaker: No, not.

Speaker: To the.

Speaker: Degree that we probably would like, assuming this would go into effect July 1st.

Speaker: But given the. Sort of the resilience of the bureau, I think in partnership with parks.

Speaker: I think we can make that happen.

Speaker: The one thing i'll just offer.

Speaker: Is it's not. Just moving people over.

Speaker: It's how we embed them.

Speaker: In.

Speaker: The system, make sure.

Speaker: That they're being supported as staff that.

Speaker: We'd want to think about. And so we know fully what's happening to paddy. I think that's.

Speaker: Hard to fully give. A confident answer that we're ready for that change. But it is certainly doable. Another unfair question. Would you feel safer if we if this decision didn't take effect until like, September 1st or something?

Speaker: Thank you for the question.

Speaker: One more time.

Speaker: Yeah, I think any any day.

Speaker: I have no strong opinion on that either.

Speaker: I think, how about this? The more time that's given for staff to contemplate this change.

Speaker: The more. Effective that the change could occur. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor Ryan.

Speaker: I just want to make a couple comments before I vote. Council.

Zimmerman I was opposed to original amendments, and I respect the rework that you sent out today at 129. I thought that was great work. I was a commissioner in charge of parks for 18 months. Yes, I know it did seem longer based on the circumstances during those 18 months, and the big winter storm of 2024 was one of them. I took a lot of punches from Portlanders. I will never forget their stories. In fact, I of course believed them and I went out during the storm during cleanup and I witnessed so many hard working foresters, which made it easier to take punches for them at that time. The truth is, I think we need to do a move right now. And this is this is the right step at the right time. And I support this updated amendment. And I thank you, councilor zimmerman, for your persistence on this one. And thank you. I'll be supporting both of them.

Speaker: Thank you. Before councilor kanal we move on, I'm just looping back to make sure folks who are in the queue for other things didn't want to speak to this councilor green, did you want to speak to this? Okay, go right ahead.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I just want to come back to this question of whether it's appropriate for City Council through budget amendments to create kind of changes for our bureaus. And I think one of the things I struggle with is, on the one hand, that's stepping too far over into the other side of the executive branch's side of the house. But this is our opportunity to provide a budget that provides guidance to this government. And so I think, you know, it's, you know, carefully crafted budget budget note helps helps us do that. I think it is appropriate on on, you know, in some cases. And so I do think I want to defend this, this aspect of it. I also don't have a credit card that we can swipe to run up a big debt. We have to balance a budget. And there is a trade off here. And the thing that I really

struggle with is we still have deep cuts in parks maintenance that are going to live through this this next fiscal year. And there were amendments that I had brought forward with some colleagues earlier in this process that did not pass, that would have provided resources for that, but those failed. So now we're in a situation now where we have to make a choice between a diminished relatively. You know, I think it's about a third cut to the tree regulation program here from this parks levy question versus a relatively large cut to parks maintenance. And so I'm leaning I'm leaning towards support at this time. I know that that's not going to be popular with some some people. But we're not making good decisions. I mean it's trade offs on the margin for all of this stuff and none of it feels good. And I just I just leave it at that. I just wanted to er the, the piece that I think, I think, I think we can put our voices and our intention as councilors, duly elected officials in the budget amendment process for how we think the execution side should go.

Speaker: Councilor smith, were you back in the queue for something on this amendment, or are you in the queue still for something later?

Speaker: I'm not in the queue.

Speaker: At all. Okay, councilor kanal.

Speaker: I apologize, I just forgot one question for dca and it's based on something councilor clark said earlier. Can you speak to other potential org chart bureau changes to parks that are in this budget or not? I believe the comment was that it's being separated out into parts or I don't want to. That's not a quote.

Speaker: Yeah, i.

Speaker: Heard that to sonia shymansky dca for vibrant communities. I wasn't entirely sure what you were referring to, but I'm sure that it's something.

Speaker: I was under the impression that parks is moving into the public works service area. Yes, and perhaps not moving, and perhaps not all parks. Another piece of parks might move into dca olivares service area.

Speaker: It I see councilor or I see city administrator jordan making an a ha face.

Speaker: Excuse me. Just to be clear, part of vibrant communities is moving to economic and community development, not part of parks.

Speaker: So okay.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor novick. Did you want another bite at the apple here?

Speaker: Yes. Questions for councilor zimmerman for one. Zimmerman three talks about increasing position authority in ppd by five permanent ongoing fte.

Speaker: Those are I'm not even proposing those.

Speaker: Okay. So you're you're proposing moving moving authority from parks to pd just as a standalone administrative thing. Would you accept a friendly amendment to say that that would take effect on November 1st?

Speaker: I'd take a friendly amendment for September 1st.

Speaker: What about what about October 1st?

Speaker: How long negotiation. But I if I'm if I appreciate it councilor. So i, I think getting through the summer is appropriate but I am acting with urgency because I think we do have serious concerns. So I'm going to stick to I'm amenable and I'm happy to entertain that at September 1st as a date, which is similar to some other right sizing that the city is going through.

Speaker: Councilors, I don't see anybody else in the queue, and I'm not sure what the resolution was there. And I think we need a resolution before we know what we're voting on. Was there a friendly amendment, accepted or not?

Speaker: I'm debating whether to make an unfriendly.

Speaker: Okay, let's do October. Steve. Come on.

Speaker: All right. I offered an amendment that the shift from a regulation from parks to pd take effect on October 1st.

Speaker: No later than October 1st.

Speaker: October 1st.

Speaker: I think that's a friendly amendment I could accept. Thank you.

Speaker: Okay. And I'm sorry. Resolve that first come back to me.

Speaker: I just I heard councilor Ryan's second the friendly amendment and realized that I don't think I caught who seconded these to begin with.

Speaker: I heard clark.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Clark thinks that she was the one who seconded these. So what? It was a long time ago. So we have that captured. And, councilor clark, do you then are you maintaining your second with this friendly amendment?

Speaker: Absolutely.

Speaker: Thank you. Okay. Fantastic. Sonia.

Speaker: Thank you. And I hesitate.

Speaker: To offer a.

Speaker: Comment that. Might introduce a new line of conversation. At this point, part of why I came up here was to share the question I had when I saw this, and I hadn't had long to look at it or think about it, but my question to my team was, does this standardize what is otherwise an outlying situation where you are administering this code? Pd is administering other code. Does this bring you into greater alignment with how the rest of the city does things? And what I heard from them is that it more creates an anomaly than resolves one. And I welcome better thinking about this, because I am not the expert structurally here. My

understanding is that pnd administers code related primarily, maybe not exclusively, to private. Property development, and that as a general matter, other bureaus administer code related to other things. Within their scope of work.

Speaker: Fire marshal.

Speaker: Parking enforcement. Sewer pipes. These codes mostly live within and are administered by those bureaus. Park rangers title 20 also in parks. So I guess I'm offering as a consideration. Does this otherwise match how code is applied.

Speaker: And administered.

Speaker: In other parts of the city? I think it does not. And so that's a policy question for you all.

Speaker: I think that fair points however. The private property aspect of tree code is I think where we have the greatest problem, right? That's where a person who's just at their home, who doesn't have the lawyers and developers to help navigate a really tough system, are are not getting good outcomes when they work with the city of Portland. And pbot, for instance, is, as we learned in the Oregonian, able to throw some curbs down and take down trees. No problems, no questions asked from tree urban forestry. So given the fact, I don't disagree that this is a slight anomaly, but given the fact of how much work pnd does on the private property. So if you have if you've got a rental property that is derelict and it's a slumlord situation, these folks are involved. If you when I helped shut down the fourth and Washington drug den a few years ago, it's these folks who are involved that private property aspect. I think they work with property owners all the time. And I will say over and over, we have heard that some code changes are planned to come toward the end of the summer into the fall. And if there is some realignment that says, hey, this would be better served in the in the public works side of it, I'm all ears, but we haven't seen that happen without this action from council. And so for the short

term, I think I have all faith in the code compliance folks at ppa. And frankly, I think they're very skilled and working with Portlanders well, all the time. So I think the anomaly is a safe risk and we should accept it.

Speaker: Dc oliveira is their tree enforcement in pd already in other areas, or would this be a completely new line of work.

Speaker: Not explicitly. Done for the record council president? Not explicitly in title 11? There may be things that come up through nuisance complaints, but those are typically redirected to parks if they're specific.

Speaker: To.

Speaker: Title 11. Just to follow up on szymanski's comments, it's true that largely the code that pd oversees with permitting is in the private sector, but in our code enforcement, we're covering everything from noise complaints.

Speaker: To other.

Speaker: Nuisance infractions.

Speaker: That.

Speaker: Typically the team interacts.

Speaker: With, you know.

Speaker: Residents and businesses.

Speaker: More.

Speaker: You know, ad hoc. I would.

Speaker: Guess that this.

Speaker: Would be a new element. So it's not.

Speaker: You know.

Speaker: Unique, but it's distinct enough where there.

Speaker: Would be.

Speaker: Subject matter expertise that.

Speaker: Could.

Speaker: Be relied upon coming from parks to, to administer.

Speaker: That code.

Speaker: So the tree inspectors and budget are focused on other code, not on title 11.

Speaker: Generally in support of but not directly.

Speaker: You know, that's parks okay.

Speaker: Councilors, I don't see anybody else in the queue. So Keelan, could you please call the roll on the new. Zoom? In one which moves 2.1 million in parks levy funds from the tree regulation program within urban forestry to the parks maintenance program, knowing that we may need to do some work in the change memo to make sure that those funds are available. Is that how we're doing this? Haley, I see you leaning forward.

Speaker: Hi. Sorry.

Speaker: Quick question.

Speaker: Were you intending to.

Speaker: Replace zimmerman? 1 or 1 and two, or are you withdrawing zimmerman one and two and.

Speaker: Adding 13 and 14?

Speaker: I think a full withdrawal of the old ones. These are freshly new. So you.

Speaker: Would be voting.

Speaker: On.

Speaker: Zimmerman.

Speaker: 13. Okay. What we had before us, said one. So zimmerman 13 and this is the first part that councilor zimmerman went over, which is the funding change,

moving the levy funding from urban forestry tree regulation program to parks maintenance. Keelan could you call the roll canal?

Speaker: As I said on may 21st, I think it's really important that we have clean bathrooms and we have maintenance fully funded. And that's a major, major lack in the in the mayor's proposal that we get a chance to rectify, I vote i.

Speaker: Ryan i.

Speaker: Koyama lane know. Morillo councilor zimmerman.

Speaker: I really appreciate all the work that you've put into this and trying to address. This problem. My concern at this time is that I just don't feel like I have a.

Speaker: Full.

Speaker: Grasp of the impacts of this policy.

Speaker: On the.

Speaker: Different bureaus and staffing.

Speaker: And funding.

Speaker: That we have, and maybe.

Speaker: That's not your fault.

Speaker: Maybe that's the fact.

Speaker: That parks.

Speaker: Didn't get that information to you. But that doesn't change the fact that I feel like this is a substantial change. And we haven't, as a council, received a full scope of information to make that decision. I would also point out that that's an issue that is not isolated with your research and amendment. That's something that's going.

Speaker: On overall.

Speaker: So maybe everyone should consider approving my amendment to add a cbo position so that we can get more information later. I vote no.

Speaker: Novick no.

Speaker: Clark. I green.

Speaker: For the same reasons that I complained about councilor zimmerman's chart not showing causation, where there may only be a correlation. I think a relatively modest cut of the parks levy funds is not going to hamper our overall urban canopy in the short run, and I do think that we need to set ourselves up for a good conversation at the parks. Levy and I and i, I've been talking ceaselessly about the need for parks maintenance in this budget cycle. So for those reasons, I vote i.

Speaker: Zimmerman.

Speaker: Thank you. I appreciate those who gave input to help me craft this in a way that was most palatable and also, I think, addresses a pretty serious concern. And I think we are set up better if this passes to pass a successful levy. And so if this if this passes, I'm also very eager for those parks employees who work in our maintenance to continue their work and their service to the city. So thank you, I vote yea.

Speaker: Avalos.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Dunphy.

Speaker: I continue.

Speaker: To.

Speaker: Be.

Speaker: Deeply concerned.

Speaker: About the parks.

Speaker: Maintenance, so.

Speaker: I vote i.

Speaker: Smith i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: The amendment is approved with eight yes votes and four no votes.

Speaker: Keelan. Could you please call the roll on zimmerman 14? I'm looking to haley to make sure that number is correct.

Speaker: It is correct. And if I could.

Speaker: Just get councilor novick.

Speaker: And councilor.

Speaker: Zimmerman to clarify.

Speaker: The friendly amendment.

Speaker: Language and where it goes.

Speaker: To be implemented no later than 1st October 2025.

Speaker: Okay, steve.

Speaker: Okay. So what you have listed in the email from councilor zimmerman as two, which is officially zimmerman 14 with the a friendly amendment from councilor novick that this would be implemented no later than October 1st. This is the proposal to move tree regulation program, staff, program and staff from urban forestry programs to Portland, permitting and development. Keelan. Could you please call the roll.

Speaker: Canal i.

Speaker: Ryan i.

Speaker: Koyama lane to clarify, I'm not completely opposed to amendments that reach over and make executive type changes or management decisions, but my bar is high for those types of amendments, and I believe that I don't have enough information to know how this will be affecting programs and all of the staff. So I vote no.

Speaker: Maria, no novick i. Clark. I green. No zimmerman.

Speaker: I avals. No dunphy.

Speaker: I would very.

Speaker: Much like to.

Speaker: Have this as a conversation and a policy committee, but I'm not there today. No.

Speaker: Smith i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: The amendment is approved with seven yes votes and five no votes.

Speaker: Councilor green, do you have an amendment within the parks program area that you are in the queue to speak to?

Speaker: Yes, but I just some I have a new omnibus amendment that has some elements that talk about parks. I guess my question to you would be, would you prefer to use this space right now to talk about things that are just standalone parks things, or can I talk about my thing now?

Speaker: Well, the precedent that we set last time was that if it touches an area, you can choose which area it falls within. So I am going to try to stay consistent to the best of my ability. Go right ahead.

Speaker: Yes. Then I would like to talk about green nine okay. Let me pull up my text for my own.

Speaker: I'm going to second it.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: We have a motion and a second on green nine. Hopefully we can hear a little bit about it.

Speaker: Okay great. Thank you madam president. Since may 21st I've put a lot of effort into trying to. Fund some priorities that are of my own, but also some of my colleagues through a new funding source. My previous ones failed to prosper. One

failed. So, you know, we did our best. It didn't work out. So I'm coming back again and I'm offering a motion. The title is motion to amend attachment d and added budget note to reduce external materials and services spending and add funding for housing, arts and operational capacity. Capacity. So colleagues, the way this works is it funds green three which is fund Portland street response program evaluation at a reduced level 200,000. It funds green six, which provides one time grant to Portland center stage at a reduced level. It's 200,000. It funds one of clark two ci positions on a one time basis. It's got dunphy to fund arts and economic development at 365,000. It has canal four funding for community centers, aquatics, the Portland tennis center, pm hours. So it's restoring the cut hours in the evening and alternative community session. It also removes it moves one of the parks rangers service dispatcher roles that was being cut into into 311 and paying for that. That's part of canal four. And then we have morillo nine, which is restore analyst positions in the cbo at 350,000. So the way that this is all paid for is by a 2% additional reduction in external materials and services, with some with some key exemptions. And these exemptions are as follows. Exempting all outgoing grant subrecipients all outgoing grant beneficiaries and outgoing loan disbursements, and it also excludes prosper, Portland's line item for ems, because I think that that complicates the fact that we already passed that budget. The net effect is it makes available \$1.5 million in general fund discretionary resources, \$192,000 in general fund overhead resources, and \$151,000 in additional other revenue. And all of that pays for these for this package. So I know that's a mouthful. And if you look at the attachment I it has the cbo has created the sort of individually impacted bureau areas that have the cuts that looks like it's part of morillo nine. It's not it's just it's just a formatting piece. So I know that there will be certainly some questions. So I'm happy to take them.

Speaker: Councilor kanal.

Speaker: Yeah. So if I was a little early on that sorry, I will second it. Now I do have one question about it, which is the overhead. 190 2371 if you can speak to where that specifically went. That's the only question I had.

Speaker: Yeah. Happy to. That covers part of morillo nine, which they're the cbo analyst positions have that general fund overhead.

Speaker: Thank you. I'll come back later.

Speaker: Counselor smith.

Speaker: Yes, thank you, madam president. I'd like to verify with. Cfo jonas or ruth.

Speaker: We i.

Speaker: Just think that that you're leaving some money on the table. I think you're leaving some money on the table. So I want to I want to know for sure. Is the is the 2% that that you're cutting off of ems? Is it, in fact, 1.5 million or a different number?

Speaker: So I can speak to a little bit how that how we got to that number. So there's definitely more ems in the city's budget than that. But but I think this is first of all, I believe it was general fund only if I'm remembering correctly. It's ongoing. And it is it is only for things that we aren't legally required to pay. So like it's is it one time.

Speaker: The amendment says this is a one time general fund.

Speaker: Sorry. Okay. Sorry I'm misremembering. So but I think this is general fund only. So like none of the ems that's in the utilities for example, would be in here. Additionally, things that were legally required to pay, like fpd and our benefits that are paid out as ems and health, health benefits that are paid out as ems don't aren't in this denominator. So I think what getting into ems is tricky just because there are so many things lumped into there, many of which we don't really have

discretion over. So I think there was an attempt to get at sort of a denominator that made sense in order to come up with that number.

Speaker: And could you explain the difference between the external materials and services versus the internal?

Speaker: Sure. So external materials and services are any external include anything that's like contracts, grants, anything that goes out the door. So it includes a huge variety of different types of expenditures. Internal materials and services is only for services that are provided internally. So our central services and those are done through interagency agreements. And. And. And budgeted as internal materials and services as the sort of category in which they're budgeted.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Counselor clark.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. While I really appreciate counselor green adding clark to very much and green six, I'm struggling with reading through the list of all the reductions and noting that the big reductions come from parks, police and fire. So I'm I'm kind of wrestling with that, not really comfortable with it. I don't know if we can ask if interim dca causey is here or.

Speaker: If i.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Then we do I believe have all of the dca's in the room and we have. With us.

Speaker: Counselor green wants to address this. First of all.

Speaker: I appreciate the question. I was remiss in my motivation to also say that this is paired with the budget amendment that directs how these ems reductions should happen. So that's green ten. The budget amendment says to guide the

implementation of the 2% reductions to ems. Council directs the city administrator to prioritize eliminating expenditures that reflect contract bloat, excessive consulting, and overreliance on external vendors for functions that could be fulfilled by city staff. So, for instance, when I talk to labor leaders, they say, well, why are we paying? Why are we paying consultants to do design work or pay is I think councilor kanal uses this, this phrasing a lot, which is why are we paying other people to think for us? So the idea here is, you know, please do not execute. Find the reduction in not hiring solemn consulting, for instance, for \$1 million contract to help with the strategy session. That's the intention with this. And that's what the budget note directs. The sort of schedule of cuts you're seeing is the is the kind of undirected, like if you do nothing else and if you apply 2% to this, these are those these are those impacts. And so I do want to just be fully transparent that there are risks here. And the risk is that we that we don't get the outcome that the budget note is, is directing. Right. And then they start going after some of the kind of things that you, you care about there.

Speaker: Councilor can we hear from interim dca?

Speaker: Yeah. And director cozzie director myers is online as well. If you'd like for him to come up on screen too, or we are happy to defer to you.

Speaker: You know, if he would.

Speaker: Like to go first.

Speaker: That would be fantastic. And I'm happy to chime in where I can.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Director myers, would you like to add anything here before we turn to or dca? Myers I apologize before we turn to interim dca.

Speaker: You know, I'm almost wondering. For the record, I'm bob cozzie interim dca for public safety service area. I know that a lot of our team across the bureaus had dca.

Speaker: Myers link.

Speaker: To this meeting. So that might be what we're looking at right now is someone else who didn't change their name.

Speaker: So i.

Speaker: Apologize for that. Yeah, yeah. Thank you. And I am really jumping into deep water here. And thank you for this opportunity. On one hand, I look at, you know, additional funding for, you.

Speaker: Know.

Speaker: Evaluation of Portland street response. And that's certainly something that psr. Could welcome. I look at some of the other components in here. And I do have some concern when I see that.

Speaker: There is a reduction.

Speaker: To the Portland police bureau general fund by \$287,000.

Speaker: And a.

Speaker: Reduction to Portland fire, \$183,000. Now, there's also a section in pbem for a reduction of \$13,000. And.

Speaker: You know.

Speaker: Knowing the structural deficiencies, particularly at pbem, I'm just beginning to get a handle on the fact that they don't have adequate staffing. I'm certainly concerned there. I see the other cuts as well as without.

Speaker: Having a. Lot of. Time to.

Speaker: Review what the impact would be. I certainly have concerns. What I a question that I had and I think, ruth, that you answered this. Earlier is contracts that that we have with.

Speaker: Current vendors.

Speaker: Those are not included in this.

Speaker: Is that correct?

Speaker: Because we have a legal obligation to pay. That. That is the spirit behind the exemptions that I put in there. Outgoing recipients. You know, was intended to pick that up. Okay. You know, without really knowing what the impact will be. I don't think I can speak. Much further, but I am here to hopefully answer some questions if you have them.

Speaker: We ask the same question of our parks dca as well. That's a big that's a big chunk of dough.

Speaker: Dca shyman sky.

Speaker: Hi again.

Speaker: Sonia shyman sky I think I saw that it's about \$700,000 ems cut in the parks bureau, and.

Speaker: That an.

Speaker: Amount to be added back. I did ask, is it the same amount or is it a different and greater.

Speaker: Amount to.

Speaker: Be added. Back for those particular services?

Speaker: I don't believe.

Speaker: It's the same.

Speaker: It's just it's a lesser amount, but it's also for.

Speaker: Different sorts of.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Believe that through canal for that's brought in 265,000 is added specifically to restore pm hours at a few facilities. But the external material and services budget is reduced by \$692,000.

Speaker: These are all very reasonable and fair things for you to consider and to do. I know that ems sometimes surprises me in how directly the spending contributes to provision of services. That's not to say it's I'm not making a judgment about its importance or how closely it should be protected. I will just say 700,000 ish is significant, and the services that are proposed for restoration are highly valued and very important to community.

Speaker: Councilor clark. Anything else? Councilor smith. Let's see. I don't know if that goes to me next. I, I'm trying to understand what is cut in the contract here because I'm trying to weigh these trade offs. There are some things councilor green that you include that I really like, and I appreciate that you tried to carve out some pieces of ems that we wouldn't want to cut. Director shymansky, since you're up here, I'm wondering if you have a sense of what external materials and services buys within parks.

Speaker: I know it buys bark chips, and I know it buys a lot of other things. Claudio, can you give us as specifically as possible.

Speaker: Maybe a.

Speaker: Handful of examples?

Speaker: Sure. I would say that the single biggest item is utilities. So specifically the utilities necessary to run pools, community centers, etc. They are air and water. We pay. We pay water and bts bills as well. We are, I think, the city's biggest water user. And that shows up as an external material in service. And of course, as was

mentioned, there's a lot all of our. Garbage hauling that is that is external materials and services. So I would need to look closer at sort of where there are opportunities to do \$700,000 cut, but if it's council's direction, we would do it.

Speaker: Is there an ability to take a cut like this on things like. And I hate to call out any service as unimportant because they are all important, but something like bark chips, for example, as a permanent cut would be problematic, as a one year cut might be weatherable, whereas garbage hauling as a one year cut would not be weatherable. Using those as kind of standards on either side. Do you suspect if you looked at the numbers, that there would be a way to take a cut that in weatherable cuts, or would we be cutting into things like water to fill the pools, electricity in our community centers, and garbage hauling?

Speaker: Conceptually, yes. And we did put forward a number of ems cuts to meet our own cut target. And the theory was, yes, we will scale what scalable and we will not eat into what is not discretionary. I think this is a question of at this amount relative to the denominator. Can we keep doing that or does it begin to cut into things like pool water or that are not as discretionary.

Speaker: Yeah, I would say that a one time reduction is definitely much more manageable than an ongoing reduction. Going further than that in the moment, I wouldn't want to characterize it. We would just need to go back. We've spent a lot of effort getting to the reductions that we've gotten to. We could certainly do more. We potentially have more on the table depending on on where things go with the levy. So it's but I wouldn't want to characterize it here on the fly.

Speaker: Thank you. City administrator Jordan, I noticed that there's a significant cut in the city administrator's office, almost a half \$1 million. Is that a cut from from contracts through Portland solutions, or are there other external materials and services that cut could come from? And I'd ask, we use the phrase a lot Washington

monument here. I'd ask that you not give me the Washington monument. But but realistically, what would this what what are these external materials and services within the city administrator's budget?

Speaker: Thank you for the question. We currently.

Speaker: Don't do any maintenance or contracts on the Washington monument, so we I have spoken previously about expenses in the city administrator's office. And so I'm on the record saying that the bulk of expenses in the office are in Portland solutions. And I can tell you that the bulk of expenses in Portland solutions is external. Ms. It's in contracts for the operation of shelters, primarily. And then there are other things, but. You know, you have the city and I might add that that the city attorney's office is listed specifically, I think for an ems cut and the city attorney's office is the second biggest office in the city administrator's office. So if we're including ogle, government relations, equity and human rights, the attorney's office and Portland solutions, those are the bulk of where ems is. And I would say proportionately, ogle and oe have very small amounts in them. Ems, I'm not looking at the specific figures right in front of me, but that's my that's my assessment. So to come up with almost half \$1 million, I think we'd have to take at least a look at some of the programs in Portland. Solutions.

Speaker: Thank you. Colleagues, I'm getting notes that other dca's may want to speak to this as well. I also see that there are a lot of other councilors in the queue, so I will put myself back at the end of the queue to give other dca's an opportunity after other councilors have spoken, but I will just say now councilor, I like a lot of what you're buying. I am really concerned with the extent of some of these cuts. I am leaning no right now because I don't think I've had enough time to sit with some of these, and I apologize for not spending more time with it previously. I will continue to think about it as I hear from other colleagues. Councilor Ryan.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I kind of want to listen to the other dca's come up that said, you know, I made it clear back in may that my lens would be shaped by a few things going into the weeds of operations, that this elevation does start me at a no. And so I started at a no on this one. And sure, there are a lot of pieces of this that politically have nudged me to a yes. And these have been fascinating conversations. So I've had conflicted debates with my own self. As I listen to all the conversations over the last half hour, I don't know who hasn't, but clearly there will be impacts of these reductions. And I also said I would not support amendments to the mayor's balanced budget that made cuts to police and fire, and they seem to be included here based on what I listened to. And now I heard that about Portland solutions. So this is very well intentioned amendment, but I will not be supporting it at this time. Thanks.

Speaker: Councilor canal.

Speaker: Thank you. I, I'm going to just note that there may be some space here. There is a I think it's eight. Where is it 600 plus thousand dollars. It's not allocated here. There's some restrictions on that funding. And I'm trying to understand that a little bit better. That might be able to sort of soften some of the specific blows. But I want to take a step back for a second and say two things. One is as it relates to unintended consequences, it's a concept that comes up and there is a certain level. I think it's less about the way I would frame it is less about unintended consequences and a consequence that we know the details of versus one that we have a general idea of. We know that two people in the city budget office are going to get laid off right now. If we don't do anything about it. We know that that's categorical. We know that the only person who does racial equity plans for the whole city at oer is going to get laid off. One of the four people in the ada team at oer. Some of that's not in this. Some of that is. But I know that these are things that

we have to weigh. So it can't just be a general opportunity cost conversation. We should engage with that specific opportunity cost, which is that absent a revenue source, we are not going to find a way to save some of these positions. And that's very concerning to me. I think we have seen the value of both the current and a future beefed up cbo through this process, and I want to make sure that director levine has everything and everyone that she needs for that. That's particularly important to me. The other thing I wanted to talk about is the contracting piece. There are dozens of examples I can give in my three and a half years working at the Portland building about work that can and should be done by city employees, that is contracted out. And it is it is work that I've often described as councilor green put it, that is thinking for us, there is work where contractors are good community based organizations that do violence prevention, which are exempted from this. By the way, that's very important. This doesn't cut over grantees or anything like that. There's a testimony virtually about the violence prevention, community violence intervention money. None of that's affected by this. There's work that we can't do ourselves as effectively. But then there is work like strategic planning assistance, and there is work like community engagement contracts, where people do really well, but they're more expensive than a city employee. I managed a project where we had the money for three years to fund a city, a community engagement staffer, and we were told over and over and over again that we would get that funding or get that position authority to spend our own money. And I can know from a different project that I worked on that the community engagement contract cost more than a staffer to do the same amount of work. There's so many examples I could give about how we squander money, and it's to not have an ongoing labor commitment, and that is a profoundly anti-labor practice that we do. And i, I think that this is the beginning of asking the administration to start looking at that

differently and bringing these, these particular types of work back into the city, back to afscme and pro tech and cp, back to all these specific unions that are doing this work. And in many cases, there are still some fte that has to then manage the contract. So we're also wasting the money there. So that's my interest in this is starting the process of going at the practice of contracting out work that could be done by unionized labor in this workforce, people who can afford to live here and do live here, because a lot of this, you know, professional services contracting is to people in philadelphia or baltimore or something. And I'm sure they're great. But I want to make sure that we're working to put our Portland city budget dollars into the city of Portland.

Speaker: Councilor zimmerman.

Speaker: I think we have a little bit of a better idea from parks. What what this could be used on in terms of materials and services, what's truly used on maybe in the city administrators. I'm looking for a way to get to yes on this amendment as well, but I'm noting that there are a couple areas that have just significant cuts, like multiple. Employees worth of cuts, and I know they're not employees, but that that level of work. So. I I'm going to think out loud a little here in terms of, of options that might exist. What I don't know right now is if I were to go and look at parks and rec, this is noting 692 of materials and services. But I'm wondering what the amount of unspent revenue in that bucket was in the current year. And I could apply that question to all the big hitters here above six figures and say about how much do we normally return to know if it has a substantial categorical, categorical change in service, or if it's one of those we don't want to ever get right up to the edge. And I I'm going to look quickly just to see if there is a feeling of severity in terms of these numbers and what that might look like.

Speaker: Sure. That is always a difficult it's a totally legitimate question to ask. It's a difficult one because a lot of spending is encumbered in one year, and it gets carried over into the next. And so what you see as underspending in the current year often is not. There are there are sort of encumbrances against that resource. But looking at, you know, looking at projections for the current fiscal year, I'm looking at in just in general, fund only for parks, we're probably going to underspend by 1 or 2 million. Yeah.

Speaker: Okay. So 1 or 2 million. And i, I note that because. What it what it may what we may end up seeing here is that in the next year we have a slightly lower. Well where I come from beginning fund balance. But actually the way the city does it is we wouldn't see that reflection of savings until the fall. What we used to call the fall bump, the technical adjustment and fall. It may be a little bit smaller than we're normally used to in our operations, but I'm sensing a workability here, and that's what I'm trying to kind of put my head around for. Ruth levine, our budget director. I think that you mentioned the amount of general fund contingency that we had left over last time was in around the 999 category.

Speaker: That's right.

Speaker: Okay. My thinking out loud part here is that if we were to have a bureau, for instance, come and say, hey, mr. City administrator, we're at risk of not paying the water bill at one of our at one of our bureaus, our utility bill. The lights may go off. That is exactly what contingency is for. That's the kind of thing that as a finance chair, I would say, yes, we have a problem. Some something spiked. You come on in and to keep the lights on at a community center, we're going to float you an extra quarter of \$1 million from the general fund contingency. So if we were to potentially add a set aside from that, almost million dollars that we created in excess last month as a as a fund to tap into, I think I'm quite I think I could get

comfortable with this amendment because I don't think any of the groups listed here should feel like they have to do the same thing with less. I think we're saying, please get closer to finalizing out your budgets, but if you run up against something, we have a set aside that you can make the case for materials and services as a as a fund to tap into. And I would be curious what colleagues think about that, given that we created nearly a million extra dollars in contingency on the 21st. But thank you for that quick answer. I appreciate it a lot.

Speaker: Councilor novick you haven't spoken to this yet, have you?

Speaker: I have not, thank you, madam president. First of all, as to councilor zimmermann's last point, some of us have some designs on that million dollars. For example, some of us are thinking about using it, which includes some discretionary funding and some overhead to fund some pbem positions. But second, I just think this is. I don't think it behooves us who believe in the value of government to decide. Well, we think there must be a bunch of waste, fraud and abuse here. So let's just vote to cut 2% and they'll find the waste, fraud and abuse somewhere. I don't if we if there is contract bloat, excessive consulting and overreliance on external vendors or functions that can be fulfilled by city staff, let's identify that specifically. Let's not just assume that the parks bureau has \$692,000 of those things without knowing.

Speaker: Would love to offer offer some responses when you think that's appropriate.

Speaker: Why don't councilor green? We have you offer responses, and while you're offering responses, i'll just note that I put myself back in the queue to give a couple of dcas an opportunity to come up. So I think de oliveira wanted to speak and I wasn't sure if dca wanted to come back up. If you all come up well, councilor green is speaking, that'd be great.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. Councilor novick to respond. If we were given budget documents with the level of specificity for me to identify specific contracts, and I wouldn't mean I wouldn't go down this road, I think it is an imperfect road to go down. That's why the budget note is attached to give more clear guidance to the city administrator on what the priority is. And i'll just use an anecdote that I remember from asking 189. Contract struggle from last year. They had pointed out that the city of Portland found over \$1 million to buy a piece of granite from vermont, and have it moved here for the base of a statue that is an ems expenditure. But they didn't have that money for, you know, on the table for their negotiation. Negotiation at the time, I've heard other anecdotes where we pay we pay management consultants over \$1 million for like a weekend of work for strategy, visioning. Those, those anecdotes exist. And while I don't have a spreadsheet of all the specific contracts, I know that they exist. And so I would very much looking forward to a world where we have that level of resolution and so we can be much more prescriptive. And i'll just say, you know, I do think we need to get a handle on our external contracting consulting. My vision for this city. And insofar as I have a voice as a City Councilor and the budget process, I believe in public sector capacity. I don't believe in outsourcing that to third party contractors. It's just fundamentally something I don't. That I don't that i, that I don't agree with. So I think we've got some other dca's up here that want to kind of talk to it. So thanks.

Speaker: Thank you all for coming up. If you wanted to respond to any of the questions that we've asked of some of your colleagues about impacts, I think we'd be happy to hear those. And I think in doing so, the question from councilor zimmerman also about how much of these you have left at the end of the year and if perhaps while difficult, it's something that could be absorbable for one year.

Speaker: Great thanks, council president.

Speaker: I think i'll go first. Don oliveira, for the record, the one item I want to.

Speaker: Flag for council's situational.

Speaker: Awareness is the. \$75,000 in the office of economic development that ems allocation is part of a two.

Speaker: Year project.

Speaker: For the permit improvement. Team to upgrade ppe permitting software. It is a discrete project that is both software and implementation, and once completed, it will.

Speaker: Be done.

Speaker: And i'll just.

Speaker: Offer for your consideration that.

Speaker: While we could probably get through with that, it's a contract, not just again for people. Councilor green.

Speaker: But for actual systems that we're.

Speaker: Investing in that we would.

Speaker: Ideally like to.

Speaker: Purchase what we agree to a year and a half ago.

Speaker: So my recommendation would be for your consideration.

Speaker: Is to consider.

Speaker: That as a. Project that's close to completion. Thank you for your consideration.

Speaker: Great. For the record again, jonas perry, d.c. Budget finance and chief financial officer a couple of things i'll flag looking at the reductions, maybe i'll just say I appreciate the effort and intent of looking citywide at citywide contract efficiencies, certainly something a cfo that's a priority of mine. The thing that catches my attention is a reduction in the office of the chief financial officer, which

will be the new evolution of budget and finance. As I mentioned at previous budget work sessions within that service area, we have already reduced our ems in this to meet the original budget reductions to the bare minimum. So a further reduction to ems. Ems will be a reduction to services in that within that office, it will be a reduction to tax support, specialty tax support that we get from external sources, software support, specialty and surge support, background checks, translation services, employee trainings to make sure that we're maintaining our financial expertise, etc. So I just want to be explicit that there will be reductions directly resulting from that, at least in that service area. I can't speak for others. The other thing i'll mention and then maybe hand to d.c. Morrissey, is we also know we have upcoming enterprise efficiency work that we need to work on, and that may benefit from from having some of those resources available to help facilitate that work and get to some long term efficiency. Some of those efficiencies identified that are likely be identified will be to ems. And so we'll actually need to. This, I think, takes us a little bit of a step backwards in implementing that. And so I don't know if you want to add more.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Thanks so much for.

Speaker: The record, sarah morrissey, dca.

Speaker: For city operations. I wanted to.

Speaker: Flag two items. One, we are unable.

Speaker: To take a reduction.

Speaker: For the office of community based police accountability. So that will need.

Speaker: To be. Re distributed.

Speaker: To another fund balance due to the settlement with the DOJ. And then the.

Speaker: Second is in the.

Speaker: Office of city operations.

Speaker: We have the independent. Police review, we have the DCA office, we have almost no EMS. And we also have 311 and procurement procurements. EMS is primarily co-op. And so we will not be basic. That's basically committed to prosper via an IGA for the implementation of that program. So that full impact would likely sit with 311, and that would likely have a staffing impact as well. So wanted to share that with the council.

Speaker: Thank you all. Councilor Clark.

Speaker: Thank you. Sure. Thank you, madam president. I'm desperately searching for my magic wand. I don't know where it is, but we really need one right now because there's so much in this that I want, not just my own amendment. And Councilor Greene's and Councilor Dunphy's. I really want what's in your amendment terribly. But I'm afraid of unintended consequences here with this sort of haircut approach. And I thought that we had talked earlier about not doing haircuts, per se, but I also want to make a comment about the contracting piece, because I totally agree with you, and I think that we could bring that up in the governance committee and have a really good discussion about our philosophy around contracting. Other pieces may not be so easily adapted to a resolution or a policy here, but I guess I'm just wrestling out loud with the tension I feel over this because I really want these things, but I just think there are going to be unintended consequences that we're just with this sort of haircut approach. And actually, I think it was maybe oops, sorry, Councilor Ryan, that mentioned the public safety side. I just I can't abide by that. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor morillo.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. So I guess I just have a few questions. And to be clear, under green ten, this isn't.

Speaker: A blind.

Speaker: Cut, right? We would. Pass green ten and then get the updates on these cuts every six weeks to understand the implications of every cut. And we're going to be. Working with the agencies to make the most sense about which areas it needs to be taken out of when.

Speaker: Discussing.

Speaker: Like access outsourcing. I guess that's not that's that was a rhetorical question, really. I'm just saying that that's what I'm seeing here. But also, no bureau is required to cut a particular part of the contract with dca. Oliveira cited as part as a particular contract that is 75 k, he's not obligated to cut those specific contracts that's not specified in the amendment or the note. Quite the opposite. So we're what we're talking about is 2% of ems, which could be any contract of choosing. So I think that it's very reasonable to find 2% in our own budgets. And if there are impacts that we don't like with certain contracts, then we should find them elsewhere. But these are really critical services that we're trying to support that are going to help a lot of people during a budget crunch. So frankly, I really appreciate councilor green finding creative ways to give us more flexibility with this budget, because I feel like you're the only person that's actually tried at all to do that. And maybe you're taking a lot of public beatings for doing so, but I appreciate it.

Speaker: Councilor smith.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. Others of us have tried to councilor morillo, we just didn't get our stuff passed. So I'm going to add a finer point to this. It is so very interesting that as this was presented, we watched dca cfo. You know,

the cbo office identify what could be a problem. And from day one, I have said that we don't line item stuff. And when you hide stuff in external materials and services and internal materials and services and don't line item what your stuff is, and if their fte in those materials. And so I have a big problem with that to begin with. Stop putting your stuff in external materials. If you're if you're paying for ftes, let me see that line item. And then you come up and you say, oh, but that pays for this person or that person. Stop. It is meant some of this stuff. Yes. We can't just take a haircut. I agree with you, councilor clark. But if we do and have a general way where we can know exactly what's in it, every time I talk about asking for money out of the administrator's budget and in the ems or ims, oh, that's for Portland solutions. Well, if you would put Portland solutions exactly out there on how much we're paying for how many ftes, then we would know what we could take and we couldn't take. So that part is a is an issue. And I appreciate everybody coming up and vouching for their programs and saying, this is what we can't take. And i, I agree with councilor morillo. They're going to be in contact if this passes and not going to try to take those things out that we cannot absolutely take out. But note to self, it would be more helpful to us if we had better line items of what's in each of these things. If you're going to say material services, what is it? What is it? And you all don't say it because you don't want us to know. Or maybe it was the practice that you didn't do it in the past, so you're not doing it in the future. But for me and others who are used to seeing line items, we wouldn't have this issue right now if saying 2%. So we're giving you an opportunity to say where the 2% is from, and the fact that it gives direction to the city administrator to do that, because he knows what's in all of this. It didn't take any of his power away, not one bit, because he understands what is, what can be done and what can't be done. And I just want to say thank you

for bringing this up because it's needed. And we got to do better for this next cycle. And we will.

Speaker: Right on.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor canal.

Speaker: So thank you. I have a question for both councilor Ryan and councilor Clark, which is if hypothetically, because you both mentioned one of the concerns was public safety, if hypothetically, public safety was exempted, would that affect your support for this? And I have a response. I have a comment. After I have question, I get a response if they would be willing.

Speaker: Councilors, if either of you would like to respond, go right ahead.

Speaker: That's a tough one. I think it's the public safety piece that probably pushed me over the edge, but I do. I am concerned about the unintended consequences, and I do think that some of these things can be taken up as policies in our committees. I think, you know, we're all wrestling with limited resources and scrambling for anything we can get. And I appreciate what councilor Smith said about finding out really what the truth is, the bottom line on these these things. But I'm not sure it would change my vote.

Speaker: I made other comments as well and it wouldn't change my vote. It's not the right practice. I had experiences as a commissioner in charge where we didn't have outside opinions. It would have been not good for Portlanders. So there needs to be some money in the budget for this. And what I've listened to from all of the collective administrators today made it more clear to me that I can't support this.

Speaker: Sure. Thank you for clarifying that. So I think what I'm struggling with is, I agree with councilor Ryan that there needs to be money in the budget for this. And you see these \$314,000 of general fund discretionary coming from parks, plus an additional \$377,235 of other revenue, which is some that money is going back into

parks for the other programs. But these are large sums of money. And then you stop and think for a second that that three just the first one of those, the three 14,000 is part of \$15 million of ems. That's just the discretionary ems, right? There's an additional 17 million ish in parks for that. That is ems that's funded through a different type of revenue. So I think that's something where I struggle with the idea that they wouldn't \$15 million when you when you frame it that way to find \$314,000 out of I mean, I think there's I want there to be bark chips. I want to say that emphatically bark chips are important. They actually do matter. I think there's money for bark chips I in here. And so that that's what I'm, I'm struggling with. Having said that, I'm going to float something and i, I just note that the if you look at the top of the before it gets into the enumerated parts of it, again, this is green nine and I hope that we get a chance to talk about green ten because I support it. And I think it it helps ensure that green nine makes sense the best possible way. Once passed. It, it raises, you know, these three types of revenue that total. \$2.567 million. And it spends \$1.88 million, \$1.881 million. So there's \$686,553 left over. And so the thing I'm going to float is exempting the 287,661 from police, exempting the \$183,100 from fire, exempting the \$5,000 from the community board for police accountability, exempting the \$31,371 for the office of public safety dca, exempting \$13,044 from pbem. There are no cuts to boec here that I saw, so that's the entirety of the public safety space, and that adds up to \$520,176, which leaves \$166,377 that I think we should probably use to soften the blow to parks, because parks has taken the biggest hit here. And so that would be the thing that I would float instead of making this a budget, a non-neutral amendment that raises revenue, we could use somewhere else. It would keep it as budget neutral, but it would soften the blow on the bureau taking the biggest hit, which is parks, and it would exempt

public safety. And I would that that's an important value for me and I wanted to just float it. I'm not proposing at this moment, but see where what folks think about it.

Speaker: Can you say it again. Slowly and carefully for my slow little brain.

Speaker: And q haley exemption to police fire. The office for community based police accountability, the dca office for public safety, and pbem.

Speaker: Yeah. So this this was not neutral. It was 683,000 \$686,553 up. I would remove the third line, 287,861 reduction to police. So this would not reduce that \$183,100 in the fourth line for Portland fire and rescue. 10th line reduced bureau program expense in the office of public safety general fund by \$31,371, and go down to the bottom line on the page \$13,044 for pbem. Go to the first line on the next page bpa for \$5,000, which, by the way, is a charter requirement. Not not the d.o.j. And that adds up to 520, 176, 520,176. That leaves an additional 166 377, which I would reduce. The second line. That's 692,000 to parks by the 166,377, which would actually, sorry, got the number off here. 692 -166 377 doing math live in a windows calculator. 525 623 would be the reduction, not 692. And that would make this budget neutral.

Speaker: Councilor green. Would you like to respond or should we move on in the queue to councilor avalos first?

Speaker: I am intrigued by your suggestions. I would like to hear from councilor avalos.

Speaker: Councilor avalos, you are next in the queue.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Well, i'll.

Speaker: Start by responding.

Speaker: To this.

Speaker: Proposal.

Speaker: I guess.

Speaker: Did you in this proposal decide how the things would get reallocated?
Maybe I missed that.

Speaker: It was a lot of.

Speaker: Numbers.

Speaker: Like. Are you going to be. Suggesting that because that's.

Speaker: Revenue essentially.

Speaker: That you're cutting and therefore because all.

Speaker: Of.

Speaker: These dollars are allocated.

Speaker: So how.

Speaker: Are we going to.

Speaker: Do that?

Speaker: There were there were dollars that were not allocated. Oh, and this is, this is a it was unbalanced in a good way. It would have ended us up with 686,000. So I'm putting it back into the bureaus. If in this suggestion, which again is not a formal motion at this time.

Speaker: Okay. I agree with the larger sentiment that it's really frustrating to try to make any of these decisions when we operate.

Speaker: With such.

Speaker: Limited information, when we're not getting line by line items, when every everybody does the whole, you know, national monument, monument thing or whatever.

Speaker: And that. Just puts.

Speaker: Me in such a hard spot, because I obviously want a lot. Of the things that are in the package. I know that our community, I think needs and I am concerned

about, you know, where those cuts are going to come if they're going to, if they're going to result in any fte. And, you know, we could definitely debate, you know, the reasonableness of what the bureau heads or whatever.

Speaker: Are proposing.

Speaker: But at the end of.

Speaker: The.

Speaker: Day, once we make this decision, so it feels like a lot of it will be out of.

Speaker: Our control. And I'm scared about.

Speaker: Those repercussions. So I'm.

Speaker: Really.

Speaker: Grappling with all.

Speaker: Of this.

Speaker: And I'm going to keep listening to see how I feel. But just yeah, it's just a really conflicting feeling to get information right from your bureaus and your dca's, because ideally they're giving you the best information they can, but it doesn't. I just don't always trust it. And I don't know how to feel about that, honestly. And i, I can't make my own decisions because I don't have all of it in front of me. So it just feels like a really I'm putting this really hard. Spot and I don't want to have the negative repercussions of certain contracts getting cut or fte getting cut, and then it just feels like I don't know what's going to happen, and I don't know how to grapple with that right now. Honestly, I'm really conflicted.

Speaker: So I'm just going to answer the first question there about if any fte are going to get cut. This is all ems, so no fte would get cut. This would instead restore three positions that would get cut one park service dispatcher, two analyst positions at the city budget office. And then additionally, some hours that I don't know if it adds up to an fte for that. Those community center hours. Just clarifying.

Speaker: Well, but.

Speaker: But I don't know that that's entirely true because the thing is, like and this is the thing I've largely had an issue with as it relates to contracts, like some contracts aren't just for external things, right. We might have contracts that pay. For us to bring in staff. And so what if there's a contract that is going to affect us or you're making a face?

Speaker: What's the face for?

Speaker: I am not familiar with that.

Speaker: That's all.

Speaker: I'm just thinking about. I'm thinking about when I was an executive director, okay? And I have a budget and I'm getting money from all these kinds of sources. I'm getting it from grants. I'm getting it from individual donors.

Speaker: All of those.

Speaker: Things are messy, right? Like a one grant that I'm getting. It could fund some of my staff. It could fund an external contract. It funds all these things. And I don't know this how the bureaus work with that. I don't have that information. So I don't like feeling like I don't know the real impact because these things are all really intertwined. And if we're going to leave the decision, I mean, I appreciate having, you know, green ten that like gives some more direction about how to make those cuts. I'm also, you know, and I have a bunch of budget notes that I'm like, you know, I'm putting these suggestions. I also, to be quite honest, I don't know if that's actually going to happen.

Speaker: I don't.

Speaker: Know if like how to keep keep them accountable to that either.

Speaker: So I don't.

Speaker: Feel that the notes are like a solid thing for me, but I think I'm just frustrated because I don't really know the impact and I know how dollars are just again, they're so woven together, and so I don't think that it exactly means that just because it's ems and that's technically not fte, I don't believe that that exactly means that fte won't be lost, but I can't answer that question because I don't have the information and I'm frustrated about that. So.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor who people keep jumping in the queue. I want to remind us that while there's a lot we can debate, we are moving toward a vote here. So I don't want to stop people from saying things they need to explain how and why they're going to vote the way they are, or to try to influence your colleagues. But I do want to make sure that we don't have folks just jumping in if we don't need to use that time and space. I also am seeing that our interim fire chief is online with a comment, and in the same way that we gave some space to the dcas, I'm wondering, do you see a cozy, if you mind, if we hear from aj jackson? Chief jackson director cozzie is our dca cozy is coming up.

Speaker: I'm up here.

Speaker: So again, for the record, dca causi my phone was blowing up through the conversation and chief jackson had messaged me and said that she does have some specific examples of the impact to Portland fire. And I mentioned to her that if we have the opportunity that I could come back up. So chief jackson.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: For allowing me.

Speaker: The time.

Speaker: For the record.

Speaker: My name is.

Speaker: Aj jackson.

Speaker: I'm the. Interim fire.

Speaker: Chief for.

Speaker: Portland fire and rescue. And just.

Speaker: To provide a little bit of context.

Speaker: I know there's.

Speaker: A lot of questions and.

Speaker: There's kind of fears about what's embedded in the external materials.

Speaker: And services.

Speaker: And i. Just want.

Speaker: To.

Speaker: Speak.

Speaker: For fire, and I don't want to speak for anyone.

Speaker: Else.

Speaker: But the majority of our ems.

Speaker: Is really.

Speaker: Going to support our station operations.

Speaker: Apparatus maintenance.

Speaker: And suppression support.

Speaker: So that's simple repairs, that's fire hose, self-contained breathing apparatus. It is a big.

Speaker: Chunk of our. Budget overall that goes to supporting our efforts. And just to kind of give a little bit of perspective as it.

Speaker: Is like right now.

Speaker: We are projected to go over our budget.

Speaker: And right now it's about at 10 million.

Speaker: Is the projected.

Speaker: Ending.

Speaker: Which is.

Speaker: 5% of our budget. And I guess for me and.

Speaker: For who might be, you know, stepping in behind.

Speaker: Behind me.

Speaker: As the new fire chief.

Speaker: Coming in, I just want.

Speaker: That person.

Speaker: To have.

Speaker: A full arsenal.

Speaker: Right. And to not be caught already on the defensive, on how to support our operations and ensure that we can maintain the services we provide to the community. So if there are further questions or line item concerns, we are more than happy to provide that information to you all so you can have a more informed decision, at least from the fire perspective. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you chief. Thank you casey. Thank you. We have a couple of additional people in the queue. I'll note that our colleague, councilor koyama lane is going to try to jump back online with us, but had to had to leave the meeting. Councilor zimmerman, did you have anything additional to add?

Speaker: Thank you. I just wanted to comment on the ideas that were put forward by councilor canal in terms of exempting those that you listed. I appreciated that that helps me get much closer. The one area that I would actually say I'd rather, because it's a smaller amount and we are in this constant negotiation with the county on our Portland solutions stuff and our joint office stuff, I would say that extra 160 you noted for parks, maybe that could go back into the administration, the city administration, where I think that would probably benefit Portland

solutions in a sheltering manner. But I there's a couple of beaches out here. I generally am comfortable with the ems aspect. The areas I wouldn't I wouldn't want a cut applied based on this action. If we miscalculated in this amendment, the 2%. So if we said we think there's 2% represents this number, and actually that bureau doesn't have that in ems, the way the budget document would signal that is that they'd have to make that cut in a similar way because they've got to balance. So I want to make sure that that's avoidable, that we aren't adding or sending a signal of make this cut. Regardless, I think it needs to make sure that we are signaling only make this cut in ems if that's happening. But I feel like there are some conversations and some work here, and I just appreciated councilor kanal adjustment because saving the public safety pieces here, the apparatus that the chief just spoke about, I know the work it takes to get a fire truck serviced and that's important. These are investments. You do not want things to go down years without the right maintenance. It gets a lot more expensive. So I'm generally getting there and I think we can move a few things around, maybe to pass this at a different time.

Speaker: Councilor morillo.

Speaker: Thank you. I'm getting a little frustrated by the fact that it seems like no one seems to comprehend what a budget is. A budget note is legally equivalent to a resolution, which means that it is giving direction to our agencies as the legislative body. With the power of the purse, we can give direction to our agencies about how they're going to spend these dollars. So when it says that they are required to check in with us every six weeks and give us updates, that does not mean that this is going to go, you know, randomly through bureaus without any oversight from us. We are quite literally the oversight body. So I feel like this is as clear as it can be. As far as engagement timeline, do people want it more than every six weeks? What is it

going to take to make people happy? Because I I'm just failing to see how ems would involve cuts to fte. By definition, these are two separate and different parts of the budget that do not overlap. Am I misunderstanding something? Okay, zimmerman, answer it then.

Speaker: Counselor zimmerman, did you want to say something to that before we move to counselor.

Speaker: Can.

Speaker: I totally agree, I think there's one question that remains, which is if in this amendment, because it has specific dollar amount reductions that are cited, if we apply it in this amendment to a bureau and they don't actually have that in their, in their ems, that that that could have a different effect because they still have to balance it. I think it is such a minuscule percentage point, it's not really worth wrapping the axle, but it could cause pause because you're right, ems is not people, right? And given the fact that the way that we lump things together in this city's operations of budget is making this more difficult to counselor smith's point, I think if we can clarify 1 or 2 things there, your point is made.

Speaker: I just I need to jump in here. I'm trying to respect the stack, but the numbers that are enumerated there did come from the cbo and those were from ems budgets. Now, whether or not there's a preference to cut those budgets, that's a different question. But those are those are these those are ems categories in their budgets. I would be open to amendments or friendly approaches that could get us closer. But really green. Ten the budget note is, is providing the vision for this. And we are, you know, to counselor smith's points. Ditto. And I think that that is you know, next time we got to have more resolution. So thanks for letting me jump in here.

Speaker: Thank you, counselor councilor canal.

Speaker: Yeah, I've had a little time to think about it and hear feedback. I think regardless of whether or not this is the thing that makes it pass or not, this aligns with how I'm viewing the situation. So I will make the request for a friendly amendment to counselor green that I floated earlier. I am very open to saying up to that last dollar amount for that last category. In case there's a rounding or a small amount, as opposed to the hard and fast number of 166,377. And if it's if it's the gap between living and dying on this to get what we need, I'm happy to put it elsewhere, but I'd ask if we could go 5050 on it for parks in the city. Administrator counselor zimmerman, if that's a if that's okay with you.

Speaker: Yeah, I appreciate it. I we. Were under the gun right now from the county's perspective in terms of whether or not they're going to live up to the iga. And frankly, I would like to morrow to bring a note that is stern about our position on that. And I want to be careful that we don't add to the messiness in our own, because last week, hearing that they had a 40% reduction in their potentially a 40% reduction in their sheltering, I don't want to then further contribute to it, because I think that agreement right now is hanging on by like a thread of a thread. So that's my concern.

Speaker: I'm realizing that you just put \$2.1 million into parks maintenance, so I'm happy to float it the way I said it earlier, but putting 166,377 into the city administrator's office instead of parks at the end there, and I'd ask if counselor green would be comfortable considering that amendment friendly.

Speaker: I am comfortable with that.

Speaker: And I was the seconder.

Speaker: You were the seconder. So I assume that you are also okay with it. So, counselors, the proposal before us is now green nine with a number of items taken out of the reductions, generally those related to public safety and a. Increase and

increase bullet added, which would send the remainder of the dollars. Because this did raise more than it spent to or actually, I guess it would decrease the reduction. It would decrease the reduction to the city administrator's office general fund discretionary with the remainder of the dollars. Specifically, in order to keep Portland solutions as whole as possible. Is that a fair summary of what you're doing here, counselors? Okay. Counselor avalos. Councilor avalos did you remove yourself from the queue? Okay. Councilor kanal are you back in the queue? Okay, counselor. Seeing no one else in the queue, I am assuming, counselor green, that that's a legacy hand.

Speaker: Their legacy hand.

Speaker: So sorry. Fantastic.

Speaker: Can we repeat the amendment?

Speaker: Yeah. So, Keelan, I'm going to have you call the roll. But before then, can you, haley, please tell us the changes to green nine? We are not voting on an amendment to green nine. We're voting on green nine. This was a friendly amendment that was accepted to it. So it's green nine different from what is on the page because we have removed some reductions and reduced a reduction. And haley, can you share with us what those changes are?

Speaker: We need the amounts shared back to us. Councilor kanal can.

Speaker: You send it.

Speaker: To you?

Speaker: Yeah, yeah. Great. Okay.

Speaker: Or you can vocalize them here and I can record them.

Speaker: Sure. So in the first line this is page 20 of the document. It's the first of the points under green nine. Reduce program bureau program expense in the city administrator's office general fund by. 323,930. So that's a reduction in the amount

reduced. The third line would be struck that says bureau program expense reduce bureau program expense in the Portland police bureau general fund by 287 861. That would be struck so it would not be reduced. The fourth line would also be struck reduce bureau program expense in the Portland fire and rescue general fund by 183 100. If you go down to the. It's in the middle of the page. Reduce bureau program expense in the office of public safety general fund by 31,003 71. That would also be struck. It's the. Ten 10th, the last one on that page. Reduce bureau program expense in the Portland bureau of emergency management general fund by \$13,044 would be struck the next one after that. First on the next page, reduce bureau program expense in the office of community based police accountability general fund by \$5,000 would also be struck. So that is six lines that are sorry, five lines that are struck. And the very first one, the dollar amount changed from. 493,007 to 323 930.

Speaker: Councilors. Did everybody catch that? Okay. Keelan, could you please call the roll on the amended version of green nine. Canal.

Speaker: Thank you to councilor green for your consistent effort in trying to figure out how to make these things happen and save represented city public workers. I vote i.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: As politically seductive as this one is, I still have to remain on my principles. I vote no.

Speaker: Koyama lane let me see if she's joined.

Speaker: Can you guys hear me?

Speaker: Yeah, we can hear you.

Speaker: You can.

Speaker: I very much appreciate the discussion and the effort. I literally just said right before this as much as possible, I think it's important that we try to stay at the governance level. There are problems that we need to address. I want to address them. I'm not convinced that this is the right approach at this time. I vote no.

Speaker: Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick the day I start governing by anecdote and assuming there must be a bunch of waste in government. So I'm going to vote to make random cuts and hope somebody else will find the waste. Is the day I joined the republican party. Hell no.

Speaker: Clark.

Speaker: Well. I think I'm being seduced. I, I want to say hub staffing very, very badly. I want the Portland center stage. I want all the things that are in councilor dunphy's amendment. Perhaps against my better judgment, I'm voting yes.

Speaker: Green.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Zimmerman.

Speaker: I am. I am always glad that councilor green is on the finance committee with me. I appreciate the way you look at this. I think it's why we get along and a lot of stuff. Budgets are fast. You got to keep up or you will get lost in the dust, I vote yes.

Speaker: Envelopes.

Speaker: Me.

Speaker: I don't believe the rules allow that. I apologize, councilor. You can always change your vote at the end if you need to.

Speaker: I'm sorry.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: I'm gonna vote no right now, and then I might change it.

Speaker: Then i.

Speaker: Smith. I pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: I heard things from our dcas that don't line up with the numbers on the page. I think there likely is room for cuts like this, but I can't do it in this hatchet of a of an attempt. No.

Speaker: Classics.

Speaker: Seven five, I believe.

Speaker: Sorry.

Speaker: I'm looking for the official count from our clerk, though.

Speaker: Yeah, my vote tally tracker just crashed. I believe it was seven. Yes to five. No, but i'll verify.

Speaker: That's what I wrote down as well. Colleagues, we were scheduled to stop at 6:00 tonight because we also have time tomorrow. So I am going to pause us here. We did two things in two hours. We have a lot to do. Tomorrow. I am going to encourage us all to say what we need to say, to try to convince our colleagues to change their minds, to reach better policy, and to explain our votes before we vote, but to try to not say more than that tomorrow so we can get through this all. We will reconvene at 930 tomorrow morning, and we are scheduled between 930 and 6 tomorrow. And that is the time we have for our budget work. Haley, do you have something? Before I recess our meeting, one request.

Speaker: Would be for councilors whose amendments were encompassed.

Speaker: In green.

Speaker: Nine to send me a quick message that formally withdraws your amendment if it was encompassed and you're happy with that. So we can officially remove those from the to do list for tomorrow. Thank you.

Speaker: And with that, I will recess our meeting to tomorrow at 930.

Portland City Council Meeting Closed Caption File

June 11, 2025 – 9:30 a.m.

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

Speaker: This morning. It is 9:33 a.m. On June 11th. It is Wednesday, and we are reconvening our council meeting to discuss the budget. Colleagues, when we left yesterday, we were talking about amendments within the parks policy area and giving folks an opportunity to bring forward a top priority. We heard from councilor zimmerman and green, and we'll pick back up there. But before we start, I just want to remind us all that we have about nine hours today. We are scheduled to end this afternoon at, I believe, 6:00, maybe 630. I should look it up. 6:00. So a little less than that, actually. And there is a lot that folks still want to do. So I would just encourage us all to say what we need to say to get our points across and then stop. We don't have. Rules that suggest that we respond to everything. Some comments can be left alone. We don't need to speak to every vote. If we've already spoken about why we're going to vote a certain way first, and we don't need to bloviate. Councilor green, I see you first in the queue, but you have already brought forward an amendment. Are you? Oh I'm sorry. Keelan do you need to call the roll?

Speaker: We do. And actually we have public communications this morning as our first item before we jump into the.

Speaker: I am so sorry. Okay, well, let's do that instead of just picking up where we left off, let's call the roll and then do general communications. But we don't have public testimony today, right?

Speaker: No public testimony, just public communications. And then city attorney will also read the rules. Canal here. Ryan koyama lane here.

Speaker: Morillo here.

Speaker: Novick. Clark. Here. Here. Zimmerman. Here. Avalos. Dunphy. Here. Smith.

Speaker: Here.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney here.

Speaker: And, mr. Taylor, could you please read us our rules of decorum?

Speaker: Welcome, everyone, to the Portland City Council to testify before council in person or virtually. You must sign up in advance on the council agenda at wwe.gov/agenda. Information on engaging with council can be found on the council clerk's webpage. Individuals may testify for three minutes unless the presiding officer states otherwise, your microphone will be muted when your time is over. The presiding officer preserves order. Disruptive conduct such as shouting. Refusing to conclude your testimony when your time is up or interrupting others testimony or council deliberations will not be allowed. If you cause a disruption, a warning will be given. Further disruption will result in ejection from the meeting. Anyone who fails to leave once ejected is subject to arrest for trespass. Additionally, council may take a short recess and reconvene virtually. Your testimony should please address the matter being considered. When testifying, please state your name for the record. Your address is not necessary. If you are a lobbyist, please identify the organization you represent. Virtual testifier should please unmute themselves when the council clerk calls your name. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you and Keelan, could you please call up our first folks for public communication?

Speaker: Or first up, we have addie smith.

Speaker: I'm going to need a few minutes to set my laptop up just to record.

Speaker: I'm here with us today.

Speaker: Thank you for having me. I signed up in April. So this is a lot's happened since then.

Speaker: I know there's often a backlog to get these slots.

Speaker: Yeah, it needs to change. And we, the voters can change it. Good morning. My name is adi smith. Today is June 11th. I am speaking before the Portland City Council. Democrat led states like Oregon, Washington state, california democrats have controlled the state legislatures since 2012, 1992 and the 1970s, respectively. Yet police still create fake police reports and create fake charges. They still lie in police reports, so on and so forth. Da's and attorneys still create fake charges, commit perjury with impunity, lie to judges and juries and judges, still hand down rulings on these fake charges and years long sentences on these fake charges. Democrats have controlled these respective state legislatures and have created no laws to hold judges, das, or attorneys accountable when they commit perjury, violate the laws and rights of the constituents, specifically those who are predominantly black and brown. These states have bar associations that do not hold attorneys accountable for committing perjury, creating fake charges, and prosecuting innocent people. These states have commissions on judicial conduct that are funded by us taxpayers. To the state legislatures that do not hold these judges accountable when they commit perjury. Tina kotek and the Oregon legislature are silent about violations of the laws and rights of young black men that have been harmed by Oregon's justice system. Nearly 90 million people stayed home in last year's presidential election. That's 36.33% of the population of the voters. That's more than the percentage who voted for trump or harris. The people pleaded with harris to change her stance on israel, and continuing to send them

weapons and money to commit the ethnic cleansing of its rightful brown people of palestine. This same month last year, biden deported over 12,000 people. We don't know who. We don't know what those people statuses were, whether they were legal illegal immigrants or us citizens because the media didn't blast it all over the news. There were no protests, no social media was commenting about it. And gavin newsom is saying that law enforcement is only doing their jobs, quote unquote. Meanwhile, law enforcement in california has racially profiled, assaulted and arrested black people with impunity. Newsom is posting every seven minutes on his twitter page about trump when he is no different than trump. His ex-wife is in a relationship with eric trump. They didn't divorce because of political beliefs. They divorced because he cheated. Gavin newsom is doing everything he can to keep the lid on his real political beliefs until he can get in the white house, and hell will freeze over and i'll skate on the ice before i'll ever help get him there. In Oregon, black people make up 1.7% of the population, but we make up over 9% of Oregon's jail population. Democrats aren't the lesser evil. Democrats scoff and speak out against scotus, but are dead silent when municipal circuit court of appeals and their own state right here in Oregon violate the laws of rights of black people. That's another reason why trump or his surrogate is going to be in office in 2028, because you guys are silent on what's happening to black people right here. The fire is inside the house. Thank you very much.

Speaker: Thank you for being here. We appreciate hearing your concerns.

Speaker: Next up we have cammy price. Any price? Terrance hayes.

Speaker: I'm here.

Speaker: Good morning. Thank you for being here.

Speaker: Is it on me?

Speaker: Go right ahead.

Speaker: How y'all doing? I just want to start by saying that the continued narrative that you guys, a lot of you are creating that pits community against policing is nonsense. And furthermore, most of y'all have never had the lived experience to actually talk about what happens between police officers and especially the black community. And from where I'm standing outside of Loretta Smith, the rest of y'all just be talking. You actually don't know what you're talking about. Angelina. Candace, y'all know who y'all are. You guys really don't know what y'all talking about. You've continued to double down on narratives that actually don't bring police and community closer. It doesn't make black men in our community more safer from police officers. You guys have done nothing to actually make young black men safer. You talk about the same things that the City Council is. Before y'all talked about police budgets, policing, and it actually does not make community safer. It's a bit ridiculous that many of y'all have built political careers on the back, on the back of dead black men, yet y'all silenced the voices of black men that actually know what they talking about. In the black and brown communities. It is a bit ridiculous that we're talking about police budgets, as if black people are owning more businesses, as if black men are dying less by numbers in this city. And as if any of those things taken \$2 million from the police for parks does not make community safer. I don't have an issue with the \$2 million that's between y'all and the police. I sincerely don't care. It is your responsibility to do what y'all want with money. I really don't care. What I care about is the narrative of black folks have continued to be leveraged when no results have thus far came out of this City Council to make young black men, brown men, and immigrants and refugee communities safer. Loretta did a town hall. Young people stood up and said that they hear gunshots and are scared, and police don't respond. I've seen no real answer out of this council about how to get police officers there faster and how to

make sure when they show up that there are engaging community safely. It is not a lot to ask to create policy and do the things necessary to make make sure officers are not bringing harm when they come. It is also not a lot to ask to make sure we are properly staffed. You guys job is to not bring your narratives and your politics to the table. It is your job now to represent community. Y'all continue to do that. You've brought your activist dispositions when you need to represent this community holistically. It is a bit ridiculous. Jamie, I expected from you to stand. You have lived experience in these spaces and you've continued to seem to get bullied by your activist counterparts. It is a bit ridiculous that you guys are afraid. Don't let your whiteness be a reason that you can't stand up and do what's right. Olivia. Stand up. Be proud that you're willing to say something. The rest of them is not saying. Our community is tired of being leveraged. There is no investment. There is no double down to make sure black and brown people are better off when this is over. And y'all voices cannot continue to dominate ours in this conversation.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Anyone here? Thank you. Please keep your support or disappointment to silent means.

Speaker: Next up we have noah pelican joining online.

Speaker: Hello. Good morning. Portland City Council come today to testify regarding the Portland ashkelon sister city agreement. My name is noah pelican. I'm a lifelong Portlander. I've been involved before as a precinct committee person for the Multnomah County democrats, as a shop steward for ufcw 555. But I'm here today to testify on my own behalf. The city of Portland holds a sister city agreement with the city of ashkelon, israel. Ashkelon was allocated to palestine in the 1947 united nations partition plan for palestine, who conquered by israel in 1948. It has since been almost entirely ethnically cleansed through a series of mass

deportations. Given the ongoing case at the international court of justice regarding a genocide in palestine. The arrest warrants issued by the international criminal court for prime minister benjamin netanyahu and defense minister yoav gallant, alleging responsibility for the war crime of starvation as a method of warfare and crimes against humanity of murder, persecution and other inhumane acts during the gaza war and the decisions of the united nations special committee on israeli practices and amnesty international, which claim an ongoing genocide in gaza, claims reinforced by the likes of united nations special rapporteur on the occupied palestinian territories, francesca albanese and human rights watch. I would request, as a citizen of Portland, that the Portland City Council critically review our sister city agreement with the city of ashkelon. I find it imperative that the content and extent of this agreement is made publicly available. I believe that we should have the knowledge specifically if this includes financial ties, or holds any relation, even tangential to war crimes or violations of international law as perpetrated by the israeli state. Finally, I would request that, given what we know of the ongoing actions of the israeli state and military in gaza, as well as in the occupied palestinian territories and the west bank, a critical discussion is facilitated by the City Council, with public input as to whether we wish to continue this sister city partnership. I sincerely hope that this request is taken to heart and acted upon as all of us, especially those in positions of power such as yourselves, hold a moral imperative to act in times of grave injustice, which is what I believe we are witnessing at the moment. So thank you for your time and for hearing my testimony, and I wish you all the best. With the forthcoming budget discussion.

Speaker: Thank you, noah, for being here today.

Speaker: Our last person is jordan lewis.

Speaker: Welcome.

Speaker: Hello Portland City Council I'm Jordan Lewis with Portland DSA. I sorry this spring Portland DSA, Democratic Socialists of America boarded TriMet in Portland streetcar to survey transit riders on their experiences and priorities for improvement. I scheduled this communication spot months ago before the state transportation package was revealed, with a solid 2.2% increase to the state stiff tax for transit. However, we still want to showcase our effort because we are proud of it. We think it adds some much needed context on the needs of our transit system. At this moment, 340 riders from 65 counties answered our survey, and these were totally random strangers, samplings of people who happened to be riding transit during rush hour or on weekends. Our zip code analysis confirmed that the riders were geographically well distributed and tended to ride more regularly than those in TriMet's own attitude and awareness survey, as 11% of our respondents rode less than once per week, while 40% of TriMet respondents rode once per month or less. This implies that our results better reflected workers and those dependent on TriMet than the TriMet survey, which overrepresented former office commuters who remained on TriMet's internal mailing list after the pandemic. 66% of respondents had a bachelor's degree or higher. The results of our survey did not entirely contradict theirs. However, the number one concern with transit was still rider behavior, though by a much lower margin than TriMet and TriMet reported. The next highest concerns were service frequency and shelter quality at a similar rate to poor passenger behavior. I want to highlight how, though most riders complain about safety, those same riders would prefer increased frequencies over increased outreach worker presence. As City Council, you do not control the rates at which busses run but you. But PBO has some control over bus shelter quality and the streets on which transit runs. I hope that you read the entire survey report in detail, but I'd suggest that rather than bashing transit for political points, councilors trade

out the law and order mentality for better shelter, maintenance and bus improvements. I personally have seen pbot remove entire shelters at west burnside and saint clair and seen benches removed from shelters around the city, like at belmont and southeast 30th. You may not like transit, but someone in your community relies on it and they deserve dignified, frequent service with functional shelters. I want to close with quotes from some riders we surveyed. Most busses downtown have incredibly difficult disabled access trimet security, and police intimidate and harass people and delay trips, making riders feel unsafe. Security should be narcon. Security should be public safety such as narcan, not policing fares on the 39, there is a stop with a lot of trash and brush around it. There's a fallen tree across the sidewalk that makes it impossible for wheelchairs and other mobility devices to get to the stop, and for those who can walk around it, you have to get very close to cars that are coming from behind you. It's been there for several weeks. Cars speeding on north Vancouver avenue make it difficult to cross the street, and many near-miss accidents. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you for sharing that with us.

Speaker: That completes communications.

Speaker: Okay, councilors, we're now going to pick up where we left off yesterday. We are in the parks policy area. We will then move to public safety and then community engagement, housing and homelessness. And then there were a few things in another category. Will then move to budget notes and then open it up for other priorities that have either been brought since we talked about a policy area, or that you did not get to raise the initial time through. Councilor green. You brought something yesterday on parks. Are you in the queue for some other point?

Speaker: Madam president, there was an accompanying budget note green ten that was paired with green nine that we took up last night. I would just like to hear

that because it provides the guidance for the targeted ems cuts. If you think that's appropriate at this time.

Speaker: Given that we took things as packages previously. Yeah, let's go ahead and start there then. Councilor green seconded.

Speaker: Oh, thank you, colleagues. I apologize for having my foot up. I have an injury. It's not out of disrespect. I'm introducing a budget note to direct oversight of external materials and services reduction. The budget note reads to guide the implementation of the 2% reduction to external materials and services, council directs the city administrator to prioritize eliminating expenditures that reflect contract bloat, excessive consulting, and overreliance on external vendors for functions that could be fulfilled by city staff. Reductions should target high cost, low justification projects, for example, luxury materials, transport or redundant advisory services. Cuts should not come at the expense of union represented, represented positions or collectively bargained contracts. Further, council directs that the 2% ems cut to quote other revenue in Portland parks and recreation, and estimated savings of \$377,000 shall be allocated to increase parks and recreation program expenses by the same amount. To restore funding for community centers. Aquatics, the Portland tennis center, evening hours and alternative community service. That's what was in green nine to ensure transparency and alignment with council values, the city administrator shall provide written updates every six weeks to the end of fy 2526. Each update must identify affected contracts, quantify projected savings, assess impacts on service delivery and internal staffing capacity, and describe efforts to safeguard union work. The city administrator may apply flexibility in meeting the 2% reduction target, and is not required to implement cuts evenly by bureau or line item concentrated reductions, such as canceling or scaling back large external contracts are permitted where they are most effectively, where

they most effectively advance fiscal responsibility, minimize service disruption, and advance the spirit of this note, the oversight framework ensures that cuts reinforce long term fiscal responsibility while preserving workforce integrity and public service continuity. Update attachments as needed to reflect this change. So that's the language of the note colleagues.

Speaker: Thank you counselor. Is there a second second? Councilor canal is second. Counselor green, are you. I'm sorry, counselor dunphy, are you in the queue for discussion of this amendment? Councilor kanal, are you in the queue for discussion, counselor? Novick, are you in the queue for discussion?

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Okay, colleagues seeing no one in the queue for discussion. Keelan, could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Koyama lane. Yes.

Speaker: Morillo I novick. No. Clark i. Green i.

Speaker: Zimmerman. I avalos. I dunphy.

Speaker: I. Smith i. Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: The amendment is approved with ten yes votes and two no votes.

Speaker: Thank you colleagues.

Speaker: Councilor dunphy, are you in the queue to put forward an amendment in the parks area?

Speaker: Yes, ma'am.

Speaker: Go right ahead.

Speaker: Thank you. Colleagues, I'd like to draw your attention to dunphy five. This is a revised version that was pre filed pertaining to leach botanical garden. Before I start, I just want to again disclose my wife works at leach botanical garden. I'd be introducing this regardless. It's our only botanical garden. Our garden partner in east Portland. My previous amendment had attempted to. It was based off some bad information. They recently had a changeover of executive directors, and they were. The information was passed to the new executive director that there was another year of funding. That is not accurate. However, they have asked for some assistance in this coming year to transition to full financial independence. With the new executive director in place, my amendment directs \$100,000 out of the parks levy contingency fund to leach botanical garden for one year to in order to help with the final transition to financial independence. This will also help prevent any cuts to programing or staffs, and I'd ask for a second. So.

Speaker: Colleagues, is there okay. I believe councilor morillo seconded that. Councilor kanal are you in the queue for discussion? Councilor novick are you in the queue for discussion?

Speaker: Oh, I need to add also. I'm sorry, there is \$1.4 million in the parks levy contingency fund. This would direct roughly 7% of that towards parks.

Speaker: Councilor smith, are you in the queue for discussion?

Speaker: Yes. Currently. Do we currently give money to botanical gardens? Are we just expanding?

Speaker: Most of our garden received different. Let me start over. Yes, there are different agreements in place. The parks bureau has been moving towards a licensing agreement rather than a management agreement with a lot of our community partners, and they are moving towards some consistency, and this is to help with that new contract regime.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you.

Speaker: Colleagues. Is there any other discussion on this amendment. Yeah. Councilor Ryan.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. Yes. Councilor dunphy, I just want to have a little more context. So they do have an executive director, you said.

Speaker: Yeah, they have a new executive director who started in February. The previous one left in January, and there was some miscommunication in the budget writing between their the previous outgoing executive director had put into the budget that he submitted to parks, that they were anticipating \$360,000 coming in a fourth year of the contract, which actually is expired. And so the new executive director found a budget that had a \$360,000 line item in it that was in fact incorrect and is not coming. This is not to keep them as whole as their budget previously anticipated, but is to help with. Smooth out the transition there.

Speaker: Is there anyone from parks here that could answer the question on why that happened? And then if what are the consequences of this hundred k going in?

Speaker: Yeah. Claudio. Great.

Speaker: If you could introduce.

Speaker: Yourself opportunity to educate us all on the memorandum of understanding between parks and the friends groups.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Claudio campuzano finance property technology manager for vibrant community support services, the commissioner, councilor dunphy has has it exactly right. We have a three year agreement with the leech botanical garden that included a grant that was being made to them over the course of three years, specifically to help bridge them as they as they achieve financial independence. That that goal was established because of the \$12 million upgrade to the facility

that was performed by parks. That allowed for a pretty substantial improvement to the wedding venue, etc. And that they they keep the revenues for as well as as well as several years ago we allowed them to start charging admission prior it was free. And so that was sort of the deal was to allow them to charge admission and keep the revenues at the site, and in exchange for not receiving any further subsidy from, from the city. So we and we've been moving to that license agreement, and that's similar to what we've been doing with all of our all of our partners is management agreements are really not the most appropriate way they need to be. They need to be solicited and, and gone through a procurement process. And in a lot of these instances, we're we're not really paying them for service. We're we're allowing them to it's a partnership allowing them to maintain the site, run it for public purpose, but also for some private purposes.

Speaker: So thank you. And I was actually I was trying to figure out why the 300 and some thousand was not put forth.

Speaker: I'm sorry. I think that that the that councilor dunphy had that right as well. It was a transition. It was a transition on the executive side of the garden, the outgoing executive director maybe didn't didn't transfer that knowledge around the ending of the agreement. And so the agreement ends at the end of this fiscal year. And I think that they were anticipating that, that that subsidy would continue.

Speaker: And so this is like a bridge, a transition slope. And this is fine with parks.

Speaker: Yeah, absolutely.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Councilor claudia, before you leave, I'm sorry. Could you give us a sense of what the parks levy contingency is generally used for? What are the other types

of uses? I understand that this is 7%, which isn't a large portion, but it isn't nothing either. And I'd just like to understand what we are putting at risk if we.

Speaker: Do this. Yeah, that's that's a good question. So as with most most funds in the city, the what and you probably have heard this from other folks.

Contingency is effectively ending balance. So it is it is what we were what we have at the end of the year. We do have it as contingency so that we can budget in the event of, of necessary expenditures. But but really and in the case of the parks levy, because this is the end of the fifth year, that really is what we anticipate to be what remains of total levy dollars collected over the five year period. And so we would be sort of landing that landing relatively close over the course of the five years. It's over \$250 million. So that that \$1 million is what's left at the end.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilors. Any other questions or comments? Okay. Seeing no other discussion. Thank you both. Keelan could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Thank you. I think it's I think it's really important that we demonstrate not only that we're willing to invest generally in the things that are important, but specifically in district one. And I am grateful to councilor dunphy for bringing this forward, I vote i, i.

Speaker: Koyama lane I morillo.

Speaker: This is such a special resource for our city. I'm very grateful to councilor dunphy for fighting for his district.

Speaker: I vote yea novick. No green. I zimmerman.

Speaker: Thanks. I appreciate this and I'm sure it will pass and I'm grateful for that. But I've been in government a long time, and I think we're bumping up against an interesting ethical dilemma here. Usually we would declare a potential conflict of interest or we would not vote on it when our family is involved. So I wish this had come a different route. I don't know that I don't want to contribute to this, because

I think we're touching up on something. So I'm going to vote no. And I'm sorry for that. No.

Speaker: I dunphy.

Speaker: I smith.

Speaker: I understand what you're talking about. Councilor zimmerman we didn't get any direction from the city attorney's office that it would be a problem. And I'm not I know we're not in discussion right now, but I didn't hear. I think that he would have jumped in if there was a problem. So I'm going to vote yes.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

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

Speaker: Councilor kanal are you in the queue for an amendment in the parks area?

Speaker: Yes, ma'am.

Speaker: Go right ahead.

Speaker: Colleagues.

Speaker: I sent this email just a little while ago with a revised version. I was waiting for a revised scoring a portion of my previously filed amendments, canal 15 and canal four were included in the green ten. I want to say nine. The one that passed yesterday, the last one. And so I have taken the portion of canal four that's relevant to parks, put it in to replace the part of canal 15 that is done, and repropose it as canal 15, and i'll revise it. I'm going to read it out loud here. It's in your email. So this is canal 15 as revised allocate previously banked funding currently in contingency from revenue increases or expense reductions on may 21st to the to restore funding for two service dispatchers under parks and to transfer that those positions to the 311 program restoring 2.0 fte and the Portland bureau of emergency management increasing fte by 4.0. It has four sorry, six specific items

under it reduced contingency funding by 999,000. Increased bureau program expenses in the general fund. Discretionary ongoing revenue in the city operations 311 program by \$252,000 and increase the city operations 311 program by two fte. Increase increased bureau program expense by 747,000 at the Portland view of emergency management general fund and increase position authority at pbem by four fte and of course, update attachments a through h to reflect these changes. I'm proposing it here because it relates to park ranger service dispatchers, and the core function of that role is in support of the parks. If there's a second.

Speaker: Is there a second? Second?

Speaker: Okay. Go ahead.

Speaker: So yesterday there are three park ranger service dispatchers in parks. All three of them were slated in the mayor's proposed budget to be laid off historically. And the rationale for that is that this work should be done by 311. I find that rationale very compelling, that 311 should actually be the place that dispatches it. We brought up the director, the manager of 311 and asked in the previous times where different types of dispatch have been moved to three one, one. Have you ever received the work but not the staff? And specifically pbet came up in this regard last time and she said no. In fact, we have multiple examples of types of dispatch being moved over with the staff. That wouldn't have happened this time. We've restored one of the three dispatchers, but we've not restored the other two. Having a park ranger program is incredibly important. We will need to do more investment into park rangers in general, but having an infinite number of park rangers is not helpful. If the dispatcher cannot get them to the park at the request of people who have a need. These are also represented positions. I should note separately, we have the Portland bureau of emergency management, which has issued a I want to say, \$3.5 million request for specific needs to resolve some

critical deficiencies in our emergency management structure. This would begin the process of making that a portion of that ask possible, and it uses money that we have already banked in contingency, which was the money we ended up on the day in the approved budget and then put into contingency so that our budget would be balanced and we could approve it and send it off to the scc. So this is money that would ultimately need to come and be used somewhere, or just be \$1 million added to contingency if we didn't do anything with it. And I think I have one of the I have a few people here who can speak to any particular questions on both of the two sides of it. The deputy director of pbem is present, as well as one of the three park service dispatchers. I want to note the particular person who's here is not one of the people whose jobs would be affected. We already saved this person's job. So this is a person who can speak neutrally about the impacts to the program, and we can all be confident that it's not because it's about their personal position being restored or not. So I just wanted to note that for the record.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor councilor novick. Are you in the queue to speak to this amendment?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Right ahead.

Speaker: I'm concerned about whether the numbers add up because I seek director levine's response to this. It's my understanding that I want to. I want at least 625,000 for pbem for three positions, two planners and one training response person. But it's my understanding that even for shifting money to pbem, which is a, quote, overhead bureau, 43% of the money we give them has to be discretionary. And I thought that what we had left over on may 21st, only 309,000 was discretionary. So you can't squeeze your parks dispatchers plus 250 some thousand

for pbem out of that money. So I don't think so. I just want to check with director levine to see if this works.

Speaker: Yeah, sorry, I was just trying to work on it right now. I'm. I think you're correct. Councilor novick. We'd have to, but we need to just take a minute to do the math. On on the balancing.

Speaker: Director levine, I'm the reason I put this up this way and got owen to respond on it. For the record, the budget work session we had last week, we asked about this exact question whether or not we'd be able to allocate the contingency to something. And the response that you gave was that we would be able to, if it was towards overhead, but that if it was going to a non overhead need, that that would be where the problem might arise. And my understanding is the 747 isn't overhead usage. So I just want to know where I got these numbers from. And 747 and 252 does add up to the aggregate of 999. That's in contingency.

Speaker: Sorry. Yeah I think hang on i. Can I just check with can we just chat offline. Could we maybe come back to it in a couple minutes.

Speaker: That's okay counselor, are you okay to chat offline and we'll move on to the next amendment. In the meantime.

Speaker: As long as it's not using the same funding for something else, I'm happy to wait.

Speaker: I think I may be the only person proposing using the funding for something else, and that is not until public safety.

Speaker: So this is also it could have gone in either category, as you can see. But yeah, I'm happy to wait until a couple other amendments have gone by.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Point of.

Speaker: Order, counselor.

Speaker: Can the money that's the million dollars that's set aside. Is that discretionary ongoing general fund? I don't know what that is, counselor.

Speaker: There was a we reduced more than we spent because of an amendment that I brought forward that was ongoing funds, and it was a mix of general fund and overhead funds. And I would look to director levine to tell us what the split in those funds was.

Speaker: Sure was 309,000, roughly, of general fund discretionary and 689,000 of general fund overhead. And the so it's just a matter of.

Speaker: Time only when you say overhead.

Speaker: No ongoing.

Speaker: Going all the million the entire million is ongoing, correct? Yes. Okay. That's what I need to find out.

Speaker: Okay, counselor, we will get back to you in the queue. Great. Counselors. Giving folks a minute to get out of the queue. If they were only in on this councilor novick are you in the queue on an additional parks amendment?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Right ahead.

Speaker: Thank you. I'm the queue for novick green 17, which would eliminate the golf fee surcharge of \$5 and replace the projected revenue with a one time transfer of 1.25 million from the golf fund. Novick green budget note 18 sort of elaborates on that. The basic issue is that we talked to the golf program, and they said we had said approved a \$5 per round increase in the golf program. Said, first of all, they weren't sure whether around meant nine holes or 18 holes. But more importantly, they have separate fees for youth. For seniors, they charge different amounts and different courses, and simply adding \$5 per round for everybody would have upset what they try to make a more equitable fee structure. So what they said was they'd

feel much better off if we just told them to give give us \$1.25 million and they will figure out how to equitably adjust their fees to account for that. And novick green, I realize we're not supposed to get to budget notes until later, but novick green 18 is the budget note, which sort of elaborates on that and explains that we're asking them to develop and implement a new equitable pricing structure to generate the amount.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: I hear a motion and a second and councilor, we have had people bring things as packages if they go together. So if you'd like to have us discuss 17 and 18 together, I'm happy to have us do that.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Okay, counselors, we have a motion and a second on the table. Keelan. That second was from counselor green. Is there any discussion? Counselor zimmerman, are you in the queue for discussion? Counselor green, are you in the queue for discussion?

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I just wanted to motivate why I decided to join this amendment. My intention was to provide one time resources so we could stop the bleeding in our parks. I was compelled by the argument that you do need a reasonable pricing structure, and it was a bit of a blunt force, and that we're still holding harmless the resources that we created earlier. And i'll note that I am paying a karmic price right now because I have injured my knee playing golf, and I feel like that is because I tried to raise golf fees in a blunt way. So I'm supporting this.

Speaker: Councilor I put myself in the queue. We have been moving quickly, and I understand that we haven't had a lot of time to do the background work, as we don't have people with long institutional knowledge, but I would just encourage us

as we go through the day to day to be very careful with our decision making, because this is the type of thing that we should have caught through work with the bureau before it was brought forward, I supported the original. I will support this fix as long as a question I have about the funding we've spent being whole is answered in the way that I need. I suspect we passed an amendment yesterday that is going to need similar fixing in the future, and after today, we will not have time to do that in this budget. So I just want to take this opportunity to encourage us to be deliberate and know that there are some things we might not be able to do quite yet. I know that we have lost director levine to trying to figure out the amendment that councilor kanal brought forward. Is dca in the room? Yes, you are, jonas. I just want to make sure that novick green 17 keeps us, keeps us balanced. We appropriated the first year of money that was raised from that \$5 surcharge. Would the one time transfer of 1.25 million fully cover what we appropriated, or are we leaving loose ends in our budget that we will need to fix if we pass novick green 17 and 18?

Speaker: Yeah. Good question. I would interpret this as leaving a slight gap because those amounts are not the same, and i, as you.

Speaker: What was the amount that we appropriated from the golf fund?

Speaker: I take that back. I believe it was 11.25 was the \$5 impact of the additional charge. So this would be consistent with that amount.

Speaker: So this would not leave any loose ends. We would have the same amount of money coming out to the same purposes. And we would just be asking the golf program to find a new, more equitable way to raise the dollars rather than \$5 across.

Speaker: The board.

Speaker: Understanding no loose ends. Okay. Thank you for confirming that. Counselor smith, are you in the queue to discuss these amendments or this amendment and budget? Note?

Speaker: Yes. As we learned earlier in the process, there was \$4 million in the gulf fund. And it is my understanding, when we were in covid that people were doing a lot of golf. And so we created this, this contingency. And. I don't think that it is fair to continue to raid the golf fund just because it had \$4 million in it and people didn't know other places to get funding from. And in that particular fund, it, it allows us it allows parks to have programs for kids who want to learn how to play golf. And if there is, I mean, we have so many needs in terms of parks and to take their contingency for something that does not, it doesn't mix. I mean, I'd rather spend that money to, to upgrade a, a golf course or something like that. If we're not going to have any of those funds if we, if we take all of their 4 million out and this is actually a this is not a one time need. This is an ongoing need. And I think we need to take ongoing money from ongoing money, not just using a, a one time, because we're going to have to figure out how do we pay for it next year.

Speaker: So thank you, counselor. Councilor novick.

Speaker: Yes, counselor smith, I just wanted to note that we already voted to take money from the golf fund by adding a \$5 surcharge. The point of this amendment is actually to try to protect programs like the youth program by allowing the golf program to figure that out.

Speaker: Thank you. Because I have another amendment coming up that is going to affect that golf money that we actually pulled for the elections department. It's a one time fee. I think we need to have the money that we have in contingency actually replace that so that we're not here every year asking for those funds. I think that was morillo. The elections. Was it morillo ten.

Speaker: Councilor can you help us with which number amendment that was of yours?

Speaker: I yep. Six great.

Speaker: Okay. What are your six?

Speaker: Yeah, I think we took a million out to, to pay for the, the elections. And that's one time only in that fund actually needs to be paid with one time only money. And I think we talked about it and I said last week that I would be bringing something forward to replace that million. I don't know exactly. Was it 1,000,002?

Speaker: It's been a long time. Let me pull it.

Speaker: I know.

Speaker: Sorry, nothing feels real anymore. If it happened last week.

Speaker: Councilor I believe it was 825,525.

Speaker: Right. And so I wanted to take it out of a fund that had ongoing money so that you wouldn't have to keep bringing this amendment forward every year. And that's I mean, it is it is already a it's in code. And so we need to fund it like it is in code. And I don't know how you feel about that, but that's where I was going to put another amendment in to put that 800,000 back into the gulf and replace it with contingency fund money.

Speaker: Councilor smith, point of information. Which amendment is it your of yours? What number is it?

Speaker: It it is not there. I was telling them that I'm bringing one forward. I talked about it last week that I was going to bring it forward, but I just wanted them to know that this is it probably should come out of a one time. It should come out of ongoing money. And I know that my colleague here is. He's he's trying to use it for parks as well. But I just think that we need to figure out how to do that.

Speaker: Can you clarify what the sources for your change, the ongoing dollars.

Speaker: The contingency, the million dollars that we have in contingency, ongoing councilor?

Speaker: I think this is important for us to note, because that would affect the 1.25 here. I would suggest that we move forward with our discussion and vote on these two amendments, but know that we may need to make some changes if we move forward with councilor smith's amendment later in the day.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, counselor councilor novick.

Speaker: I would say.

Speaker: I don't have anything further to say other than we've already moved the amendment. It's been seconded, right?

Speaker: We have. And counselor zimmerman just reconfirming you're not in the queue for this. Okay, counselor. Seeing no one else in the queue for discussion. Counselor Ryan is getting in the queue. Go right ahead, counselor. Ryan.

Speaker: I was listening to both of you, and I got more confused as I listened. And so we're voting on what right now? And is this a restoration of funding?

Speaker: We're voting on novick green 17, which would be followed by novick green 18, which is a budget note that goes into more details. Novick green 17 would undo the \$5 surcharge to the gulf fee that we passed on the 21st. It would retain the \$1.25 million transfer out of the gulf fund, which went in part to parks programing and in part through the morillo amendment to the elections office. I'm shorthanding names of offices here, and it would then direct the gulf program to figure out a more equitable pricing strategy to raise the funds to cover that \$1.25 million gap from the transfer, rather than having a \$5 across the board fee. Novick green ten goes into some detail about how the gulf program might more equitably distribute price increases to fill that gap, so this does not change the money that

has been appropriated, but it changes the method of raising the funds to fill the gap that is created. When we appropriate those dollars that were sent through two amendments on the 21st out of the gulf fund, does that help?

Speaker: For those of us who voted no on the originals? It just it's you're trying to grasp your head around this. If it's actually a solution to the problem that I experienced last week.

Speaker: Councilor this is at the request of the gulf program. They said rather than tell us you have to raise a \$5 fee on every round, could you please let us figure out how to raise it by more equitable structure? We'll continue to preserve lower prices for seniors, youth, etcetera.

Speaker: All right. I think I'm done. I just think for those of us that were already against the original, you're trying to figure out if this is good or not. And I'm taking it in on the dais because I just found out. Thanks.

Speaker: Thank you, counselor councilor seeing no one else in the queue for discussion. Keelan, could you please call the roll on novick green 17, which is the undoing of the \$5 surcharge, but the retention of the \$1.25 million in transfers.

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: 17. Yeah, i.

Speaker: Better than it used to be, but no koyama lane.

Speaker: Thank you, counselors novick and green. I appreciate the work that you've put in and that you've been collaborative with this I vote yea.

Speaker: Morillo I novick.

Speaker: Thanks to my chief of staff, spencer knowles, who reached out to the golf program on this issue, i.

Speaker: Clark.

Speaker: I believe I voted no on the original, but I think this is damage control and it's a lesson to all of us about the fast boats that we take up here. And I'm voting yes on damage control green.

Speaker: I zimmerman.

Speaker: I did not appreciate the surcharge. I didn't appreciate reading the golf fund for uses not related to golf. I think this is another version of that. While I do appreciate that you're taking a more deliberate look, I still don't support rating the golf fund. I think they are self-sustained funds. So no.

Speaker: Unless i.

Speaker: Then i.

Speaker: Smith no.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

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

Speaker: Thank you counselors, is there any other discussion on novick green 18? Seeing no one else in the queue? Keelan can you please call the roll on novick green 18. This is the budget note that goes with 17 to provide some guidance to the golf program on how to prioritize the raising of these fees.

Speaker: Canal. Hi Ryan.

Speaker: Sure, that's a practice that should be a given.

Speaker: I koyama lane I morillo. I novick.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Clark, I green, I zimmerman I avalos. I dunphy I smith. I pirtle-guiney I the amendment is approved with 12 yes votes.

Speaker: Thank you, counselor zimmerman. Are you in the queue to bring forward you know what, you brought forward an amendment in the parks area already.

Speaker: And then you requested that I bring forward a technical amendment.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Did that is a good point. Do you have a technical amendment prepared to help flesh that out?

Speaker: Yes. Okay. So yesterday we took action and I appreciated that. Given that action, there's a technical adjustment that the council president and budget office has written and asked me to deliver. So technical amendment to true up the fte allocation across bureaus based on the passage of zimmerman 1314 amendments from yesterday. One increase the bureau operating expenses by 2.1 million in the parks maintenance program. Increase the authority of parks and recreation maintenance program by ten fte. Decrease the same amount in the tree regulation program of 2.1 million. Decrease the position authority in urban forestry by ten fte. Those amendments. Excuse me. Secondly, decrease position authority in Portland parks and recreation. Urban forestry by 27 fte. Increase position authority in the Portland permitting and development organizational unit by 27 permanent ongoing fte. Reduce the bureau operating expenses in pcef and in Portland parks and bureau by 3.6 million in urban forestry and increase the operating expenses in the Portland clean energy fund in the Portland permitting and development fund by 3.6. All of these are updates attachments a through h as needed.

Speaker: I'll second that.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: And councilor. Thank you for bringing this forward, colleagues. This doesn't make any changes functionally to what we voted on yesterday. It just adds in the technical pieces that weren't in that amendment. Councilor Ryan, are you in the queue for discussion?

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Counselor. Avalos, are you in the queue for discussion?

Speaker: I guess I was trying to understand what we were fixing.

Speaker: I most of the amendments that we have brought forward have had specific information about the dollar amounts that we're transferring and the fte authority, the position authority that was changing. And as counselor zimmerman had moved from his higher numbers to his lower numbers, not all of those technical pieces were transferred over in the new amendment. So I just asked him to add those in rather than try to do it on the dais. Yesterday, he had asked me if he could bring that today as a technical fix. Councilor is that a fair description here?

Speaker: Yeah, we have a strange practice here, but it's the one we're using, which is we talk about the fte allocations in the amendments as separate line items. And so this meets that desire by the budget office. I think that there are any number of ways we can do this, but the intent from yesterday is just being chewed up even further here.

Speaker: Councilor. Okay. Councilor koyama lane. Any questions?

Speaker: I want to point out that when I asked counselor zimmerman questions yesterday, he really couldn't answer them about who he's collaborated with on the administrative side and want to remind folks that I don't. I don't believe due diligence has been done. And there are many organizations that you have letters from, including willamette riverkeeper, trees for life, Oregon bird alliance, columbia slough watershed council that are really concerned about this. So I encourage you to think about your values and your right, what you believe is right, and put aside considering what you're going to get from someone else, or any trading that might happen, and make sure that you're voting with your values. And if you're doing that, then you can sleep well at night. So just last reminder.

Speaker: Counselor smith.

Speaker: So did didn't we already vote on it? We can't take it back. This is just to true up what we did yesterday, right?

Speaker: It wasn't specific enough.

Speaker: Okay?

Speaker: We did move the money yesterday. Yes. Just provides the additional direction on what that means. Okay. Without this, that amendment will still stand. There just will be some messiness in our budget.

Speaker: They will come to us at a later date and ask for the fte allocations, because they have the money in their budget already.

Speaker: Okay, okay. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor kanal.

Speaker: Yeah, I agree with that argument that this is this is in fact technical. I think there may be a disagreement on whether or not it was a good idea to move it. And I think that's still that's always a worthwhile conversation to have. I don't think that's necessarily what this vote is about. I think it's important that we're honest. Yesterday we said we were picking winners and losers. This is formalizing that. It's I'm glad it's ten and ten. I'm really glad it's not a net reduction. So that's that's my rationale on it is we've already moved the money. This is going to result in ten people or ten positions being reduced in one place, and also result in ten positions being saved that would otherwise have been laid off. And i, I know for the people that are in one of those two categories of ten, this is not academic, and I fully understand that, but that this is, to me the obvious eventual consequence and better to get it done now of yesterday's vote.

Speaker: Councilor green.

Speaker: Thank you. I voted for the first part of this yesterday. I voted no on the second part, both passed. I voted for this because we had lost a considerable

amount of jobs in parks maintenance. And this doesn't gut the urban forestry program, of course, that there is a trade off on the margin here. But I think it's very, very important that we are providing resources to parks maintenance. So that way we don't lose the capacity of our parks. As the crown jewel of our city. I made that choice on the merits and i'll, i'll i'll reaffirm that decision today.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor, councilors, is there any other discussion? Seeing no other discussion. Keelan, could you please call the roll?

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Ryan koyama lane. No.

Speaker: Morillo. I voted no on the full amendment yesterday, but this technical adjustment is needed, so I novick.

Speaker: Ditto.

Speaker: I clark.

Speaker: I think this is another example of a cautionary tale. We're making structural changes and I agreed to those yesterday. This is sort of a learn as you go experiment this budget session. We're we're working fast and furious. And I will vote yes.

Speaker: Green.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Zimmerman.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Avalos.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Dunphy.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Smith i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: Amendment is approved with ten yes votes and two no votes.

Speaker: Thank you colleagues. Councilor. Thank you. Colleagues, I want to take a quick moment before we move on to just recognize one of our staff who's here helping us today. We often have haley blonsky sitting at the side of the table at the front, and she is actually out today. So lillian nguyen is helping us out instead. And, lillian, I know that it's fast moving and long hours doing these council meetings. So thank you for being here with us today, working on this. We really appreciate you. And I'm sure as we move forward, we will start peppering things at you. Feel free to interrupt at any time if you need us to move a little slower so you can capture all the details.

Speaker: Appreciate it.

Speaker: Okay. Councilors. Does anybody else have an amendment you'd like to move forward in the parks policy area?

Speaker: Point of order, madam president.

Speaker: Are you ready.

Speaker: In the event that we move on to another category and then I get the information, will I be able to do it, even though we won't technically be in parks at that point?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: You will.

Speaker: I guess. Also, if the next category we're going to is public safety, and I have the pbem part of that, it's still part of that category.

Speaker: Then as well.

Speaker: Yes. Okay. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: And I very soon.

Speaker: A point of information just as I'm like following. And we're going by category. So right now you put a call out for remaining parks ones. I see other ones here. Am I assuming then if nobody's raising their hand that those are all being withdrawn or.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: We asked everybody to bring forward their top priority by policy area at the meeting on the 21st. I've been maintaining that so that we have some consistency, and after we get through, everybody's most important package or amendment by policy area, we will then go through budget notes, and then we will go back to amendments and everybody will have a chance. We may just do a round robin. If a lot of people have things they want to bring forward, to bring forward additional things in policy areas such. Yeah, and budget notes that are attached to packages with amendments. Feel free to bring continue bringing forward as we go. But folks agreed on the 21st to hold on standalone budget notes until we got through the money movement. Okay, councilor clark, are you in the queue in parks or are you anticipating a move to public safety?

Speaker: No, I just wanted to ask you a clarifying question. So my understanding is we're doing amendments now that involve money and later we're doing budget notes.

Speaker: If your budget note is part of a package with an amendment, bring them together. If your budget note is stand alone, let's wait until we get through this first round on amendments. Thanks as much as I would love to have my budget notes, and I'm sure you all would in the budget. They are things we can do by resolution later if we need to. Okay. Councilor canal are you in the queue for a question or anticipating the move to public safety?

Speaker: I neither, I think I'm ready to make the amendment at this point.

Speaker: The amendment that you brought forward in parks.

Speaker: Yeah. There is a revision to the dollar amount in one place.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: And I appreciate councilor novick bringing that up because there was a miscommunication earlier. Can I should I read it back? How is it what's most convenient for you.

Speaker: If you can maybe point out to us first in the new canal 15 that we have in our inboxes? Colleagues, this is in your inbox from 10 a.m. Today to show us in that where the revision is. And I think that might help lillian as well. And then read the whole thing for folks who aren't looking at it on their screens.

Speaker: It is in the second to final and third to final bullet points. The two related to pbem. So and it reduces the. The dollar amount from 747 to 483. And it reduces the four fte to two fte for pbem.

Speaker: Thank you councilor. Colleagues, is there any discussion on the new new canal? 15 councilor novick.

Speaker: Yes, I'm just going to oppose this because I'm going to fight for pbem to get three positions, two letters and one. And one training and exercise person. And I don't want to use up the money that we have banked from may 21st on anything else.

Speaker: Can I clarify a question there?

Speaker: I don't think that there was a question. Councilor let's let your colleagues discuss. Councilor clark, are you in the queue to discuss this amendment? Okay. I hate when I come up in the queue this early. Colleagues, I am leaning toward opposing this amendment. I know that there are many other proposals for how to make pbem a little more whole, and I believe that in some of those, we might even

be able to find some funds for the. New positions from the or moving the positions, I guess, from the ranger dispatchers. 2311. Selfishly, I also had a proposal that i'll be bringing forward in the public safety service area using some of these funds, which came from one of the amendments that I brought forward on the 21st. We have contracts within some of our community violence prevention programs, which were held flat. They were not increased because the. They were not given the same cola increase that positions were. But we know that those contracts go to organizations that have increasing costs. And I'd like to make sure that the buying power is not reduced. For those reasons, i'll be opposed. Colleagues, is there any other discussion on this amendment?

Speaker: I'm in the queue.

Speaker: Council president. Councilor avalos so just to summarize, you're opposing it because you want to use the dollars for something else.

Speaker: I do, and I also believe that we have more proposals coming forward which would allow us to cover some of these other positions that councilor kanal has named here. Councilor kanal.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Two questions. And then a comment. My question for you, madam president, is if you can give me the number of that amendment because I'm looking at the public safety list and not seeing one with your name.

Speaker: Yeah. Unfortunately, in working on technical things, some of my amendments came in late. So this is pirtle-guiney 16. I have a paper copy that I was going to hand to everybody when I got in the queue for this. I'm happy to hand you a copy now if you'd like to see it.

Speaker: I'd love to. And then to councilor novick's point. And to clarify, I wanted to ask him a question if you could speak to. So just to clarify, you're saying the portion

of this that is that meets with your objection is the portion related to park service dispatchers, and you'd prefer to use all of this money on pbem?

Speaker: My position is that I'm not voting for any money for public safety or anything until we get \$625,000 from pbem for three positions.

Speaker: So there is there are other amendments.

Speaker: I don't care. I'm not voting for anything that I think might undermine that until we get the 625 for pbem period.

Speaker: Okay. I well, I guess then the only comment I would say is we should not let the perfect be the enemy of the good. And I would think that if we could have two amendments that added up to the right dollar amount because there's two different funding sources, then that is a good use of money, because as opposed to trying to combine two pre-filed amendments from three different people or something like that that are completely disparate in their funding source type. I should also note that this would this would also reduce the contingency draw from \$999,000 and leave \$290,000 in the contingency for potential other uses. And I believe that's overhead money. I'm seeing a nod. So this would this would leave \$290,000. That could be, I think, to use your term, councilor novick unlocked with additional discretionary. Should we find that somewhere else in the budget?

Thanks.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor zimmerman, did you have a comment to the amendment?

Speaker: Thanks. I'm leaning towards supporting this it and I would do that in noting I probably won't be supportive of larger grabs in those same areas. And to the point that I think councilor kanal is making of a couple of spots or a couple of folks, those those are probably going to meet my needs. But my request to folks is if they have if they have competing amendments that you think that would be

better uses, that we articulate those so that we can look directly and make some evaluations. It is hard to read minds. Just saying I have one coming is hard for me to understand which one I would prefer over. So right now I'm. I appreciate the pbem work that councilor kanal is citing here, and I'm generally leaning in support.

Speaker: Councilor morillo.

Speaker: Yeah, I agree with councilor zimmerman's assessment here. I would like to see council president, if you have written language for the things you're planning to bring forward, because I haven't been able to see those or read through them yet. And so it's hard for me to tell which one I would support. And I would also just say that we had two weeks to put this entire thing together. So, yeah, there's going to be a lot of hasty amendment making, and we should probably all stop chastising each other for that.

Speaker: Councilor canal at the request of our colleagues, I'm passing this around not to take away from your discussion, but because folks have asked to look at it. I hope that that is all right with you.

Speaker: Yeah. I'd just like to ask if dave crapo if he could come up.

Speaker: Councilor. I believe councilor novick was next in the queue. So it looks like he's removed himself from the queue. Go ahead.

Speaker: Yeah. Thank you for being here. Dave, could you speak to just maybe briefly, what a day in the life looks like for your role?

Speaker: Great. Yeah. Thank you for this opportunity to speak. For the record, I'm dave crapo. I'm the city of Portland's first park ranger dispatcher. And I'm here under the ask me 189 banner. There's a lot of stuff that we do that you could probably guess. We take online reports, we take email reports, and we take phone reports from staff around the city and from park neighbors and park guests. Generally, people don't call us because they're having a good time. They're calling

us because they're seeing something that is frustrating or upsetting or concerning or traumatic. Around the city, we take those calls and we share them with rangers in the field, and then we track rangers movements in the field. So they call out to us on the radio and we keep a spreadsheet. We know where everybody's been. We know when they're talking to people. We know when they're leaving, challenging conversations, and if they're in trouble, we're the ear on the radio that sends the help. So that's the thing that differentiates us from a 311 call taker, 311 call takers are our partners. And like when we're on lunch or when we're on a break, they will take those calls as backup, but then we triage them as soon as we get back to the desk and we make sure that things keep moving. We also take after hours emergency maintenance reports and send them off to prms so that if there is some kind of emergency in a park that could damage infrastructure, that we get a quick response to that and then we have some really long term ongoing relationships with our callers. I've met with 11 out of 12 of you and your staff in the last couple of weeks, and the thing that I've heard from almost everybody is you guys do a lot of casework, don't you? Which is not really part of what you think a dispatcher does. But we do a lot of follow up with people who have seen or experienced upsetting and traumatic things in our parks or as park neighbors, and we make sure they got the help that they needed. And if they didn't get that help, we keep on pushing.

Speaker: Thank you. And I think you've already answered my other two questions for now. Thanks for clarifying that. Asking 189 is the labor unit for this 11.

Speaker: Are we good?

Speaker: Yeah, I think so.

Speaker: All right. Thank you for giving me.

Speaker: Councilor novick.

Speaker: Yeah, I just want some clarification about what this actually does in terms of in terms of resources for pbem. How many given the discretionary overhead split that we need, how many pbem and dispatcher positions does this actually pay for?

Speaker: Yeah, I think we could invite up the deputy director of pbem if he's still. Yeah, okay. In the back.

Speaker: But I'm asking this of director levine because again, it's an issue of the discretionary overhead split.

Speaker: So as amended as councilor kanal just read out earlier, we just corrected the discretionary overhead split. So you can think of it as just a normal general fund overhead function. And so the question is just how much does that buy. So the split is copacetic.

Speaker: And how much does it buy. How much does using all of the 900 of the 300,000 in discretionary that we have left over from a 21st plus that commensurate amount of overhead, how much does that actually buy? Does it really buy two positions and one and two positions and the other?

Speaker: So sorry, I'm just pulling up the amounts. So I believe and councilor kanal can probably speak to this too. It's 483,000 to pbem. So, you know, I guess the question for pbem is how much, you know, how much can does that buy them in in two positions. And having not done them, you know, it depends on the classifications and the like, which I don't have in front of me.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Sorry, counselor. I would like to make sure that we get the question answered. Director levine just gave an answer. Councilor novick does that fulfill your does that answer your question, or should we look to dca? Your your question is answered.

Speaker: That specific question is answered. I wouldn't mind hearing dca and jordanne whiley talk about what they elaborate on, what they could do with that money.

Speaker: Thank you. Good morning. For the record, I'm bob cozzie dca interim Monday is when I actually take the role officially, so I'm still double duty and I'm getting up to speed on a lot of things. And I did invite deputy director jordan here. Jordan wiley to answer specific questions about pbem.

Speaker: So yeah, thanks. Jordan wiley, deputy director for pbem. So the question was, what does 480 and change get us? Approximately two positions? I think our position wouldn't change in terms of our priorities. We still need planners. That's the first and foremost critical function that we're about to lose in a couple of days. Planning is one of those critical components of emergency management that is core, I would argue. I think most folks that know anything about em on this council understand that. And so we're about to lose that last, literally the last planner we have. So our first priority would be to get additional planning support. So if it's two positions, two planners I know councilor kanal we talked before about having training and exercise be part of that. That's the sort of yin to the yang so to speak, is you need both. And so if there were additional positions by, for example, novick a couple of your excuse me, councilman novick, for a couple of your amendments, I think we'd be looking to fill those training and exercise positions if we could go above and beyond two fte with this 400,000, I would just add to the nuance of planning and the sci hub nexus. I know that's something that councilor clark has mentioned. Several of you have mentioned. That's absolutely on our minds. And focusing these planners on sci hub. I also want to adjust expectations again, just to make sure it takes a long time to build those plans and then exercise them. We're talking about 6 to 9 months, maybe even to hire the right person, plus them to be

oriented and develop the plan. We're looking at a year ish. The reason I bring that up is because where the funds come from, if they are one time only, right. So that's the nuances. I want to make sure if they were, we would still take it because then we'd make the argument. Next year. We need to transfer this into ongoing position, ongoing funding, if it's ongoing, even better. But regardless, no matter what you can help with, it's going to be a huge help for our tiny little department.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor novick. Any additional questions?

Speaker: No, thank you.

Speaker: Councilor smith.

Speaker: Yes, thank you, madam president. And I thought your you had a need for additional resources, whether it be fte or external services, to help out with homeless when you go on calls. I think we talked about that.

Speaker: We don't have that need now at pbem for homeless support. There's some of the work that can branch into that, for example, in an emergency situation.

Speaker: I want to make sure because I know we talked about.

Speaker: Some of. Yes.

Speaker: And so I'm hearing something different. So I just wanted to make sure that, you know, we were getting your particular priority.

Speaker: Yeah. Okay. And I've shared with council before if we had everything we would love to have, it's 55 fte and another \$10 million that would go to support a lot of programs. We're talking about what would be our first and foremost priority today.

Speaker: I just want to make sure. Okay.

Speaker: Thank you. Yeah. Of course.

Speaker: Councilor novick, are you in the queue again?

Speaker: Oh, no. Sorry, I have to take myself out.

Speaker: Councilor kanal, are you in the queue again?

Speaker: Yes, and I'll keep it very brief. 483,000 divided by two fte is \$241,000. If you look at the memo that pbem sent to you, councilor novick that you send out to council, not a single position in that cost more than \$241,000 a year, including all benefits and midpoint plus 50. So it absolutely covers the cost. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor smith, are you back in the queue?

Speaker: No. Let's see.

Speaker: Colleagues, is there any other discussion to the newly amended new version of canal 15?

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Keelan, could you please call the roll.

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: Public safety is a very broad area of work. It includes park rangers and includes the dispatchers that get them to the parks. Pbem has taken cuts for three years and is a completely underutilized, under-resourced part of our public safety system. We have done a lot to shore up the parts that everybody thinks of first.

When you think of public safety in other parts of the budget, and it's time for us to shore these parts up, too. And I'm very grateful for not only the time that you gave us both in our offices and up here, but also in the case of pbem coming to the community and public safety committee and speaking to your needs there, I vote i.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: I look forward to a budget note eventually this year resolution that really connects the dots between the dispatch work with the rangers and our public safety system. We have to improve in that collaboration. So in the faith that you'll be there and the hope that that the councilor that's bringing this amendment will connect those dots with me and others. I will go ahead and vote. I, i.

Speaker: Koyama lane I morillo.

Speaker: Covers two areas I really care about pbem and parks, and I know how much our parks rangers do to take care of public safety issues. So i.

Speaker: Novick I'm actually going to contradict myself because the issue I have with this is merely one of sort of prioritization and timing. I wanted to get all 625 pbem and then try to get the money for the parks rangers in a separate amendment. So I'm going to take a bird in the hand and vote yes on this and then try to get money, more money for pbem and a subsequent amendment. So i.

Speaker: Clark.

Speaker: I like that bird in the hand. I vote i.

Speaker: Green i.

Speaker: Zimmerman i.

Speaker: Avalos i. Dunphy i.

Speaker: Smith i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney no.

Speaker: The amendment is approved with 11 yes votes and one no vote.

Speaker: Colleagues, we are in the public safety service area. Would anybody like to bring forward a priority? Councilor avalos.

Speaker: Hello, I would like to move. Avalos three and I can talk about it, but maybe I need a second first.

Speaker: Why don't you give us a brief overview so that folks know what they are deciding to second or not?

Speaker: Okay. So and this changed a little bit in that it was another number that I'm not remembering. But now is going to be \$15 million worth. So this amendment would move 75% of the overtime budget at 15 million to council oversight. It doesn't eliminate funding, just requires approval. It my intentions behind this are

one I just in general believe that transparent that taxpayers deserve transparency on how these overtime dollars are spent. I also have great confidence in dca bob cozzie experiences in helping to helping boec reduce overtime, and I believe that this is an opportunity for the dca to help prove that they're making progress by having this regular check in, and this creates some more checks and balances while ensuring that funds are available when they're truly needed. And the current system has led to millions in overruns in the over in the overtime, with very little oversight. So boiling it down to this is not about what is that? This is not cutting police funding. We're just adding accountability to spending that's consistently over budget. So that is the rationale.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor is there a second for avalos?

Speaker: Three second.

Speaker: Okay. Councilor green seconds. Councilor novick, are you in the queue for debate on avalos?

Speaker: Three no colleagues.

Speaker: Is there any discussion on avalos three. Councilor zimmerman.

Speaker: Thank you. I would like to know where in the budget I can find the overtime line item that this would be taken from, because we're citing \$15 million of overtime, which is 75% of some overtime budget, but I'm not sure where that's at. Can somebody point me to the line item of overtime?

Speaker: Director levine I see councilor avalos looking your way. Is that something that you could help her with?

Speaker: Maybe owen because he was helping with this. I don't know if he's here. Available.

Speaker: Yeah, sure. He's upstairs. I think the numbers are based on what ppb has currently budgeted in their overtime commitment item, which is about \$20 million. And so I think we just calculated 75% of whatever they have budgeted in there.

Speaker: Is that separate from the. So does that \$20 million? Is that separate from the overtime that is used from vacancy savings?

Speaker: No, it's all one pot. So they pull their vacancy savings out of personnel and they move it into overtime. So it becomes part of their overtime budget. So it's just one line item that says overtime.

Speaker: But those \$15 million are tied to an fte position within operations. Somewhere in the police bureau. There's vacant right now. And the police bureau in their budget has to indicate they are expecting to use about \$20 million of vacancy in overtime use. Is that a fair and accurate description?

Speaker: Yes, except for the fact that not all of it is backed by that personnel savings. It's some of it is just straight budgeted from from other resources, if that makes sense. So and I would defer to the psa budget folks if they're here on on kind of explaining that further. But but the mechanism you described is correct.

Speaker: Yeah. I wouldn't mind hearing from somebody within either the bureau or the public safety service area. I guess my point here is that I've I've lived under a situation for public safety area where they came back and reported on overtime, and that was one thing, but that was because that that department had an overtime line item for authorizations. But I think we're bumping up against the fte hires here again, as we did with another topic last a couple weeks ago. And so this would certainly give me great pause if this is being pulled from that area, since that's where overtime money is generally drawn from.

Speaker: Director cozzie would you like to chime in on that?

Speaker: Yeah. Thank you. For the record, I'm bob cozzie dc public safety. I have a few thoughts on this and I appreciate really appreciate the importance of accountability. I can really resonate with that and have had success at boec specifically along these same lines specific to the actual budget impact. Nathan lamy is here. Hopefully, councilor zimmerman, to be able to answer your question. Yeah.

Speaker: So in terms of structurally, for the record, I'm nathan lamy. I manage the budget, strategy and performance team for the public safety service area in terms of the way that the budget is structured. The Portland police bureau receives its cal target at the beginning of the year. We then forecast the number of filled positions that we expect to see within the bureau, and then have generally reduced the salary line items as well as benefits, taxes, other costs that would be associated with filled positions for any positions that we expect to be vacant in the upcoming year. We have then taken about half of the dollars that are required for overtime to maintain the current service levels, and we pull those dollars out of salary. We put those into the overtime line item. So in terms of the question of whether we would bump up against that, it's going to be highly dependent on what the overtime needs are. If there were increased protest response or other responses that the bureau needs, that could push beyond the 20 million we currently have budgeted, if the bureau were to be able to hire at a faster rate than we had forecast, or if separations happen at a slower rate, we would potentially bump up on that. So there is a fair amount of uncertainty here in terms of the question of whether or not putting this into a set aside would actually get us a hard stop in our budget system. This would be an unusual in my experience in the city, we have not had this sort of framework where we're asking for dollars retroactively to budget things in,

but we would potentially hit that depending on sort of when the expenses come throughout the year.

Speaker: To be clear, when you say this would be unusual, policy set asides I understood were pretty common. So I was going under the framework that we tend to use for policy set aside. So can you explain why you say this is unusual?

Speaker: Yeah. Generally, I mean, in the time that with the city for seven years, generally when I've done budgeting policy set aside has been when there's been a sort of unknown cost that we might need to ask for dollars for future things. Some of this seems like it might be retroactively. So I don't have the budget note in front of me right now. But if we were asking for. Transfers to take place on a regular basis from that policy set aside for spending those already taken place, if the bureau were to not get that approval afterwards, then it would need to scramble to build, to balance things out in the remaining time in the fiscal year. If it was asking to anticipate what that spending is and sort of build out that plan, that would put it more into the sort of usual framework.

Speaker: Thanks. So I appreciate that. I just I would encourage colleagues to understand that there's no such thing as putting money in the contingency and not having removed it from the bureau. You're either in the bureau's account or you're not. And so by setting this money into contingency, we are directly defunding by another 15 million the Portland police bureau. I very much recognize the desire to monitor overtime usage. I think that that mechanism can exist, whether it be in the community and public safety committee, finance committee or this entire council. But just because the city of Portland has a term we call policy set aside, which is just an asterisks on a line item budget, it is ultimately increasing the contingency by \$15 million. And it can be used for anything that this council deems necessary in the upcoming year. And I think that's very, very risky. I think that governing bodies will

look at contingency funds in moments of emergency, moments of need, and it sends a message that that those funds were not needed in our operational bureaus. And this is a \$15 million pull from the bureau into contingency, even with the best intentions to give it back each quarter or whatever. I would really encourage folks to vote no on this. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor, councilor smith.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I think there is a way for us to separate funds within a bureau, within a bureau's fund. And I think we did a little bit of that at Multnomah County because we were constantly putting money in, in contingency for the sheriff's office. So that being said, but I think we have a bigger issue here. Local news station did a kind of exposé on on the city of Portland and found that we spent this last fiscal year, \$50 million in overtime. And as the chair of the workforce and development committee, I want to look at how we can reduce overtime costs across the board, because that is unconscionable, that we have 50 million and overtime costs. Now, while your your costs are 20 million, you almost make half of our overtime costs. And I understand and I get it, I don't necessarily support this particular amendment but I understand sitting in this seat and I'm looking at a 50 million overtime seat. You all are the kind of. You know, people like you. It's a sexy thing to talk about the police in their overtime. But we're not talking about these other folks who have a huge overtime that we don't talk about at all. But I think we need to have a 30,000 foot question about overtime in general, so that we can keep those gaps that we have in the budget to make sure that we're paying for those necessary services that the city provides, which is infrastructure. And so that is the conversation that that I'm trying to that I will be trying to get to. I get it, but it's going to put you all at a, at a deficit trying to get us. And personally, I don't want to I don't want to keep you overtime. I don't want to tell you what you

what you need to do and how to do it. I got enough to do in my own little four person office, so no, I don't need that responsibility. But I do think we need to have a bigger conversation with you all included in it, and to see how we're going to how we're going to reduce those costs overall. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor, councilor clark.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president.

Speaker: Thank you. I agree with councilor smith. I think the issue of overtime and transparency and accountability can really be handled in our substantive policy committees that we can ask for regular reports on overtime, we can ask for regular reports on recruitment. I have found the bureau to be very transparent, to be very accountable, and I don't want to tie their hands in any way because overtime, in my understanding, is just related to the fact that we have a recruitment problem, that we don't have enough people to fill the hours, and that's why we have overtime. It's pretty simple. So I'm inclined to vote no against this. I appreciate what what councilor avalos is trying to do, but I think we can accomplish this in another way. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor. Councilor Ryan.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. Yeah. Real quick. I'm just definitely voting no on this. It's really clear to me that this is a cut. And also, I continue to be concerned that this council is diving into very micro level and telling executives how they should manage their resources and how they should manage their operations. We all know there's chronic understaffing, therefore there's going to be overtime. So it will be an easy no for me. Thanks.

Speaker: Councilor morillo.

Speaker: I have a few things to say about this one. Just because we throw the word defunding around because it is politically charged now does not mean that

everything is defunding. As much as we would like it to be. For political gain, you can separate things out in bureaus so that the money is retained in separate accounts within that bureau. That's not a defunding. And secondly, again, I don't know why I have to keep emphasizing this. We are literally the City Council. We have the power of the purse, and we can direct agencies and bureaus to act in accordance to our budget notes and our amendments, which are again, as legally binding as a resolution is. So it seems very convenient when we say that we have direct oversight power and when we don't. And for some reason that always happens when we talk about holding the police accountable. So I will be supporting this.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor avalos, you were back in the queue.

Speaker: Yeah. Thank you, councilor morillo. I am definitely not interested in slogans that just are trying to make a political tension out of what is a fiscal responsibility. We, and I think councilor smith is speaking to that. I think all of us agree that it is unsustainable for our city to continue spending so much on overtime. That's any budget that that's going to be a problem. And you know what I maintain and what I continue to say is that there is an entire public safety spectrum that we need to get serious about filling. You know, I mentioned this in passing to a colleague, but i'll just daylight here that like we've talked a lot about Portland street response, which obviously I support. We need to talk more about chat. We need to talk more about ps3's. We need to talk more about what are the things that we are doing in the meantime. Because at the end of the day, recruiting a police officer, if it takes 18 months, that is beyond one fiscal year. And everyone keeps trying to explain to me what they think my district needs. Again, I live in my district. I am a person of color who lives in my district, so I don't appreciate being told that. I don't understand the lived experiences of the people that I have, those same lived

experiences. And so this is an opportunity for us to talk about how we as City Council can direct some, have some direct oversight. And I agree that there are lots of ways that many other budget amendments and notes that have passed that are essentially doing the same thing, it's just politically charged, because anytime we bring up police, we tend to turn into politics instead of what I'm trying to do, which is policy. To me, this is simple policy. I'll also note that I specifically chose 75% and not 100%, so that they can anticipate what comes down the pipe. They've got 25% to work with. That gives them a whole quarter's worth of time to see where the trends are. I'm going to be holding the bureau very accountable through, you know, dca causes leadership that I am very confident in, that we can start to chip away at that. But we need to start talking about how we're reducing those overtime costs and how in the interim, while we are increasing our police force. Because again, I will remind people, I do the work to understand. I was on governor brown's task force a couple of years ago, specifically trying to workshop and figure out how do we increase this pipeline of getting police on the streets. Absolutely. My district needs they need support, but they also need lots of different things of support. They need somebody to answer the phone call. And that's not always going to be police. So if everybody's definition of public safety is just police, then we're just going to have to agree to disagree. And I think my district has been clear that what they consider safe is somebody answering the call. And what I'm trying to do is make sure that we're answering the call with multiple options. So back to this. You know, I feel that I'm doing my due diligence. I believe it is completely in line with the way that other people are trying to govern through their amendments. I believe I've given enough leeway so that we can be flexible, and that the police have an opportunity to adjust. And I think, you know, sure, there's many other ways that we could do it. Yeah, we could do it through having a conversation or millions of other

ways. But I am choosing to use my powers as a City Councilor, as somebody that is using this process to direct the bureaus about what I believe need to be the outcomes, and that is what has resulted in this amendment. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor Ryan, have you spoken to this?

Speaker: I have, I just had a follow up question.

Speaker: Let me check. Councilor smith. Have you spoken? You have not spoken. You have as well. Okay, I apologize. Okay. Let's get councilor Ryan's additional question and your additional question. And then I think the mayor had a comment as well.

Speaker: Councilor avalos, I'm curious, is there another amendment coming up with fire for fiscal accountability around overtime because theirs is actually more so? Is this just focused on police or are you looking at other bureaus as well within public safety? Curious.

Speaker: Yeah, and thanks for bringing that up, because I don't think I mentioned at the beginning because that was the other change that I made, not just the 15 million, but I took fire out partially. I did that because fire has a particular difference in the way that they staff, because they have minimum staffing requirements. So, for example, the fire truck has to have four staff that's bargained in their contract. And so they're a little bit more, they're a little more rigid in how they manage that. And fire has been consistently showing their attempts and are being successful in actually reducing their overtime costs. So this is me putting another layer on police and saying, hey, we need to see results. And I'm using my authority as a City Councilor to force that through this amendment.

Speaker: Okay. That's clear. So it's targeted just at police okay.

Speaker: Councilor smith, you had an additional question.

Speaker: Yes. I'll defer to the mayor.

Speaker: Mr. Mayor, did you want to make a comment?

Speaker: Yes. Thank you, madam president, I appreciate councilors. I wanted to just point of clarification. We did increase chat. We did increase Portland street response. I've spoke to all of you at length about overtime. I share your concern from an operational standpoint. It's a workplace safety issue and I'm absolutely committed to address that. And I know I've talked to you about that. What I wanted to just also mention is, is that I respect the role of this council as the budget writing committee. I, in turn, asked this council to respect the job of the mayor and our ability to implement the budget as you see fit. If we have to come back to council for requests, it doesn't allow us the dynamic necessary for a fast changing environment in today's newspaper clearly outlines that concern. We're concerned about going back to the past. It didn't work then. It won't work now. And I would just say if something goes awry, who do we hold accountable at that point we want? And the charter clearly explains the executive is in charge of the day to day operations, and I hope and expect to be held accountable as our bureaus perform. If council creates oversight, set asides for us to have to come back and ask for requests in a fast changing environment, we lose that ability. And at the end of the day, what do our citizens and who should they hold accountable? I just ask that we're willing, we're ready as the executive, to be held accountable for the operational results of our city. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, mr. Mayor. Okay, the queue is getting a little crowded here. Councilor kanal. I don't believe you've spoken to this amendment.

Speaker: Yeah, I just.

Speaker: This is not this is about some of the arguments that have come up here. I don't think that there's any question that that the mayor shares the concern around overtime. I think he's been very clear on that. I personally do not view this

as a separation of powers issue, any of these policy set asides. I think that the framing of it as either we have to give the money in the budget as a one time conversation that occurs once a year and then never revisit it, or not give the money and not have that third option of setting money aside with particular criteria on it. It can. That's a seductive way of putting it, of framing it. But it is a it creates a brinksmanship aspect of it too, which is saying either give the money or it is an actual cut. And I don't think that I am, I don't I reject the binary of options there that we have to do it one way or the other. I also don't think this would be micromanaging in the sense that it is applying specific criteria. That's not really about it. Frankly, I share the problem statement here. I will speak to my thoughts on the solution statement when we get to a vote, and I'll just leave it at that. But I don't want this conversation to be framed around philosophy of governance that I think doesn't align with our role as legislators, which I think councilor morillo has, has stated a couple times here in a way that makes a lot of sense to me personally. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor morillo.

Speaker: Our role as the City Council is both legislative and quasi judicial, and according to our own city published presentation on what the City Council is allowed to do is power to make appropriations, raise revenue and make laws. Power to apply laws and policies, set of circumstances. The mayor does have executive and administrative things to do, but the entire point of budget notes and amendments is that we are directing bureaus to do certain things. We were elected to represent certain districts. So this is asking for, I think, very basic. It is an extremely basic request to ask any bureau to be responsible with their overtime. I don't know why it gets. Police are treated like a very precious bureau in a way that no other bureau is. When they're using their overtime to the overtime goes towards

over policing protests that don't exist. We spent millions of dollars on protests that did not come up last year, and now we're in a big budget deficit. So I think this is a very basic request, and it's well within our power to request it.

Speaker: Councilor zimmerman.

Speaker: Thanks. I agree that it's within our power. I actually don't have those those concerns. I would ask, what do we think the what will be the parameter to award the additional 75% of the overtime in quarter two or quarter three, when the police bureau comes to give it? I have seen no indication from anybody on this dais about what is a qualifying event. I worry about that because I think that makes operational decisions, then directly tied to the politics of whether or not there's the votes to get overtime money for an event. That worries me a lot. I think that we've we've hired these sworn chiefs and commanders based on their both their legal and constitutional duties to make the best decisions that they can. And when you set aside money in a contingency fund. We will either end the year with that fully intact, or we are going to spend it on a variety of things. And at this point, the council doesn't seem to be indicating that they would award any additional funding to the police bureau. And I do want to say one last thing, which is there was a statement made by the sponsor of this that we're we're spending all this money on overtime as if it's some new pot. But we've already heard time and time again that we've allocated this amount of money to the police bureau for their vacant for their their authorized fte. So if you take that money and then because it's not going to be spent, some of it gets used in overtime. It's not like overtime is new money that's being pulled out of the general fund to be spent. That's not occurring here, but we keep using it as if somehow, some way that is what's happening. But if the bureau has been funded for x number of officers and staff and they have to use overtime because they don't have enough of those officers and staff, they aren't they're

pulling it from the money that they already have. And so to call this new money or that we've got to get overtime spending in check. Sure. To some extent. But it's not a new draw on the city. It's not a new draw. The city Portland police bureau will use overtime funds from what they're being allocated, even if they were fully staffed up. So please ask yourself what what in the future would allow you to vote in favor of authorizing additional overtime funds when they come to us in quarter 2 or 3, and they request that they need those? I think that's an important test here.

Speaker: Colleagues. I also don't believe that this is an overreach of our powers. I do think we have this this power and this ability. And I don't believe that our police are, to use my colleague's words, precious in a way that our other bureaus are not. I think we have a lot of really important people who work for us at the city. I, in fact, don't always agree with their decisions. But I do know that sometimes the decision on whether to assign overtime or step up the number of officers in an area is based on sensitive information, and I am concerned that if we do this, it will put us in the position of asking the chiefs team to bring forward sensitive information in a public meeting in order to ask us for more overtime. And having worked in roles where I deal with sensitive information before, that's not something that I'm willing to put us in a position of having to do. Deciding whether to allocate more overtime isn't something that we can do in executive committee, and I certainly don't want to set something up where we're receiving information behind the scenes and making decisions that we can't justify to Portlanders, because we've received that information behind the scenes. I would highly encourage our chairs of the community and public safety committee if this fails to have regular check ins about overtime with our police. I hope that dc, bob cozzie and the chief would be open to those conversations. I think there are other ways to get at this accountability that many of us would hope to see. That doesn't put us in an awkward position of

needing to make decisions with information that we maybe can't discuss on the dais at the time.

Speaker: Madam president, if I can chime in very quickly, I also want to mention that we have regular meetings with all of the public safety directors and chiefs and share budget information specific to overtime on a recurring basis. So I have had my eyes through that forum on pbs's overtime as well as fires overtime and of course, boec. One thing I want to mention is also that it is absolutely my intention of communicating that same information, regardless of the outcome of this vote. I take the importance of accountability to heart, and I really do want to help ppb. I want to help the entire service area to really get a handle on what overtime spending is, and name the dollars, rather than have a pile of money that we just take from. And we really don't know what it's intended for. I want to name exactly where that money goes, and over the course of this next many months, that's exactly what I plan to do.

Speaker: Thank you, director.

Speaker: Councilor novick, are you back in the queue to this amendment?

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Okay, colleagues, seeing no one else in the queue for discussion. Keelan, could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: Yeah. Just to reiterate, I believe that there is I see much of the same problems that councilor avalos and councilor smith raised. I do think this is within our power to do. I do think that that we do need to focus where there's been issues. I don't believe that this is the right way to go about it, and I'm looking forward to having the conversations about later. Narrower, focused approaches to

the overtime question in multiple bureaus within public safety. And so I'm going to vote no on this while reserving my right to reconsider it if needed.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: I have a little bit of a shock.

Speaker: No koyama lane.

Speaker: Thank you for your work on this, councilor avalos. I vote i.

Speaker: Maria. I novick.

Speaker: No. Clark.

Speaker: Public safety is one of the most critical functions of government, and I think the mayor raises a very important point that we're living in very uncertain times, and we need maximum flexibility. I'm voting no.

Speaker: Green.

Speaker: Thank you for your leadership, councilor avalos, I vote yes.

Speaker: Zimmerman.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Avalos.

Speaker: Thank you all for the discussion. I mean, obviously, i, I truly do understand where everyone's coming from. I think reasonable, reasonable people can come to different places on this. I think what I'm encouraged, though, to hear from my colleagues is that we all understand the problem, and I will certainly be pushing this issue over the next year. Yeah, there are many ways to address this. This was my attempt to do it in this process. So regardless of the outcome of this vote, I will continue to push this. And I'm glad to hear a signal from my colleagues that you're also interested, and I'm going to hold you to that. So I vote i.

Speaker: Don't know, smith.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: The amendment fails with four yes votes and no votes.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Keelan councilor novick. Are you in the queue with a priority public safety amendment?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Okay. Go right ahead.

Speaker: So I'm proposing an amendment which I anticipate will subsequently be gutted and stuffed by an amendment to the amendment that councilor green is going to propose. Novick 12 is a motion to amend the budget to transfer police bureau general fund from one time revenue from the 2425 budget to fy 2526, to fund efforts to bolster recruitment, to increase staffing, and also efforts to maximize the value of public safety support specialists. This. This would restore money to police for recruitment efforts and for its steps to enhance the value of public safety support specialists, which would include having leadership for public safety support specialists from within that category, rather than police sergeants. And what this would do is increase bureau personnel expenses within the Portland police bureau general fund by \$1.991 million and increase beginning general fund balance the general fund by \$1.991 million. I the. This money is available because of police underspending. I actually would ask director levine to identify the current amount of police underspending. And i'll explain how this fits into that.

Speaker: Thank you, director levine. Before we get a second, could you just let folks know what that looks like?

Speaker: Sure. So they're projecting about \$3 million in underspending in the current fiscal year and 2024, 25.

Speaker: And am I correct that you have begged us not to try to take all of the \$3 million for new expenditures because you want to save half a million, you know, just to be safe?

Speaker: Yeah. I think it would be good practice to save half a million.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Counselor. Is there a second? Counselor? Okay. Councilor. Clark. Seconded. Is there a discussion to counselor novick's amendment? Counselor smith, are you in the queue for discussion?

Speaker: Yes, I'm trying to figure this out. Didn't we vote to take 1.9 million? And councilor novick voted to do that. So I'm trying to figure out what's the difference between what you took out earlier to give to parks, and now you want to put 1.9 back into it?

Speaker: It is. It is the same amount. I stand by my vote to give money to money to parks. Since then, two things have happened. A different funding source has been identified, which doesn't mean reversing the money to parks. And also, I've had conversations with chief day where I feel much more comfortable with where they're going in terms of recruitment strategy. I feel more certain about what the strategy is. I like what he's doing in terms of enhancing planning to do, in terms of enhancing the value of the public safety support specialist, underutilized. One thing I'm counting on them to do, and we'll have conversations about that in terms of recruitment, is to do advertising and marketing, to try to appeal to people who don't want to be cops just because they like carrying a gun, to sort of expand the pool of people who are interested in policing. And I'm going to harass all of you with the new zealand police recruitment video from 2017, which exemplifies such a strategy.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you so much. And I wonder how is this going to impact the mayor's budget? Because wasn't his budget contingent on taking the underspending from from bureaus? I his.

Speaker: I'll defer to the mayor, but the mayor's office is my understanding is okay with this proposal.

Speaker: Director levine, could you explain the underspend question there?

Speaker: Sure. Yeah. So this is under spending that sort of became known in the last couple of weeks. And the reason for that is that. So you'll recall that in the spring technical adjustment ordinance, council allocated 3.5 million to the police bureau. And part of the reason for that was potential needs for overtime surrounding may day and the rose festival, which have now passed and didn't require significant amounts of overtime. So essentially this wasn't forecasted at the time of the mayor's proposed budget. It's sort of new year end underspending. It's also worth just noting that \$3 million, about 1% of the police bureau's budget. So that's kind of definitely in the range of what we would expect of year end underspending of this type.

Speaker: Thank you, director levine, and thank you for bringing this forward.

Speaker: Councilor green.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. Councilor novick. I, I can't support the amendment as it's introduced, but I've I'm prepared to offer a counter amendment at this time.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: I'm colleagues. I'm going.

Speaker: To.

Speaker: I'm going to distribute a floor amendment language down the dais here. Can you send this to the clerk, please? This is green 13. This what I'm calling a public

safety policy. Set aside. The language would be read as follows. Motion to set aside \$2.2 million from the Portland police bureau's fy 2024 2025 budget in support of recruitment and capacity building requested by bureau and program directors within the public safety service area, including pbem chat, Portland street response, boec, Portland fire and rescue, and the Portland police bureau. Increased general fund, contingency and fund and debt management by \$2.2 million to establish a public safety, recruiting and capacity building, set aside increased beginning fund balance in the general fund by \$2.2 million. Update attachments a through h as needed to reflect this change. And colleagues, the reason why I'm posing this alternative approach is that I actually think we need to move past this practice of rolling forward vacancy savings in a bureau. I think as we've moved to this new enterprise organization, I think we need to think about vacancies as pools that exist at a service area level. I think this will help us address and this isn't just for public safety, but maybe this is the first attempt at doing this kind of model. I think that will help us address the issues I think are associated with this struggle between vacancy savings on the one hand, but if you lose them, then you need to contract out, right? That's a problem I see for labor. That's a problem I see for good budgeting. I would also note that public safety is more than just police. It's this whole service area. And I think that there are other elements within the public safety service area that also need capacity building resources. And so the way this is written is the bureau and program directors would go to dca kasi they say, I have a targeted need, I've got an opportunity to hire this fte. I want to do some recruitment spend to try to accelerate our pipeline. And then the director cozzie would request from council to draw upon that set aside and have the resources to do that in the fiscal year and that those are set aside. This this amendment does not divert funds away from public safety, but it does move us closer to that more

efficient enterprise. So for those reasons, I'm offering this alternative and I would request your support for that.

Speaker: Councilor novick. This feels a little too different to be a friendly amendment, but you could choose to pull your proposal off the table, or you could choose to not do so. And we would continue with debate on your amendment.

Speaker: Well, I was going to describe it as a friendly, complete replacement. But if technically that's not appropriate that I could withdraw mine. I want to say that I encourage people to support the green complete replacement, and I want to emphasize what councilor green said. My understanding is that technically, the way this will work out is that at some point, director cozzie will develop a some recommendations how to spend this money, and we'll bring those recommendations to council for our approval. Is that correct, director levine? That's how it would play out.

Speaker: Yes. Yeah. He'd have to come back to City Council with some recommendations.

Speaker: I also just want to note that I had novick 13, a budget note directing the Portland police bureau to develop a staffing strategy and analysis of current practices that it meant to be a companion to my amendment, which I think is still relevant. But anyway, novick 12 was withdrawn.

Speaker: Okay. And, councilor, we would need a second to green 13.

Speaker: I'll second green 13.

Speaker: Councilor novick first right of refusal. I apologize council.

Speaker: Councilor novick to.

Speaker: Do that. Second.

Speaker: Given that he withdrew. Okay, so councilors, we now have a new amendment on the table. Green 13. Councilor smith, you already spoke on a

general topic here, councilor novick, as did you. So I'm going to go to councilor morillo.

Speaker: Yeah, I will be supportive of councilor green's amended amendment of councilor novick's proposal. I think it's a really smart move. I think it's a fair compromise around the public safety bureaus. But I do have to air out some grievances as far as what happened with this discussion, this budget cycle, because I think it was completely unacceptable. I am extremely beyond frustrated that ppb and some members of this council spent extraordinary amounts of energy fighting to keep \$2 million of new unrequested funding increases that were proposed by the mayor and not yet enacted. When our parks bureau is in dire straits and absolutely needed that funding, I also think it is completely absurd and insulting that the police bureau randomly pulled out \$3 million of funds that were sitting unspent a week ago, and that we just found out about that as the budget body. That is completely unacceptable. And I think that if any other bureau did that, my colleagues would be completely aghast and would throw an absolute fit about it. So I'm throwing a fit about this one. And when we talk about the existing resources that police have, we are still, for some reason, not having a conversation in any real way about the police's special revenue fund, which has over \$6 million in assets from the department of justice that are required to be spent down. And that includes things for hiring on missions or things that ppb claims that they don't have enough money to support. So when the bureau is talking about being in dire consequences year after year, while having a budget bigger than any other bureau and having more money than they ever had before, I wonder why it is that we're not looking at the special revenue fund, or why it is that we were not told about this additional \$3 million that were just randomly found last week. I would have loved to know about that as we were making our decisions as the budget body of this city.

And this is all coming out at the heels also of our conversations around ice and policing and how our police are going to be protecting our city against a federal administration that is harming people that look like me and many other folks on this dais. And so I'm really asking this bureau to be responsible and transparent. And i, I will be supporting councilor green's amendment, and I'm not even sure I fully like it, because I actually don't think that Portland police bureau should get any additional money until they can be more transparent about those dollars. I think that if you are a bureau that can randomly pull out \$3 million from under the couch cushions, then maybe we should say no again and see if you can pull out another 3 million. I would love to see what would happen if we did that. But in the spirit of good compromise, i'll be supporting this.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor zimmerman.

Speaker: We noted that 3 million is what's coming back, and I'm just curious why this was written for 2.2 and then I have a future after if there's a response.

Speaker: Yeah. Great question. In kind of this last minute communication with ruth levine and others to try to figure out kind of what's the balance of monies at play. I think the understanding was would really not be comfortable with much more than \$2.5 million of this, of this money that would be sort of rolling forward in this fashion being allocated. So 2.2 felt like the right number there.

Speaker: Okay. Thanks. So the reason that it's not comfortable with it being allocated gets to all bureaus are shaking the cushions. And while that was a spirited speech I will just say yesterday we heard from the fire chief that they have a \$10 million underspend, which is 5% of their budget police. This represents about 1% of their budget. Parks yesterday told us that they have over \$1 million just in materials and services. That's not going to be spent as an underspend on 15 million. And I don't know the percentages of 1 million to 15 million, but it's a percentage. The

point is, is that every bureau in my career at this government and others turns money in at the end of the year, given a variety of reasons to think that this is some sort of grand conspiracy, I think is disheartening. This city deals with underspends generally in the fall bump in the technical adjustment, and so let's not benign, but whatever I was going to say, let's not let's not take it out against one bureau who is saying we have a fix to a thing that you all did last week when all bureaus are going to come forward and say, here's the savings we had from the from the last fy, which I think should be a good practice. I hope our bureaus all don't get into the practice of it's may. We better run the credit card and get to zero. This is not the federal government in a we only fund you for what you previously spent. So I appreciate that all the bureaus generally turn things in. That's a normal practice in city government. I appreciate this. This use of it. I. I'm actually not sure where I am on support for this because I think repackaging it in a service area and keeping it in contingency is not a refunding of what happened three weeks ago, and I don't think that this council is going to authorize our dca to spend money to recruit police officers unless he puts up an equal recruitment budget for the other areas which have, in terms of scale, significantly different scales of what we're talking about. We've got 14 new psr employees to hire up because we funded those, and I'm looking forward to that. We have fire and rescue to hire up, frankly, boec history of hiring up has been great, and I really appreciate that. But I don't have faith that if we put this in contingency, contingency, just like the last time, that this council will actually do any action in the future to support our dca, causey and the police chief of executing those funds in support of a police bureau hiring. And this this gives me great pause here. I want to be supportive, but this gives me pause as a we defunded 2,000,003 weeks ago, and now we're going to put this a little bit of out there to kind of make folks feel comfortable. But this still feels like we have taken

away, I think what was a good a good effort that the mayor put forward in his proposed budget to keep us on the path of continuing to hire more officers, fill vacancies and be on the up side of what has been a down five years. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor councilor canal.

Speaker: Just a couple questions here. So to clarify, there was \$3.5 million originally. There is a request here to allocate 2.2 of what appears to be 2.5 million. That could theoretically be allocated, because I think I understood this as saying half \$1 million would be preferred to leave in this year's fiscal year, this fiscal year's budget for pb can can you explain where the other half a million went? Is that was that spent?

Speaker: Yeah. I think maybe nathan could come up. Better to answer that.

Speaker: I before we bring people up because we really. Yeah. We are taking a lot of time on things right now. I believe what we heard was that we needed to leave at least a half a million. There was 3.5, and our colleague decided that 2.2 was the best number. At one point, I had heard we should leave up to maybe a million. So I believe this wasn't a where did it go? I think it was just a choice by our colleague who brought this forward. Is that correct, councilor green?

Speaker: Okay, so then there's 800,000 still not described. And I just want to remind everyone that that when this came up in the technical adjustment ordinance, we were told that part of the reason why we had to do this is that some of that money had already been spent. And that's that's an important note here. And I this has nothing to do with whether we vote yes or no on this question, but I am a little surprised to hear that none of it was spent when that was not what we were told back during the spring technical adjustment ordinance. I'm going to support this. I want to answer councilor zimmermann's question from just now, and also in the last item, for three plus years I've worked in the public, I worked in

the public safety service area and repeatedly asked the question about what is the barrier to filling vacancies, and I learned that information. I've supported filling the vacancies in the police bureau this entire time, and I still do. I think that it is. It is a very valid use of overtime to fill the precinct patrol backfill category when there is money that is being spent or depends on where you put it. But the paying for the services that a vacant position would be performing while those positions are being filled and those officers are going through roughly two years to get to the point where they're out, you know, done training. So for me personally, and if that helps with the sort of theoretical speculative vote counting on this question, I would be very supportive of the idea that use of overtime for recruitment, training, hiring, all of that should be released. When that comes back. I have for as as it relates to everything else, the particulars I would bring up are in the proposed budget note i'll be raising in a moment on canal ten as to the use of it, but I can just pledge here in public that in the event that it is to release these funds for use, for hiring, for recruiting, for training, as well as a lot of the other things that I wrote a note to prioritize the things that are listed in the first paragraph of canal ten. I will personally vote to release this money there if that comes up. I also think it's really important that we have some available as needed elsewhere. I know that I'm going to use the old title director cozzie in this context of him being boec director has has talked about some needs over there. I know that there's been some needs raised at pbem, and so we might need to talk about position authority in those contexts too, because they don't have the fte to fill. But I'm grateful that there is an option there as well. So i'll be voting yes on it. And I said that in public. Call me out if I don't do it when it comes back up.

Speaker: Councilor.

Speaker: Councilor avalos is next.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Yeah. I just wanted to point out actually that I agree with you, councilor zimmermann. It would really personally be my preference that any dollars that are left over go through a regular process of the tau right. And some of that like we don't know, we can't know what all the leftover is going to be until technically after the fiscal year ends. I think the reason this is coming up this way is because there's there was movement around trying to restore that 1.9 million. So this is a choice that's being made because of people trying to restore that 1.9 million. I actually agree that I don't think we should be doing anything with taking any money that is left over and doing anything with it now, that's why we have the tau or the bump process. But this, you know, again, this feels like it was a result of clearly councilors being pressured to put police money back. So that feels frustrating for me because my choice would be that we just wait and that they can make their case in the fall, and they tend to, right? History has shown that the police tend to come back for the bump processes and ask for the money, and they tend to get it all. So this to me is, you know, a negotiation around like people wanting to put the money back into police, other people not wanting to. How do you get to those seven votes? How do you get to larger consensus? And people have come to this conclusion of, well, why don't we just take the money and have it ready for all of the public safety bureaus? So, you know, I'm leaning towards supporting it because of that larger philosophy. But I do in principle don't like that we're doing this because I agree, I think every bureau should put their money back into the general fund, and then we get to decide what to do with it through those processes. So this is going around that process to do this, you know, by this pressure in my opinion. So that's where I'm at.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor, councilor smith.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I do agree with councilor zimmermann as well. And this does not put it back. And it doesn't it kind of I'm getting some defunding vibes because the people who who had the underspending will not get a chance to spend it. This will just be a one time spend because there is a budget that's approved with the entire amount that the mayor put in. So this wouldn't, you know, putting ftes in it would not transfer over. Do you see what I'm saying? Okay.

Speaker: Thank you councilor. I just want to be clear to both councilor smith and councilor zimmermann that you're right. This is not a restore of what happened on may 21st. That's actually not my intention. I'm not intending to restore and undo what the council took as action on may 21st. I would note that this and this is a philosophical change in direction. I would note that the monies that were approved in the fall tor and the spring tor were one time resources for overtime, for additional overtime. And so this just says, let's take the underspend of that. Let's put it again in a one time set aside. So that way dca can support the surge operations that are identified as necessary to bring our overtime dollars down over time. But with with the opportunity for more than just the police to come to the table. So that's the intention by my, my, my thing. And I just wanted to make sure it was clear that this was not intended to be a reversal of the previous council action.

Speaker: Okay. And just to be clear, that this was this was money and the reason why we got the money, we didn't use it during the rose festival. That's what director levine said. So it's not like they were they were trying to be disingenuous about the money. And I think that I agree that we may want to keep this for the bump, because everybody keeps talking about waiting for the bump to pay for things that we're not paying for right now. So I wouldn't be supporting this.

Speaker: Just.

Speaker: Councilor zimmerman.

Speaker: I'm just curious if the authors would be open to just allocating this money directly to the dcr for public safety service area, instead of placing it in contingency, so that we can keep that funding in in the public safety service area that serves all those units that that have been identified in it.

Speaker: I my understanding, director from director levine is that it doesn't can't really work that way. There's I actually asked about the option. Can we just give it to the service area as a whole. And I think we can't do that. Well.

Speaker: All service areas have a service area. Director's budget. I'd like to know about this then.

Speaker: Yeah. I mean, you could put it in the office of the dca. It's just the in order to pay for police overtime or police personnel, it would have to go into police's budget because the office of the dca has other programs in it. And like their business management business services division and there.

Speaker: So I think I appreciate that. So I think the mechanism that I'm trying to understand here is that if we can use the money from the dca's office to execute the recruiting, retention, hiring type events. I'm hoping that the other side is listening to this.

Speaker: Say.

Speaker: All right, the concern that we heard with the reduction of \$2 million a couple of weeks ago was that we want to keep on doing the recruiting events. We want to make sure we're doing everything we can to fill vacancies, and we're going to stay on that. And that means we may not execute some overtime missions because we want to we want to preserve the money for recruiting. If we place this money instead of in contingency, but just into the director's budget and the public safety service area executes recruiting and retention events on behalf of all the departments that exist underneath that service area. So that's pbem, chat, etc. And

police, fire and rescue. Then that I'm trying to understand if that would allow the chief and the command staff at Portland police bureau and at fire and others to not have to use their operational overtime for those efforts, because we have put recruitment funds in the dcas category, and they can do that from a service area instead of this idea that we're going to use that we wouldn't be using the dcas funds for operational overtime, certainly, but we also would eliminate the need for the bureaus to use those operational funds for recruitment efforts. And I feel like that would achieve the concerns we heard about the reduction, while also allowing the dca to use this money, actually, instead of just coming back to us, which I think is going to be a very long, drawn out process. I'm curious what thoughts are.

Speaker: Council president direct response.

Speaker: Go right ahead.

Speaker: As the author of this amendment, I'm not comfortable with that change, but if you wanted to amend something else, we can consider that.

Speaker: Can I direct respond as well?

Speaker: I.

Speaker: We cannot direct respond to everything and get through everything. We are at almost noon. I allowed councilor green to do that since he is the carrier. I'm sorry. Councilor zimmermann, are you? I'm okay. Councilor canal.

Speaker: Thank you. Yeah, I think there's a conversation I'd love to have about the question over recruitment and perhaps giving some some back and forth in the community and public safety committee with the service area about whether or not, to some degree centralizing or not centralizing hiring makes or recruitment efforts make sense. I think that's an ongoing conversation that I think is of interest to me. And I think there's reasons it's been done the way it's been done that are not just siloing reasons there are unique needs. I think that the police bureau has

versus other bureaus as well. So I'd love to hear that. I think that's a good question to ask to councilor zimmerman. And your point, I also wanted to clarify that it was not the police that said the thing I called out earlier about that some of the money had already been spent. I don't want to imply that that they were misleading us. That's not where we got that information. During the spring technical adjustment ordinance conversation. And so I don't want that to be misconstrued. But as it relates to this, I think the only other thing that's worth talking about, and I'll be talking about this when we get into the later conversation, is that there's a national monuments conversation going on as it relates to overtime, and where within the categories things would be reduced or not increased. And so the conversation and that's, that's why I'm bringing up my note canal ten, to ensure that those missions that keep getting brought up, that we're going to cut human trafficking, if there's not whatever the particular dollar amount that's being brought up in the moment is, is not it doesn't have to be that way. And so I think the guidance we can give and I'll have some more information when I propose that amendment. And the pair note to say no, we don't need these missions to be cut. And I want to say one other thing that's not that is related to this. And I apologize to the administrator for using you as a reference point here. But the budget right now is the same dollar amount that it was in the city administrator's budget recommendations. And so supporting 316 versus 318 has been characterized as defunding or in, in a very ludicrous way as, as abolishing. And I think nobody's ever accused city administrator michael jordan of being a police abolitionist for supporting \$316 million for police. Nobody's ever accused mayor wilson of that for trying to swap a 9.5 million out and 12.5 million in in the decision package, as you can see that it's absurd to say that about people supporting the exact same dollar amounts and for the same exact reasons. So I just want to get that out of the way. This conversation has gotten a little

unnecessarily even. I do think this will be a really good support for recruitment and hiring and training, and I'm going to support it as a result.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor novick.

Speaker: Yeah, I just wanted to get director cozzie response causes response to councilor zimmermann's comments. And just to ask you, can you work with this amendment as written? You know, just, you know, give give us your thoughts.

Speaker: Yeah. Thank you, bob cozzie for the record and director, I go by both right now. Yes, I definitely can work with this. You know, having only had my eyes on it this morning and consulting with my team and as well as the police bureau, recognizing this helps build a training pipeline for all public safety bureaus that need a training pipeline. It also will help with recruitment efforts across the board. You know, the concept of direct to the dca. I, I greatly appreciate that. In particular. I think it would be helpful, certainly to perhaps cut out some of the red tape. But with that, I mentioned accountability before, and I absolutely plan on coming before council in various forms of committees or full City Council with updates and reports and the needs of all public safety bureaus. So yes, we can work with it. I do want to make a clarification, though, on, you know, the 3 million, 3.5 million, really, chief de and his team have done an excellent job the past many months, really putting their arms and efforts around overtime management. And that's something that is absolutely going to carry forward. That's part of the reason why there is money left over. It really isn't. You know, the analogy of couch cushions, that's not what happened. And they've done a really good job in my opinion, really unpacking the overtime elephant and figuring out how to eat it.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor morillo.

Speaker: I would like to move for us to vote on this.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: So that would be a motion to end debate. We do have one other person in the queue. Councilor smith, would you mind us just moving forward since that will be fast?

Speaker: I just have a quick statement. I just want to thank.

Speaker: Hold on, hold on. We have a motion on the table to.

Speaker: End debate.

Speaker: I would like to hear what councilor smith has to say.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Are you withdrawing your motion?

Speaker: Yeah. And then I'm going to put it right back up.

Speaker: Okay. Everyone is forewarned, councilor smith.

Speaker: Not really, but no. If you believe that you can do something with this, then I change my understanding of it. Thank you so much.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor, I believe there is no one else in the queue, so Keelan, could you please call the roll? This is on who? I'm. I'm missing the number now. Councilor, is this councilor green teen? Yes. Okay. Green 13, which replaced the amendment that novick put on the table, which would take \$2.2 million. That was left over in the end of the police budget and use it for recruitment and capacity building within the public safety service area.

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: Yes, Ryan. Thank you.

Speaker: Director cozzie. You're plugged right in and we need you.

Speaker: I koyama lane.

Speaker: So we're all learning a lot through this budget process. I don't know, I might be learning the most being the newest. I truly hope next year that a lot of things look different. I'm known to be someone who listens, holds space, picks up

the phone. Even with people that I don't agree with, I will pick up the phone for president aaron schmitz often. I think it's important, and I'm also someone who supports people having conversations and compromising. And I helped support some of these conversations. And at the same time, as I believe it's important to listen to others, what I'm learning personally in this role is I also need to trust myself and vote with my gut. I told president aaron schmaltz that while I supported folks having conversations that I did want to stay out of this, it felt like it was getting messy. And also because I believe that this will pass without my vote. It feels right for me to vote no.

Speaker: Maria.

Speaker: I think it's really important that this amendment changes it so that public safety is prioritized in all the ways, including that this money could go to Portland street response. It could go to chat, or if the police can finally fund their finally fill the 91 fully funded vacant positions that have sat empty for the past five years, then it can help with that too. So I vote, i.

Speaker: Novick I clark.

Speaker: I'm not really happy with this amendment. I wanted to restore the 1.9 to the police bureau. While I appreciate what councilor green has said about a new model, I think that has merit in the future. But I feel like I've been put in the squeeze chute, and it forces me to have faith in director cozzie to do the right thing. So I will vote yes.

Speaker: Green i.

Speaker: Zimmerman, avalos.

Speaker: Like I said, I really wish that we could have just done this in the towel, but I appreciate this amendment because I think it helps force the council to have a more holistic view of what public safety is. And yes, we put more money into psr

and chat, but they are still not at 24 over seven. And that is what I'm going to continue to strive for. I think this is a good step forward towards that. So I'm going to vote. Aye.

Speaker: I smith.

Speaker: I. Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: The amendment is approved with 11 yes votes and one no vote.

Speaker: We are still in the public safety service area. I believe we have heard from canal, avalos and green.

Speaker: Haven.

Speaker: Does anybody else have anything you'd like to bring forward? Councilor novick I believe you put something forward also.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: I want to make sure that everybody has something to bring forward who hasn't has had a chance at their first choice. I've got a couple.

Speaker: Of things.

Speaker: We'll come back after we do the other policy areas for additional things. Councilor kanal I thought you had moved to public safety before. Did I get that wrong?

Speaker: No. I proposed my amendment in parks, but I'd be happy to go after the other person in the queue, which is yourself.

Speaker: That's.

Speaker: That's me. That's a bit awkward.

Speaker: I am happy to be deferential.

Speaker: Why is that awkward?

Speaker: You are. You are councilor.

Speaker: Do i?

Speaker: We're going through. We're giving everybody one shot in each service area. So councilor kanal is right. He had first proposed the last one in parks. So go right ahead. Councilor for public safety.

Speaker: I'm going to move the amendment canal five and the paired note canal ten. And so we have discussed canal five. It was briefly in the president's package in an earlier form. It was then debated without ever being proposed. It is not actually ever been proposed, except briefly as part of the president's package. In the first thing it was, it has been adjusted significantly, and it is being repropose at a smaller dollar amount. It would convert ongoing overtime dollars that are in the police bureau currently to one time, and in return it would create \$500,000 of ongoing funding instead of one time funding for the office of violence prevention and ceasefire and their grants program, and 1 million of the \$2 million for the chat program would become ongoing. Putting this into the ongoing city budget for the very first time. And then there is a paired note canal ten, which I have some data on. As it comes up, I'll talk about, and it is instructing the police bureau to prioritize, which we all we've already talked about recruiting and training being the first priority, but beyond that, prioritizing retail theft, stolen vehicle operations, investigations, gun violence reduction, street racing, human trafficking, and traffic priority projects, which are the precise categories that police said they would be prioritizing. I also added sexual and domestic violence and property crime broadly, and instead deprioritizing the all other item, which is where demonstrations, crowd control events and community presence goes, as well as to document those and say and be able to report separately on those in the future. I also would like to note explicitly that I'm very open to adjusting the funding source for canal zero five. If there is a better place to find ongoing money for chat. I have asked psa for that and

multiple bureaus within it, but I would like to have the conversation and perhaps pursue those ongoing conversations as well beyond these amendments to.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor councilor kanal has put canal five and canal ten on the table. Is there a second for canal five? Second?

Speaker: Second?

Speaker: Is there a second for canal ten?

Speaker: Second second? Jinx.

Speaker: Okay, I believe councilor dunphy seconded both of those councilors. Is there a debate on canal 5 or 10? Councilor zimmerman.

Speaker: Have we resolved the difference of opinion between the central budget office and the bureaus and this central or the service area for what the impact of this so-called ongoing fund, which doesn't exist, actually means for fte reduction to the police bureau, because the last time we heard about it was the larger number. It was 17.5, and there was argument between the two. I would love to get a more clear of an answer so we know what we're actually voting on.

Speaker: So, councilor, do you have somebody specific you would like to have answer that. Or should I look to the budget office? Or should I tell you my memory of where.

Speaker: We are? I am uninterested in your memory of it, given how much they have. I think that the discrepancies between the business representatives and the cbo and the chief and the dca and the mayor all have to be discussed. What does this 1.5 actually mean? Because three weeks ago it meant 17.5 fte. Please, I hope there is a clear answer on what this means.

Speaker: Director cozzie could we get you and your business services folks here? And I am hoping so that we can move through a little bit more before we have to take a lunch break, that we can get a concise explanation as to the effect of this.

Speaker: Nathan, you go.

Speaker: You happy.

Speaker: To take a first start on nathan leamy? I manage the budget, strategy and performance team for the public safety service area. Ultimately, the discussion we had in one of the work sessions around the budget is that this would not lead to an immediate abolishment of positions for the police bureau, but it would make worse an issue the bureau has as a whole. There are positions that are currently unfilled, and whether they are funded or not, is not going to be really able to be determined until we establish what the ongoing overtime needs of the bureau would be. Once the bureau is able to get to full staffing, I think what is, you know, ultimately the spirit of this amendment, obviously a swap for one time and ongoing dollars does matter. If not, councilor kanal would not be bringing it to be able to provide the sort of assurances to chat staff by having ongoing funding for those programs.

Speaker: I'm going to stop you right there. So I need to understand a part of it. So. It may be a pipe dream that we're going to hire 90 folks in this year. Sure. But what we're saying is by removing the ongoing money, we're removing that authorization for whatever year we were to hit that. So if our authorized fte total in the Portland police bureau is 901, this will have a direct authorization impact on the size of the authorized positions of the police bureau. I want to make sure I'm understanding that.

Speaker: As you noted previously, the city of Portland does it somewhat strangely. The authorization for fte and dollars is a separate process, but city policy does say any ongoing authorized positions need to be funded with ongoing dollars.

Speaker: So if we broke city policy, the best case scenario here is that we'd have the same fte authorizations, but no appropriation to pay them if they were hired.

Correct. That's me being generous with the description of what we're being asked to do here. Okay. I'm good.

Speaker: Okay. Counselors. Is anybody else? Any other discussion on the amendment?

Speaker: I'm in.

Speaker: The queue. Which one are we on? Five.

Speaker: Five, 110 together.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Counselor. I had really hoped to support this. And when you first brought it forward, it was my intent to support it. And frankly, there has been so much movement of money that I'm not sure I can right now. I'm going to spend the next 30s thinking about it. But because I had told you previously that I had hoped to, I just wanted to note that now. Councilor you back in the queue for discussion?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Go right ahead.

Speaker: Okay. This swap of ongoing to one time has occurred before. If you look at the mayor's proposed budget for may 5th, there are three documents. There's the proposed budget. Then there's decision packages, the numbers, decision packages, the explanation. If you go to the decision package numbers on page 20, you can see that the mayor took \$9.35 million of recommended and requested ongoing funding. It's the fourth line on the page away, and replaced it with 8.05 million of one time funding in that fourth line, and an additional \$4 million in the first line, also one time funding. That's the line that was subsequently increased to 2 million. So that's \$9.35 million in ongoing funding, replaced by \$10.05 million in one time funding, effectively doing what this amendment does, but four times more by the math that was given to us. If the \$2.5 million swap would have led to 17.5

positions becoming limited duration, a \$10 million swap would have also led to 70 positions becoming limited duration. But when the mayor made his budget proposal, which again did have that 2 million more at the time, no comment was made that 70 positions were going to be converted to limited duration. There is a narrative here that I think is really important to bring up, and I want to point out that on the May 28th, 2025 budget work session, and if you're watching the video, it's at the two hour, 57 minute, 55 second mark, the budget lead for PPB said, and I quote, there is no mechanism that says that if ongoing dollars are swapped out, it has to come from those vacant FTE. It's just the most straightforward place for the bureau to take dollars from. End quote. That is a choice. And that's why there's an important budget note paired with it that to say, no, we don't want you to take funding away from these positions. We don't want you to take funding away from human trafficking and all the other community needs. There's other places in this that I have sent when I'll talk about it. When we start talking about amendment, if this is a separate conversation around the budget, note where we have seen that there are 79,000 hours of overtime in the budget for two categories collectively marked all other, and there are no zero proposed decreases to the overtime hours allotted to those categories. 100% of the hours that they're saying will be reduced are being reduced from precinct patrol backfill. And while I'm saying this actually Keelan, I don't know if you have the file we sent over to share. If not, I can share it.

Speaker: If you can do this without a presentation, that would be very helpful. It is 1217.

Speaker: Sure.

Speaker: Precinct patrol, backfill, retail theft, stolen vehicle operations, gun violence reduction, street racing, precinct crime reduction, human trafficking, traffic priority projects, and investigative overtime would all take a hit in the way. And

that's again a choice. We just got that quote, but all other which has 45,000 hours in it, and another all other which has 34,470 hours in it would take zero reductions. Right. This the entire conversation we're talking about here is a net of under 35,000 hours. And there's 79,000 hours in there in these two places. And so that's why the budget note is so important, because budget note ten speaks to this exact prioritization. And I think to quote well, paraphrase one of councilor zimmerman's points in other conversations, we don't have a budget problem in some of those places we have a prioritization problem. And so as a result, the first paragraph of canal ten says to prioritize all those things I just listed and to disaggregate and report separately over the course of the year, with no change in the funding to this, other than it goes from ongoing to one time. The demonstration and crowd control response, which is part of all other, and the hours spent by patrol officers on community presence. And again, there is no reduction if the budget for police is 316 million right now, which it is, and this were to pass, the budget will still be 316 million. All we're asking for is for the reduced amount. It was 2.5. Now it's \$1.5 million to be asked for again next year. And in return, what do we get? We get the ability to make the office of violence prevention and ceasefire grant recipients, who do the community violence intervention that we heard in testimony earlier today at the top of today's meeting, be able to have contracts that go beyond a year, a fiscal year, and more importantly than that, even the community health assess and treat program or chat would be ongoing for the first time. Those employees would not have to be begging for their jobs every year, or looking for new jobs every April. And also leverage that money for external funding, because the funding sources that I've been talking to for chat want to see the city put skin in the game, by which they mean put it into the ongoing budget and commit to this program and make sure

that it's a long term program, just like we've done about a year in advance for Portland street response. Thanks.

Speaker: Councilors.

Speaker: Is there any other discussion? Okay. Keelan, could you please call the roll on canal five?

Speaker: Canal on canal five. The amendment I vote i.

Speaker: Ryan no. Koyama lane i. Morillo i. Novick no.

Speaker: Clark, no.

Speaker: Green i.

Speaker: Zimmerman no.

Speaker: Avalos i.

Speaker: Dunphy.

Speaker: I smith.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Point of order. I'm gonna change my vote to a no so I can move to reconsider later.

Speaker: Keelan could you please call the roll on canal ten?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: I was listening.

Speaker: Could you please call the roll on canal ten?

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: So again, this is. The again, this is the budget note this is the one that says we support police spending their time on human trafficking, stolen vehicle missions, all those things. And I want to be very clear that that's what we're voting on. If you support that prioritization, you should join me I vote aye.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Koyama lane.

Speaker: Yes. Maria i. Novick no.

Speaker: Clark.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Green.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Zimmerman.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Avalos i. Dunphy i.

Speaker: Smith.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: The amendment is approved with seven yes votes and five no votes.

What happened with canal clark?

Speaker: I am next in the queue with a public safety amendment. Now that I've off half my colleagues on one vote and half on the other. I mentioned that.

Speaker: What was the outcome of the first canal one?

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: The first one was six five with one absence. It did not pass. The second
116.

Speaker: Canal five was six five with one absence. Correct? Keelan.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: And canal ten.

Speaker: Seven. 7 to.

Speaker: 5.

Speaker: 7 to 5.

Speaker: Six. What were councilor kanal? Does the count that.

Speaker: Does the count? That was just stated.

Speaker: For.

Speaker: I'm sorry you changed your vote. So it was five six with one absence, I apologize. Those five six with one absence.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: And the second one canal ten. Seven. Seven. Yes. Five. No. So canal five fails. Canal ten is approved.

Speaker: Counselors. Councilor zimmerman. Are you in the queue for a point of order? Can I move forward with my amendment?

Speaker: I have an amendment.

Speaker: I'll wait.

Speaker: Up to you.

Speaker: Okay. Pirtle-guiney 16 I passed out a few minutes ago. We no longer have the funds for this that I was hoping to move forward, but I still would like to put it on the table because I think it is an important concept to raise. This is a motion to increase rather than maintain the contract levels through the office of violence prevention and ceasefire. These are programs that work with people who have been victims of gun violence, and that work with communities to try to reduce gun violence. These are critical programs in my district. And when I talk to folks in my district about what they need, this is one of the things that is brought up repeatedly, because the positions in these offices receive the treatment that all positions in the city do, of cost of living increases being included in the base budget that moves forward. But the contracts do not. The buying power of those contracts

decreases over time, because the reality is that the people we contract with have increasing costs over time. I had hoped to increase the contracts by the same amount that we increase our colas, so that the buying power would not be decreased. This would cost a total of \$180,000. Those were funds I was hoping to take from the contingency money left over general fund contingency from amendments that I brought forward on the 21st. We've chosen to spend that money elsewhere. I'm not looking for a second and a vote because we don't have the funds to do this anymore. But I want to point out that this amendment is here, is on the table, and I would love for us to be able to come back to it at some point.

Speaker: I'll second madam president. There are other places you can get the money.

Speaker: Well, that was a point of order or question. That was what I was going to ask. I hear you. And is it in general, aren't we operating at this point that things can be out of balance because we can find it later, and then we'll have to fix it later?

Speaker: Colleagues, we are \$700,000 in the hole on contingent on general fund right now, because one of the amendments we passed yesterday, we were told was in balance and it was not.

Speaker: A separate issue.

Speaker: So I am now going to withdraw my amendment. Councilor zimmerman, the floor is yours.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Madam president. I'm making a motion to amend. Amend to move 1.2 million of opioid settlement funds into contingency policy, set aside intended for access and payment to Multnomah County for the future operations of a 24 seven drop off sobering center. Once opened, the city of Portland has been a longtime participant with Multnomah County in designing and crafting the new sobering

center program. City services desire a better alternative for severely intoxicated people, and a sobering center offers that solution as a primary user, the city of Portland commits with funding to helping Multnomah County to bring a sobering center to the Portland community as soon as possible. Thank you. I would enjoy a second.

Speaker: Second point of order. Is this in the public safety? Area?

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: I can use that point of order. Actually, yes. Sobering services are considered part of public safety, and the police bureau has traditionally paid for the sobering center. But that stopped in 2019, which is why Multnomah County is trying to reignite it. So it is public safety related. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilors. Counselor smith, are you in the queue to discuss this amendment?

Speaker: Yes, counselor zimmerman, for this, do we have money left over in the opioid settlement pot?

Speaker: Yes, ma'am.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Okay. I don't I know I had a opioid request and I didn't it didn't pass. But for this one, tell me why this is this is urgent at this moment.

Speaker: I appreciate the question. So for 23 and 24, many members of Portland staff, including police, mayors, representatives, psa, the public safety service area have been at the executive table of Multnomah County's sobering center. Work Multnomah County received \$25 million last legislative session from the state legislature to help with this. They've used some of that for the deflection, and they will use the remainder of it as they stand up. Their sobering center, the it is estimated in that planning that a couple of things will happen. One is that

Multnomah County plans to create a cheers style van like we've seen in other communities. And like we used to have here, two, that they expect that there will be times when police officers during their interactions will have will will think that sobering is a better alternative than for a jail hospital or leaving them on the streets, and it returns us to a pre 2019 kind of situation where we used to have this type of service, and because of the nature of the drugs that have hit our community, the sobering services were shut down. But that service used to be paid for by Portland police from their budget. And this, I think, is a good faith effort, given that the previous City Council has had \$1.9 million actually allocated. But in this proposed budget by the mayor, he pulled out that 1.9 because that sobering center is not yet open. I think it's important to signal to Multnomah County that we will stay in this game with them if they are able to open it up, because it is a very critical need and they expect to open theirs by the end of this upcoming fiscal year and into the next one. We had it. It was there. I don't think that carving it out in the proposed budget was the right move, and this is a fix to do that. I think you may have seen a letter from Multnomah County chair this week. I think that some of you may have received calls from Multnomah County commissioners today, and I'm hoping for the city of Portland to signal that we stay committed to opening a sobering center in this community.

Speaker: Councilor smith. Anything additional?

Speaker: And this will go into contingency.

Speaker: Yes. If Multnomah County fails to open the site, then then they would not have the ability to pull these funds. But if they open the site and the city administration feels that our payment can go forward for that, then I would support that authorization. Okay. It is similar to where it sat in contingency previous budget.

Speaker: Counselor smith. Anything further? Counselor avalos.

Speaker: So I'm having a similar moment to counselor president where this was money that I was intending to bring forward to use for a health. And I think that what is important about the difference in what I am suggesting and how we use those dollars, is that for health is providing a permanent housing solution as well. And so for already has a sobering, you know, essentially sobering center. And then they the capital dollars that I'm intending to use with the 1.2 million that I was going to introduce in a later category, because I understood it was under another category, or else I would have introduced it. Now that those dollars are to stand up 46 new beds in a moment where we are in a dire housing crisis and it is intersectional with our dire addiction crisis, that, to me feels like the more appropriate use all the stuff with Multnomah County. I mean, honestly, I'm not interested because I think this is a duty we have as a city to put some dollars into work that we're doing. This is something that obviously affects my district, and I care a lot about adding this capacity in d1, and I think that it is also an important key to kind of a corridor in my district between adventist health and for health to have this permanent supportive housing option that will be moving people into a more stable housing solution, because sobriety beds are not a stable solution. Those are intended to be, you know, you come in and you go, whereas for health, the for health option is an actual stable solution. And that is what a lot of our communities need is. They need housing and they need an opportunity to do that in with permanent supportive resources, which is what ford does, which is also related to addiction. So I would urge my colleagues to vote no on this so that I can introduce for health with this 1.2 million, which I believe is a better use. So I will be voting no on this for that reason.

Speaker: Thank you, counselor councilor koyama lane.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. Thank you, counselor zimmerman. I appreciate your perspective, especially as the counselor appointed by mayor wilson to the soc, the steering and oversight committee, and someone that does have a lot of experience in Multnomah County. I am curious if and how you've worked with our administrative side on this, and if not, that's fine. But then I would like to hear from them.

Speaker: Thanks. So as I mentioned, for the last, for the last two years, the city administration has been fully at the table for planning of the sobering center and the mayor's representatives, the police chiefs, representatives have been at that table. Members of our public safety service area have been at that table. The funding cobbled together to open the sobering center relies on Portland contributing to that service. I want to be really clear when people say that there are other sobering sites around, there are not. There are no such things as other sobering sites in this community. There are detox sites, which is a very different service. There are treatment beds, which is a very different service. There are no sobering beds. And we may be one of the largest, if not the largest urban community without a sobering site. And that's why the Portland administration was at the table for the last two years. The mayor is aware that I was bringing this today. Commissioners are letting you all know right now that for a health is getting \$6 million from Multnomah County. They do not need this 1.2, but we desperately need a sobering center. These are different services and public safety. Our position in this is why we should be involved in this, and it's why Multnomah County should be involved with for health, because that is the long term treatment, long term beds for that side of it. This is clearly within the public safety wheelhouse, which is why the city has been in the planning of this all along, and why the city is not in the planning of the four treatment beds, because that's not in our line of business.

Speaker: So I think you kind of answered the question about how you collaborated. I also am hearing talking about working with the administration for over two years. Wilson has been in this position for five and a half months. I know that you are working on being very strategic with your choices and relationships, so I would like to hear from your team as well.

Speaker: Mr. Mayor, would you like to respond?

Speaker: Certainly. And you're right, this has been a five month arc. It started with conversations with the chair and with commissioner edwards asking for support. We were both challenged county in Portland with meeting our obligations to one another. County owed us for sv and test sites which they are unable to. So we went to start filling that gap. So we utilize those funds for the sv. So to pull them back would take money away from that. So that was a very difficult choice. We noted to county that we needed these open now. And they had noted 2026 was when they were going to open. Now they pushed it to 2027. So we had noted to them they were for ongoing support of that operation, which is not expected to 2027. Worked with councilor avalos this last month. I would say she brought forward the use for the opioid. She asked if I would support it. I thought it was a great move because again, our focus is beds. We need beds. We don't care if they're overnight beds, 24 over seven beds, recovery beds. We need beds. So it was a very good move. Yesterday, counselor zimmerman brought this to my attention. I received a call from commissioner edwards this morning, noting that they have \$6 million going to for health. She explained that that's a county prerogative, that's a county funding. And so I believe that we have both now solved for if the zimmerman amendment goes forward, we're able to provide funds for, for at the rate of 6 million, which was, per edwards, the nexus for the county. And to councilor zimmerman, the 1.2 that

he brings forward is the nexus for the sobering center, which was something that pb, as noted, paid for as it's a public safety response as well.

Speaker: So can.

Speaker: I clarify, are you feeling supportive of this?

Speaker: Yeah, so long as I know that the for health, I think that it's a good choice. And I believe it was always a county prerogative, a county funding. And edwards confirmed that they are and do have funding going. They didn't cut it.

Speaker: Thank you. I will be supporting this amendment.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor, councilor Ryan.

Speaker: Oh.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. My hand was up for actually the same dialog that the vice chair, the vice president, asked for, and i, I appreciate you taking time to explain that fully. And it took me a while to figure out if you were actually supportive of this amendment. But you are correct. I just want to hear it again. Okay. Yeah. The closure of the sobering center in 2019 by the city and the county was a was a big mistake. Yes, there were new drugs, but we should have responded with a better plan at that time. We unfortunately it's been closed and we're allowing people on the streets who want to just navigate sidewalks to have to see that. So the humanitarian crisis didn't just show up overnight. It was those kind of mistakes along the way. So yes, this is urgent and I will be supportive of it. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilors. Well, I know that these funds may not have initially been in the budget because the county isn't there yet. I think it is really important that we continue to put the pressure on to get there, because the sobering center is absolutely critical, and making sure that we have the funds available as soon as they are ready is a way that we can help to do that. Thank you for bringing this forward, councilor. I'll continue to be supportive. Councilor smith.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Madam president. While I do support the idea of assisting with this, because it's a huge issue and a lot of folks who are indigent and who are homeless, they need these services. But I got to tell you, I am troubled by consistently, you know, passing city money over to the county. I don't think that we should be underwriting the things that they should be paying for. And so here we go again, y'all. This is their thing. This is what they need to be paying for. They have the extra money from metro to pay for these kinds of things. And for me, it's just like I'm done with it. And they have reneged on some things that we have been in the works on, and I don't feel like they get rewarded for not meeting their obligation to the city and everything else. And then we keep continuing to give them money. We have other things. And the reason why I'm a little I'm also a little teed off because I asked for the money for summer jobs to help do additional summer jobs for kids who had legal troubles that I needed, and that we were going to do training on the importance of not. Not taking drugs, not selling drugs, not human trafficking and all that. And I would much rather spend that money in that way before I give Multnomah County additional funds from us, because they have not been a fair partner. And I agree with what you're saying, but I just don't know that I want to do that at this point.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor canal, have you had an opportunity to speak? Go right ahead.

Speaker: I have two.

Speaker: Questions, and one of them is going to sound like it's saying something that's not saying. So I want to just preface it up there. This was proposed to be money given directly to the county. And you're saying that in the past it used to

come from the police bureau. So my question is for the first question is, would we not put that new money into the police bureau? Be very clear, put the new money in, and then have it be an expense that we direct? What? Why would it be a direct give instead of and again this I'm not talking about having them use existing money. I'm just curious why it's not a pass through.

Speaker: Yeah. So. This gets to the heart of the sobering center. A sobering center is, in every community, considered part of the public safety apparatus. It's not considered part of the treatment continuum. It's a really important distinction. Sobering, unfortunately, is not reimbursable by medicaid, the way that that detox and treatment is. So that that line is a line of delineation, most so in our history because of that need, existing Portland police have have paid to have that service stood up by a nonprofit previously. And because it got so dangerous with the type of meth and fentanyl that are on the streets today, it was not safe for the people being taken there. It was not safe for the people working there. And so it shut down. We've seen what those five years have felt like on the streets. A couple of years ago, the county said, okay, got it. But we still have to have a solution to this. So they undertook a planning process to restart a sobering center. They didn't used to be in the business of a sobering center, but they are now getting into the business of a sobering center. So this is this is them recognizing this, this hole that was created by by everybody shutting it down in 2019. And so I don't think that it needs to be Portland police who pays for it? I think that it used to be. But times have changed a lot in the last six years. And so I think if we just do a direct allocation when they're ready, that's fine. And I and I do think it is different than the social services as it relates to the housing continuum, the homeless services continuum, because I think this one falls directly into line with public safety, because right now, if you're intoxicated to the point you can't help yourself on the

street, most of the time a person is just left there and we hope they don't decompensate. The other option is a hospital visit, which in this planning group, by the way, the hospitals are sitting at as well and said coming to the hospital is also a bad idea. It's not serving them well. And the last course is a trumped up jail charge. And where the jail is not going to take that person anyway because they're so sick. So the option ends up being this is why so many people are left on the street and the county is trying to solve for that. And I think the port, the city of Portland apparatus is trying to say, we recognize we're going to be the number one user of this, and we'd like to make sure it gets open. And that's why I'm supporting us remaining with skin in the game and a signal. And I and I do not dispute some of our other social services issues, but I think this one falls into a public safety service, which is why I think we should have skin here.

Speaker: And then my other question.

Speaker: Thank you. My other question is, is the \$6 million for health? I know that the county is approving their budget tomorrow or adopting their budget tomorrow. Is it in there right now or are we just counting on it being added?

Speaker: The conversation that I had with her today was that she and or confirmed the 6 million was going from county to aurora, so I can only just go off of that.

Speaker: So it's.

Speaker: In.

Speaker: The email.

Speaker: You're saying it's in the approved budget and it'll be voted on tomorrow to finalize, or that someone's going to amend that \$6 million in.

Speaker: It's in the budget. Her point note was it's in the budget. And that was money that I believe was assured.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Can I just use the point? They the way they might signal this is they won't say it's going to for what they'll say is we're creating an rfp for 27 bed detox center to be built. And we want to contribute to it. Like that's generally how they would signal this. But from the chair and from from excuse me, commissioner edwards, it sounds like that. And that's a long term relationship that they have there. I was lobbied by them when I was over there as a staffer like that for a building is happening, which is not a surprise. That's within their line of business.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor avalos. Actually, counselor, I'm going to go to councilor dunphy since he hasn't spoken. I'm sorry.

Speaker: I just I don't know if anybody knows the answer to this, but was for anticipating that \$6 million or is that does this \$6 million act keep them whole, or were they anticipating both something from the county and something from the city in their ask? Do we know? Okay.

Speaker: Councilor smith, are you back in the queue or still in the queue?

Speaker: Yes, I'm back in the queue.

Speaker: It does not mean that we can't do both things. So are you going to suggest that we continue to use to use the opioid money every year as an ongoing source, because we're going to get it for the next 15 years? So is that what your intention is?

Speaker: My intention is that we not back out of the commitment. It previously it was in the budget is ongoing contingency set aside.

Speaker: Six years ago.

Speaker: No, not six years ago. It was in it last year it was removed by this mayor and this proposed budget. It was in it last year. In the current year we're sitting in

right now, there is a tap a fund they could tap today but but they because they haven't opened. So I'm trying to keep it there. Even though this is a reduction I'm trying to keep some semblance of a funding payment there.

Speaker: Okay. So are you trying what I'm trying to figure out. So are you going to try to get this 1.2 every year or because it is this money and this is what I've talked about, the un, the unassigned dollars that we're expected to get for the next 15 years should be considered ongoing money. So I'm trying to figure out, are you trying to get this for ongoing money.

Speaker: For my, my, my proposal today is a one time only I would encourage, and I will encourage the mayor to include a payment. I think it's appropriate to come from the opioid opioid settlement dollars, a payment to the county moving forward. But that's not what I'm asking for today. I'm asking for this one time set aside in contingency so that it in the general fund contingency policy, set aside of 1.2 million so that it can be tapped, and a signal to not have to carve out new space next year because it got pushed out this year. And I think it should keep its space in the budget.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you, councilor.

Speaker: Councilor avalos.

Speaker: Well, i'll just first state my frustration on the record. Mayor, we've been working on this for a month. Hearing this as a surprise on the dais. I don't appreciate that I have been working with you on this, because I believe it leads to our goals that we both share around adding more beds around making sure that we can have addiction and recovery services. The solution that I'm proposing is adding a more permanent solution instead of fitting filling some hole. And I agree with councilor smith. I mean, there's a larger discussion we need to have here, but I believe that the city's book of business is building, you know, these buildings and

this is adding housing while also accomplishing the goals and the mission of the opioid settlement funds. And just to be clear, director levine, is this just so that it's on the record is what this amendment is proposing within the use within the proper I don't know, what do you call it.

Speaker: The allowed uses of opioid settlement fund?

Speaker: I would look to the city attorney to answer that question.

Speaker: Mr. Taylor, could you confirm this for us?

Speaker: I believe that it does. I believe one of the approved uses, for example, is to support crisis stabilization centers as an alternative to hospital emergency departments. So it would appear to fall within use. I believe it would fall within an allowed use. Yes.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: So, yeah, frustrated that this wasn't a discussion considering I've been talking about this for weeks. So councilor zimmermann, I'm frustrated by that. Again, I feel like I continue to experience this from you, and we're going to have to talk offline about it. I'm upset. I think ultimately I'm not going to support this because I still believe that adding 46 new beds in my district is super important. It's something that I've been working with for on, and it doesn't even sound like, you know, there's a lot of is it going to happen? Is it in Multnomah County's budget? I'm not interested in taking that risk right now. I think it is my responsibility to use what's within my budget, within our budget. And I believe that this these dollars need to continue to go to for us. So I'm going to vote no.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor colleagues, seeing no one else in the queue. Keelan could you please call the roll on zimmerman. What number is this?

Speaker: 15.

Speaker: Now? 16.

Speaker: 16 and 16.

Speaker: And I just I want to make sure I clarify that if there was any question about this as a general fund contingency policy set aside, increased 1.2 million and updates attachment a through h as necessary. We've got all the technicalities taken care of now.

Speaker: Thank you counselor, and this is a one time use of dollars.

Speaker: I have one question.

Speaker: Councilor morillo. You have a question.

Speaker: I'm so sorry. Can we just get one final clarification? So did. Is the county's 6 million fully funding for or not?

Speaker: I have no idea. If four doesn't didn't come and lobby me about any projects that they want. What I know is that they have a build out that they've been trying to do, and they're cobbling together money, which is pretty normal for groups. I don't know the size of their project, but my amendment wasn't about for my amendment was about a sobering center.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Mayor, do you know, since you've been in discussion with the county.

Speaker: I don't that information came to me this morning. I'm just writing a note to provide information to councilor avalos after this meeting. And once it becomes clarified on their budget. So I don't know that.

Speaker: Okay, I guess we're flying blind.

Speaker: We're not flying blind. I mean, the sobering center is a choice as it stands alone. And I think it's an important choice that this city for a long time has, has been in. And so I know it's being compared against, but I don't I don't consider these to be a compared against idea. Both of these things are going to happen for is going

to build out. And I would love it if we could get a sobering center to occur. I like both two. I think we've called the vote though, right?

Speaker: We have and we have additional councilors getting in the queue. Councilor kanal is it very quick because otherwise we're going to move to the vote.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Robert taylor, is there a legal requirement that we spend or assign these opioid dollars in this budget, like does something bad happen if it's not assigned to either?

Speaker: I don't believe we're required to spend them now. We can spend them in the in a future budget or in a supplemental budget. So I don't think you have to do this right now.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Keelan can you please call the roll canal.

Speaker: No. Oh. I still don't.

Speaker: Yeah, okay.

Speaker: I would like to figure out what's going on here a little bit more. I think I was not lobbied on this. I haven't gotten any information on this whatsoever. Same with the four conversation, but at least I'd read that one earlier. But I didn't know the new information because we don't have to legally assign it right now. I think I'm likely to vote no on both of these and then understand for a potential supplemental budget on it. I strongly support the idea of a sobering center. I just want to understand the opportunity cost on the other side of it. And with the county not voting on their budget until tomorrow, I think it's vital to try to get some more information here. I share counselor smith's concerns as well. So I'm going to vote no on both of these.

Speaker: There's only one thing on the table. Let's be clear.

Speaker: Sorry that that.

Speaker: Is accurate.

Speaker: I vote no on this. Thank you for clarifying.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: Yeah, the mayor and council, zimmerman are at the table.

Speaker: I vote yea koyama lane. I maria.

Speaker: Ask.

Speaker: I wish that we had more information from the county on if I understand that they're these are both good ideas and I think they're both things that our community needs. I think our community does need the combination of beds and sobering and like long term care more than immediate sobering. And that's something that we really lack. And so I'm going to have to vote no on this.

Speaker: Novick.

Speaker: I'm just voting against things that are surprising to me. No,

Speaker: Clark.

Speaker: My 93 year old next door neighbor is a former Multnomah County sheriff. And when he found out that I was going to run for office, the first thing he said to me was bring back a sobering center. So with this vote, I'm fulfilling my obligation to my 93 year old neighbor, I vote yea green.

Speaker: I'm i, I'm going to vote now to preserve the option to reconsider later.

Speaker: Zimmerman i.

Speaker: Avalos. No.

Speaker: Dunphy.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Smith.

Speaker: You know. Making sure that you that you your commitments that you honor your commitments to people is great. But this is only for one year of operating funds. And I find it very unconscionable that the mayor would work with my district colleague and support her and then flip on her in the during the meeting. That's not acceptable. That is not cool at all. In no way. And if you were at the table, if you and councilor zimmerman were at the table, you have the ability to write the first draft of the budget, and you failed to put money in there because you didn't think that it was important or it was critical. And besides that, I am so tired of Multnomah County not not adhering to the iga. I'm not giving them anything else. And we need to go back and check that as well. So, you know, shame on you, mayor. Shame on you for doing that to her. I vote no pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: Councilor I seconded this and voting no in order to be able to bring it back. After we have more conversations with a few of our colleagues.

Speaker: The amendment fails with four yes votes and eight no votes.

Speaker: Colleagues, I would like us to finish up public safety and then take a lunch break. I was hoping we'd get through community engagement first, but I think folks all need a little downtime. Are there any is there anyone who has not brought forward their top priority in public safety who would like to do so? Okay, colleagues, seeing nobody else coming forward, we are going to take a 45 minute recess. Before we go, I just want to lay out what to expect when we get back. When we get back at 145, we will have about 2.5 hours to get through the community engagement section. Housing and homelessness. And if there is anything else on the other section that we haven't gotten to, to get through budget notes and to come back around to additional amendments while we are scheduled until six, I'm going to need us to close out a little sooner than then on our amendments because as you remember from yesterday, we actually have a number of things that will

need to come back to, and I'm not sure how long that will take, but I'm guessing that I will start getting pressure from staff around 430 or 5 to move in that direction. I can try to get an update on that number by the time we get back, so please be back here by 145 to continue our work. Thank you. All. We are slowly making our way back in to reconvene our Portland City Council meeting to adopt amendments to the budget. I am going to stall as I pull my things up. Councilors, we have chalan huddleston with us now in the hot seat, keeping track of everything. So, chalan, please let us know if folks are making amendments from the floor. And you need us to slow down a little bit so you can capture things. And if numbers are not adding up in the way that we are saying they are, so that we can catch those mistakes in the moment, feel free to just catch my eye, turn on the mic and interrupt us. Whatever you need. We want to make sure that it's working for you.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Colleagues. We are. Oh, my zoom turned off. We are picking back up in the. Community engagement portion of our work, and we have a number of amendments here, and I believe we have some combinations of those amendments that folks have been working on. And I cannot see hands up, because my zoom isn't up yet. Are you first in the queue, vice president okay. Councilor koyama lane, why don't you go ahead and get started? I'll message our colleagues who aren't here yet.

Speaker: All right. Pauline.

Speaker: Hello. I'm bringing forward a budget note and two amendments. I'm passing it around right now. I'm bringing them to you in service of building a shared action plan and finding a common path forward between our council and administration, specifically related to civic life and engagement, but also including equity, sustainability and communication. I've spoken with councilors, city staff and

community members over the past week or so about this topic gone really in depth on it. And while everyone has their own unique perspective on what needs to happen in terms of engagement with the community, I have heard some consistent themes rising to the top and some consistent awareness and interest in the following areas. Improvement to the functions of the programs currently under civic life. Maintaining current funding levels for those programs that benefit our community. Ensuring that the vital programs that are currently housed in the office of civic life have the opportunity to be adequately supported and to achieve their vision. Avoiding potential actions that might lead to adversarial relationships between the city administrator's office and council, and co-creating a unified strategic vision for what engagement, equity, neighborhood connections, and communications all are how they connect. I think many understand that the office of civic life has had many different paths and bumps and challenges. I've learned that there has been a lot of work to in this area. First, I kind of thought it started closer to 2017, 2018, but the more I learned this is something that has gone back for decades and that many different commissioners have had different ideas about. I've learned that there's been a lot of work to create recommendations for change, most of which have not yet been implemented and some of which are now being used are being implemented, but are really used to define needed changes in structure and reporting assignments and streamlining. So I have had the opportunity to see a preview of some of those upcoming changes. From my understanding, a pause button has been hit knowing that there are amendments related related to this topic that are that were forthcoming to me, it feels important to allow our professional staff the time to bring them forward to council for presentation and consideration before taking big, significant action through the budget process. So, for instance, in this new role that we have for our engagement

officer, I have learned that there are over 100 city employees throughout our whole city doing different types of community engagement work, and it's been something that has been a hope of councils for a while that that can be more streamlined, and it can be something that is more unified, and that when you are talking to doing community engagement with the fire department, that it looks similar to community engagement that you are doing with a bureau in public works, say, parks. So ensuring that there is a consistency in approach and practice makes a lot of sense to me. That seems critical, and it also takes leadership and management. It's my hope to find a common ground where priorities for programs are honored through funding, and we also give some time to allow changes to be to be presented and considered. So I'm bringing forward three things. Should I read all of them? They're a bit different.

Speaker: There's if this is a package, why don't you read them all?

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: So koyama lane nine is a motion to add a budget note for the city administrator, the office of civic life and related programing. And it motion it motion. Yeah. For them to work collaboratively with council in development of a single unified plan that addresses structural and programmatic challenges within the office of civic life with engagement officer, the office of equity and human rights, the office of sustainability, as outlined in avalos nine. But adding in sustainability and those different positions are ones where we have leaders who are chiefs but are outside of bureaus. This outlines that collaboration will begin with the first briefing to council about these changes and connections no later than August 1st, 2025 on current structures and staffing. Key recommendations for change from previous processes and any proposed changes to structures and staffing. In addition, regular briefings will then continue in alignment with briefings

to council as outlined in morillo ten. Restructuring should include reference to a community partnership support framework. See clerk three motion to amend attachment d. This should also add a focus on culturally specific and culturally responsive community based organizations, as well as a citywide focus on creation of the community partnership support framework. Partnerships with community based organizations should be part of a citywide engagement strategy, as clark outlined in four. Yeah in clark four, clark seven outlines using measurable data and outcomes to support and increase volunteer engagement. This is something I've we've heard on the dais, come up a lot with special attention to the parks bureau. These efforts will be documented and regularly regularly reported quarterly to council. This is an opportunity to be intentional in how the city values and supports volunteers as important partners. All right. Ten and 11 are amendments. This ten is a motion to amend the budget to restore funding for diversity and civic leadership program, district coalition offices, small grants, motion, small grants. Yep. Sorry, it's all blending together here. Using the proposed fy 25 to 26 civic life budget, resulting in no net change to the budget. Funding restoration will be through reducing personnel costs, not through program cuts, as zimmerman requested in zimmerman six for the next budget for fy 2627, the dco rfp process will will address insurance needs. Like many of you, you might have had. I have had folks coming to me saying, are we giving insurance to all the neighborhood associations? It's a it's a small amount. I believe it's \$80,000. I have felt like, why aren't we just doing this? Should I just pay out of my own office budget? What I learned is they are already covered for this for the next 12 months, but they pay their insurance on July 1st, so they would like to know that they will have insurance for the following year. That's fair. And also they are. They are made whole for next year. From my understanding, there's a plan for there to be an rfp process for these different coalitions. So this

specifically says that for the next budget, that rfp process will address insurance needs. And through all of this, funding is restored to the office of community and civic life. It's in the office of community and civic life. Restoration goes to diversity and civic leadership program, district coalition offices, and small grants. Sorry, one more amendment and then I'm. I'll stop. All right. This one is a motion to amend the budget to move one fte from the office of civic life to council operations. The focus of the position will be to be a liaison to staff and key partners working on community engagement across the city. Position and funding will be identified using proposed fy 2526 office budget, resulting in no net change to the budget. City administrator to report on this move no later than July 31st, 2025. So that just decreases the one point fte from office of civic life and puts it into council operations. I am happy to take any questions.

Speaker: Councilor novick are you in the queue for questions on this package?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Go right ahead.

Speaker: Councilor koyama lane I don't see how how does koyama lane ten balance? What I see is increase program expense by 4.77 949 and I see something saying funding restoration will be through reducing personnel costs. But I don't see where the 477 is coming from.

Speaker: From working with. Folks from the city administrator's office, from the chief of. Who is at the head of the office of community and civic life, and also seeing the new structures that are forthcoming. There's going to be a ton of movement. And so it will be from positions that are reclassified.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: And if you look here, there's including vacant positions.

Speaker: Councilor would this come from reductions of other positions or vacancies within the office of civic life?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Councilor novick.

Speaker: That I confess, I'm still worried that that seems too vague, but thank you.

Speaker: Councilor kanal.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I have i'll just say I think 11 is a is a slam dunk for me. I'd like to talk about nine and ten. And by the way, I withdrew my amendment canal nine because of your work on this issue that led to 11. So thank you. So I just want to reference the what's referenced in koyama lane ten. It talks about personnel costs and references. Zimmerman, six, and zimmerman six, talks about removing or I think completely eliminating one of the program offers, if I recall correctly, in the office of civic life, which is the five fte there. So because that would reduce expenditure by 1.35 million and this uses for 77, I'm going to guess that one of two things is true and ask you which it is. Which is does this free up \$900,000. That's unassigned because the full the same thing that's referenced in zimmerman six is happening. Or are you asking for some sort of reduction within the pool, the same way that the 20% reductions are being actualized at 9.5% this year, or something else?

Speaker: Is it okay if I bring up?

Speaker: Someone to.

Speaker: Help me.

Speaker: Who wants to.

Speaker: Write ahead?

Speaker: While they're coming up? I guess we have.

Speaker: Two people coming up right now.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: While they're doing that, I'll ask the next question, which is can you explain in number nine what single unified means? I recognize the conversation around having some sort of common purpose, having done community engagement on multiple of these bureaus behalf, I can tell you the type of trauma that people come into community engagement around public safety from various sides of it, specifically as it relates to policing or lack thereof or whatever is very different than when you have someone giving community engagement on other topics. And so I'm not sure there's I have a I have for years had a concern that that trying to make a one size fits all approach to community engagement in the city is not the best idea. And also that the way it is now is too siloed. So single unified might be an overcorrection, but I'm not sure.

Speaker: Do you have a suggestion of different wording or is it more comment?

Speaker: Come back to me on that.

Speaker: But yes.

Speaker: Would you all like to answer councilor kanal question? And then if you would like to answer councilor novick or speak to what he was saying about his concerns around it not being specific, exactly which positions. Yeah.

Speaker: Go ahead and introduce yourselves and jump in.

Speaker: Hi. Good afternoon, I'm amanda garcia snell. I'm the engagement officer for the record. So I'll take a poke at it here and see if this is getting at what you're looking for. So part of I'm pretty new, just to preface that, I've been here for a few months, but part of the my understanding of what had been conducted in the past around assessments for equitable community engagement strategy across the city has been through Portland engagement project and the efforts internal and external to identify what this my position should really look like and do. And so my

understanding is that the plan for that is to is for me to work on that effort across the organization. So there are still a lot of conversations to have to develop that strategy. But the intention, if I'm as my, as my understanding is that the intention is to develop a unified strategy for equitable community engagement. Yes, a one size fits all is not does not work, but engagement is multifaceted. There are lots of different types of engagement, and so there would be opportunities to really look at how that should be conducted and implemented across the organization. Those conversations, those in addition to the assessments that have already been conducted, those would come out of conversations with leadership across the organization as well as direction from you all.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Thank you. I, I don't know if this is in here, but I will say I'm pretty concerned that I've never been fully behind the idea of applying the 20% reduction to community engagement at all. There are dozens of people who do specialized community engagement work around the bureaus for specific advisory groups, specific types of projects. And I want to make sure and I've been one of them. I want to make sure that that that that works specialization is recognized. So I'm a little concerned about that being a reference here. So I think as it relates to ten, I might prefer to have a little more clarity that this would be targeted at the same five positions or some portion thereof, that the referenced proposal zimmerman six talks about. I think that would help me get to a place where we could clarify that this is the administrative side, or to be more clear about another particular source, and i'll leave it there on ten on nine, I think. Comprehensive and integrated are two words that feel better to me than single unified, because it recognizes some aspect of the fact that it's a plan that's going to cover multiple things that might be a little bit different, but have to work together. And I recognize that we've had the same

conversation on a couple other documents recently as well, about words that that convey the same meaning to or different meanings to the same people.

Speaker: I appreciate it, and I would be amenable to a friendly amendment to change a single unified plan to a comprehensive citywide plan.

Speaker: That's good.

Speaker: With me.

Speaker: And just to follow up, I have heard from dca morrissey that for k koyama lane 11, it would need to be a position elimination and position creation because it would go from a represented position on the executive side to an at-will position in council operations. There are ripple effects.

Speaker: I'm out of time, clark.

Speaker: Thank you, madam chair. I would just speak briefly to councilor koyama lane integration, if you will, of my budget notes three and seven. You can read it for yourself, but pretty simply, it's really meant to encourage more development of a volunteer program with public private partnerships. Given what's happening with parks, we have some models around the city that we can actually pursue. And as parks is moving into the public works service area, it makes a lot of sense to have this in public works. We also have a pbob director, millicent williams, who's quite familiar with volunteer programs, which is something she did in Washington, dc. And you can read it for yourself. There are several different components to it, and koyama lane nine references those. Clark seven really is very straightforward. It's an outgrowth of a conversation that I had with mayor wilson about the reduction that we've experienced in volunteerism in Portland over the last few years, and the need to reengage with the community on volunteerism. So we're asking that we develop some metrics in the parks department to actually measure how we're doing with parks volunteerism. So that short and sweet is what those two are.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor councilor morillo.

Speaker: I think I like the budget notes for nine and 11. I'm still sorry. I know folks have explained this already. Can you spell out exactly where the funding source for this is coming from? So we're going to be cutting a position. Do we know what position to move to? Another one for koyama lane ten.

Speaker: All right. Ahead.

Speaker: So the. Yes ish is the short answer for that. We would want to think about what all meet your needs as well as a future conversations with dca leadership to make sure, service area leadership to make sure that we're understanding their needs in addition to what has already been collected in terms of assessments around. Citywide approach to engagement. Potentially, it's a neighborhood program related connection, because it seems to be there seems to be interest, at least from what I have observed in your conversations around that connection. But we're certainly open to, you know, taking that direction from you. More conversations.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Did you have anything else, counselor? Councilor koyama lane you wanted to add something?

Speaker: I just.

Speaker: Wanted to add that I hope it's okay that I share that I've gotten a peek at some of the new org charts, and to see some of these changes, I know that there is a hope to be considerate and for city employees to not see those for the first time right here, or hear about them from us on the dais. And so I think there's a piece of we're not showing those yet, and they would like to be able to show the team first

and get some feedback and have those conversations. But I was able to see those and can probably share them with you privately.

Speaker: Councilor zimmerman.

Speaker: Okay, so. Not thrilled with my zimmerman six being put up as some sort of version that that was cutting a program, and yours won't. But money does have to come from somewhere. And what is not in any of these amendments is a reduction anywhere. So I seems a little disingenuous. You are referencing a set of amendments that I proposed relative to the reduction of the office of civic life and community, so that we could restore the diversity and leadership program, improve the immigrant refugee program, restore the neighborhood coalition's neighborhood associations, operations and small grants. But I was able to offer those amendments up because I had cut somewhere in the budget. But there is no cut here, and you'd be asking us to put ourselves further out of balance if we passed these. So since you put my name in your in your note or in your amendment, I as somehow that you've solved the problem I was trying to solve in a way that doesn't have a negative fund balance. I I'm trying to understand it, but it feels like the this is a positive note, right? It puts positive programs back in but without any consequences because somewhere we're going to have to give. And I don't think we have an amendment that goes along with this.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Counselor zimmerman, would you like councilor koyama lane to address those concerns?

Speaker: Sure.

Speaker: First, counselor zimmerman, I apologize. I did not mean for this to come across as disingenuous when you and I spoke about this and I asked your priorities, I was under the impression that a high priority for you was that the funding was

restored to these programs, and that you genuinely cared about these programs. If it makes you feel more comfortable, I'm happy to strike your name from this. I did feel like I was trying to take from that conversation, genuinely take that hope from you and try to still achieve that. I would like to point out that there is no net change to the budget in this, and that in the very soon forthcoming changes we're about to see, we will see that the rearranging of positions and the reclassifying will make it. So we will be able to eliminate some of these positions. We will be able to look closer to the neighborhood program, look at that program, and we will be able to do what I think I've heard a lot of counselors up here say including you is really important to them, which is restoring the neighborhood program and the cuts that all of these programs were.

Speaker: Yeah, I appreciate that. I think the intent was good, but I hope there are no other bureaus or other offices who present and then think that their org chart gets to change on July 1st. That is not a mechanism from which we do this work. We approve fte counts today to be executed in the upcoming years. So while it sounds like the bureau plans to move a lot of stuff around to meet what you're talking about. I think that is a step too far. It probably is unauthorized because the fte count, the org charts, the budget that they're going to be receiving from this count from this body for next year is all part of the bake of the budget process. So we don't write a blank check to an organization with no fte count, no mission statement, no program offer, and no org chart. So that seems a little bit strange to me that the bureau would want to basically go untouched and say, in the future year, we'll adjust to what what it is that, that you want that takes amendments. And i'll remind you that this this is the group who came forward when they presented their budget to the finance committee. They said they preserved staff over programs. And so we're sitting here having to refund neighborhood coalitions and

neighborhood associations because they chose they made the choices they made. And I think a lot of us have said we'd like to find a way to restore the neighborhood coalitions, but that takes an action. And that isn't just a please rejigger it. This is an official budget. This document came forward. And what you're describing is not something that was in the proposed budget, which means that it's not been something that was either blessed off on from a mayor's perspective or has been blessed off from this budget committee. I'm working with a couple of colleagues that, you know, you've all seen mine. I've heard some feedback. I think that if there's time to get into an alternative, I would be happy to share that. But I don't know that this restores the programs the way that I was hoping to. But I do appreciate the effort, particularly in the civic life diversity and leadership program and the small grants. But we have to pay for it from somewhere. And I don't see a debit and credit here.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor, councilor avalos.

Speaker: I first just want to really, really appreciate councilor vice president koyama lane, because I think what I appreciate about the amendments that she's proposing is, and what I've seen from her throughout this entire budget process is a willingness to bring all of the partners to the table and help us make strong decisions that are informed by the staff that have to execute them. And that's what I'm seeing and how you've crafted this. I really am grateful to you for doing that. I had a lot of concerns with the other way that some of the amendments that you're naming in here, how they were structured, and I feel like you did a really good job of consolidating all of that and achieving the outcome we all want, while also ensuring that we have a good, you know, that we are working collaboratively with our city leaders to minimize harm. Right. And so that's what I'm seeing in these. I am absolutely going to be supportive. But I just wanted to put that on the record,

because everyone should know that vice president koyama lane is emerging as a really strong, collaborative leader, and I just appreciate it so much. And I think it's the kind of leadership I want to see us do more in next year's budget, because I've been and I've shared on the dais, I've been very concerned about certain programmatic changes that are happening without collaboration with the bureaus. And I think this is an example of the way we should be doing it. So I wanted to appreciate you on in public. So thank you. I will support your amendments.

Speaker: Councilor smith.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. Thank you. Vice president koyama lane, for putting this together. I do have some of the same concerns that councilor zimmermann has. And so what I'm not clear on right now. And so there's an assumption that we all know the workings of what civic life is right now and what was taken away. So it is civic life. Was it taken out of a particular service area and put somewhere else?

Speaker: I.

Speaker: I don't think.

Speaker: The issue that the reason why you're here, sarah, is because it is under your, under your service area that she would be taking some staff and adding to civic life.

Speaker: And von berg, assistant city administrator for the record. That's okay. Thank you, councilor smith, for the question. I know currently, right now, civic life resides within the city administrator's office under the assistant city administrator.

Speaker: So here's here's the bigger issue. I don't think that neighborhood associations should be in council operations. I just council operations should be just that. It should be operations as it relates to our committees and how we bring things forward and to, to look at our resolutions. And that that is what council

operations is. It's not it's not civic life. That's not what we should do. We have to keep those things separately. And if it's I'm I'm looking at you, but I'm saying this to the maker of the motion that when it was brought up before, I had some concerns about it. But I'm just I am so unclear about this particular, about all three of these and where money's coming from and where it's not. And why would we just take one person and put them in council operations to do civic life? Madam vice president, could you explain to me.

Speaker: Councilor koyama lane, do you want to address the koyama lane 11 and what is included there?

Speaker: I actually agree with you, councilor smith. I heard a lot of different perspectives. At first I thought, oh, councilors are were the ones with constituents. We're doing a lot of work with them. Maybe it should be under us. And then as I spoke with, especially district coalition leaders and different folks from neighborhood associations, I became convinced that it is important that there is a separation. And that neighborhood, the neighborhood program, is not on our side. So they can really be a neutral convener. And so this one position for koyama lane 11, that's not someone that would be running the neighborhood program. They would be a liaison to the neighborhood work that would still say, stay on the executive side.

Speaker: Well.

Speaker: We're still trying to figure out what council operations does for us right now as it relates to community engagement and what we what resources we can get. I've talked to I've talked to you several times and it's been great and wonderful, but we were limited on what we could get from you unless it was a citywide event, whether or not we could get you to send out emails or any of those things. So I'm really confused by how this will better help us in, in doing community outreach,

because we all have field representatives in our office now to do that field outreach. And I just think council operations needs to concentrate on council operations and how we bring the budget forward and all those things. We need more people to help us with that, because I think people are really good right now with their outreach. It seems off a little off balance to me. I appreciate it, but it just to me it doesn't. I just don't want to see that in council operations. I think they have a different they're a policy oriented operation and that's what it needs to stay stay at.

Speaker: For koyama lane 11.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: For koyama lane ten. I am open to working with mr. Bieri to come up with a number of fte to specify what that would look like in order to cover those costs, if that. Would that help some of my colleagues looking over at some of.

Speaker: Madam president, I was not finished, but but I so the issue is, I mean, we called out people earlier and asked them if they were working with administration and, and councilor zimmerman was called out a couple of times and asked about that. So I think the work that you're doing right now is the work that you need to do before you get here so that you can explain it to us and you can have them explain it to you to do it. This is this policy stuff and creating policy and understanding who the stakeholders are and who you how you need to do it. It has to be fully baked when you drop it on how it's how it's going to come, where the money's coming from, how are you going to do it? And you got to have folks that that are going to be in these bureaus that to be able to back you up if need be. But. I know where you're trying to go with this, and I appreciate it because I think community engagement is important. And we've made it a we've made it a priority in our office, and I think there needs to be more of it. But I think this is not baked enough yet.

Speaker: Councilor smith anything else?

Speaker: Nope.

Speaker: Okay. Councilor koyama lane, I appreciate the work that you did to try to bring folks together on this. I'm still absorbing some of the specifics. I was looking at the same thing. Some of our colleagues were in koyama lane ten, where it looks like we don't quite have the specificity yet that we need, and I'm wondering if you would be willing to have some conversations about making sure that koyama lane ten has the specificity I see. It seems like you were trying to make it a balanced amendment, and if that's the goal, then I'd like to make sure it is actually balanced amendment. And I'm wondering if you would be willing to take the time to try to figure out what we would need to do to make that change?

Speaker: Absolutely.

Speaker: It's being worked on right now, and it looks like it would be around 3 or 4 fte. If we need to specify.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: I'm happy to do so.

Speaker: I'm concerned with koyama lane ten colleagues. I know that we all had a lot of frustration with our budget engagement process that ran through the office of civic life, and I learned a lot about how we need to make sure we maintain control over those things in a way that I thought we were going to have partnership and not have to. But I don't think that the solution to that is moving somebody into council operations. We have some great staff there who I think can support us with this work, and we are making some other changes that we've already voted through to support this work. I wouldn't be opposed to expanding capacity there in the future if we decide that's needed. But as we try to balance our needs and the needs of the administration as a whole, this feels like it's responsive to one action, one incident that didn't go well. And I think that there are I think we might be able to

improve the coordinated work on engagement without an additional position.

Councilor canal, I believe you've spoken to this, right? Okay, councilor green.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. And thank you, vice president koyama lane. I see what you're doing here. I think it is the work of trying to bring together some very strong opinions about this, this very important part of our of our city. I'm going to support this. I'm going to be looking for reacting to kind of the balance of all the changes here. But I just wanted to offer my support. I think it's important. I think it's okay to do this level of direction at this dais and operate in this kind of relatively uncertain space when we know that we're going through a big reorganization in the city, and so we can get ahead of that and say, this is how I want that vision to be implemented. So that's that's a big part of why I'm supporting this today. And so curious to see how the rest of the conversation goes. But I'm I'm ultimately supporting the spirit of it.

Speaker: Looks like we're back to people who have spoken previously. Councilor kanal did you want a second opportunity to speak?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: I just asked.

Speaker: Questions earlier, I think. I think I agree with the concerns around ten, and I've heard a lot of different arguments here. I think those are those are compelling. I actually think that one of the challenges we face around ten is we have a bureau that is very small and consistently taking these little adjustments and changes that seem to reflect a desire, a long term desire to not have it as a separate bureau, but an unwillingness to just do it up front now. And that's predates any of the current structure. I'm looking at a few years of this, this conversation around civic life. I know a lot of the folks who work in civic life. We shared an office, and I know that a lot of them do very, very good work, and I'm sure everybody else does,

too. I just don't work with everybody closely. So I'm I do see that ten kind of continues the, the maybe kind of that I'm not clear on for, for the future of this bureau. I do want to really strongly defend 11, though I view I think you can view community engagement as a part of implementing a policy. And that's great. And it is often part of implementing a policy and taking a vision and a clear direction and applying it into actual, concrete actions. And I think we sometimes do a good job at that in the city and sometimes not. But I think what's missed often is that it's a part of policy development and not as a box we check not sitting here listening to people give testimony before we do what we were going to do anyway. But because it's a part of actually shaping how we think, and the people who are setting the direction and doing the legislation policy development are City Council. And I think that having on principle as well as in practice, having the administration be the place where all community engagement is housed, it doesn't make sense as a filter between policy makers and the people who are trying to weigh in on policy development. So I do want to very strongly support that. My original amendment created two positions. And I think this is already the compromise. Getting it down to one. I'd love to have a second if there's a conversation around how to do that, we should. But I do want to strongly, strongly defend that as it relates to nine. I think the change to comprehensive helps me. I don't know, I'd like to see maybe it be less less either less referential or for us to understand if our intention is to like, would we still vote on avalos? Nine. Morillo ten. Clark three. Clark four. Clark seven. Or is the idea that this would capture all of that as well? And I think in the event that we did want to capture all of it, I think it might make sense to just literally make it an omnibus copy paste it in. Otherwise, I'm confused by the referential nature of it, but I still like the concept.

Speaker: Councilor is your intent with these references that when this is written into the budget, and we're not talking about amendments that no longer exist, is your intent that the language of those amendments would be included here, or that it's just referential? And is there a way to make sure this is clear when those amendments are not before us?

Speaker: I'm open to suggestions. And one what makes the most sense. It does seem that if other amendments are referenced, that it could be some sort of an attachment to and including those.

Speaker: So is your intent that we're voting on the full content of those amendments as well? For example, I don't believe your intent is that we're voting on the full content of zimmerman six. Is that okay?

Speaker: Especially since many of these say, as similar to or as outlined it in, and it's just part of it.

Speaker: Okay. We may need to figure out a way if we're going to pass this to make sure that it's clear as a standalone document.

Speaker: And as a standalone document, all of the information is here. And so my intention was to show the collaboration and intention to include some of these different pieces. And so I also am fine if my colleagues are fine with not attaching those. And I'm also fine to strike anyone's name as they're referenced if they prefer.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Councilor kanal were you then?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Councilor green. Councilor clark.

Speaker: Thank you. I would prefer that they actually be included. I don't know if that's a footnote or an attachment or however it is that all the language is there of clark three and seven, and I'm assuming alice nine as well.

Speaker: Councilor koyama lane.

Speaker: I also just wanted to clarify that this is not about civic life. This, for me, as I learned more, is really about making sure we have an equitable engagement strategy that includes systems across all service areas and are actually built into being of service to the community. So my expectation is not that we're holding to what we currently know as the office of civic life, but is that we're holding the administration accountable to these new systems that serve Portlanders better, hopefully. And I would like to see this realignment process that I know a lot of resources and work has gone into. I'd like to see it have a chance to move forward and have a better understanding of what a comprehensive plan could look like before we make massive cuts and resources to a whole area.

Speaker: Councilors, we have three amendments before us. It sounds like there's a little bit of cleanup on koyama lane ten that councilor koyama lane is working on language for. Councilor. Do you want a little bit of time for that? And we can let others propose other amendments in this area. Is that helpful?

Speaker: We can.

Speaker: Vote on nine.

Speaker: Or do you think it's coming soon and we should vote on the others while we wait for that?

Speaker: I heard working on it looks like there may be. Yeah, so working on it.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: I asked for an amount of time, but need to give them the space to work.

Speaker: On tourism.

Speaker: Is it possible to go ahead and vote on the others?

Speaker: Meaning nine and 11? Yeah, we can move forward there. On koyama lane nine. Is there any cleanup around? The names or are you planning to attach those? If this is adopted in.

Speaker: I would like to attach those.

Speaker: Okay. Is there any other discussion?

Speaker: Can I just get a clarification on what's being attached?

Speaker: Yes please. So I believe koyama lane nine references other amendments. This isn't something that we've seen done in a budget note, and those other amendments may or may not be adopted. So we can't have a budget note in our budget that references things that are not in existence. So I think what we may need to do before this budget note is officially entered into the budget, if it is adopted, is take the language. And rather than saying, as outlined in avalos nine say as outlined in footnote one and have a footnote with the language and instead of, as outlined in morillo ten, say as outlined in footnote two, with the language. Restructuring should include reference to a community partnership support framework and then a footnote that just includes that rather than saying clerk three partnership with community based organizations should be part of a citywide engagement strategy. That may, not, may or may not need a framework, or may or may not need a footnote, and then use measurable data and outcomes to support an increased volunteer engagement with special attention to parks. And again, that may or may not need a footnote, depending on the specific language there, but that we not refer to other budget notes and amendments.

Speaker: Madam president, morillo ten. Passed already, so I'm not sure that's necessary to add that as a footnote.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: I think rather than saying morillo ten, though, because it's once it's adopted, it is part of the budget. So regular briefings will continue in alignment with briefings to council. Period perhaps.

Speaker: Or we can add it if that. If that is helpful. But that will be included in other places already in the budget.

Speaker: Okay. Councilor clark.

Speaker: We're just going to say I really like your idea of the footnote to have all the language in a footnote.

Speaker: So.

Speaker: Councilors, I think what I'm going to ask is that we vote on this knowing what the intent is, but ask our colleague to write it slightly differently and turn it back into the clerk's office and the budget office so that it refers to information that's included here. Because in the final budget, we don't list things by amendment, and some of these may or may not be passed so that we have a clean document.

Speaker: Point of order.

Speaker: Madam president. That's not how we do this. We have to do it inside our meeting right here so we can see what's clear. Sorry. So we can see what's clear that you can't come back and then put something in. You got to put at least the core of what your language is so that we can vote on it.

Speaker: I wholly understand, I'm trying to move us with what we have. And we did this similar, I know. The alternative is to move on and not vote yet, but I had a few people say, can we vote on nine and 11 while we wait?

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Just to clarify, madam chair, we can take the language and avalos nine, clark three, and clark seven and create footnotes to this koyama lane nine correct.

Speaker: The core language of the budget. Note would not.

Speaker: Everybody has that language now?

Speaker: Correct.

Speaker: But it's not in this spot, this one spot together.

Speaker: No, it's just referenced.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Okay. Is there any other discussion? Keelan. Can you please call the roll on koyama lane nine?

Speaker: May I ask who seconded these?

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: There we go.

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: Yeah, I'm willing to accept that structural issue here and i'll vote. I.

Speaker: I know.

Speaker: Koyama lane. Yes.

Speaker: Maria. I novick. I clark.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Green. I zimmerman.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Avalos i.

Speaker: Dunphy. I smith no.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

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

Speaker: Councilors. I think we're still waiting a few minutes on koyama lane ten. So we are going to move to koyama lane 11. Is there any more discussion on koyama lane 11? Okay. Keelan, could you please call the roll canal.

Speaker: Although the new information that it would have to be a separate position is concerning to me, I think it's really important that we have capacity for council operations to assist in community engagement, and I hope that we have them also look specifically at if should this pass at advisory groups and how they can support those that are and liaise with those that report to council. I vote i.

Speaker: Ryan. No.

Speaker: I. Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick this is 11 right?

Speaker: I clark. I green. I zimmerman.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Avalos i. Dunphy i. Smith i.

Speaker: Like this and I think this would be something to work with the mayor and the executive team on because there. Doing civic life and changing these decreasing increase. I think there's some other conversations that need to be had because government relations has tribal relations has international relations. So we need to figure out where are the outreach organizations, where are they going to lie? I don't think they need to be under the city administrator's office. I think we need to find a place for them and that that doesn't have a conflict of interest. And I think there needs to be a group of us to work with the mayor as he's developing the new structure to identify how we. How we get to where this koyama lane 11 is. And I vote, i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney know.

Speaker: The amendment is approved with ten yes votes and two no votes.

Speaker: Councilor koyama lane are we in a place where we can get an updated version of koyama lane ten?

Speaker: Please move on to some other amendments for now.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Councilor clark, are you in the queue to propose a community engagement amendment? Okay, councilors. Does anybody else have anything you would like to propose in the community engagement policy area?

Speaker: I do, but a question. We're just doing one thing and we're just doing amendments.

Speaker: We're doing top priority amendments. And I'm not seeing anyone in the queue, though I saw two people nod their heads.

Speaker: Okay, so then hold on. I'm just double checking. Yeah. So I have two, but they're both notes, so i'll wait.

Speaker: Hey, counselor zimmerman, are you nodding your head that you want to bring something forward?

Speaker: Yes, I certainly do.

Speaker: Thank you. I'm the reason I was hesitating. I'm looking to see if my co-sponsor wants to do this, and I will read it in and let that person take the chance or take the opportunity. So previously, I had a number of amendments that restored civic life related programs while eliminating the civic life overhead. So with some changes to those and given what just occurred. Repackage those in an amendment to reduce the five fte in civic life by what was previously 1.35 million. And since we just took an action, I have to do the math in public. That's always fun from civic life and use it on a full restore of the diversity and leadership program that was 180,000 to restore it, increasing by one fte. The immigrant and refugee program, another 160 restoring the neighborhood operations and grant funds in the district coalitions, and an additional \$70 \$70,000 on top of that for insurance reasons. So that's 380 total. I made no changes to the youth council, no changes to the adapt program, and one additional position. Excuse me, one additional position for a.

That was the position from councilor clark and councilor canal on the cei hub, and I'm going to call them employee of \$170,000. That, along with a community engagement person at \$181,000, spends what looks to be about a 1 million of that 1.3 and repackages those amendments from before. But given what we were just voting on, we're doing math in public. And that becomes confusing. And I will give a chance for my co-sponsor if that person wants to make any comments.

Speaker: I'll second it. I'd like.

Speaker: To.

Speaker: Speak to just the couple kind of questions around it here. I think it's worth discussing here. I think the math adds up to 1,071,000 roughly, and would create a \$282,000 surplus this way. I have some questions around the inclusion of the cei in this versus a different amendment. I support getting it. I just want to have that conversation. And I also have a couple questions for I'm guessing our aca or our chief engagement officer as to some clarity, because the org chart I'm seeing does not have five administration positions on it. And I want to understand, without naming names, the positions that are in the administration program offer before committing to vote for it or not. But I will second it because I think it's worth a conversation.

Speaker: And councilor, I think at some point in discussion, we're going to need to look to you and councilor koyama lane to understand the overlap and differences between her amendment on the table and yours. Councilor novick are you in the queue for discussion?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Okay. I'm going to ask while you are asking your question or making your statement for our aca to come up to answer councilor connell's question about the administrative positions. But let's have councilor novick speak first.

Speaker: I'm just making a blanket statement that I'm going to vote against adding money to anything or restoring money for anything, even if there's an offset. Until we've addressed the \$700,000 gap that the green nihilism amendment created yesterday, I think that any savings we can find should first be addressed to closing that \$700,000 gap period.

Speaker: Can I respond to that? Because it's both on those. I was the co-sponsor on both of these.

Speaker: Let's let's hear the answer to your question. We will get to a response there. Annie, would you mind introducing yourself. And we have a question on the table. It sounds like the amendment being put forward would eliminate five administrative positions. Is that correct, councilor zimmerman?

Speaker: Yes. In the budget book civic life notes that they have five fte in civic life administration and a budget of 1.3 5,000,008.95.

Speaker: And that's different from what we see on the org chart that councilor koyama lane sent out. So I think.

Speaker: We're I don't know if this is the org chart that was submitted to the mayor when they devised the budget, or if this is your chart that was being talked about that they want to come up with after we pass this budget.

Speaker: So what we're looking.

Speaker: For is a crosswalk. We just need a crosswalk between these two things.

Speaker: Thank you. Council president annie von berg for the record. Assistant city administrator i, I have not had a chance to talk to councilor zimmerman, so I'm unsure exactly the positions he has identified. What I'm deducing from the language there is that it's not included in one of the programs that was identified. So that does give us an idea. I'm not sure if you would like those specific positions. It does put us in a curious situation of individuals.

Speaker: There are five positions in the civic life admin. I take that to be the administration of that office or that bureau. That's the way the that's the way your budget document reads. So I'm talking about the five admin, which is a program, a separate program offer within the office of civic life. That's where my reduction and that 1.35, that's that's where I was talking about.

Speaker: It for clarity. I think that helps. I'm still not entirely clear what positions those are, since we don't break that out operationally. I will say the org chart that council vice president koyama lane showed is not representative of the future state.

Speaker: Councilor kanal. I don't know if that helps your concerns at all. What you just heard.

Speaker: A little bit, I think.

Speaker: This isn't about I think we weren't trying to clarify what councilor zimmerman was saying here. We're trying to clarify what was put into the book. We didn't make the book. So if the book has the positions, I don't think it's on the legislative side here to have to answer about what the executive presented to us. I, I think you should I would like to understand that says it's 1.353. That's pretty clear in terms of the dollar amount. But I think we're seeing an org chart here. And I'm trying not to show it because I don't want to be talking about individual people. But I think in terms of understanding the positions, I do want to understand that. And I do think that's on the that side of the dais to answer maybe not you specifically. I don't mean to put you on the spot.

Speaker: Yeah, I could read through the personnel costs that's listed under the civic life incomes. Excuse me. Document this.

Speaker: What's that?

Speaker: How to cite this document.

Speaker: And I'm going to give you a minute to look at that, because I do want to respond to something else. I just want to remind everyone of, of our council rules, 3.02.040. Part b, part 1b6 about refraining from personal criticism. I think referring to an amendment that is creating a surplus, by the way, to help offset that exact concern of \$282,000 that would go towards defraying that by directing a comment at another counselor and saying it was a nihilism amendment, is well outside of what we're allowed to do, I would argue, by law. And I think that's something that we should try to avoid doing, especially when there are attempts being made to resolve that exact thing. But the sequencing of these amendments is not designed in a way that is necessarily conducive to it. So I just I want to point that out here, and I'm hoping that we can get to a place where we can understand that maybe we're not going to solve every problem in one fell swoop, but that maybe we can defray \$282,000 of a 700 ish potential surplus, sorry, potential deficit that none of us knew about at the time, and then maybe work to get the rest of it figured out over the course of the day.

Speaker: Councilor we have a lot of other things we need to work out over the course of the day.

Speaker: I agree.

Speaker: Councilor clark, are you in the queue with the question?

Speaker: Yes, please.

Speaker: Thank you, madam chair. Counselor zimmerman, can you just one more time go through the separate pieces of this because you did it pretty quickly. I didn't catch them all. Thank you.

Speaker: Option one or option two there. Sameer.

Speaker: I'd prefer two.

Speaker: Okay. Reduce five fte from civic life. Which is 1,000,353 million. And some change. That's in the civic life. Admin. Restore the diversity and leadership program by 180,000 because that was cut. Increase the immigrant and refugee program by 161 additional fte. Restore and then some. The district coalition small grant funds and operation funds and their insurance fund at \$380,000. Because civic life is home to the youth youth council, I made no changes there, but just noting that they'll they'll need a new home in in city ops increasing the community engagement and council ops by 181,288 and the cei hub. No. Excuse me.

Speaker: That's not.

Speaker: In it.

Speaker: The co-sponsors asking, maybe not the cei hub person. So I misspoke on the first one. Apologies. That that creates a surplus. And the money for those restores all comes from the reduction of the overhead of civic life.

Speaker: Counselor clark. Counselor smith.

Speaker: Yes. Who's here from civic life?

Speaker: We have the engagement officer, amanda garcia. Snell we also have shannon fairchild here. That has a little more details that we can speak to those individual positions if you'd like.

Speaker: Right. So those five positions, how is that going to impact your your office if you take them away.

Speaker: I'm trying to be thoughtful about this because we haven't fully worked through the realignment conversations yet. And so I anticipate that we will be able to meet the needs of you all and service area leadership through fewer positions. But without having those conversations, I'm I'm reluctant to say I think there is a lot of opportunity for an equitable a citywide, equitable community engagement

strategy that can look different, very different than how it looks now and be in service to community.

Speaker: How can can you answer me this? How many seats do you have altogether?

Speaker: Currently there are 14 in civic life.

Speaker: So with this cut, you're going to go down to nine.

Speaker: Some of those two of those positions are currently vacant.

Speaker: But they're talking about five positions.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: The so.

Speaker: Well my understanding of what those five positions, of those five positions, how that would impact is, is that then civic life would not have a director, it would not have administrator administrative positions that support those individual programmatic functions.

Speaker: So it is confusing to me, and it sounds like it's putting civic life upside down to me. That's just to me. I understand what my colleagues are trying to do, but because we haven't had a clear picture given we just came in and we just start cutting and I'm not comfortable with just cutting right now until I see the up and over and how it's going to be redesigned. And so it's one thing if you take one fte and move it, but when you're taking five and now civic life is not going to have a director as as a result of the new mayor's budget.

Speaker: No, no, sorry. I thought you were referring to the amendment with the five administrative positions.

Speaker: Right. So but if that happens, you're your director. Your executive director is going to be gone with the with the new five that we cut.

Speaker: If I'm understanding the amendment correctly, yes, that would be the case. The engagement officer would be included in one of those five.

Speaker: Wow. Okay. I'm I don't think that I don't think this is where the space or the place that we should do this right now, I just don't it feels very uncomfortable. And it feels like we've cut so many fte. From this budget to begin with. From the permitting down to the parks and now to civic life. I think all of us have ideas on how the city should be run, and I'm just going to repeat a little bit a paraphrase of what what mayor wilson said. And that's their responsibility. I think it is our responsibility to put together some sort of work group, to work with him, to let them know how we see this running for the next fiscal year, trying to do all these amendments. It is, I'm telling you, for me, and I can keep up with stuff, but this is causing me not to be able to keep up in a way that's meaningful, and voting on things that I don't think I should be voting on right now, that I should be a part of a work group to work with the city manager and the mayor's office, to see how this is how we want to see it, so that it is it is developed in the way that we want it when the budget comes out again. So we won't be in this situation of piecemealing things together, because I don't have a clear idea of what your department actually all does. And so we don't have enough time to talk about it. That's why I was asking you what what the number of fte will be. And not having an executive director within a department. That seems odd to me. Who's going to be leading the charge?

Speaker: Point of order, madam president. I would withdraw the amendment if the seconder would be okay with that.

Speaker: Yes. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, thank you.

Speaker: Councilors. Anybody else information?

Speaker: Does that mean are we going back to tcl ten.

Speaker: Right now. We do not have a motion on the table. We are waiting for our colleague to have the language that she needs for amendment ten. And in the meantime we're moving through other amendments. I guess tcl ten is on the table, but it has been set aside until she has the information that she needs. Counselors. Does anybody else have a community engagement amendment that they would like to bring forward? Counselor smith, is that the purpose for which you're in the queue?

Speaker: Yes. Yes, ma'am. Madam president, I would like to do some housekeeping with smith 12 and we have to increase the appropriation for the albina displacement lawsuit settlement. And I would say that that is that would be a community one. I move to amend the budget by increasing operating expenses to align with City Council's decision to increase the settlement for the emmanuel displaced persons association. Two and related plaintiffs in particular. I moved to increase operating expenses in the insurance and claims operating fund by 7.5 million and reduce the contingency by 7.5 million. Future budget actions, including a supplemental budget during fiscal year 2526, will be required to allocate general fund resources to reimburse the insurance and claims fund, and ensure adequate resources exist to pay potential future settled settlement claims.

Speaker: Counselor. To clarify, this is a technical requirement because we made the vote for that. That change in the settlement after our budget documents have been put together. This doesn't change anything to the settlement. Is that accurate?

Speaker: It's accurate.

Speaker: Okay. Do we have a second for smith? 12. I'll second it. Councilor kanal, are you in the queue for discussion of smith 12?

Speaker: Just a question.

Speaker: Is the first million because wouldn't this just be 6.5 million of additional dollars?

Speaker: 7.5 I'm.

Speaker: Going to look to our budget director, director levine. Originally the settlement was for 2 million. We added 6.5 million more. And this makes an adjustment by 7.5 million. Is that what we need to be doing, or does this need to be only six?

Speaker: Madam president, we're not approving prospers.

Speaker: Correct. I think.

Speaker: Our money for the 1 million and then adding the 7.5 million.

Speaker: That's correct. I think it it all is coming out of the insurance and claims for fund. I think I'm, I'm a little unclear, honestly how they had budgeted that first million. So this just covered our bases.

Speaker: This includes the first million by intent.

Speaker: Yeah okay. Yeah.

Speaker: Thank you. Yeah.

Speaker: Counselors is there any other discussion on smith 12? Keelan. Could you. Oh, counselor green.

Speaker: Are you.

Speaker: Madam president, I am I'd like to have a little bit more discussion. I'd like to ask some questions.

Speaker: Okay. Go ahead.

Speaker: D.c. Area, can you please address the dais? Thank you. I would just like to understand a little bit more about the behind the scenes accounting of what we did on that day versus what's being proposed, and, in your view, just kind of help help us understand this.

Speaker: Yes. Thank you, counselor, for the record, edc, budget finance and chief financial officer so that settlement, which added \$6 million for the city's portion from 7.5 from from sorry, from 1 million to 7.5. Which isn't accounted for in the risk in claims fund forecast. The way that fund is typically replenished is it's a somewhat convoluted but intentional kind of four year replenishment plan. So the funds in the city that typically have claims pay into that, that may not be the optimal allocation method for two reasons. The typical allocation method one, a four year time frame of repayment, may not be adequate to replenish that risk and claims fund so that it has resources to pay out upcoming settlements and claims that are coming. So we may have to look at shortening that replenishment window and dispersing those costs citywide on a more of a one year or two year time frame. So that's one challenge that we haven't yet figured out in the last week. The other challenge is that that allocation methodology might overweight the responsibility to bureaus that typically have claims and underweight to bureaus that typically don't have claims. And so that might not be the optimal allocation. So another option is to run it through something more like a general fund overhead type model that disperses it citywide. And that will have impacts. So we're still working on identifying what those allocations would look like, what the right repayment recommendation would be, and we will have to come back in the fall bump and recommend that those adjustments be made. To be clear, that will be reductions to budgets citywide.

Speaker: Thank you. And with the proposal on the table, are there any second or third order consequences that you're aware of?

Speaker: I'm sorry. I want to make sure I understand the question.

Speaker: So the councilor is asking us to just make the transfer now out of a drawdown of a of a contingency balance. I'm asking if there are any things that we need to think about in that regard. So that balance includes contingency or reserve

amount that's recommended by an external actuarial expert about the amount that we should keep in pocket to accommodate unexpected claims. And that that amount is already funded at a at an amount lower than the recommendation. I believe it's around 7,075% of the of the recommended level. So we will be increasing the risk to the city by carrying, for a short time a balance that's lower, lower than we would typically prefer. We think we hope that's manageable. It's a relatively short time frame if we can realign this in the in the fall technical adjustment ordinance.

Speaker: Okay. That's helpful for me. So it's just really a it's kind of a risk. It's not a solvency question. It's just sort of a risk of the relative generally accepted guidance.

Speaker: Yeah. I mean, there's certainly risk in having a lower balance than would be recommended. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor dca. Barry, we did something yesterday where we borrowed from the systems development charges from the parks. So this is not like this is extraordinary in terms of strategies to make sure that we're we're made whole. And you mentioned that it would be less money to bureaus if we take it from the fall bump. But the fall bump is extra. That is not taking from any operating budget for fiscal year 2526.

Speaker: Is there? If there's a question in there?

Speaker: No, I just wanted to make a statement and say that I didn't understand your your response when you said it's going to take from bureaus, but we're we're doing the operating budget and this, this is how we normally pay for risk claims. But this is the first time that I've seen that you all have done it in this manner, because we approved a \$2 million request last week, a \$1.6 million request, a 598,000 request, and I've approved over millions of dollars since day one. And this is this is

becoming an extraordinary challenge for you in many ways. But I think it should be just as easy as you have done everything else.

Speaker: So, councilor, you're correct that this is a it's a very unique circumstance. To my knowledge. It's the first time that the city has experienced a circumstance where we had a claim that was planned for, and we had moved through the combination of allocations across the city and planning for and expecting that. And managing that reserve level, etc. And to my knowledge, it's a very unique circumstance that we're not well equipped to respond to, because it's the first time that, to my knowledge, that that's happened where a claim like that has appeared at a six times responsibility without having the typical level of forethought. So that is exactly correct. And so I just would acknowledge that, that this is a very unique moment.

Speaker: So we have a risk fund. We have a risk fund that pays out whatever the we approve. And just understanding that we're not a rubber stamp to whatever you all give us, that should be understood. And we're not going to rubber stamp everything you do. But we have to date done everything you have asked us to do. But when there are extraordinary circumstances, then we took the opportunity to expand this extraordinary circumstances. So I really wish that the sentiment and the tone of how you're explaining this should be one of we did harm. We have to pay. This is the route that we see best. We took \$50,000,000.50 and we only needed 44 million. We took \$50 million from the parks, you know, and then, yeah, you can roll your eyes.

Speaker: Councilor.

Speaker: Councilor, I apologize. I'm absolutely not rolling my eyes at what you're saying I'm looking.

Speaker: At, but I'm just trying to make a point here.

Speaker: I agree with you on the merits and benefit and value of the settlement. I am only describing the financial impacts of.

Speaker: That.

Speaker: Councilor and dca. I want to draw us back to the amendment before us. Thank you. We voted on a settlement and in order to cover those costs in the budget, we need to have a place technically where it comes from. And I think we've gone down a road of what happens later that we probably ought to discuss at some point when we're not staring down a timeline on our budget.

Speaker: I agree, madam president.

Speaker: Councilor clark, did you have anything further?

Speaker: Just a simple question. Where is this amendment coming from?

Speaker: This is smith 12. It is in attachment i. It is the updated attachment I that was uploaded, I believe, last night or this morning. So it may not be in printed documents that you have from the day before.

Speaker: So it's in the.

Speaker: It's in, it's in the printed one.

Speaker: Yes. On page 69.

Speaker: Yeah. It is in the but I believe councilor clark may have something from before this was.

Speaker: Added the ninth.

Speaker: Councilor clark, while you look for that and perhaps your colleague next to you can see if they have it pulled up. I'm going to go to councilor Ryan.

Speaker: Thank you. Hi, jonas. I just have a question, a clarifying question. What percentage do you project this will mean for reductions next year to the general fund councilor?

Speaker: It's a good question. I don't think we know that yet. We're doing a couple different types of analysis, a different allocation methodologies to present, to be ready to present some options to council. I mean, it would be if we imagine \$6 million and maybe that's able to be spread out over a couple of years. As I mentioned, we do have an obligation to keep that risk and claims fund solvent because we anticipate there will be more things coming down the pike. So I think it's probably going to be to your allocation 3 million a year citywide. Just if you want to think about an order of magnitude at.

Speaker: This moment, it just I wanted to get a ballpark.

Speaker: Yeah, yeah.

Speaker: That's all. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor avalos.

Speaker: I think mostly my question is just do we need to do this now? Like, it seems like there's some options that we have maybe in the towel or other things like does it have to happen in this budget?

Speaker: Councilor avalos yes, we this was just a technical fix that we had to put in so that they could get their money in July. And so I want to make sure that they get their money and that it's not put off until fiscal year 26, 25, 26. That's all.

Speaker: I see. Okay.

Speaker: Councilors, is there any other discussion? Councilor clark, did you have any follow up? Okay. Keelan, could you please call the roll councilors, this is smith 12, which moves 7.5 million from contingency to the insurance and claims operating fund so that we can pay out the settlement that we've previously approved with the note that we will have to come back to address refilling the contingency at a future time.

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: Yeah, I was a little.

Speaker: Concerned by the piece about the possibility of moving towards spreading settlements across the whole city. I think our current process does allocate it where the settlement comes from, and I'd like to see that maintained. Just wanted to reference that. That's outside the scope of this amendment though. Just it came up in conversation. I wanted to make sure I spoke to that. Thank you I vote i.

Speaker: I koyama lane.

Speaker: I. Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick no.

Speaker: Clark i. Green I zimmerman.

Speaker: He's stepped out.

Speaker: Thank you. Avalos i. Dunphy i.

Speaker: Smith i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: The amendment is approved with ten yes votes.

Speaker: Thank you colleagues does anybody else have a community engagement amendment to bring forward. Councilor koyama lane. Are you ready to have us return to koyama lane ten?

Speaker: I am thank you, colleagues, for your patience. I am ready to strike the words after funding restoration will be through reducing and then striking personnel costs, not through program cuts. Zimmerman six and replacing it with the fte. Within civic life. And those positions will be manager one, coordinator one and coordinator two. And with that it will restore. The things listed in koyama lane ten.

Speaker: Councilor.

Speaker: Because we had some slip ups with on the dais amendments yesterday, do we have confirmation that this balances?

Speaker: I worked on this with the budget office.

Speaker: Director levine, do we have confirmation that koyama lane with this change will still balance that the elimination of a manager, one coordinator, one coordinator, two position will add up to at least 477,949, in funds that are available to use in the ways outlined in the amendment. And answer that because I was out.

Speaker: Please introduce yourself.

Speaker: Is this on?

Speaker: Can you hear me? Yes. Okay. Hi, I'm owen seats, budget and policy analyst for the city budget office. Sorry, I'm tracking a lot of things. So the question is.

Speaker: We had some slip ups with on the dais amendments yesterday. I just want to confirm that the elimination of a manager one, coordinator one and coordinator two will add up to at least \$477,949 and that the funds will be usable for the three programs laid out in koyama lane ten for the expenditures. And the three programs are. Remind me.

Speaker: First in civic leadership program, district coalition offices operating grants and the small grants program.

Speaker: Okay. Yes.

Speaker: Okay. Does it come in at exactly that number or does it leave any extra?

Speaker: Well, when you write an amendment. So as the amendment is written, you would move the three fte and the budget separately so you can the fte. It's an approximate projection. So you could the three fte would.

Speaker: Turn to what it balance.

Speaker: Yes, it would balance if the amendment as written or as described.

Speaker: Thank you counselors. Is there any discussion on koyama lane ten?

Speaker: Madam chair, can you just repeat the three pieces again? Increases which three pieces?

Speaker: So koyama lane ten as written, increased bureau program expenses in diversity and civic leadership. District coalition offices operating grants and the small grants program. And it is paying for that by cutting three fte within civic life, specifically a manager one. Coordinator one coordinator two. Is that correct, counselor?

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor kanal did you have a discussion on this amendment? Go right ahead.

Speaker: Yeah, I see the.

Speaker: Coordinator one is vacant. So it's good to know that I'm assuming that the coordinator two is the pio position. But I'm not sure and just wanted to flag that, that at least one of these is vacant already. And I thought that was helpful to know. Thanks.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Counselor. Ryan.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: I'm just curious who you spoke with in civic life to make the decisions on what positions would be cut.

Speaker: Mostly amanda garcia snell and then different. Community work community members who are connected with our district coalitions.

Speaker: And the.

Speaker: Positions again, are I'm looking at this. Right. Okay.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Because they made us name them. Yeah. Manager one. Coordinator one. Coordinator two. From my understanding, there are a couple people who have added the neighborhood program. The person supporting district one is has left or is on leave. So they're also, you know, managing personnel. Things shift.

Speaker: Okay. I had the opportunity to oversee civic life for one year. It was a really hard assignment because the bureau was quite depressed, if you will, after a couple commissioners in charge had that assignment and restructured it quite a bit. We had to we had the assignment given to us to help restructure it further. This is personal because I know these people and I haven't had a chance to talk to them. So I will definitely be a no on this. As for me, it's an example of diving too deep into the org chart and making decisions up here that I don't have the context of. I would have had that context in the one year I had this assignment and would have been very careful about such behavior. So I just have to say, for my own values, this is something I can't be participating in. So I will be voting no.

Speaker: Thank you councilor. Councilor, I don't believe councilor smith has spoken this round. So councilor koyama lane, we're going to go to councilor smith and then come back to you. Go right ahead, councilor smith.

Speaker: Thank you. I wanted to find out in this version if there is an executive director.

Speaker: Going back to. Given that.

Speaker: You said manager, it's going to be manager one. Coordinator.

Speaker: Do you want to speak to that? The positions that our vice president named off were manager one, coordinator one and coordinator two. The engagement officer serves as the director here. So I don't believe that position is cut.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor koyama lane, you took yourself out of the queue. Did you have something to add, councilor?

Speaker: From my understanding and I can get some clarification, is that the intention is that through the reorganization and reclassification, that folks would be reclassified and would not be losing, would not be without a job. Is that something that can be.

Speaker: Reclassified where now that we're down in the weeds of this, I'm kind of curious.

Speaker: I see our aca coming forward to address this.

Speaker: I want to.

Speaker: Get these weeds. But here we are.

Speaker: Thank you. Assistant city administrator. At this point in time with the realignment process, we know that there's going to be reclassifications. We know that this is going to look very different. It's too early to tell, though, exactly what those cost savings will be. We'll have a better understanding right now. We're hopefully around the fall budget adjustment.

Speaker: Thank you. I do appreciate the attempt to restore the funding for the grants. I wish that we could do that, but this isn't the pathway that I would want to take. Thanks.

Speaker: And so koyama lane.

Speaker: I appreciate that, councilor Ryan, and appreciate your. What your expertise and your experience that you bring. And I would love to bring you in on more of these conversations, too. This is connected to somewhat of the advisory bodies work that you and I are working on in the governance.

Speaker: I realize.

Speaker: That, and this has all been very rushed. And, you know, we just got this information after lunch. So thanks.

Speaker: Seeing no other discussion in the queue. Keelan could you please call the roll canal.

Speaker: Based on the knowledge I have at this moment that at two of these are vacant, i'll vote.

Speaker: I. Ryan.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Koyama lane I'm really hopeful that this will pass and that a lot of this funding can be restored to our community. I vote yea.

Speaker: Morillo based on the updated information.

Speaker: I vote yea novick.

Speaker: The updated information on my blind faith and tiffany koyama lane i.

Speaker: Mark i.

Speaker: Thank you green. I miss zimmerman no.

Speaker: Avalos i. Dunphy. I. Smith no. Pirtle-guiney i.

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

Speaker: Colleagues, are there any more amendments folks would like to bring forward in the community engagement policy area space? I should say policy space. Okay, councilor smith, I believe that's a legacy hand. Is that correct?

Speaker: Yes, ma'am.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Colleagues, we are going to move on to amendments that are related to housing and homelessness. I know there are a lot of budget notes here. We do have a couple of amendments as well. Councilor avalos, do you have something to bring forward?

Speaker: I do, so I would like to move forward with avalos for. This is i'll go ahead and share and then see if I have a second if that's. Yeah. Okay. So avalos for is to move \$500,000 into the pilot program for home share into preserving affordable housing units in the north and northeast preference policy. So the north and northeast housing preference policy is designed to provide housing opportunities to residents displaced by urban renewal in historically black neighborhoods of north and northeast Portland. These units are currently in need of short term financial help to help them catch up from years of reduced rental income from covid years, but also from extended vacancies that were required by the policy. And there's been some discussion around the policy issues, and we've been in close touch with the housing bureau around this. And, you know, some of the policy issues are around the time required to keep units open, etc. These are all being actively addressed by hb and will be in place within the next couple of months. I, you know, the home share idea. I truly think it is an idea we should explore. I just don't believe right now is the time to take a new program, or start a new program with resources that we can't afford to lose, especially when we have units that are at risk of being lost. So I'm just choosing to prioritize saving units before adding a new pilot program. I think it's something we can explore in the future, and especially to when other organizations and the county are providing similar types of programs to home share. So I also want to keep an eye on that and see if we can be a partner there. But ultimately, this is about keeping families in existing affordable housing. I believe that's more important right now than starting new programs, and I feel adamant about proposing this as well, just because there weren't, in my opinion, a lot of things in the budget that were working to preserve more housing and more housing. So this is my attempt to save critical units before they get lost.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor, is there a second?

Speaker: Second?

Speaker: Colleagues, is there any discussion? Councilor Clark?

Speaker: Thank you, madam chair. Councilor Avalos. Is this redirecting the 500,000 in the mayor's budget? And we do have a home share program. I believe that is. I don't know if it's citywide, but it needs to be citywide.

Speaker: I have a count. There's a county program. Is that the one you're referencing?

Speaker: Well, there's actually a private program going on in my district. A home share program. And I thought that the mayor's 500,000 for home share would go out on an RFP for organizations to apply for. Is that correct? Mr. Mayor, do you mind if I ask?

Speaker: Yeah, it was originally a \$3 million program that because of budget challenges, reduced to 500,000. And then Donnie Oliver, our DCA, was to stand up the department to primarily look at renters, right. Rent the rights to begin the program, and then any additional would go to credits for helping homeowners open up their rooms for boarders for. Yeah.

Speaker: I continue to see a real value with this program that is in your budget and that it is citywide. So I'm going to be a no vote on this.

Speaker: Councilor Ryan.

Speaker: Yes. Thank you, madam president. Mayor, I'm glad that you're here. I'd like to hear more from you on this because this is something you put into the budget. I realize that this is a great tool, especially for elders looking for housing. And so I just want to hear more why this was one of your priorities, to put it in the budget, because it looks like it might be taken away here. Yeah.

Speaker: Thank you, Councilor Ryan. We have a deeply affordable housing crisis. Like many crises in Portland, it is very difficult to find housing that is at 7 or \$800

and ssi and ssdi payments are not keeping up, forcing many people into homelessness. So this is a program in which to begin to open up those 200,000 empty rooms that are in Portland. By doing this, we're trying to create a program to incent homeowners to become partners in our housing crisis. The reason why home share or padsplit, or a host of different names that are used around the nation is important. Councilor avalos and i, we hosted padsplit successful app in atlanta that has 7000 rooms for rent today that allows a person to get into for about \$400 compared to an apartment where you need first and last month's rent and furniture, which is going to cost 4000. This is an immediate opportunity for us to open up deeply affordable housing in Portland. These funds, as I noted, aren't 3 million because that's what we had hoped to do to not only stand up the program, to have dca oliveira create it, to create renter rights, renter rights, to make sure that all parties were going to be cared for. But then we also wanted additional funds to create credits 1000, 2000, 3000 to start incenting homeowners to begin opening up their homes to address the housing crisis. So I could go on, but i'll leave it there.

Speaker: Councilor Ryan, anything further?

Speaker: No, I needed to hear that from the mayor directly. Thank you. I won't be supporting this. I'd like to keep this in the budget.

Speaker: Councilor avalos, you've put two things against each other that are both very important to me. The north and northeast housing preference policy is, I think, one of the best things our city has done. I also think that we need to increase ways to find naturally occurring affordable housing, that affordable housing that is not subsidized affordable housing. And the mayor is attempting to do that. I agree that we need to find ways to invest further in the north and northeast housing preference policy. I would gladly work with you through the year to find ways that we can partner on an expansion of those services, and a retention of the

apartments that we already have in my district. I can't support an attempt to move away from a program that will allow us to have more naturally occurring affordable housing as well, though. Councilor Clark.

Speaker: I appreciate that comment. Madam president, I would just like to add that there's a flip side to this too, and it's really represented by my great grandmother, who was poor in the south and rented out rooms to actually survive and rent them to itinerant workers, homeless men, one of whom became my grandfather. So I think there is definitely a role for this, both for affordable housing as well, for lower income homeowners to bring in income.

Speaker: Councilor Kanak.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I have two questions. The first is to the mayor. Could you I was you mentioned that it was to be used to incentivize homeowners to be a part of it. So this money would be paid out to people who own homes in order to augment the amount of money that they're making in rent through those \$800 examples you were giving.

Speaker: Yeah, this program is already successful in like Atlanta. They have 7000 padsplit has 40,000 rooms that are available. What we were doing with the incentive was to supercharge it to get these rooms open within months or a half a year. It's not traditional do credits. So I pulled that back. The 500 k is to set up the program to make sure that we are protecting renters and renters to make sure that the relationship is solid. So that's what we're doing right now, is setting an fd up in Portland housing bureau. Now, if there were any extra funds, I would hope that dca oliveira would maybe open it up and offer some credits. But it's really designed for elderlies trying to stay in their house that are struggling with their taxes by opening up in a home share or a room share program. So it's designed not only for those that are looking for deeply affordable, it's trying to help elderly age in place as well

by providing a way to augment rent. So and our elderly is the fastest growing homeless population in the city right now. So you see, it's kind of a twin approach help our homeless. But also it doesn't you don't have to be homeless to participate. You could be a high school kid on a minimum wage job and still be able to live in the city you were born in, so it's a host of solutions for different populations.

Speaker: Just to clarify, you're saying the first chunk of the \$500,000 would be the personnel cost for one fte in the housing bureau.

Speaker: That's what dca, oliveira. And frankly, I think it would be best if you don't mind.

Speaker: Sure.

Speaker: Yeah. And the second chunk would be to payments to the renters. No, sorry. To the to the landlords.

Speaker: Yeah. And I don't think we have enough for that second part. Councilor. And so if we chose to do it, we would come back to you at some later date.

Speaker: And I'd love to know what classification gets to 500 k with benefits and not leaving anything left over.

Speaker: Yeah, thanks for the question, councilor daniel. For the record. So as the mayor was explaining.

Speaker: The 500.

Speaker: K.

Speaker: Would.

Speaker: First go to, we've already started.

Speaker: Some very high level.

Speaker: Analysis around the country about.

Speaker: The different programs.

Speaker: Where they've worked, where they've been regulated, unregulated. But we need deeper analysis. Councilor. So there'd be one fte.

Speaker: For that.

Speaker: And then.

Speaker: Subsequently with.

Speaker: The remainder, because you're right, that's just one fte is probably fully loaded, maybe 200 k, but.

Speaker: That's probably.

Speaker: Off by a couple, you know, a few thousand would be then is that incentives for homeowners is that, you know, vouchers. For renters? Is that.

Speaker: For us to.

Speaker: Actually develop the code that would come to you all for.

Speaker: Your consideration.

Speaker: As a council, if we want to put.

Speaker: Something in place?

Speaker: Those are all things that we have to evaluate over the over the course of the year. So I think it's.

Speaker: Fair to say that there is.

Speaker: A portion of those, that 500 k that would.

Speaker: Go.

Speaker: To either homeowners or renters as the.

Speaker: Program that you all would.

Speaker: Adopt would, you know, would allow. There's still there's still some there's still some evaluation that has to happen. To clarify, mayor, I just heard something slightly different. There would be a portion of this money that went to renters, perhaps.

Speaker: To be very clear, we haven't. I think it's premature. There are programs in atlanta and the specifics here, chicago, houston that we're.

Speaker: Aware of. That have.

Speaker: Different that the cities and the governments provide. Different resources. What's right for Portland is still tbd.

Speaker: Sure.

Speaker: And I recognize you have to say that that way, because we're deciding sort of our policy here through this to some degree. And my second question is, is to councilor avalos, what are the risks if we don't put this money into the north and northeast preference policy.

Speaker: We're going to lose a lot of affordable housing. And so I just strongly feel that at a time when we're in both a dire budget and a severe housing shortage, that we can't afford to lose those in particular, for a program that is serving displaced black Portlanders, I again, I'm not against the goal. And we all agree that these are both two good programs. But going back to zimmerman, winners and losers, whatever. If that's the framing we're using, I would like to ensure that black Portlanders can keep a critical, critical access to a resource for housing before we start investing in a new program. We don't this homeshare program, it would be new. To be clear. It's not. It would be right. Starting it up. I've expressed some concerns about rental protections. That's a whole other thing. It would just kind of depend on how it was structured, which is kind of what dc oliveras is talking about. But I'm definitely concerned about that. But that's not the reason I'm doing this. I am trying to protect housing that will be lost.

Speaker: Thank you. I think maybe one of the conversations that we've had in slightly different contexts is whether or not it's the first thing we need to do is

protect the housing and responses we already have before we start expanding new things. And I think this falls into that category. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor smith.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. Dca olivares, could you come back up, please?

Speaker: Do i.

Speaker: Have the I had the wrong understanding of the program. And I'm wondering. This sounds like an initiative that someone in the community and economic development office can do. It's a project. It's something that they could set up because I was under the understanding that some of these funds, the 500,000, would go to the renter to subsidize the housing that they would be sharing in a home or to the home owner. But this is administrative totally. And I think this you can have someone in the Portland housing bureau work on this and put it together, and then put the \$500,000 towards the subsidy.

Speaker: Councilor. Yes, for the record, I want to acknowledge that the housing bureau, as we know today, perhaps doesn't have the policy capacity, frankly, to do the analysis and what the mayor's amendment was pushing us to do is to do that evaluation to ensure to address councilor avalos point, we want to ensure we understand.

Speaker: The.

Speaker: Impacts of the program. We see the opportunity there. But what's actually right for the city of Portland and its residents? We don't have.

Speaker: The answers.

Speaker: To that yet. And I think it's the due diligence part that we're asking for those resources for. And once we come back to council for that program, then we would have those resources to implement. It would be a shame for us to do the

analysis, do the work, come to you all? We rebuild the program with no resources to implement.

Speaker: But that's what you're doing right now.

Speaker: At a very high level, and just enough for us to say that this is a potential for the city, but not enough to do any sort of programmatic investments.

Speaker: Okay, I yeah, and so I was really excited about this program because I was thinking that we were going to play some seniors in homes with the subsidy from city of Portland. That's what I was thinking was going to happen in fiscal year 2526. I didn't realize this was all administrative.

Speaker: I think there's a possibility that we can start the program, but without resources to even.

Speaker: I know, I know, but this not not the future resources, but the resources that are in the mayor's budget. It's a it's I thought it was an actual subsidy that was going to go to seniors to help them live in other folks homes and do either a subsidy to the homeowner or, and, or the, the renter. So but this is an administrative thing. So which I think could have been done with the fte. And not \$500,000 there.

Speaker: So some of the money is for fte and some of it would be used once the program is. Established for those.

Speaker: Are you trying to build the program as a pilot to grow it so that you can put more money into it in 26, 27.

Speaker: Or even 25, 26?

Speaker: So you're thinking about the fall bump already. And so.

Speaker: No councilor the 500 k is for an fte and resources to run a pilot once we've established a program.

Speaker: So when you tell you're confusing me, when you tell me a pilot, you're going to try to run the pilot so that you can create a program. But earlier you said this the money is not going to be a subsidy yet until we get more money.

Speaker: No, not more money until we establish what the program is. The program doesn't. There's no program right now.

Speaker: Right?

Speaker: I know doesn't exist.

Speaker: Exactly.

Speaker: We have to create something. And once it's created, there would be resources available for either the homeowner or the renter, depending on which program we establish. Because there's various programs around the country, we're not going to be building this from scratch.

Speaker: But you can't do that on \$500,000.

Speaker: I think we I think we can councilor.

Speaker: So are you telling me today that some of that \$500,000, that there's going to be some seniors that are going to go live with other people and they're going to have a place to stay, whether it be 10 or 20 people, that out of this budget.

Speaker: Out.

Speaker: Of this budget, yes.

Speaker: There's going to be people that are going to get a place to stay or get a subsidy as a result.

Speaker: Correct?

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Sorry if that was not clear initially. Okay.

Speaker: Councilor clark, are you back in the queue or was that.

Speaker: Yes, I'm back in the queue.

Speaker: Councilor avalos is back in the queue. Okay, clark. And then avalos.

Speaker: Okay, this is a little more than I thought it was. I thought we were putting out an rfp to the organizations that are already doing homeshare. Can somebody can you clarify that for me? Either the city administrator or the mayor?

Speaker: Mr. Mayor, would you like to address that?

Speaker: You bet.

Speaker: Councilor, it would be all the above. So you have homeshare. You have padsplit, you have some other applications. What we would want to do is come up with a boilerplate expectation to protect renters and rent, to really harmonize all those, to make sure we're caring for Portland and then like dca, oliveira had mentioned any excess would be to create some incentives to get the program kickstarted so we can start seeing how it works.

Speaker: Well, it would it would be my thought, my hope, my desire that we actually place people now and the programs that do exist.

Speaker: Absolutely. That would be the goal.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor, councilor avalos.

Speaker: Which is.

Speaker: Exactly why.

Speaker: I'm proposing this, because it is not going to be going directly. It's not a 1 to 1. There is a lot of administrative costs. We'd have to start something up. All of those things that, you know, even if we had some money that would be able to go, we don't know how much. It would depend on how we structure the program. There's lots of ways to structure it. There's a lot of rental concerns that I have about it. So again, I just feel that this is an opportunity to invest directly in something we already have that we're going to lose without it, and that we have time to explore this. And we have there's other ways that we can explore it in the way that

councilor smith was saying, because, you know, if the businesses want to come, right, the home share type of businesses want to come and establish, there's other ways, other routes to do that, instead of allocating a significant amount of money to a pilot that I don't know how much is going to go to housing people directly right now because it has to get stood up. So that is why I'm choosing to prioritize investing in protecting a bunch of housing that's going to be lost, and it's going to impact black Portlanders in particular. And I'm worried about losing that right now when we are so desperate for more housing.

Speaker: Councilor zimmerman.

Speaker: I'm just trying to understand how 500,000, which is about one unit, maybe two units of most affordable, how that is going to help us not lose units. I just want to note, the housing bureau's equity and business operations manager said that on average, 10 to 15 units, or two per 2 to 3% of the roughly 470 units subject to the policy sit vacant at any time. I'm trying to understand 500,000 in what's been a, you know, a pretty large program. I don't feel like there's something at a loss here. And I do want to say, I think we are absolutely at a loss for potentially opening up a new pilot project, which, by the way, is the only way to start a new thing. That is recognizing a change in the market. I'm supportive of a \$500,000 pilot I tried last year at the county to get the home share type of pilot going because of some really great advocacy work. It takes money to match up families and renters. I know a person who left because the only route for her was using her extra rooms in her house, and so I feel like the program itself is at risk if we don't fund with this 500. And I think we should take, frankly, what what currently exists is not working. So why wouldn't we want to invest in some pilots? And this one seems like it's a good shot. But we keep getting said that some units are going to be lost in the north northeast program, and I am failing to see the correlation between this

500,000 and saving a unit that potentially is where's that risk? I don't understand that.

Speaker: I'm happy to forward a memo I received from fbe director explaining all of that.

Speaker: And so the fbe director, when they developed their budget, developed their budget \$500,000 shy of being able to save those units, given \$500,000 is a big number to any one of us as an individual. But in a budget, that's a pretty small fraction of a thing. So I'm trying to understand why they need this infusion or why they can't start the pilot. So tell me what's going on there.

Speaker: The problem is that the problem is the loss of units because of all of the policy issues that have been happening, right, that I mentioned at the beginning. Like, there's all these issues that we're creating, longer vacancies. They weren't able to get people in. The policy was creating a huge barrier to them getting people in. And as you sit vacant right, these that is why they're getting they are at risk. And so they have been working really hard on fixing the policy. They've made really great progress. But fixing the policy is not going to affect the fact that they don't have the influx of cash. They need to protect those from not losing their affordability status. So again, i'll pass. They wrote that policy.

Speaker: They self inflicted that wound. They wrote that policy. The Oregonian by the way what I read earlier was from the Oregonians article on may 19th. But they they are the ones responsible for this policy and now need a bailout. But I don't understand why they can't just adjust their policy and be more rigorous in terms of getting those vacancies filled. If they have a what turns out to be a very long list, it sounds like.

Speaker: No, it's not that. They well, first of all, policies, of course, always have conflict, have issues and they're fixing it. So I don't get the logic of they wrote this

policy and it's not working. And like yeah, it's not it wasn't working and they needed to fix it. And they are. But at the time when in all of the time that was lost by the policy not working is where the financial issues have been coming up. And this is so fixing that policy is not going to fix the fact that they have this huge hole, and this is going to be to protect that. It is a small amount, but it is it will really put them over the top. And again, we'll preserve housing that we have now. And again, I'm just choosing to preserve that instead of trying something new right now.

Speaker: Councilor green.

Speaker: I will try to keep this brief because I know that we are under a time clock. But I must say here, as an economist. Sorry, councilor that the \$500,000 is intended to create sort of a vacancy set aside to support the balance sheets of these distressed units. Every affordable housing provider, frankly, every housing provider of any stripe in this city right now is dealing with cost pressures related to covid inflation. And so this is a sort of liquidity problem. And the memo that I'm reading says that, you know, this this amount of money could support approximately 250 months of rent at the 60% ami. And so this is really, I think, a pretty efficient way to stretch those dollars. If it was about the replacement cost of the buildings, it'd be pretty suspect because you wouldn't be able to build the one unit. Right. But I think this would be a much less expensive and therefore much more efficient way to preserve a housing stock than if we let them go into receivership. And then they go back to the market. And that's a loss of affordable housing. So that's why I'm pretty compelled by it. I'm also quite torn because, I mean, we do need to have ways to connect seniors who that's our fastest growing homeless population. So I just but I wanted to put in the record my observations of it.

Speaker: Thank you, resident economist, for explaining your words. I can't.

Speaker: Councilor seeing no one else in the queue. We will move to a vote. This is a vote on. Now I'm going to lose the number. Avalos four, which would shift \$500,000 from creating a home share program to funding north northeast housing preference policy units. Keelan, could you please call the roll canal.

Speaker: Yeah. Thank you to councilor avalos for putting this up. Mayor. You have really actually given me a lot of things to think about through this process. I did not originally think that this was even a conversation. And I think there is value to the home sharing pilot. And I definitely been at least partially convinced by that. And I think part of this is the question over what do we value more? And I have to look at this as a high value of overhead. And the fact that more of the subsidization and the conversation here has been going to landlords as opposed to renters, and compare that with protecting a very limited piece of affordable housing stock in my district, which supports the communities, that of the communities of color, specifically the black community, have been displaced. We've been talking about this what feels like in five different conversations over the course of this month. My position remains the same. It wasn't elected by padsplit. I was elected by the people of district two and I vote yes.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: That was a good conversation, one of the better ones today. Thank you, councilor avalos and mayor wilson. I think both things can be true. Like a lot of the conversations we've had, we tend to focus on the false narratives way too much. So I'm going to explain why I'm going to vote no very quickly. I knew someone really well and I called them on a Saturday and they were down. I could tell they were really upset. And finally I found out that they were injured and they couldn't do their part time job that supplemented their social security. So their rent was due soon and they didn't know how they were going to pay it. And it was hard for them

to have enough pride to tell me that. So this was my mom. And so we helped her with that, the rent that month. And then we asked her to consider putting up maybe something at the church she went to. And within a week or two, she had a new apartment lined up through someone in her church who just was recently widowed. And so then both of them, you know, it was a win win for both of them. That was organic. Those organic stories are out there, and we need to have a matchmaking system to build that. And having administrators work on something to build something is not a bad word. And you got to start somewhere. So I'm going to vote no on this, knowing there'll be more conversations about it. But I'd like to get the party started in the city of Portland to figure out what can be a very low overhead system to set up this matchmaking system, especially for those who would like to age in place in the city of Portland. So I vote no on this.

Speaker: Koyama lane I really.

Speaker: Appreciate the conversation and the work by both of you. I'm just going to say here what I've said to other folks, which is I don't always see eye to eye exactly with the mayor about how he's getting to his goals. But he does have very big goals, and he does have a lot of support. And he has also made some promises about doing this in a year. And so I have told him I'm going to try my best when I can to support you, especially in this. This year. I've also said if we're chipping away at his plan, I want to make sure that there are seven votes. I also don't want to get to a one year point, and the mayor is able to say, look, look how council didn't support me in my plan. I don't know. So I think what you're fighting for, councilor avalos, is really important. If I'm your seventh vote, I would be willing to reconsider. But right now I feel like I need to vote no.

Speaker: Morillo.

Speaker: I really appreciate this conversation, and my chief of staff and I were talking earlier today about how it feels like we've gotten to the point in the budget where there are only terrible choices before us, because everything is important and everything matters, and it's quite painful and hard. With that being said, I think it's really important to maintain these historic programs that have benefited black Portlanders for so long. We do have an aging population that's one of the fastest growing populations of unhoused people in the city of Portland. And also, black Portlanders have the lowest median income of anyone else. And there's a reason why we only have around. What is it, 6% people who are black actually living in our city? That is a problem that is not going to get fixed unless we make serious investments. And it is clear that the north northeast plan, they are doing everything they can to rectify the program and make sure that it's getting up and running. And I have faith that they're going to get that done. And it's something that will be immediately beneficial, which is what we need. As much as I want to invest in other things right now, I think we're in a position to kind of plug some holes here rather than try to start new programs before we have benefited the ones that currently exist. So with that, I will vote.

Speaker: I novick.

Speaker: I told the mayor a while ago that I was going to be with him on this issue. I was partly influenced by a county employee. Some of us know who said that the county had a homeshare program in the past. That didn't work, but it was that that was about incentives, and she thought it was worth giving incentives a shot. I should apologize for making that commitment without having conversations with councilor avalos or anybody else who had alternate uses for the money. So I'm not as councilor morillo said, I'm not easy about this, but I'm going to fulfill my

commitment to the mayor and vote yes and hope that this moonshot works. I'm sorry, I vote no, no, this moonshot works.

Speaker: Councilor, can you just clarify for our clerk.

Speaker: Your vote?

Speaker: No. Sorry.

Speaker: Clerk.

Speaker: So in honor of my grandmother and my great grandmother, who were poor women who rented out rooms. I'm voting no.

Speaker: Green.

Speaker: I struggle with this one.

Speaker: I've had conversations with the mayor. I again, i, I really appreciate the innovation and the thought here. I did have to lock in as an economist there. And what I realized is that it is less costly to preserve than it is to build new when it comes to affordable housing. So for that reason, I am a yes.

Speaker: Zimmerman.

Speaker: On the flip side, it is becoming more and more expensive for people to keep their homes here, and this program could have been well on its way to helping more Portlanders do that. So I'm sorry you don't have the partnership that you thought you had over here. Mayor, this is not a good amendment. We should be trying out pilots. This is it takes incentives to get people to get connected so that they can find each other in the home share program. This is different than other rent and landlord type programs. It's very different. So I vote no.

Speaker: Avalos I appreciate the discussion. I think that I have shown my willingness to the mayor to go along with his vision and his plan. He has a vision around the shelters that, you know, we all have complicated feelings about. So I don't see this as me saying I don't support the mayor and his overall goals. In fact, I

have the same goals. I want more housing, and it just feels really tough right now for me to invest in a new idea when we've got a lot of other new ideas, as far as I'm concerned, and this is just another one that I can't afford to invest in when so many people are at risk of losing delicate, affordable housing. So I vote yes.

Speaker: Dunphy.

Speaker: I firmly believe the mayor's sincerity in his efforts to try and do everything he can to create as much housing as possible. But I was in this building when an upstart app based company came and said that they have a solution for seniors with a spare bedroom and students who need a place to stay. It's affordable. And now airbnb has come through and devastated our rental economy. I'm sorry, it smells like airbnb. It walks like airbnb. I'm inherently skeptical of anything tech based that is going to funnel money out of our community in a way that is deeply unaccountable. I cannot support the helm chair problem, so I'm happy to vote yes.

Speaker: Smith.

Speaker: I really want to try to find some ways in which to help folks who live in district two, and I don't think people understand what the northeast policy is. We're I think we're talking above people's heads, and we're assuming that everyone knows what it is, but it's to bring back black Portlanders who were originally in albina, back to albina area, and to get housing. And i, I think we need to have a conversation in all of our committees so we can understand it better. I the same way I told the mayor that I was going to support this, and that this is something that I think that we should try, because there are a lot of single people who who have homes and have three and four rooms bedrooms and, you know, they're house rich and cash poor. So I think that this we need to really give this an opportunity to see what we can do with it. And I will be looking for other opportunities to find that

\$500,000. Councilor avalos, that that is needed. I didn't know anything about that. But I'm going to vote no on this.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: Councilor, with my commitment to work with you to find other ways throughout the next year to support this program, I'm going to stand by my commitment to the mayor to support his pilot and to give him a year to see if this works. I vote no.

Speaker: The amendment fails with five yes votes and seven no votes.

Speaker: Councilors. Does anybody else have an amendment in the housing and homelessness area that they would like to bring forward before we move to budget notes? Councilor morillo.

Speaker: Thank you. I would like to bring forward morillo 16. This is a motion to amend the budget to restore a proposed cut to the impact reduction program, to offset investments in rental assistance.

Speaker: Second, thank you.

Speaker: Councilors. Councilors, is there any discussion on morillo 16? Councilor zimmermann.

Speaker: I mostly put my hand up so I could have time to read it and make sure I understood the impact before we move to a vote.

Speaker: I can explain it like.

Speaker: Me to move.

Speaker: To councilor.

Speaker: Sorry, I'm.

Speaker: You said offset a restore to a cut to a thing, and I'm trying to read it.

Speaker: All right.

Speaker: Let me break it down for you. Zimmerman. So the 8% cut that all the bureaus were asked to have is what ended up being restored. The okay, I'm tired now. I'm going to explain it better. Okay. So all the bureaus were asked to have an 8% cut. The original 8% cut was one of these sweeps teams. And then the mayor's budget restored. This final sweeps team. To me, I think it makes sense that if we're asking bureaus across the board to have an 8% cut, that we would do it here. I also want to point people to the fact that this amendment is going to redirect funds that were previously proposed for the impact reduction program to expand rental assistance and eviction legal defense, and it prioritizes housing stability and upstream prevention over short term enforcement interventions. And keeping people housed is one of the top ways that we are going to reduce people becoming unhoused in our streets and actually promote community well-being. So I think that the mayor's budget really largely focuses on shelters and more short term solutions to homelessness. But we also need to address some of the upstream problems that we have. Some of you may have seen that there was a propublica article published today about the impact of sweeps on unhoused populations, specifically in the city of Portland. And it has been absolutely devastating to our communities. I have talked at length about my own experience being unhoused, and what I have heard from houseless youth who live in my district, and the impacts of these sweeps on them have been devastating. The amount of times that I've talked to houseless youth, who are defined as under the age of 24, who are trying to get back on their feet, who are displaced over and over again, who lose their identification, who miss out on job interviews, who miss out on job trainings, who are just unable to reintegrate, not through any fault of their own. Not because they are incapable, but because things are stacked up against them. I think that we have a moral and a fiscal responsibility to ensure that we are preventing more people from becoming

unhoused in the long term, and I appreciate the shelter plans. I think that those are going to be really important in the short term, but we also have to do other things, and that's part of what this amendment tries to address.

Speaker: Thank you. I appreciate that clarification. I'm very clear in terms of what it is now, there are many, many millions of rental assistance between the city and county. I think that the impact reduction program got stood up because of a real need when it comes to the trash that Portlanders are experiencing. Nobody wanted to create that, but over the last few years, it's become a need. And so I hear you councilor on the on the part you're trying to fill, but I think this reduction would move away from the need that irp has to stay on top of the trash, because I don't think Portlanders yet are ready to say we should reduce that part of our part of our apparatus. I think I think we've come a long way. So I appreciate you clarifying that. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor smith.

Speaker: Thank you. Question councilor morillo. Where would the money go to? Would we send that over to Multnomah County to do rent assistance?

Speaker: No, it would go to the Portland housing bureau.

Speaker: So the Portland housing bureau is doing rent assistance as well, in addition to the monies that we send over to Multnomah County for homelessness, because they spread that between rent assistance and homeless shelters. So we're also doing that as well.

Speaker: Yes, that's correct. That was a program that was started throughout covid. And I think that as federal dollars were cut away, we saw that our communities are still in desperate need of them. So it hasn't gone away and the need is still there. We have all of the infrastructure set up within the Portland housing bureau to continue to help our communities, so this would be a very easy

transfer for them. We spoke with them at length, and they said that they were ready to take in this money if needed. I also want to point out that while the problem will become exacerbated, there will be more unhoused people on our streets. People cannot afford to live in our city. The average rent for a one bedroom apartment is \$1,700 a month. My single mother, who working a minimum wage with two daughters, would absolutely not be able to afford that. Nowadays, that's just not possible. And the houseless people on our streets are not garbage. I know that's not what you meant to imply, councilor zimmerman, but this is impacting people. It's not just about garbage. And frankly, a lot of the encampments that I've seen are actually pretty well maintained, and they still get swept no matter how well they behave or what they do, or if they don't do drugs. That's what what I've been seeing. And sometimes I kind of think that, I don't know, maybe this is too personal to say, but it's weird bantering with people in the hallways that I love and care for, and knowing that when I was house was in college, if you found me on a park bench, you probably would have called the cops on me and made sure I was swept.

Speaker: No ma'am, I wouldn't have. But I have another question for you. So right now, Portland housing bureau, they don't offer the program because they were using arpa, arpa dollars to pay for it. And so the program is gone. And the and the mayor decided not to put it in his budget. And so this goes back to what I'm saying. Again, I you know, if I do a friendly amendment, if you would take it from the 31 million that were given to the county, take \$500,000 from it. But but not on this. I'm I guess what I'm trying to say is we're creating more stuff. We're creating more housing and homeless stuff that we have already agreed that it goes through Multnomah County. And so as everybody is coming up with their own thing, the mayor's coming up with his additional shelter. We still have the safe villages. We still have Portland solutions. Now, you want to go back and backfill the arpa money,

and we can't backfill the arpa money. But I would be willing to. If you wanted a friendly amendment, I could take it from that 20. I guess it's \$26 million. Now. Take \$500,000 from there. Take another \$500,000 for the northeast preference policy. But I just think that we just need to either say what we're going to be, are we going to build housing, or are we going to maintain all these social programs that are supposed to be done by Multnomah County?

Speaker: So i'll answer it first, and then I would love to pass it off to dca. Oliveira. We are actually cutting sweeps are one sweeps team to do it. It's not anything wild okay one sweeps team and we are not creating anything. We are reallocating it. First of all, this is a one time expense. And if dca oliveira, if you want to explain what we do or don't do with the rent assistance from the city, that would be lovely.

Speaker: Yeah. Thanks, councilor daniel, for the record. So to take one step back, councilor smith, this isn't a new program. In fact, the 8% cut in this 465,000 approximately was about a 20% cut of the existing program. So even with the 8% cut the housing bureau took, the program was still going to exist just at a lower service level. And the number of households that would be served by adding this back in would range between 40 to 75, based on the level of eviction support or rental assistance. Whatever the service that we're providing would be. The good is, is that the infrastructure in the bureau already exists. These programs are going to continue to run, and this would just be increasing the levels back to not just covid levels, but this programs were in different forms pre-covid as well. So I guess what I'm offering is councilor morillo amendment essentially makes the bureau whole based on the 8% cut.

Speaker: Well, I know, but you all gave up all of that a few years ago. And so this was arpa money that propped this up, right?

Speaker: To a certain degree. But this again, this existed pre arpa as well. It just increased our ability. The need.

Speaker: For it. Maybe I've been out of it for, for a few years. I was for about five. But the last time I checked that y'all weren't doing any rent assistance.

Speaker: The rent assistance is largely new, but a lot of these resources is actually going to eviction prevention. So it provides legal defense fund resources. And I would argue that those are some of the most needed services right now. To councilor morillo point, we're trying to prevent people from entering a houselessness state. And so the resources that we provide for legal defense is probably the most significant of this. Not to say that rent assistance isn't important, but we sort of rely on the county for that. There is some as a part of legal defense. Sometimes supporting renters is part of that package. But I would offer that the eviction defense fund might be the core element here and not to.

Speaker: So are they help are we helping people to stay in their homes because of eviction or giving folks money, cash money to stay in their homes because they can't afford to pay for their for their housing? Or are we doing both?

Speaker: Both, yes. People come to the housing bureau all the time for different needs. Councilor. And this is just a resource that we that's flexible enough to provide with our, of course, with our external partners.

Speaker: Are you using cdbg money for this as well?

Speaker: Not for this.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor avalos, did you have a comment to the amendment?

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor morillo. I think, you know, especially after feeling disappointed that my last amendment didn't pass, especially given the conversation that we had about the albina settlement. Kind of hurts to see that. And many promises are always made to help black people and trust that those promises are often not kept. So I'm just needing to name that. And I say that in support of this amendment, because people need to be kept in their housing. Y'all. Like, I really don't know why we insist on not doing the things that are very obvious, which is people cannot afford their rent. They cannot black people literally cannot afford rent anywhere in this entire city. And so this to me is an obvious choice to support adding some dollars back into a program that we've already had pre-covid, as has been discussed, and whether the county also provides, you know what? Every government should provide rental assistance, as far as I'm concerned, because we have failed our constituents by not providing enough housing, by letting the market go wild, by decreasing their buying power, by lots of and through lots of different ways, not creating economic opportunities. We have failed people. And providing rental assistance is the bare minimum that they deserve. So I will be supporting this.

Speaker: Councilor kanal.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. Yeah, so most of the city took an 8% cut. And I think we've exempted some parts of the city and we're deciding as we go if it makes sense to continue the exemptions that were done throughout various parts of this process. We have reporting that has shown before we get to the reporting, one of the stats we often hear is that 40% of the people in shelter go back to the streets, and only 20% end up going back, going into housing. And that's true. And despite the fact that 20% of people that are in shelters go into into permanent housing, we still are seeing increases in the number of homeless people because

there's a higher rate of inflow, and inflow means outflow from housing. It means people who were housed and are not anymore. We've also heard repeatedly about the about the number of people who are getting moved around and the need to stop the moving the problem from place to place within the city. We've talked about sweeps of people as if people are something that can be swept so often in here, and I don't know how many is enough, but over a four year period, we've swept 19,000 times. Each one of those sweeps is not just one person or one tenth that is, of the encampment last year, 20 encampments a day. It's an propublica article today, by the way, conveniently. And so we're seeing it not working. And so by reducing one of the teams that do this work, again, not eliminating that process altogether, we have the ability to find some money for a really important thing, which I agree that rental assistance is vital. And I'm glad to join with my fellow renter on on promoting this, but also on eviction defense. And eviction defense is really, really critical because the overwhelming majority of landlords in eviction court have legal representation and the overwhelming majority of tenants do not. And when you we've seen that where a right to counsel in eviction court has come up in other jurisdictions, that the rate of eviction is lower, the same issues apply. But because of the balancing of power in that situation, it often leads to mediation. It often leads to things like rental assistance for the renter being accepted when that person makes a late payment and stays in their home. There's so many benefits, and I think there's a lot of money in what I believe is an impact reduction. But certainly within Portland solutions, we're seeing a supporting the building of \$1 million wrought iron fence, which is going to be paid for by odot under 405 to harden a specific campsite. We're putting in 64,000, according to the Oregonian, and taking on the ongoing maintenance obligation, because what the city needs is

more ongoing maintenance obligations. So I'm going to support this. This is maybe the biggest slam dunk I've seen in the entire list of 126. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor Ryan.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I wanted to get level set on what we've experienced the last couple of days. So wasn't it just yesterday that we had a 2% cut to ems, which is external materials and services? Is that correct?

Speaker: It is.

Speaker: Yes. Okay. And that this would be then an additional cut to the impact reduction plan. Portland solutions.

Speaker: Given that.

Speaker: If this passed.

Speaker: Inasmuch as the work of the impact reduction program is through contracts, then that is where some of that cut likely would be taken. But we don't know for sure.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: So and that was the green amendment yesterday that did that. Correct. Okay. I want to say two things i, I again, this is one of those conversations that both things can be true. But based on the cut we took yesterday and I apologize for the name of that was being used, it's the impact reduction program, not sweeps team. And I think that we need to stay the course. And I will not be supporting this.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor green.

Speaker: Yeah. Colleagues, I just want to remind us that I think less than two weeks ago, we were all at this dais with the county board members, and we received an update on the most recent data that showed that the rate of inflow of people entering unsheltered homelessness exceeds our capacity to shelter them. And there are a number of reasons why that is a problem. Of course, we need to

expand our housing supply. I made that argument. I made that argument from this dais. But we also need to prevent people from being evicted. That is critical. And if we cannot do that, then we are going to contribute to this problem and we'll have to pour more and more and more money into sweeps and to temporary unsheltered housing. And that is it's unconscionable. And so that's why I'm going to support this amendment.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor, councilor morillo.

Speaker: Thank you. I understand that there are some tensions right now about what the county is supposed to be doing versus what we're supposed to be doing. And as a dca, oliveira stated, the city had these programs before covid started, so it was always part of our book of business. As councilor smith likes to say, and to our constituents who are suffering on the streets, it really doesn't matter whose job it is, it just needs to be done. And when I did constituent services at the city before I became a City Councilor, I answered a lot of calls from people who would call for a sweeps team. I'm sorry, they do sweeps. I think it's fine to call them that. Who would come and sweep unhoused people and they would get pushed to the other sidewalk, maybe a few blocks away, and then a few days later, more angry neighbors would call, and then they would get pushed to another sidewalk and another sidewalk. And the problem never got resolved, because we never got people into housing, and we never kept people housed. And the problem is going to continue ballooning unless we actually do things to address the upstream, to address the upstream critical services that we need. This is also uniquely important for people in district one, because when I did constituent services, we were a citywide council, and what I got was a lot of calls from folks who would live in district one who would say that what the city would do is they would clear the encampments in laurelhurst park, the wealthiest, whitest areas of the city, and then

all of those encampments would go towards east Portland, because that's where the city invests less resources in. And in quarter one of 2024, this is from Oregon. Eviction data on racial disparities report from 2024, the black monthly eviction rate continued to increase, reaching the second and third highest rates in the history of the data at 9.6 and nine filings per 1000 black Portlanders. Black renters October in the previous q4 2023 had the highest rate of 10.5. We also see that latinx renters experienced a record breaking rate of 5.1 to 6.4 filings per 1000 latinx renters, so both the black and latino community are uniquely impacted by this issue. And if we want to have a Portland that actually works for everyone, we're going to have to stop continuing to allow our working class people and people who are low income to actually become unhoused in the first place. We're going to have to actually keep people housed and make a city that that is affordable to live in, where people are cared for. So no one cares where this money is coming from or who's responsible. They just need the services. And I hope that I hope that my colleagues will honor that. Today.

Speaker: Councilor smith. Yes.

Speaker: I have a question. So how many sweeps are going to be done, period. Through the through this mayor's budget?

Speaker: Mr. Mayor, would you like to respond to this or would you like us to bring up somebody from your team?

Speaker: Actually, we have.

Speaker: We have data from the propublica report. If folks want to read that since 2021, the city of Portland has carried out 19,000 sweeps and it dismantled over 20 encampments per day in 2024.

Speaker: According to our own record, we have it here. It is the city's dashboard.

Speaker: Let's.

Speaker: So what I'm trying to figure out. So for fiscal year 2526, you're saying we have one last sweep and put that money that we would spend on a sweep into rent assistance.

Speaker: And eviction defense? Correct.

Speaker: And so how many are we expected to do this year in the data? Do you know dca oliveros okay.

Speaker: He doesn't run that bureau.

Speaker: So we're going to we're going to bring up our Portland solutions team and hopefully get some quick answers here so we can get to a vote.

Speaker: For the record, I'm.

Speaker: The.

Speaker: Manager.

Speaker: Of the impact reduction program. To the question specifically about what? One team is about, able is able to do about two removals a day, part part of the risk here that I see, like we would likely remove or cut a removal team, but it also impacts other services that we provide, such as ground school or glitter and other hygiene services. We have bathrooms around town that are coming off of arpa that are coming onto our budget. And so we have a several things that we'd have to take into consideration to figure out exactly where that code code would come from. One of the things right now, we're able to intervene very quickly once a camp has reached a certain threshold. And what that has done is it cuts down on costs. So the number of removals that we do in a given week is higher, and the cost of it is lower when we are unable to intervene right at that threshold. When things become problematic, the cost and the time and material starts to increase pretty significantly. So it turns into kind of a doom loop where things are getting bigger and bigger and bigger. It takes longer for us to clean, so we're less able to be in

more places at once to keep things at a, at a, at a level that's in line with what constituents want.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Thank you. Thank you skyler.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Okay I'm going to direct respond by this team's own planning. They were originally okay with cutting one sweeps team according to their 8% cut that everyone was asked to do. Our amendment does not state that they have to cut anything from glitter or ground score. Those would be decisions made by the agency that are not necessary. This is specifically to cut one sweeps team. And if we cut one team, that would be roughly 300 sweeps per year according to their own data. But again, if we want to talk about the exacerbated issues of homelessness and the impacts on our natural landscape and garbage and all of that, then we have to talk about people becoming unhoused in the first place, because our costs for doing sweeps, for doing cleanups, for everything is going to continue to go up unless we actually address keeping people housed. And this is just one. I am asking for the bare minimum here, people. The rest of the budget has extensive funding for shelters, and not that much else to keep people in long term housing. This is a very small ask.

Speaker: Councilor kanal I hate.

Speaker: I hate following councilor morillo on renter stuff says all the stuff I would say, but I think I do want to clarify. I don't think the impact reduction program as a whole is a negative thing. I want to just say that for the record, I know some of the folks there, and I don't want it to be a broad brush here, but one of the particular actions that is taken is at the direction not of their own choosing, but as the direction of this, this council in the past has been this particular course of moving

encampments around. I say that to say it's not about demonizing a program here. It's quite the opposite. It's we built a budget or they built a budget, I should say, based on the assumption that everybody had in the city of an 8% cut. And then there's an attempt to increase that. And this would be, well, it'll be increasing it and or recutting it. You can frame it however you want in this particular case, because it did get bounced up and down. But I think the conversation here is ultimately the very similar point to what was just said, which is that when an encampment is small, it costs less to remove than when it gets bigger. So intervening earlier is cheaper. Well, how about we go way before that, before the people become houseless in the first place. And we save the money up front and we make it so someone doesn't have to go through the trauma of being displaced in the first place, either from the home that they're in and by by working on the eviction prevention side. We can do that. Thanks.

Speaker: Councilor avalos.

Speaker: I agree with councilor morillo that this is a bare minimum ask and if we are investing literally so many more millions in this budget to supposedly help people get off the street through the shelters, then frankly, this should be a wash. So if we reduce this team by one and we are putting we're reducing it by 400, some thousand and we're putting millions and millions into shelters, then I would see that as a wash.

Speaker: Councilor morillo.

Speaker: Yeah. And I just wanted to add additional clarification that this is going to take us from 25 sweeps teams or, I'm sorry, 25 teams to 24 teams.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: My hand is in the queue. I have a question for either the mayor or folks from Portland solutions. I'm wondering if part of these teams I had a an

explanation to me about a group called the intense group. The folks that from Portland solutions will do more than just say, do you want housing? Goodbye. But we'll stay with people and with consent, get into their tent and help them and talk to them. And is that part of this work or is that separate?

Speaker: No.

Speaker: I'll refer to director skyler.

Speaker: Becker, director, Portland solutions. So I think what you're referring to can be encompassed in a couple different pieces of our program. So i'll try to say this quickly. The outreach team, our street services coordination center, does a lot of that engagement and outreach. We also have on staff for with our contractors, rapid response, a specialist to help connect folks to different resources so that exists in multiple pieces within the program. That specialist helps engage with folks who are interested in resources and to connect them to different potential resources, like shelter is the most obvious, but other resources as well. So that exists in different parts of what lucas hillier was saying before, is that that cut one team basically encompasses a lot of different programs, so we braid them together in a function. So trash pickup the encampment removal, but also the assessment program that happens kind of before that removal happens. So that cut would just be encompassed by doing less work just off the top of all of those different programs that are part of impact reduction program. So glitter ground score, central city concern, rapid response, city of roses, a lot of different contractors that braid into that work, if that makes sense.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor morillo.

Speaker: So my amendment cuts a campsite removal crew, 25 crews to 24 crews, and I'm happy to send a screenshot if that is helpful for everybody.

Speaker: Councilor may I ask? My understanding was it was restoring the 8% cut or is it more specific than that?

Speaker: Lucas seems like.

Speaker: He has.

Speaker: Yeah. Thank you again, Lucas.

Speaker: So it's from your own justification packet, by.

Speaker: The way. Thank you. The last year at the beginning of the fiscal year, we had \$3 million. I think it was 3 million or maybe \$2.5 million of carryover money. So at the beginning of last fiscal year, there were 25 crews. Four months ago, that one time money kind of started running out where our budget was running pretty hot. So we had already cut that down to 19 crews. And so we're going into next fiscal year with the assumption of going with the 19, possibly the 17, kind of depending on how how this vote turns out.

Speaker: So in the packet that you sent for this year's budget with the 8% cut, those were not the updated numbers.

Speaker: I believe that was several weeks ago. And we've since had to pare down based on the carryover running out. We had to put the proposed budget numbers together for the 8% cut probably two months ago.

Speaker: Departments put together proposed budgets back in November and December.

Speaker: I mean, that seems like a pretty big jump for the 8% cut that we're discussing right now. If those numbers were not updated.

Speaker: So it's a little confusing because we went into last fiscal year at \$21 million, and that included, I think it was three and a half or two and a half. Carryover carryover. And so. We built a budget at 8%. So we without without the

8%, we're already looking at 2 to \$3 million less going into this fiscal year as we were last year, if that makes sense.

Speaker: Yeah. So we're taking we don't have the carryover that we had last year. So the budget is going from like 21 million to about 16.6 is what we proposed in this year's upcoming budget. And then we also this would be an additional 8% cut. So you're seeing a reduction of crews from last year because we don't have that carryover. So that extra \$3 million. And then we also would be taking an 8% cut. So that's why the crew number is significantly lower.

Speaker: Councilor kanal.

Speaker: So. \$428,198 is the amount that this amendment refers to. And the total budget of the impact reduction program is \$16,671,013. In the mayor's proposed that that did take a small adjustment yesterday with the passage of the 2% ems cut.

Speaker: Correct.

Speaker: But I just want to understand, because this is not 8%, it's I just give you the exact thing. It's 2.56% is the 428. That's. So I think that to mr. Hillier's original question, that is it more specific than that? It is because it's clearly significantly less. It's just shy of a third of an 8% reduction to the overall budget. So I just want to clarify that because this is not an 8% reduction. And I think that the tailoring of that dollar amount to the specific use of a single team, one out of 17, 19, 25 doesn't particularly matter for this, but it's one team is I think, the conversation we're having here.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor kanal I always leave my math to you.

Speaker: Counselor Ryan.

Speaker: Go ahead. Okay.

Speaker: Thank you, madam vice president. I actually buy the Portland solutions team is up here. High sky. I wanted to connect what this amendment could do to

the coordination of Portland solutions. Working with the mayor's team, which are part of, of course, the overnight shelter plan. You got to you got to cut yesterday that we threw the green amendment of 2 million. And then here's an additional cut. What will be the impact of how you roll out these services? All of our constituent folks are going to get phone calls as we put these shelters in place. And you obviously do more than sweeping. So I just need to hear how that connects to this plan.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Thank you. And the mayor could answer I don't know.

Speaker: Yeah. Councilor mayor, would you like to respond?

Speaker: I didn't catch that question fully. So if you want to ask it again. But I do think we need to talk about just top line numbers. What was the fiscal year 25 number? If I recall, it was 21. We're budgeting 16 today with an additional 8%. It goes even further. So if we need the level set, which we should, what was 25.

Speaker: Yeah. So I think in terms of removals, you know Lucas mentioned this earlier, but I think we'll see a significant decrease in crews from this last fiscal year. So folks who are constituents are calling folks who are reporting we will just not be able to do as many removals in a day. We also that 2% across the board will impact, you know, our services. So again, our services are the outreach team, our alternative shelter sites, our overnight shelter sites. Now that we're developing with the mayor and then the public environment management office and their work as well. So it will just not enable us to give the same level of service that we've been providing to different constituents across the board.

Speaker: Councilor. Morillo.

Speaker: Yeah, so I appreciate the difficult choices that we have before us. And I think that's been the order of the day, is that there are a lot of tough choices, but

there is an incalculable loss that happens when someone loses their housing, because getting back into housing is one of the most difficult things that you could possibly do. And I was someone who was very lucky. People took me in and thought that I was worth investing in, and I wouldn't be sitting here on this dais today if it wasn't for my community stepping up and making sure that I had a house to live in. But without that, I don't know what would have happened to me. It's extremely hard when you're working minimum wage to save up enough money to pay for first and last month's rent and to get back into housing, especially if you're an immigrant, you don't know how to navigate these programs. What I am asking for is for our council to have some sort of political courage and vision for the future, about what it means for us to actually keep people housed so that we don't have to have more and more cleanup crews, and that instead we actually have housed neighbors. I get the feeling that I'm just sitting on my soapbox now, and I'm probably not going to change anyone's mind, so I'm happy to just, you know, move to a vote on this. But I do want to point out that we are asking this group to take a small fraction of the cut that every other bureau has had to take. As councilor kanal has pointed out. So this is really a very simple question to me. We are either going to invest in alternatives to sweeping human beings or not. That is the decision before us today. And whether or not we choose to keep people housed long term so that we don't have to keep sweeping them, that's the choice.

Speaker: People just hopped into the queue. Mayor wilson.

Speaker: Thank you for your patience. So page 103 of the proposed budget, the 25 number, the fiscal year 25 that is going into arp right this minute is 22,338,000. The proposed budget we have right now is 16,242,000. And so you're looking at a \$6 million cut from fiscal year 25 to fiscal year 26. In addition, the amendment passed yesterday with the ems, the external materials and services has cut an additional

2%, and that will be shouldered in Portland solutions, which will have an impact on the impact reduction program. An additional 8% is going to have an additional whatever that amount or cost is. So just wanted to talk about the numbers as we have it in the budget.

Speaker: So it's not 8%. I'm asking for \$428,198.

Speaker: Councilor kanal point of order. I'm just trying to understand, like I it was my impression that the ceo, the mayor, can speak when we ask questions. Are they able to just be in the queue and be a participating member of discussion?

Speaker: That's a great question for us to discuss. Maybe we can ask when council president returns.

Speaker: I just think it's important to establish what are the boundaries here, because this is the council and the mayor is not technically a part of it. So no disrespect, but it truly like this is a bigger picture question that I think we need to address.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor councilor kanal.

Speaker: Yeah, just I appreciate the point there. Mayor. I just to clarify and I think you might have missed it. It's 2.5% reduction, not eight. I think there was a little bit of back and forth there with the 482 figure. I'll also point out that back under its old name, which was the very easy to say, hucker, the housing and urban camping impact reduction program. The budget for was was 18 and 19 million. So it has spiked and then reduced. It's a little bit lower than it was before. I imagine there's some conversation there because there's some money that's gone into new parts of the assistant city administrator's overall portfolio and Portland solutions in general. So I think I don't know the exact details of that, but I think that's an important reference point. But I think the conversation around. The ems is, is partially because external materials and services, such a big part of your budget as

a percentage. And that's so it is fair to say that it is close to it's not just a 2% cut of a small subsection, it's close to a 2% cut of the whole thing, because there are a few folks, it's a it's a larger part of it. But I will also note that it was originally 492,000 \$490,000, not \$2 million. I don't know where that number came from. And then that number got reduced significantly as a result of the amendment to the amendment yesterday. So I think that this is a different conversation. And the numbers are, I think, inadvertently being inflated a little bit. I want to just bring that back down.

Speaker: Councilor kanal, if I may. I think part of the confusion around the percentage on the balance sheet that I'm looking at, it includes Oregon department of transportation revenue, which is \$2 million, which is not included in our 8% cut exercise. So our 8% cut exercise was just city resources and didn't include the odot. So if you add the Oregon department of transportation, \$2 million in there, that might get you closer to the 8 million. So just to speak to that discrepancy.

Speaker: Thank you. Thank you for clarifying.

Speaker: I'm good. Counselor smith.

Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, madam vice president. You know, I think we've gotten to the point where we're we're pitting the homeowners against the renters. And I can tell you in my community, they. Absolutely do not care for unsanctioned housing camps on our sidewalks. We had a town hall meeting at the middle school, at parkrose middle school. And one of the participants said, I really I really like what you're doing about the sidewalks, but I don't need you to put a sidewalk here. I said, why not? You don't have one. And she said, because I don't want people to camp on my sidewalk. And if I get sidewalks, I don't have any now. They don't camp. So we all have the same issue is that we want to make sure that we have humane policies that keep people from laying on the cement at night, unsheltered, unsafe, possibly hungry, houseless, and try to make sure that we can have opportunities for them to

be sheltered. And at the same time, we have another group of people where just regular working folks, they're being priced out of the city of Portland in terms of rent. So for me, it's not this or that. It has to be both in a way that's meaningful and we're not going to be able to do it all in this budget. We're going to have to figure out what are we, what's important. And I don't want to fight against that because as a homeowner and one of the 4 or 5 homeowners on here, 1010. I don't like it either. I don't like it either. Some folks, they chase my grandkids on the way to work in the morning on the way to school, catching the school bus, and I'm afraid for them. And they they do. They go from one side of the street to the other side of the street. They know the rules. But we do need to have people to help clean that up. And if we're reducing those as it's a it's okay to reduce that piece of it. I say take the money from the \$26 million that we're that we're sending over to Multnomah County. They have reneged on on everything that they promised us, take some of their money away from over there. And I'm with you.

Speaker: Councilor morillo. Are you proposing a friendly amendment?

Speaker: Yes, ma'am.

Speaker: Can I take a moment to think about it?

Speaker: Yep.

Speaker: Is to take some money from that 26 million that we're spending. It was 31 million, but now it's down to 26.

Speaker: I think it's actually \$24.8 million from fb that's going into the Multnomah County. It was a 5% reduction for across the board at fb. And then we reduced it again by 4.8 million.

Speaker: Okay. So sorry that that big check that we send over that's supposed to be used whichever from 31 to 24. But I know that the 24 was supposed to be for the mayor's shelter beds. So I'm getting confused on the numbers because it was

28 for so long and there was 31. Whatever that number is, I'd take that money from Multnomah County instead of taking it from from Portland solutions. Even though I don't like it, I don't like us not figuring out who our identity is, but I would be willing to support taking it from that money.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: I appreciate a negotiation, counselor. Smith. So. Okay, proposed amendment again, I think I'm fairly.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: I would if you would accept a friendly amendment that would take the 500,000 away from the money that we send to Multnomah County and put it into helping people stay in their homes from Portland housing bureau.

Speaker: And the money that goes to the county is doing what exactly?

Speaker: Right.

Speaker: Well, that's that's our iga. That is our iga. We're breaking the iga already anyway. That is our iga.

Speaker: Rent assistance.

Speaker: It mostly goes to congregate shelters.

Speaker: Councilor morillo are you considering whether this is a friendly amendment? I apologize, I missed the original.

Speaker: I am considering it because I specifically wanted sweeps to be removed in order to keep people housed. I didn't want to necessarily touch shelters or move funding that goes from county eviction defense to our. Own doesn't make.

Speaker: Any sense.

Speaker: We actually don't know where that money is going. We just send it over there and they do whatever they want to with it. So.

Speaker: We have some idea of what the money is actually used for. It sounds like there's a point of information counselor.

Speaker: To be a friendly amendment. Does the original maker of the motion alone have to agree to it, or does the second agree have to agree to it as well?

Speaker: Our practice has generally been to ask both.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: I'll save us all some time. I completely respect it, but I think we're opening a giant can of worms so I would not accept it as friendly.

Speaker: Okay, if.

Speaker: You accept this councilor morillo, you'll be looking for a new seconder.

Speaker: I don't really feel comfortable with it knowing that the county is using the money for other services. I would like to keep it in place. I understand I may not have the votes for this, so it's fine. We will have more unhoused people on our streets to sweep later.

Speaker: Councilor clerk can we go in the queue?

Speaker: I'd like to call the question.

Speaker: Sure.

Speaker: Second counselor just.

Speaker: Don't call. Quit.

Speaker: Just go. Just go.

Speaker: Vote on the vote.

Speaker: Exactly.

Speaker: We are prepared to vote council president. On on the amendment, as is.

Speaker: The.

Speaker: Underlying amendment.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Council councilor clark, your hand is not in the queue to discuss the underlying amendment. Councilor smith, your hand is not in the queue to discuss the underlying amendment. Okay. Councilor. Morillo. Sorry. Keelan, could you please call the roll on the initial amendment? Morillo 16.

Speaker: Canal I want to thank my fellow renter on this council for bringing this forward. 47% of us are renters, and we have one sixth of this council. And there's a reason for that. It's because of the precarity that you face when you're a renter. One of the biggest things we can do to end the precarity is have this council stand up to support you when you are in need of rent assistance or in need of eviction representation support. And so I would ask my colleagues who are not in the precarious position of being a renter to support those who are by supporting this amendment alongside me, I vote aye.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Koyama lane.

Speaker: Thank you for this work. Councilor morillo I entered this discussion intending to do what I did similarly with the home share pilot. However, I really do find myself being persuaded by the idea of an incremental reduction to this program and service to starting to get upstream on these issues. It's really important that until we start moving upstream in our investments, we're not going to make the kind of change we're all seeking. I want to acknowledge that councilor morillo is very generous in being vulnerable and sharing her personal experiences. I think she should be listened to more. I hope that mr. Mayor and council morillo can, that you will bring her in on some of these conversations, because I think her voice is really important. The first time I met her, there was an event where someone was unhoused and they were screaming and were very upset and no one

knew what to do. And she stood up and grabbed the mic and said, yeah, you're upset. You should be. We all should be. And she changed the whole the whole tone of the room. So I still support your plan and I am also voting yes on this amendment.

Speaker: Maria.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor.

Speaker: I novick.

Speaker: I don't think it's really relevant, but I'm a renter too. I just want to note that it's my understanding that in order to give rent assistance to everybody who really desperately needs it in the city would cost hundreds of millions, if not billions of dollars.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Clerk I think that we learned today that the impact reduction program also does trash pickup, ground score, bathroom cleaning and other activities that are going to be increasingly important as we site more homeless shelters in dense areas of the city. So I am voting no. Green.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Zimmerman.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Avalos. I dunphy. I smith.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney. The amendment fails with six yes votes and five no.

Speaker: Are there any other councilors who have a budget amendment related to housing and homelessness that they are bringing forward? If so, put your hand in the queue.

Speaker: Can i.

Speaker: A point of information and ask a question? And this is to robert taylor. At what point is it too late to change your vote?

Speaker: When once the roll call has been completed and the clerk has announced the result, it is too late to change your vote unless you have unanimous consent of the other members of council to.

Speaker: We can.

Speaker: Now move to the next section of administration. Is that what you have your hand up for, councilor zimmerman? Go ahead.

Speaker: Sir.

Speaker: So i, I put my hand up because I think we're moving to the other category, and that's where some notes were going to be discussed.

Speaker: So just any of the other things.

Speaker: We colleagues, I'm sorry that I've been running in and out. I had a family thing. It is now resolved. So we have discussed administration, economic development, revenue generating and transportation. At the previous meeting. There are a few things left in other, so we were going to see if any councilors needed to propose something now in the other category and then move to budget notes and give everybody a chance to move forward. Their priority. Hopefully we will have time if we move quickly for priority two budget notes, but we are scheduled to end at six, and while we have a little bit of wiggle room with staff, we are not running until ten or midnight tonight. So if you have an amendment in the other category that you have not had the opportunity to bring forward, now is the time. Councilor zimmerman. Is that why you are in the queue?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: I just have two quick ones. They are no, there one amendment. Excuse me. No change to the overall budget, but it's a directing in the parks, materials and services. I would amend to direct \$140,000 to continue the parks funding of the restroom at pioneer courthouse square.

Speaker: Councilor councilor. Is this in the other category? This sounds like it's in the parks category, and I'm sorry, I'm trying to keep us within what we said we were going to do.

Speaker: It is in any category you want it to be other doesn't mean you said earlier priorities in those. And our first you allowed an amendment to be read at the 1130. Our last time we had this meeting outside of the order. Councilor into the second category.

Speaker: We have other things that we do need to do, and we will have time for more amendments. In the other category I have listed that has not been discussed. I believe two amendments sounds like a parks amendment. We will have time for it, but I want to make sure there's nobody in the queue for the other category. Councilor dunphy, are you in the queue for anything in the other category?

Speaker: I would just firmly reject your.

Speaker: I'm sure everybody has had a concern about the order at some point. Councilor dunphy, are you in the queue for something in the other category?

Speaker: Yes, because mine is a technical adjustment. It's technically a transportation.

Speaker: Let's hold on. We will have time for more amendments if we move quickly.

Speaker: Folks mean to you.

Speaker: There is an other category on your list from the budget office. Many of those have not had an opportunity to move forward because they were not listed in

another category. And I want to make sure we give folks an opportunity. If they had something that didn't have another opportunity to move forward. I understand that we are short on time and everybody is worried about getting their priorities in. I hope that we all respect each other by moving quickly so that we can do that. Councilor avalos, do you have something in the other category as listed by our cbo office?

Speaker: I sure do, it's right at the top. Avalos five. All right, so. Avalos five is to fund critical recovery infrastructure in east Portland. So avalos five uses the 1.2 million in opioid settlement funds for mental health services grants. East Portland is on the front line of addiction crisis of the addiction crisis but underserved by resources for health, is one of Oregon's oldest, largest and most respected nonprofit treatment centers providing treatment for substance use disorders and co-occurring mental health disorders. And for our health is building 46 new residential treatment beds on the same campus as their treatment clinics. As I shared earlier, this allows people in recovery to live in longer term residential beds instead of shelters. These one time funds are a great investment and use of the opioid settlement dollars, and we have confirmed that it's allowed under the uses. I've also confirmed directly in the hours since the last discussion we had about this directly with poorer health, that they do, in fact need this money. The county is not covering the gap, and even though their original need was 1.5 and I was only able to scrape by, scrape 1.2 together. I spoke with devarshi this afternoon and he told me that combined with the sdc waiver and this 1.2, he will be able to completely close the gap and get this building open. So I urgently request that we put these dollars into the capital that they need immediately. We can get these 46 beds open, and that will help our overall problem. And I think it will accomplish a lot of the councilor's goals. So do I have a second I guess second.

Speaker: Councilor green, are you in the queue to discuss this amendment? That is a very good point. Thank you. Councilor canal, are you in the queue to discuss this amendment? Councilor zimmerman, are you in the queue to discuss this amendment?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Go right ahead.

Speaker: Multnomah County is fully put \$6 million into this. This is their line of business. This is not our line of business. Many of you asked those questions and I appreciated it. So I followed up with the county commission that they have \$6 million in the county budget for this. For health also has the ability to bill for their services. We are bailing out an organization who is already getting bailed out from another government. When we have the need for a sobering center. I don't love that these have been pitted against each other. But sobering, sobering center is part of the city's book of business. It should remain there. And if we are looking at whether or not for is going to develop, they are going to develop whether or not all the funding streams come together to keep a sobering center in the works is still a question mark. If the city walks away. So I appreciate the these are these are in conflict, right? That's a tough part. But i, I think that supporting the county's effort to open up a sobering center is a better use of these dollars. And I think that they the county has requested that we continue our commitment here. And they do that while funding for a with their \$6 million. So I hope for some of you who indicated that you would bring back the sobering question, that you will do so that we can allocate these funds to the sobering center. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor. I'm next in the queue. Colleagues, I was also going to speak to the fact that we need some of these funds for the sobering center. I changed my vote to no so that I could bring that back. I'm really not sure how to put

a finer point on the fact that while there has been a lot of conversation over the last few weeks about whether we are already breaking the iga with the county or whether they are already breaking it with us, and what our commitments are and who should be giving whom money. And we will talk about that more if we get to budget notes. This is money that was committed previously and under a new mayor. That mayor gets to make his own decisions about what to do. But it is money that our partners in this work because like them or not, at times they are our partners in this work. They are our partners in the work of supporting Portlanders. And folks in Multnomah County are depending on us having dollars available, and if we want any ability to pressure them to do the work of the sobering center more quickly. We can't pull those dollars off the table. Councilor I would love to learn more about this work and how we can support the housing element of it, but I cannot support taking all of these dollars when we need to return to the conversation about money for a sobering center. Councilor smith.

Speaker: Yes, madam president, thank you for your comments. A couple things. Councilor zimmerman said that Multnomah County will probably put out an rfp, and then people can they can apply for it. So it's no guarantee that they're going to get the money. Number two, this money is going to sit in contingency for a whole year. And because I don't have a straight answer on how much opioid money we get every year, we can allocate dollars next year when they actually need it because they said they're not going to need it until 27. So why are we holding on to some money? That's only going to be a one time only request when we can help an organization put some beds in district one and do that this fiscal year, and then next fiscal year, we'll put some money to the side because they're not going to use it.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor kanal I'm not in the queue for this okay.

Speaker: Alright.

Speaker: Is there any other discussion on this amendment?

Speaker: I'll just put a finer point on it that again, we spoke. Councilor dunphy and I spoke with devarshi directly, and he is not getting the dollars that he was promised. There's all this complication with dollars, but the county is not providing them this. And what councilor smith is saying, it is not guaranteed. So I'm not interested in putting this further in the balance. We have the money right now. It will go directly to putting new beds in. And for all the reasons that councilor smith and councilor dunphy and i, we need this for district one. And so I would urge you to support this.

Speaker: Councilor clark.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I would just say that this is really a slippery slope when it comes to our as councilor smith likes to say, our book of business, because this is really a mental health issue that belongs at Multnomah County. I don't think we should be taking over another function or be involved in another function when we're already stretched in our joint office relationship. So I'm going to vote no.

Speaker: But a sobering center is not the I don't can you.

Speaker: Enumerate you're not in the queue right now, councilor. Colleagues, is there any other discussion? Councilor zimmerman.

Speaker: I know that. I know that we're heated. I'm heated. It shouldn't have to be that way. And to councilor murillo's point, like we're at the point of it where everything is going to suck to make a decision. Right? And I and I hear that and I feel that I also have generally had a good relationship with fora health. Right. I think they provide an important service, but they provide a current service that exists. They are looking to expand and it's important, but it will do nothing. It will do

nothing. It will do nothing for anybody. If we walk outside and encounter a person who is in crisis today, it's not they are not opening a sobering center. And so I'm not trying to question the validity of treatment beds. Anybody who knows my record, anybody who's worked with me at the county, knows that I have worked as much as I could to get more treatment. Beds have said so for the state, for the county. But there is a gap in our community, a huge gap. And that gap is treatment. Beds are important when a person is ready for treatment, but we have a lot of Portlanders who are not ready for the detox and treatment continuum, but we have them every day and every night in very unsafe situations. A sobering center is, and it is supposed to be just a band-aid. And I know we don't like to talk about the downstream thing, but in this case, the downstream is a roaring river of nothingness for people who are too intoxicated to take care of themselves. And this community, again, is one of the largest communities without respect for the need for that service to exist, for a health, their long term treatment beds, their inpatient treatment beds, potentially future detox is an admirable thing. If there is a route for that in the future. I think the county and the state are helping them, but they are a large nonprofit. I don't know that they need the hand up in this case, but to get a sobering center off the ground that is run by Multnomah County and in partnership with the city or the state, we must help. So I would just urge you to please consider that before we say we're going to continue to have no option between the street and when people are ready for treatment, these are very different things sobering treatment and detox. Thank you.

Speaker: I believe we are on councilor morillo.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. There is a treatment center in Oregon that turns away, at least according to the data from last year, 200 people a month who are begging to get into treatment because we don't have enough long-term

treatment beds. So when we talk about needing sobering versus long term treatment, all the things we do need all of them. But the reality is that we have failed to invest in our long term treatment. For the past 30 years, councilor avalos has done the legwork and has worked on this for weeks, if not months to get all of the information to put this together. And you have brought forward an amendment that wasn't even submitted online.

Speaker: So it's been in the works for years. And you know that.

Speaker: I think that I'm really excited to support councilor avalos amendment, because the reality is that we need long term treatment beds. It's not going to be enough to continue to put a band-aid on every single issue facing us at the city, and I feel prepared to vote whenever we're ready if we want to move along.

Speaker: Councilor.

Speaker: Councilor Ryan.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. In 2020 and September, the former mayor put me at the table with the county, and I was in every meeting with commissioner myron trying to wake up the county that they actually have a responsibility to provide mental health and behavioral health services. I'm so thrilled that they're making headway on this, and that they're going to actually put that investment in to for our health. And so in terms of finding your lane and your roles and responsibilities, that's absolutely perfect. What I also learned during that process is how many people were angry that the sobering station was center was closed, I think in 2019. And we're finally making headway on something. The fact that our market doesn't have a sobering station is ridiculous, and our first responders need somewhere to take people where in that acute condition. Also, at a sobering station where you have medical response, where they could observe the horrible, tough withdrawal process is exactly the way that you have a moment in time where

someone might say yes to treatment. So all of these things are connected. Know your lane, know your role. I will be rejecting this amendment, and I'm thrilled that we're going to be part of helping the county get the sobering station up and running. Thanks.

Speaker: Councilor smith.

Speaker: Yes, madam president, I think we can do both. I need a clarity on how much money from the city administrator. How much money do we get every year in the opioid settlement? How much should we be expecting in fiscal year 2526?

Speaker: I think ruth has a estimate. And just just I know that year to year it varies. So yeah, there's a projection for.

Speaker: So I know that we're expecting 1.02 million to be available next year. Sorry I'm just looking for the right piece of paper. Here we go. After the current. Allocations and the expected additional revenue and the amount available this year, the actual amount we receive each year fluctuates. I think we're expecting about one. Sorry. Okay. Thank you. We're expecting 1.5 million a year each year for the next seven years. But the number we have available for next year is 1.02 million.

Speaker: So someone told me it was 15 years and we were getting more than 1 million. But the settlement money. And we were getting more than 1 million a year because mayor wilson is getting money for the opioid beds. That doesn't sound quite right. There was more money that we get in for this. Well, at any rate, what I'm saying is we only need this for fiscal year 2526. The county is not going to need the money until 27. We can do both. I'll put a budget note in that says that we are looking for the opioid money to be used for 25, for 26, 27, but right now we have an immediate need. That is a one time only need the I think the monies that are going to bybee lakes is that ongoing, mr. Mayor?

Speaker: No, I believe so. I'll turn to okay.

Speaker: No, it's not okay.

Speaker: So we still have other opportunities. So that would tell me that we get more than 1 million a year from the opioid settlement because he's he has money, he has a million that he's taking. And then there's another million. It's more than 1 million.

Speaker: Yeah. That that includes some of the accumulated amounts.

Speaker: So that were unused.

Speaker: So correct.

Speaker: Yeah. Okay. I really think the sobering center is an important tool for us to have. I agree with it. I think we should support it. But I think this time for this fiscal year, we need to go ahead and support councilor avalos amendment because they won't be able to. It doesn't make sense. I'm a parent. If you're not going to use a resource, you don't try to take it away when you can use it for your kids right now. So I will be supporting this. Thank you.

Speaker: Counselor. We don't use a resource if we can't use it right now, but we also have partners and we are showing them through our budget what kind of partners we want to be. And this is money that they have told us they were depending on. It is money that we have in the past put on the table. It is money that if we don't put on the table, affects how they see us as partners. And I think we need to take seriously how we are partnering, especially with folks who we have very complicated relationships with.

Speaker: Well, the first stab at it, madam president, was for the mayor, and the mayor didn't put it in his budget.

Speaker: He did not. That's right. I am frustrated by that. And I have shared that with the mayor, and I was looking for a way to add it back in, and was grateful to our colleague for finding a source. Councilor kanal.

Speaker: I mean, that conversation a moment ago was part of what I intended to ask about and to understand. I have not talked to the mayor about this particular thing because the motion, the proposal about the sobering center was not on my radar. I only knew about the for health conversation. I think that's notable. We've already talked about that. Mayor, could you speak if you're willing, and I understand if you're not to speak to why this how we ended up in a situation where the county might expect money from us, as the council president put it, but it was not in your proposal.

Speaker: Mr. Mayor. Go right ahead if you'd like.

Speaker: Thank you, counselor. Thank you, council president. It started in February and I alluded to it earlier when we were trueing up our budgets for the deficits. County had noted that the 38 million that we expected on the iga to come to Portland wasn't going to be paid there, struggling as Portland was. They offered 10 million at that time. We had the sobering center funding in a bucket. It was earmarked for ongoing operational funding. After speaking with commissioner edwards and chair, I did acknowledge that that liability was in fact and needed to be paid. However, it was for operating expenses ongoing, so I noted it was for future periods when you had the sobering center open. And we had been talking back and forth since that period of time. So there was no easy decisions on this one. So I understand council president's frustrations. We were as well. There's and I've shared that frustration with all 12 of you multiple times as we tried to true up our budget. We have a significant gap. So did county. We're all frustrated. But that was essentially the debits and the credits of the discussion. Do we have an ongoing. Yes

and next budget? We have to really add that in to. But that would be the fy 27 budget. And they're expecting to have it open in 27. I felt that that would be appropriate. But this discussion is a good discussion to have right now.

Speaker: Thank you. Counselor.

Speaker: Seeing no one else in the queue, Keelan could you please call the roll on avalos five, which is funding from the opioid settlement fund to for a health canal.

Speaker: Ask for an indulgence from the clerk. When this is over, please count to five before you say the final vote count. Because I might change it. I'm really, really conflicted on this. And I think the most compelling argument I've heard is from councilor smith about the fiscal year element of it. So I want to first say that I strongly, strongly support having a sobering center. I cannot understate how often this comes up in, in the public safety context. And it is a public safety component. But my understanding being that it needs to be something that we've committed to for the next fiscal year is a very important and compelling argument in deciding between two things, because my understanding is that the need for health is a one time need, and that allows us to do both. So I will vote i.

Speaker: Ryan. Know koyama lane.

Speaker: Thank you so much to my colleague, councilor avalos for the work you've done, I vote aye.

Speaker: Maria. I.

Speaker: Novick know clark.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Green or.

Speaker: Zimmerman. No avalos. I dunphy. I smith. I pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: The amendment is approved with seven yes votes and five no votes.

Speaker: Colleagues. Anything else from the other category? Seeing no one in councilor kanal. Are you in the queue for the other category?

Speaker: Yes, I am okay.

Speaker: What do you have?

Speaker: I move canal 18 and I'm going to make one small adjustment to one word in there. Based on some other things we talked about here. So. This would i'll just say as we go, the changes from bureau of planning and sustainability to Portland bureau of emergency management. That is the change as you see it here. So this this would instruct the city leadership and city administrator and the mayor to restore funding at the office of equity and human rights for two analyst one positions and one analyst two positions. These are three rank and file union represented workers, as well as add a represented position at the bureau. The Portland bureau of emergency management, to plan for the critical energy infrastructure hub at a total cost of \$600,000. In general fund resources, it would. You can see the bullet points here. Reduces salary adjustment policy. Set aside general fund contingency by 600,000. It increases general fund bureau operating expenses in the office of equity and human rights by 450,000, and increases general fund bureau operating expenses in the Portland bureau of emergency management by \$150,000. Increases position authority at over by three position authority at pbem by one, and updates attachments a through h to reflect this change. And just to give the brief speaking to it. And we can answer questions as well. This is a revised version of canal oh one, which was voted on on may 21st and tied six six and failed. As a result of that, I've received feedback from multiple colleagues who voted no on it and tried to incorporate that into this revised, revised version. The first thing on the funding side, instead of putting a pool of seven deputy director positions into the hands of the mayor and city administrator, it

would put only six. It would exempt the city budget office deputy director position from that list. These are general fund funded bureaus and exempting all public safety bureaus, as well as the city budget office. And then on the other side of it, the spending side, it would fund the critical energy infrastructure hub planning position that we've talked about a lot at the pbem. I should note that councilor clark has brought this up multiple times that we need to we need somebody at the bureau of planning and sustainability, which was part of the amendment last night. This is the other half of that. This is at the pbem side of it. And so this would check that box meet that need. And also I will just say I'm going to call it's canal 18 officially, but I'm going to call it the robin hood amendment. This is the only amendment of the 126 that addresses management bloat at the city, and moves money from management to rank and file workers. That's for a second. There were ones that did the half of it on the on the management side. I want to credit councilor zimmerman for that.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: And. Councilors, we have a motion made. Is there a second?

Speaker: Second?

Speaker: Councilor dunphy, are you in the queue to speak to this amendment?

Speaker: I am, yes, go right ahead.

Speaker: Councilor kanal, I would like to offer to see if you'd be amenable to an amendment that my team has been trying to work on, which would. Change the ongoing amounts. Sorry, I'm trying to read a red line version of this. Sorry. Come back to me. I need a second.

Speaker: Councilors. Is there any other discussion on canal 18? Councilor clark.

Speaker: Okay, this is like one more time around. Would you mind listing each of those items one more time? Briefly, please. Thank you.

Speaker: So there are seven sorry, six deputy director positions that would go into a pool. They would not all go away. I want to first start by that, the same way that we've had the. The 20% reduction. And we're actualizing 9.5% of it over the course of the year. This would give a pool of total compensation of \$1.8 million to the to the administration, and ask them to reduce that cost by 600,000. So it's actually less aggressive than what we're doing to equity, community engagement, etc. I'll list off those six bureaus in a second if anyone's interested, but I will first start on the other side. It would restore three positions at the office of equity and human rights. One is one of four of the ada team that's being laid off. One is one of two of the lgbtq two s plus team at the office of equity and human rights, and the third is the only person in oer and frankly, citywide, who does racial equity, plans out and works with all the bureaus. It would also add a fourth position to the Portland bureau of emergency management, which is to do cei hub planning specifically that that could flex if there's a, you know, if that's 38 hours a week, they can do other things. And the other two, but the primary function would be cei hub planning. That's critical energy infrastructure. Thanks, councilor.

Speaker: I'm looking at canal 18. Did you drop the bureau of planning and sustainability?

Speaker: Yes, I was, I did and replaced it with pbem. Based on my understanding of the fact that that your initial ask was for one in each and we did get the one yesterday.

Speaker: Thank you for that clarification.

Speaker: Councilor dunphy, are you ready for us to come back to you or should I buy you more time?

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: I can just answer the other part of the question, then that's okay.

Speaker: Go ahead.

Speaker: So the positions, the bureaus that we're talking about here are parks and recreation, bureau of human resources, office of government relations, Portland housing bureau, bureau of planning and sustainability, office of equity and human rights, and the city budget office. These are the seven that were in the original city budget office is now dropped from that list. So there's six remaining. Again, these are not reductions. All six of them would not. It's not. We're laying off six people here. That's not what's happening. It's looking at this pool of people and giving the mayor and administrator two tools with which to reduce that total compensation by \$600,000 over the course of the year. One tool could be reduction of positions. At least one of these is vacant for sure, and the other is reclassifications. And this is in line with the budget note which we adopted on May 21st, which is, I want to say oh two, but I will verify that that talks about reducing sorry, oh eight, which is to reduce the deputy director classification across the city altogether. In recognition of the fact that we added a layer of management with the dcas and never started the process of reducing deputy directors, we already adopted that budget. Note.

Speaker: Counselors, I'm next in the queue. I'm a big fan of reducing management, but after the last amendment where we did generalized sweeping cuts without understanding the impacts, I had colleagues come up to me and express remorse. I had colleagues come up to me and say they had heard from leaders who they respect, that the consequences of our vote were not what they thought it would be. I have had colleagues come up to me and say, we'll need to figure out how to restore funding for x service area, because the cuts there are actually worse than we thought. Colleagues, I want to do many of the changes that many of you are bringing forward, including this one, and we have to understand the consequences of our votes. And I wish that in the first five months we had been here, we had had

the will to do the accountability work in our policy committees to dig deep enough to understand the consequences of our votes. But I don't hold a gavel chairing a policy committee, so I didn't get to make that happen. So I have yet another amendment before me asking me to do something that certainly aligns with my values, to fund things that certainly align with my values, and it feels downright irresponsible, because when we did this yesterday, we did things that we did not understand the consequences of. And I would like us to act more responsibly in the very short amount of time that we have left today. As much as I support the values here and the things that it buys, I have to be a no. Councilor Zimmerman.

Speaker: Thanks. I was hoping we could get a response from the city administrator regarding these changes that are being outlined, and your impression and reaction to these classification changes. Thank you.

Speaker: Thanks for the question. Without, you know, analysis of each bureau and looking at them, i, I appreciate, I guess, the flexibility to look at all of them as a pool and try to figure out how best to accumulate the savings that the amendment asks for. Each of these bureaus is unique in how they're structured, and how the management has evolved over time. It's appropriate to take a look at classes of employees. I'd like to be able to do it system wide. I think the previous budget note asked for that, and I appreciate the intent of looking at management across the entire organization, just as any cut in the general fund, especially when public safety is eliminated from the review, it gets very challenging. So we once again are going to go after the rest of the general fund and not look at public safety, where a huge amount of the money lies and a huge amount of the money also lies in our homeless services. And I appreciate the attempt to look at, look at this from a management perspective. But we have now constrained the review to a fairly small group of bureaus relative to the whole city. And so I appreciate trying to accumulate

savings in the general fund to be able to reallocate that money to other purposes. I appreciate that, and we'll take a look at it. It's hard to predict the impact in each individual bureau right now, but the smaller ones, particularly because their management is thin. Perhaps reclassifying them is the appropriate thing to do. I will tell you that. What hr will tell me is that not only do you get to look at these things on a bureau by bureau basis, and what's the issue within the bureau, but you must also do an equity analysis of these positions across the entire city. And so it's a little more complicated than just looking at what is six positions in the city and trying to reevaluate their spans of control and et-cetera and how they relate within their bureau. You have to look horizontally across the city to check on equity. So it's a little complicated to give you an answer right now about what the outcome will be, but i, I obviously clearly understand the intent.

Speaker: Councilor kanal.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I think the comparison to the amendment we talked about yesterday is a little bit interesting because this was scored going back before, I think may 17th, 19th, sorry, the Monday prior to our approval and we got this. The only thing that's changed is where the position's going in one of these cases to what bureau, because of an amendment that passed that made half of the need that was going to be addressed here moot. And so we shifted to funding the other half of the need and pbem this has been scored for a while and nearly a month now, and I just wanted to make a comment about consequences, because I think, I think there's two parts of the consequences here that I think we haven't talked about yet, which is the consequences of doing nothing, consequences of not doing this is that we have, again, one of the four people who does ada work, the Americans with disabilities act, work at the office of equity and human rights will lose their job. One of the two people who works on lgbtqia to. Plus folks will lose

their job. And the only person who works on the racial equity planning for the whole city of bureau by bureau in the office of equity and human rights will lose their job to. But also we will be sending a message because these these budgets do send messages. And I think it's not fair to us as a council and not fair to the to the city as a whole. But it's also true that the messages that we send are not just interpreted in light of what we do, but in light of what's happening at the federal level. I think it's very important to consider the message that we would be sending by choosing willingly to take on a consequence of laying off people who work on lgbtqia to, plus work and racial equity. Right now, I think that's a viable question to ask. And it's important thing to wonder what the message we would send there that's a consequence that we should talk about. And, you know, given that this one's been filed for 21 days at this point, 20, 21 days since we first talked about a version of this that was very similar but slightly adjusted and refiled it, I think it's appropriate to say that we've had time to sit with the concept, and if people oppose it, that's, of course, a choice that we all have the right to make individually. And in closing, I'd just say, you know, if Portland is a union town and if this is a worker friendly council, then I think we should look at what message it sends as well to put three union represented jobs to, to close them out and to not add a fourth, and instead to protect non-represented managers when we've already talked about over the course of this entire book. And if you go through the entire budget, you'll see that the cuts to management were not nearly as steep as the cuts to union represented workers. And this helps to start the process of moving that back into balance.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor seeing no one else in the queue. Keelan can you please call the roll on canal 18. Canal.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: I know.

Speaker: Koyama lane I really appreciate you councilor kanal I am worried about the unintended consequences and I have to vote no.

Speaker: Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick I incorporate by reference everything the council president said a bit ago about responsibility.

Speaker: No clerk.

Speaker: Well, I'm sorry if this throws a monkey wrench into our plans to address classifications across the enterprise or whatever else we were going to be doing in the next year, and I appreciate the president's frustration. I hear that loud and clear. But if the federal administration is going to cut fema and they're threatening doing that, then this position on the cei hub in pbem is very, very important to me that we plan for disasters, that we have an adequate plan in place, whether it's this disaster or another disaster. So I'm voting I grain.

Speaker: I just want to echo the fact that every single choice, even the choice of do nothing, has unintended consequences. I.

Speaker: Zimmermann know. Avalos no.

Speaker: Dunphy. I.

Speaker: Smith. No. Pirtle-guiney no.

Speaker: The amendment fails with five yes votes and seven no votes.

Speaker: Councilors. That clears out the other category. So we are scheduled to be done at six. I have been told that staff can stay a little bit later so that we can get a few more things done. So what we are going to do is move into budget notes and give everybody a chance to do their top priority budget. Note my goal is in 60 minutes, one hour to do two rounds. One of budget notes and one where if folks

have a priority amendment or budget note, you can bring a second thing forward of your choice. That is virtually impossible to do in 60 minutes with all of us talking. So I am hoping that we can hold our fire, except where there are things that must be asked or said. We will then take a 15 minute break in order to figure out balance, and then we will come back and we will have 30 to 45 minutes to do what we need to do to get things back in balance and wrap up. That should put us wrapping up around 730. I appreciate staff to whom we said we would end at six, but who are willing to stay a little bit later. Thank you. Zimmerman, are you in the queue to bring forward a budget note?

Speaker: Yes, ma'am.

Speaker: Go right ahead.

Speaker: I want to start just with a compliment. Madam president, this is not an easy show to wrangle. So what you just laid out is a plan that works. So I appreciate that deeply. Colleagues, I am going to introduce this budget note and. I think it should be easy for us to pass. I would never ask you not to comment on it, but I hope we don't spend a lot of time. Budget note the city attorney will conduct a deep analysis and make every effort to invite alignment of the analysis across the league of Oregon cities. The Oregon attorney general, the district attorneys association. If those associations or offices are willing regarding the siting and operations of ice centers within the city of within the city or other Oregon cities, and the implications and application of Portland and Oregon's sanctuary laws in order to provide renewed guidance to the City Council, all city officials, and to provide the basis for the city of Portland to ensure all city officials, all city employees, have firm, foundational, and legally sound understanding when and if resisting federal overreach and or refusing to provide assistance to the federal government for actions deemed illegal inside the state of Oregon. Given the ongoing threats of legal

action by the federal government against city and state officials for simply following their local and state laws, this analysis should serve as a shared guiding report for other neighboring jurisdictions. In an effort to provide united and coherent understanding across multiple jurisdictions in Oregon. Given this rapidly emerging need of legal opinions and actions, this note should be delivered in the most appropriate manner deemed by the city attorney and mayor for city officials to receive legal guidance and strategy, and while balancing the needs of any partnering office and participating association. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Counselor angelecia.

Speaker: Did you? Yeah.

Speaker: I'd like to second counselors.

Speaker: I know folks are in the queue to put forward budget notes, but I'm going to run through to see if there's any discussion. Councilor dunphy, are you in the queue to discuss? Councilor avalos, are you in the queue to discuss?

Speaker: I was just if you could just drop me that language real quick. It's hard to process a lot of texts in my brain. I need to see it. Thanks.

Speaker: Councilor green, are you in the queue to discuss councilor Ryan, are you in the queue? Councilor novick?

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Councilor clark.

Speaker: Yes? Could you just read the first two sentences?

Speaker: The city attorney will conduct a deep analysis and make every effort to invite alignment of the analysis across the league of Oregon cities. The Oregon attorney general and the district attorney's association. If those groups are willing. Regarding the siting and operations of ice centers within the city or Oregon cities,

and the implication and application of Portland and Oregon sanctuary laws in order to provide renewed guidance to all of us. And I colleagues, I am very clear eyed that we could never compel some of those that I listed. That was an invitation to them to participate in that analysis, because I think a united approach is appropriate.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor. I had does the clerk have this language?

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Councilor would you mind sending it to the clerk? Thank you. And probably to our budget office as well. Okay. Councilor novick, are you in the queue for discussion?

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Okay. Colleagues seeing no one in the queue for discussion. Keelan, could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: We're going to talk about a lot of notes. I'm going to be deferential unless I have a reason not to be going forward on all of these. So although I'm a little, you know, processing this live, I'm going to vote I on it.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: Similar to my colleague who just spoke, i.

Speaker: Koyama lane councilor zimmerman. I'm usually so frustrated when you surprise me with stuff and it just happens on the dais and we haven't had a conversation. And this is a really lovely surprise to have from you. Thank you. I vote yea.

Speaker: Morillo.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor.

Speaker: Zimmerman, i.

Speaker: Vote aye.

Speaker: Novick i.

Speaker: Aye green.

Speaker: Hi.

Speaker: Zimmerman.

Speaker: Hi,

Speaker: Avalos.

Speaker: Thank you i.

Speaker: Dunphy. I smith. I pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: Necessary budget note necessary direction for where we are and enthusiastic i.

Speaker: Amendment is approved with 12 yes votes.

Speaker: Councilor dunphy, are you in the queue with the budget now?

Speaker: Yes, please.

Speaker: Ma'am. Colleagues, as quickly as I can get through this. Dunphy. Ten motion to an attachment d and add a budget note to measure east Portland services and ensure equitable distribution of pbot and parks discretionary funds. This, as previously described, is updated language since we last talked, but also is specifically an attempt to hold east Portland harmless and discretionary decisions as made in this budget process. Happy to read the text if folks want it, but it is available.

Speaker: Counselors.

Speaker: Is there a second?

Speaker: Second?

Speaker: Thank you, councilor avalos. Counselor zimmerman, are you in the queue for discussion? Councilor avalos. Counselor. Green. Counselor. Ryan

councilor novick. Counselor. Seeing no discussion. Keelan could you please call the roll.

Speaker: Canal I koyama lane i.

Speaker: Maria.

Speaker: I novick i. Clark. I. Green i. Zimmerman i. Avalos i. Dunphy i. Smith i. Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: Amendment is approved with 12 yes votes.

Speaker: Councilor avalos do you have a budget note to move forward. Please go ahead.

Speaker: It is going to be. Eight. This is the one that is requesting for in preparation to the fy 2627 budget. So not the one that we're currently funding to ask to direct the mayor to set aside 15% in a health benefit increase. Health care costs are rising faster than wages. And I'm very worried about our city employees continuing to shoulder that burden. This is about retaining quality employees. Good benefits help us compete as a city for a talented workforce. And I just want us to be proactive in planning to prevent further cuts. And as we discussed, talked with the lawyers and everybody. And they suggest it should be a note because it is a guidance for the next budget process to just make sure we're setting aside enough money to protect from deeper cuts.

Speaker: Thank you. Counselor, is there a second?

Speaker: Second?

Speaker: Thank you counselor. Counselor green, do you have are you in session? Counselor Ryan I do have a question. I apologize for taking the time, but I am wondering, and I see that we're missing our budget director right now. But perhaps somebody else in the office or debris can help. Do we have a rough estimate of the

scale of the difference between 8% and 15%, and the split between general fund and other funds?

Speaker: Council president I don't have that. I've just reached out to the budget office, folks and including director levine to see if they can get that very quickly.

Speaker: I'm hoping to understand in supporting this what that means for how we begin our budget next time around. Councilor novick did you have discussion on this budget note councilor canal. Counselor clark okay. Dca is that something you think you'll have within the next 2 to 3 minutes or probably not.

Speaker: If you can give me just a minute.

Speaker: Okay. Do others need that information before we vote, or am I the only one holding us up here? No earlier in the queue than me. Who would like that information also?

Speaker: Sorry, council president, I've got the number. Thank you. Aaron. So it would be at the 15%. Around 8.7 million general fund. And. Sorry aaron is that. And go ahead.

Speaker: Business operations division manager.

Speaker: So we're estimating.

Speaker: That it would be.

Speaker: About \$22 million total. The citywide.

Speaker: City core portion, general general fund would be about 8.7.

Speaker: And if we did the traditional I believe it's 8%, what would the numbers be?

Speaker: It would.

Speaker: Be about.

Speaker: Just looking.

Speaker: At the calculations here. Would be about half of that.

Speaker: Right. Okay.

Speaker: So we are talking about starting out next year's budget with just over 4 million less in general fund for other things, and just over 11 million less in total funds, so about 7 million less in other funds for whatever other expenditures we were starting the year with. Is that correct?

Speaker: That's correct. That's what we have in the budget right now for the beginning balance.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor koyama lane, are you in the queue to discuss this amendment? Okay. Councilors. Seeing no one else in the queue. Keelan could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Just to clarify, this is on avalos eight.

Speaker: Avalos eight. Yes.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Canal that as well.

Speaker: Sorry i. Ryan i. Koyama lane I morillo. Yeah.

Speaker: She's out of.

Speaker: The room.

Speaker: Sorry.

Speaker: Novick nay.

Speaker: Clark. No green. I zimmerman.

Speaker: Also out of the room.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Avalos i. Dunphy i. Smith i. Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: The amendment is approved with eight yes votes, two no votes and two absent.

Speaker: Councilor green, are you in the queue with a budget note? Go right ahead.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I have two budget notes. One is short, one is a little bit longer, and coauthored with councilor. Morillo is your preference that we just do one? And then if there's time, we go around again.

Speaker: If there if it's a package, go ahead. Otherwise let's do one. I'm trying to give everybody a turn here.

Speaker: It's not a package. So i'll just do the one that's not coauthored. It's green 12. The budget note says motion to amend attachment d and add a budget note for anti-displacement task force colleagues. This is a note to provide some direction to the community and economic development service area as follows. Explore funding opportunities within the next six months for the next steps for the anti-displacement action plan, starting with the cost to establish a community led task force to monitor and guide anti-displacement strategies in our economic development and housing work. The task force to focus on housing in its first year. I motivate this because while I am not on the housing committee, my book of business as I've come to appreciate that term, councilor smith is very much housing and this is a no cost obligation. And I think it's worth reaffirming our commitment to anti-displacement.

Speaker: Second, thanks.

Speaker: Councilor Ryan, are you in the queue for discussion?

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Councilor. Novick. No. Canal clark koyama lane smith.

Speaker: No, it's for something else.

Speaker: Seeing no one in the queue for discussion. Keelan could you please call the roll?

Speaker: I'm sorry I missed the second.

Speaker: I second it.

Speaker: I believe it was councilor kanal. Thank you.

Speaker: I Ryan.

Speaker: Councilor. Can I come back?

Speaker: I don't believe we can do that. But you can change your vote at the end if you need to. You can also look at my computer. If you're looking for this note.

Speaker: There's no budget issues here. It's a budget note.

Speaker: It is a budget note.

Speaker: All right i.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Morillo novick.

Speaker: I, i. Green a.

Speaker: Zimmerman avalos.

Speaker: I, i.

Speaker: Smith i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: The amendment is approved with ten yes votes and two absent.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor councilor. Ryan, do you have a budget note.

Speaker: I do fantastic. I read this into the record during one of those work sessions that were kind of a budget session he was last week, and as a big advocate to improve services to Portlanders, especially in parks, since that's where we play. And I like to think out of the box and discover better practices that would be applicable for Portland. Embracing a proven partnership, especially when they have created a better program just across the river in Vancouver, usa. I pay attention. As such, my budget note number five supports the Portland tennis program and

directs that a meeting with leaders and stakeholders occur to discuss the possibility of partnering with the united states tennis association for investments into the Portland tennis program. Usta has started and has stated a willingness to fund capital improvements to the tennis program and city courts, as well as take on more programming. As you know, we have over \$600 million deficit when it comes to our deferred maintenance. This expanded partnership could make great sense for the city, but we won't know unless the city gives a real consideration to this proposal. The budget note will ensure that we explore this opportunity. This may seem like a small step, and yet it forces our culture to take pragmatic steps to pursue when facing our financial challenges we face today, in the foreseeable future. So the budget note that was submitted. Do I read that?

Speaker: Or you could just direct us to it?

Speaker: Yeah, it's in the book because it was read last week.

Speaker: And it's Ryan five. Is that correct?

Speaker: It is budget note five okay. Basically the long and short is that after September 30th, 2025 meeting occurs, and before November 15th, the cfo will present a report to the City Council regarding their financial assessment findings and recommendations on how to proceed with this partnership.

Speaker: Is there a second.

Speaker: Second, second councilor koyama lane.

Speaker: You had people race for it?

Speaker: I've been on.

Speaker: The winning side.

Speaker: Too much.

Speaker: So councilor novick are you in the queue for discussion?

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Councilor canal.

Speaker: I just have a question.

Speaker: It's I yeah. So I'm generally very supportive of doing due diligence. I think we've we've had this conversation a lot. I just wanted to the findings on recommendations of how to proceed with this partnership. And I just I think it's important to just daylight and potentially get clarification that we're not committed in any way to proceeding with expanding this partnership. We're just getting information on how we would we would do that if we chose to. Is that accurate?

Speaker: That's accurate. I've learned enough to know that it helps to do a budget note, to get the culture to actually think out of the box a little bit and actually embrace partnerships. And as we move forward with parks, they have to actually look to this type of culture change. So I think it's a step in the right direction.

Speaker: I think so too. Thanks.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor clarke.

Speaker: Councilor koyama lane, councilor smith.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Keelan seeing nobody else in the queue, could you please call the roll on Ryan five.

Speaker: Canal i. Ryan i. Koyama lane i.

Speaker: Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick I clark.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: For partnerships. Yes.

Speaker: Green councilor Ryan, you're a sports guy. I think that's on the record.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: I hope to see a budget note in the future that looks at pickleball in the waterfront park. I vote i.

Speaker: Thanks for.

Speaker: The skate park.

Speaker: Zimmerman.

Speaker: Avalos i. Dunphy i.

Speaker: Smith i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: The amendment is approved with 11 yes votes and one absent.

Speaker: Look at that.

Speaker: Councilors. I am next in the queue. While I have a lot of budget notes that I pre filed that I would love to move, I am doing a courtesy for my first slot instead. Pirtle-guiney 17 is a budget. Note that I have been talking to the mayor's office about. We learned recently that there are amendments at the county to remove their \$10 million payment to the city that helps to fund our fund, our tax and save shelters. This is a budget note, which would simply say that if the county decreases their payment to the city, the city would decrease our payment through the iga to the county by a subsequent amount. Not. I want to be very, very clear not to try to pick a fight, not to try to break the iga. Not because the partnership does not matter, because all of those things are very important to me, but because we need to make our budget whole and fund our tax and save shelters, which we are fully funding in our budget. And we would be holding back those dollars specifically in order to make those programs whole. I did give the county a heads up that we would be considering this budget note, because the partnership does matter to me, and I think that leaning in is more important than leaning out. But I also think that if we are going to pass a budget with a commitment to shelter, we ought to make

sure that we can fund that commitment to shelter. And the county passes their budget tomorrow, and we pass our amendments today. So I was not able to wait and see what they did with their budget. So I am bringing this first as a courtesy for the work that I've been doing with the mayor.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor dunphy. Councilor green, are you in the queue to discuss this?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Go ahead.

Speaker: I think this is a I think this is necessary. It is a little bit. It squares up in a way that I think can be a little threatening, but I think unless you put something firm in place, there's no commitment that the commitment stays in place. I think it's a reasonable approach to that, so I'm prepared to support it.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor novick, are you in the queue for discussion to this budget?

Speaker: Note no. Councilor kanal, no. Councilor clark.

Speaker: Could you just spell out for the record the sega?

Speaker: Yes, the homeless response system, iga intergovernmental agreement? Thank you to my colleagues for the right. I don't know why I just blinked when put on the spot.

Speaker: It's been a lot of hours. So many acronyms. Yeah.

Speaker: Councilor clark, any other comments?

Speaker: No, I just I think is this offense is the best defense essentially.

Speaker: Councilor koyama lane are you in the queue for this? Councilor smith?

Speaker: Madam president, thank you. And you see why I didn't want to give them that other money? I told you I don't give it to them. I think this is important. And we

have to have folks who are grown ups in the room who understand that it's important and it's critical to keep your word. And I will be voting yes, yes, yes for this when it comes up for a vote. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor. Councilor. Seeing no other discussion in the queue, Keelan, could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president, for bringing this forward and for your leadership on this. This is something I want to just add my voice to yours and saying, we're not trying to pick a fight here and look forward to collaborating with our friends and partners at the county.

Speaker: Good work, i.

Speaker: Koyama lane i. Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick i.

Speaker: Clark.

Speaker: I. Green. I.

Speaker: Zimmerman. I avalos. I dunphy. I smith. I pirtle-guiney. I the amendment is approved with 12 yes votes.

Speaker: Thank you colleagues councilor novick.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I move novick two motion to add a budget note to amend amendment d and add a budget note the directs the bureau of human resources to begin bargaining with relevant labor units, with the goal of reassigning welfare checks from armed police officers to armed responders like public safety support specialists and Portland street response. Portland street response always already does some of this work. So the key thing would be getting public safety support specialists authorized to do it as well. Bhr and the public safety service area are to provide updates to council every four months on the

progress of negotiations and progress towards the transfer of work. I'd also like to take this opportunity to note that, sadly, brian wilson just died. I hope that wherever he is, he's sending us good vibrations over the next hour and a half because god knows we need them.

Speaker: Councilor is there a second?

Speaker: Second?

Speaker: Thank you, councilor dunphy, councilor, councilor green, I think your hand is just perpetually up. Councilor kanal are you in the queue to discuss this? Councilor clark.

Speaker: I have a question. So this this is advisory.

Speaker: It's not.

Speaker: Force of law. It's asking them to consider this.

Speaker: It directs bhr to begin bargaining with relevant labor units. And it's asked them to provide updates on the progress of negotiations and progress towards the transfer of work. I've discussed this with the chief. I've discussed this with dca bob cozzie. The mayor actually wrote us a wrote us an email saying that he wants to get armed responders out of the job of welfare checks. So I think that this proposal is not something the executive opposes.

Speaker: Thank you for that.

Speaker: This morning. Okay.

Speaker: Councilor koyama lane, are you in the queue for discussion, councilor smith?

Speaker: No, I'm in the queue for.

Speaker: Councilor morillo.

Speaker: No, I'm just raising my hand for other stuff.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Seeing no one else in the queue. Keelan, could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: Hi, Ryan.

Speaker: I koyama lane hi.

Speaker: Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick i.

Speaker: Clark. I green.

Speaker: I zimmerman. Stepped out.

Speaker: Avalos councilor novick. You're a real one for this I appreciate this.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: I smith.

Speaker: I. Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: The amendment is approved with 11 yes votes and one absent.

Speaker: Okay. Councilor canal, I believe you are next.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I would like to move to together that are linked canal 12 and 13. These are studying potential future sources of revenue for the city to get information that could later be used for policy development budget to study long term vacancy fees on both the commercial and residential side, as well as to study a package delivery fee. And it would report back at the time of the city administrator's recommendations for next year, which come out at the end of February, with concepts and structures that could be used to either inform potential policy changes or provide the data necessary for the rationale. We would need to give the public for why we're not pursuing them. Thank you.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Councilor green, are you in the queue for discussion, councilor clark?

Speaker: Councilor canal. Is this enough time?

Speaker: I think looking at previous budget notes, we've seen it. I mean, our we have an entire social housing plan coming in a year. So I think this is a narrower set of things to request information on and for it to be informing us in the and not just informing us. What I tried to avoid with this choice of the date was that I want the mayor to be a part of receiving that information too, and ideally to be able to evaluate that information as he develops his budget based not only on the city administrator's recommendations on February 28th, but also this information.

Speaker: Koyama lane councilor smith, councilor morillo councilor Ryan.

Speaker: Yeah, I do.

Speaker: Are you combining commercial and residential?

Speaker: As of right now? They are they are they're combined. It's two different parts of the city doing it, but they're in the same budget.

Speaker: No okay. Because to me they're very different okay. So i'll have to weigh if I'm supporting it.

Speaker: Would you.

Speaker: You'd be welcome to move to divide it for a separate vote if you'd like.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: I would support the commercial one, but not the residential. I have not met. I've asked so many people who build and do residential, and no one has told me they want that. They they don't want to rent out a unit. Commercial is different. It's more nuanced.

Speaker: I if.

Speaker: You'd like to make the motion, I wouldn't object at all.

Speaker: I motion that we decouple the two and we have one vote for residential and one for commercial. Do I have a second?

Speaker: Is there a second?

Speaker: Second?

Speaker: If you're if the request is to divide the two, divide the question to vote separately. Any member can do that as a matter of right. So you don't have to vote on the motion to divide it. You can just request it. Yeah, you can request it. And then councilor kanal can decide which one to vote on first.

Speaker: Councilor kanal what are we voting on first.

Speaker: Commercial first. Okay.

Speaker: Councilors, I'm in the queue to speak to this. I hear regularly, frankly, in district from folks who would like us to consider vacancy fees. And I agree with the question that councilor clark asked which which is that? I don't think that this is enough time. I think that to come up with a plan to do something like this, to decide if we want to do something like this, requires significant stakeholder engagement to get it right. And to say that we are going to study something and then decide if we're going to do it seven months from now without time to do stakeholder work, we could decide if we wanted to put together a stakeholder group in seven months, but I don't think we can do the work that's necessary to get something like this right. And this is the type of thing that can go very wrong if you don't get it right. I would like for us to have this conversation, but I cannot support the budget. Note with the timeline that's laid out here.

Speaker: December 28th.

Speaker: Councilor canal are you back in the queue?

Speaker: Yes, ma'am. I just want to clarify that this would not do any fee creation on any side of it. It would simply get us models back. I think the model that I would look at for this is some of the conversations we had around the social housing study, where we're getting the stakeholder engagement part is going to be parallel

and continuing after that. And I would welcome a conversation after we receive some information back from the administrative side about, is it something that we're ready to do? Because it may not be next fiscal year either. And I think that's an appropriate thing. That's not just do we do something or do we not? It's also how and also maybe we do it, but not in that exact time frame. So thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor Keelan seeing no one else in the queue, councilor green.

Speaker: You would be excused for not knowing whether I'm up or not. Thank you. I support the timeline. I don't think that what I'm seeing is an expectation that we deliver a final like this is what the tax is or the fee is. I should say it's a study. And studies are oftentimes constrained by timelines. It's pretty routine for a scholar to receive a call for papers for a conference and write a paper inside of eight months and present their findings, and the findings may be incomplete. And that's okay. That's that itself is a result. I, I also hear from constituents that there's just no appetite to study and study and study for a very long period of time. So people want us to move fast. I'm prepared to support this is the this is the commercial one, right?

Speaker: Point of order. I think we're discussing them all together. And then voting on them separately.

Speaker: Is we're.

Speaker: Discussing altogether, and then we'll take three votes.

Speaker: I'm comfortable with the timeline. That's it for me at this at this point.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor Keelan. Seeing no one else in the queue for discussion, could you please call the vote on the first half of divided canal 12, which would specifically create a budget note to study long term commercial?

Speaker: Yes. It's actually the second paragraph of motion 12.

Speaker: Vacancy fees. Great. The second paragraph of canal 12 to study long term commercial vacancy fees.

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: Yeah. Thank you everyone. I vote aye Ryan.

Speaker: Yeah, I've been in numerous conversations, especially out in saint john's and another part of the district where this has come up. So I would I'm curious. I vote yea.

Speaker: Koyama lane i. Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick wait a minute. This is the residential one. No, it's the commercial one.

Speaker: Commercial.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Mark. I just want to clarify that I'm curious, but if we were to do anything with this report, it would take a lot more work. Just to be clear, and I think we were talking about advisory councils or whatever it is, but just a preliminary look, see at this is okay. So I vote yes.

Speaker: Green a zimmerman.

Speaker: I share my colleague to my rights comments about alexi. Similar to my support for councilor green's social housing. I think information is helpful. This I don't see action here, so I'm going to vote i.

Speaker: I don't.

Speaker: I'm going to repeat my call for help from the public. Related to this. I was on an episode of city cast Portland talking about this. We've obviously got a problem, but what are some solutions that folks in the community are also looking for? So while the city is working on this, I would love to talk to property owners who also see a problem and are looking for a solution, so I vote i.

Speaker: Smith.

Speaker: I pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: I said I was going to vote no. I hear from colleagues who are saying that they don't think that this is about next year's budget. My saying I would vote no was in response to my colleague who brought this, saying he wanted it back in time for next year's budget, which made me very uncomfortable with the timing. I do want to see the conversation move forward that councilor dunphy has called for many times. I'm going to take a risk and hope that we don't rush this process and say, i.

Speaker: Motion carries with 12 yes votes.

Speaker: Councilors. Does anyone else in the queue for discussion of the second part of canal 12 motion to add a budget note to study long term residential vacancy fees?

Speaker: Yeah, I have.

Speaker: A question.

Speaker: Thanks. I am trying to understand what a residential vacancy in the sense is. Are we talking about units that have been registered with the city already as rental units, or are we talking? I don't think anybody's lived in that that house on my street for a while. That's what I'm trying to understand here.

Speaker: No, it's for units that have been registered. Yes. Okay.

Speaker: Registered residential units that don't see. Okay. Thank you for that I appreciate it. I'm feeling less supportive of this given the mom and pop aspect of that. And that's what most houses are. So i'll just leave it there in case there's helpful comments at all.

Speaker: Does anybody else in the queue for discussion?

Speaker: Can I just ask a question. So this doesn't involve airbnb does it or does it.

Speaker: It's written not to involve that. I think there's a broader conversation that that I think the housing and homelessness committee should have. And I look forward to hearing from my colleagues on it as to that aspect of it. I think this is structurally developing what a model would look like to inform. I think if we were to discuss what types of units it would apply to beyond what the sort of base level of what I just answered councilor zimmerman's question on that would be after receiving this information, and hopefully the Portland housing bureau could give us the details necessary to talk about that side. But I think this should ideally be informed by the housing and homelessness committee.

Speaker: Okay. I would just say what I said before is that I'm interested in information, but this is a lot more complex, and I don't think there's time for it to inform a budget decision. I think there has to be more process involved in the community. But I'll give you the vote, but with caution.

Speaker: Councilor seeing no one else in the queue for discussion. Keelan can you please call the roll on the second part of canal 12, which is a study of the long term of long term residential vacancy fees?

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: Thank you colleagues for the thoughtful conversation here. I put it in this order because I think I like to eat my appetizer before I get to the main course. And for me, this is the main course. As a renter, I think it's really important that we look into this and understand what we can do. I also just want to quickly respond to the question and say, just to clarify, I picked the date so that it could theoretically maybe be part of the conversation, not so that it has to be a part of the conversation for next year's budget. And I think that's an important clarification. I appreciate the concern. I vote i.

Speaker: Ryan supply, supply, supply. The city of austin, texas, which we are compared to quite often, is actually experiencing rents going down because they've been building for some time. We need to build Portland. I don't see this as being any sort of a solution to the problem. I vote no.

Speaker: I maria.

Speaker: I of course.

Speaker: Novick i. Mark.

Speaker: I green.

Speaker: I, I think the study is going to show that there's probably not a great impact to a vacancy fee on the residential side. That's just me as an economist with this I but if that's also true, then there shouldn't be a huge financial impact to the owners of the buildings. And so I don't see this as a, as an issue and mutually exclusive with a pro supply, social housing driven approach. So I vote I zimmerman.

Speaker: Thanks. As I'm hearing folks comments, I'm realizing that this still includes the commercialized residential properties, but it would also include single family resident properties. I can't change that. Now that we're in the vote, I'm going to vote no. Thank you.

Speaker: Avalos i.

Speaker: Similar last time we've identified a problem. This is a different problem than the commercial problem. This is less about livability and more about the need for homes. So if anybody in the community has solutions I am very interested. And also airbnb should absolutely be included. I vote yes.

Speaker: I pirtle-guiney. I motion carries with ten yes votes and two no votes.

Speaker: Councilors.

Speaker: Is there any discussion on canal 13?

Speaker: Thank you, thank you.

Speaker: All 13 was read as well.

Speaker: I'll enter the queue just because I want people to have a chance to process it before they have to vote. Colleagues, we've talked about this briefly in a budget work session, but colorado and minnesota have statewide delivery fees. We've studied it in the state. This is for last mile deliveries. So not the wholesale side of things. And it's in some cases it exempts prepared food. I have chosen to say it would exempt prepared food before even look at it. And to look at per delivery fee concepts, structures and legalities. Because there were some open questions on legality and to how to ensure that it would minimize the impacts of such a fee if one were to exist on on vulnerable consumers. So there's a two paragraph. It crosses a page line. Just there's page 28, the beginning of page 29, just so you can know that for sure. And again, it's pursuing another potential source of revenue that we should know more about before we rule it in or out. And also just quickly note this does not affect any of the rest of the like. It doesn't affect rideshare, for example. It doesn't and it wouldn't affect doordash, uber eats, any of that sort of stuff as well. Thanks.

Speaker: Colleagues. Is there any other discussion on this budget note?

Speaker: I have a question, counselor. Do we know if there is a preemption or not?

Speaker: The report that I read on it is actually fairly unclear. It says that we could do it in a certain way that would. It was written very much in terms of the model would dictate that. So not in an absolute sense, yes, or an absolute sense no. And I think that's why it's important to get more information and not have I think a couple people up here are lawyers. I am not, and I would love to have our attorneys look into it as part of this process. So we could have official legal advice on the process as well.

Speaker: Counselors, is there any other discussion to this budget? Note?

Counselor smith.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I would like to go over this in a finer detail in the labor and workforce committee so that we can discuss some of the issues that you want to talk about before we this is a budget note. It's not revenue related, but let's talk about this. And labor and workforce.

Speaker: Can I just make a clarification. So i.

Speaker: Think our.

Speaker: I think our assumption has been that when we talk about going back to before we had committees, and when we talk about reporting back to council, that that report back can also include deep committee conversation. So my understanding, for example, as it relates to reporting back on the implementation of the councilor novick note that we just passed is that the community and public safety committee will be the primary place where we're hearing that information. I think I'd be perfectly fine if this one were to come to either labor and workforce development or arts and economy. I would leave that up to I don't know who, but not. I'm fine being deferential to colleagues on that.

Speaker: If we need to do a resolution or ordinance, we're better suited to do it from that jump than just, you know, leaving it up to the administrators to look at these budgets and figure out how to how to complete all of them.

Speaker: I agree, I think if we get to the point of making a concrete action that that would make sense. This is not that concrete action. This is simply a study.

Speaker: Counselors. Is there any other discussion on this budget note? Seeing none Keelan can you please call the roll on canal 13 to study a package delivery fee?

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: Hi,

Speaker: Ryan. No koyama lane. I morillo. I novick. I clark colleagues.

Speaker: I've been a long time advocate for local government against preemption, any kind of preemption of our revenue, raising authorities of any kind. So I'm very interested in whether we are preempted, but I don't know that I'm interested in a delivery fee, but I'm certainly interested in getting that information because I think increasingly we're going to need to look at all of our revenue raising options. So I just want to be clear about that, that I appreciate the preemption study. I vote yea.

Speaker: Green. Zimmerman.

Speaker: Yeah, I think I'm going to shock you in my support of this, actually, because I think I would support anything to get people back in stores and not just buying from their couch scrolling and anti-socialism. So I will support any move to get people back into the human interactions. Pro-social is good. Let's see what they have to say. Yes. Not that kind of socialism.

Speaker: You do. Not yet. Not yet.

Speaker: It's a double negative.

Speaker: We're at councilor. Avalos.

Speaker: It's fine.

Speaker: I dunphy. I smith.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Any i.

Speaker: The motion carries with 11 yes votes and one no vote.

Speaker: Councilor zimmerman I look forward to sharing with you why parents often shop from their phones in between meetings, instead of trying to do it when they get home from work and have kids to feed.

Speaker: I'm just as guilty without the excuse of children i.

Speaker: I believe we are on councilor clark.

Speaker: Great.

Speaker: Snuck up on me. This is clark 12. It's a very simple budget note I worked with dca oliveira on this. As you know, we have a bit of history with the keller auditorium, and I'm sorry it came up the other day in our discussion, but the last council left us with a study, a feasibility study, and with two options. And what this budget does is it says that once the feasibility study done and the transportation transportation study is done at psu, that they would stand up a team to develop a financial plan to look at really phasing in the finance plan for the keller auditorium, and that they would present us to that as that report in April of 2026.

Speaker: Second. Councilors, is there any.

Speaker: Councilors is there any discussion on this budget note? Seeing none Keelan could you please call the roll canal.

Speaker: Apologize. I'm just finishing reading the last sentence here. I thought there'd be some conversation. I vote aye, thank.

Speaker: You Ryan.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor clark. It is on our general ledger. I vote aye.

Speaker: Koyama lane i. Morillo i. Novick i.

Speaker: Clark. I green.

Speaker: Always going to support an asset management legend.

Speaker: I zimmerman.

Speaker: He's not behind the post.

Speaker: Thanks, avalos i.

Speaker: Dunphy i. Smith I pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: I the motion carries with 11 yes votes and one absent.

Speaker: Thank you councilor koyama lane. Do you have a budget note?

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I have a package koyama lane three, five and six. I'd like to note that three is an amendment I we did we have spoken about it. I do see these as a package. For the sake of time. I am happy to talk about these three. But we can also separate them and I can move the amendment later if you'd like. I do feel that they all are related.

Speaker: I'll second this.

Speaker: Councilor kanal are you seconding all three?

Speaker: I'll second whatever portion that you allow to be considered together here.

Speaker: This is three, five and six.

Speaker: That's correct.

Speaker: If we can do this quickly, let's do it. But we do have two more people who haven't had a chance to go.

Speaker: So.

Speaker: Understood. If it gets long, feel free to. We can divide this. All right. Thank you, colleagues, for your engagement on the important issue of vision zero. We've gotten the chance to discuss all three of these at a recent budget work session. Also, many related questions and discussion came up when a related resolution recommitting to our city's work on vision zero passed unanimously in the transportation infrastructure committee and is now co-sponsored by everyone who was on that committee. Vision zero states no person should die or be incapacitated from simply going about their day. Protecting human lives is core to vision zero, the goal to eliminate traffic deaths and serious injuries on Portland streets. So we're at the ten year anniversary now of the first adoption of vision zero here in Portland. And we're seeing a horrifying and unacceptable 57% increase in traffic deaths on our streets in the past decade. In 2024, 58 people were killed in our districts in

traffic crashes. So I bring forward these three. The vision amendment koyama lane three pulls the vision lead, vision zero lead position up to the dca level in public works. The hope of this is to increase cross bureau responsibility towards vision zero by elevating the work out of pbot exclusively, and also aims to emphasize the evidence based importance of making vision zero work across bureau. And I want to note that some questions came up when I visited. I also visited the community and public safety committee. Thank you for inviting me to talk about vision zero. And some different questions came up. And so the vision zero lead in the city answered some of these questions in a packet that you have in front of you. And there were also questions about some of the data. So when we look at the data for 2019 to 2023, the breakdown of fatal crashes show that the majority of people that are killed are in vehicles. It's 43%, 38% are pedestrians, 16% motorcyclists, 4% bicyclists. And we don't have to go deeply into this unless folks would like to ask. But this question was brought up by councilor zimmerman. And so we did look into it that 30, 38% of those crashes of where a person was killed and they were walking for those in 57% of those, the vehicle did not have the right of way. And for all serious injury crashes involving pedestrians. So it wasn't fatal. But there was a serious injury 75% of the time. The vehicle did not have the right of way. So in many cases when the pedestrian did not have the right of way, excessive speed or impaired driving were the key causal factors, causal factors in the crash. And we can break down the data further here or another time. And so just wanted to provide a cursory analysis which shows that most of the most pedestrians killed and injured are really simply going about their lives. And if you look in the packet, you'll see a bit more about the safe systems approach, which recognize that no one individual cause of fatal and serious crashes. There is no one. We must build a system with layers of many redundant supports so that if one fails, there are others

to keep a crash from becoming fatal. I would appreciate your support with this and I'm happy to take any questions.

Speaker: Councilors.

Speaker: We had a second to these right councilor kanal all of them. Okay.

Councilors, is there any discussion of this package? I have a number of folks. So let's go in the let's go in the order that we're in here. Councilor green, did you have okay, councilor smith, did you have a question?

Speaker: Yes, I did, I just wanted to make a note. We've we've been doing this for ten years. Correct. And it it appears that the crashes are increasing and I'm not sure. And I support vision zero, but I'm not sure how effective they've been in eliminating crashes. It's they're getting worse. And as I was looking through your three budget notes and your amendment, it looks like you have to identify funding where you're going to take funding funds from. Specifically, is it the mayor's budget somewhere? Is there a place where you think that you can get the 200? There's 218 twice, 216 twice. So I'm not clear where you're going to get the money from. And I know we had it in the treasurer, in the transportation committee, and it was well received. And we're pulling and I'm pulling for vision zero. But in terms of identifying the appropriate funding or mandating pbob to do funding on something that has not been effective is kind of troubling.

Speaker: May I respond, madam president?

Speaker: Go ahead.

Speaker: Thank you for bringing that up, councilor smith there, this is the 216 is from moving the position. So this does not change our budget, okay. It's from just moving the position from within pbob to now out into still in public works, but in the dca's office.

Speaker: So was it funded in the budget or you're trying.

Speaker: To already funded.

Speaker: Okay. So you move it from which department to which.

Speaker: From within pbob to now up above within dca, the dca for public works within their office. So they have closer access to work with that dca to do more cross bureau work does not change the budget.

Speaker: If I'm looking at that service area in the dca in that service area is dca, dana powell, and I think her expertise is in water. If I were you, I would keep it at the pbob level to talk to someone who is ingrained in this and who has expertise. I hear you staying close to the power. You think you're staying close to the money, but you need to stay close to the people who know how to do the work and who have done the work from a transportation level. Not to say that she has not. She understands that she has a 30,000 foot look in an eye, in an ear for everything. But I think it's not necessary.

Speaker: Would you could we bring up. Williams?

Speaker: We have other folks who need to move through here.

Speaker: I'm sorry. That's okay.

Speaker: I mean, I see both of them are here. Director williams and dca donna are both here.

Speaker: But we are.

Speaker: Primarily working on budget notes right now. And I said that the council could bring this amendment if this was going to be quick altogether. But we have two colleagues, yourself included, councilor, who still need to bring a budget note. And I was hoping we could get to two weeks. So I'm going to try to keep us moving.

Speaker: Okay. I think this requires further conversation.

Speaker: Councilor morillo did you have a question or a comment here? Councilor novick no. Councilor clark.

Speaker: Yes I do. I share some of the same concerns that have been expressed by councilor smith. My understanding was that director williams was actually going to bring together all the folks that touched this area, because there's no question that we all support vision zero, and the committee supports it wholeheartedly. And I'm glad to hear this is not other money that we're moving somewhere, but I'm just concerned for the same reason. I'm sorry. I really wish we could hear from dca dot people about this. I assume that you have talked to her about this, and what kind of feedback did you get? Councilor koyama lane.

Speaker: Sure.

Speaker: I'm going to table the amendment for now. I would love to talk about it more.

Speaker: Okay. All right. Okay, i.

Speaker: Need.

Speaker: I need.

Speaker: I need to it's okay. We'll talk about it. For the two budget notes. It has been brought to my attention that odot does not share race and ethnicity in their data that pbob and the county have been pushing for that. And so I believe it's important in koyama lane five to add after by race and ethnicity in parentheses when available, and then in koyama lane six, I'd like to move the date from September 1st, 2025 to January 15th, 2026. Those are the two changes. It's all been in collaboration with the deputy city administrator, with bringing in the director of pbob, bringing in the vision lead, vision zero lead. And I know that a lot has been going on. We have talked we did vote on a task force that is in addition to this, to that still is going to happen, which would be led by the vision zero lead.

Speaker: Councilor novick, are you in the queue to discuss this?

Speaker: Yes, i.

Speaker: Forgot, I actually have one question for councilor koyama lane, which is under koyama lane five. It says identify revenue that ensures pbot can meet its critical needs and continue its work in the vision zero action plan. That's critical. Bureau needs are, you know, billions of dollars worth. So I was wondering if you could just strike the can meet it's critical bureau needs and just leave it as identified revenue that ensures pbot can continue its work in the vision zero action plan.

Speaker: Absolutely. I'm having deja vu that this came up and just add the word you wanted to. I'll accept your friendly.

Speaker: Yeah. I was. Just going to strike the words meet. It's critical bureau needs and.

Speaker: I accept that friendly amendment.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor kanal. Did I hear you say you're good?

Speaker: Yes. Okay.

Speaker: Councilors. Is there anybody else with any discussion on these budget notes? Seeing none. Keelan, could you please call the roll on koyama lane five?

Speaker: Canal. I Ryan,

Speaker: I. Koyama lane I hi.

Speaker: Novick I clark.

Speaker: Thank you councilor koyama lane for being the constant champion for vision zero I vote i.

Speaker: I zimmerman.

Speaker: No. Avalos.

Speaker: And also thank you for your collaboration with our city bureaus. You continue to show that it's queen behavior i.

Speaker: Dunphy. I.

Speaker: Smith I support vision zero but I have some concerns and I did sign off on that and i'll be supportive, but i, I don't think I can vote for this right now. No.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney. I motion carries with ten yes votes and two no votes.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilors, is there any additional discussion on koyama lane six? Seeing none Keelan, could you please call the roll on koyama lane six?

Speaker: May I first check with the budget office to make sure that you have the language that you needed for this. The changes.

Speaker: You.

Speaker: Need a refresher. Or make sure we got all the details. Thank you.

Speaker: Okay, counselor, could you please read the updated language motion.

Speaker: So this is in complement with what the resolution that we passed which recommits our pledge to vision zero and also calls for a task force. So this was in response to chair clark of the transportation infrastructure committee, who said if there will be needed support for this, such as an administrative, some administrative support, which is what was identified, that you would actually have a budget note and explain that. And so that's what this is it what I had heard from the dcas is that would not be a problem. There could be a vacancy easily used to help with any administrative work to help bring this group together. So it is adding motion to add a budget note to support vision zero programing, motion to amend attachment d and add a budget note regarding pbots vision zero program as follows June 9th, 2025.

Speaker: I believe.

Speaker: That's just a note on the document.

Speaker: Where am i? Okay.

Speaker: It's weird.

Speaker: Weird copy paste thing.

Speaker: We're on here. I've got it right here, if that's helpful.

Speaker: Direct public work service area, public safety service area, and community and economic development service area to collaborate collaboratively. Create a funding and staffing plan for the administration work of a vision zero task force slash vision zero citywide team, and report back to the council by September 1st, 2025.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: And then. I'm striking the September 1st, 2025. That is what's on there. And I'm changing it to January 15th, 2026.

Speaker: Okay, so the change here is the date at the end to January 15th, 2026.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Fantastic. Okay. Keelan, could you please call the roll.

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: This is koyama lane six. Correct?

Speaker: Correct.

Speaker: Amended I vote aye.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: Hi, koyama lane. Hi. Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick i.

Speaker: Clark. I green.

Speaker: Hi.

Speaker: Zimmerman.

Speaker: No. Avalos I smith.

Speaker: I was looking at this and it says create a funding and staffing plan for the administration. So staffing ing to me means more than one. And like I said earlier, I wanted to see some more information before we approve this budget. Note it

doesn't mandate that we do a particular amount, but I'd like to see some more information first and be able to talk to the dca and to the director. So I'm going to say no.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: Motion carries with ten yes votes and two no votes.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Colleagues, we're going to try to get through two more in five minutes. Councilor smith, do you have a budget note?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Go right ahead.

Speaker: I have smith 13 budget note from councilor smith to disclose executive contracts. And as you all know, we have a new form of government. And this new form of government does not require the mayor or the city administrator to get our approval to approve contracts. So in the interest of promoting fiscal transparency and ensuring responsible governance, I propose the adoption of a requirement that mandates the mayor and the city administrator to disclose all contracts, agreements or commitments exceeding \$50,000 during the City Council meeting prior to execution. This measure is intended to provide the City Council with clear and timely insight into the liabilities and fiscal obligations that the mayor has entered on on behalf of the city of Portland, within the 2526 budget year. Requiring such disclosures will facilitate enhanced oversight, support informed decision making, and uphold the public trust by ensuring accountability for substantial financial commitments.

Speaker: Thank you. Council councilor. Councilors. Is there any discussion on this budget note?

Speaker: What was the number?

Speaker: Sorry, the number 13.

Speaker: It's not on there. It's 13. It's a new one. I talk to you all about it last week, but it was not put into the book.

Speaker: I believe at that time you had said it might end up being smith. 11 was what I had written down. It is not smith 11 that is different. But if folks had notes about the discussion, that's what it would have been listed on. It's now smith 13 second. Councilors. Is there any discussion about this budget note?

Speaker: Madam president, I'm sorry I didn't I didn't know if anyone was going to say anything.

Speaker: Let me get council discussion and I will have a question for you. City administrator.

Speaker: I would.

Speaker: Love to hear from the city administrator.

Speaker: I see a few people who would like to hear from you and city administrator while you're talking. I was going to ask you if requiring reports before you enter into a contract would ever pose a problem. When we are on a recess and may not have a council meeting for a few weeks, or if that, if generally you were planning far enough in advance that that would be okay.

Speaker: At the current cadence of council meetings and the current pressure on your agendas, this will slow the purchasing process. So I just need you to understand that.

Speaker: I would be willing to change the language from a City Council meeting to an executive meeting just so that we would know. So it doesn't have to be public. But I just want to know what you all are doing and how you're spending the money.

Speaker: Okay. Reporting requirement. If it could come, if it could come in a written form to the council on a periodic basis.

Speaker: Well, no, no, no, I wanted to come. I can put it in an executive session meeting prior to you executing the contract. We know and understand that you don't need our approval. But before you execute, I would like to go into an executive session. I think the issue that madam president brought up would probably put some things, could put some things at risk. And I didn't think about that.

Speaker: I appreciate I appreciate your flexibility. I'll look to the city attorney as to whether this is a topic that can be discussed in executive session.

Speaker: We are limited by law on what we can handle in an executive session, and I don't believe this would fall within the allowed purposes of that.

Speaker: What I'm concerned about city attorney robert taylor, is that things are being executed. And i'll give you the example. On may 2nd, there was a there was a contract that was executed with the state of Oregon to do our permitting way before we had a chance to even talk about maybe keeping our permitting here locally. So we contracted that out, and I was shocked and amazed that we did that before we even had a chance to take a vote on it. And so by not knowing that those are the kind of things that kind of blindsides you. And when I found out about it. Of course, labor was knocking on the door and I told him I didn't know anything about it.

Speaker: Councilor if our council president let me say if it's all right with you. That particular issue, I think, is maybe slightly different in in how that will be executed than you have an impression of. And I'd ask donny to just comment.

Speaker: I would ask that we not go down that path right now. We need to be focused on this budget. Note we have an allowance from staff to spend extra time, and we are quickly running through it. And I'd like to make sure that our final colleague has an opportunity.

Speaker: Madam president, I will change it from a City Council meeting to a. To. To. I don't know if we can do an email that's that's not safe either.

Speaker: I councilor perhaps.

Speaker: Well, we can have to go the route of City Council meeting. That's the only thing that we have available.

Speaker: Could I I'm not sure why an email wouldn't work. I'm wondering if we could get a report, an email notifying us before contracts are entered into, and then interested councilors could follow up for more information or to enter their concerns.

Speaker: And I can tell you my experience with my 912 on February 19th. We're supposed to get reports every 15 days. If we say we're going to go into a City Council meeting or executive meeting, that is more. People follow that regularly than to send us an email. So i. I don't know how we, we, we reconcile this. I mean, we can try with the email and then when we find out that contracts were executed, that, that we didn't get an email on. And then there's the other issue of the oversight. So I don't want to micromanage folks. I just want to know how money is being spent in this in the city before it's being spent. And I don't want to give you direction or tell you that you can't do it, because you can certainly do it. We just want to know about it.

Speaker: So, councilor, I think you need to make a decision as the carrier of the amendment of whether you'd like us to vote on it in its current form, or whether you would like to.

Speaker: I will start with with an email to see if we can. Get that correspondence.

Speaker: So for any contract of \$50,000 or more, the City Council will receive an email.

Speaker: Prior to execution.

Speaker: Execution. I believe councilor zimmerman had a comment.

Speaker: Thanks. I don't see this as being a necessary budget note or necessary reporting constraint on the executive branch. This new form of government provides for, while not on this dais, a strong mayor with all executive authority. Our role in budget monitoring, I don't think is made any easier by this action. I think it actually would confuse it as some sort of permission asking when we take a vote on this budget, we will have granted that permission for you to execute the funds you've been appropriated. So whether I think the normal practice would be that a city administrator's report, which we get would include a pay council want you to know, in the last 30 days, we have finally inked the contract on x, y, z service, which you put into the budget six months ago, blah blah blah blah. So my need is met here. This seems overly burdensome and I will also say just even if we were to have a compromise here, the level is so low that this is just about every single item we buy. Now, if we have concern that the city is executing huge contracts above \$1 million, I'm willing to have that conversation. But for an organization this big, everything we do is \$50,000. And so I won't be supporting this note. I think it's overburdensome and kind of takes away, I think, the intent behind a strong mayor system. Thank you.

Speaker: I don't think it's taking away any more intent than any of the other budget amendments that we've taken away and added and, and taken away ftes that you've put forward. But if you want to do a friendly amendment to up to \$1 million, you said you would be amenable to that. I would certainly accept it, sir. Let me tell you, there's things going on. There's a lot of moving, moving things going on right now. And you see, i, I say agreements or commitments. The rose garden may not have a tenant soon. We're talking about the keller. We're talking about a lot of different things. We're talking about baseball. People are making commitments and

they're talking about stuff, and they're asking me, and I don't know anything about it. So for me, if we want to do \$1 million, we can do \$1 million. But I really want to know what what is what is being said or what what agreement or what commitment is being made. And the expectation is that we're going to support it when it comes before us and council.

Speaker: I'll note that I did get a message from folks in the administration that this is something that will be part of the city administrator's report moving forward. I understand, councilor, that that's not in advance. And you are looking for in advance.

Speaker: I just want to know, before you do that.

Speaker: Councilor Ryan, did you have a comment before we move.

Speaker: To i.

Speaker: Do i, I appreciate this conversation. And the last council, of course, we had a different form of government. So we were able to see all these contracts. I think in the transition, we're struggling to figure out the right note on that. I think, is it 50,000 is too low? Personally, I think it should be much higher. But I want to hear from city administrator Jordan on the impact of this. And is there a best practice of other cities with this type of government, and what is that contract level?

Speaker: Thank you councilor. In most cities where there is either a strong mayor or a council manager form of government. Once the council has appropriated funds for to do the work of the city, it is up to either the mayor or the administrator manager, depending on the form, to be able to execute on that. One of the reasons I think that we have this form of government that we have now is that the public expected this government to be professionally run and to operate in as efficient manner as it could. I have absolutely no problem with reporting to this council. All of our contractual actions, every contract we get into, if that's what the council

wants, I would I would be concerned about having to report to the council before we enter into an agreement. It will slow the process down. There's just no question.

Speaker: Well, sending an email or putting it in in an email saying this is what you're getting ready to do. You're not asking for our permission. You just informing us of what you're going to do.

Speaker: I appreciate that, councilor. I would ask, if you're not asking permission, why do you need to know before we do it?

Speaker: Well, sir, there there are certain amount of trust issues that are going on here. And again, I did my 9/12 and I have not received 115 day report. And we've received all kind of money and everyone is waiting for two months down the line to send a big report. So that has not been adhered to.

Speaker: Councilor and mr. Jordan, I'm sorry, but I really need us to stick to the topic of whether there is discussion on this budget note so that we can get to a vote and allow councilor morillo an opportunity. We are already past time.

Speaker: Yes, but he asked me a question why? And I think I owe him an answer.

Speaker: I think we need to keep questions to the topic at hand.

Speaker: I don't need an answer.

Speaker: That we're talking about contracts. He asked me a question about a contract. Why do I feel like I need it?

Speaker: Councilor is there any other discussion to the budget? Note?

Speaker: Councilor kanal thank you. I'll just make two quick notes. One is if this doesn't also just put on the pile of reasons why we need to discuss the weekly council meeting ordinance. I don't know what does. And secondly, I think it is there are times where we've been surprised. I completely share the concern. I was shocked to read the conversation or read the article I should say about the fence I mentioned earlier and the choice to take on an ongoing maintenance obligation.

And I think that's that's something where I think the threshold is not just about the dollar amount, which I recognize maybe needs to be higher. I'm very sympathetic to that argument, but also whether there's going to need to be an ongoing need, because otherwise what's going to happen is we're going to have the executive side of the government commit us to something that we then have to fund in the budget every year. And when we come to this meeting next year, it's if you don't do it, it's going to break the relationship we have or we've already committed this funding in a contract that's come up in this budget process already. So there has to be some this is this is taking away our budgetary authority. If we have no transparency and the ability to say, I don't know if there's like a consensus on this council.

Speaker: Exactly. Because you cannot commit our resources for more than one fiscal year. And the article I'm not saying the article is correct, but it said that the city of Portland would keep the upkeep on it. I read that same article too. So those kind of things, and you have to kind of judge what I mean, you know, there are some things that we should know before you're doing it.

Speaker: Yeah. So I think the temporal aspect of this to how long does a financial commitment last is another part of this question for me. And if I don't think we're being given a ton of time here to negotiate a detail on it, so I'm inclined to support this as is, and I and I'll also note, yeah, an email is great. I'd love it. An email with a couple days at least to read it a week would be really, really nice, I think. I don't think a week delay is unreasonable. I'll also just note that my understanding is that we could do, at least as it relates to buying property. We could do an executive session about that, but circle back on that one later. Thanks.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor, councilors, is there any other debate on the budget note?

Speaker: I.

Speaker: I have changed some language agreements or commitments exceeding \$1 million.

Speaker: Why don't you read the whole thing and then we will.

Speaker: Vote. In the interest of promoting fiscal transparency and ensuring responsible governance, I propose the adoption of a requirement that mandates the mayor and the city administrator to disclose all contracts, agreements or commitments exceeding \$1 million.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor, seeing no other discussion, Keelan, could you please call the roll.

Speaker: Canal?

Speaker: I have.

Speaker: A point of order real quickly.

Speaker: Is that the full text of it or no?

Speaker: It said this measure is intended to provide City Council with clear and timely insight into the liabilities and fiscal obligations that the mayor has entered on behalf of the city of Portland. Within the fiscal year 20 2526 budget. Requiring such disclosures will facilitate enhanced oversight, support informed decision making, and uphold the public trust by ensuring accountability for substantial financial commitments.

Speaker: Thank you. And noting that it doesn't mandate a specific method of disclosure at this time, I think that should hopefully address other people's concerns. I vote i.

Speaker: I appreciate the fact that it went up to a million, but I think this needs further discussion at governance personally. And at this moment I'm going to vote no.

Speaker: Koyama lane.

Speaker: Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick no clerk.

Speaker: Not here. She's gone.

Speaker: Green.

Speaker: Hi.

Speaker: Zimmerman.

Speaker: Also not in the room.

Speaker: Avalos i. Dunphy i.

Speaker: Smith i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney know though I would be interested in taking this up in governance.

Speaker: Point of order.

Speaker: I'd like to change my vote to a no so that I can move to reconsider later when our colleagues are back.

Speaker: We will not have time for that, but you are welcome to change your vote.

Speaker: The amendment fails with five yes votes and four no votes.

Speaker: Councilor morillo I believe you have not yet had an opportunity to bring forward a budget. Would you like to do so at this time?

Speaker: Yes, and we've already had extensive discussion on this, so I will try not to torture you all too much. This is for morillo seven. It's a budget note, leveraging the police special revenue fund to advance evidence based policing. I handed out a printed copy for all of you. It's been considerably cut down, and you'll notice that a lot of what's written in there are definitions for clarity, so hopefully that helps. And if the definitions for clarity and the additional length frighten you, we can cut it.

Speaker: Councilor is there a second?

Speaker: Second?

Speaker: Councilor kanal morillo.

Speaker: Barely eked out.

Speaker: There, so.

Speaker: Do people need a refresher?

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: You went over two last time, so if you can remind us of which this is, that would be great.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: This note directs the portion of \$1 million of the police special revenue funds to be used to support independent evaluation of policing strategies. So future investments are guided by data and proven outcomes. We need data driven policing, methodical, evidence based and accountable. Public safety is too important to rely on intuition, esthetics or vibes. We need to know what works and fund what works so this fund will otherwise sit idly unless it is spent down again. This is money that comes from the federal government that the police bureau is required to spend down, and using it on studies is actually a very common use of these funds. So this is nothing out of the ordinary and I think will help our police bureau be a lot more efficient and a lot more accountable to the public.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor, councilors. Does anybody have any discussion or questions here?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Or novick.

Speaker: I just wanted to note that I had a conversation about the these funds with chief day, and he sent me information indicating that asset forfeiture proceeds that we get from the federal government come with an odd string attached that it

has to be, it seems they're saying that the chief has to approve of any use of those funds. So if council is directing it, that might jeopardize their ability to reach those funds. The chief also indicated that he's willing to work with any councilor, including councilor morillo, to talk about any reasonable uses, but he's worried about violating the federal rule.

Speaker: I would expect that the chief would be interested in evidence based policing, so I'm happy to work with him on this budget note. And the city attorney has already confirmed that this is an appropriate use of these funds, given the strings that are attached to federal dollars.

Speaker: So i'll comment just to note that councilor novick in in hearing that same concern, I asked the chief if he would entertain bringing a report to council regularly to share with us. I guess not the chief, but leadership within the public safety service area. If they would be willing to bring a report sharing with us what their plan was for the spending of these resources. And while I didn't ask for a firm written commitment, I did get an indication that that could be a path that would thread the needle as well. Councilor smith.

Speaker: Yes, I had a conversation a couple days ago with the chief asking about the \$6 million that was in forfeiture, because I was concerned that we may run out of money for some things and to see if we could use those funds. What he said to me was that they have to be approved by doj and the treasury. That's what he said, and they have to give permission. And that takes a while to get that permission to come back. And so the concern was that this current administration is probably looking for any opportunity to take away anything that the city of Portland is doing. So there's a there's an extra layer, and it would probably take a few months to get that approved.

Speaker: Can can we have robert taylor give an analysis of this.

Speaker: Mr. Taylor?

Speaker: Would you weigh in for us?

Speaker: Thank you for this opportunity. The I think I think a lot of what's been said here is true that the department of justice needs to approve it, along with the treasury, as we discussed earlier in the work session, the funds come with non supplanting requirements, meaning you can't you need to use it for new things. You can't use it to backfill cuts. As councilor morillo has said that you can do it for hiring contractors or experts to help you do feasibility studies and the like. We have corresponded with the appropriate federal regulator, and what they have indicated to us is under the federal rules, the money does have to be appropriated and approved by the governing body. And so we could do this through a budget note. But as part of the anti supplanting requirement, the doj wants to be sure that the agency had, the police chief also approves of it. That helps, I think, ensure that it is not supplanting some other uses. I think that's the lay of the land we have here. As you consider this budget note.

Speaker: And for the record, if these dollars aren't used, they're just going to sit there and then be taken back by the federal government eventually if they aren't spent. So I don't mind waiting to use these dollars for a good study if a chief is interested in it. I mean, I don't see why they would not be interested in evidence based policing.

Speaker: Thank you counselor. Are there any other comments on this budget note?

Speaker: I have a.

Speaker: Quick question. The accountability has come up several times in this conversation, so I just need to hear from the budget office how much, again, are we spending with police oversight in the next year's budget?

Speaker: This is separate.

Speaker: I don't have the figure in front of me. I could get it. If you give me a minute.

Speaker: I can do it. It's two point. It's two point.

Speaker: It's about \$2.1 million. In the current budget, there's a you have to hold 5% in a fund. But the actual budget for the cbp is roughly 2.1 million.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor addition to the 5%.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: I thought that was what you said.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: I would add that this is different than police oversight. This would be research conducted by phd research scientists. Impact evaluations are very different from oversight.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor, councilors, is there any other discussion to the budget?

Speaker: Note I'm sorry I came a little bit late. I missed the first part. Councilor morillo, is this something that the police bureau is asking for or they want?

Speaker: It sounds like councilor novick had a conversation with chief day, and that he would be willing to work with any councilor to.

Speaker: Know.

Speaker: To respond to that. The conversations chief day was he'd be willing to work with any councilor, but he was worried that if the council is directing how we spend the money, that might violate federal orders, that it has to be up to the discretion of the police chief.

Speaker: Bob cozzie up here. We need to be very quick. Can you answer that question in two sentences or less?

Speaker: Absolutely. Dca, kc for the record, pb is open to conducting a study on evidence based policing. However, as councilor novick mentioned, asset dictating asset forfeiture funds being used for that could jeopardize the funding stream as a whole.

Speaker: Thank you director.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilors. Is there any other discussion on this budget note?

Speaker: I just want to add that the note does not say anything about requiring them not to seek approval, so it would not violate the doj standards. We can have this note pending approval. Or if you would like to add a friendly amendment, you're welcome to do so.

Speaker: Councilors, is there any other discussion seeing none Keelan could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Thank you for taking our feedback into account. Between the last version of this and the current one, I vote.

Speaker: I know. Koyama lane i.

Speaker: Morillo Portland deserves evidence based policing, I vote i.

Speaker: Novick reluctant no.

Speaker: Clerk. No green. I zimmerman.

Speaker: Con.

Speaker: Harmless.

Speaker: I. Dunphy i. Smith i. Pirtle-guiney no.

Speaker: The motion carries with seven yes votes for no no votes and one absent.

Speaker: Councilors. We are at 708. Everybody has had an opportunity to bring forward one budget. Note. We need to take a quick recess so that our budget team can crunch some numbers so that we can make sure we have a balanced budget as we leave today. I am.

Speaker: A point of information is there. I'm understanding. Like earlier when we were talking about tcl five that we were going to come back to it. Can we do a quick vote? I think we talked it out. We just need to do a vote.

Speaker: I had hoped we could come back to a lot of things and I have told many people no, and I am not getting a single budget note that I had wanted to bring forward because I used mine on a courtesy. Lots of people have been messaging me asking for more, and we are already 40 minutes past. When we had said that we would move on on our delayed schedule. So here's what I'm going to ask us to do. If you have been working on trying to figure out a way to balance things, please continue that work over this 15 minute recess. If you have a technical fix, not a new thing. We all have more we want to do, but a technical fix. I understand there are some technical fixes needed. Please come bring that to me now. During this recess I will be sitting right here. I will not move the whole time. We are going to give our budget team 15 minutes. We are going to meet back here at 725, at which point we will adopt any technical fixes. We will figure out how to balance our budget and we will adopt the attachments into our budget, which we will then move to a second reading on the 18th. Councilors. I know there is a lot being left on the table. I think everybody up here is disappointed and frustrated, and I have asked us many times today to move quickly and speak less. And I think for some of our colleagues that did not sink in, and I am gravely sorry for all of us that that is the case. We are on recess. We will convene back in 15 minutes. Councilor.

Speaker: Can you see the building we're looking.

Speaker: Yeah. Oh that's great. Oh that's great.

Speaker: Are you going to stay.

Speaker: In? Everybody back in. If folks can sit down, that would be great.

Speaker: We got work to do. So.

Speaker: Here let me.

Speaker: Hold on. 12345678. We have eight of us. Okay. We have three things to do. And we are going to try to do it in the next 32 minutes. First thing that we need to do is I had asked if anybody had technical changes. One technical change was brought forward. Colleagues, you should have a sheet in front of you. When we at a very late hour on the 21st, created additional funding for vision zero, we put those funds apparently into the general fund. We, I believe, intended to put them into the general transportation fund. Councilor dunphy, thank you for catching this. Dunphy 13, simply moves those funds. Councilor would you like to move this amendment?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: So moved, please. I look a second.

Speaker: Second, second. Would you.

Speaker: Like to second councilor koyama lane? I can withdraw my second. Okay, I withdraw my second. Go right ahead. Okay. Seconded by councilor koyama lane colleagues, is there any discussion on this technical change? Seeing none and assuming that the hands in the queue are from our previous discussion.

Speaker: I can take that.

Speaker: Keelan, could you please call the roll.

Speaker: Canal i.

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

Speaker: Green.

Speaker: I zimmerman. Avalos post i. Dunphy i. Smith i. Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: Motion carries with 11 yes votes and one absent.

Speaker: Thank you colleagues. The next thing we need to do is make sure our budget is balanced. Ruth, could you please go over the various funds for us and let us know where we are in and where we are out of balance?

Speaker: Sure. So we just have an issue in some of the general fund. Everything else is in balance. So within the general fund, in discretionary resources ongoing, we are balanced general fund discretionary. One time there is a deficit of \$646,000. And then on the overhead side there is essentially 290,000 left in contingency from the from the approved still. And there's a one time deficit in general fund overhead of \$87,000.

Speaker: Thank you. And, director levine, are these deficits the two deficits. Solely from the amendment green nine yesterday, or are there other things adding to those deficits?

Speaker: No, that's right. It's just the green nine. Basically the. Reductions didn't add up to the adds on the general fund side because some of the reductions are actually from other funds. And so the general fund piece didn't net out.

Speaker: Thank you. So colleagues, we have a couple of options here. We could revote and lessen the expenditures. We could revote and add back in some of the things that were originally on the list, but were reduced. We could vote to find new revenue, or we could revote to undo the amendment altogether. I would entertain a motion here.

Speaker: Motion. I would move to reconsider the vote on green nine.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Point of order.

Speaker: Here we have a motion on the table. Let's hear the point of order.

Speaker: So I just wanted to ask that there's also other revenue. My understanding is that that should be that that should be up at this moment.

Speaker: I'm sorry. There's also what.

Speaker: Sorry other revenue. There was that third column in the spreadsheet, and I just wanted to make sure that that was not the case before because you didn't mention that. Director levine. That's a that's a name of a category.

Speaker: Right. But we can't use that other revenue. If you want more details, we can have Owen speak to it, but basically it doesn't. It's things like fee revenue. So when you reduce external materials and services, that would be expenditure tied to revenues. And you don't spend that money, then you don't recover those revenues. So it's not revenue we can repurpose for something else.

Speaker: Thank you for clarifying that. And sorry.

Speaker: Do we have a motion on the floor?

Speaker: We do have a motion on the floor. There was a point of order with a question there clarifying things. And I'm hoping that that question has now been answered. Okay. We have a motion on the floor.

Speaker: Point of information. What exactly is the motion?

Speaker: I moved to reconsider the vote on green nine.

Speaker: Is there a second.

Speaker: City, Mr. Jordan? Is that in line with our rules of order.

Speaker: Mr. Taylor?

Speaker: Thank you. Good question. So a motion to reconsider under our rules needs to be made. Before the end of the meeting on which the item is passed. So the reconsideration would not be in order. However, a motion to rescind the green nine would be in order. So you would basically just wipe out that amendment.

Speaker: Even though this is technically the same meeting, because we recessed, it would need to be a motion to rescind.

Speaker: I also have a follow up question.

Speaker: I want to make sure we get the answer on this, and then we'll take your is this a point of information or a point of order? Councilor morillo.

Speaker: Let's let.

Speaker: Let's let mr. Taylor answer and then you can let me know.

Speaker: There's more than one path to get to the, the to get us home here. Council president, thank you for the reminder that we recessed and we did not adjourn the meeting yesterday. So the rule is the motion must be the motion to reconsider must be made before the adjournment of the meeting when the item was considered by council. So since we were in recess last night, you may and we have not. We did not adjourn that meeting. You may do the motion to reconsider. That is in order. Alternatively, since we've already passed that amendment, you could make a motion to rescind the amendment. Either one of those.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: I would still like to move to reconsider the vote on green nine.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you.

Speaker: And just to confirm, did you vote yes on green nine?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: So she was on the prevailing vote. Did you have a point of information or a point of order? Councilor morillo.

Speaker: I think point of order. I guess this seems like a pretty egregious step, considering the fact that we could just amend this to address the imbalance pretty

easily. I don't see why that's not on the table. I think everyone got a piece of what they wanted in this. Seems like reasonable that we just go through and trim it.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: I sorted out a few options and this was the motion that was made. You could certainly bring that up in discussion of the motion.

Speaker: Point of order. Second.

Speaker: We have a second. We are moving into discussion on the motion to reconsider. And I heard a point of order.

Speaker: I'm looking at the queue right now, and I'm seeing that that councilor green is first in the queue. And I also know that he had been asked to come up with something. I'd love to hear that before we get into this. And I think the queue should prevail.

Speaker: Councilor there were a number of hands left in the queue from earlier in the meeting, and I mentioned as we were talking about the technical amendment, that I was assuming those were old hands and was looking around the table. I attempted to do the same here because I think there were some old hands left up. So if folks want to all remove themselves from the queue, then moving forward as we discuss this motion, we could certainly use the queue.

Speaker: Are we going to put our hands down at the same time? And then you're going to count to three, and then we put them all up at once.

Speaker: Or we can or we can use this for discussion as is there. I just was explaining the process since there was a point of information.

Speaker: I think.

Speaker: Councilor green had his hand up first, and he was asked to make a correction to this. And he has a correction.

Speaker: Councilors, we have a motion and a second on the table, and we're in discussion on that motion. And second, we could certainly if we vote this down, move to discussion of something else. I laid out a few options. So councilors, is there discussion on the motion on the table? Mr. Taylor.

Speaker: If a motion to reconsider fails, then you cannot reconsider it again. So if the desire is not to, if you don't want to, it just just so just so you know, the result of a failed motion to reconsider.

Speaker: But that's not the same as withdrawing. Correct.

Speaker: You could withdraw it. That would be that would be acceptable.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Councilor green, are you in the queue to speak to the motion to reconsider?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Go right ahead.

Speaker: I've twice now been likened to republican trump himself and now a nihilist by councilor novick. At least I've not been accused of being a monarchist, but I find these comparisons objectionable. I would note that. Say what you will about the optimism in my colleagues to solve complicated and competing challenges in a very dynamic and compressed timeline at this dais. It is at least a belief system. I hear the frustration with unintended consequences. But the first meeting I took when I took office was with a group of renters who were desperate for a voice in this building and are suffering from the unintended consequences of a miscommunication of a regulatory agreement. And I have prioritized meetings with rank and file workers who are worried about losing their jobs and how they're going to pay their bills as an unintended consequence of opening thousands of new

shelter beds. If my methods are unconventional, I'll just note that conventional methods have not served these constituents of mine in the amendment I brought was balanced, and I did say that there were risks as I motivated the amendment, but that I believe that the risks were worth the benefits that I wanted to pay for. So when you go out and you talk to the press, I'd ask you not to mischaracterize a claim of mischaracterization. So I've got a number of options that I would like to consider. I like one more than the other. Now, I this is I want to remember. So the motion actually is.

Speaker: It's the motion to reconsider if it if the motion carries then green nine would be back before the body as if it had never been voted on. If the motion fails, then we could not move to reconsider green again.

Speaker: So if it's at this time, it's appropriate to amend the motion being reconsidered.

Speaker: I mean, right now what's pending is, is the question of should we reconsider green nine? And if the motion to reconsider carries, then green nine would be back before the body, as if you hadn't voted on it in the first place. And then you could make amendments to green nine.

Speaker: Okay, in the spirit of rationality and reasonableness, I'm going to say let's reconsider this. I have some amendments to my original motion that I hope this body will consider in good faith. So let's have that conversation.

Speaker: Councilor smith, you made this motion. Okay. Councilor kanal, are you in the queue to speak to the motion?

Speaker: I just I just want to ask your.

Speaker: My concern about this reconsideration motion is that if it fails, we can't do it again. And I'd like I think this might be a plan c or plan d. And I'd like to talk about a and b before we potentially lose plan d. So that's why I was I was surprised

there for a moment. I just wanted to clarify. Councilor I understand your surprise. Things move very fast at this dais. We are a body of 12. We're doing the best we can with very complicated information. So I've got I've got an approach that I think may be palatable. And I would like an opportunity to do that. Okay.

Speaker: Councilor avalos, are you in the queue to discuss the motion to reconsider?

Speaker: I guess so. I did not vote on green nine yesterday. I had my concerns. Obviously, we're all dealing with the fact that it ended up being unbalanced unexpectedly. I am understanding that councilor green has put together a essentially just cutting the amounts in each amount. And so I want to support, even though I didn't vote for it yesterday, I there's a lot in there and a lot of, you know, so I want to support their chance to be able to just trim that. They have trimmed it in a balanced way, and I think that's better than losing the whole thing. And I also think it's better than some of the other ideas that I've heard that I'm not super into. And so I'd rather us just balance this. We can do that like that. And so I would ask councilor smith that you withdraw so that we have the opportunity to do that, and people don't have to vote for it. But I think we need the opportunity because they it was their amendment and they they had the problem and they found a solution. And I think we should hear that before we do this. And if you withdraw it, you can always put it back to rescind.

Speaker: If I keep my amendment and you all support it, he gets to add his amendment. So that's.

Speaker: This would allow us would move us back to reconsidering green nine, at which point we could vote it up, vote it down, table it, or vote to amend it.

Speaker: We would need to vote to rescind it so that it's just back on the table or vote to reconsider it. But do we have to vote to reconsider?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: And then he can bring it back up.

Speaker: Okay, okay.

Speaker: Councilor morillo, are you in the queue to discuss the vote? To reconsider?

Speaker: Yes. I think that this this package really did a lot of important things for our communities. And it was negotiated with a lot of people, you know, without breaking quorum and making sure that everyone got part of what they wanted. And so it seems very hasty to me and sort of punitive. This feels more like a personal punishment based on stylistic differences, or maybe to punish people for making a mistake rather than good governance and trying to correct a mistake here on the dais, which we can easily do together. I don't know why we wouldn't work together to just correct this, and we have options on the table to trim it down. So, you know, we're doing things to protect renters at everett station. We're doing things like evaluating Portland street response. We're funding Portland center stage, a cultural hub. We're also addressing the cei hub and making sure that there's public safety with regards to the environment. This is a good package, and if there was a mistake made, then give us the opportunity to correct it.

Speaker: Councilor novick are you in the queue to speak to the vote to reconsider? Green nine.

Speaker: I had to hear.

Speaker: Yes, actually want to respond to it. Councilor morillo just said, first of all, this is not something that was negotiated with everybody in the council. Five people got goodies out of it and got two other people to vote with them, five people. So I think we have rules. Well, but so you pick and choose who you wanted to be part of the discussion. Also, a number of us were opposed to this yesterday because we

were concerned that random cuts would have consequences that we didn't know about because there was an assumption that we would there was waste, fraud and abuse out there that we don't know where it is ourselves. We're counting on the bureaucrats to figure it out. So it's not just that everybody thought this was a wonderful idea and everybody got things out of it. Some of us thought that it was a bad idea from to begin with, and didn't get anything out of it. So I support the motion to reconsider.

Speaker: Councilor kanal are you in the queue to discuss the motion to reconsider?

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Okay, colleagues, seeing no one else in the queue. Keelan, could you please call the roll on the motion to reconsider?

Speaker: No, no. Ryan, i. I'm sorry. Just second. Koyama lane. Oh, no. Mario.

Speaker: No, no.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Clark,

Speaker: I green.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Zimmerman.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Avalos.

Speaker: This is on the motion to reconsider, which would put us back to debate.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: No, no.

Speaker: I voted no.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Smith. I pirtle-guiney i. The motion fails to carry with six yes votes and five no colleagues.

Speaker: The motion to reconsider has failed. We still have a budget gap in front of us. Councilor green, are you in the queue to make a motion?

Speaker: Yes I am. Thank you, madam president. I move. I guess it would be green. 14 now the following. Cut the two cbo positions that we added in green nine. That reduces \$350,000 on exempt prosper Portland, which took off the table \$261,083.65. Cut \$50,000 from the psr study from green nine. Cut \$75,000 from the everett station loft. Tenants from green nine cut \$51,000 from storefront installations. Cut \$130,000 for the park service dispatcher, which was the job I was trying to save that I believe will balance this, and I'm happy to be proven wrong during this discussion. Thank you.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Do we have a motion for a new amendment which would trim green nine on the table? I would like to hold for two minutes to give our budget team time to run those numbers. If somebody could send this to director levine, or do you want us to send it to you?

Speaker: I already have it. I believe that would balance the budget to make those reductions. It reduces both discretionary and overhead by certain portions. Enough discretionary to cover the one time gap we currently have. And then it will cut additional overhead resource. But all in all, it should be balanced.

Speaker: Thank you. On. Councilor green. Are you in the queue for discussion? Councilor kanal are you in the queue for discussion?

Speaker: Yes madam president, i.

Speaker: Think I first thank you to councilor green for coming up with this. This is feels like, you know, you we get a lot of the way there and then something two

steps forward, one step back kind of thing. And I totally acknowledge that I'm trying to find a way to come up with something that can help here. And I think we've all I've got a funding source here that but not seeing it at this moment. So I look forward to this conversation. But I really just wanted to express appreciation for that and say that if we're going to ask somebody to come up with an idea, we should let them put that idea forward. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilors, I'm next in the queue. I will note, because I cannot help myself at this hour, that a motion to reconsider would have allowed us to consider this as well, but in a different form. Director Levine, I think that I heard councilor Green include on his list, adding Prosper Portland back into the entities that would have their budget included in this EMS cut. And we already passed the Prosper Portland budget, so I am wondering how that is possible.

Speaker: I'm looking at the city attorney, I think.

Speaker: I'm sorry if that's a better question for Mr. Taylor. I'm happy to direct my question there. I am concerned that this is, again, something we can't actually do.

Speaker: I mean, my read is that it basically reduces the amount of general fund we would send to Prosper Portland, and that their board would have to include that in their adopted budget for their Prosper, which I don't think they've adopted yet. And I think it would be okay. But yeah, I don't know what you're thinking.

Speaker: Are we allowed to make changes that unbalance their budget after we have sent them an approved budget?

Speaker: So right now the City Council is sitting as the governing body of the city of Portland. Previously, when you considered the Prosper budget, you were operating as the budget committee for Prosper. You. You as the budget committee sent them a recommended budget. You now, as the city of Portland, can decide and make the final decision on how much money you want to send to Prosper Portland. You can

make that decision here today. And then for prosper's purposes, they would either need to adjust their budget to reflect the reduction from the city of Portland, or they could leave their appropriation level the same, but they cannot spend money that they do not receive. So the appropriation level might be high, but they would have reduced revenue to spend.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: For that clarification.

Speaker: Point of order. How much was is included to prosper or taken away from prosper.

Speaker: Councilor green? What is the reduction.

Speaker: In this most recent action? This reduces, or I should say yes, this reduces the general fund allocation allocation to prosper Portland by \$261,000. Rounded of a total of over \$13 million. And I will note that prosper Portland did not lay off any staff in their budget. Where we are cutting a parks dispatcher with this move right now.

Speaker: Councilor smith, are you in the queue for discussion or was that your question?

Speaker: I was in the queue for discussion because I was concerned that this was different from the original. Green line, and I have a problem with that. And as you know, I supported not taking the money away from prosper. And so this is kind of going around. We have other spaces and places where there are dollars.

Speaker: Councilor.

Speaker: Right.

Speaker: I hear you, I tried to offer an amendment earlier in this process that would have held harmless all of the program offers for prosper Portland, and avoided this entire discussion. I'm prepared. If this doesn't pass, I'm prepared to do

another prosper Portland amendment. That is just a one time effect that would also hold harmless their effects. So I hear your concern, but we're in a situation where we've got to balance this.

Speaker: Councilor canal.

Speaker: Just a question has prosper. I want to just I'm going to be careful how I say this. When we had the conversation around the change to the albina settlement, we looked at the idea that we were taking on \$6.5 million with the, i'll say, hope that prosper Portland would take on half of the funding for that, half of the cost of that, as was originally when it was \$2 million. I don't believe that's happened yet. I'm disappointed by that. I'm disappointed by by hearing that. I think it's a worthwhile thing to put into this conversation. And I think this is the right course of action. I'll be supporting the overall thing. And this 261,000, I believe you said rounded. And so that seems like, you know, one of those things where everybody's kind of eating a little bit here. Oh, and I believe it's that this would be one time transfer as well. Right. Okay. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor green.

Speaker: Yeah. And I would just like to also note that earlier today we passed a budget note called green ten that gave the city administrator the discretion to balance all of these ems cuts across the city enterprise. And so I just want to remind folks that when we look at the specific line items and we're thinking about the direct impacts, the city administrator has the ability to make these adjustments.

Speaker: Councilor avalos.

Speaker: I would really appreciate if this could be amended again to not take that from prosper like that. Can we take more from any of the other items? Do you have any interest in that? Like I think it's opening this other can of worms. You know, I didn't support the prosper cuts. I'm trying to get here with you. I did not support

this amendment yesterday. I'm trying to help here, but that's that's pushing me a little hard. So is there another place that we can make those trims of that? 265 I don't agree that the budget note, like you put that amount in the way that this amendment, we could debate that all day. But like I just I'm not comfortable with that. So is there any opportunity to cut some other things that are not prosper right now?

Speaker: Anyone is free to introduce an amendment to my amendment. I'm open. I'm trying my best to offer the ideas I have. Okay, it's just a big pot of money.

Speaker: It does not come. It does not have to come from prosper. They are just not exempted. It doesn't have to come from them.

Speaker: If you're going to say that I can make an amendment, then I say you take that. 267 from Portland center stage.

Speaker: Okay. Okay.

Speaker: That's that's the first thing I'm thinking. I'm on the fly here and I'm trying really hard to get here, dude, but, like, that's really hard for me. I'm trying really hard to support this.

Speaker: I think we'll lose some critical votes. If that's your hard line.

Speaker: About i.

Speaker: Don't know what to do.

Speaker: Councilor novick are you in the queue to discuss the amendment?

Speaker: Yes. I just wanted to say that I think that the five people that voted for something that gave them goodies and found out that there was unbalanced. The honorable thing to do is to vote to balance it by cutting their own goodies rather than. And I realize I like some of these goodies myself, but rather than force the rest of us to vote for other cuts we hadn't considered before, wherever they are.

Speaker: Councilor smith, are you back in the queue?

Speaker: Yes. I just want to say to there was something that someone said, I can't remember who said it, and they said, everyone has something in here, I don't have anything in here. And I was a supporter of it, but I won't be able to be a supporter of it in its current form.

Speaker: Councilor canal, are you back in the queue?

Speaker: Yes, madam president. I think the assertion here that something untoward is happening is should just be stated outright. I think this is a ridiculous sort of assumption here. There were some things that were brought in that were proposed. There were other vehicles and other amendments that got other things done. Every person has something in the budget, even if they didn't get it in green line. And sometimes it's a note, sometimes it's that sometimes it's something that wasn't an amendment. But we asked the mayor to put it in and before the may 5th proposal and it got in there. So there are things here that I think it's a broader conversation. But more importantly, I think that's exactly what this proposal does. If you look at what the what the specific cuts that are happening here are, there are things there's something here I fought for very strongly. That's that's happening. If you'd like to go for that, that's being removed. If, if you'd like to go for the, the other specific things in there, I think it makes sense to articulate that specifically. But the way that this has been proposed makes sense. As it is, I there isn't \$200,000 going or sorry, \$261,000 going to Portland center stage in the amendment that that's more than the amount that was allocated to pcs. So we can't take away more than we gave. So that's the only concern I have. I think that's a valid conversation to have too. So I would offer. That instead of it saying. I'm going to try to find the exact text here. \$261,000 from prosper Portland that we simply say pursuant to green ten, we ask the city administrator to increase the amount of ems reductions across the bureaus listed and hearsay, which could include prosper Portland, so that we're still

not exempting it, but we're making it clear that it doesn't have to come from there. I think that might help resolve the conversation, but that's a I'm floating that as an idea.

Speaker: Councilor morillo.

Speaker: So while we're talking about fairness with omnibus packages, I would like to remind everyone that there were numerous people up here who were not included in the president's package whatsoever. Zero amendments put in that package, and we did not cry half as much about that as everybody is here, because we know that there are quorum rules, there are discussions, there are things to balance that come up. But I didn't have any amendments in there. Councilor novick you didn't have any amendments in there? Councilor koyama lane you had no amendments in there. Nobody from district three, for some reason, had any amendments in the president's omnibus package that was negotiated with. It seems like councilors clark zimmerman and the more conservative side of council that ended up getting a lot of what they wanted in there, and that got voted down. So I am sorry that our quorum rules prevent us from having negotiations with everybody. That's kind of the law of the land right now, unfortunately. So if we want to talk about fairness, yeah, let's talk about fairness, because a lot of these negotiations aren't fair. It's really hard. And again, this amendment does not exempt prosper. But if we do want to talk about fairness again, then we should talk about how prosper shouldn't be exempt from everything all the time anyways. But it seems like we have some options on the table. I like councilor kanal proposal, so I think that we still have some alternatives to negotiate this down if necessary.

Speaker: Councilor novick.

Speaker: Yes, I would propose that instead of cutting 261,000 from prosper ems, we could cut council budgets by 261,000, which divided by 12 would be what would

it be? 20 something thousand apiece. Our council budgets are far higher than any other city I've found.

Speaker: Councilor kanal I you have you spoken twice to this already?

Speaker: I have.

Speaker: Please keep it brief. We are over time.

Speaker: Yeah. I don't think we should be punishing the people who are emailing our office or wanting us to show up in, in, in our communities and in our districts by cutting their budget. I think we should figure out what we should do here. I would be open to the idea of dividing out the prosper part, figuring that out, and at least taking a huge dent into it, and then discussing how to close the remaining \$261,000 gap. I think there are ways to do that, that I have scored over the course of this. There are things that were proposed to close community centers on holidays, as opposed to closing them an hour early. I'm not saying that that's a better option. I'd much rather not do that. That's why I didn't propose it in the end. But there are other options out there, and I think that we are creating an artificial scarcity of meeting time. This is the budget. How are we? At what point did anybody think this wasn't going to go after after 8:02 p.m?

Speaker: Councilor, I want to respond to that. All of our chiefs of staff agreed to our schedule in a room together at a chiefs meeting. Every single one of them. I suggested that councilors would not agree to that, and that we would need more time and we would need to go late. And I was told chiefs agreed to this. It will be fine. So please do not suggest that I am creating artificial barriers when it is something that our chiefs of staff agreed to, a schedule which we are already two hours over because I pushed back and said we would need a little bit of flexibility at the end of the day. Colleagues, is anybody else in the queue to discuss the amendment?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Councilor avalos I am amenable to the idea of instead of taking the 261 from prosper to take it from the council budgets, it equals 21,000 per office. Let's make that happen. So I move that amendment.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: We have an amendment on the table.

Speaker: It's an amendment to the amendment right.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: I would like to accept the friendly amendment.

Speaker: Oh.

Speaker: It's a can I do that right now. Is that appropriate.

Speaker: Who is your seconder.

Speaker: Second, I was.

Speaker: Councilor canal. Do you accept this as a friendly amendment.

Speaker: No okay. But I'm happy to.

Speaker: Okay. Councilor kanal is withdrawing his second with somebody else like to second.

Speaker: I second.

Speaker: Okay. Councilor morillo do you accept this friendly amendment?

Speaker: I love it, I accept.

Speaker: It, okay. Can councilor.

Speaker: The friendly amendment is instead of the 261 whatever, we're going to take it from the council budgets and everything is going to stay the same.

Speaker: I am clear on that. Yes, I accept.

Speaker: This. Okay.

Speaker: Which is an amount of just over \$21,000 per office.

Speaker: 41,750.

Speaker: Thank you for doing the math faster than I could with pen and paper. Mr. Jordan.

Speaker: Hang on. I think there's an overhead problem here. The that you're using a gross number and the there's over council offices are overhead funded, so you need to go a little higher.

Speaker: I apologize, I should have remembered that. So you'd have to be something like 37,000 a piece or something.

Speaker: Correct? Director levine, is anything that we're giving money to, something that can accept overhead.

Speaker: And again, we're out of balance in discretionary primarily. So you need to find \$646,000 in discretionary resource to balance the budget and cut about 87,000 \$88,000 in overhead resource to balance the budget.

Speaker: And minutes or less. Could we do the math to figure out if we took the 87,000 in overhead one time? That is unbalanced from council budgets, and attempted to figure out the rest of the balance that was in the prosper number, which I believe was 261,000 out of council budgets. How much we would need to cut from council budgets?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Give us five minutes.

Speaker: We're going to recess at the dais for five minutes so that our budget team can do that math. I'd ask that nobody leave this space. Feel free to mill about here, though. Okay, colleagues, I believe our budget team has numbers for us. I am reaching out to our colleagues who did not stay in close proximity to try to get them back. Director levine, are we ready?

Speaker: We missing.

Speaker: Director levine, are we ready?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: So if we were to. Move this amendment as proposed with the change that prosper is not included, and there is a reduction in council budgets, what would the reduction in council budgets need to be? Either total or per councilor your choice in order to balance?

Speaker: Sure. So it is for 49,799 per office, which equates to 597,588 total for the 12 offices. So that would be the reduction.

Speaker: 49,799 per office.

Speaker: Correct.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: So moved. Sorry.

Speaker: I believe we already have a motion to do this. We were just waiting for the numbers. Is that correct? Keelan okay. Because it's friendly. Because the seconder changed to councilor morillo and councilor green and morillo accept bid your friendly amendment. Councilors. Is there any more debate?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Counselor green, are you in the queue for debate? Counselor smith, are you in the queue for debate?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Okay. Counselor smith and then councilor kanal.

Speaker: Could you tell me what's on the table?

Speaker: Yes. This is the amendment from counselor green. With the change that we are no longer taking money from prosper Portland, but we are looking at a reduction to council budgets of \$49,799 per counselor, per council office.

Speaker: I disagree with that.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: I disagree with that. And. I'll tell you why we have equipment coming that we have to pay with our office budget. We have additional summer works interns that we're paying for out of the budget. That's going to be about \$50,000. So, I mean, we can't balance the \$8.6 billion budget on the backs of a \$1.5 billion bureau. And anybody who thinks so, they're more than welcome to pay my part. But for my part, before I do that, i'll go back and vote yes for prosper. So I'm not playing no games with my stuff. Okay.

Speaker: Councilor canal to the amended amendment.

Speaker: I have a question and then a comment. My question is if hypothetically, there were \$99,580 of general fund discretionary available, I know that the ratio doesn't make this perfect. What would that do for our council budgets if we had found \$99,580 of general fund discretionary somewhere in our couch cushions.

Speaker: You could split that 12 ways.

Speaker: It's general fund discretionary though, so I know we'd need it would be a different it wouldn't be just that divided by 12 that.

Speaker: Saved in that direction. It does work. You can add discretionary to your budgets because it's unrestricted whereas the overhead includes restricted funds. So if you found approximately \$100,000, like you're saying you could, and I think you're saying to add to your to the council budgets.

Speaker: No, I'm saying to defray the reduction in the council budgets.

Speaker: To defer.

Speaker: Does that make sense? Because the ratio.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Is the same.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: That you would split it 12 ways essentially.

Speaker: So the reduction would become instead of almost 600,000 total, it would be almost 500,000, which per office is \$41,000, 41,549 each, roughly speaking.

Speaker: Excuse me.

Speaker: Okay. In that case, I would offer a friendly amendment to transfer \$99,580 from the police oversight board sub fund to the citywide obligation reserve fund. This is money that when avalos oh three passed on may avalos 01i apologize. Passed on may 21st, we reduced the amount of money that needed to be in the police oversight board, which is indexed to 5% of the police budget. The police proposed budget was reduced. The 5% was not. The difference is \$99,580 of money. That does not need to be in that extra fund. Councilor Ryan noted earlier that there's \$2.1 million budgeted for the police oversight board. The remainder is sitting in a contingency fund, and that contingency fund has about 100 k more than it has to have legally. I had hoped to use this for a different use. We're not going to have time to propose that amendment. I would love to use it here to ensure that at least whatever that is, \$5,000 of \$8,000 of our council office budgets are saved to ensure that Portlanders have as little impact on their ability to get a response from us as possible. I'd ask that this be considered friendly.

Speaker: I will accept it.

Speaker: Friendly councilor morillo.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: So the amendment on the table is now the amendment as originally proposed by councilor green, except that it does not pull funds from prosper. It

does pull \$99,580 from the fund identified by councilor kanal, and reduces council budgets by. \$41,501. If my math is correct. I don't see any from the budgets.

Speaker: Sorry.

Speaker: Can you repeat that?

Speaker: Council budgets by \$41,501 each. I see director levine nodding. Yes. Councilor avalos, are you in the queue for discussion?

Speaker: Oops, no.

Speaker: Councilor smith and canal are those legacy hands? Are you back in the queue for discussion? Okay, I want to verify this. This is a new amendment which, while addressing green nine, is not a part of green nine. So if we pass this, we are in balance. And if we do not pass this, we are still out of balance. But green nine is not on the table either way. I believe that's how this was made. Mr. Taylor, you are nodding. Yes. Okay. Councilors seen no one else in the queue. We are voting on what I believe is green 13. Is that correct, councilor? 1414 thank you. Green 14 Keelan could you please call the roll?

Speaker: I hate this. It's got to be honest about it. I think I want to note that the money. I had a proposed amendment to use this for, and I'm not going to get a chance to talk about it anywhere else. I'm going to just mention here that this was going to be used for preparation to, to determine what we need to do to ensure better firefighting capability on the west side of the river. In the case of a fire at the critical energy infrastructure hub, we have industrial firefighting capacity on the east side of the river. One of the reasons that a fire could start is a earthquake that would prevent people from getting across the river, so that was what I wanted to use it for. And so that can be described as a goody for, for one of us. But I think it's actually something that a lot of us support preparing for it. Even, you know, those of us, it's not in our district for us. And I'm really, really resent that. I also really,

really want to push back against the narrative that council budgets are an indulgence, right? They are to ensure that you get your councilor in district, hosting their own town halls, not just coming to those that other people invite them to. And being a part of our communities, not just sitting here all the time. And i'll have that argument in detail afterwards, I am sure I vote yes, regretfully.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: Yeah, I voted no on this yesterday and I'm still in that place. I do appreciate councilor kanal willingness to figure out how to thread this needle, so I wanted to say that, but I still remain a no vote on this amendment.

Speaker: Koyama lane.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor kanal I know how much that meant to you. It was very big of you and I appreciate everyone working together to make this adjustment. I vote i.

Speaker: Novick I hate this too, but not the cutting council budgets part i.

Speaker: Clark I don't know about hate. That's a pretty strong word, but it's certainly been agonizing agonizing from yesterday when I voted yes for it. But I feel like contributing another \$41,501 to the critical energy infrastructure hub and Portland center stage and other things is worth it to me, so I vote.

Speaker: I agree.

Speaker: So we're voting on the amended green 14, correct? Okay. Yeah, I don't like this either. Guys. I think the thing that I hate the most about it is we now have to cut one of those park service dispatchers who was, I think, pretty grateful to see their job saved from a cut. And we're doing that because we don't want to take a couple hundred grand from prosper Portland that has \$50 million in a strategic investment fund.

Speaker: I zimmerman.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: This is so agonizing, but I'm going to vote.

Speaker: I don't.

Speaker: I also hate it. I.

Speaker: Know pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: In order to balance the budget so we can let our staff go home and for no other reason, I vote.

Speaker: I motion carries with nine yes votes and three no votes.

Speaker: Director levine, I'd like to confirm that we have a balanced budget.

Speaker: Would you.

Speaker: Like a five minute recess to confirm that, or are you confident?

Speaker: Sorry. Can you give us two minutes?

Speaker: Yes. I'm going to hopefully have a more successful ask this time, colleagues, that we stay here.

Speaker: I swear to you. Thank you.

Speaker: Do we have a balanced budget? Okay, councilors. Wait a minute. We're not cheering yet. We're not done. Councilors. I said we had three things we had to do when we got back. The first was that technical piece. The second was balancing the budget. The third is that we need to actually adopt the attachments. The way that we do things at the city is through a series of attachments to agenda items. If you look at the agenda item for this meeting, adopting the budget, there are attachments b through j. I'm not sure where a went.

Speaker: There should be an a to.

Speaker: Okay, there's not an a, but I believe that a is attached to agenda item five from yesterday. We're going to check. We're going to make sure we have all of.

Nope. There's no are we adopting b through h and no a.

Speaker: It's attached to the presentation item. It's the script right. That's attached to the presentation.

Speaker: I don't see a presentation item.

Speaker: To b through j. That's fine.

Speaker: Yeah. We're sure.

Speaker: Legally. Okay. Hold on I see a finger up from mr. Taylor. One that's saying to. Wait a minute, mr. Jordan. One that's saying to wait a minute.

Speaker: Point of.

Speaker: Point of order. Madam president. My understanding is that yesterday we actually had to make that motion already to adopt what was then considered a through h, and the vote was not called correct. So that motion is, as I understand it, currently on the table.

Speaker: Correct. I just want to make sure we all know what we're voting on. So I'm hoping that we find attachment a but we will. That motion is open and we will now vote on all of those attachments.

Speaker: Okay i'll let the I may have another point of order after you clarify the attachment situation. Thanks.

Speaker: Mr. Taylor. Legally, are all of the attachments that we need here.

Speaker: Yes. And as councilor kanal pointed out and you pointed out yesterday, we made the motion to approve the adjustments in a through h that was moved and seconded. A through h are all of the attachments associated with the budget? I and j were attachments, but those were all the proposed amendments that you discussed. So you do not have to adopt those. You would want to adopt a through

h. As you moved and seconded yesterday, that would be the vote you would be taking. And that would be essentially adopting and approving the package of amendments that you have discussed and voted on yesterday and today.

Speaker: Do we know what attachment a is? I'm happy to have us just vote colleagues, but I'd like to make sure that you all know what we're voting on first.

Speaker: Yes. Attachment a is was associated with the first item that you opened yesterday, which was conduct a proposed use hearing and attachment a is just the script that usually is associated with the budget to help the council and the public follow along the amendments that you have been adopting yesterday and today have been to b through h.

Speaker: So what we need to do is adopt attachments b through h. Right now.

Speaker: That would be sufficient. Yes.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Madam president, I made that motion yesterday. May I have the floor to amend that motion?

Speaker: Please go right ahead.

Speaker: Withdraw the motion. Yield to councilor. Koyama lane.

Speaker: Thank you. I motion to move koyama lane three. It will take 90s to clarify, it is 216,000. That is not a new general fund ask. It's the realignment. Councilor recreational cannabis tax revenue.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: We vote and you're not letting us do it and you.

Speaker: Vote on it.

Speaker: I move to call the question.

Speaker: Counselor. We were in discussion. You asked to withdraw your motion.

Speaker: I still have.

Speaker: The floor. I'm not sure that we can recognize that. You can turn that over to another counselor who I have not recognized.

Speaker: I did that on may 21st. We have precedent on it.

Speaker: We sure do. And I was told after the fact that we did it wrong.

Speaker: Can councilor kanal move.

Speaker: To move?

Speaker: Mr. Taylor?

Speaker: I think I think this situation is one that would call for a point of order. And then the president could make a ruling on that point of order. And then if three counselors disagree with the president's ruling, it could be appealed by a vote of the council. So if there's a point of order on whether the motion is in order, somebody can raise that point of order. You can make a ruling and decide whether or not that motion is in order or not. And if three counselors disagree with your ruling, then it can be subject to a vote by the council.

Speaker: Okay, point of order. I think we should just move this ahead because it's going to take 90s to pass it, because it's literally just a technical adjustment for vision zero. That needed to happen earlier and was rushed through. Let's just get it done.

Speaker: I believe that's a different point of order than what we were discussing there. Councilor morillo.

Speaker: Point of order. Madam president, I don't think this is the time to recognize a new amendment. I would like a ruling from you on that.

Speaker: I would agree that we are in the process of adopting the attachments to our budget, and we need to move forward with that process. While the initial motion was withdrawn, I thought so that we could amend it to. Vote on attachments b through h. I don't believe that the second was withdrawn, and I

believe we were in the point on the agenda where we were adopting the attachments, not the point on the agenda where we were voting on amendments.

Speaker: Point of information. If a motion is withdrawn, then wouldn't the seconder still be able to keep it going?

Speaker: Perhaps. But I still would suggest that we were at the point of the agenda where we were voting on attachments and not the point of the agenda where we were voting on amendments.

Speaker: Sure. I'm just clarifying. Thank you. And I believe could you just clarify who was the seconder on that motion?

Speaker: Thank you. Yeah.

Speaker: So my point of order is still actually at your level, madam president, for a determination. And I think we can just hear that. I think it's probably an inevitable voting at this point.

Speaker: I believe it's an inevitable voting, but I would contend as a ruling who made the amendment and if it was withdrawn aside that we are at the point in the agenda where we are voting on attachments, not amendments.

Speaker: Okay, I have my hand up. So it just takes three of us to disagree with the president, and then we can vote because we're just dragging this out for no reason when it is of perfectly good amendment that will help make our streets safer.

Speaker: Councilor editorialization aside, three people can overrule that ruling. We vote on whether or not to overrule me, and then we would move to a motion to vote.

Speaker: And let's get to it.

Speaker: 2 to 2 other members join councilor morillo in requesting the appeal.

Speaker: Yep.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: And then the. The question before council now is shall the ruling of the president stand as the ruling of the council. So a yes vote affirms the president's ruling and a no vote would reject the president's ruling. A tie vote sustains the president's ruling.

Speaker: So is this a vote that requires discussion, or do we move straight to the vote?

Speaker: This can be this is subject to debate.

Speaker: Councilor kanal are you in the queue for debate?

Speaker: No, madam.

Speaker: Councilor koyama lane are you in the queue for debate?

Speaker: I very much did not want to do this. I asked you multiple times. I believe there are times to not be rigid. And this this was a choice for it to be like this. I would like to just move this through.

Speaker: Let's do it.

Speaker: This was on the table earlier and you made me take it off. So let's just do this, colleagues.

Speaker: I put myself in the queue for debate because I want to be clear. Multiple of our colleagues asked me if there were time for additional things. Multiple of our colleagues had other things they wanted on the table. One set of people are trying at the last minute to move something through, and nobody else has that opportunity. I try to operate in a way that provides opportunity for each of us. That is why I made this ruling. Councilor morillo.

Speaker: This is a huge waste of time. Let's move on to the vote so we can pass it and go home.

Speaker: Councilor smith.

Speaker: Madam president, I do agree with you. I had four more things that were on there that that will not be heard, and I wanted them to be heard. And that's fine with me because I'm, you know, I want to do the work. I want to make sure that everybody's voices were heard ever since, you know, we put our name into the book. But right now we've gotten to the point that we're we've been here too long, and we're going to figure out how to do this better next year where we're not, you know, spending 9:00 in the morning till 9:00 at night to finish this thing. So I agree with you. We need to we need to do the attachments and just be done with it because I'm done with it.

Speaker: Thank you counselor. Seeing no one else in the queue, a yes vote is to sustain the president's ruling that we need to move forward. We are at the attachment part of the agenda. A no vote is to overrule the president's ruling and allow the motion on the amendment to come forward. Keelan, can you please call the roll canal.

Speaker: Because this was already proposed, I will vote no.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: I just want to thank council president for her poise, her persistence. It's been quite elegant all day long and into the evening. I, I vote i.

Speaker: Koyama lane know.

Speaker: Morillo this was already proposed. This isn't new.

Speaker: No novick.

Speaker: I'm confused about what's new and what's not, but it's a coin flip. But I'm voting no voting i.

Speaker: Clark. No green.

Speaker: I. I know.

Speaker: Zimmerman.

Speaker: So this is twice where gamesmanship has happened the last time. And as miss loretta said, believe them when they show you who they are. There are so many amendments across this entire dais who were put down, did not get heard out of a general courtesy. This is discourteous. I would encourage everybody to agree with the council president. This I vote i.

Speaker: Envelopes.

Speaker: What I found discourteous was council president asking koyama lane to take her amendment down. We were ready to vote. I don't even know why that happened. I'm frustrated by that. We could. We were ready to vote. So I feel annoyed that councilor koyama lane was pressured to take her amendment down. And so I'm voting no.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Smith. I pirtle-guiney. I motion fails to carry with five yes votes and seven no votes.

Speaker: Okay, so no voted no counselor clark.

Speaker: Voted no. It was 5 to 7.

Speaker: Oh.

Speaker: Mr. Taylor, do we return to the motion that I that was placed on the table, which is the motion on the amendment, or do we return to a blank slate?

Speaker: It's a it's up to you as the as the chair to recognize the next action of the council. What would you like to do?

Speaker: Counselors. I believe that in that case, we don't have anything on the table. We have a blank slate. And I would entertain a motion.

Speaker: A motion to approve all of the attachments to the original ordinance.

Speaker: No point of order. The entire point of us rejecting that ruling is that we wanted to vote. How does that mean that she just gets a blank slate? That should mean that we get to vote. That was the whole point of that order.

Speaker: I also saw some mirrors hand up on the floor. You did not have the floor, counselor.

Speaker: That was the whole point. It was not to be a blank slate was to reject that ruling and do what we wanted.

Speaker: So I believe that that puts us at a blank slate. Since we had not entered.

Speaker: Council president. I may have I may have erred here. So on the question of whether to sustain the ruling of the chair, that failed, correct?

Speaker: Correct. Sustaining the ruling failed.

Speaker: Sustaining the ruling. Failed.

Speaker: Correct.

Speaker: And so therefore, the procedure by which councilor kanal yielded the floor.

Speaker: We are at the point without a motion on the floor, but with the yielding to councilor koyama lane and councilor koyama lane has the floor with no motion on the floor.

Speaker: I motion.

Speaker: To that. Correct?

Speaker: That is correct. Yes.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. And to be clear, counselor, what I was saying is we should start with no motion on the floor, which was, I believe, where we had ended. Councilor koyama lane.

Speaker: Motion to bring forward koyama lane three. And I move to call the question second.

Speaker: Counselors, we have a motion and a second and an additional motion to call the question. Counselor, would you like to retain that second motion to call the question? Or given that there is nobody in the queue, would you prefer to withdraw that.

Speaker: I withdraw?

Speaker: Counselors, we have a motion on tcl three and a second on the table. Nobody is in the queue for discussion. Keelan, could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Counselor? I. Ryan no.

Speaker: Koyama lane a reminder, I've worked with dca's bureau directors and the vision zero lead to talk about this transition plan and make sure that this work continues and is enhanced by this move.

Speaker: I know that.

Speaker: Maria.

Speaker: This is a really important step for vision zero and for all of our districts. Thank you councilor koyama lane for working on it. I ecstatically vote i.

Speaker: Novick i.

Speaker: Clark.

Speaker: Thank you councilor koyama lane for fighting for what my constituents care the most about.

Speaker: I zimmerman.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Avalos i. Dunphy i. Smith i.

Speaker: I'm a big supporter of vision zero, and I'm honestly not sure how moving this up to the dca level makes the program better. I vote no.

Speaker: Motion carries with nine yes votes and three no votes.

Speaker: Director levine, do we have a balanced budget?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Okay, colleagues, we no longer have the attachments open that we need open. And I would entertain a motion to open attachments b through h.

Speaker: So moved second.

Speaker: Take the first two voices, which were dunphy and morillo. And you two can choose who wants the motion in the second. Okay. Motion by dunphy, seconded by morillo counselors. Is there any discussion? Keelan, could you please call the roll.

Speaker: Canal just.

Speaker: Clarifying that this is a vote on the attachments, but the ultimate vote on the budget is next week.

Speaker: Correct this. This vote approves all of the attachments that have been amended.

Speaker: Thank you. Just want to make sure everybody was on the same page I vote i.

Speaker: Ryan i.

Speaker: Koyama lane. I morillo. I novick I clark. I green. I zimmerman. I avalos.

Speaker: I. Dunphy i. Smith i. Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: Motion carries with 12 yes votes colleagues.

Speaker: Colleagues. Today is a first reading of our budget. We will second read the budget and pass it on June 18th. I would remind you that if there are any further amendments to the budget on June 18th, it will require a nine vote majority and an emergency clause added to it. With that, I will move the budget to second reading and close today's council meeting.