



November 1, 2023 Council Agenda

5737

City Hall – 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 attendance. Members of council elect to attend remotely by video and teleconference, or in-person. The City makes several avenues available for the public to listen to the audio broadcast of this meeting, including the City's YouTube Channel, [eGov PDX](#), the [Open Signal website](#), and Xfinity Channel 30 and 330.

Questions may be directed to councilclerk@portlandoregon.gov

Wednesday, November 1, 2023 9:30 am

Session Status: Recessed

Council in Attendance: Mayor Ted Wheeler

Commissioner Carmen Rubio

Commissioner Dan Ryan

Commissioner Rene Gonzalez

Commissioner Mingus Mapps

Mayor Wheeler presided.

Commissioner Gonzalez left at 10:24 a.m. and returned at 10:28 a.m.

Officers in attendance: Anne Milligan, Senior Deputy City Attorney; Keelan McClymont, Council Clerk

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

Council recessed at 11:27 a.m.

Communications

906

[Request of Michael Akselrud to address Council regarding illegal fireworks](#) (Communication)

Document number: 906-2023

Disposition: Placed on File

907

[Request of Connie Schwendemann to address Council regarding public easement trees](#) (Communication)

Document number: 907-2023

Disposition: Placed on File

908

[Request of Richard Peterson to address Council regarding public easement trees](#) (Communication)

Document number: 908-2023

Disposition: Placed on File

909

[Request of Aubrey Russell to address Council regarding monuments review process](#) (Communication)

Document number: 909-2023

Disposition: Placed on File

910

[Request of Jude Brewer to address Council regarding Regional Arts & Culture Council contract renewal for 2024](#)
(Communication)

Document number: 910-2023

Disposition: Placed on File

Time Certain

911

[Authorize solicitation and execute multiple contracts required to implement advanced metering infrastructure and a new customer engagement portal for City utility accounts for amount not to exceed \\$76 million](#)
(Ordinance)

Document number: 191517

Introduced by: Commissioner Mingus Mapps

Bureau: Water

Time certain: 9:45 am

Time requested: 20 minutes

Disposition: Passed to second reading

Passed to second reading November 8, 2023 at 9:30 a.m.

912

[Accept the Portland Parks & Recreation Board 2022-2023 Annual Report](#) (Report)

Document number: 912-2023

Introduced by: Commissioner Dan Ryan

Bureau: Parks & Recreation

Time certain: 10:05 am

Time requested: 15 minutes

Disposition: Accepted

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

Votes: Commissioner Mingus Mapps Yea

Commissioner Carmen Rubio Yea

Commissioner Dan Ryan Yea

Commissioner Rene Gonzalez Yea

Mayor Ted Wheeler Yea

Consent Agenda

913

[Reappoint Damien Hall, Matthew Gebhardt, Jenny Kim, and TomiRene Hettman to the Home Forward Board of Commissioners](#) (Resolution)

Document number: 37634

Introduced by: Commissioner Carmen Rubio; Mayor Ted Wheeler

Bureau: Housing Bureau

Disposition: Adopted

Votes: Commissioner Mingus Mapps Yea

Commissioner Carmen Rubio Yea

Commissioner Dan Ryan Yea

Commissioner Rene Gonzalez Yea

Mayor Ted Wheeler Yea

914

[Authorize Contract with Schweers Technologies for the Parking Enforcement Handheld Citation System not to exceed \\$1,900,000.\(Procurement Report - RFP 00002110\)](#) (Report)

Document number: 914-2023

Introduced by: Mayor Ted Wheeler

Bureau: Management and Finance; Revenue and Financial Services

Disposition: Accepted - Prepare Contract

Votes: Commissioner Mingus Mapps Yea

Commissioner Carmen Rubio Yea

Commissioner Dan Ryan Yea

Commissioner Rene Gonzalez Yea

Mayor Ted Wheeler Yea

915

[Accept grant from the U.S. Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance FY 2023 National Sexual Assault Kit Initiative Competitive Grant Program for \\$2,500,000 and appropriate \\$724,955 for FY 2023-24](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 191507

Introduced by: Mayor Ted Wheeler

Bureau: Police

Disposition: Passed to second reading

Passed to second reading November 8, 2023 at 9:30 a.m.

916

[Accept grant from the U.S. Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance FY 2023 Smart Policing Initiative Grant Program for \\$800,000 and appropriate \\$312,946 for FY 2023-24](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 191508

Introduced by: Mayor Ted Wheeler

Bureau: Police

Disposition: Passed to second reading

Passed to second reading November 8, 2023 at 9:30 a.m.

917

[Amend contract with Wolf Water Resources, Inc. for professional engineering services for the Johnson Creek Oxbow Enhancement Project E08406 not to exceed \\$662,023 \(amend Contract 30007086\)](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 191510

Introduced by: Commissioner Mingus Mapps

Bureau: Environmental Services

Disposition: Passed to second reading

Passed to second reading November 8, 2023 at 9:30 a.m.

918

[*Amend Intergovernmental Agreement with Metro for 82nd Ave planning and project development to increase amount to \\$920,000 and appropriate \\$420,000 in FY 2023-24 \(amend Contract 30008082\)](#) (Emergency Ordinance)

Document number: 191502

Introduced by: Commissioner Mingus Mapps

Bureau: Transportation

Disposition: Passed

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

919

[Amend Private For-Hire Transportation Regulations Code to increase vehicle age limit, identify administrative suspension for exemption from eligibility, amend driving history requirements, and require decertification of drivers \(amend Code Chapter 16.40\)](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 191503

Introduced by: Commissioner Mingus Mapps

Bureau: Transportation

Second reading agenda item 900.

Disposition: Passed

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

Regular Agenda

920

[*Ratify a collective bargaining agreement with Portland Fire Fighters' Association relating to the terms and conditions of employment of represented employees in the Community Health Unit of Portland Fire & Rescue for 2023-2026](#) (Emergency Ordinance)

Document number: 191504

Introduced by: Mayor Ted Wheeler

Bureau: Human Resources; Management and Finance

Time requested: 10 minutes

Disposition: Passed

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

921

[*Pay settlement of Michael Weisdorf bodily injury lawsuit for \\$300,000 involving the Portland Police Bureau](#) (Emergency Ordinance)

Document number: 191505

Introduced by: Mayor Ted Wheeler

Bureau: Management and Finance; Revenue and Financial Services; Risk Management

Time requested: 15 minutes

Disposition: Passed

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

922

[Approve findings to authorize an exemption to the competitive bidding requirements and authorize use of the alternative contracting method of Construction Manager/General Contractor for the Columbia Boulevard Wastewater Treatment Plant Wet Weather Clarifier and Hypochlorite System Modifications Project for an estimated amount of \\$63 million](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 191514

Introduced by: Commissioner Mingus Mapps

Bureau: Environmental Services

Time requested: 10 minutes

Disposition: Passed to second reading

Passed to second reading November 8, 2023 at 9:30 a.m.

923

[Authorize competitive solicitation and contract with the lowest responsible bidder and provide payment for construction of the Sheridan Trunk Work Zone 3 Project E11008 for an estimated cost of \\$1,652,000](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 191515

Introduced by: Commissioner Mingus Mapps

Bureau: Environmental Services

Time requested: 10 minutes

Disposition: Passed to second reading

Passed to second reading November 8, 2023 at 9:30 a.m.

924

[Authorize competitive solicitation and price agreements for on-call green stormwater infrastructure maintenance and irrigation services for \\$12 million over five years](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 191516

Introduced by: Commissioner Mingus Mapps

Bureau: Environmental Services

Time requested: 10 minutes

Disposition: Passed to second reading

Passed to second reading November 8, 2023 at 9:30 a.m.

925

[Authorize contract with HDR Engineering, Inc. for consulting services to support participation in a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission relicensing process for the Portland Hydroelectric Project in the amount of \\$2,833,575](#)
(Ordinance)

Document number: 191518

Introduced by: Commissioner Mingus Mapps

Bureau: Water

Time requested: 15 minutes

Disposition: Passed to second reading

Passed to second reading November 8, 2023 at 9:30 a.m.

Wednesday, November 1, 2023 2:00 pm

Session Status: Adjourned

Council in Attendance: Mayor Ted Wheeler

Commissioner Carmen Rubio

Commissioner Dan Ryan

Commissioner Rene Gonzalez

Commissioner Mingus Mapps

Mayor Wheeler presided.

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

Council recessed at 4:30 p.m. and reconvened at 4:40 p.m.

Commissioner Gonzalez returned at 4:42 p.m.

Council adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

Time Certain

926

[Ensure an effective, efficient transition to Portland's new form of government by establishing a coordinated high-level reporting structure for city bureaus, offices and key functions](#) (Resolution)

Document number: 37635

Introduced by: Mayor Ted Wheeler

Bureau: Management and Finance

Time certain: 2:00 pm

Time requested: 3 hours

Disposition: Adopted As Amended

Motion to move Wheeler Amendment 1 related to the Impact Reduction Program: Moved by Wheeler and seconded by Mapps. (Y-4; Gonzalez absent)

Motion to move Wheeler Amendment 2 related to the Community Board for Police Accountability and the Office of Community-based Police Accountability: Moved by Wheeler and seconded by Gonzalez. (Y-5)

Motion to move Rubio Amendment 1 to move the Chief Sustainability Officer to report directly to the City Administrator in the organizational chart: Moved by Rubio and seconded by Gonzalez. (Y-5)

Motion to move Rubio Amendment 2 to update Exhibit A to combine "Permitting" and "Development Services" into one line to read "Permitting and Development Services": Moved by Rubio and seconded by Ryan. (Y-5)

Motion to move Mapps Amendment 1 related to managing Portland's Natural Resources: Moved by Mapps and seconded by Gonzalez. (Y-Mapps; N-Rubio, Ryan, Gonzalez, Wheeler) Motion failed.

Motion to move Ryan Amendment 1 related to Citywide Operational Natural Area and Tree Management Unit in the Parks and Recreation Service Area: Moved by Ryan and seconded by Gonzalez. Y-Rubio, Ryan, Gonzalez; N-Mapps, Wheeler

Motion to move Ryan and Gonzalez Amendment 1 related to renaming service areas: Moved by Gonzalez and seconded by Ryan. (Y-Mapps, Ryan, Gonzalez, Wheeler; N-Rubio)

Motion to move Ryan Amendment 2 related to moving Arts to a new service area: Moved by Ryan and seconded by Gonzalez. (Y-Rubio, Ryan, Gonzalez, Wheeler; N-Mapps)

Motion to move Gonzalez Amendment 1 related to service management: Moved by Gonzalez and seconded by Mapps. (Y-Mapps, Rubio, Ryan, Gonzalez; N-Wheeler)

Motion to move Gonzalez Amendment 2 related to reservation of authority: Moved by Gonzalez and seconded by Ryan. (Y-Mapps, Rubio, Ryan, Gonzalez; N-Wheeler)

Motion to move Ryan Amendment 3 related to approval of Interim City Administrator: Moved by Ryan and seconded by Gonzalez. (Y-Rubio, Ryan, Gonzalez; N-Mapps, Wheeler)

Motion to move Gonzalez Amendment 3 related to transition of authority for Council: Moved by Gonzalez and seconded by Ryan. (Y-Mapps, Rubio, Ryan, Gonzalez; N-Wheeler)

Motion to move Gonzalez Amendment 4 related to organizational chart effective date: Moved by Gonzalez and seconded by Ryan. (Y-5)

Motion to move Gonzalez Amendment 5 related to the authority of the Chief Administrative Officer: Moved by Gonzalez and seconded by Ryan. (Y-Rubio, Ryan, Gonzalez; N-Mapps, Wheeler)

Motion to move Ryan Amendment 4 related to Council Chambers and workspace construction: Moved by Ryan and Gonzalez. Motion withdrawn. No vote called.

Motion to move Ryan Amendment 5 related to authority to change proposed organizational structure during the upcoming budget process: Moved by Ryan and seconded by Gonzalez. (Y-Ryan, Gonzalez; N-Mapps, Rubio, Wheeler) Motion failed.

Votes: Commissioner Mingus Mapps Yea

Commissioner Carmen Rubio Yea

Commissioner Dan Ryan Yea

Commissioner Rene Gonzalez Yea

Mayor Ted Wheeler Nay

Thursday, November 2, 2023 2:00 pm

Session Status: No session scheduled

**Portland City Council Meeting Speaker List
November 1, 2023 - 9:30 a.m.**

Name	Agenda Item
Mayor Ted Wheeler	
Keelan McClymont	
Commissioner Rene Gonzalez	
Commissioner Mingus Mapps	
Commissioner Carmen Rubio	
Commissioner Dan Ryan	
Anne Milligan	
Michael Akselrud	906
Connie Schwendemann	907
Richard Peterson	908
Aubrey Russell	909
Jude Brewer	910
Quisha Light	911
Farshad Allahdadi	911
C.N.E. Corbin	912
Elana Pirtle-Guiney	912
Jared Essig	912
Kim Fouts	920
Isaac McLennan	920
Stephenie Sullivan	920
Karen O'Kasey	921
Marc Poris Portland Copwatch	921
Liani Reyna	921
Jared Essig	921
Biko Taylor	922
Muriel Gueissaz-Teufel	922
Tressie Word	922
Lisa Huntington	923
Daniel Boatman	923
Ryan Durocher	924
Edward Campbell	925
Liane Davis	925

**Portland City Council Meeting Speaker List
November 1, 2023 - 2:00 p.m.**

Name	Agenda Item
Mayor Ted Wheeler	
Keelan McClymont	
Commissioner Rene Gonzalez	
Commissioner Mingus Mapps	
Commissioner Carmen Rubio	
Commissioner Dan Ryan	
Linly Rees	
Mike Jordan	926
Shoshanah Oppenheim	926
Becky Tillson	926
Willie Levenson	926
Elana Pirtle Guiney	926
JR Lily	926
Jason Margolis	926
Bob Sallinger	926
Walter Weyler	926
Marianne Fitzgerald	926
David Chen	926
Zari Santner	926
Terry Harris	926
Sarah Silkie	926
Jenny O'Connor	926
Micah Meskel	926
John Toran	926
Dan Handelman Portland Copwatch	926
Jena Kain	926
Kiel Johnson	926
Babs Vanelli	926
Diane Meisenhelter	926
lynn handlin	926
Isaac McLennan	926
Cherice Bock	926
Bob Weinstein	926
Terri Preeg Riggsby	926

Debbie Aiona	926
Janice Thompson	926
Keith Edwards	926
Adena Long	926
Todd Lofgren	926
Robert Taylor	926
Dawn Uchiyama	926
Elyse Rosenberg	926
Caitlin McGehee	926
Maty Sauter	926
Tim Grewe	926

Portland City Council Meeting Closed Caption File

November 1, 2023 – 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 is the Wednesday, November 1st, 2023.

Speaker: Morning session of the Portland City Council. Keelan good morning. Please call the roll. Good morning.

Speaker: Mapps here. Rubio here. Ryan here. Gonzalez here.

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

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

your name for the record. Your address is not necessary. We disclose if you are a lobbyist. If you are representing an organized session, please identify it for testifiers. Joining virtually. Please unmute yourself. Once the council clerk calls your name. Thank you.

Speaker: All right. Thank you. First up is communications. Our first individual this morning. Please, item 906 request of michael axelrod to address council regarding illegal fireworks.

Speaker: They're joining us online. Good morning, michael.

Speaker: Hey, good morning. Can you hear me?

Speaker: Yeah, loud and clear. Great.

Speaker: Um, I'm just here as a follow up. I came in a few months ago and, if you recall, spoke about this. I don't have any prepared remarks today. I just wanted to really just follow up. I tried to do that online by emailing some of you and haven't heard back and don't see that there's been any updates on the website about anything that's being done about this. I again, I appreciate all you guys are doing and not really here to complain as much as but we can get something done about this and I'm willing to also volunteer if that's even something you need or want to help with the issue. But I don't need all of my time. I just wanted to say that and see if there's been anything done on it.

Speaker: Thank you, michael. I know the Portland police bureau was listening to your testimony. That was what, about eight, eight weeks ago? If my recollection is correct. As you know, I led the effort to make the use of fireworks illegal in the city of Portland, and that was both responsive to the fires that we'd seen in the community, as well as, frankly, the irresponsibility on the part of a few. And just as a reminder about a month after we passed that fireworks ban and we got a lot of blowback for it, frankly, there was a catastrophic apartment fire on the east side of

the river that took lives as a result of people disposing of illegal fireworks incorrectly in a dumpster underneath the apartment building. So this is something that I am concerned about. I can't give you a specific update today, and I'm sorry, I wasn't aware of your testimony coming this morning. I would have provided something had I known. So apologies, but I'll have somebody. Megan from our office, maybe Stephanie reach out to give you more of a specific update.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Next individual, please. 907.

Speaker: 907 and 908 would like to present together for six minutes. Not a problem. Okay. 907 request of Connie Schwendiman to address council regarding public easement trees and 908 requests of Richard Peterson to address council regarding public easement trees. They're joining us online. Welcome

Speaker: Good morning. Good morning. I want to thank the mayor and commissioners for allowing this time for public testimony. My name is Connie Schwendiman. I'm a Portland resident. I'm here to discuss the city's policy of shifting responsibility to the owners of properties adjoining street trees. Um let's a little bit less than two years ago, my husband and I gave testimony about our first elm tree that died and the bad experience we experienced, the bad experience we had with the city. Um, our second tree has just been removed. And now we're \$25,000 in less than two years, paying for two trees to be removed. We find this to be an unfair policy and it's yet another example of the unbundling of services by Portland Parks Department and the Urban Forestry Department with expert knowledge. The city has been very well aware of the aging canopy of our trees and the timing couldn't be more perfect for the city to bow out of its responsibility as far as trees go, this is an undue burden on the citizens who own properties adjacent to these trees and we find that unfair. Um, I would like to suggest some changes. First of all, please

don't call the death of a tree a violation when we received that a form. It is like a slap in the face. We did not violate any city ordinance. Our tree simply died. Both of them simply died. Uh, let's see. Oh, also on the website for urban forestry department, please make it clear to spell it out that that the planting maintenance and removal of trees are the public's.

Speaker: Thank you, commissioner Gonzalez had a comment. Connie? Connie are you still there?

Speaker: Yeah, she's. I am. Okay. I i just wanted to share with you, you know, we just went through this for the second time in four years for dutch elm, and it is really an unsatisfactory experience as a homeowner. I've conveyed to parks just some pieces about how the notices are provided. The that, you know, we'll continue to follow up on. But it is unbelievably expensive for homeowners. It becomes it's a total shock. There's not much you can do. Preventative when you're talking about dutch elm. Um, I you know, not necessarily going to weigh in if this is something that at this point the homeowners should continue to fund. But it is very painful. I am there with you. I my wife can go on on this subject as she had to deal with the last one. So i, I just all I can say is I understand what you're have gone through. It is painful. And I wish we had a better way to address this in the city. Commissioner really, there's no incentive to plant a tree in the city of Portland because it's like getting the old maid card because it's on you from day one.

Speaker: And it's not just elm trees. It's all trees. So I find this very unfair and it hasn't always been the city's policy and I know it's all a matter of money, but I hope that you can find some money to support our homeowners as well. Yeah and I don't want to overemphasize this point, but literally on our side of the street, 100 years ago, they planted elms and on the other side of the street, they planted someone something else.

Speaker: So every homeowner on our side of the street is has had to confront this in recent years. And it's just bad luck that we're on the side of the street where they planted dutch elms or elm trees. So I don't have a solution here. I just wanted to communicate. My household is going through the same thing and is extremely unpleasant.

Speaker: I know that you are the folks who approved the budgets and so I am beseeching you that. You reconsider the response ability with the city parks department and urban forestry division vis a vis street trees. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, commissioner Ryan had a comment as well.

Speaker: Yeah. First of all, thank you so much, connie. I see that you communicated with the city on December eighth, 20, 2021, 2021. And I know that now that you're back and you have more grim news. So we appreciate your follow up. Um, and, and the results we want aren't happening with with a testimony like this because we want to incentivize residents to actually have street trees, not penalize them for having them. So your statements are great. I will say that both jen and someone else from urban forestry is watching right now, and I expect they'll be in touch with you. And we also have to look at some past decisions that were made that gets into the weeds on this one. Um and one example of that is, is urban forestry used to remove elm street trees infected with dutch elm disease, a budget realignment several years ago did remove this service to bring elm trees in alignment with other street trees. So it's where maybe policy and practice had a miscommunication. That happens a lot in government. And so my point is we have to look into this on a deeper level. But also, you deserve some customer service so they'll be in touch with you soon. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, commissioner. Thank you, connie. Uh, next individual, please. 9090, actually, we're going to have, I think.

Speaker: Oh, I'm sorry.

Speaker: Yeah, I apologize. Jumped the gun there. Yeah richard well, good morning.

Speaker: And thank you for the time that you allotted us. Um, I haven't got a bunch of notes down. I wanted to kind of put this on a personal level and give you some perspective for our community here in laurelhurst, we've lived in this house for 50 years. We've attended this tree for 50 years. And with a with a cost of I looking back at, at what we had paid at about \$20,000 for inoculation and pruning and so forth. So that's an additional burden. And we were happy to pay that with the understanding and that it was your trees, it was the city street trees. And we wanted to be good citizens. I also know that when we moved in, this was a blue collar neighborhood. There are many people that have lived in this area for as many years as we have. I'm on a fixed income and a number of people that are living in laurelhurst, um, are on fixed income, a particular lady that has a tree in front of her yard and i, I know for a fact that if she was burdened with this, she could not handle the expense. She would have to sell the house and move. So I just. This hurts in so many levels. Um, that I just want you to know that, that this is a terrible burden on, on some people. And the trees in general. We have you know, we had these trees. They were part of the urban canopy that that has been touted by the city as one of the things that are a good reason to come live in Portland this tree generated shade and oxygen for our whole community. And I think the whole community should be involved in the removal or maintenance of those trees. Um so i, I guess I don't want to take any more of your time other than just letting you know that the this affects the life of the people that are living here very severely.

And I know there are people that are just absolutely can't handle this. Thank you very much. I had one more comment.

Speaker: Thank you, commissioner Gonzalez.

Speaker: Yeah. And just for those listening at home, I'm just going to walk you through what a citizen experience is when this happens. You literally get a notice that you have to remove a tree within 30 days. You go out and contract that when you're talking 100 year old elm tree. We got quotes everywhere from eight grand to 30 grand. So you're getting a surprise in the mail that you've got to go solve if you think you've been following the rules because you've been getting your tree inoculated and that's not a small check for a lot of families. So with really no more warning than 30 days notice. So it is a deeply unpleasant experience as a as a citizen that we've had the misfortune of experiencing twice in the last four years as it sounds like they have. And it is a shift from policy of some years back. Understand the budget. So again, I thank you for testifying and I can only communicate that empathy in the sense that I we have had to go through this twice now. Thanks

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: I do think what he brings up, though, is something that policymakers have to keep looking at, which is policies that look at elders aging in place and when they're on fixed income. And I don't think we put enough clauses in terms of fees and taxes on that segment of our population. Thank you so much for being here.

Speaker: I have one more point to that, that you you kind of touched on. I know that we are paying property tax base on the perceived value of the of the land. Um, which at home which includes those trees and I wonder if any consideration is being made to reevaluate the tax burden for the trees that are now gone.

Speaker: Thank you, richard. Thank you, richard. And thank you, connie. Both thank you. Next individual, please

Speaker: 909 request of aubrey russell to address council regarding monuments review process. Good morning. Is there a timer still?

Speaker: There is, timer. Okay um, aubrey russell at council here, July 19th. Art staff presented slides. Quote phase one, August 20, 23 to February 2024. Goal this phase aims to address the five toppled monuments in question. The next slide explained February 20th, 24. Share phase one findings and make recommendations about the five monuments in question. That seems pretty clear at the time. Some of us suggest. Did a set time frame lack of bias, public testimony. That was then. In September, a few weeks ago, we met with art staff and commissioner Ryan's staff. We were told, quote, we think that a year from when they accepted the report, July of next year is when we hope to bring recommendations to council for darrian jones added this in February. Quote, if the feedback we receive is that there needs to be more engagement, then then we would still need to continue probably until July. By stephen herrera said, quote, this is an emerging process, so nothing is crisp and clear on a very hard and fast timeline, end quote. So the time frame is not fixed and is shifting, but the timing will be decided by the monuments advisory board, which may forward it to council or may decide on more talks. The monuments advisory support team city bureaus like parks, but also jess perlitz and mac mcfarland may also influence timing since they will make the recommendation to council this brings me to bias. Joe perlitz chaired the lewis and clark process, which proposed putting rack in charge. Mcfarland organized with jess and rack the prototypes exhibit in which Washington and lincoln were shown in flames and degraded with paint, etcetera. And of course, the parks bureau has lobbied with rack against include ing lincoln and roosevelt in the national register listing of the

south park blocks. I wonder if this is impartial process. Yes. Finally, I asked stephen herrera about public testimony. He he said it would occur at the time of council decision and during communications communicate options. This is not public testimony, robust public testimony. Instead of public testimony. Our staff wants to organize, quote, public talks and conversations, end quote. My concern is that when art staff decides just who to talk to and in just what numbers you get, orchestrated opinion, not public opinion. Is this going to be art staff doing grassroots lobbying? To recap a set time frame, lack of bias, public testimony, any? Thank you. Thank you.

Speaker: Commissioner Gonzalez.

Speaker: Mr. Russell, just one quick question. The reference to images showing the statues in flame, what was that? Could you reiterate what you were referencing there?

Speaker: So, yes, there was just an art exhibit and it included a lot of things. But the perspective was was largely about replacing monuments. Okay. And I could provide you with text which would would support that assertion. And of course, I don't object to any art, but at the time it was being funded by rack at the time, rack was making a decision about the future of the statues and which, which, which was a conflict in my view. But people who are deeply I think have a have a history of asserting or advocating for a particular outcome in this process. I think maybe shouldn't be in central roles making decisions that it would create more trust in the public's mind. If more neutral people were put in leadership positions. But also people of and these are these are these are people of certain stature in the arts community. But people who had stature in the more general community and I'm talking about known figures such as commissioner Ryan or barbara. Barbara roberts or margaret carter or, you know, you could find lots of people who would

be recognized. It would be valued who would signify that this is an important issue, but who also know are really accountable to the public and would bring a great deal of sort of gravitas to the to the whole process. Anyways, that's that's a little rambling. But but the prototypes exhibit was a was a was an art exhibit. And I can provide I can provide you with some, some materials and it was it was funded by it was supported by rack. Is that it was it was co-organized by rack. It was in part funded by rack and it was organized by people who who have been involved in the lewis and clark process and apparently are going to continue to be involved in the process moving forward.

Speaker: Okay. And, you know, this gets to the heart of a difficult issue, right? The free expression of art is one thing. And if someone wants to depict it, our statues in flames and they consider that art, that's their prerogative. But but I think what you're getting at is what perspective they apply as advisors or guiding decisions about statues, as in other monuments in the community, that that one is entitled to their expression, but that that calls into question their objectivity. Is that a fair summary?

Speaker: That's a that's a much better summary than my own. Okay. Thank you, commissioner Ryan.

Speaker: Well, actually, your summaries are both just fine. Thanks for being here, aubrey. I know that my chief of staff and you had a conversation yesterday, kelly torres and I'm glad you're here. Um we made decisions in July, and you saw the timeline, and we're doing all we can to. I got similar information, and so we're getting it back on track. And we will have some decisions for sure by February about the fate of those. And we will include in the art talks that are very objective out in the community. Some round tables for people to be engaged in. Specifically on this topic as well. So we are a little bit behind the eight ball on getting out there

and engaging. And so we just need to do it and when you convene and you steward convening in the in the public realm on some thing that's deemed controversial, you're right, you have to have objectivity. So that all parties feel safe and heard at the table. All parties. And so that's the goal. And that's always been my goal when I do stewardship and convening. So thank you for being here and keeping us on task. I appreciate it.

Speaker: Can I ask a question? Does does this come back to council for a final decision or is there going to be a recommendation made to council? I'm just curious about what what the end game is.

Speaker: That's what I would expect when I was handed this commissioner yea. Rubio, you can weigh in if you'd like. It was started with a process with lewis and clark to kind of gauge what the landscape should be like as we move forward. And we decoupled the five topples from what the process should look like going forward. This is a conversation nationally. There's national foundations that are tuned in to this and Portland wants to get it right, but it doesn't mean perfection has to get in the way of good, that it takes another three years. But we have to we have to we did decouple them. And that's why the timeline we announced in July said February we'd have decisions and we're certain that we could have. At least three of the five decided by then. I'm being told, and they are expediting the process to get engagement going where they're actually talking and reaching out to the community. And there has been a lot of planning as you know, that's gone on and now it's time to put it into action. Not that planning is an action, but I just want to say that it helps when people are paying attention and keeping us honest.

Speaker: Could you clarify who the decision maker is?

Speaker: We are the ultimate decision maker, commissioner. Yeah, it's coming back.

Speaker: Sorry. For the record, my question was just clarifying who who makes the ultimate decision here. And it sounds like council will make the ultimate and we receive the report in July that had the timeline that we all approved of.

Speaker: So that was the public transparency moment that we have to get back on track.

Speaker: Great. Well, we all have something to look forward to this summer. Thank you. Actually commissioner, this winter. This winter? Yeah. February. Please don't. Thanks, aubrey. I know you'll be back next individual, please. Nine, ten.

Speaker: Request of jud brewer to address council regarding regional arts and culture council contract renewal for 2024. Jud is joining us online.

Speaker: Good morning, jud.

Speaker: Good morning. Thanks for having me this morning. Council. I just want to address the discontinuation of the contract with rac. Um I'm going to read a statement here. There was a time in commissioner dan Ryan's life when he fell gravely ill and he returned to the city of Portland, unsure of how much longer he would live. And in 2019, I lost two people who were very important to me. The following year, I lost my father. Within that year was when I received my rac grant getting that grant meant everything because I had moved to Portland in 2012 with a single dream to work with writers, musicians, actors and artists from all disciplines. I was not familiar with Portland at the time. I've now lived here 11 years. I've worked with hundreds of Portland artists through my show, storytellers telling stories storybound and now the process these shows are my way of giving back to the community that has saved my life. But when I moved here, I didn't know if the city did believe in me, if the city would support these dreams and when it came to applying for the rac grant, people like grants officer ingrid carlson were instrumental in helping me understand even how to write a grant. I submitted all

the materials and she was able to take a phone call with me and offer me a chance to revise all of it before submitted officially for grant approval. I was a young, struggling artist with no experience with grant writing, almost no money to my name. And so not only was I approved for a grant, but I was educated in the process of applying for grants in general, which has helped me to this day. So I want to share a statement from artist brianna barrett, my fellow rac grant recipient from that year. Brianna says the rac grant has enabled the Oregonian artist to pursue a wide range of creative projects over the years, which serves to enrich our community, inspire others and create opportunities for growth among our creative professionals. As an early career writer, I benefited tremendously from joining line-storm playwrights, a theater collective that received rac grants in the past for play readings. We mounted at artists repertory theater. The experience not only gave me an opportunity to develop my writing and find a creative home in Portland, but also directly led me to dedicate years of independent research to writing a full length play based on frances fuller victor, a 19 century author who is said to be the first historian of Oregon. I was honored to receive a grant a few years later to record a radio presentation of this story. During the pandemic, in partnership with the storybound podcast. This experience instilled in me a passion for uncovering stories about the contribution of women in history, particularly Oregonian history, and continues to connect me to audiences and theater makers who are passionate about the same. So council in closing, I would like to make this statement directly to commissioner dan Ryan. Mr. Ryan, you are not new to Portland and you should know that. Rac what rac means for our community. Thank you. That's my time.

Speaker: You have 30s if you want to finish, I appreciate it.

Speaker: Uh, you have a bachelor of arts degree. You've been touched by illness and death in your life, so you know the rule that art plays in one's life during these

struggles and how vital it is to have experienced individuals to help artists, individuals who've known our community personally and have worked to educate us beyond just the one simple grant. So I'm asking you to please reconsider your decision to discontinue view the city's contract with rac and instead seek some sort of negotiation of some sort of middle ground, if not to outright renew the same contract.

Speaker: Commissioner. Thank you.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Thank you for that beautiful testimony, jude. I appreciate it. And you're right. I am from here. And in theater basically saved my life. Fortunately, I did get sick and I had to get out of the theater world and find a and get a doctor. So I have a lived experience that I appreciate that you know a little bit about the decision, just so you really know, set the record straight. Rac is an organization that continues to exist. They're going through their own stuff. If we are committed to not missing a beat in terms of getting investments out to artists and out to arts organizations, as we may, we made a decision collectively to not continue with rac as the sole contractor. That's all they are open and we are welcoming them to apply for the contracts. But what I want you to hear, because there's been misinformation yea. Ryan. Is that the investment is going out to people like yourself to apply and to be a part of that arts ecosystem are welcomed and wanted. So I hope that you will monitor the progress on the website. I know that we'll give updates out to the arts community and we do have some arts talks coming up to next week and one the following week out in the community. You can see it on our website where we can go deeper into this dialog. Thank you for being here, jude, and please know that the arts ecosystem is a big part of the focus of this council. Thanks

Speaker: Thank thank you. Appreciate it. And I just wanted to make it clear that I make it clear that I think rac and their individual commitment to it and their specific knowledge and expertise, I just hope that will, you know, continue to be respected and acknowledged.

Speaker: So, jude, I just want to say this also, you know, as commissioner Ryan hinted at, this was not his decision alone. And I've watched people come at dan as though this was something he pulled out of a hat. He didn't I supported his decision. I supported the reasons behind that decision. And to be honest, I think actions that have happened at rac since we made that decision have done nothing but underscore and validate that decision. We have a responsibility to not only protect our infrastructure and the ecosystem in our community, we have a responsible to protect taxpayer funds and make sure that they are being invested wisely. And we are ultimately on the hook for how those funds are deployed. And I will just tell you personally, I made numerous suggestions to rac over the years, all of which were summarily dismissed or ignored and so as the contractor with rac, i'll just tell you, I was not satisfied. And so I don't want dan to take the heat alone here. I 100% support that decision. And just so you know, does that complete communications? Yes. Great. Thank you. Next we'll do the consent agenda of any items been pulled off consent?

Speaker: No items have been pulled.

Speaker: Please call the roll on the consent agenda.

Speaker: Perhaps I yea. Rubio. Hi, Ryan.

Speaker: Hi, gonzales.

Speaker: Hi, Wheeler. Hi

Speaker: Consent agenda is adopted next item, please. Time certain. Number 911 authorize solicitation and execute multiple contracts required to implement

advanced metering infrastructure and a new customer engagement portal for city utility accounts for amount not to exceed \$76 million. Commissioner Mapps.

Speaker: Thank you, mr. Mayor. Colleagues this item comes to us from the water bureau and the bureau of environmental services. This ordinance authorizes those bureaus to solicit and execute three contracts that will ultimately enable the city's utility bureaus to use wireless technology to read your water meters. Currently our utility bureaus read about 190,000 water meters manually four times a year. As this work is cumbersome and this work is expensive. In addition, our median metering infrastructure is aging and many meters in our system need to be replaced. That's why the water bureau and environmental services are in the process of modernizing our metering system. Under our next metering system, water usage will be tracked electronically every day. Water bureau customers will be able to track their water usage and roughly real time through an app on their phone, which will enable our customers to catch expensive leaks early in addition, this new metering system will allow our customers to access data they can use to manage utility costs. Finally this project, as part of this project, the city's utility bureaus will consolidate our online customer services into a new, accessible, multilingual, online and mobile customer engagement portal. I'll here to tell us more about this ordinance. We have quisha light customer service director for the Portland water bureau, and we have farshad allahdadi, business services group manager for environmental services. Welcome esha and farshad, please take it away.

Speaker: Good morning, mayor Wheeler and commissioners, as commissioner Mapps noted on quisha light and I'm the customer service director for the Portland water bureau and I'm very excited to be sitting here with my partner, bts for Portland's utility bureau's have partnered together to revolutionize how we collect customer usage data and deliver equitable, accessible customer service. This this

initiative will replace or upgrade manual water meters with digital meters and streamline data collection. It also merges four separate online customer service systems into a single new multilingual online and mobile engagement portal. With this new system, we and our customers will be able to quickly identify leaks while also empowering our customers with real time data to manage their utility costs. This ordinance authorizes the procurement of goods and services required for this groundbreaking transformation. As the commissioner noted, currently we manually read nearly 190,000m every three months, leading to undetected leaks, water loss, high bills and loss revenue manual, quarterly reads hinder our ability to shift to monthly billing and make it impossible for us to provide usage data that can help our customers manage their costs. The Portland water bureau's 2020 2024 strategic plan, rightfully included exploring advance metering infrastructure or ami as a key step towards addressing these issues. In 2020, we completed a feasibility study on automated meter reading technologies and made a compelling case for ami in 2023. Both utility bureaus secured funding and support for ami paving the way for project implementation, and we respectfully request council to authorize three solicitations and contract awards to implement ami and a new customer engagement portal at an estimated total cost of \$76 million. This project costs will be evenly shared between the water bureau and the bureau of environmental services, totaling approximately \$91 million over the next seven years. This project transforms how customers use how customer usage data is collected. It enhances transparency. It broadens services through online customer service and upon completion, our customers will have access to that single portal portal. Excuse me that commissioner Mapps mentioned. They'll be able to monitor their consumption, pay their bills or make service requests, get alerts, rebate, get rebates and enroll in programs. These services will be available on various devices and in

multiple languages. This project has and will continue to seek direct input from customers and focused communities during system design and implementation. This system wide, this system wide effort will benefit every one of our 190,000 customers and touch every one of the 190,000m in the field. So another way for you to think about this is at the account level, \$400 per account buys 20 plus years of accurate meter reading costs for access to daily usage and accessible, multilingual online self-service portal that offers the kind of service our customers are used to receiving from pge and other utilities. And it will finally allow us to move to more affordable monthly billing project costs are included in the capital investment plans for both of our bureaus and already factored into rate forecasts. We request that you support this transformation of Portland's utility services to create a more equitable and efficient future for our customers and approve our request to authorize three solicitation and contract awards to implement ami and a new customer engagement portal at an estimated total cost of \$76 million. And i'll turn it over to farshad.

Speaker: Thank you, commissioner. Is the only thing I would like to add to this is a couple of comments about the partnership between the two bureaus. As the billing agent and principal customer service and account management provider for Portland's water stormwater and sewer utility customers. The water bureau is leading this initiative. However, the water bureau and the bureau of environmental services are partners in every other sense of the word. Project governance is shared a shared responsibility of both bureaus and I lead the project steering committee and both bureaus have key subject matter experts managing the technical and policy issues associated with this work. As krissha also mentioned, both bureaus are sharing the financial responsibility of ami. Bts has included ami in its the expected capital costs in our cip. Kip pardon and overall we feel ami is a

program that is an excellent example of inter bureau collaboration and partnership consistent with the objective of the service area, public works service area and will ultimately improve service levels and value to our shared customers. Thank you.

Thank you, mr. Mayor.

Speaker: I think we might have some if there are no questions, I think there might be some public testimony on this one. Keelan I'm sorry.

Speaker: We do have one person signed up. Walter wyler is walter wyler here? That's it. All right.

Speaker: Very good. Any further discussion? Thanks for the presentation. This is the first reading of an emergency ordinance. Moves to second reading. Thank you. Well done. Thanks for your hard work. Next item, nine, one two. And that's a time certain as well. A report except the Portland parks and recreation board. 2022 to 2023 annual report. Commissioner Ryan.

Speaker: Yes. Thank you, mayor. The parks and recreation advisory board was established by council in 2021 to ensure that parks system delivers on its mission to provide healthy parks and natural areas. Urban forest management, recreation services is programing for all ages. All demographic groups, all abilities as such facilities are accessible to all Portlanders. I want to thank our parks board members for their time and passion for parks and recreation and for their continued engage moment. And now I'd like to introduce our parks board co-chairs. Thanks for coming up to the table and I must pause to mention we have two very passionate, committed and skilled leaders who are using a lot of their so-called free time to give to the city and to their passion for Portland parks and recreation. And they're leaning on our board at a very important time in the city's history, a history that is consistently placed our parks in the national standing with practices that do lead

the nation. So welcome, dr. Corbin. Good to see you. And her co-chair, elena papillon. Wait elena pirtle, ginny, is that I always do. Your name wrong?

Speaker: Elena pirtle guinea. Thank you, commissioner pirtle.

Speaker: Ginny to share their annual report. And it was really good to see you at the that the urban forestry arbor day celebration in the park recently. So anyway thank you both for being here. I had a chance to listen to a brief of your presentation last week and now I'm excited to know that my colleagues were here the same. Thanks for being here. The floor is yours. Thank you for having us this year, the Portland parks and recreation bureau has moved into a new phase after completing the 22 vision work and the board's role is also involving guided by healthy parks, healthy Portland report.

Speaker: This initiative centers minoritized marginalized and underserved communities while being responsive and transparent, allowing for Portland parks and recreation to share decision making and promote civic engagement. Healthy parks, healthy Portland comes with an admirable mission to provide equitable access to welcoming places, programs and services that improve community health and our environment and envisions a park and recreation system that is responsive to diverse and changing community needs, is nurturing health and connection for all. The board aims to uphold the mission, vision and values of healthy parks, healthy Portland with an advisory role to Portland parks and recreation and the City Council. And in our work as the public forum for public discussion and decision making, the board's work is driven by the values of equity and inclusion and accessibility and delivering parks and recreation services and the necessity of extending those services to all Portlanders, especially those who are underserved. And the board believes that this to be a great city. Portland must have great parks open spaces, natural areas and recreation opportunities that are safe, safe, well

maintained, equitably distributed and accessible to all in accordance with healthy parks and healthy parks and healthy Portland. Portland parks and recreation advisory board's 2023 2024 parties are as follows leading with belonging, justice, equity, diversity and inclusion. Increasing public engagement with the board. We do have public comments at the beginning, at the end of our meetings, and we invite Portlanders in to work with us and advocacy. It is our commitment to the city of Portland, Portland parks and recreation and the Portland community that we uphold and operationalize belonging, justice, equity, diversity, including inclusion within our advisory capacity, within our work as a board and in our board meetings. These tenets extend to who we serve and represent and include future colleagues and leadership on the board. We will continue dismantling and reducing barriers to access and participating in our meetings while creating inclusive and equitable pathways to serve as board members. Regardless of social economic status. We believe that leading with belonging, justice, equity, diversity and inclusion will increase public engagement with the board as we also work to meet community and residents where they are by volunteering at Portland parks and recreation events and doing the deep hanging out necessary to serve our city and represent its residents. S. The board will advocate for equitable and sustainable 21st century park urban park and recreation system as permitted by the city code and our bylaws to ensure that Portland parks and recreation legacy for future generations. Do you want to jump in?

Speaker: Sure.

Speaker: So based on the work that the board has done over the last year, we wanted to highlight a few pieces for you all, which you'll also see in the report. We'd like to put them on the record today though, as well. Between 2022 and 2023, the board has participated in a number of civic and community committees on behalf

of Portland parks and rec and also so on behalf of the community within the Portland parks and recreation. We have been part of the healthy parks, healthy Portland analysis. We have worked on a mission, vision, values and racial equity team for Portland parks and recreation. We've been part of a variety of park renaming committees as we've worked on title 20 amendments on the parks levy advisory committee. The parks replaced bond oversight committee work to create the darcelle 15 revised o'brien square work that is occurring. The rfp selection and review process for that new park budget advisory committees and public advisory committees to create new parks. The board has had informational presentations and reports on a variety of different topics. You have the full list in your report from us, but just to highlight a few, we have had numerous discussions about the shelter activation process, which we know are discussions happening elsewhere within the city. We have had a number of conversations about financial assistance and the pilot work that's happening within Portland parks and rec there. We have talked about Portland parks and rec work within the omsi master plan and other areas of development around Portland. And we continue to be a part of the healthy parks, healthy Portland conversations and advise Portland parks and recreation on on how that work is moving forward and toward the end of the report you'll see two important sections where we talk about areas of concern that we have moving forward. And I want to draw your attention to that because we very intentionally divided that part of the report into two sections. The first is areas of concern for parks, places where we want you to know more work needs to be done within our parks system, our parks and recreation system to be able to better serve Portlanders. As you'll see things there like the need to have more wireless internet capacity within meeting spaces so that those can be more useful, more accessible to Oregonians who need those low cost meeting and gathering spaces. You'll see

information about implementation of the ada plan and universal park design work and a few other recommendations. The section after that, though, is a section about systemic issues that are causing areas of concern for us as we look at the future of Portland parks and recreation, those are larger issues where we need your help to be able to solve those problems. Those are things like the citywide wide approach to climate resilience and Portland parks and recreation's role within that work. Those are things like our ever growing deferred maintenance backlog, which I know commissioner Ryan has heard a lot about. I know the rest of you have heard us talk about that as well. So where we really need the city to take a holistic look at how we are addressing maintenance backlog within our parks, that's a cost that is growing and that will continue to grow over time. Systems are easier to repair than replace, and our community members see these this backlog of maintenance that's needed within the community. So I hope you take a look at those two sections, specifically that second section you want to close us out.

Speaker: Yes, we ask that you continue to partnership through fully funding our parks system, partnering with parks to continue to provide more access to our parks, recreation and programing and supporting the Portland parks and recreation bureau's crucial and increasing role as the city's ecosystem of vital infrastructure, which serves at the forefront of mitigating climate change and severe weather. As a highly recognized urban park system. And lastly, the parks and recreation advisory board supports commissioner Ryan's proposal to add the citywide operational natural area and tree management unit to the parks and recreation service area. This will establish the importance of green infrastructure, ecosystem services, urban ecology again, as a vital and integral to community and environmental sustainability and livability. As the city of Portland contends with severe weather events due to climate change. And we look forward to seeing you

this afternoon during the council meeting. Thank you. This report, I know I was able to hand out the reports to some of you.

Speaker: We don't have any on us today right. Okay. I think mingus, I need to get you one. But I was fortunate to meet with most of you yesterday and hand out the report. That's that concludes our report. It's open to all of you for questions.

Speaker: Great colleagues. Any questions at this point? Public testimony.

Speaker: We have two people signed up, three minutes each name for the record, please. First up is mia winter. Coming is mia here. For followed by jared essig. Terry. Morning good morning.

Speaker: Good morning. Mayor Wheeler. Distinguished commissioners, citizens of Portland and parks and recreation representatives. Thank you for your report. I read the summary on the City Council website. My name is jared essig. I am representing the public and the rose city iron front and I commend the areas of concern that are addressed by the parks and recreation representatives of safety and sanitation. These are, in my opinion, the most the two most important issues that need to be addressed the maintenance backlog will be something that that's your mess and you'll have to figure that out. But there are two other areas of concern that are not listed here, which I want to put on the agenda. Number one, camping. Camping in the parks. Number two, monuments in the parks. I just had a good discussion with mr. Russell about his communication to the council earlier, and i'll have more to say about this both here and at rec before February, because these issues are all intersectional related. So you're going to be hearing more from me in the coming months about how to increase public safety in the city as a whole and how to bring down crime rates to where they were in 2019, which is possible if the city has an adequate and coherent strategy, e.g. Hiring more police is not a substitute for a strategy. Now public safety and public camping are often issues

that are addressed together. I'm going to address that more fully at another communication. But sanitation is the one that you can address immediately. I think that's something that everyone agrees on. You need healthy bathrooms that are open year round. There's no really, no, no disagreement on that. This doesn't really require any discussion. Now, right here in the in the Portland civic plaza, you have two bathrooms that are closed most of the year. And that is something that could be addressed right away. And you define the budget for that and use the money for that purpose. And if you don't have the money, then you need to stop spending it on your lawyers who are refusing to represent the city and win lawsuits. And you need to spend it on something else like opening public bathrooms. Um as for monuments, as okay, i'll address that. Another communication I have 30s left public safety and camping. The city of tualatin had an innovative solution on how to deal with that issue. I recommend you learn something from them. Monuments need to teach history, not just idolize our leaders. Statues are not history and the American historical association agrees. You'll hear more from me on this in the future. Thank you for your time.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: That completes testimony.

Speaker: I'll entertain a motion to accept the report.

Speaker: So moved.

Speaker: Commissioner Mapps moves. Can I get a second, please? Second commissioner Rubio seconds any further discussion on the report? Seeing none, please call the roll Mapps.

Speaker: I want to thank our guest for today's testimony and for this report. I also appreciate the public testimony we heard today. I vote I yea. Rubio.

Speaker: I want to thank commissioner Ryan for his leadership and stewardship of parks and also for our guests who gave a great overview of all the great work that's happening. And I especially want to commend the board as they continue to lead and support the work by centering the values that they talked about equity, inclusion, accessibility. Et cetera. I've seen firsthand the importance of ensuring accessibility in underserved communities and how much it means when a community. As a community, we think holistically about parks and in by especially considering the social determinants of health, climate and sustainable and also equity inclusion and racial justice. So thank you for this incredible work and for so clearly centering community in this work as well.

Speaker: I vote yea Ryan yes, first of all, I just want to say thank you, dr. Corbin and ilana.

Speaker: That was a great presentation and I want to thank both of you for your leadership. You you have a very engaged and passionate board. You're setting a culture that's really helpful for the city. And you also advocate so elegantly with both the importance of the play part of parks and the restorative nature part of it's necessary for the so called Portland to continue to have clean air and have environmental restorative justice. So I really like that you you hold all of that and it's very necessary that we do that. But we live in a world of often in the or. And I really appreciate that you lean into that and are bringing our communities together with that with that type of guidance. So I appreciate you. I see you and we look forward to working with you as we move forward. I accept the report.

Speaker: Gonzalez sorry for the back and forth.

Speaker: I'm doing child care in real time. So with closed schools. But I want to thank the presenters, all the staff at parks, the parks board and all those who contributed to this report. While all bureaus faced varying degrees of challenges,

right now, I'm happy to support Portland parks and their efforts to continue delivering some of the best urban green spaces in the nation. Our city faces many challenges, but is built with good bones. I believe our parks will be a valuable asset and reactivating our downtown and reconnecting our neighborhoods. Parks has been a good partner when we experienced severe weather opening up community center space to pbem for warming and cooling shelters, taking care of our most vulnerable residents. I'm pleased to hear about the new workgroup and the programs they plan to deliver, including expanded swim lessons. I know the to do list for parks is long and may seem challenging, but I have faith in staff under commissioner Ryan's leadership. Happy to accept this report and support parks however it can in the future. Thank you, Wheeler.

Speaker: I can't really top that.

Speaker: I mean, that's that's the full statement. I appreciate it. And I just want to say what he said, but maybe I'll add one more thing, which is this is going to be a challenging time for parks going forward because the parks depend heavily on public support through our levy. And right now, the public is not in the mood to support any government at any level going to the ballot. And so I will put out my first request out to the people of this community. I know you love the parks. You've just heard a report that demonstrates that the commissioner in charge that the leadership in the parks bureau are deeply committed not only to maintaining the assets that we have, but also adding, to use a great pun here, the pool of new programs that we have here, no collective groan yet from the audience swim lessons pool never mind. But the important point here is this. We need the public to support the parks and we have to go forward with a levy to at least maintain the current service level at some point in the not distant future. And obviously polling will direct that public sentiment will direct that. But I just really want to put that

reminder out there that this great, great park system that's been in place for so many decades is wholly dependent upon finance support from the public with that, happy to join my colleagues in voting. I thank commissioner Ryan for great leadership. Director Long, thank you for your team as well. By the reports accepted and as commissioner Fritz used to say, now for something completely different, item 9 to 0, please. On the regular agenda for this is an emergency ordinance ratify a collective bargaining agreement with Portland firefighters association relating to the terms and conditions of employment of represented employees in the community health unit of Portland fire and rescue for 2023 through 2026. Colleagues, this collective bargaining agreement with the Portland firefighters association, local 43 represents the community health medical responders, as well as the nurses establishing wages and other terms and conditions of employment. The CBA provides a premium for emergency vehicle operations certificate on stand by pay for nurses to triage calls after hours. Establishes holiday pay and a 3% premium for responders with a current paramedic certification. We have labor relations coordinator Kim Fouts, as well as Portland fire and rescue division chief Stephanie Sullivan here today to take us through the finer details of the ordinance. But before I do that, I want to ask the commissioner in charge if he has any comments he'd like to make. Commissioner sure.

Speaker: Thank you so much. Well I'm pleased to discuss this contract for a very important city program. Um, this is for chat. That's which stands for community health assess and treat in Portland fire and rescue. It addresses the health and social needs of people who can call 911 for non-emergency issues. So let me be very specific. We have a low acuity medical challenge in our community. It's a substantial amount of our medical calls that flow through both emergency and non-emergency chat helps address those in many, many cases without the need of

an ambulance or a four person fire rig. For a lot of those medicals, emts respond to these low acuity calls and provide follow up care within 24 hours. It's important because the program sends the right responders to the call and keeps fire, police and ed staff available for critical calls. They do so while responding to patients with trauma informed care and providing wraparound services. I will we'll get into some of the other important programs that are addressing right now. And fire chief stephanie sullivan speaks. But i'll turn it over to you all. Thank you, mayor.

Speaker: Good morning, mayor. And commissioners. Thank you for having us. This is an initial collective bargaining agreement that we have for this group. This is the first civilian contract that Portland firefighters association local 43 has negotiated. It was a very interesting back and forth. And I want to thank Portland firefighter association's bargaining team. They were very collaborative. We used a traditional bargaining style. However we discussed interests at the same time, which is similar to the interest based bargaining that we did with the successor agreement. And we found that by doing that, we were able to reach an agreement in about six months. So we're very pleased to be bringing this forward. It's also very a small cost addition. And because these programs are primarily grant funded and a little bit of it is coming out of the general fund, but most of it is coming from grants. This is as you both, mayor Wheeler and commissioner gonzales mentioned, these are very important programs that are helping to relieve, relieve the emergency departments and other such calls. And our amr folks and we are also looking to try to get towards a 24/7, 365 model. So we were considering that as part of these negotiations. And to that effect, we did provide some holiday pay that is very similar to our civilian contracts and while it's consistent with the civilian contracts and our human resources administered live rules that provide the same holiday pay for everybody else, I also want to thank our my management bargaining team,

including deputy chief stephanie sullivan, who came in late into this process. We also had manager lila layton and the nurse supervisor, michelle lavina, who also worked very hard and collaboratively to get to this resolution. And that's everything from me. Do you have any questions? Very good colleagues.

Speaker: Any further questions on this item? Keelan do we have public testimony? We do.

Speaker: We have one person signed up, isaac mclennan.

Speaker: Good morning, isaac. Good morning.

Speaker: Just getting signed in here. Good morning, mayor Wheeler. And uh, Portland city commissioners. My name is isaac mclennan. I'm the president for the Portland firefighters association. One firefighter here for 21 years. And a resident of the roseway neighborhood. I want to speak to you about a couple of things. First of all, as you know, this journey on the community health side started mid-year 2021, later that year, around November, we entered into a letter, a letter of agreement with the city of Portland, um, to expedite this good work that the workers were doing or were going to do, uh, being on the front line of issues that are our cities facing right in the streets, not only in Portland street response, but in the community health assessment, treat and really connecting with the community in multiple ways, right wherever they are. And again, this is the most vulnerable people in our population that these these folks go and help, much like firefighters and police, but in their own way and in a very needed way. And so collaboratively like, uh, this kim said, collaboratively, we work together to give these workers what they need, which is a good, solid contract. And I think in good faith, we met at the table and bargain in good faith. And I think we came to an agreement that will work for everyone. And we did so without the cost, the need for arbitration. And I think that really speaks loudly, especially considering what you hear going on around the

city, around the state, around the country. So again, only four months later, we have another agreement that we've we've come to the table and met in good faith. And I rise to say thank you to everyone on the negotiating team from the city. I'd like to also thank all the team that worked for Portland firefighters association, putting the long hours to make sure that these workers have the right representation and the right contract moving forward. So appreciate appreciate your time. Thanks for letting me reach in virtually. Um, thank you very much. And appreciate your support. Going forward.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: I have one more comment. Please go for it. I but chief Sullivan wanted to just could you just highlight briefly the buprenorphine pilot that that's involved in?

Speaker: I think it's an important program for those who are concerned about the fentanyl crisis we're facing on the streets of Portland.

Speaker: Absolutely. Thank you for the opportunity. We will be starting this 18 month pilot with the county. It's a buprenorphine pilot and it's a opportunity for us to engage in people with people who have immediate right after they've received naran in the streets and give them medication. That's going to assist them getting into some treatment. So when they're in withdrawal, we're going to give them medication that's going to help them to get off of drugs. So this is a very innovative pilot program. People from across the country will be looking at this and seeing how successful we are and watching how they can use that in their own city. So it's going to be a really great program. One of the one of the perks to it is that we have the chat program who will be giving this drug and we have Portland street response and the chat aftercare team. So we're going to be following up and helping them to provide these wraparound services and connecting them with treatment facilities,

getting them enrolled in medicaid, care, Oregon and whatnot. So it's a really great program for us.

Speaker: I just want to emphasize that you know, I think the union was a great partner here, given the uncertainty in long term funding for this program that is supported by Oregon. I think everybody came in as a grown ups to get this deal done without asking for the moon. There is a little bit of premium pay during the which is the shorthand for this for paramedics that can qualify. It has to be administered by a paramedic. So we need to continue to attract and retain paramedics for that function. But this was not a rich contract in other respects, it it's fair. But also recognizing the realities that we're facing in stable funding for this program. Thank you. Thank you.

Speaker: And that completed public testimony. Keelan it does. So this is an emergency ordinance. Please call the roll extremely.

Speaker: Maps.

Speaker: Um, I want to thank staff for today's presentation. I also want to congratulate and really recognize commissioner Gonzalez's leadership in helping land this contract. Really excited about the work being done in this particular program, which is why I am glad to vote I on this initial contract review.

Speaker: I want to thank the bargaining team and also commissioner Gonzalez for his leadership here. I also know that that bargaining these contracts can be a challenge, but I want to thank all the members who participated in this conversation for their dedication to a fair outcome for all involved, and especially chief gillespie, kim and all the members of local 43. I also want to take a moment to thank the community health, medical responders and health nurses who are on the ground providing such incredible, important services and community support. So

thank you for all you do to the for the community. I vote yea Ryan yes, thank you so much for the presentation.

Speaker: Thanks for being here this morning and your bargaining team. Good work. Commissioner Gonzalez, I appreciate your leadership. I remember the meeting we had with with Eric Hunter and how important that was to maintain that relationship with Care Oregon, as we go forward, I'm glad people will be watching. This is messy. It's hard, and we're going to make mistakes. And that's makes us stronger and we'll learn from them and keep moving forward. So I'm proud to support this. I vote i.

Speaker: Gonzales I want to reiterate my appreciation for both commissioner Ryan, uh, Tom Miller and my team and Care Oregon for continuing to fund and support this program.

Speaker: Great job to the negotiation team and Chief Sullivan on this, getting this to the end and our labor partners again were very helpful in promptly resolving this contract in an effective way and still good stewardship for the city of Portland. So this is a win win win as far as I'm concerned. I happily vote I Wheeler.

Speaker: I am very happy to support the commissioner in charge Rene Gonzalez as well as his hard working staff chief. Thank you for your leadership. Labor Relations did a great job and Isaac, I'm not going to leave you out of the equation here either. Your folks are doing the work. And let's let's be honest. The work that we are asking first responders to do now is not as glamorous as it was, say, ten years ago. Is really hard work. And all of us here have done ride alongs in various capacities with first responders. And we see the constant, constant pressure that they are under dealing with the wave of drugs that is sweeping across our streets with vulnerable populations who find themselves on our streets with a lack of resources upstream, whether it's behavioral health, mental health, substance use disorder, treatment, all

of that. Now falls at the feet of our first responders. And as I looked at this contract, commissioner Gonzales, I thought it was very reasonable. And you use the word adult conversation in this day and age. That's obviously something that we all appreciate. It could have been very divisive live and it wasn't. I feel like this process worked really well. Everybody stayed at the table. As commissioner Ryan indicated, the Oregon folks were there every step of the way. This was just really well done. And therefore there's no drama involved and everybody gets what they want out. So I'm really happy to vote. I thank you and the contract is approved and the ordinance is adopted. Thank you. Thank you very much. Next item, 9 to 1, pay settlement.

Speaker: Michael Weinstein bodily injury lawsuit for \$300,000 involving the Portland police bureau.

Speaker: Colleagues, this ordinance resolves a lawsuit brought against the city back in August of 2020. Attorney Karen Okc, as well as senior claims analyst Dave Farrow, are here to walk us through the ordinance. Welcome, Karen and Dave.

Speaker: Thank you. This lawsuit arises out of injuries to the plaintiff, Mr. Weisdorf, because of an encounter that he had with Portland police bureau officers the night of July 18th of 2020.

Speaker: He was a member of a large group of protesters that were being moved across Rosa Parks Way after the police department had declared an unlawful assembly as he was being moved across Rosa Parks Way, he fell and he broke his arm quite seriously. He filed a lawsuit on August 19th of 2020 asserting claims for battery and assault. After we reviewed the police reports and videos that we had of the incident, I, along with the risk management group, determined that it was in the best interests of the city to resolve this case. He had made significant treatment to his left arm, including two surgeries that he attributed to his

encounters with the police officers that night. We negotiated in formally with his attorney, and we agreed upon a settlement of \$300,000, which includes attorney's fees and resolution of any liens.

Speaker: Very good colleagues. Any questions? As public testimony, any.

Speaker: We have three people signed up. First up is mark paris. Can you hear me?

Speaker: Yep. Go ahead, mark.

Speaker: Thanks. Good morning, mayor and commissioners. My name is mark paris. I use he him pronouns an ordinary Portlander with kids in Portland public schools. And I'm testifying today as a member of the group Portland copwatch. We've got no objection to the city paying this \$300,000 settlement for bodily injury inflicted upon mr. Weisdorf by the Portland police bureau on July 18th, 2020. We understand the parties have come to an agreement and we hope that mr. Weisdorf is able to fully recover from the brutality inflicted upon him by city employees. This particular settlement raises the total, according to our records, paid out by the city, for protest between 2018 and 2020 to more than \$2.7 million from court records. We understand mr. Weisdorf was a nonviolent protester against police brutality and racism near the Portland police association's old building. And around 11:30 p.m, ppb declared a riot and required people to disperse. According to court records, mr. Weisdorf cleared the area as directed, traveled through residential streets for several blocks when Portland police officers knocked him to the ground as he attempted to get up, officers again knocked him to the ground, causing him to suffer injuries, including two fractures to his left arm, which required surgery and metal surgical hardware, as well as extensive abrasions, bruising, swelling and soft tissue damage. Court records also reveal that ppb made no attempt to arrest, restrain or detain mr. Weisdorf court records do not identify the officer's

responsible for the brutality, nor do we have any idea whether or not any officers have been disciplined for their heinous behavior. It's notable that this \$300,000 settlement is the largest payout to a single person for police brutality at a protest since 2018. Also notable is that the \$300,000 does not come out of the officer's pockets and it does not come out of the police bureau budget. These bills are footed by taxpayers who pay into the city's insurance and claims fund. We continue to appear before you on police brutality settlements in an attempt to get you to engage in dialog about these incidents of police brutality. Two weeks ago, when we testified on a police brutality case, one commissioner took time during their vote to wonder how much money was spent due to damage from the so-called riots in 2020, adding that it is harder to recruit and retain police officers. Now, number one, police brutalize Portlanders regardless of whether or not had declared a riot. Now number two, the use of police violence against innocent people is not justifiable simply because there's unruly or destructive behavior present. And if it were fully justifiable, the city would not be agreeing to pay out these huge sums of money. And number three, the mayor himself stated during a community members testimony on the police accountability commission's last quarterly report that Portland has a positive experience in terms of recruiting. We have lots of people interested in working for the police bureau and that we do not have a recruiting problem at present. And finally, there was an article posted on Oregonlive yesterday in which mr. Weisdorf is quoted as saying, my experience really made real for me the issues that we were protesting in the first place. The overly quick resort to force we've seen in the Portland police bureau, the sworn officers we trust to enforce the law should not have impunity to violate that same law. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Next individual, please.

Speaker: Next up, we have leon reyna online. Welcome.

Speaker: Hi there. Can you all hear me?

Speaker: Yep, loud and clear.

Speaker: Hello, council members. My name is Leon Reyna. Was a Portland police officer for 25 years. I reviewed the lawsuit media articles and video of this case. If I understand correctly, this is a protest where someone set fire to the police union office and police had to clear the scene. There's a difference between peaceful protest and a riot setting buildings on fire and destroying property is criminal conduct and cannot be tolerated. Protesters have a duty to leave the scene when that happens. So the fire department can put out the fire and police can try to identify and arrest offenders. I heard the declarations in the video by the police for protesters to leave. According to media reports, police pushed protester fires over I-5 from Fenwick Avenue, which is about five blocks away. It is alleged Mr. Weisdorf was assaulted that far away from the scene. I was trained in crowd control techniques to push with my baton and keep the crowd moving away. I'm struggling to understand why the cops repeatedly pushed Mr. Weisdorf to the ground instead of assisting his forward movement in the video, the group of cops converged on Mr. Weisdorf. Mr. Weisdorf looked angry, which means they were behaving vindictively at random. Protesters and city leaders cannot have it both ways. The frustration of the citizens is warranted. Portland city leaders have a race issue and continuously fail to address issues of racial disparity. The public wants to trust its police, but police are not held accountable for racial misconduct. The public can never trust them. Bad leaders groom bad officers or police leaders are known to be vindictive, which in turn teaches subordinates to be vindictive. I'm not surprised Portland was a hotbed for civil unrest in 2020 and don't believe anything will change. City leaders seem to like the status quo. This litigation took three years and what changes has the city offered to make? None that I'm aware of. The city hired dozens of attorneys

to litigate protest related excess of use of force complaints at the cost of approximately \$160,000 a year for each attorney, which means this case cost over \$500,000 to litigate. It would be less expensive to write the check than waste taxpayer dollars. Why not pay out the rest of the lawsuit so the city can move forward, lay off the extraneous attorneys and redirect those funds to training and education of police and the public on how to protest safely. Those are my recommendations.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Next up, we have Jared Essig.

Speaker: Good afternoon. Morning, Mayor. Commissioners, citizens of Portland. And representatives of Copwatch and of the police union who testified before me in public comment. Thank you. I never thought I would agree with the police officer on this question, but I almost have nothing more to say. Miss Leon Reina has pretty much adequately summed up what the city needs to do, and I'm quoting from the most recent police, the People's Police Report, published by Portland Copwatch September 20, 23, and the front right column. Speaking about other cases before today's with the city paid out massive amounts of money and most of it going to the attorney and not to actually to the plaintiffs and Ms. Reyna has brought up another point. It's not only going to the plaintiffs attorneys, it's going to city attorneys who are refusing to represent the city, refusing to argue on behalf of the public. This police officer has done a better job than the city's attorneys at representing the state. The city's position this this needs to stop, stop wasting your money on these attorneys and instead educate police and protesters on how the police peacefully protest. First of all, there is a difference between a protest and a riot. What is that difference? You have a responsibility to the public to teach this. Now the city refused to do that in their report. There is actually a difference. I

support police reform and police accountability. Just like the mr. Weisdorf did. I don't think that showing up at riots helps that. Like mlk junior said, I know you revolutionaries hate it when liberals quote mlk, but he is actually right about this. Mark and all of you other abolitionists out there that riots are countering revolutionary riots actually are designed to fail. They designed to fail. Therefore counter revolutionary. Therefore, you have succeeded in failing and therefore, that's why police are funded at record levels all over the state of Oregon. People are pointing that at Portland as reasons why to avoid this, this issue. Why to avoid police reform and accountability. So you have successfully failed to answer the massive amounts of wealth from taxpayers to rioters and funded the police at the same time. That's what's happened in city leaders prefer the status quo rather than dealing with these issues. Now, quoting from the copwatch, even though Portland copwatch testified to each one of these, the council made no effort to address the underlying policy issues causing the steady leak from their self-insurance fund, which, you know, is supported by taxpayer money. It doesn't come out of the police budget. It comes from the insurance fund. Now, copwatch also has a duty. And all these other agitators and demagogues like myself do not commit crime and to not incite crime, they have that public duty as well. And if they're not willing to do that, then we are entitled to heckle them and ask for permission to heckle. Next time he speaks.

Speaker: Thank you. This is an emergency ordinance. Any further discussion on the completes testimony? Correct. Very good. Please call the roll.

Speaker: Mapps. Hi yea. Rubio.

Speaker: Hi, Ryan. Hi gonzales. Hi, Wheeler.

Speaker: Glad the two parties came to an agreement at I vote yea. The ordinance is adopted 9 to 2 approved findings is to authorize an exemption to the competitive

bidding requirements and authorize use of the alternative contract method of construction manager.

Speaker: General contractor for the columbia boulevard wastewater treatment plant, wet weather clarifier and hypochlorite system modifications project for an estimated amount of \$63 million. Commissioner Mapps.

Speaker: Thank you, mr. Mayor. Colleagues this item comes to us from the bureau of environmental services. This ordinance authorized environmental services to use alternative contracting methods for a complex project at the city's main wastewater treatment plant. As you may recall, colleagues last month, this council approved a design services contract to replace the clarifier ers and the hypochlorite system at the columbia boulevard wastewater treatment plant. The ordinance before us today is the next step in that project. But this ordinance authorizes the city to seek an exemption to competitive bidding requirements for this project act and authorizes the use of an alternative contract method for this work. The bureau proposes using an alternative contracting method because this project is complex, the stakes are high and our room for error is small. This project requires bts to rebuild key parts of our wastewater treatment plant without shutting that plant down. Even even for a minute. So all construction must take place while operators continue to turn our wastewater into clean water using an alternative contracting method for this project will allow best to partner with the contractor early in the planning process for this project, which will both help keep our employees safe and will help contain costs. The overall cost of this project is estimated to be \$125 million and project construction is expected to begin in the winter of 2026. Here to tell us more about this project, we have a biko taylor chief procurement officer from the office of management and finance. We also have mariel teufel, a division

manager at environmental services. And finally, we should have tressie word, a project manager with bts. Welcome, director taylor.

Speaker: I'm going to cede to my colleagues at bs on this matter if they're online, no colleagues, take it away.

Speaker: We've got it. It's is it on the screen below me here? Yes yes.

Speaker: That should be okay.

Speaker: Did you want to start muriel or you go ahead, tracy.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: All right. My name is tracy ward. She her pronouns. I'm the project manager with environmental services. Next slide, please. And today I'm going to be providing a project overview two objectives requirements, budget and next steps. Next slide. So as commissioner Mapps mentioned, this is about \$125 million project located at the columbia boulevard wastewater treatment plant and the focus of this project is to improve aging infrastructure of the wet weather clarifiers are used mainly during the wet season because some of the city's stormwater is piped out to the wastewater treatment plant and their main role is to treat high flows during storm events and the disinfection system is the final step of the treatment process is to clean water before discharging it into the columbia river. Next slide please. So the objectives for this project are to reduce risk of failure and to increase system resilience. Also to support safe operation and maintenance. The wet weather clarifiers were built in the 50 and 70s and as they age they become more challenging to maintain in and the disinfect system is a highly corrosive system. So in several parts of it are spread throughout the treatment plant. So one of the goals here is, well, we'll talk more about the goals in a second. Next slide, please. So regarding the wet weather clarifier system, um, the project improves mechanical structural, electrical and instrumentation systems. It also includes repairing

concrete elements and the aging tanks and the wash down systems. Next slide. Regarding the hypochlorous system. This project consolidates the system to make it simpler to maintain and contain less. It's less corrosive material. It also so supports continuously meeting discharge requirements well into the future for safer and simpler operations. Next slide. So regarding this ordinance that we're here today, we are talking about requesting a low bid exemption for the project. This project design has not begun yet. So the level of confidence is relatively low regarding the construction cost. But we're estimating it to be around 63 million. And the reasons is that we are proposing this are because the project is complex and. It as commissioner Mapps mentioned, we need to maintain continuous and safe operation was involving the contractor early in the design process allows us their input to constructability construction sequencing packaging dealing with long lead items and things like that. And it reduced risks to the project and all types of ways. So it also advances goals of equity and inclusion and construction in this project. Will is committed to complying to with the regional equity workforce agreement and construct diversity and inclusion policies for alternative contracting and next slide. So in terms of the next steps, the goal is to come back to council with a guaranteed maximum price the summer of 2026, and then start construction in winter or fall of 26. So next slide.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Great report, colleagues. Any questions at this particular juncture for public testimony?

Speaker: No one signed up. I'll just a quick one.

Speaker: This is a great project and I enjoyed the infrastructure tour, which was a while ago. Now but I knew this was coming. I mean, the pictures tell the story has there been communication, how that will impact the neighbors on the other side of

columbia boulevard? Will there be it looks like such a big project. I just wanted to know.

Speaker: I'll turn that over to staff. I mean, my, I have intuition.

Speaker: I have intuition here. But why don't I turn it over to staff to answer the commissioner? Ryan's question, which is and I can also get it this week sometime.

Speaker: Oh, sure. I bet you we can probably answer this question.

Speaker: We do a lot of construction out there because how will this how will this project impact neighbors?

Speaker: Yeah, I can answer that. So council members, you might have seen me before. Muriel teufel and the big construction that you saw on the pictures is a current project, which is a secondary treatment expansion program. So the neighborhood is already undergoing major construction about five times bigger than the project we're talking about today. And the approach here is to do community outreach. We did send letters to the neighbors and we have noise ordinances that the contractor has to meet. Um, the impact is mainly on truck traffic on columbia boulevard, which is pretty heavily trafficked already. And so we have traffic control plans in place for that. So far it's been going well and I have not been aware of neighborhood complaints related to construction activities.

Speaker: Thank you, mayor. Because of the edits that we did on on lombard, more and more traffic is going to columbia boulevard. And so that's becoming one of the only expressways, if you will, in north Portland. That's where a lot of our haulers are and where a lot of our industry is. So just will be keeping an eye on that so we can keep the flow of currency going. Thanks. Yes

Speaker: All right. Good no testimony. This is the first reading of an emergency ordinance. It moves to second reading. Thank you. Thank you. Next item, please. 923. Non-emergency urgency ordinance authorize competitive solicitation and

contract with the lowest responsible bidder and provide payment for construction of the sheridan trunk work zone three project e11008 for an estimated cost of \$1,652,000.

Speaker: Commissioner Mapps.

Speaker: Thank you, mr. Mayor. Colleagues this item comes to us from the bureau of environmental services. This ordinance authorizes environmental services to rebuild state 510ft of a large pipe that carries sewage and stormwater in south Portland. That section of pipe is aging and is at risk of failure. This large combined pipe is a critical piece of the city's collection system and it is located in a tricky location underneath. I-5 near zero use south waterfront campus, replacing the section of pipe will extend the service life of this critical pipe and reduce the risk of pipe leakage and sewer releases which in turn will protect public health. People's property and the environment. This project will cost approximately \$1.6 million and we expect construction to begin in may of 2024. Here to tell us more about this ordinance, we have lisa huntington. Division and design division manager for bts. We also have daniel boatman, a project manager with environmental services as lisa daniel, welcome.

Speaker: Thank you. Commissioner Mapps my name is lisa huntington. For the record, I'm going to pass this over to our engineer and project manager, daniel boatman, to tell you more.

Speaker: Yeah, thank you. Um so go ahead and go to next slide, please. So as commissioner Mapps mentioned, this is just over 500ft of pipe. It is a large diameter pipe at 66in and has been it was constructed over 135 years ago. It has four service connections, maps mentioned that it is in a difficult location. And you can see i-5 and i-405 crossing just above it there. And then we have the ohsu parking lot at the downstream end of the pipe in question. Next slide, please. We

are looking at doing or we're planning on a trenchless rehabilitation of the pipe in order to reduce the impacts to both the surrounding structures and to commuters. Um, next slide, please. We've had extensive outreach for the project. Here are some of the different numbers for it. I won't read each bullet, but suffice to say that there's been fairly extensive outreach. We've also been working closely with ohsu in order to reduce impacts to their parking lot and make sure that that it remains open during the construction work we did procure a noise variance for up to ten nights during the installation of the trenchless liner in order to repair this pipe. Um, the work is planned as daytime activities, but the noise of variance allows us to extend into the evening or even overnight as needed. Um, in order to complete the work. Next slide, please. Uh commissioner Mapps noted the engineers estimate is 1.6 million six five. We have a medium confidence level and that mostly had to do with that. The technology that was selected, um, doesn't have as many vendors in the area. And so we did additional outreach in order to, to get several of our local contractors interested in bidding the project. Um, and so we're expecting between three and five bidders on the project. Additionally, the materials for, for the repair have a long lead time. So all of those made us less confident than in normally we shoot for a optimal or high confidence level. So we are hoping to advertise the project once this ordinance goes into effect in December and anticipate construction in may. And because of the long lead time for the materials, we've got a year long construction duration. But the bulk of the work would happen over just a few weeks. Next slide and that is it.

Speaker: Uh, thank you very much, mr. Mayor. I don't think there's any public testimony on this, but we should probably check.

Speaker: All right. Very good. Any further questions on this? This is a first reading of a non emergency ordinance. It moves to second reading. Thank you for the

presentation on 9 to 4. Also, a non emergency ordinance authorized competitive solicitation and price agreements for on call green stormwater infrastructure maintenance and irrigation services for \$12 million over five years.

Speaker: Commissioner Mapps mr. Mayor, colleagues, this item comes to us from the bureau of environmental services.

Speaker: This ordinance authorizes environmental services to solicit proposals from contractors to provide maintenance and irrigation services for the bureau's green street planters. The city's green street planters harness the power of nature to collect and manage stormwater and provide many green spaces through out our city by uses on call control factors to support maintenance of the more than 2500 green streets and more than 150 natural areas that filter and absorb storm water. The maintenance contracts for these assets have been in place since 2014 and are set to expire at the end of this fiscal year. The ordinance before us today updates those contracts here to tell us more about this ordinance, we have Ryan geraci, our green stormwater infrastructure operations and maintenance manager for environmental services. Welcome Ryan. Take over, please. Thank you.

Speaker: Good morning, mayor Wheeler. Commissioner Mapps yea. Rubio gonzales and Ryan. My name is Ryan darrowshire. I'm an environmental manager in the bureau of environmental services. I'm here today to present about bts green stormwater infrastructure maintenance and our need for new price agreements. Next slide please. In today's presentation, i'll highlight the functions and benefits of green stormwater infrastructure or gse and the role of gse in Portland. Stormwater management. I'll discuss the operation and maintenance necessary to keep this infrastructure functional and in good condition and i'll summarize our current price agreements for this work and our need for new agreements. Next slide. Let's start with the basic definition. When I talk about green stormwater infrastructure, I'm

referring to both green street facility is in the right of way and two larger neighborhood or regional scale vegetated water quality facilities. A green street is a vegetated, sustainable stormwater strategy that meets regulatory compliance and resource protection goals by using a natural systems approach to manage stormwater, reduce flows, improve water quality and enhance watershed health in combined sewer basins. Flow control helps reduce sewer overflows and basement sewer backups and keeps excessive stormwater volume away from the wastewater treatment plant, which we just heard about from my colleagues at bhs in separated sewer basins. Water quality treatment is the primary driver. Green infrastructure removes sediment and filters pollutants before stormwater is discharged to surface water or groundwater. In addition to these stormwater management functions, gse also provides numerous community benefits, including heat island reduction, neighborhood livability, access to nature and urban areas, trash traffic calming and pedestrian safety and many others. These benefits are especially important in historically underserved areas like the outer east side and parts of north Portland with less tree canopy and access to nature. Next slide. The city's inventory of gse has grown steadily over the past 20 years by started building green streets as pilot projects in 2000, two. In 2007, City Council adopted the green streets policy as binding city policy to promote and incorporate use of green streets in public and private development. We currently manage as commissioner Mapps said, approximately 2500 green streets with with 50 to 150 new facilities added each year. There are three new three streams of new assets being constructed. The best capital improvement program to address priority areas of stormwater risk. The public works permit process for private development and interagency projects with pbot, trimet and other local agencies. We also manage 148 regional water quality facilities which are constructed ponds and larger swales or artificial wetlands

located on tax lots. The inventory of this asset type is growing much more slowly, but several new water quality facilities were just constructed as part of the southwest capital highway project completed earlier this year. Next slide this map shows the distribution of green streets across just a portion of the city. Green streets are located in every sextant and are woven into the fabric of practically every neighborhood in Portland. Next slide. So on to green street maintenance, maintaining this network of distributed assets requires significant effort and labor, our current budget and staffing levels were able to perform regular maintenance on average three times per year. Maintenance is year round, but seasonal in nature. For example, sediment removal and winter and spring weeds and trimming and pruning in summer and planting in fall and spring inlet clearing and trash and debris removal are year round. And of course, irrigation is only in the dry months of summer. All of these activities I've listed are included in the scope of services and our current price agreements and the proposed new solicitation. Next slide. Bess has relied primarily on contracted service vendors to perform the vast majority of gse maintenance work. This work is implemented under goods and services price agreements, also known as on call contracts. Our existing price agreements have been in place for almost ten years and are set to expire at the end of the current fiscal year. We must replace these expiring contracts without delay in order to avoid a gap in service. Next slide the ordinance before council today is to authorize the solicitation and price agreements for green stormwater infrastructure maintenance and irrigation services. The total combined value of all price agreements will be 12 million over five years as we're seeking multiple vendors to provide greater flexibility and resilience to our operations, we aim to execute up to ten price agreements total for at least five each for maintenance and irrigation services, with some vendors providing both services and some only one. We have already

engaged with the inclusive contracting team and procurement services. We're very eager to work with them to conduct targeted outreach to ensure a broad and diverse pool of proposers. And we aim to make the rfp process as inclusive as possible by identifying and mitigating barriers to participation. Next slide. So with council's authorization via this ordinance, bids will work with procurement services to issue an rfp conduct targeted outreach and ultimately execute new price agreements as described. We hope to have the new agreements in place by June to avoid a gap in service. Thank you for allowing me to present this information today. I'd be happy to answer any questions you may have.

Speaker: Very good. Thanks, colleagues. Any questions at this particular juncture, do we have public testimony? See, no one signed up. Great. Good presentation. Thank you. This is a first reading of an ordinance. Urgency ordinance. It moves to second reading. Thanks. Thanks a lot. Thank you. Thank you. And our next item, 9 to 5, which is also a non emergency ordinance authorized contract with hdr engineering, inc. For consulting services to support participation in a federal energy regulatory commission relicensing process for the Portland hydroelectric project in the amount. Of \$2,833,575.

Speaker: Commissioner Mapps.

Speaker: Thank you, mr. Mayor. Colleagues this item comes to us from the Portland water bureau. As you know, the water bureau operates a hydroelectric plant at bull run. That hydro electric plant generates enough clean electricity to power 10,000 homes in the Portland metro area every 50 years. The city of Portland must apply to the federal government to either renew or return our license to operate that hydro electric plant. The city of Portland applied for and received its license to operate the Portland hydroelectric project in 1979, which means it is now time for the water bureau to begin the ferc relicensing process. Yes, ferc requires a

five year formal relicensing process. Consulting services are required to complete this filing. Which brings us to the ordinance before us today, which authorizes us, the water bureau, to enter into a professional services contract with HDR Engineering Inc for consulting services to support the city and participating in and completing the regular processes associated with relicensing or or with license surrender for the Portland hydroelectric project. This project will cost approximately \$2.8 million. Services and expenditures under under this contract will occur over several fiscal years. Funding for the first year costs is available in both the water bureaus and the Portland hydro projects. Adopted budgets for fiscal year 2324. Here to tell us more about this ordinance, we have Edward Campbell, deputy director for the Portland water bureau. And we have Leanne Davis, environmental regulatory manager with the Portland water bureau. Edward Leanne, welcome. I'll turn the floor over to you.

Speaker: Thank you, commissioner. Again, Edward Campbell, deputy director, Portland water bureau, and the commissioner did a great job of introducing us. So I'll just move along. So if we can get the slides up. Thank you. Um, you may recall I was here in July I to seek authorization from the council on our process to initiate the federal hydropower relicensing process. And at that time I mentioned that we would be coming back seeking a professional technical expert services to help us with that process. And that's what we're here seeking authorization for today. So next slide. Thanks. So a quick reminder on what the Portland hydro electric project is. Essentially for the last 41 years, the city's been generating and selling power from two powerhouses located at our Bull Run dams. We have essentially been taking advantage of our drinking water operations to which require us to move water through the reservoirs and downstream to generate electricity on a year round basis. The projects have generated \$13 million overall and that history of net

revenues to the general fund and they are an important contributor to the region's supply of non carbon emitting electricity. See next slide, please. So the relicensing process that lies ahead for us will be conducted according to a formal process and a strict schedule all regulated by the federal energy regulatory commission. And in July, as I mentioned, you authorized us to proceed with developing and submitting our necessary pre-application materials by the February 2024 deadline. We are, as of this week, in the process of finalizing those documents and we plan to file with ferc by the end of this calendar year. The five year regulatory process will provide the city with opportunities to hear from all interested parties and to further study and review both the regulatory and financial status of the hydropower operation before the council needs to make a final decision of whether to renew or to surrender. As we covered in July a surrender decision will be will require its own ferc directed process. And we anticipate that it will be ready for a council decision in fiscal year 20 2728. Uh, so with that, i'll turn it over to leanne davis to walk us through the provisions of the contract. Okay. Thank you.

Speaker: Next slide, please. So the ordinance is to approve the contract. And as you know, that it as we've said, hydropower, relicensing is a very infrequent process for the city. We do not currently have the staff capacity or the expertise to undergo this process alone. This contract will provide the consulting services necessary to complete the federally mandated process steps on time and with the appropriate documentation. So this ordinance will authorize the professional services contract with hdr engineering. Next slide please. The contract will include an array of professional services, not including, but not limited to project management. So including meeting and site visit scheduling project scheduling and the legal record maintenance services for outreach and communication tools. Support for city staff engaging in informal and formal consultation with tribal nations and state and

federal regulatory agencies. Managing and implementing all of the required studies as well as completing the reports associated with those studies. There will be several relicensing documents required as part of this process. So we support to develop the draft and final documents. And finally also technical support for the national environmental policy act or nepa environmental review and public process. That's also involved. It's also important to note that that this contract allows for similar services. If the council were to decide to go with the decision to surrender the license. Next slide, please. So the total amount of the contract is just over \$2.8 million for five years. These funds are available in the water bureau as well as the bureau of hydroelectric power's current year budgets. Additional funding authorization would be requested in the fy 24 through the fy 2029 budget cycles and the initial cost of this service agreement is expected to be will be a 5050 split between the water bureau and the bureau of hydroelectric electric power pending the cost service analysis that was discussed in the prior resolution. Next slide, please. The current contract includes about 680, almost \$685,000 or nearly or 24% of the contract for businesses that have been certified by the state of Oregon. Business for inclusion and diversity for disadvantaged minority women emerging or service, disabled, veteran owned businesses. Next slide, please. And so this is just an overview of the timeline we're currently in the pre pre relicensing phase. Once we file a formal documentation expected by the end of this year, we will initiate the formal relicense signing process, which will take about five years. We would be conducting annual reports to the council during throughout this process. The next major deadline anticipated in February 2027, where we would have to file our final license application. Then we anticipate coming to council for a final decision with license and the known terms and conditions of that license in 2028. And if all goes as planned, a new license in 2029. Next slide, please. And this is a public website

that we have developed for more information on the project. For anyone that has interest or questions about it, great colleagues.

Speaker: Any questions? No looks like you've covered all the bases. Do we have public testimony?

Speaker: No one signed up.

Speaker: All right. This is a first reading. It moves to second reading. Thank you. Thanks. Good job. Thank you. I believe that completes our business for this morning. We're adjourned till 2 p.m.

Portland City Council Meeting Closed Caption File

November 1, 2023 – 2:00 p.m.

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

Speaker: This is the November 1, 2023 afternoon session of the Portland City Council. Keelan. Good afternoon again. Please call the roll. Good afternoon.

Speaker: Maps here. Rubio here. Ryan here. Gonzalez here. Wheeler here.

Speaker: Colleagues, today marks a significant. Oh, sorry. I guess I should let you do your job, too. Can you please read time certain item 9 to 6, please raise. That is a resolution on mayor.

Speaker: May we have the council? Oh, I forgot.

Speaker: Rules of order and decorum. I need to slow down. Good afternoon. Could we please hear the rules of order and decorum? Glad to. Thank you.

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

further disruption will result in ejection from the meeting. Anyone who fails to leave once ejected, is subject to arrest for trespass. Additionally, council may take a short recess and reconvene. Reconvene virtually your testimony today should address the matter being considered when testifying. State your name for the record, your address is not necessary. Please disclose if you are a lobbyist. If you are representing an organization, please identify it. And for testifiers joining virtually. Please unmute yourself once the council clerk calls your name. Thank you.

Speaker: All right. Thank you. Keelan could you please read time certain item 9 to 6. It's a resolution.

Speaker: Ensure an effective, efficient transition to Portland's new form of government by establishing a coordinated, high level reporting structure for city bureaus offices and key functions.

Speaker: Good. And before we get into this, I just want to make sure I give a housecleaning, heads up testimony. Today will be two minutes each. We have a lot of people signed up. We want to get through it all. So please adjust your remarks accordingly if necessary, so that you can get them in in two minutes. Thank you for that. Colleagues today marks a significant milestone shown in the charter transition project act. It was nearly one year ago when Portlanders voted to fundamentally change their form of government and mandate us to restructure by January first, 2025. Today, the transition team will present their recommendations for a new city organization that reports up to a single city administrator and mayor. While this is not new information to us, it is our opportunity to hear from the transition team. Take invited testimony and take public testimony, deliberate and ultimately for us to vote on the resolution as well as any amendments that are put forward. This has been a long, thorough and deliberative process that's engaged the public city employees bureau leadership, as well as council offices as along the way. We've

been fortunate to learn from the expertise of peer cities across the country and incorporate best practices, shared by the international cities managers association. In we've seen multiple drafts of this organizational structure for over the last several months and we're considering final recommendations today. Ultimately council must decide the final form that we approve for implementation action. As we heard during yesterday's work session, in order to meet the technical requirements to be fully implemented by the January first, 2025 deadline. We need to adopt and begin implementing a new structure immediately. We, I highly encourage us to reach a decision point today. With that, I'd like to hand this over to our transition team. That's michael jordan, shoshana oppenheim, becky tilson and I believe it's just the three of you starting us off today. Good afternoon. Thank you, mr. Mayor.

Speaker: Members of the council commissioners, thanks for having us. I was going I was only going to introduce shoshana. I didn't want to steal her thunder, but I just wanted to say. Go ahead, shoshana.

Speaker: Thanks, mike. Sorry we haven't coordinated this very well. Sorry. Good afternoon. Thank you. Mayor. Council I'm shoshana oppenheim, ayashi the pronouns and I'm the transition project manager, managing the project to implement the 2022 amendment to the city charter. The quick roadmap of the staff presentation. I'll provide some context for where we are in the project and how our work fits together. Becky tilson in the city organization project manager, will outline how the chief administrative officer developed the recommendation under consideration today. And then cao michael jordan will review the proposal and discuss the opportunities it provides for the city of Portland and the new city administrator tim grew. The city budget officer is here to answer any questions about the funding strategies we discussed yesterday. Almost a year ago, voters

took the extraordinary action of changing our form of government directly. After the results of the election were known. The city moved into two action mobilizing resources is engaging stakeholders and delivering for Portlanders. I think we can all agree that the charter commission did not give us the luxury of time, the short runway, to opening the new form of government on January 1st, 2025, requires us to prioritize the charter implementation along with the multiple challenges facing the city. We have shown Portlanders that we can do both in fact, setting up our new form of government for success. Today may position the city of Portland to address the critical challenges facing our community for generations to come. What voters asked us to do is multi faceted, including changes to our elections methods, how we are governed, our internal reporting structures, the roles within the budgeting process, the charter amendments touch all aspects of city operations. A central element of the charter amendments is to transition city's leadership to a legislative council and executive mayor who manages the city with the help of the city administrator. Together, over the last 11 months, we have been successful. This council adopted the code necessary to implement ranked choice voting and the council appointed independent district commission established districts for City Council elections. The City Council appointed independent district. I'm sorry, salary commission is established. Salaries for the incoming elected officials and this council adopted a framework for the operations for City Council meetings and now we are here together. Today to adopt a reporting structure for the city so that we can be ready for business on January 1st, 2025. The resolution before you today is foundational to the mayor council form of government, where the future executive mayor runs the day to day operations with the assistance of a city administrator. And as the mayor mentioned earlier, the recommendation was formed by lessons learned from peer cities. Our own independent research professional organizations

like the national league of cities, the international mayors I'm sorry, city managers association, and most importantly, with the executive leadership made up of our city directors, deputy directors and your offices, as this resolution helps us prepare for the next fiscal year, which spans the current form of government and the future mayor council form of government, and prepare for the council and mayor that join us in the middle of the budget development process. Among the first tasks for the future. Mayor will be to recruit and appoint a city administrator. Subject to the council confirmation in the resolution that you're considering today will ensure that when that future mayor is elected in 2024 and launches the recruitment process, they can clearly articulate the organizational structure that the city administrator will lead the reporting structure that you are considering today is designed to create synergies, align programs and improve service delivery. Adopting a reporting structure today allows us to pivot our attention to the city's most important resource city staff, who are experienced changes to their workgroups, their reporting structure and the focus of their programs. Adopting a structure today says that we can point to the destination in and script the critical moves to ensure our success and create an organization of change champions who are able to innovate and build Portland's future. Adopting the structure will also allow time for the critical technical alignments needed to make this structure a reality. The list of next steps is long. As you heard yesterday, the team shifts into high gear after you act to adopt Portland's future organizational structure. Thank you so much for your consideration. An congratulations to this council and the city leadership for your contributions to this impressive milestone to implement the charter amendments approved by voters. And with that, i'll pass it to becky tilson.

Speaker: Hi, mayor Wheeler. Commissioners and community members. Thank you for having us. I'm becky tilson. I use she her pronouns and I'm the project manager

for the city organization project, working with the office of management and finance. Thank you also to Shoshana for grounding us in the context and talking about why it's important that we accomplish this work. Now I want to start by saying that the recommendation you'll see today we aimed to set up the new city administrator for success by designing an organizational structure that reports to one administrator rather than five council offices. As we have now. We set out to create something with reasonable spans of control, logical groupings of bureaus, and a leadership team with shared accountability for city goals and values operating as one unified city under a collective vision is an exciting opportunity for us to rethink and reshape how we work together as a whole city team. The process that got us to today's recommendation kicked off earlier this year. A February 2023 council resolution directed the city's chief administrative officer, Mike Right Here, to work with bureau directors and council offices to recommend organizational structure changes to prepare for the new form of government ahead of the fiscal year 2025 budget development process. To implement the project in the time allotted, we focused on changes at the program level and higher, not at the individual or team level. As a note, if you don't see a program called out specifically on the proposed organizational chart, that means that we're recommending that it remain in its current bureau configuration. As Shoshana outlined, this timeline means that we will have the time for budgeting and new service areas, implementing the technical changes and supporting employees through the change. A lot of feedback, input and research went into developing the recommendation in this spring. Your council offices convene teams in the service areas established by Mayor Wheeler. In January of this year to conduct a series of programmatic assessments looking at what works and what can be improved in the service areas as well as across the city. Each team released two reports which were

shared with employees and community. The executive leadership team, council offices and subject matter experts met in service area groups and as a whole throughout the spring and summer, wrestling with philosophical and technical questions, debating different structures, and working to ensure that our core values are upheld. We conducted an employee survey and a manager survey designed specifically to inform the programmatic assessments. We did a review of community feedback from a variety of sources, including city audits of bureaus and programs, recommendations from the ombudsman's office, public comment received by the Portland charter commission and the Portland insight survey and the Portland engagement project and we compiled all of that into a community outcomes report. We conducted best practices, research and hosted several panel discussions with experts from across the country on the role of the city administrator, the role of deputy city administrators and on centering equity through organizational change. We utilized an equity tool to help make and explain decisions based on desired community outcomes and city core values. And we released a draft chart in September and collected a large number of community employee and council member comments and feedback collectively, all of this input and good thinking went into the recommendation that you see before you today.

Next slide please. I also want to take a minute to talk about why the how of how we got here matters. This project is about creating a new organizational structure and it's also about further developing our organizational culture. When we consider the transition, we're undergoing to the new form of government, it's important to consider the culture that we want to perpetuate and bring with us. So I want to talk for a second about the value of this exercise wise, beyond the development of the organization chart itself. First, the executive leadership team, the team of bureau directors is building a culture of collaboration and citywide perspective, and they

work really well together as we look to operate more as one city and will be unified under the leadership of a city administrator and their deputies. This is a great benefit. We have an organization made up of employees who will have a clear sense of where they will land. This will help the dcas and the bureau directors as they're working within their service areas. We'll have transparency about our structure for community and as we further build out teams, we'll have clarity around points of contact for community members looking to engage with their city government in its new form. We have centered our core values through the addition of equity communications and engagement officers and a leadership team that's charged with upholding and advancing our commitments. We have employees who are familiar with the facts of the change and will be supported over the next year as we get ready to make the changes we've heard from employees, leadership and community during this process and have received so many good ideas about additional ways that we can improve beyond these initial structural changes which will help frame up the next phase of work. The changes rightsized and implementable and sets up the new city administrator for success. And as my colleagues have heard me say, a number of times, as I love to say, there are a lot of right ways to organize the city and we're going to pick one of them. And the structure really can only take us so far what we do with it, how we lead in it, how we continue to improve, how we deliver services, support lenders in the new form of government is what will make the biggest difference. So this is the starting point. I'm really grateful to everybody who took the time to engage with this work, and I really look forward to the hard and complex work of implementing our new structure and considering ways that we can continue to improve over time. I'm going to pass it to mike jordan to talk about the specifics of the proposal. Thank you, becky.

Speaker: And thank you to both of you for the part you've played in this last year particularly, it's been a herculean lift and I'll do a little thank yous at the end of my presentation. My role here today is to talk a little bit about the structure itself and what we're proposing and some of the changes that have been made since the first draft was let out for public comment on September the 12th. So what you see on this slide is the overarching framework I'm going to concentrate on the right side of this. Our next slide will concentrate mostly on the executive office. So this slide shows that we have six service areas that we're calling them budget and finance, city operations, community and economic development, community safety, parks and recreation and public works. The draft that went out on September the 12th had five service areas and it included park and recreation and the arts in the public works service area. We got, as you can imagine, a fair amount of feedback about that proposal and listening to all of that feedback. One of the major changes between the first draft and this draft that you're considering today is that there is an extra service area that has parks and recreation and the Portland children's levy in it. I mentioned earlier that arts was also in the public works service area. We looking at the suite of services that are in community and economic development that namely the film and events office that currently is in prosper Portland and the movement of the spectator venues from the cio's office to the community and economic development group. We believe that that suite of activities that the arts fit well within that suite of activities. And so you'll see the arts and community and economic development. One of the other major changes from the first draft in September to this draft that is that that draft had a natural resources element within the public works service area. We put that in there because we were anticipating a report from five of our bureaus that have been in a conversation now for nearly the entire calendar year and conversations have been going on previous

to that, particularly between parks and recreation and the bureau of environmental services. We were hoping to get a conclusion to that conversation. I think we've received some preliminary indications of what the choices might be, but we haven't. I would say we have not finished that conversation yet. And couple that with the creation of the sixth service area for parks and recreation, it created for us at least a dilemma about where a natural resource department would be in the organization and so what we did with this recommendation is we pulled the natural resources line from the org chart, but we kept language within exhibit two that talks about this conversation that's been going on and our desire to continue that conversation and bring forward at a later date a recommendations on how a natural resources group could fit within city government. And then lastly, for this sheet, I'd like to bring to your attention and everyone's attention that it's a little difficult to see. But on this chart near the top, under the icon for Portlanders is a note for a leadership team. We really envision that the deputy city administrators that will head up these service areas, the city administrator, the assistant city administrator who i'll talk a little bit more about on our next slide and the equity officer would make up an executive leadership team for the city. And I want to emphasize that I think we are all subject to thinking about organizational structure in a vertical way, certain groups report to certain bureaus which report to certain executives who report to the mayor ultimately and we think about the organization in a very vertical way. I think what this this reconstruction of the way we think about ourselves, what it offered offers us particularly within this leadership team, is an opportunity to look horizontally across the organization and to think about the city as a complete enterprise and how we allocate our human resource is how we think about the delivery of services, particularly within the city, to support the direct service delivery of our bureaus. It provides us that opportunity which we quite frankly lack today. It

is very challenging for us to think horizontally across the organization, and I think this new structure gives us an opportunity not only to think horizontally, but also to give clarity of accountability, witty and transparent, about how we do business and what decisions get made. And where they get made in the organization. So let's go to the next slide. This slide concentrates on what we've been calling the executive office is under the new structure, the mayor is the executive in the new structure and the mayor is required to hire a city administrator to assist that person in the day to day management of the city. The charter also requires that at least all of the employees that are involved in the executive branch's business need to report up through and to be accountable to the city administrator. So we made a change in this office because of that. And i'll talk about that in just a moment. I want to note before I talk about the city administrator that the mayor on this chart not only appoints the city administrator, which the council must confirm, but also appoints directly the city attorney and the chief of police also. And those are also confirmable appointments. S other than that, however, for all employees do report up to and through up through and to the city administrator. You can see on the chart that there is an assistant city administrator that has five different sections. If you will, reporting to that person. They are a communications group, a community and civic life. That may sound familiar to, but the creation of an engagement officer to have that group report to them, but also to oversee engagement across the entire city, the council operations group I'm going to come back to on the next slide and talk a little more detail about that. The office of government relations, which we have today, and then a new office which we are still, I would say, in the in the mode of constructing, if you will, and that is a group called Portland solutions. You can see within that group that most of our houseless services and many of our livability programs that have been developed over the last few years, many of them under

under emergency order have been collected in this area. I want to say something about changes. First of all, Portland's solutions in the September 12th draft report directly to the mayor, we had advice from the city attorney that it would be more appropriate for us to have that office report to the city administrator because of the issues I just mentioned about charter language and having all of the services that the city provides report up through to the city administrator. And secondly, we that office used to have a line about neighborhood associations and district offices in it. We have moved those with a great amount of public input over over into the community and civic life group. So that group looks a lot more now like the new manifestation of community and civic life that we have all become familiar with. The other change that I will mention before I move on is that the equity officer was a kind of a standard zone office in the previous draft with advice from many. We moved the office of equity and human rights out of the city operations service area and reporting directly to the equity officer. With that, i'll move on to the next slide, which is a view of a staffing proposal puzzle for the City Council and the mayor and also for a group of shared staff that would support it. The City Council in its operations. So the left side of the slide, the colored green colored boxes, represent the fact that we are proposing that to staff be assigned to each councilor. We'll have 12 councilors. That means 24 staff assigned to them so that they can do their work as legislators at the city and also to be able to handle constituent relations and any other services that they might need. Secondly the mayor has a staff of five, including the chief of staff. So senior senior aides and regular aides, and then an administrative specialist. So five staff in the mayor's office also, which is a little difficult to see on the slide in the middle, there are some issues that we are also considering that the there will need to be a business operations support. So think hr and think purchasing those kinds of services that councilors will need from time

to time. Also, technology support for the offices. And then lastly, security, which we obviously provide. Also, it should be noted that that set of blue boxes and green boxes, as we have and the supporting business operations as technology and security support, we have geared this proposal to match the current expenditure level that we have in this year's budget to support the mayor and council so that part of the slide was really designed to match that level of expenditure. But we also know that the council will likely have to need support to do its legislative functions. They will likely, in our exploration of other communities that have larger councils like this, they all have committees of some kind. You pass some legislation earlier this year 3.02 that envisions and the construction of committees. And so we really think there will need to be some support, support for committees. And you see that in the shared council staff model in the middle of the page, which involves a manager or five employees to manage that part of the work and also shared support staff in an administrative specialist, one assigned to each of the districts to support the three councilors from each district. But the shared council staff office also, I think, has a couple of other functions as besides supporting council and committees, really being able to process legislation from from the executive branch to the legislative branch and be kind of the traffic cop. If you will, to make sure that it gets processed appropriately with the auditor to make sure that the clerk gets what they need to make sure the council runs appropriately and then secondly, to be, if you will, the broker of communications and the need for information and risk search that the council will need to have done by members of the executive branch to be able to do their work. We were originally thinking about the potential communications matrix between 12 councilors and 7000 employees and became a bit concerned about how that might operate and we certainly don't want to shut down, communicate in in the organization, but we also think that that

communication may need to be kind of managed, if you will, so that it can efficiently respond to council needs and make sure that the executive branch understands council's direction and requests for information. So the last thing or not the last thing, but the last slide I wanted to talk about just very briefly is we also took a look at the current liaison assignments that the commissioners and the mayor have at the city and as you can see, they are numerous. And we took a shot at all of those numerous liaison responsibilities and what they entail and how they might be reassigned across the new organizational structure so that we can, if you will, manage the division of labor in an appropriate way. And also from a subject matter content perspective of what might be most appropriate. It obviously a new council and new mayor and new administrator may very well see it differently. But this is our shot at being able to look at how those liaison roles might get allocated. Next slide. This is my last slide and I want to be able to take just a moment. I think both Shoshana and Becky have noted it appropriately so. But as you can see on this slide, and it doesn't begin to cover all the people that have been involved in this in the last actually few years, because it really started with the charter commissions work before the election in. And I know that staff and the volunteers on the commission touched literally thousands of Portlanders through that process. And as Becky noted, we datamined a lot of that intake that they did over two years to help us understand what Portlanders were expecting of this change in government. And it was it was a very rich data source. So really for the last three years, numerous, literally thousands of people have been involved at different levels. But I want to particularly recognize the two people are at the dais with me right now. Shoshana, I think had envisioned and how we might go about project managing all these different component parts. Well before the election even took place. And we certainly leaned on her good thinking to get us going at the very

beginning. And of course, we, we voluntold becky that she was going to get the unique opportunity to try and figure out how this organizational structure could change and literally invented the process twice to be able to process all the questions that we had and go through and engage as she noted, engage with. So many folks in the organization from the very top to the very bottom. And everybody in between. And so and as I'm fond of saying, they did it all at a stupid fast pace. And so I want to appreciate their efforts. And with that, mr. Mayor, happy to try and answer questions.

Speaker: All right. First of all, I just want to take up where you left off. I want to thank you, michael, and I want to thank becky and shoshana and your entire team. There were lots of people who have played a huge role in this up to this point. I want to acknowledge that that transitioning an organization of this size and complex city in such a short timeframe, a year is, as you said, a nearly impossible task. We have a \$7 billion budget, nearly 7000 employees, dozens of bureaus, a City Council, all. And what we don't have is a lot of time. And so I think you've done an outstanding job, particularly given how much outreach, how much input you've received, the work that you've put into this. I just want to acknowledge that and I know I speak for the entirety of the council that we truly appreciate your efforts. So thank you so much for your leadership on that. So I also want to point out that the hard work is yet to be done. This is the broad brush work. Now we have to get into the specifics. And as we get into the specifics s that's where the challenge is, will lie and I just want to start off by saying I really appreciate this council. I believe we have been communicative. We do not agree on the specifics. And that's okay. And so I just want to level set here today and acknowledge that. But I really appreciate it and respect the amount of work that my colleagues and their their staffs have put into this effort as well. So we will now move to the portion of the hearing where we

entertain amendments to the resolution on the amendments proposed as of Tuesday afternoon. And I should step back, Michael, as I do with all of these, and point out that what staff put forth was a proposal, if you will, a broad proposal that they believe encompasses the feedback that they've received from bureaus, from City Council members, from staff, from the public at large or from interested groups. So they've done their level best to put forward a proposal. But it's ultimately up to this council to decide how to shape this. And so we have amendments that were proposed as of Tuesday after noon yesterday. Those are reflected in the Tuesday memo. You have that memo and the public can also access that memo and the City Council website. There have been three changes to the amendments in the Tuesday memo. There was a change to Gonzalez, three, a change to Ryan. Four and if I understand correctly, Commissioner Ryan, there may be a new amendment. Orion five put on the table this afternoon, potentially to proceed efficiently today will move and second, the amendments as referenced in the Tuesday memo that will put them on the table for further deliberation and for the two amendments that have been changed and as well as the one that Commissioner Ryan would like to add, will ask the commissioners to read those in their entirety for the record as they are not yet in the record in their full capacity. If you're following along at home, please know that Rubio amendment one and two will come up earlier in the process. Those have not changed after all, the amendments have been placed on the table for discussion on will ask the commissioners after that to go back and provide a more detailed summary of each of those amendments. Those listening at home can better understand what we're voting on today. I feel that this is a necessary step, given that the majority of amendment that were included in the Tuesday memo and will not be fully read. So if we've already got your amendments on the Tuesday memo, we don't have to

hear the whole thing, chapter and verse and attachments. Then we'll hold public invited and public testimony before council discussion and ultimately a vote on the amendments after we voted on the amendments, then we vote on the resolution as amended. Commissioners as please for the record, read your name. The number of amendments and brief reference to the topic boec and then we'll seek a second for consideration. I will go ahead and model this for the group with my amendments. Mine are largely technical in nature. I'll kick this off with Wheeler amendment one, which was reflected in the Tuesday memo regarding the impact reduction program. Can I get a second? Second commissioner Mapps second? So that is on the tape. On two Wheeler. Two is reflected in the Tuesday memo regarding the community board for police accountability and the office of community based police accountability. Can I please get a second to move this amendment? Commissioner Gonzalez second, this amendment so it is also on the table for further for input and deliberate action. Commissioner Rubio, I understand you'd like to bring two amendments. Rubio one and Rubio two. Yes

Speaker: Thank you so I move that the first i. I move that the first amendment is to move the chief sustainability officer to report directly to the city administrator for in the organizational chart similar to the equity officer.

Speaker: Can I get a second? Second commissioner, I think that was Gonzalez seconds permit and I'm sorry.

Speaker: Rubio two thank you. Second one is regarding permitting and development. And so I'm moving to on exhibit a to combine, combine, permitting and development services into one line that reads permitting and development services in the community and economic development service area section of the organizational chart to reflect council's intention to create one permitting entity per council resolution 37628 second.

Speaker: So commissioner Rubio moves Rubio two commissioner Ryan seconds. That's Rubio to commissioner Mapps. I understand you have one amendment. Sure

Speaker: I just have one amendment. Colleague I move that we propose a change to the language of this resolution so that the directs the city administrator or the chief administrative officer for the city to explore how the city can do a better job at managing Portland's natural resources. Second, thank you, commissioner Gonzalez.

Speaker: Seconds and that is maps number one. Commissioner Ryan and commissioner Gonzalez. As you know, your amendment s are somewhat intertwined in order. I understand you both have five amendments to propose in addition to a shared amendment. Commissioner Ryan, do you want to go first with Ryan?

Speaker: One that's sure.

Speaker: Yes, I will. Probably an amendment one natural resources. This amendment will result in a city wide operation and natural area and tree management unit in the parks and recreation service area, which would be responsible for the day to day, month to month management services for natural areas and the urban tree canopy. I'm reading this whole thing right in the memo, I think for Ryan, one that was on the Tuesday memo, was it?

Speaker: Yeah, it was on the I don't have to read all that so you don't have to. Thanks commissioner Gonzalez seconds so that color coding was off here. Okay. And then Ryan Gonzalez one, I don't know if either or both of you want to propose that proposal to be seconded.

Speaker: Okay. I so propose just update some of the branding associated with the parks and children's levy service areas, also to provide some continuity in the public safety space and description of their work.

Speaker: Commissioner Gonzalez moves can I get a second? Second, commissioner Ryan seconds that will be Ryan slash Gonzalez number one and commissioner Ryan Ryan two moving arts two moving arts to the new service area second.

Speaker: So we have a motion from commissioner Ryan, a second from commissioner Gonzalez on Ryan to that is now on the table.

Speaker: Commissioner Gonzalez. Gonzalez one call the service management.

Speaker: This is to start the early movement towards flying information for the new service areas designates a commissioner in charge. Also allows for the designation of a deputy for each commissioner, instructs such deputies to cooperate with the ceo and the city administrator, depending on how we define the role and planning for the operations, the new form of government effective January 1st, 2025.

Speaker: Can I get a second? Second, second. Commissioner Mapps seconds. Gonzalez one and we'll go back with more thorough discussions and some of these we're going to need to read more into the record. Gonzalez two reservation of authority. I'm sorry. Gonzalez two reservation of authority, primarily purpose of this is to clarify what we don't intend to do with the very complex resolutions here is to ensure that we're preserving authority granted under the city charter and budget authority and the current commission. Is there a second, second commissioner Ryan seconds that's Gonzalez to Ryan three this amendment ensures that council will approve the interim city administrator is hired before January first, 2025, second, commissioner Gonzalez seconds. Ryan three Gonzalez three.

Speaker: This addresses some of the necessary coordination between commissioners and the cio in the final. Six months of 2024. As we really prepare for the big handoff of January 1st, 2025.

Speaker: Can I get a second? Second, commissioner Ryan moves. Mayor that one needs to be read.

Speaker: Oh yeah, that's new.

Speaker: And which other ones? Haley need to. That's the only one. Ryan and the new one, right?

Speaker: And only one so far I meant and Ryan.

Speaker: Ryan. Five. Ryan four and five. Ryan four and five. Okay. Commissioner Gonzalez because this was not in the Tuesday memo. It needs to read the entirety of the amendment just to be clear, there was some wordsmithing.

Speaker: This was in the memo, but i'll read the verbatim. Be it resolved. The city charter affirms the authority of commissioners in charge related to executive and legislative powers, including oversight, assigned responsibilities until January 1st, 2025. In addition, City Council recognized that a transition period relates to roles and responsibilities is needed before July 1st, 2024. The mayor's office shall lead a discussion with commissioners in charge regarding roles and responsibilities, particular related to budget and policy that will inform how the commissioners in charge in any interim city administrator or deputies work together for the final six months of 2024.

Speaker: Very good and that was seconded. Did I get a second, second, second from commissioner Ryan Gonzalez. For uh, that's me transition.

Speaker: That's this will sorry, I'm getting caught up here. It makes clear that the org chart will be effective with the potential for deputy city administrators as of July 1st, 2024, and yeah, that's it.

Speaker: Is there a second? Second commissioner Ryan, seconds Gonzalez five this further clarifies the authority of the interim cao throughout the transition period. Is

there a second, second. Ryan seconds. Ryan for council chambers and workspace construction and commissioner, i'll need you to read the full text of this.

Speaker: This amendment memorializes the agreement on the construction of chambers and council offices. There has been some language changes after the publishing of the Tuesday memo yesterday, so i'll read the changes in the amendment and the memo resolution to add and to be resolved. Statement and new exhibit c as follows. And amend resolution title to and add and coordinate chamber and council workspace construction after the word functions.

Speaker: Is there a second second commissioner Gonzalez seconds?

Speaker: That's Ryan for an. And last but not least, Ryan five. I understand you have a new amendment.

Speaker: Yeah, it's about authority to change amendment five, Ryan amendment five. I do have serious concerns about the cost of this new form of government. The voters approved a ceiling of 8.7 million to implement this new form of government. Today's proposal moves that ceiling to 13 million. Result result, resulting in a total investment of 23.9 million. This amendment makes it clear that there is still work to be done as we enter the budgeting season and edits will need to be made. As this amendment was added today, I will read the amendment in its entirety. Whereas voters approved a cost estimate from. 900,000 to 8.7 million in support of charter reform, whereas the current organizational proposed structure is estimated to cost 23.9 million in ongoing funds, whereas existing council and mayor's office budgets are 10.9 million, leaving a \$13 million gap in funding the proposed organizational structure. Be it further resolved council reserves the authority to make ongoing changes to exhibit a during the upcoming budget process. As I'm going to second that, we had also communicated the potential of a friendly amendment.

Speaker: But upon reevaluation, I don't think the friendly amendment is necessary. So there's going to be an amendment to Ryan's amendment no longer necessary.

Speaker: But you are seconding wholeheartedly. Second. Okay, so Ryan five is now on the table as well. And could I ask that I have a hard copy maybe? Haley, I'm looking at you. I'd like to have a hard copy of Ryan five.

Speaker: It's in your binder.

Speaker: Oh, it is? Yeah okay. Thanks. Oh, in the back. Thanks all right, so now that all the amendments, are there any other amendments I should ask? I assume not. Now that all the amendments have been placed on the table for discussion, we'll go around and give linly has something I think I want to make sure.

Speaker: Commissioner Ryan. I want to make sure we clarify for your amendment four. There was a bit of language that was already included in the Tuesday memo, and I just want to confirm that it was intended to include the language with there, be it resolved and the exhibit c, so if you could just acknowledge that that would be helpful. Yes, it was a wordsmithing moment.

Speaker: I should have just read that part.

Speaker: Okay, good. So now for those of you who are watching at home, you're probably thoroughly confused. And that's okay. We are simply putting amendments on the table for further discussion. And now that the amendments have been placed on the table for discussion, we'll go around and give quick summaries for each of our amendments so that those here, as well as at home can better understand what we're voting on today. That will also give you some idea of potentially what you want to talk about in public testimony. So we're not deliberating them yet. We're simply giving a little more exposure to what the purpose of these amendments are. And i'll start. Wheeler one changes the

reporting structure that clarifies that the impact reduction program does not report to the street service coordination center. That's what it does. It is effectively a technical amendment to make that clear. Wheeler. Two alters who the community board for police accountability and office of community based police accountability will report to because they are both both new bureaus and or offices. They're required to be independent. Therefore they need to report directly in that chart to a deputy city administrator. Again slightly technical, but that's what it does.

Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Speaker: Yes, sir.

Speaker: Do you need us up here anymore?

Speaker: You don't like sitting here?

Speaker: I will stay here as long as you like, but I thought I'd get used to it.

Speaker: Let others go.

Speaker: No, you don't need to be here. But undoubtedly you will be called back at some point. So make yourselves more comfortable. Thank you, michael.

Speaker: I was.

Speaker: Now that all the amendments have. Thank you. Okay, so i'll go back through the list again. I've put my two on the table. All commissioner Ryan, natural resources. Ryan one. Now we're going in different order.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Just give a little, little more detail so people who want to testify know what what the proposal is.

Speaker: So you're going to go in the same order as the exactly same order then when you do Rubio next was Rubio yeah.

Speaker: For that it went you yea. Rubio you're right. Why don't we do Rubio one and Rubio two? Thank you.

Speaker: It's pretty simple. Same as I explained before. Rubio one is moving it is amending exhibit a to add chief sustainability officer for in the city administrator section of the organization chart similar to equity officer and this is in response to tremendous community input. Not only into charter change commission work, but also in the development of this organizational structure, both to council in our meetings and also in internal communication to the staff. So that's Rubio one. And then Rubio two permitting and development. This is a simple change. It amends exhibit a to currently permit and development services are in two different lines in the organization structure, which has led to a lot of concern and confusion among our external stakeholders. So this is simply moving it into the same line. Two for streamlining and to convey externally how this is in alignment with the intent of council's recent resolution. Thank you, commissioner.

Speaker: Commissioner Ryan. Ryan one natural resources. Just go in different order. I'm sorry. Maps one natural resources.

Speaker: The colleagues thinks my amendment basically proposes that we change the language in this resolution so that it directs the city's chief administrator officer to explore how the city can do better at managing our city's natural resources. As some quick background for folks who are just catching up to this conversation. In February of this year, this council passed resolution 37 609, which directs did planning and sustainable city parks bts water and pbot to establish a process that results in a work plan for coordinating and integrating services related to our natural areas. In response to that directive, the directors of those bureaus and staff participated in three workshops on natural resources management. This group also contracted with eco northwest to analyze more than 140 documents, which describes the various ways our city bureaus work together to manage our natural spaces. On top of that, this work group contracted with catalyst llc to conduct

employee and advisory committee surveys, which yielded over 80 pages of comments for more than 152 respondents. This in turn, those analyzes were presented to almost 100 staff managers and leaders from stakeholder bureaus. They also presented these results to the public Portland utility board and to a joint session of the Portland parks and recreation board and the urban forestry commission. Now the results of those analyzes basically found and highlighted. Five areas in the natural resources space where the city should strive to do better. Those areas included stormwater management, land conservation and watershed conservation. Carbon reduction and growing our tree canopy colleagues. The amendment that I bring forward today is straightforward and it just directs the city to continue to support these efforts to improve the way we manage our natural areas. I want to be clear on what this amendment does not do. This amendment does not call for the creation of a new bureau, nor does this bureau strip any other, nor does this amendment strip any bureaus of authority, staff or or funding. Instead the amendments I bring forward today, and i'll just read it real quickly, or at least a portion of it real quickly. It says, quote, now, therefore, be it resolved that City Council directs the chief administrative officer with the cooperation of city bureaus to hire an external facilitator to continue to their work, started in March of 2023 to evaluate potential coordination and consolidation or matrixing of natural resources, green infrastructure for urban watershed management, natural areas, urban tree canopy, environmental remediation, urban climate resilience and other line services that work plan should be brought to the chief administrative officer and shared with council no later than December 20th of 2023. Once that work plan is submitted, the bureaus will work together to begin a thoughtful, structured public process to determine how these services can be aligned. And i'll skip a little

bit of language here that basically that plan on how these services should be realigned. We'll come back to this council on September 30th of 2024.

Speaker: Thank you. Ryan won natural resources. Yes this amendment will result in a city wide operational natural area and tree management unit in parks and recreation service area, which would be responsible for the day to day, month to month management services for natural areas and the urban tree canopy.

Speaker: This new organizational unit will build upon existing operational management structure to be more accountable, efficient and effective. Meet regulatory and financial requirements and best practices, and will include community engagement and community stewardship related to this work to the city's natural areas and trees. Port Portland parks and recreation is the largest operation natural area and tree service provider for the city of Portland with almost 8000 acres of natural areas and 1.2 million park trees under its management, Portland parks and recreation has successfully found a balance of protecting the environment and urban forest and connecting Portlanders to nature, public safety and natural areas is primarily responsibility of park rangers as one of our greatest threats to an urban wildfire, the Portland parks rangers, Portland fire and rescue and our land stewardship group work together to mitigate urban wildfire threats. Portlanders and environmental advocacy stakeholders have repeatedly demanded that the city of Portland prioritize nature in our city, clean rivers and streams a healthy urban forest and connecting Portlanders to nature. This is not an effort to let certain bureaus invest less in natural resources. But to the contrary, the proposal will ensure the city of Portland is more effective, more efficient and more coordinated with investments, and all resources will be managed for accountability to the community and City Council. I'd like to highlight briefly what this amendment does not change due to environmental services expertise and regulatory role as the

city's sewer and stormwater utility. Bts will continue to have strategic thought leadership, policy making and funding responsibilities for protecting public health and the environment by collecting and recovering resources from the city's wastewater, managing stormwater and restoring and protecting Portland's rivers, streams and watershed transportation will continue to manage public right of way and transportation services, except for how they will relate to natural areas and trees. Water should not transfer to bull run watershed management response abilities due to its unique qualities and the use for the city's drinking water. I'd like to thank director long and her team for bringing a common sense proposal for council's consideration to make sure we have a vibrant communities in Portland by supporting nature, we need to become more efficient and effective together. I want a new form of government to align city bureaus to support nature and make Portland a place where families and all Portlanders want to live, work and play. Thank you.

Speaker: Ryan Gonzalez.

Speaker: One I think we. Go ahead. Do you want to share the renaming of this service area?

Speaker: Speaks to a more aspirates aspect of this body of work within our city. We must confront an undeniable truth. We're losing families. We're losing enrollment in our schools. We're also losing elders who I wish would stay in Portland and age in place. Quite frankly, they're leaving our city in grim numbers for the first time since the 80s. Our population growth and school enrollment are waning. There needs to be more focus on creating a thriving, more livable city for all Portlanders and so I just think it's important that we really focus on families at this time and have a work area that's really looking out for our families and our

elders. Aging in place. That's what we need for a vibrant city, for a vibrant economy in a city that we all love. I'll pass it on to you for public safety.

Speaker: I think I've alluded to it's a continuation of the description of the space and just assuring some continuity. I'll leave it at that.

Speaker: Great. Ryan to moving arts colleagues in the spirit of Portland's long standing commitment to arts, culture and innovation, I'm here today championing a future that inter wins our city's values and our actions.

Speaker: Portland as we know, is ever evolving, ever growing, weaving the arts into the fabric of our city's beloved institutions, owns Portland parks and recreation. The children and youth levy natural areas under the banner of vibrant communities isn't just about reshuffling, it's about reimagining and deepening our commitment to every community member. To why this move? Why now? Because in Portland, arts and culture aren't just add ons. They are the lifeblood of our neighborhoods. The stories we tell, the history we honor and the future that we envision this service areas where we play sport and convene and community and showcase our diverse talents and cultures that define us as Portlanders. Our parks are a testament to our love for nature and gathering have long celebrated the beauty of diverse expressions. It's not just about efficient management. It's about holistic vision, where every tree, every trail and every piece of art tells a tale of our shared journey. We pairing this with the children's levy. We can open doors for our youth, sparking creativity and ensuring that our next generation remains deeply connected to the cultural threads that make our city unique. It's a vision where art and education walk hand in hand, inspiring and uplifting, in essence, we're not just reorganizing, we're revisioning. We're crafting a space where arts don't just exist, but they flourish, where they become the rhythm and rhyme of our daily lives. I

wholeheartedly support these amendments seeking a vibrant future where arts and culture are not just on the sidelines, but at the heart of our collective identity.

Speaker: Thank you, yea. Gonzalez one service management.

Speaker: I in the intro, I describe and reasonable detail this as well as the rest of my amendments are on the one hand largely legal oriented and clarifying authority through the transition, but secondarily to facilitate prompt support from commissioners to the cao and to the charter reform implementation process.

Speaker: So we're trying to do two things simultaneously clarify legal responsibilities and add authority during this transition period, but also how we best facilitate cooperation among the moving parts during that period.

Speaker: Thank you. And gonzales to reservoir version of authority.

Speaker: I think I described to three, four and five reasonably well in the intro, so. Got it. Good

Speaker: Then we'll move to Ryan. Three approval of interim cao. Yeah just a practice that I know is a part of the new form of government just to be actively engaged in working with the mayor to approve the interim. Thank you. Ryan. For council chambers and works workplace construction.

Speaker: Well, gonzales three is one.

Speaker: He's already described three.

Speaker: You did three and four. He's deferring and five.

Speaker: Yeah. So, okay, back to Ryan for I'm digging.

Speaker: No worries. You did all three. You did all four. Did i?

Speaker: For once, I was brief.

Speaker: This amendment is about the council chambers and construction place. We had three work sessions, felt like more on this topic. This amendment memorializes the agreement on the construction of the chambers and council

offices. There have been some language changes after the publishing of the Tuesday memo, so that's why we read that earlier. Great basically, we're all on board. We got there. Great. Bravo.

Speaker: Last but not least, Ryan five, the authority to change.

Speaker: Yeah, I read that a little bit more about that earlier. I just think it's important that as elected officials that we're transparent with what the voters the will of the voters and that that was obviously in all of the materials. And so we have to make certain that we even though we're right now aspirationally working on the org chart, we have to do a lot of work that we're decoupling the budget. When the budget sessions come up, we need to get back on track in terms of honoring the ceiling that the voters approved. Perfect.

Speaker: Okay. So now that all the amendments have been motioned and seconded and briefly describe, it's my understanding that some of my colleagues have invited testimony. I would ask that invited testimony. Please keep your remarks to no more than three minutes. So that we can get through all of the people here who are here for public testimony. Commissioner Ryan, would you like to kick off invited testimony? I believe you have for folks joining us today.

Speaker: Yeah, willie levinson, there you are. If you could come up with elena padilla, jenny, where she's been here all day. Thanks for being back. Morning and afternoon session. One of your children and j.r. Lily, are they here? They're there doing it remotely. But we do have jason margolis here, so you can come up anytime when they're when they're finished or you can come up. Now, I realize you have two kids, it looks like next to you. Yeah

Speaker: No, they're not mine.

Speaker: Oh, I just. I just assumed she'd never do that. Yeah go ahead. Okay.

Speaker: Thanks, willie levinson with human access project.

Speaker: I just wanted to. To speak in favor of Ryan's amendment to keep operating one of the trees within the parks department. Parks does a great job of maintaining the trees and. And having the connection between property ownership and significant part of the parks being the trees. It it makes sense to keep it where it is.

Speaker: Good afternoon. Good to see you all again. Elena bertollini with the Portland parks and rec advisory board. I'll wholly admit that I've not been here all day. I went home and grabbed my kid who is not in school and is having a great civics lesson behind us. I am here speaking on behalf of the Portland parks and recreation advisory board. When I say I'm here on behalf of the board, I want to clarify that we are a board of members who live from the west side of the river to rockwood and the farthest stretches of northeast Portland down to sellwood. We have members who are disability rights activists, retirees, runners, parents, policy consultants, recreation consultants, environmental and nature advocates. We bring all of these perspectives and many more when we think about the future of parks. And we are thinking a lot right now about the future of parks. Both parks with a small p, what do our parks in our neighborhoods in a growing city with a growing population mean? We hope to see it growing again. We believe it will be and we need to plan for that. What does that look like? And also parks with a big p, how do the services is overseen by the bureau of parks and recreation? Look as you all realign our city? And does that strength in our parks system or does that detract from our park system? The parks board wrote you all a letter previously when you came out with your initial proposal with some values about what we hope you kept in mind. I'm here today to reiterate just one piece of that. Given the amendments that you have before you, it is really critical to members of the parks board that you do align parks with a new natural resources group and that they be located within

the same service area. There are three reasons that we believe that's so important. The first is it allows for holistic planning. Earlier this morning I sat before your commission and commissioner Rubio. You actually used the words I was planning on saying today when you said that it was important for us as a community to think about, think holistically about parks. And as a parent of two young children. Often when I think about parks, I think about playgrounds and sports fields. But our parks are also at the centers of our local ecosystems. They keep us healthy and they keep our watersheds healthy. They are sources of shade and clean air. And as part of the solution to our climate crisis, and if we are not approaching our natural resources and tree canopy holistically, we are not able to do the full work of our parks. You have also, as commissioner Mapps noted, already started this work. Your bureaus have been working together to figure out how to better align services for a number of years. And one of our boards recommendations when we heard the presentation recently about that work was that centralizing the work around our tree canopy specifically and around natural resources more broadly could create significant efficiencies within city government, creating a place for this work to occur within the new city structure, that location where those efficiencies can be achieved, and placing parks and recreation and the operation of those natural resources together builds on the work you've already become begun. It's the next logical step. And finally, I promise I'm wrapping up. Mayor it allows for the best operationalization of the work. At the end of the day, your bureaus are here to implement the work and we can go round and round about values and how things best align from a values perspective, but based on what we see as the advisory body for your bureau of parks and recreation. An we believe that given parks and recreation's work already overseeing the vast majority of land management and tree management in our city, that it can anchor the work we believe that parks and

recreation aligns well with much of the other programming. You're looking at like the children's levy and our city's arts programming. We also believe, though, that that service area can be the place where we address our natural areas and that if we create, as Ryan one does, a city operational natural area and tree management unit and place it within the same service area as Portland parks and recreation, we can best implement the programs that you all are working to have more efficiency within. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you so much, j.r, can you unmute.

Speaker: The floor is yours.

Speaker: Wonderful. Thank you, commissioner. Good afternoon, mayor and commissioners. Ya'at'ééh. Liliiana shea touching initially educated by touching. For those who don't speak navajo. My name is j.r. Lilly. He him his I the navajo nation part of the red runs water people and born for the cliff dwelling people. I come in today wear a number of hats in the community serving on the native American community advisory committee with nr as well as the incoming board chair for the Portland parks foundation, and also serve as the urban forestry commissioner and with the east Portland parks coalition, a former budget advisory committee member and several other capacities that help advocate and speak for our trees, I'm testifying today in support of Ryan won the amendment to add a citywide operational natural area and tree management with parks and rec, mainly because I believe it will better support our goals of including community voices in the process to grow, to grow our tree canopy, especially in the east Portland where we need more trees, not just for shade equity, but also for our critters and our birds and just the overall health of the community. Places where there's trees that are planted have a better outcome for all communities on various levels. When Portland parks and rec does some really good engagement with the neighborhoods

around a park site like mill park or park lane, in other areas, other departments in the city could really benefit from that engagement already, and that existing relationship that's happening like pbot could, that's planting street trees nearby could benefit from that engagement and community voice because I know when community we just see trees, we see trees. But us bureaucrats, when we look at the situation, we see park trees, we see street trees, we see trees on private property 80 and trees on business property. And those are all managed by different people and so who we have to give you know, feedback to and thought process is like four different people. If we're just consolidate some of those processes together and share the engagement would be community would really appreciate that the hope of this process would be to support the staff members just working closer together in these area. Idea of like a one stop shop for community to really engage and let our voice be heard and help. Um, just practices of trees and making sure that they're taking care of properly trees provide so much benefit for our community, including reducing stress. So they say if you're making a intense phone call, do it underneath a tree. It definitely will help in the outcome. Um, so I just want to as many ways as we can advocate because look, the health of our trees is connected to the health of our community. The better we can steward them and make the process better. Um my community refers to them as the one our one legged relatives. So thank you for your support and any questions, i'll be available. Thank you, jason margolis, if you could come up, jason's the arts laureate for our city and also the leader of the band program at roosevelt high school.

Speaker: Thanks for being here, jason. Yeah, sorry. I assumed every child near you was yours.

Speaker: No, it's fine. I do have children at home, so I know. Okay.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: I wear blue today to show my solidarity for my fellow teachers who are on the first day of strike at. And I just got back from roosevelt where all the teachers were convening. And I believe I'm here today to talk about just how this affects art programs in general from a performing arts perspective. I was speaking with our choir teacher today, and they were on track to do their final tech production today for their play that starts tomorrow. So and depending on how long this strike goes on, everything's getting pushed back. Back. And in terms of even ticket sales and auditions for the musical, which are supposed to take place later in the month, um, for music teachers, it's just, you know, coming off of the pandemic, I feel like we are just starting to get traction in and I'd it's so devastated waiting for kids not to be together because all these art forms are contingent on students being together. And of course I realize we're all fighting for rights for teachers, which is rightfully so. So but in the end, we're, we're really hurting students who desperately need arts right now. Of all forms, whether it's performing visual dance, whatever it is. And we hope that this ends quickly. We would have all thought I would have thought that this would have been resolved by now, but it's not so yeah, I'm really hoping this doesn't go into December and longer than that because we have a district jazz festival in December and you know, every day counts. So yeah. Do you have any questions for me?

Speaker: Well, thank you, jason. I mean, I think you're in the moment and I think a lot of people know that. And we I know earlier, I think darian jones reached out to you and you know, we're we're talking about elevating the arts portfolio and including it with children and youth and so thank you for being a teacher or a music teacher and for building a robust program. Yeah. And I look forward to us continuing to build together. So thank you for being here. Yeah absolutely. Okay. Yeah. Thank you.

Speaker: Welcome.

Speaker: All right. Thank you, commissioner Ryan, does that conclude your testimony? All right. Okay. Thank you to the invited speakers. Does anybody else have invited testimony? Very good. We have, I believe, a couple of dozen people signed up today for public testimony. We want to make sure we hear from everyone. So we will ask you. Please, please, please do your best to limit your talking points to two minutes so that everybody has a chance to be heard. There will be a clock available that you'll be able to see if you're testifying virtually and haven't already. Please take a moment to switch to gallery view on your settings that'll make it a little easier for you to see what's going on and to see the time clock when you have 30s remaining, you'll see the timer begin to flash and then it'll turn red. When your time is up. At the end of those two minutes, the council clerk will meet you, meet you. If you're not wrapping up, we'll give people the opportunity to wrap up. But we really ask people to stick to two minutes. Keelan it's up to you from here on out. Thank you. Thank you, mayor.

Speaker: First up, we have bob salinger. Hey, bob.

Speaker: Good afternoon. Afternoon good afternoon, mayor Wheeler. Members of City Council for the record, my name is bob salinger, and I'm representing willamette riverkeeper. And our thousands of members in the Portland metro area. We have a long history of working on watershed issues in Portland and I personally have served on a couple of terms on the parks board. The pub watershed advisory council, and about a dozen budget committees for beaches and parks. We are here today to strongly endorse maps amendment number one and to strongly oppose Ryan amendment number one, a maps amendment number one allows us to move into a new era of natural resource management. We've long been a leader in these issues, but the fact is, is that we have slowed down and we started to go backwards.

It's important to understand what maps amendment number one does is it creates a natural resource bureau adds it back into the org chart. It does not specify what that bureau will do. That's a process to come, but it gives us a chance to think about all the different elements of natural resources as trees, natural areas, but also superfund, science, fishing, wildlife, regulatory compliance, stormwater strategies and so on. We have multiple elements we need to rethink how they come together, how they're matrixed. This gives us that opportunity to do that. It's a visionary approach. It's important as we do that, that we think about how it is funded, how these how this new bureau relates back to other infrastructure bureaus and to make sure that we do it in a intentional way. That being said, we think it is the path forward. We do oppose Ryan amendment number one. We think this is a last minute, poorly thought out proposal. It pulls trees in natural areas, out of out of bays, but doesn't address any of the other issues that are so important. It doesn't address potential legal issues such as the andersen lawsuit. And it basically we just modifies an inadequate status quo. We can do better. We urge you to go with the maps amendment number one. Thank you. Thank you.

Speaker: Next up, we have walter weiler online.

Speaker: Welcome, walter.

Speaker: Hello. I'm walter.

Speaker: Walter, downtown city resident and voter. And ladies and gentlemen, while I respect the dedication, the work and the process of the proposal you are discussing today, my thoughts reflect that the impression of me, just as a single voter, I urge you to reject this proposal as too complex and too expensive and lacking adequate community input. The plan should be sent back for work regarding achievement structure, cost and community input goals that would be set by the council. Too complicated. Many new positions populated at least two

additional management levels is an unnecessary first step of implementation in recruiting. Training and organizing work will take months before operations smooth, too expensive. An additional \$13 million plus renovation of city hall plus voting system implementation will be a complete surprise to voters who approved the ballot measure. I liked commissioner Ryan's amendment. Finally, lacking community input, the charter advisory team, I understand, was not seriously engaged in the development of this plan, and there was virtually little other community input. My time is not up, but I'm finished. Ladies and gentlemen, have a good day. All the best. Thank you. Thank you.

Speaker: Walter. It's always good to see you.

Speaker: Brevity, brevity.

Speaker: We have the next three people may come up together. Marion fitzgerald, david chen and jerry santner. Welcome. I begin.

Speaker: Why don't you go ahead, mr.

Speaker: Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is marion fitzgerald and although I'm the president of my neighborhood association, I'm here on behalf of myself only neighborhoods have always taken a horizontal view of the delivery of services throughout the city and when I saw the organization chart that came out last week, particularly the big exhibit with the elected and mayors, it's top heavy. It's got unclear authority and accountable to the people of Portland. And it's crazy expensive. I urge you to start lean and build later rather than build this big bureaucracy and have to make cuts that we can't afford. And these positions I want to just say that I didn't know until this week about the maps and Ryan proposals for natural resources. As my neighborhood has two parks and three natural areas and no stormwater system and nobody has come to either. My neighborhood in southwest Portland nor the sweeney parks committee to discuss this. And you

know, we need more discussion. So I support mr. Maps proposal to study it further and come into the community because we live here, we want to use these resources and nobody's checked in with us. So I do want to thank commissioner Ryan for moving the neighborhoods and district offices a little further up in the civic engagement point. But I still don't understand why there's eight city administrators and why civic engagement is with the junior administrator. The assistant administrator rather than the deputy administrator. When everybody needs to be at the table as peers, not as unequal people. So I just want to conclude agreeing wholeheartedly with the last two speakers that there has not been enough meaningful civic engagement on this proposal for the last year. And it's very expensive. And I'm really concerned about the trade offs and services that the people will experience in order to pay for a very top heavy administration. Thank you. Thank you.

Speaker: David chen hi, david. Mr. Mayor.

Speaker: Commissioners, thank you for the chance to talk to you today. Last I saw you, other than commissioner gonzales, was about 20 months ago when you appointed me to the charter commission and I was not in the super majority. I'm here to mention two things. First, in the proposed org chart, it looks like the city administrator is overseeing the council staff. And this is kind of like having the police chief supervise the staff of the community police oversight board or in our federal structure having the president supervise congressional staff probably council staff should be included in the city's hr system, it infrastructure and other basic admin functions, but might be worth looking at how legislate staffs in other cities are managed or, to my point, not managed by the executive function. A second and I think a little more attention needs to be paid to the charter section that empowers the mayor to appoint the city administrator. This is section two 401

f. If you're taking notes on January 1st, 2025, the mayor elected in November 2024, takes office and they're empowered to appoint the city administrator. And as you know, that appointment needs to be confirmed by the City Council, the new City Council, section 202 401. F also says that the mayor acts as the city administrator for if the office of the city administrator is vacant so we could end up indefinitely with a mayor acting as the city administrator because they have either not appointed a city administrator or because council won't confirm the mayor's appointee. This could make the mayor's office more attractive than some critics have been saying. But if you don't think that's the right result, I encourage you to fix it. And thank you for all you do for the city. Thank you.

Speaker: And david, if I could just quickly, we did think about that and the expectation is the interim city administrator will actually overlap from when I leave office on December 31st for six months in the new mayor term. So there the expectation is there will not be a vacancy and that that city administrator would leave once the process has been completed and new city administrator has been appointed, although the longer term that could happen, the mayor can unilaterally remove the city administrator, though, correct?

Speaker: Yeah. Mayor, it actually brings up a it brings up a change in what our amendment proposed. We had originally proposed that the council approve the interim ceo, which might align with the new charter structure. We actually softened the language in the amendment to merely be consulted on it. It does. The testimony actually raises a question. If in softening it, we inadvertently took away essentially the ratification of that ceo for the new form of government. Right? If council had approved that ceo, is there an argument that that's somehow more effective going into the new form of government? I don't know. I'm just posing an

open legal question. Your exchange actually creates an interesting an interesting question that I don't think we're going to resolve today. But thank.

Speaker: Thanks. And we can raise it later with legal counsel, city attorney. Yeah. Thanks, david. Hi. Sorry

Speaker: Good afternoon, mayor. Members of the council. My name is larry santner. Some of you know that I work for Portland parks and recreation for over 30 years. The last eight years as its director, I was prepared to offer three points in my testimony. I'm afraid the time is not going to allow me to cover all of them. But I'm going to give it a shot. The first point that I wanted to make was that parks recreation facilities, natural areas, urban forests they are not a luxury, they're not amenities, they're part of cities. Infrastructure nature, and they should be treated as such in that light, I firmly believe that they should be located with other cities, infrastructure and I want to stay away from the word public works. Everything that the city does is public works. We need to call those bureaus infrastructure bureaus and parks and recreation is one of those. So they should be aligned with other infrastructure bureaus and report to the same deputy city administrator. The second thing that I want to mention is that when I was with parks, I worked very closely with I and my staff were very closely with a lot of other infrastructure bureaus because our work every work that we did, it touched upon that and we found that working on well, I'm not even going to make my second point. I realized that whenever we commissioner of parks had another infrastructure under its portfolio, the two bureaus worked most effectively and productively. And that's another reason that I think the parks bureau should be under the infrastructure. The second point is that I believe that all the natural resources, urban forests, I'm afraid.

Speaker: Why don't you make your point?

Speaker: Actually, I make my point. I want to give you a little bit of context, mayor, if I may. When I was bureau, when I was a bureau director, I formed a natural, a specific unit in the bureau called city nature. I brought the urban forest and natural resources together, and the intent was collaborations, transparency and efficiencies. But one thing that it did, it signified two elements. One was the inadequacy of funding for those. And the third, the second one was that that fund was fungible. All it was used at the end of the year to fill the gap of the shortfall in other divisions. And I wanted to stop that. So I think although parks, we all loved our natural areas, our urban forests, but when push came to shove, the asset that expenditure on assets would be minimized. Thank you. And okay, appreciate it.

Speaker: Next up, we have terry harris on line, followed by sarah silky and jenny o'connor.

Speaker: Welcome.

Speaker: Good afternoon. I'm terry harris.

Speaker: I'm an alternate member of gtac testifying in my personal capacity, I've provided detailed written comments. The three minutes. I'd also explained why you should adopt only a budget framework today and remand the org chart for future refinements. But with these two minuscule minutes, I will simply urge the council to reject outright the mayor and council scheme. You've been presented here the structure and staffing for the mayor and council made only public a week ago, is ill conceived, massively under-resourced, forced and misaligned with the charter and charter amendments. First of all, the chart is incomplete. The mandatory roles of the auditor and city attorney are not accounted for here. Second, the lines of reporting and accountability to the extent that they exist at all on this chart, violate the separation of powers called for by the charter amendments. Legislative staff need to be hired and fired and supervised within the legislative branch and shared

staff. By definition, in reporting to multiple bosses is doomed to failure. Finally, the entire exercise, both in the council and the mayor's office, is wildly under-resourced. You were told yesterday that the council could expect probably a minimum of five council committees here. Cities average 7 or 8, but where the committee clerks, the records clerks, the researchers, the bill drafters, the legislative director, a committee council, a parliamentarian. There's no provision here for the much larger responsible duties of council president. All we see here are two analysts and two coordinate lawyers floating in space. Meanwhile while it's the elected mayor at the very top of the executive branch who supervises the city, administers later, it will be important that that mayor has the tools to do that supervision in a substantive way. This chart does not come close to providing those tools. The bottom line and last year's budget note notwithstanding, the mayor and council chart won't cut it, send it back. Thank you. Sarah.

Speaker: Silky.

Speaker: Good afternoon. My name is sarah silky. I use she they pronouns. I am a city employee, but I am here on leave and my personal capacity as a Portlander who grew up here. I am concerned about the financial impact of the proposed transition plan on our ability to provide basic city services to residents. It is too top heavy. Please excuse me if I'm a little distracted. My three kids are here in the chambers due to the schools being closed. We support Portland area teachers on strike first. I totally agree with the testimony of bob salinger and mary ann fitzgerald. Fitzgerald about the importance of the environment to Portlanders and the important importance of the horizontal for city services. I am really excited about a lot of aspects of the proposed new organization, especially the focused natural resources unit, and I understand that the time and budget constraints everyone is under to get this ready by January 2025 is tight. However there are

worrisome parallels between pbs and the city of Portland's proposed org chart here. This proposal adds six very high level positions in addition to the voter mandated city administrator. At the same time that willamette week and the Portland business journal are reporting on layoffs in development services and soon to come in transportation. We could use that same money instead of for six high level position. You could hire over a dozen maintenance techs to actually do the work of filling potholes or building more ada curb ramps every year. Or does lynn Portland street response staff to support getting people off the streets? The analogy to Portland public schools is that teachers want basic things like functioning and safe classrooms, just like Portlanders want basic services, not additional layers of administration. I ask you to consider a commitment to no net addition of high level management positions and implementing this transition even better would be a reduction of high level management. So the resources can go where they're needed most on the front line. Again, I really appreciate the time, thought and effort of all involved. It's been a fast and top heavy process with minimal input from frontline workers, so I'm not surprised that an extra layer of management is where this proposal is landed. And jenny o'connor yes, I am.

Speaker: My name is jenny o'connor. I'm a Portland citizen and property owner. I'm also I'm speaking for myself as a citizen, but I'm also a member of the 350 watchdog team and a member of the emerging coalition on climate and of climate and environmental groups. I wanted to acknowledge the work that's been done and say thank you to all of you. I'm going to leave it at that. I I'm impressed. My point one is I support commissioner Mapps amendment on the national natural resources as outlined. I i ditto bob salinger's remarks and I liked it because the scope of work was outlined. It had tasks, it had a timeline, and it also had public involvement, which commissioner Ryan's didn't. And so therefore I'm opposing

commission Ryan's amendment and I support commissioner Mapps amendment. I see. I'm opposing commissioner Rubio's amendment one to amend exhibit to add chief sustainability officer. There's been over a thousand comments that have come in asking for a climate officer to be added at the top level under the city administrator. There's been a lot of thought, a lot of thought that's gone through this. We are we're we're we got the idea from kings county who's already done this, and we have have a scope of work for them to implement the climate emergency. And this is to your legacy, mayor Wheeler, because you declared that we have a climate emergency, then bts did a really extensive look at all the things we have to do to get to zero emissions by 2050. Nobody has talked about this. None of you. And I want to see a climate officer here added to the administrative chief administrator's office at the top level.

Speaker: Your amendment does. I think that's what our amendment does.

Speaker: No, she's saying that you're going to take the chief sustainability officer, vivian, who's already managing and already has her her plate full. If you look and we looked at the job description of your chief officer or your chief sustainability officer and we looked at the job description, an of the climate officer for the kings county hired last year. Big difference, big difference. And if you guys are going to do your homework, then look at that. And I'm saying this because a lot of us came up with this idea. It wasn't a climate officer, it wasn't to replace vivian and put a chief sustainability officer up there. It's to hire a new climate officer at the top level. Well, you know how far we are into this. I do. Okay well, 92% remaining. Sure on 47 tasks.

Speaker: Well, i. I really sincerely appreciate what you're saying. And I don't think we're far off. I think our intention actually, I know our intention was to be responsive to what community is saying. So I think that there's a way for us to close

that gap. We're happy to talk to you afterwards. There's still room for us to shape things going forward.

Speaker: Yeah, no, I'd love to talk to you because I have I've been I've been thinking about this for two weeks. Okay.

Speaker: But just know that our intention is there. It's not to subvert. We're in alignment.

Speaker: Then why is there no one assigned to oversee the climate emergency work plan?

Speaker: This is who this position would be doing that for the whole city, as well as overseeing the new climate commission that we're about to start.

Speaker: So are you going to take vivian's job of all that and you're going to add this on top of that? Our goal is to add capacity so that we are hopefully moving into position to be a climate leader. I'm getting really upset and it's really no, not it's not a good thing. Okay

Speaker: Well, we can always agree to disagree. That's a democracy. Commissioner Gonzalez maybe.

Speaker: I guess so.

Speaker: But can I just clarify one piece here?

Speaker: So I think part of the confusion is the header on the amendment versus what the amendment actually does. The amendment adds a chief sustainability officer in the city administrator section of the organizational chart, similar to the equity officer or the I think where the confusion is coming is the is the header says moving chief sustainable officer to city administrator. So the body, the intent is to create a new position and I'm going to put an asterisk on this just to be clear. But I think the clear intent is to create a new position, one that has parity with the chief equity officer. Just the header says the header is confusing. So I recognize the

grounds for your confusion. I would back up with commissioner Rubio is saying the intent here is to create a new position on that that sits at the chief administrative officer's direct report level as senior as you get. I say all of that with the caveat that I'm going to repeat a number of times and I said it yesterday, we still have to go through the budget process. So regardless of what we do today, we have to go through a separate process to figure out how we're going to pay for all of this overhead. That's the number of folks have testified to. So just trying to reconcile why there might be some confusion on this.

Speaker: Now, I feel kind of stupid because it's almost like you know, I didn't understand it right.

Speaker: Well, we didn't help we didn't help you with the heading. And that's my apologies to you said you were going to move the chief.

Speaker: And so I took that literally. So sorry about that.

Speaker: Not not at all. And while you're here, just so I can be clear and maybe michael, you can answer this later, I think in addition to the budget, don't we have to bring the definitions of the positions? Do we need positional authority? Which means we actually have to have a public discussion about the specific duties in those positions. Is that accurate?

Speaker: New classifications have to come to council and would this be one?

Speaker: I think so. Okay. So it's very likely we'll we'll have a more in-depth conversation about the specific duties of this position.

Speaker: So would you consider you're looking at king county climate officer job description?

Speaker: Yes. And you can talk to my office and me directly.

Speaker: Yeah, no, I'd love to.

Speaker: Uh, one more point, because I was listening to all of you yesterday. I thought you guys should hire from within. You've got a lot of talent, a lot of talent. I know. I work for the department of public works in san francisco, so I worked at different levels. I left as a project manager. I know what the problem with budget comes with. I would say look at your you know, what the talent you have within your organization and elevate.

Speaker: Absolutely. Thank you. Appreciate you. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Sorry for the.

Speaker: That's good discussion.

Speaker: It was a very good discussion. I learned a lot, too.

Speaker: Thank you. Thank you.

Speaker: Next up, we have micah. Michelle online followed by john turan and dan handelman, Portland copwatch.

Speaker: Hi, micah. Hi mayor council.

Speaker: Thanks for the opportunity to testify. My name is micah mezcacal, assistant conservation director for Portland audubon. I'm going to keep my testimony brief as I am the general public. I've had limited time to review the proposed amendments, but i'll start broadly. I urge and Portland audubon urges you to ground your decisions today on optimizing future function instead of the politics of today and yeah, the key piece is we believe that the formation of a natural resource group could be very beneficial towards the holistic protection, stewardship and expansion of our environmental assets in the city. We have long been in this position for 40 years really advocating for the holistic treatment of all those as they will bring synchronization among these efforts. And so today we're in support of maps amendment number one, to allow for the further ongoing discussion and collaborate between bureaus. It's been ongoing and we want it to continue to about

how to best organize the city's environmental programs into including recreation and how the new groups can maximize their joint goals. We're planning on continuing to follow that discussion and the development of this group to help inform it and taking a real watershed approach to a watershed approach to its work. Um, i'll note that there's a lot of grassroots community support for this model that we've heard over the years and for this session today and that you've seen in the public record record, we do not support. Ryan amendment number one on structural level, though, we agree with the goal and think it can be achieved through the ongoing discussion of the city's natural resource group. We're dedicated to continue to advocate for the achievement of retaining a strong connection between parks, natural areas, recreation and people. And lastly, we support the placement of the chief climate officer and whatever position that will empower our at the most to really coordinate the city's entire efforts towards building climate resilience. Um, thank you for your time.

Speaker: Thanks, micah.

Speaker: John turan good afternoon.

Speaker: I'm john turan. Longtime I'm downtown Portland resident. I'm here to urge a no vote on the city reorganization charter. But before I go into that, I just wanted to clarify, is it correct that the mayor currently has administrative responsibility for the entire city? No okay.

Speaker: I have some of the administrative bureaus under my responsibility, but the commissioners, in addition to their legislative and budgetary authority, they also have direct management authority for bureaus that are assigned to them. Okay, so I have some of the some of the managerial authority. But I don't have all of it.

Speaker: Okay. I thought I thought I read in the paper that you were going to take over the administration of all the bureaus.

Speaker: Oh, well, that could be the case under the current under the existing charter. I have the ability to move. Bureaus include taking them all back and putting them under myself. I have that authority.

Speaker: Okay. And you also still would do the policy making, is that correct?

Speaker: It depends. If it's budget or if it's general city policy or legislative authority that resides with the council as a whole under the current city charter. And there's nothing I can do to take that authority away.

Speaker: Okay. And how big is your staff?

Speaker: Well, we have 21, 22. 22? Yeah

Speaker: So I'm just kind of reiterating some of the same points that everybody else has been made. But I do feel like this new organization chart is bloated. If you give each of the city administrator an assistant, it amounts to about 28 to 30 people to do just the administrative portion that they're proposing. Um, I also think that the shared administration is a bad idea. I think you could determine the shape of legislation merely by like the phone calls that come in. And with the way that the organization is structured, essentially the city administrator would get notice of any messages that came into the, you know, the counselor's office before the administration, before the counselor even got it, because, you know, the admins there, the city administrator, administrators, their boss on top of that at the city administrator gets to set the legislative calendar, which to me is a is a policymaking function on, you know, the sequence that you set out legislation to be heard. And so I think that's a really dangerous consolidation underneath that organizational chart. Also point out one point. One of the charter reform says it's the duty of the new council to set this structure. And so I feel like we're setting up

the new or interim city administrator for failure. And, you know, we could be hiring all these people decide that it's not correct and end up sending them back home. And my final point would be to save a little bit of money on construction costs instead of chopping up the current offices, I would suggest moving all of the non-elected employees over to the Portland building. And you taking you have the city attorneys have one whole floor, plus you have the elections office. And I think that could be sufficient space at least way cheaper to get everybody at home. So thank you. Thank you for your time.

Speaker: And by the way, we are restacking, the Portland building with bureau offices that are currently in private sector leases. We're looking at that very strategy. You suggest. I think it's a smart one. Commissioner Gonzales, I appreciate your comments.

Speaker: Share your concerns on cost. We'll get into each of them. But I want to clarify one piece. You indicated this so this state administrator would set the legislative calendar.

Speaker: Yes, I think it's on page. Two.

Speaker: Um, probably about like six bubbles down.

Speaker: I think is where there's a scheduling they get to set the calendar. I what was the question?

Speaker: Does anybody, someone come on, I just want to clarify one thing.

Speaker: I don't want to get sidetrack, but is that okay? There is there a way we can pull it up?

Speaker: I just. I'm sorry. What what's the question?

Speaker: I think it was Mr. Gonzales who sets the legislative calendar under the new system.

Speaker: I assume, like when council meets that kind of stuff is. Sir. Is that what you mean? Correct

Speaker: The council sets their own legislative three, the three, the president's three.

Speaker: That's correct.

Speaker: Through the council. President, you have your exhibit a, I think I'm going to guess as you pull it up, I think you're referencing that there is a scheduler position that is inside the bureaucracy that ultimately reports it's the ceo, but that is distinct from who actually sets the legislative calendar.

Speaker: I, I think that's a legislative function to set your calendar, even if there is someone called the scheduler somewhere in the bureaucracy.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: And I guess that would make more sense to put that bubble underneath the president of the council to me.

Speaker: Yeah, we can we can clarify that if the exhibit is not clear on the functions of the president, is that the question that the exhibit might not be?

Speaker: I think if you go to the tab for legislative just go down. Sorry, I don't want to get us too far down a rabbit hole. I just wanted to clear on here. I'm doing it anyway. I'm about to jump into.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: So the third column, fifth bubble down, council operations and legislative process.

Speaker: So what's the so to me that that that seems like a policy making and that should be couched underneath the president of the council rather than the city administrator there.

Speaker: And it's concerning that like my admin staff will be getting all my phone calls. Whose boss is the city administrator for is also the one setting, the setting the calendar. It feels a little bit like policymaking.

Speaker: And shoshana, the specific point I was jumping on is who sets the calendar for the new legislative function? I believe that is the president under the proposed code language we've read. But I but I want to reconcile that.

Speaker: Yeah. Sorry hi, tate white strategic project manager for the record. Hi good afternoon. It is confusing thing. There's a lot of nuance. Yes today in the work session, we talked about the shared council staff who report to council staff director because they're shared. We couldn't really pick a single council member for them to report to. And so that's why you have that council staff director who also helps serve all the councilors and supports communication between the council and the executive. You're right that that director ultimately reports to the city administrator. That's what we had to do to have that permanent staff so that they don't change over each time there's an election. However, we note your concern and we'll make sure to put in tools to make sure that there's some space between the city administrator and that staff. Thank you.

Speaker: Great. And now I'm beating a dead horse.

Speaker: But who is your understanding? Who is setting the legislative calendar in the new form of government that would ultimately be the council and the council president would have that authority be crystal clear.

Speaker: Thank you and thank you for this dialog.

Speaker: Commissioner Mapps and I will be very brief here. I appreciate the comments and even I appreciate the conversation. Um I think this does point to a tension and maybe some distance we have from best practices around building an air gap between an executive branch staff and legislative branch staff. So for

example, if you go through the testimony that we received today, I think there is some and even today, I think we heard someone say this, and if you check the paper that came in, you'll also find examples of our voters telling us that basically council staff shouldn't report to the chief administrative officer because the chief administrative officer is part of the executive branch as opposed to the legislative branch. This would be like staff in the in congress reporting to the white house somehow. So I think there's something there. We're not going to resolve this question today, but i'll i'll put that out there as something that we might want to think about before we're done with this process.

Speaker: Understood. Thank you.

Speaker: Very good. Thank you. Thank you.

Speaker: Colleagues, could I suggest we get through the rest of public testimony? Because I know there's some people who have to get home to their kids with the school strike. Let's get through the testimony, make notes of things. You want to follow up on. We'll follow up at the end.

Speaker: Next up, we have dan handelman. Welcome

Speaker: Good afternoon. Mayor Wheeler, members of council. I'm dan handelman. I use he him pronouns and I'm a member of Portland copwatch and a former member of the police accountability commission. The pac's work ended when we presented a plan to you on September 21st. It's not 100% clear how much of the resolution you're adopting today will be able to undergo further changes as a group focused on police accountability, we're deeply concerned that new oversight system is proposed to be under the same deputy city administrator as the police bureau. This is not in the slides that you were shown. It's in the mayor's amendment. It's buried on page 19 of the memo from the chief administrative officer. It was not the recommendation of the pac, nor is it consistent with the

charter to put the new board into the community safety division. The charter section two, dash 106. Clearly indicates the new board will be independent of all other city offices just last year, when the independent police review was released from the auditor's office, they became an independent agency not linked to any other office. In 2001, when it was created, it was put into the auditor's office, although then mayor vera katz had taken the older system piascy into her portfolio, she recognized that the police commissioner should not also manage the oversight system. Mayor Wheeler also recognized this challenging part of the existing system. When council heard appeals from the citizen review committee and he was asked as police commissioner to weigh in on decisions previously made by the bureau, there seems to be some misunderstand of what the new charter says. I read it carefully because there's discussion at a pcp meeting a few weeks ago where it was asserted. The new mayor will also be the police commissioner. That's not what the charter says. The mayor will hire the employees of all the bureaus will report to the administrator and their deputies at Portland copwatch. We urge the council to add an amendment that makes it clear the new board will be independent. It will not report to the same administrator as the police or else you will risk papel dating the distrust that has existed ever since before the pc was created in 1982, the appearance that the police are the ones who investigate other police. If you want a suggestion, the city operations area where the bureau of human resources will be located, the new board. Thank you. Thank you.

Speaker: Dan.

Speaker: Then next three testifiers are jenna kane online, kyle johnson and babs vanelli online. Welcome go ahead, jenna. Thank you dear council members, thank you for your intentional work to facilitate a smooth transition to a new form of government with a substantially increased council.

Speaker: I'm testifying today to ask for your support not to adopt commissioner Mapps amendment number one to restore a new bureau of natural resources and with a natural resources plan by September 30th, 2024, and to have a facility discussion with a rich public engagement process and to ensure that funding streams are assured. And for a bureau of this important magnet renewed, my hope is also here. Hearing the testimony money through parks earlier that that parks, it seems like, would be an integral part of a natural resources service area. And so I strongly would hope that these bureaus would come together to really look at the public's good. Instead of what's politically feasible, to be able to work together for to protect the environment for Portlanders and future generations as the other aspect is that I too noted the incredibly inflated top tier management and this proposed budget. And I have some concerns around the staffing impact for line staff at the city and to really keep that in mind as you look at the groupings of the service areas to ensure that, you know, allowing politics to dictate what's the best for the public is to really keep the good of the public in mind, as well as protect staffing positions at the line staff level. Um I'd like to also add the importance of focusing on equity. And I'm glad that you have an equity officer at the highest level and I've seen that in addition to relying on that position in ensuring that that position is well integrated and has the authority to work across bureaus, that the same is true for hiring a new climate officer in the city administrator's office. That's integral to being able to address the climate emergency work plan and to make sure that we make progress instead of being steeped in the status quo and an action as far as the climate. Thank you so much.

Speaker: Thank you, jenna.

Speaker: Next up is kyle johnson.

Speaker: Uh, mayor Wheeler, council. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today. My name is kyle johnson and I'm the vice chair of bike loud. Although today I'm speaking for myself. I've been a transportation advocate in Portland for the past 15 years. During that time, I started Portland's bike train movement and the largest bicycle valet in north America, and I have also helped get several important transportation projects over the finish line. As of this morning, I have also stood in front of a street grinder to prevent a bike lane from being removed. And over this past 15 years, we have never experienced what is going on right now in terms of the city actively seeking to remove bike lanes. As you talk about how our government should function under the new charter, I hope that you will consider a less centralized and less politicized transportation decision making structure that is more accountable all to the policies City Council passes the Broadway bike lane scandal has tarnished Portland's reputation, both within the city and globally. Most importantly for this council is the damage that has been done to the relationship of trust between this council. Pbot staff and all Portlanders as city nerd is the most popular transportation planning youtube channel in it. City planner ray delante gives his take on different cities in his recent video about Portland. With over 300,000 views, he dedicated an entire section to the Broadway scandal. At the end, he said something that I think captured what people felt when they read director William's emails, and the veil was lifted on how these life and death decisions are being made. In his video, he said planners are doing years of extensive outreach to every impacted community. But if a rich business owner wants to take out a bike lane, they can just take a City Council member out to a nice lunch. I can't even imagine how demoralizing this is for staff. All I can say to them is try to remember why you got into planning in the first place. I'd like you to all consider what would have happened if director William's emails had not been leaked by her own staff.

The sudden nighttime removal of the Broadway protected bike lane without any public engagement would have been unprecedented in North American history. The closest example is when Rob Ford was elected mayor of Toronto and removed a bike lane. Canadian cyclists laid on the ground to stop the grinder from removing the paint, and it was international news. Well now we have that in Portland as well. To rebuild trust, we need a transportation system where decisions are made in accordance to the policies and plans. This council adopts. No one should question whether a decision was made because a wealthy landowner might take a council member out to lunch. I hope you will take seriously how we can avoid a scandal like this from ever happening again. Thank you very much. Thank you.

Speaker: Next up, we have Babs Minnelli.

Speaker: Hello, all. My name is Gabrielle Lee, 75 year old lifelong Portland resident. Just a reminder that we seniors vote I don't know about all of you, but my head is spinning, trying to assimilate all the information that's come in today. I am going to stick with my original plan testimony just with a couple of caveats. I just want to acknowledge that I sent emails to Michael Jordan and his team and to all of you on there. We were in council members last week. Thank you know, we were. And are now responding to my email. Um, that being said, I am passionate about what's back up. First of all in general, I support the organization annual chart as it stands today and I have just a couple of caveats. I am passionate about. Number one, a climate officer being added to the executive leadership team under the city administrative number two, a standalone natural resources deal. Now, several people that I respect have supported, uh, your agreement today, Commissioner Mapps and so applaud you for bringing that to the table. However, since I have nothing to lose, I'm going to stick with my original testimony, which is to say, let's get a natural resource deal now rather than later. Okay and if Michael Jordan pointed out this whole

process is stupid fast, he said that also yesterday. I implore all of you, please do not feel that you can do this. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Babs

Speaker: Next up, we have Diane Meisenhelder, Lynn Hanlon, and Isaac MacLennan on line.

Speaker: Welcome.

Speaker: Go ahead, Diane. Um I'm going to also be a little bit saying that I think these last minute amendments need more public scrutiny and it would be better to vote on them at a future meeting after hearing public testimony, the latest reports from the world's best climate scientists state that climate change is happening faster than anticipated.

Speaker: And we have until 2029. Now to reduce emissions by at least 50% or face unthinkable consequences is to reach Portland's climate goals. XPD supports a chief climate officer that would be part of the new administrator's office and the city's executive leadership team. The climate officer needs to have the authority to develop the necessary budgets, adequate external funding and oversee the implementation decisions in the realms of climate, natural resources, environment and sustainability across the various bureaus. We support the restoration of a bureau of natural resources. And so I'll say I support maps. Amendment one and do not. And oppose Ryan's amendment one, but will create and implement a plan for the protection of the city's natural resources as a buffer against climate change, reducing emission and for community health and well-being. This bureau should undertake policies around climate change mitigation, adaptation, restoration, ecological resilience strategies with respect to how climate change will affect our natural resources and vice versa. We support a version of the climate sustainability committee at the administrative executive level that will be more open to

community involvement and input with working groups involving representatives of local climate organized actions, actually taking on research, couch development and plans for actions to move things forward quickly through a coherent strategy in collaboration with the climate cabinet cabinet of city bureau representatives. All of this should be accomplished within a climate justice and equity framework with involvement and input of a diverse body of citizens who have worked on climate advocacy. The transition to this new government will be a distraction to the timeline we have so together, like the citizen led campaign for peace, we can succeed alongside a city leadership planning for just and effective responses to expected climate disruptions and trying to mediate and reduce emissions. So that we don't have the worst case to prevent the worst case scenarios. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Lynn hanlon. Hi, my name is lynn hanlon.

Speaker: Um, thanks for letting me be here and talk. I appreciate this is a huge task y'all had. Um, and like everybody else, the last minute of some of it is a little disconcerting, but understandable. Um so I first of all, I'm very much in support of maps. The maps amendment one to establish the natural resource department, whatever it is, onto the chart. Um we need this very badly. Uh in part. And the bureau needs this bureau or whatever we're going to call it needs to have real authority to do stuff and work with other bureaus in part to prevent things like the division street debacle debacle when pbot and the water bureau refuse to talk to each other. And now the people in my part of town out of east Portland have a worse heat island situation than ever. We got concrete instead of trees. So to prevent that, let's do this. Um and reject and I'd like you to reject the Ryan amendment is weak last minute inadequate. You know I think that the goals are good, but it's let's go with the maps amendment one. Um so to date, the city has

made a serious lack of progress on climate and in some areas we've gone backwards in terms of climate justice, things like allowing and encouraging the expansion of dangerous polluting fossil, not fuel storage in general, and transportation in the hub. We've lost tree canopy in areas like outer east Portland. This is just part of how the city is sliding backwards instead of going aggressively forwards. Um, I very much support having a city climate officer. I'm a little bit confused about the interaction earlier because I also thought that when commissioner. Rubio said, oh, we have one, we're just promoting them up to the to be under the new manager. Yeah. So I want the, the new climate officer to be in addition to the planning and sustainability officer. I don't want those combined and I maybe I'm confused about how all that happened. I would I would like some clarification on it, if at all possible. Um I think I've run out of time, so thank you. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank mclennan.

Speaker: Good afternoon, mayor Wheeler. Uh, hello again. And commissioners isaac mclennan, Portland firefighters association president, a firefighter for over 20 years and a resident of the roseway neighborhood. I addressed you here on this point. Only because I'm concerned about the overall cost of this transition, specifically on how we're going to find the funds in order to transition the city government into what the voters passed. And I completely understand that the task before you is monumental. And I know that you all can do it. This council is by far the right council to take us across this, uh, this bridge. But the voters did not pass the reduction in public safety. And I'm concerned that when the bill comes for this transition on, it's going to be we're going to look for how we can come find the money to do that. And in times in the past, we've gone through budget cuts. We just cannot continue to cut the budget. We know the number one priority to reduce the

overall costs, specifically in fire, is to hire more firefighters and not ultimately reduce the cost of overtime. So I'm concerned only and I want to make sure I just address you all so that you hear those concerns. Um, public safety should not be on the table to find money to support this transition. Voters did not pass this transition knowing that it would cost them a reduction in public safety. So with that, I'll yield the other 40s. Thanks for my time. Thank you.

Speaker: Uh, next up, we have Sherry Spark, Bob Weinstein and Terry Rigsby.

Speaker: Welcome. Thanks for being here.

Speaker: Thank you. Thanks, Mayor Wheeler and commissioners for giving us time to make comments today. My name is Sherry Spark and I work for 350 PDX, which is an environment and climate justice organization here in Portland. And we've been doing a lot of the organizing around the climate officer position, and so appreciate the intention to make sure that that outcry from the public is heard and so we want to make sure to work on making that something that is going to work really well for the city. I think the main thing that we want to emphasize is that in this moment where we have this historic opportunity to really organize the ways that we structure the city and the ways that we work together, we want to make sure that climate is really emphasized sized in there. This is going to be the number one thing that all of our bureaus and service areas are going to have to deal with in addition to the normal things that everybody's had to deal with in the past. But it's going to get more and more impactful as climate change, unfortunately unfolds. So working cohesively across the city to make sure all of our climate, environment and sustainability initiatives and great goals happen and happen well and happen in a coordinated and cohesive way is really important to us. So first of all, we want to make sure that that climate officer position is there in the city administrator's office. That there on that executive leadership team and that they have that

opportunity to make sure to work with all of the bureaus and service areas to coordinate well and to bring in climate to areas that maybe people haven't been paying attention to. Climate and then second of all, we want to make sure that that is not removing the sustainability officer work. That is also really important. So that's a whole job in itself. The new position would be a lot of work as well. So we want to make sure both of those positions still remain so that that can all happen. Well, we also support the work to make a natural resources plan, and I think that fits in well with that idea of continuing to plan well how all of these functions work together. Well, thank you. Thank you.

Speaker: Bob weinstein.

Speaker: Uh, mayor and council members. My name is bob weinstein. For the record, last year, voters approved a new charter for not a blank check to expand bureaucracy projected annual costs are 13 million above current costs. 1,344% and 120% above the commission's low and high estimates of 0.9 million and 5.9 million provided to you in the public estimates for transition costs are nearing 20 million and counting. 66% and 13% above the commission's low and high estimates of 12 to 17.7 million provided to you. But unfortunately not provided to the public during the election as part of its \$190,000 effort to purportedly educate voters about the new charter, the city provided information online and in a flier to all voters right here that had the estimated operating costs but completely omitted the 12 to 17 million in transition costs. The city rebuffed my effort to have this information provided to the voters. San diego, san bento and Seattle council members have nine, six and four staff members respectively. While I know staffing levels will be up to the new council, the current proposal grossly under estimates, the cost of an understaffed. What's the future council having any council member report to the city administers later is not appropriate. It's anti-democratic. There should be a

separation of powers as other cities. The state of Oregon and federal governments all have legislative staffs report to the legislative body, not to the executive branch. It's based part of our democratic fabric in this country. On June 29th, 2022, commissioner Ryan raised the issue of conflict of interest with respect to commission members running in the first election. Under a system they designed, comparing it to hiring committee members who design a process and job description and then apply mailers. Mayor Wheeler later stated that if any members ran, it would be a campaign issue. Both of you are correct that any new position appointments should be interim until the new city administrator can make permanent hires. Please engage citizens on whether millions of new bureaucracy is the best use of limited financial resources versus versus investing in priorities like first responders. Pbot and other pressing needs. Thank you. I took walt Wheeler's extra time. He said. I could have it.

Speaker: Thank you, mayor.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Appreciate it.

Speaker: Hi. Good afternoon. My name is terry grigsby. Thank you for allowing us to provide input today. I am a natural resource professional and I strongly support commissioner Mapps amendment to restore the city of Portland's natural resource bureau and in particular to ensure that that's adequately funded and that that natural resource office or bureau has the authority to impact priorities and programs, aims amongst other our infrastructure bureaus. However, I'm actually here today as someone with a disability and I in looking at the proposed city restructure, I see that it completely lacks representation, mission and programmatic support for people with disabilities as well as for our aging community. Most major cities have aging and disability offices that are both visibly,

easily visible and regularly engaged with the community and the proposed Portland city restructure verifies that Portland views those of us with disabilities as well as our seniors as less important than our able bodied and young citizens. The restructuring process is an opportunity for me to shift how Portland engages with and supports the disabled and aging community and I'd much like the proposed new bureau of natural resources. I ask that the restructure create a centralized office that can support programs for our disabled and aging communities. The current program, located within the office of equity and human rights, is so under-resourced that it does little more than ensure basic compliance and that knowingly leaves the city open for legal repercussions, as when bureaus are not in compliance. But it keeps the city from truly addressing the unique needs of our growing aging population and those of us with a myriad of disabilities across all ages, racial and gender identification and socioeconomic status. So this is a large area of opportunity for Portland to become a leader, and I urge you to take this issue seriously and add it into the restructure. Thank you very much.

Speaker: Appreciate it. Thanks all three.

Speaker: Our next three testifiers are Kelly Yea, Gonzalez, Deb Iona and Janice Thompson. I don't see Kelly. Let's how about Debbie? Are you able to unmute. Hi, Debbie. Yes, thank you.

Speaker: I'm Debbie Iona, a former member of the Police Accountability City Commission.

Speaker: And I'm speaking in that capacity today. First, I want to echo the concern you have heard about placing the new police accountability system under the same deputy city administrator as the police bureau. I've been involved with accountability issues for over 20 years and understand that there are community members who will not trust the system where the police and the oversight system

are in the same section of the organizational chart. At the chart, you are considering today has an asterisk for prosper. Portland noting that they report to the prosper Portland board. This structure is similar to the way the new office of community based police accountability will function by reporting to the community board for police accountability for the police investigations of misconduct and discipline are supposed to be handled by the new oversight board with no interference from other parts of the city. Other types of hiring, firing and personnel matters will be up to the chief and the deputy administrator. It is not spelled out that the mayor would have any authority in those decisions. Mister Jordan's memo seems to acknowledge this interpretation of how the system will work, even though it doesn't reflect the concern about the real or perceived conflict of interest that he wrote. There is a proverbial dotted line from the police bureau to the police chief, as the charter states that the police chief is appointed by the mayor and confirmed by council. The dca of community safety will lead on day to day strategy and priorities of the community safety service area, while ultimately the mayor will be held responsible for the success of the police chief in their role, end quote. So thank you for considering my comments. I do hope you'll think carefully about the importance of separate meeting the accountability system from the police bureau so that we, you know, reassure our community members that the accountability system is truly independent. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, debbie.

Speaker: Janice thompson. Janice thompson, represent only myself.

Speaker: I see this resolution as a vital step in responding to last fall's vote for major changes in city governance. To be clear, this plan is just a first step in my unwinding the commission form of government that for over 100 years has contributed to inefficient and costly siloing of bureaus and political rather than

professional management of city operations that organizational changes are needed was demonstrated last August when the council agreed to streamline the development permitting process. As commissioner Rubio said at the time, this effort kept faith with the voters who told us the council loudly and clearly last November that a more responsive and coordinated city government is essential. I highlight commissioner Rubio's leadership due to its timeliness compared to several amendments before you today. I also support both of the Rubio amendments before you, but before I continue on the amendments, I want to stress that your vote today does need to be followed by budget decisions that adequately support this plan in its been carried authorized as like too much bureaucracy. And I think what people need to realize is, in my view, is that it's bringing Portland into the era of modern municipal management with not just an emphasis on vertical, but an important emphasis on horizontal management. So clearly, I think the current council should not be surprised that early cost estimates frequently increase, given the low confidence level label typically applied, for example, to major construction projects. I would say that the cbo's initial cost estimates would have been appropriately labeled as being very, very low cost evidence level. Any notion that those initial estimate estimates should be viewed as a cap is quite inappropriate. And I oppose the new Ryan amendment regarding mayor's amendment number two, I concur with the concerns by dan handelman and iona. I see pros and cons to both maps and Ryan's amendment number one. However, I oppose both of them due to their 11th hour presentation option rather, I would argue that these commissioners should compile their unfortunately siloed work to date and provide that information for the new elected officials and new city administrator. I don't support renaming the service areas. I see no advantage to

public safety over community safety, vibrant community. This is not consistent with what I almost a minute over with. I you're almost a minute. Yeah. I'll just wrap it up.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Thank you. Is not consistent with what I think is a more appropriate use. Plain english approach. Thank you for your time.

Speaker: Thank you. Appreciate your thoughtfulness.

Speaker: Um, let me circle back. Kelly yea. Gonzalez, our last testifier is keith edwards. Keith edwards. Okay, that completes testimony.

Speaker: All right.

Speaker: Very good. So I actually want to acknowledge something that was just said that's really important. None of this gets keith. Keith is that you? Yeah. Oh, come on up.

Speaker: The mayor.

Speaker: You gotta yell. You gotta yell. You got to have energy. Welcome, sir. Thank you. You get. You get the last word.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you. Thank you, mayor.

Speaker: And thank you.

Speaker: City Council. I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you today. I hope that all the remarks that are given to you today are the testimony is not fall on deaf ears. I hope we're not at the point we're not at the point of no return yet. So I hope that you will consider what we have to share with you today. I am speaking generally to the amendment for from Ryan and I want to talk about trying to put 12 pounds of rocks in a 4 pound bag. It's rather difficult at best. I think you may have missed the mark when the citizens of the city voted to amend increase the size of the City Council to 12 council members, including not including the mayor, because that message to me, what I heard and what I also when I voted in favor of that was

that the City Council would be closer and more accessible, able to each and every citizen. So it seems to me that you should be trying to consider putting a building, renovate a building and put it in every in the central area, in every district. So now the citizens can go there on bicycle. Some of them can walk, and it's certainly more accessible. So you don't have to do all four of them at once. You can do one at a time. Maybe you can take six years to do all four of them. They can be done sequentially and temporary housing can be put in the districts that aren't being renovated and completed before January. One of 2025. But I think this is a way to look at all of our citizens being able to access and. The environmental impact that you have of everyone trying to come down here to park, drive their car, whatever it is, to come to the City Council meetings. So I hope you take this into consideration. Yea. Ryan. Remember, this is not the end of the day. This is the beginning. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, sir. And i'll pick up right where you left off. Did you have. Well, I just wanted to let mr. Edwards know.

Speaker: Actually, I was the one that brought up that we needed to focus on having district offices ready when everyone came in. So it's already in motion?

Speaker: Yeah, it makes sense. And to meet your budgetary issues as well. Exactly. Thanks

Speaker: So I want to be really clear that that our employers gave us a very clear directive which is to have the new form of government as outlined in the new charter up and operational on January 1st, 2025. And as the gentleman leading that effort indicated, we are moving at a stupid fast pace. I concur. It's really important for people to understand we're not going to get it right. This will be an evolutionary process. We want to have what we think is our best faith effort, understand that we are completely reworking Portland city government up and operational on January

1st of 2025, but we also freely acknowledge that changes will be made to this work at a later date. It's not going to work perfectly early as it rolls out, and I expect the next council will have to do some follow up work, some true up work staff will have to continue to figure out where the most appropriate alignments are if we didn't get it exactly right. And so I just want to level set here and acknowledge that right up front this is this is a very short timeline for the level of institutional change that is required offered by our employers. And so we're doing our level best. So this isn't the end of the discussion. If something doesn't happen that you wanted to happen or if something happens that you didn't want to happen, there will be opportunities at future dates to be able to reframe change or evolve this structure. So I want to be really, really clear about that. So thank you for everybody who testified it was interesting testimony. Um, a lot of good discussions were precipitated. At this point. We'll open up for discussion and votes on amendments, if that's okay with everybody. Oh, you know what? I promised a break. We'll take a ten minute break. We should do that. It's 430. We'll reconvene at 440. We're in recess. Things will now go through the amendments. I'm going to do my best to try and go through the amendments in in the order in which they were offered up again, Wheeler one is first up, this is a technical amendment in honor of our elementary school teachers who always taught us that it matters where the comma goes or where the bullet point goes. Us legal counsel is informed me that we had inherent bullet points, so the motion to amend page two of exhibit a to remove the bullet point in front of impact reduction program and clarifying the impact reduction program is an independent entity, separate and distinct from the street services coordination center reporting to the Portland solutions matter. Any further discussion on this amendment, seeing none, please call the roll. Mapps

Speaker: Hi yea. Rubio. Hi Ryan.

Speaker: Hi. Gonzales Wheeler. Hi

Speaker: The amendment is adopted. Wheeler to this is the motion to amend exhibit a to establish the community board for police accountability in the office of community banks. Police accountability. The oversight system is a stand alone entity in the community safety service area, reporting directly to the deputy city administrator for community safety. If anybody has further questions, we do have Robert Taylor here who can discuss this. This is somewhat related to the settlement agreement questions as well. Yes

Speaker: Will you check that your mic is on? Oh, sorry.

Speaker: Do I have to repeat all that? No you don't want me to. Does anybody have any further questions on this particular amendment, Wheeler, to please call the roll maps.

Speaker: Hi, Arabia. Hi, Ryan. Hi Gonzales. Wheeler

Speaker: Hi. The amendment passes as Rubio number one, which is moving the chief sustainability officer to the city administrator. Commissioner Rubio, anything else you want to add any further discussion on this? I just want to say for the record, the way I read this and I believe the way that Commissioner Rubio intended it is this is actually elevating this chief sustainable city officer position. It could be that capacity and the position that should be reclassified, called whatever we need it to call it with expanded duties.

Speaker: Got it. Okay

Speaker: Thank you. Any further discussion on this item, please call the roll on Rubio. Number one Mapps.

Speaker: Hi.

Speaker: Rubio hi, Ryan hi. Gonzalez hi, Wheeler hi.

Speaker: The amendment is adopted. Rubio, too, which is related to permitting and development. Any further discussion on further clarification, please call the roll.

Speaker: Hi. Oh, sorry.

Speaker: Take two knocks.

Speaker: Hi, Rubio hi, Ryan.

Speaker: Hi. Gonzales hi, Wheeler. Hi

Speaker: The amendment passes Mapps one natural resources is.

Speaker: Mr. Mayor, can I make some comments here, please? Um, number one, I want to express my appreciation for all the testimony we heard today. I think we over the past several days, we've all probably received more than 100 letters or an emails from folks who had opinions on this. Frankly, I believe most of those emails have been in support of the proposal that I brought forward. Um, colleagues, I believe this is a common sense, um, common sense, good government proposal, which basically suggests that this council continue the work that we ordered our staffs to do to, uh, bring together our best thinking about how to do a better job of managing our natural resources. Now it's probably quite apparent to everyone in the room that we have two amendments that kind of abut each other and are in roughly the same space. You got maps one and then we got Ryan one or whatever. Commissioner Ryan's amendment is. As I see it, I don't think there's anything which is inconsistent with my proposal and what commissioner Ryan proposes to do. Commissioner Ryan wants to stand up, um, or commissioner Ryan wants to move resources, staff and um, and services into a new trees and natural areas unit. I have a lot of questions about the micro mechanics, the economics of that, which I will explore when we get to commissioner Ryan's amendment. Nothing. I'm proposing today precludes doing that. I will make it clear. I also think that it is too early today to vote yes on commissioner Ryan's proposal. But I think that we can continue to

have this discussion today. We've heard from a wide range of citizens and experts who really have encouraged us to move in this space, and I sure hope that we will. And if any of my colleagues have any questions, I'd be happy to respond to them.

Speaker: So I have a comment and it's based in part on the testimony we heard and maybe it's based on my own assumption that the reason we're having this conversation now and this pertains to your amendment, it pertains as well to commissioner Ryan's amendment is because of the organization chart discussion that we are having. And here's the concern I have as I read these. I got the impression and I think people who testified got the impression that these are mutually exclusive. And I believe there is even staff here who believes that these are mutually exclusive.

Speaker: I would say commissioner Ryan's commissioner Ryan's proposal precludes would make some choices. That means that if you proceed, my proposal, we wouldn't be able to have on the table any more expound on this just a bit.

Speaker: So with regard to your proposal. Well, first of all, my understanding is that we are now in possession like literally in the last 48 hours of the draft draft report that you and your office and a number of bureaus have spent a considerable amount of time and energy putting together. Council has not yet even heard the final report. And furthermore, are we already have incapsula stated in a previous resolution that we would bring this back to council by a certain date that was on under exhibit two of the resolution we passed. Page 20 and 21. So that process is already underway. But what I and I think we should let that process run its course. I'd actually like to see and read the final report before I make a decision. And on top of that, in this amendment, as I read it, it is assigning the chief administrative officer, the responsibility for landing this project in this calendar year. And I'm worried about that. Just in terms of capacity, because as he said so eloquently

earlier, maybe it was even earlier today, a lot of things have been thrown over the fence. And I'm worried that something this important may not get the attention it deserves given the other duties currently assigned to that office. Commissioner Ryan, we heard substantial will and we'll get to yours in a minute. Substantial testimony on yours. There were a lot of people who liked it. There were people as well who raised questions or concerns. And so I guess my question and this may be for Michael rather than either of you two, is if we. What's precipitating what I think is a premature concern around the natural resources question is the org chart. If we were and I'm just saying this for my own edification for a moment, if we tabled the discussion of the natural resources until we get the final report, do we have more information from both offices about what their proposed thing about whether these are in fact in alignment or in conflict? If we tabled that concern motion and therefore it was not included in the org chart today, could it be included in the org chart later? And if so, how are.

Speaker: Mr. Mayor, commissioners, I think what you're articulating is the very reason that we didn't put it on the org chart and the final version. And that's because we were expecting more information from the five bureaus that have been working on this conversation. It's an important conversation and really respect the work and want to take it into account. To the last part of your question, I think this council can make that change any time they wish. It gets complicated if you're trying to budget into the change, the financials on this, if in fact it is an all encompassing kind of natural resources division or bureau, the financials will be a little bit complicated because the money currently comes from multiple sources to fund the programs that we're talking about. So can you do it? Yes, we'll it be complicated if it's in out of sync with budget? Yes. But it doesn't mean you can't do it.

Speaker: And the reason I'm concerned about this and I'll just confess to my own lack of knowledge, I've got nothing to lose here as far as I'm concerned. These exhibits are both meaty and they deal with a very important subject that has been carefully studied by both of these commissioners and their offices and multiple bureaus for a long period of time. Um, but it's being brought to council right now. In the last 48 hours because we're having this discussion around transition and I feel like we're being shortchanged as a council in terms of the amount of information we have and the knowledge that we have, the opportunity to develop and I feel like the public is being shortchanged as well. We had some really smart people that I trust who are supporting commissioner Ryan's. We had smart people who I trust supporting commissioner Mapps, but I have not even begun to read the 300 page draft report on commissioner Mapps proposal around natural resources. And for my perspective, if it's not critical, path to the question today, which is the transition plan, I don't see why we need to shoehorn it into this conversation and give it a half hearted effort. I think we need to understand that the natural resources question thoroughly but separately, if it can be re-injected into the process at a later time.

Speaker: Well, I think from the testimony today, Mr. Mayor, you've heard that it's an important topic to the community.

Speaker: So I personally just me one vote out of five, I would table both of these amendments, but that's just me. But I'll leave it to my colleagues.

Speaker: Allow me to speak for a moment and I appreciate everything you said. Actually yeah. We'll stay there. Um, the reason we didn't have an amendment nice try, Michael. The reason we didn't have an amendment until, as you say, the last 48 hours is because we knew about this process. And Parks was heavily engaged in it. I'd actually like to hear from Director Long and Todd about what they could add to

this conversation, which I think would be really helpful. I do have a question for you, commissioner Mapps yes, um, you're right. There was a there was a campaign of letters that came in and there was a lot of testimony today in support all most 95% of them spoke of the new bureau that you're building. You then said that's not true. It's time for you to be on the record, because all of the supporters that came today and in the letters, all spoke to a new bureau.

Speaker: Sure. Commissioner Ryan, thank you for that question. To be clear, what I'm proposing in my amendment is that we continue the planning process that we've had, that we've had amongst our five bureaus. I know if you're a lay person, it's easy to kind of reduce that to setting up a bureau. So also an artifact of the way this conversation has been structured and that we have to put something on the org chart in order to have a continuing discussion around that. I don't think we've been particularly well served by this. One question you have to answer is where does this discussion actually kind of fit likely happened? But just as commissioner Ryan, your your amendment calls for the creation of a did you answer the question management unit? I don't know if you actually mean to stand up a whole new unit there, a whole new bureau in that space. You know I see you're shaking your head no. So I suspect that these are artifacts of language and artifacts of the way conversations get framed in a public discourse that have confused you a little bit.

Speaker: Know what's confusing to probably anyone that's been paying attention. Is that the letters again, that came in the testimony today in support of your amendment was all about a new bureau. So I just want to hear you on the public record say that is not even though your supporters came, many of them to say that you're telling the supporters that came today, that's absolutely not the case.

Speaker: Commissioner Ryan, I appreciate your curiosity about natural areas and how to manage them. What we've been trying to do in this building over the last

year or so is have to enter bureau conversation about how we can do a better job of managing our natural areas that could be manifested through the creation of a new bureau. It could be manifest through reassignment of responsibility cities. It could be manifested through new igas, it could be manifested through the city, getting out of certain lines of business. It could be manifested through the city, getting into new lines of business. Commissioner Ryan, what I am proposing is that we continue this important conversation and I think if you look at the language that I put forward, especially in the where no in the now, therefore or be it further resolved, that's exactly what I call for. And if you'd like I could read it for you but I think I've already read it for you one time.

Speaker: I'm fine. I just wanted you to be on record because I thought it was confusing for people who came.

Speaker: I just want to be clear. Are you clear? Do you understand what I said? Right then actually, maybe would be helpful so we don't have to make everyone go through this over and over again? What is it you're what's your understanding of what I just said? Just so the record can be clear? Because I know you care about this moment. Okay okay.

Speaker: What I understand is that based on the campaign and everyone who's sent in letters, which you mention earlier, that they were in support of your amendment and the people who came to speak today, many of them seemed to be expecting a new bureau. So me sitting up here wanting to have better understanding of that. I brought up director long because they have been participating in this work because it was asked of them to do that, which dates predates all of us. It goes back to commissioner fish when he had both beaches and parks. So just trying to level set. Sure. So commissioner transparent.

Speaker: Commissioner Ryan, just for clarity sake, what question is it that you're trying to pose to the parks bureau at this moment?

Speaker: Well, right now they haven't had a chance to. We will pivot to that. I was just asking you to be on record to say your amendment is not about building a new bureau.

Speaker: My amendment is about continuing the conversation about how we can work together as a city to do a better job of managing our natural resources. There are many different dimensions to both how we can do that and just as there are many different dimensions to what constitutes natural resources, great. Well welcome.

Speaker: Isn't this fun? So I think it would be great for you all to just give some context to the good work that you've been doing with all of your other bureau colleagues. Certainly on natural areas.

Speaker: I appreciate that. Mayor Wheeler. You referred to a 300 page report that you've that you just received that came from commissioner.

Speaker: I just I just wanted to clarify that that 300 page report was product from the work that myself director tsuchiyama and the other bureau directors from pbots and water had undergone since February or March of this year. Thank you. So it's not a report that necessarily supports a natural resource service organization unit, but what I'd like to clarify is that it offers five opportunities for us to consider. There are five. The first one is to continue to do our work as is, but more equitably and better together. The second one was to consolidate urban tree canopy services. The third was to consolidate natural area management. The fourth was to consolidate watershed and green infrastructure for management, and the fifth was to create a natural resource organizational unit. What the what Ryan's amendment one would the proposal would accomplish is three of those five opportunities that

have that were presented in that recommendation. You are right. You have we owe you a work plan and but we do have five very coherent and very doable opportunities at at our feet and director, to be perfectly clear, I'm not casting any aspersion on.

Speaker: No. And I'm sure it's great and I look forward to reading it and I would hope we have a work session on it as well. When the final report I just wanted to clarify that because I it's I think it's important for the council to know, even as we continue this conversation. Thank you. And I do appreciate that. Thank you.

Speaker: Director long, just so I understand the proposal that commissioner Ryan has brought forward, how should we think about that proposal in the context of this report? Has is it your position that that that conversation has been complete and now in that report, there's a recommendation which commissioner Ryan has chosen to move forward with or is there more planning and discussion that you would anticipate that needs to happen amongst our five bureaus?

Speaker: I, I would say that, as I mentioned before, I would say that at least three of the opportunities that were identified would be addressed through the proposal.

Speaker: So I have been having this conversation with in particular with bws, who is quite frankly, the other bigger player, right? Since 2019. Sure we did a lot of work together. We have. I interagency agreements, we have mous, we have shared best practices and we've created some great organizational relationships. One of the things that we did do is we identified in particular tree canopy urban forest, tree canopy as an area that could be consolidated under parks and recreation. That recommendation was never, never came to light. It was never implemented. You'll also know, I'm sure you know, we recently we processed an interagency agreement around around approximately 11 properties that are jointly managed between bears and parks. And we're able to sort of identify who should be doing what work.

What I would like to add about the Ryan amendment one is that we're talking about not streamlining and aligning to our strengths. Parks and recreation is managing over 8000 acres of natural areas. We are managing 1.2 million park trees. The idea is that if we were to move forward with those those three options in the middle, as it were, it would be addressing those two particular areas. The third, of course, is the area that I think gets held harmless and that's bzw's authority around wastewater and stormwater and that work. Okay.

Speaker: Thank you so another question. I'm glad that we have you here, sir. Um, and the be it further resolved section of commissioner Ryan's amendment, he proposes aligning natural areas and tree management positions, funding and services. Can you tell me how many positions is you're proposing to realign and which bureaus they would come from that would be very difficult to say exactly.

Speaker: I do know that approximately ten staff in bs are doing natural area work. I don't know the specifics of their classifications. What percentage of their time is spent on what type of work, but I also want to remind folks that we are talking about opera national alignment. So there is a lot of work that bts does now and will continue to do around and the protection and preservation policy around the natural areas. And could i, could I that is okay.

Speaker: I'm todd lofgren, deputy director, Portland parks and recreation in the amendment. Also is just to bring that idea for council's consideration during the budget process as well. And so there's not actually go to the next budget process.

Speaker: We're supposed to move some bodies, us some dollars and some programs into this new unit. That's correct. And so you said there might be ten bodies and beds. I was looking at this chart that pulled. Do you know of any other bureaus might be involved in this space? So, for example, I was looking at this graph that came out of the study group and I was actually kind of surprised to see

how many pbot dollars go into the urban canopy space. Can you give me a sense of what this what Ryan's amendment would mean for pbot, especially in terms of staffing and funding?

Speaker: So I can just jump in.

Speaker: So we have interagency agreements already with some of these bureaus to do some of this work for pbot at the inner agency agreement for this past year was about \$1.2 million, a little over a million of that went to urban forestry operations. A lot of that was emergency response for fallen trees in the right of way, as well as horticulture services where pbot wanted to purchase trees. So beyond that, there might not be too much. There are some natural areas, to be frank, that aren't actively managed by pbot, right, because they're focused on the right of way transport station infrastructure as their core mission. But for a variety of reasons, this form of government, we have natural areas that are spread around in different bureaus, so they have unserved unmet service needs. So that would be a conversation of like, how would we have better trash pickup? Do we want to mobilize volunteers to help pbot natural areas? Do we want to address nuisance behavior or other things that are happening in those natural areas that currently maybe pbot doesn't have the resources today? So those would be the conversations that would be opened up by having kind of a one city approach to natural area management and tree management.

Speaker: So you're not saying here when you say align positions, funding and services into this new parks unit, you're not necessarily saying that we're talking about moving dollars or staff from from pbot? Well, it seems like we were with bs, but now we're not with pbot, so pbot right now we understand.

Speaker: And this is why we need some time to work with the bureaus, right? To have this proposal come back to you during the budget process. And then also do

community engagement right on this. And so through this budget advisory committee reviews that all the bureaus would have for these proposals and then it would come back for you. So it would give more time for public engagement around this idea. But there's at least an estimate of about \$1.2 million, not fte, for these kinds of services from pbob today.

Speaker: So about \$1.2 million out of pbob that goes to parks. Okay.

Speaker: There. Currently expending those resources already. So this is really about a functional alignment. And so I heard a lot today about community members saying that they want to have a one stop shop for services that they understand. Sure. And so this would provide community members, volunteers and others to say, hey, do I have a concern about a natural area in Portland? Is the beach not cleared up? You know, along a river? Is there some other activity that's happening that would be this operational unit where we'd mobilize day to day, month to month resources? Meanwhile, the bureaus would still retain their regulatory and until we have a new form of government, active city administrator. Sure. Their own budget decision making authority to set these service levels. Sure.

Speaker: Great. One more question, colleagues, and then i'll let us try to get home. I know people have kids at home. Um, one of the reasons why it's kind of hard for me to evaluate commissioner Ryan's proposal is, of course, over the space. The color of money matters in that we were we because of the anderson lawsuit there are the funds that we the funds that we come in that we bring in from ratepayers are limited in how we can be spent, even though we spend some of these on sort of natural areas. Can you give me a sense of how the Ryan amendment intersects with the anderson lawsuit? Do you understand that? Sure. Okay

Speaker: So it's really important that ratepayer dollars go to the mission of water and the bureau's those missions are and so we have legal review when we have

these expenditures, just like we have these inter agency agreements today between the water bureau and bts. And so we'd go through that same type of process of any decision making that was made around using ratepayer dollars that we'd have legal review. And of course those would be approved by City Council as well. Okay.

Speaker: Well, unfortunately, I'm kind of voting on this today. I think I have the city attorney in the room. Can I ask the city attorney a quick question? I promise I'll keep it quick and then maybe I have don, my director, in the room, too. Is she on line or is she in person? In person? Oh, there. Hey, don, come on up. Hi. I know robert has kids at home, so I'm going to try to ask him a quick question, then let him get back to his young person. You're not the only. One um, robert, you probably should introduce yourself.

Speaker: Thank you, commissioner. Robert taylor, city attorney.

Speaker: Thank you. I just a quick question. We got Ryan. One, I've been trying to figure out how Ryan one inch our acts with the anderson lawsuit, which I have to live under. Do you understand that based on what you've read today, can you or what you've seen in these amendments? Do you understand the implications of this?

Speaker: I thank you, commissioner.

Speaker: Looking at both the maps one and the Ryan one amendment, the anderson lawsuit and the settlement would apply to both of those the same way. And your point about the color of money is right. And so what anderson essentially said is that water and sewer funds can only be spent for things that are reasonably related to the provision of water and sewer and that's true regardless of how we organize the city under maps, one or Ryan one.

Speaker: Okay. So can we. Although I do spend some dollars, especially in the space for green approaches to especially stormwater management, what would

that mean to align those dollars into into the parks? We know and this is kind of an authentic question. I know I do lots of subcontracting with lots of different groups. But yeah, and, and you know, the facts matter and the specific expenditures matter.

Speaker: Yeah. And so once those come to council or once there's a plan to do that through an iga, our office would get involved to review it and the critical inquiry is whether it's related to water and sewer services. You can't use those funds to do other things outside of that. That's the big lesson from that lawsuit.

Speaker: I got it.

Speaker: Thank you so much. And we also colleagues have the director of the bureau of environmental services down here. Well, don, please introduce yourself. And I might have a question or two for you.

Speaker: Good afternoon. City Council dawn uchiyama, director of the bureau of environmental services.

Speaker: What would you encourage this council to think about as we consider the maps amendment and the commissioner Ryan amendment council?

Speaker: I think that you should absolutely approve a maps amendment one, and I completely disagree with commissioner Ryan's amendment.

Speaker: I am kind of shocked that we're at this point after spending the last nine months looking at a work plan developing relations with community thinking about all of the overall work that we need to do together to be crammed in this point, trying to make this decision in the last minute.

Speaker: We have an more analysis that needs to be done. We have more engagement that needs to be done. That's what we've promised our our constituents and I think we need to make good on that promise of doing that work plan. We also needs to consider how we are using ratepayer dollars. The legal implication oceans are regulatory requirements. That analysis has not been done

and we should not be making this decision in such haste. We have a work plan and it's built on the work plan we did for the development services work and permitting, and we have a promise to work with our stakeholders and have a process that they can follow and contribute and weigh in on. This is a topic that Portland cares deeply about, and it's part of our identity. It's part of our recovery. And it's not something that we should be doing in such haste. So I support commissioner Mapps your amendment and speak very strongly for support of us continuing on the path of the work plan and answering to the chief administrative officer and working with our community to help have them help guide us.

Speaker: Thank you, director. And in fairness, I'd like to give the director of the parks bureau an opportunity to respond to some of the feedback that we just had. Director do you have anything you'd like to add?

Speaker: Thank you. Commissioner Mapps yeah, John is right.

Speaker: We've been working hand in glove since February and like I mentioned together as bureaus since at least 2019. Having these conversations nations, I think there's more conversation to be had. I do believe that Ryan one's amendment is solid and I believe that, as I mentioned, it is one of the opportunities that has been identified. I do believe that many of the nuances can be worked out and be considered and it doesn't preclude continuing to have conversations with stakeholders, both internal and external. Well, can I add one thing, commissioner Mapps?

Speaker: Please? Do I just want to add that I feel like peeling off the park bureau into six service area and then putting this proposal of natural resources is antithetical to the way that we've been working. We're trying to bring our work closer together. We're not trying to peel off and do things on our own. My understanding is, is this this transition was supposed to bring us together and help

us organize services in a way that that looked at new ways of working, not peeling off and doing things in dependently and so I think the Ryan proposal is in opposition of the spirit of the transition.

Speaker: Well, thank you. Thank you, director. I know it took some courage to say all of that, and I know I've taken up a lot of space and oxygen right now, so I'd like to give my friend and colleague, dan Ryan an opportunity to say a few words.

Speaker: I appreciate that you both came up. Thank you. Um I definitely would like to say that we are working as one city, and when we found out that this amendment was coming up, I just looked to my bureau at parks to say I thought we'd been working together as a team. Can you please make your case? And then that's why they brought the amendment. So I think we both are saying the same thing. I think so, yeah. I just didn't want to give one side the moral high ground on that. So I really appreciate this. What's most important right now is that we're getting everything out on the table. Yep because there was just so much confusion about what you were hearing in the campaign and that was coming to us and that with the maps amendment.

Speaker: So I want to thank our directors. You're both awesome. I want to thank my fellow commissioners. Um, I'm wondering if based on the conversation, anybody's given any further thought to my proposal that we table both of these amendments, have a work session when the report is finalized, have a more thorough discussion, let you complete your outreach any further thoughts?

Speaker: I'd be interested to hear what commissioner Ryan has to say.

Speaker: I was ready to vote so. Okay let's call the vote.

Speaker: Then I will signal that I'm going to vote no on both, not because I don't respect or trust the work you've done. I just think we're shoehorning it into this

process. And I'd like to know more about it before I vote on it. Please call the roll on maps. One maps. Hi yea. Rubio.

Speaker: This is a lot. I also want to just say that I think I'm in a little different position than some a lot of my colleagues on council because of my previous knowledge of this issue as as parks commissioner and something that I've been engaged in and have been getting updates about and so knowing how natural lands are, you know, specifically and currently divided and the vast majority are currently being managed by the parks bureau, it's comfortable to me. So I'm not as you know, feeling like I don't have all the information in, but I am not supporting this amendment. And really I do. And I commissioner Mapps I want to say really support the intent and the spirit of this amendment. It's just the first sentence that locates it that's a little more prescriptive, prescriptive about its location, which conflicts with the other amendment. But that said, you know, I really support the entirety of the remainder of what you outlined about the work and that it speaks to all areas of natural resources and not just land management. So I agree that those discussions should continue. Um I also believe that expertise that exists inside of the bureau at related to regulatory compliance needs to stay at bhs because of their core responsibility over water. Stormwater and wastewater. So this means that parks and bhs need to have a clear and shared understanding of how how to compensate for that expertise and also how violation lines specifically will be handled and paid. I do wish I had more time to find a path through for both these situations to really dig in. Since my team really only had a time to engage last night and today and we had council all day and I wish we had more time to kind of dig into the five years that I know we've been, you know, and honoring that work and dialog that's been happening for five plus years. So and in this case, I've had more time and engagement with parks work that's just how it happened to be because of

my previous role. So in conclusion, regardless of what happens with each of these amendments, I would really appreciate hearing from both service areas going forward on how this is all going to work out to the benefit of the environment, of course, and also our community. So I'm voting no. So because of that one initial point. But I really hope that this this dialog continues. Ryan no.

Speaker: Gonzalez I think I'm going to echo a lot of commissioner Rubio's points here.

Speaker: In the interest of brevity. I'll just keep it moving along. I i, I'm going to vote no on this at this point in time. But my understanding of these issues in a really random way, even in Portland, fire deals with these in a non-intuitive way. And I've learned a lot in my bureau assignments about these complex issues is with respect to natural areas, I've appreciated the dialog with both bureaus that are impacted here and both offices. I hope that dialog continues. And regardless of the votes today, I've kind of signaling which way I'm going today. But it's conditional. It's subject to deepening under standing of these complex sort of operating final decisions we're making. Not even getting into the policy. I think I've gotten more clarity on the ratemaking pieces and I'm getting comfortable there, although there's more information. Ian, please continue to send my way on that. Um it's just a long way of saying I'm voting no on this, but I've deeply appreciated the dialog and hope it continues.

Speaker: Wheeler yeah, I appreciate the dialog too uncomfortable though it was. I got a lot out of it and I appreciate it, particularly our directors and our commissioners for bringing their different perspectives. I hope we wait until the final report comes out. I look forward to reading it. I look forward to discussing it with my staff and I look forward to us holding a work session so that we can go through and continue this conversation that we had today. I vote no. The

amendment fails us. Please call the roll on Ryan one pertaining to natural resources maps. No yea. Rubio.

Speaker: I won't. I won't repeat what I've just said in the context of the prior amendment. But in short, I do support the operational lands management and tree management shifting to the parks bureau. Again, because I have more familiarity in this approach and model and have for two plus years. But I also want to reiterate that I believe bsww's regulatory expertise stay intact where it is, and it's just that's a very strong line for me. Also, I want to acknowledge that per face value, what director long and indicated that this is still an ongoing conversation. The budget is really where it's going to. We're going to have to have a plan that actually operationalizes tbd. So again, I hope and expect the larger natural resources discussion continue. As and it reaches a resolution in a timely way. I vote i. Ryan hi. Gonzales hi.

Speaker: Wheeler no, the amendment passes. Ryan gonzales one any further discussion? Renaming of service areas, please call the roll maps.

Speaker: Hi. Hi

Speaker: Rubio so no issues of personal safety are top of mind right now. But but for me, I don't think there's a need to rename the service area. I like the idea of community being centered in the name. I would, you know, like to if I made a friendly amendment. I don't think that it would necessarily pass today. And I know we're all tired, so i'll simply vote no and allow us to move on.

Speaker: Ryan hi.

Speaker: Gonzales hi, Wheeler.

Speaker: I vote I the amendment is adopted. Ryan to moving arts to a new service area. Is there any further discussion on this particular amendment? Commissioner Mapps, just very quickly, I know it's late and I don't want to get too deep into this.

Speaker: I'm going to vote no on this one. I think arts is a appropriately placed with economic development. I realize parks plays an important part or has a sponsor some important arts programing and that's great. However, the arts and the life of Portland is much broader than what is being offered through the parks bureau and indeed, I think that if we were to move this, we would lose some opportunities to use the arts to turbocharge our economy. So that's my discussion. I don't think we've called the vote yet. Or have we called the vote yet? Yeah she's okay then.

Speaker: Sorry. Never mind. Okay, good. Any further discussion? Glisan. Please call the role.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Rubio arts is very connected to our community and economy and I also believe that this could easily stay in the community and economic development service area and could, in the future move there.

Speaker: Currently, though, I know that there are some very important timely projects connected to this area that are being carried out currently by the commissioner's office. So I very much support support this being seen through to completion. So for this reason I vote i. Ryan hi.

Speaker: Gonzales hi.

Speaker: Wheeler hi. The amendment passes. Gonzales one related to service management, and I apologize, guys. I do have some questions about this one. Um. This is. This so, so in rooting reading this, the language strikes me as somewhat inconsistent. It states what I think is obvious. It says, nothing precludes the mayor or commissioners from initiating, streamlining, integration or other development of their respective service areas prior. To July 1st of 2024. That is simply established saying, as I understand it, current authority that is correct.

Speaker: And it is it is to communicate an intention that at least within service areas, we are committed to horizontal collaboration, which has been talked about in a extensively in the discussions about charter reform, the importance to go horizontal. Italy, what we're seeing here is that we're committed to that. It may have to start inside our current responsibility is to really in many of us are already doing that. And so it's more of an aspirational commitment where we want to continue to go.

Speaker: Well, let me just lay my cards on the table. I think this is inconsistent with the transition goals as I read this, this maintains the silos. You still have commissioners in charge of vertical silos. Am I reading that correctly?

Speaker: You continue to have commissioners in charge of service areas. That is correct. But what this is trying to communicate is that we are committed to finding ways for our existing bureaus to work more effectively together. It is an element of horizontal collaboration, an it's not trying to do everything all at once, but we're putting on each of us a responsibility to, in our areas, find ways for our bureaus to work better together. I would say in public safety, there are some very interesting questions about how this will all play out. Fully recognize that you and I should. This pass will have to work through some things on in public safety because there are some some pieces that are across each other's lines a little.

Speaker: So how how would then the commissioners work with the deputy city administrator who who's in charge of the deputy city administrators that the commissioner or is it the interim city manager?

Speaker: It is the commissioner, although with instructions from the commission. The last part is instructing each designated deputy to work, cooperate fully with the cao in planning for the operations of the new form of government.

Speaker: That's the current form of government we already have. And clearly the voters have directed us to transition to a more horizontal structure by January first, 2025. So I think what we were getting at was we were trying to move to that structure on at least July 1st of 2024 and operate with the interim city administrator managing the entire enterprise, including the horizontal and the vertical. But then have deputy city administrators and then if commissioners wanted it, commissioners could be advisors in specific areas or they could oversee specific programming. My concern here is this just cements what what we're already doing. There's no point continuing the transition. If you have commissioners in charge of vertical sleeves and the interim city manager has no authority, well, the subsequent resolutions do set forth the city administrator's authority.

Speaker: I do believe there are different visions of what that position, that position's authority should be in this interim period. And so I agree with you that in some respects that there is an incongruence with the vision you articulated and what is in these resolutions. I will say at a more fundamental level, that actually is a difference between in your view of how the transition should work and potentially your colleagues. That's not a disagreement on where we need to be on January 1st, 2025. I think we're in unanimous agreement that that a new form of government needs to be successful on that day, that we each have responsibility in getting us there. It is a different vision on how we get to that end for what? For what that's worth.

Speaker: And I accept that. I'm just being pragmatic. We just had a half an hour discussion on two amendments where two commissioners disagreed vehemently on a very important subject, and they're both reasonable, honest, hardworking, smart people. But but, you know, intention is one thing. Results are another. And what the voters told us is they want to get rid of the vertical silos. They want us to

move towards an enterprise management system with professional management. And I don't see how we go cold turkey from December 31st, 2024, in a siloed form of government to January first, 2025, with a new mayor and a new City Council under a completely different structure. And there's budgetary considerations. There's issues of systems, there's alignment, there's policies that need to be considered across the enterprise. There's no way to do that. With this amendment in place, we would be static. We would be hanging on to the current form of government.

Speaker: I strongly disagree with that characterization. There's pretty explicit direction and authority granted to the interim ceo.

Speaker: Walk through this because you have assigned me budget and finance and so I would be responsible for budget and finance s. I would presume ably under this scheme, I would hire my own deputy city administrator here and I would ignore the interim city manager's advice if I felt like it. That doesn't strike me as enterprise management that frankly, I'd want to be part of what it authorizes you to do, should you so choose, is to designate the cao as your deputy.

Speaker: That's entirely your choice. You could not not sue. It also gives that opportunity to each of your colleagues who are duly elected until end of 2024 to serve as commissioners. In some cases, we were elected until 2026 to serve as commissioner as well.

Speaker: I will be stronger in my language if this amendment passes. We are scrapping the transition process that is utterly false been explained. That is a false characterization. Okay, well then explain it.

Speaker: We are clearly stating we are committed to serving the new form of government. January 1st, 2025. So because we don't agree necessarily with the path that you have charted and how to get there, that does not mean we are not

committed to delivering the new form of government. I think leaning towards that characterization is unfair to your colleagues who are all duly elected to serve the city of Portland until 2024 or 2026. And we are all committed to servicing our areas to do the best job we can. Until then, and also to support a very complicated implementation motion. So this can't be either or. It shouldn't be either or.

Speaker: Then what?

Speaker: What is the role of the deputy city administrator for under your proposed amendment one?

Speaker: He is a deputy city.

Speaker: Could you the I'm sorry, the interim city manager, what is the role of the interim city manager? Because they won't have authority to bring bureaus together if the commissioners in charge of the sleeves don't agree, they won't have the ability to do a joint budget if the commissioners don't. All agree, they won't be able to align systems that the commissioners don't all agree to give him that authority or her, but I'm assuming I would pick michael. I don't I don't see how this doesn't create problem after problem after problem in terms of trying to transition on a very short timeline to January 1st, 2025. The on budget authority and to present unified budgets by service area.

Speaker: Again, I completely disagree with the characterization. I think once these resolutions are passed today, the clear instruction to the bureau office and to the cao and to all that are concerned is you're preparing budgets across service areas in the next cycle. And if we need to further clarify, happy to do that. But that's the full intent. With respect to the specific responsibilities and authority of the cao, they are set forth in the amended resolution as it is, there's still a clear, important role for the cao. So in the transition and at times that's elevating to council where there are tensions between bureaus and how to implement that may not make them the

final arbitrator arbiter of those conflicts. They will have to elevate it to council at times. Okay

Speaker: And did I understand correctly, commissioner, that the deputy city administrators would be interim number one? Yes and number two, it is the intention, if this passes, that the commissioners would hire their own deputy city administrator to oversee their sleeve. Is that correct?

Speaker: It would. It it's within the purview of the commissioners. So that may mean identifying existing resource without spending the new dollars. That's a conceivable solution. It could be designating your existing a current director to be your deputy with in your service areas. We're leaving that flexibility to the commissioners on this interim basis.

Speaker: So the interim city manager might end up, in fact with no deputy city administrators. Is that one possible outcome?

Speaker: I think that we look at January 1st, 2025, there will certainly be in place a structure that we need to have for the administrative function. But this the idea here is to be clear how we're flying until December 31, 2024. I also we didn't put it in the amendments or in the resolutions. I think we need to talk about it a stub period sometime after elections in November of 2024. I'm not sure we have to figure that all out right now. But there is there is this sort of transition of authority. While it doesn't occur until December 31st, 2024, we do have to be thoughtful all on how we transition that stub period. We weren't ready to articulate how we'd recommend doing that here. I think we need to make space for that conversation. Well, it's three weeks and it's over the holidays.

Speaker: I just want to caution you on that. So I love the city and I love our employees and they work hard, but that's probably the quietest time of year except for in November of 2024, when there's going to be a lot of work onboarding a new

council and a new form of government. All right. So thank you. I appreciate feedback and forth, as always. I don't know if people have other thoughts on that. If not, please call the roll on Gonzalez one Mapps.

Speaker: I yea. Rubio for this amendment.

Speaker: I'll simply share that we're already having discussions in our service area about being ready for the transition come July one, 2024. So it's in alignment with what we're already doing. I Ryan yeah, two things.

Speaker: I love working with this current City Council and I like that we're taking on tough conversations and we, we, we move the work forward. I want us to make sure that we are in that seat for the will of the voters until the very end of December. And the second point is I look forward to the shared leadership decisions that we will do with the interim ceo, cao oh, sorry. I vote yea Gonzalez.

Speaker: I vote aye. Wheeler

Speaker: Well, needless to say, I'm deeply disappointed. I think this sets us way back. I think this will create additional impediments to making this transition motion a successful one. I think we've just added a ton of work to michael's plate. I think we've disrespected the work of the transition team up to this point. That said, I'm not a quitter and I hear my colleagues and I respect their voice. We will figure out how to make it work. Michael will you commit to we'll sit down and we'll make it work. So I vote i. But I'm clearly outgunned on this one. The amendment passes is next one Ryan amendment three approval of the interim. I'm sorry, I vote nay.

Thank you. Nay. But I still lose.

Speaker: Thank you, Ryan.

Speaker: Amendment three.

Speaker: I think we have Gonzalez amendment to.

Speaker: Did I skip one? Okay, so Gonzalez.

Speaker: Yeah. Reservation for Gonzalez.

Speaker: I'm sorry.

Speaker: I'm looking at the wrong one. Thank you. Gonzalez to which is reservation of authority maps. I yea. Rubio I Ryan i.

Speaker: Gonzalez I Wheeler this is very similar to again, this maintains silos. Through 2024.

Speaker: It maintains the status quo. I vote no, but the amendment passes. Ryan amendment three approval of the interim cao maps.

Speaker: I think I can. I'd like to have some discussion on this one. Amendments have been evolving over the course of the last day or two and even maybe over the course of the day. One of the questions I had was, I believe, some amendment was on the table that essentially allowed commissioners to essentially appoint their own deputy city attorney or deputy city administrators, which struck me as being a little bit inconsistent with the practice of the mayor not being able to appoint his as interim chief administrative officer. And I feel like commissioner Gonzalez might be the expert in this space. Commissioner Gonzalez, given your understanding of the amendments on the table? Yeah. What's the practical effect of Ryan three the and certainly we can have robert supplement.

Speaker: As big as the language has evolved a little bit here. So Gonzalez, one clarifies that both the mayor and a commissioner in charge may designate a deputy. So that's one of the areas of language changed is that any of the five of us can designate a deputy. Okay. The mayor's not at all. Hands are not at all tied there. What has changed in this language is we initially proposed that the city administrator or the cao would have to be approved by a majority of this council. We've actually softened that language here. We need to be essentially be consulted. We need to be engaged. This parallels a little bit how I believe the csd had was set

up. I will call out in testing any. There is an interesting question. If this council doesn't approve of the interim city administrator, do they actually carry forward to the next form of government? And I don't know. I mean, and it's you know, they would be approved under the existing charter, the new charter says that a city administrator has to be approved by council. So I know in some of the dialog we thought, well, the previous council approves that will be sufficient temporarily only for the new form of government. But that's kind of an interesting legal question. So one, did I answer your question? I just want to make sure I'm answering your question, but it led to it so I might have missed it.

Speaker: It's been a long day. So since Gonzalez one passed, does that functionally make Ryan three butte I don't think so.

Speaker: I mean, we I don't think so. It's asking that we be consulted on the city administrator. I mean, that's essentially it's softer than the way it previously said. I guess. I think I'm getting to your point, though. If the mayor wanted to adopt an interim ceo, they can certainly adopt the deputy. You know, does this this is this some way weaken the mayor's power? It's not really the intent. I mean, the goal here is really setting up for what goes in the next form of governance. Is that where is that where is that where you're getting that we're somehow discriminating against the mayor? Yeah, that was my that was my concern.

Speaker: Although the I think literally this amendment looks different today than it did or at this hour than it did last night when I went to did it.

Speaker: This is definitely previously this said the majority council had to approve. I don't know, robert, if you have thoughts on here on this piece.

Speaker: Robert taylor, city attorney, i, I so the council just passed gonzales one that gives the mayor and each commissioner the ability to designate a deputy in charge of their service areas. And that designation is at the sole discretion of the

mayor or commissioner in charge. That's how that amendment works. That was just passed at this Ryan amendment three would provide that in the event that an interim city administrator later is hired, then the mayor would involve all of the council members and their staff in the hiring of that person. So under the amendment we just passed appointment of the deputies sole and complete discretion of the commissioner in charge of the mayor. Under this, the hiring of the interim city administrator would take the input of all of the council members in the hiring process.

Speaker: To be clear, the deputies no longer report to the city administrator. They report to the commissioners.

Speaker: Under the amendment that was just passed, the deputies appoint report to the commissioners, not, you are presuming what might happen.

Speaker: Yes talking about who has who has input from other officers and commissioner Mapps, I mean, kind of my thought is I mean, if the rest of these amendments pass, this may be unimportant, except I think we still have to face the question, Ryan, of what?

Speaker: So we identify an interim cao. What is their authority on January one, 2025? And if this council doesn't approve that cao, do they have less authority than they otherwise would?

Speaker: And so the commission or the way I the way I think of that is, you you have to say separate the position from the person who's in the position. And so the position would be created by action of council through an ordinance, through the budget, we would say there is now an interim city administrator that interim city administrator will serve from this date through the first six months of the new form of government subject to the new mayor's authority to fire that person. Day one and hire somebody else. That council can take that action now to provide for that

continuity of the position and authority, be subject to the authority in the new charter for the mayor to just fire that person who actually serves in that role. You know, so right now, for example, if we had that position and that position reported to the mayor under our current form of government, the mayor has sole discretion to appoint who the mayor wants in that position on. So and I think to get back to the mayor's point about the amendment we just passed, and then this amendment, it you know, if the mayor would choose to use the deputy city administrator and designate that person in his sole discretion, then, you know, maybe we don't do an interim city administrator. I think a lot of these things are sort of up are up for future discussion once we know what the final question was about January 1st.

Speaker: And the answer is the question. Mission is undefined. The city administrator would have the same fairly limited authority that we just or the majority just agreed to under this amendment. It it would be up to the new council to come in and give the city administrator different authority and do the work of moving the organization towards an enterprise wide management system. Well, I think we have just punted that to 2025. I think except mayor January 1st, 2025 by operation of law, the new charter goes into effect.

Speaker: And under that charter, all the city employees report up to the city administrator. So January one, 2025, the mayor can fire the existing city administrator, appoint a new city administrator that person can then fire all the deputies and appoint new people all and we can start fresh on day one or or they can keep them or do some combination of that.

Speaker: So robert, I just want to be crystal clear on this. I know this hypothetical, but just play through the exact scenario you just described. But if that city administrator has not been ratified by a City Council, whether the old City Council or the new one are does that does that create an ambiguity in your mind?

Speaker: I think that we would I think an action by this council to create the position and provide the continuity of authority would give that person the authority to sufficient to give them to take them into the until again, the next mayor has the option subject to the next mayor making an appointment and confirmation. We have a similar issue with the police chief, for example. So we want this council to take some action to make sure that there is an city attorney for that.

Speaker: And city attorney.

Speaker: That's right. So you want to have some regardless of who is in that position, you want to make sure that the authority of that position continues through January to give the new mayor new council some ability to make a decision on. Okay.

Speaker: So, robert, just say it another way. When the new council is on board and the mayor appoints the city administrator of the council, does have to go through a process of proving them? Yes. So this was a the spirit of a practice that we will be implementing on January 20th, 25 and to give it momentum and commissioner Mapps.

Speaker: What I would say is I'm not sure this is necessary, but the last thing I want to do is I mean, I don't want to disrupt the mayor's ability to do the same thing. The rest of us do. It was originally designed to when we were concerned about the cao having broad authority over our bureaus that was part of the concern here. I just don't feel strongly about this one way or another, to be honest with you.

Speaker: But commissioner Gonzalez, thank you for that clarification. I want to thank staff for my colleagues, for this discussion. I'm going to vote no on this one. I don't think we have called the vote yet. Have we called the vote yet? I've lost track of where we're at yet. So just so I understand the spirit of what commissioner Ryan was trying to do here is I think it may be a little bit redundant in this particular

space. So when we do call the piper, I'm going to be a no. But I don't think we've called the votes yet.

Speaker: Have we any further discussion? Please call the roll.

Speaker: No, yea. Rubio.

Speaker: I. Ryan hi, gonzales hi, Wheeler. No, the amendment passes, mister mayor.

Speaker: Point of privilege.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: I'll just say for those of you who park in the parking garage across the street and you give your key fob to the guy because it's really busy, I don't know what time they go home. 7:00, I suspect. Seven, 7:00. All right. So you might have you're either out of luck or it sounds like you have about another hour before you're walking home. Trust me. Thank you, mr. Mayor. All right.

Speaker: Good call. Uh, I believe gonzales three is next. Is that correct?

Speaker: Yes. Yes.

Speaker: Transition and authority for council. Uh. What does this do that's different than what was previously voted on?

Speaker: I think the second part of this is really me just talking that we still have work to do to identify how the last six months of transition is going to occur. Supposed to be discussions led by you with each of us, including in our service areas on what's the what's the right way to fly in those last six months. So while we're setting up a general framework for how operation of the city is going to go until December 31st, 2024, today, they're still going to be further the design work that needs to be sorted out, led by you, um, at least the second part and I'm always happy to have these conversations and I've had a lot of them and I've offered a lot of them and I'll continue to offer a lot of them.

Speaker: And michael and I will always have a door open to do that, to discuss the issues that are here. Um the. This is also a restatement of, of the, the commissioners being able to choose their own deputies. That issue is now settled. Um. Minimum classification is still have to come forward. Robert for the dcas I understand now the commissioners can select their own, but there's going to be minimum requirement standards.

Speaker: I believe the classifications would still have to be approved by council, by council, correct. Okay.

Speaker: Good. Yeah.

Speaker: Okay. I don't have any further questions. Please call the roll maps.

Speaker: I yea. Rubio I Ryan hi, gonzales.

Speaker: Hi, Wheeler.

Speaker: No motion passes gonzales for transition. I did have a question on this. Yes. Where? Where is the rest of the org chart? This speaks to one layer of the organization chart, but it doesn't speak to other senior level positions listed on the org chart. It doesn't talk about the natural resources person, the or the sustainability officer, the equity officer. Um communications officer. Where are they in this language? Well I think there's really two parts.

Speaker: One, we're clearly adopting today approval of the service areas as amended, including its composition in the concept of deputy city attorney, deputy city administrators and that that would be effective. We want to be clear that in some ways on a date, July one, 2024, even though, you know, I think that's open to discussion if we want to make that org chart sooner or later. But this would make it clear that it's effective. July 1st, 2024, the second part is also just being clear. We have to have a whole separate discussion on authorizing positions and the budget process. So even though we're adopting the org chart, each of the positions in in

there are still subject to budget discussion and authorization and the other component is that Robert and team had sort of alluded to we have to define some of these roles as did legal counsel.

Speaker: Did you review this?

Speaker: Yes. So I have a question maybe for you.

Speaker: Obviously, the transition team, they're already feeling the pressure of time and they need an indication that they can move forward in developing classic vacations and pay ranges for the full org chart. Does this allow that to move forward. And I guess I'm also not clear on whether the council wants to move forward on that.

Speaker: My, my, my reading of this is that it would give the direction to the transition team that this is the organized structure that council is anticipating budgeting into starting July 1st, 2024, and that council can start doing things in anticipation of that. So creating the classification, but only preparing, but not for all the classification options.

Speaker: If I'm reading this correctly, I think that there's other amendments that come later that also get to that point about directing the budget office to organize the 2425 budget in alignment with the new org chart.

Speaker: So I think some of some of these amendments build on each other, but the important point is that this council is telling the transition team that it should take the steps in anticipation of budgeting into an org chart that looks like this starting July one, 2024. And then council is also reserving its authority to make those budget decisions.

Speaker: So define beginning July 1st, 2024. They're ready to do this? Now they're ready to go forward with that work. Does this preclude them from starting that work until July 1st, 2024?

Speaker: No, I don't think it prohibits that. It doesn't prohibit the pre work.

Speaker: No. Okay.

Speaker: I just want to make sure we have that on the record.

Speaker: And I'd be clear, I actually am encouraging it. We want a fiscal budget for 20 2425. That makes sense. We have a lot of complexity to work through. They're also going to be some very difficult budget decisions, and that's what the second sentence is trying to allude to. But we're trying to fly in formation so we can prepare a good budget in the next cycle.

Speaker: Okay. Any further discussion? Please call the roll maps. Rubio hi, Ryan hi.

Speaker: Gonzales hi, Wheeler hi.

Speaker: The amendment is adopted. Gonzales five the authority of the chief administrative officer. And I do have some questions on this. If I can find my paper here.

Speaker: So, so and this may be a moot point point at this point.

Speaker: Michael, could you come up, please. So my original reading of this was that it makes it very, very difficult not to think about things at the enterprise level. And I know you've had a chance to go through this amendment. Could you give us your impression of it? Sure

Speaker: Mr. Mayor, members of the council. Well, I think the page that has the chart that shows where current language changes to different language in a couple of cases presents a limitation on on for instance, the second second row refers to the technical implementation team and that the team is authorized to act. But it appears that it's authorized to act in the budget and finance and city operations service areas and not the others, as which is a concern regarding technical implementation of the org chart for the whole enterprise. Because there are technical pieces that interrelate and cover the whole city, not just certain service

areas. And I may be reading that wrong, but that's how I read it. The language on it, on its face.

Speaker: Could you give I know we're getting late, but could you give some examples of where that would be outside of budget and finance and city operations, service areas. Well the org chart, if adopted, moves programs from one service area to another.

Speaker: And some of those service areas aren't final and budget and operations. And for instance, the couple of programs that move from the cao's office now into community economic development, we need to be able to consider all of the service areas when we're making technical changes, whether it's in sap or it's in the human resources system is particularly in the budget systems. So we really just have to consider the whole enterprise when we do this. Obviously we have to given given the amendments that have already passed, we have to do this in conjunction with you who oversee those other service areas.

Speaker: So, michael, under this amendment, who's in charge, who is who's making decisions. I think we would need to make we would need to recommend technical changes and make sure that everybody's on board with those things to be to be proactive.

Speaker: Well, most of these things aren't aren't issues that are policy issues or those kinds of things. They're issues of implementing what this council directs as the change in organizational structure. Elise is here. She's much more versed in the technical changes that have to happen on the back side and please be kind to elise because I owe her everything. If we're going to be successful over the next 14 months.

Speaker: Good evening. I know you're all tired.

Speaker: Thank you for bearing with us.

Speaker: My name is elise rosenberg. I'm the deputy director of the bureau of technology services, but I'm also serving as the sponsor for technical implementation. And just at a very high level, what that means is taking whatever decisions you all make from an organizational chart level, big boxes breaking it down into very, very little boxes which position goes where backed by what revenue, having authority over, what spend over what contract, what's over, who's timesheets. It's how does that roll back up into a budget that's transparent to our community and that reflects the organizing national chart. So all the way back down and all the way back up through systems like sap, like our budget system. And there are about 100 integrations between other systems. And so, so each bureau has had a lot of latitude, mood about the way they want to structure their bureaus to follow their function. Right? They have a mission to complete. They structure their bureau financially and personnel wise in terms of the way that they need in order to develop and deliver that function. And they have the expertise to make sure that while we might put systems and processes together to try to accommodate these changes at scale, which will be extremely challenging in order for them to be successful in the bureaus, we really need to work with every bureau who's impacted and we actually already have a structure in place where bureaus have designated expert s that are working with our technical team. They have been since August to be on standby to help us actually process these in a way where those bureaus can be successful. Got it. Does that make sense?

Speaker: Very helpful. And what I would call out here, mike, is that gonzales amendment one, it directs deputies to work with you to facility late completion of charter reform, implementation by January 1st, 2025. So they have explicit instructions to do so. We are also ratifying the org chart today say that hopefully gives the structure in which this work would be done. So if you find a technical gap

in your technical authority a little pun, there, I think you can come back. I mean, you have other things to hang your hats on in what we've approved here. And if we're getting, you know, obstruction from a designated deputy, frankly, if you're getting obstruction from a commissioner like you, you have something to point to in here. That's what I'd submit.

Speaker: All right.

Speaker: Any further, I've kind of commissioner Mapps.

Speaker: I've kind of lost track of the plot here. Commissioner Gonzales can you briefly summarize what you're trying to get at with this amendment?

Speaker: Yeah. And this is this was essentially we there were broad authority provisions granted to the cio in the original resolution before us. I think much of it was intended to address the transition in the challenge is always, you know, when you get into the nitty gritty, does this inadvertently undermine existing commissioners ability to function over there, service areas. And so the spirit of these edits is just Mike's got a bunch of work to do, technical team have a bunch of work to do. They can do whatever the heck they want inside of the first two service areas to kind of the internally focused ones. If there are issues they bring outside of those, one deputies have to cooperate with them. They're explicitly instructed to work with Mike under Gonzales one. But those issues would potentially get arbitrated by us if there's tension between a bureau and their their work, we're hoping that's not going to be very much right. But that's that that would be that's the rub. It wouldn't be on unregulated authority in the cio to resolve that, that they would eventually have to punt back to us if there's if there's substantial issues. I suspect we don't want to deal with the technical issues. The problem is, is how do we define it in such a way that we frankly really, I suspect, want to delegate that to you guys. If it doesn't create a unintended consequence. So I again, what I call it,

commissioner Mapps. If this is insufficient authority for them, they can come back and tell us and we you know, we're not trying to obstruct. Let me be clear. Just didn't want to have unintended consequences of over delegation.

Speaker: Gonzales for call the role maps. I appreciate this discussion i'll be transparent here.

Speaker: I'm not sure if I fully track the ins and outs of this amendment, which is why I'm going to vote no.

Speaker: Oh, I'm sorry, did you vote?

Speaker: He voted no.

Speaker: No. Okay thank you. And actually, just a quick clarification. This is gonzales five.

Speaker: You're right.

Speaker: I stand corrected. It is gonzales five. Do you want to keep your vote the way it was?

Speaker: Okay. That's what I and yeah.

Speaker: Oh, shoot. Okay Rubio you can change it if you want because I misread.

Speaker: Do you want to change your vote?

Speaker: No.

Speaker: My kids just going to miss soccer practice.

Speaker: Oh, okay. Sorry yeah. Ryan hi.

Speaker: Gonzales. Hi, Wheeler.

Speaker: No, the amendment pass is gonzales number. No, I think were to Ryan again, aren't we see, Ryan four so I have a question about Ryan four four so i, I understand that it deprioritizes us both the City Council chamber and the offices on the second floor. Four and I thought we'd already given head nods to city staff to go forward with the gc and the architects on both of those i, i, I don't think anything

takes away going forward on the timeline that we've talked about and what this specifies that the chamber the goal is to deliver a chamber by January one, 2025 and what we call for workspaces near the council chambers that that can start as soon as possible.

Speaker: The necessary procurement and that work would begin by July 1st. So when we say in the 2425 fiscal year that's I'm looking to be that just to translate that into dates. That's July 1st, 2020.

Speaker: Fair enough. So let me suggest this because we had a facility, his work session and at the end of the work session, we were tasked I was tasked the transition team was tasked with working on a detailed resolution that encompasses all of what council had discussed over the last several weeks related to discussion. I don't understand why it's coming up here in the context of an org chart.

Speaker: Well, I actually think at the end of the last facilities work session, there was a request to what you labeled the majority to come back with a plan that would be acceptable. There were conversations as as colleagues that I think we gravitated towards an agreement on what that timeline looks for. But I actually walked out of the last work session with the interpretation that you had requested of us to come back with a plan that would be consistent with. And I got to get the ordinance number 191246, which calls for actually a report to be delivered by the chief procurement officer. So we felt like we were doing our homework in an attempt to try and be consistent with the conversations that were had, including and the reason that was highest priority listed delivery of district offices. That was articulated as a high priority by many of us during that work session. Um, and when respect to delivery, the new mayor and city administrative office is a highest priority, we see that as an easy get. You can set up well let me ask let me ask you a specific question, because I'm getting nervous for commissioner Mapps.

Speaker: So it says moving the council chamber renovations to quote a closer proximity to offices. We agreed in work session with the thumbs up that the offices wouldn't start until July 1st. But we heard from the cmg and the architect. They need a year to do the chamber. So are we delaying the work of the chamber?

Speaker: No, we why is this language here? It's to give procurement and give facilities. If they came back and was going to save us a million bucks right, to start chambers on March one instead of January 1st. And it gives them the ability to come back and do that estimation. I'm not sure that's the case, but we heard it in the work session. It actually became crystal clear that the bigger the gap between starting a chamber and starting offices on the second floor adds to cost. And so if we're not prejudging, we just heard that loud and clear. So we're giving them flexibility. If they want to compress those two together. Well, we already have checkpoints built in, and one of them is we have to come back to council with the guaranteed maximum price.

Speaker: And if we add additional check points, that seems to me it's just adding uncertainty and adding cost and potentially making the work of the cmg sis more difficult. I'm not I don't see why we do that. What's what's the gain?

Speaker: The only piece is if it came back and they told us that you're starting second floor offices on July one that's set we've all agreed on that right July 1st, 2024. And so it's an add. And we're also committed to starting chambers January 1st, 2024. But if they came back, we heard it that they that the longer the bigger that delta between those two dates, it can drive up costs. So if they want to delay council chambers, they can do it a little bit. If it materially saves costs, that's that's the space we're giving to facilities. Frankly, we're giving it back to you. If you conclude it's not really worth it in that plan, then so be it. We're still January 1st and July 1st.

Speaker: I guess I just have one comment about about exhibit c and as long as the intent is that we can begin chamber as January 1st and begin second floor offices July one, I think that will probably meet what the discussion was about.

Speaker: I do have a concern about about the last sentence under b to be which commencement date of work is subject to the approval by the majority of council of temporary workspace. So I will tell you, we probably need to get that done very soon.

Speaker: Hasn't everybody seen the temporary workspace case?

Speaker: Because each each of the cmg, each of the guaranteed maximum prices, there will be three. I understand and 2 to 3. And each of them are somewhat dependent on all of them being approved and mobilization, demobilization. You heard from the cmg, see, they need to plan for the entire work plan plan before they can give you the first guaranteed maximum price. We need that soon so that we can mobilize by January 1st. I believe, for council chambers or ish and so they're interdependent, right? Which means the second floor space, if it is dependent on your approval of temporary space, we need that approval like soon. So I just wanted to make everybody aware of the interdependencies of the different parts of the project as it goes to cost for the gc and the people who really know what they're talking about are here. So I may be off and they can say what the director meant to say was, and I'd appreciate that.

Speaker: Do you want you if you want to add caitlin mcgee so we could go forward with gmp one based off of the most efficient process of construction and then either do a change order to add cost.

Speaker: No, no.

Speaker: So no change orders.

Speaker: So I'm just saying, you know, we could go forward with what we assumed or were approved to do so.

Speaker: But the goal would be to have everything outlined so that when we come to you with our gmp, the multiple ones at one time, we understand and outline the schedule and how they impact each other. So we're not coming back to you with added costs. That's helpful because you make a difference between plan one and plan two.

Speaker: Just in the original ordinance plan 1 or 1 was chambers and two was office space. I just trying to remember how the ordinance, the original ordinance was the gmp's yeah, got it. And you know, frankly, maddie, this is as much for you guys. The hope I had understood our homework was to come back and come up with a plan out of the last work session and to reflect dates that were being discussed. The goal here was to give you guidance on how to, you know, really to achieve procurement officer under the ordinance on how to come back with a plan that is reflective. There are some wrinkles around here, right? I mean, the I don't I understand what mike's saying about the temporary space. We're hoping that that's going to be prompt resolved. There was originally concerns when staff saw the space initially that was initially proposed. So that's we just wanted to make sure we weren't being surprised. But the other piece came out of the direct conversations with cmg that just started in the work session. If if, if there's two big a gap between the starting of the two projects, it's and frankly, the mayor's office is the third component. We have three components of the more they can keep subs here, the more continuously we heard that loud and clear that saved money. I don't know how to quantify it. I mean, that's a for you guys. But yeah, I think so.

Speaker: You're correct. The longer the delay between gmp one and gmp two starting, the more the price goes up. I think I have a question in this amendment as

to what constitutes a material cost savings. So I don't know how we define material, but what we can say is by not launching all of the work January 1st and giving ourselves maximum flexibility, we will start to see a slowly, incrementally increasing cost at at what point that becomes material? Well, I don't know because it's not defined, but I think we are comfortable as a design team and construction team with having a confirmation that chambers starts. January 1st and having a confirmation that office says can start July 1st. And I think to mike's point, we are reaching the point where bouncing around with uncertainty about what might start, when is becoming a hazard unto its own. And so I think what I would encourage is I know that the mayor's office has been working on a resolution. I've seen that resolution. We've put a lot of input into that. And I think it fairly strikes the balance is that everybody was seeking. So I don't know what my place is here, but I might recommend tabling this and seeing that resolution because because we are also at a situation where for council chambers to start January first, which is what hits that year long deadline, we are having to decommission this space. So it's really not possible for us to decommission this move it up to 1900 and then have a decision to wait to delay chambers to July 1st, because now we have all of our electronic equipment up at 1900 and people still wanting, I guess, to have chambers here.

Speaker: Maddie hurt you? Okay, this does have my name on it. I'd like to table it.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Thank you for new information. I just got the resolution coming from the mayor's office. Very, very helpful.

Speaker: Without objection, Ryan five authority to change.

Speaker: Let's vote on that. Just kidding. Um thank you, ma'am. Yeah. Thank you. We're done.

Speaker: We got one more.

Speaker: One more. But you guys are. Oh, we're done. All right, so I'm trying to figure out what Ryan five.

Speaker: It's to bring the budget into this. It's been difficult for me and many voters to see what even those that voted yes on it, to see the escalating cost. And so it's to rein that in and to make sure that we have some checks and balances going forward. And right now, we're we're projecting to go way over the ceiling that was in all the materials to the voters. So in the spirit of will the voters, this is why this is an amendment. And for us to get some fiscal discipline going forward.

Speaker: So we had a work session on, gosh, is that just yesterday?

Speaker: Holy cow.

Speaker: My god.

Speaker: And I think a couple of points were made by the budget office. The first is the council already has and will retain amendment authority for decisions that are made during the actual budget process. And there's nothing that changes the council's authority and the budget office emphasized that point. And they also outlined some of the trade offs of staffing and funding decisions is that we have to be prepared for. So I don't see how this alters or adjusts the current authority's already granted to council. I don't see what this does. Tim. I don't know if I got it wrong. Just tell me I'm wrong. It's late and sorry you have to say your name for the record.

Speaker: I think what you're referencing is what I came to you yesterday to say. As you will have the authority, you've always had as we price the components of the charter change, you'll have the ability to change things as we go through. I'm assuming that the first time you will see a plan and I'm also assuming that the mayor will be consulting with you, will be in the proposed budget. A proposed budget will come to you as the city budget council and you'll be able to amend that.

So if there's things in there that you want to change, you'll have the option for doing that. And then once the adopted budget is approved, we move quickly and excuse me, the approved budget is approved. We quickly move into the adopted budget and normally there's not as much flexibility in changing them. But you can still adopt at that point. So I guess what I'm telling you is you'll have the opportunity for weighing in on the fiscal aspects of what we're paying for in this charter amendment as we flow through the budget process.

Speaker: So I appreciate that Tim and I did hear you and having this in the public record again is great. I just want to make sure we're memorializing that so that we actually did have that authority.

Speaker: Nothing changes in terms of the budget committee and there is quite a big delta at the moment.

Speaker: And I just want to make sure we're all aware of that.

Speaker: And I for one appreciated commissioner Ryan's point on this, that we at least spend some time in the budget process talking about a scenario under which the contours of transition are as what the voters were told. Right? So we may move well beyond that, recognizing the realities, but voters were told something.

Speaker: The voters were given a document that had and if you go back and review, it had numerous points where it said these are estimates and they talk about all the risk of the estimates because it was done very quickly. And now we're in a situation where we have things like inflation and things that are happening that are just frankly going to increase the cost. But we told it to the voters.

Speaker: Tim, I understand that to a point, right? But the low end of the estimate was 900,000. And we're talking to 23 million, right. And 13 million of which is new. This isn't a small well, we don't start with 900,000.

Speaker: We gave them a range and I wasn't here at the time.

Speaker: Now, the ceiling the ceiling was very large range on the costs.

Speaker: The ceiling was 18.7. So I understand what you're saying. We will need to explain. We will need to explain on the types of expenditure increases that occurred based upon that that original estimate to make sure to understand why we had things. For example, you're just talking about the construction things here. Not all that was included in the way it was included in the original estimate.

Speaker: I think the construction is completely out of it right? 900,008.7 was ongoing. So just to be so again, that's why I have provision for regional offices and things like that in the estimate. Outside of that, if all.

Speaker: Tim, just before you go, just so I'm clear here, it's your analysis that this amendment is largely redundant with authorities that we already have. Right? Okay. Thank you.

Speaker: And can I follow up to that question?

Speaker: So we believed it when I said it.

Speaker: How how do then how will we present in the budget process the debt atlas between what voters were told and what is in the mayor's proposed?

Speaker: Once we have a proposal, all we can work backwards and say here's what's different than what we're in. Those estimates at the time and that will be up to you as you go through the budget process. If you want to create different scenarios in terms of what we're actually going to fund and the.

Speaker: Yeah, I mean, I think the struggle for me commissioner Mapps I'm sorry we're here so late is that the budget that we've seen so far was built from an org chart. It was kind of right in and yet I feel we have a responsibility to stewards. Voters were told this and what is the level of government you get with that and may be insufficient. We may all sit around and conclude 900,008.7 is not going to work right? I mean, but that that we automatically go with the larger number with just

sort of skipping over. And I don't mean to be flip there. Right but but we just moved past the original estimates as though those weren't real constraints in our analytical process. And I that's where I take some exception. That's why I like I like Ryan's amendment here and I don't think it's superfluous from that perspective, but well, we're going to prepare our budget because budgets, you think we have a lot of time to do a budget process, but we really don't.

Speaker: It's fairly automated type of system. We're going to be doing whatever you agree to on the charter organizational chart, and that's how we will create our budgeting. Now it's up to you if you want us to develop other scenarios as we go through that budget process.

Speaker: And just to reiterate, let's say the org chart has a certain number of positions. If those positions aren't funded during the budget process, they don't happen. Mean that's basically right. Okay council has final authority on that. Commissioner Mapps.

Speaker: All right. So hand up. But I think it went away just before we call the roll here. Commissioner Ryan, can you remind me what the intent of this amendment was again? Were you trying to accomplish here?

Speaker: I was accomplishing what I said earlier, and it's in writing, which is that we promised in the voters pamphlet and all the materials what the ceiling was. And we're dramatically over that ceiling right now. So I wanted to call that out so that we could be fiscally responsible as we continue to move forward. I have been listening just like you, that we actually have that authority, of course, in the budget process, I still felt it was necessary to call it out. I was in agreement with the testimony that said we have a top heavy org chart that we're putting forward and so we're going to have to make some tough decisions going forward. So it's a way to just memorialize that and remind people the will of the voters. Read into this that the ceiling was 8.7.

And we're looking at right now being 13 million over that. That's not that's that takes inflation to a whole nother level. So yeah, I do think I understand what you're saying, commissioner.

Speaker: I think we do as we go through the budget process, need to have clear information for you on what changed from that original estimation and then you can make decisions on whether or not those things should continue to.

Speaker: And I was just trying to take that those instructions throughout our many conversations as I was looking at the council offices saying, man, they look pretty good to me. So I don't know why we have to spend this much money so throughout this journey I've just been doing the best I can, like all of us, to be fiscally responsible colleagues.

Speaker: I noticed that ruth levine has her hand up. Is that someone we want to call on.

Speaker: Are the only. No, that's.

Speaker: That's not a city employee, is it?

Speaker: Is it is. Director oh, yeah. Call on ruth. It seems like ruth.

Speaker: Are you sorry?

Speaker: Sorry, sorry. I know.

Speaker: I apologize. Sorry about that.

Speaker: Go ahead.

Speaker: I know it's late.

Speaker: I just wanted to be super clear about what the original estimates.

Speaker: What the numbers you're talking about, where the ceiling is.

Speaker: 8.7. And that was that. That particular number is taking out the current budget. We had at that time. So it was making assumptions in some cases about how things would be funded that council has not yet made decisions on if that

makes sense. So i, I'm not i, I just I'm just wanted to flag that it may not be entirely apples to apples. It doesn't change the underlying sentiment. I just wanted to correct for the record that I want to be clear, first of all, that it's assuming certain current costs that would go away in the new structure. And so I just don't want um, so yeah, it's not entirely at this point an apples to apples comparis because we just haven't made all the decisions. You haven't made all the decisions about how things would be funded. Does that make sense?

Speaker: Mayor can I make a suggestion that we bring to you an outline line of what was in the assumptions and the calculations at the time that was presented to the charter commission when they were making their recommendations? Is it is very slim. It is does not include a deputy city administrator structure. It does not include the equity position, the sustainability position in any of those positions that are reporting within the city administrator's office. I think that that might clarify for you what was in the those numbers, because I think that there might be confusion. And I think to ruth's point, it's not an apples to apples comparison. If we're including the deputy structure, if we're including a lot of the things that came out of the organizational conversation, we've actually done some of that previously. So let's just make sure that you have that information that's appreciated.

Speaker: I mean, what I would not to belabor this point. Right. But voters approve something. We as elected elect heads will be asked to approve some things, including the budget. There are a number of decisions that have been made neither by voters or by electeds that are at this point sort of the, you know, the foundation for reducing the budget. And that's where you're seeing some discomfort and just putting it on the record. We're going to be talking about in the budget cycle what voters were told. And it's you can choose how to frame it and present it, but there

are many decisions that have been made to date without electeds weighing in or the voters weighted in that are embedded in that 13 million.

Speaker: Can we and today is your day to make those decisions.

Speaker: So and we'll reflect that, of course, when we come back.

Speaker: And we will get that document to you that she was just responding to. So we can we are all on the same page as to what's changed since that estimate. Okay

Speaker: Any further discussion on this amendment and call the roll?

Speaker: Mapps based on the staff test testimony that we heard on this one, I'm going to vote no.

Speaker: This amendment appears to be redundant and a little bit performative. Yea. Rubio.

Speaker: I really appreciate the spirit in which this was brought forward and I appreciate, um, commissioner Ryan lifting up the point that we have to be, um, have, be good stewards of public funds and, and it was also really helpful to hear the staff talk about how this, how this impacts and if this is consequential or not to the budget process. And so no hearing that it it is not. And I do believe the budget process is the best way to kind of address exactly this. So I'm going to vote no.

Speaker: Ryan. I

Speaker: Gonzalez i.

Speaker: Wheeler no, the amendment fails to the main motion. This is the resolution as amended. Any further discussion?

Speaker: Mayor?

Speaker: I think we should clarify with respect to the amendments that to the extent that language in the original resolutions or exhibits is inconsistent with the amendments adopted by council today, the amendment shall be controlling just that we clarify that on the record.

Speaker: I'm going to defer to legal counsel. That sounds like a legal question.

Speaker: Yes, and I think we'd recommend that because that gives direction to staff.

Speaker: I think it could be done by consensus of the council rather than a motion and vote. But it's up to presiding to decide.

Speaker: All right. Any further discussion on the resolution as amended? Please call the roll. Mapps. Hi, yea. Rubio.

Speaker: Hi, Ryan. Hi gonzales. Hi, Wheeler. Hard? No this is a mishmash of confusing, poorly vetted and I think in some cases, possibly contradictory amendments that were brought forward with minimal opportunity to discuss.

Speaker: They doubled down on the siloed nature of our current form of government and wrapped them in a thin veneer of wishful thinking that said, I think this is going to have the collective impact of slowing down the process under-resourcing the process, and quite possibly the operations of the city. Under the next City Council, at least initially, they'll have the opportunity to fix it and this probably adds costs, but I still don't understand why offices worked their way into this discussion today. This was about the org chart. We already agreed on what we were doing around the offices. We'd already told our private sector partners what we were going to do and to have an amendment that says this whole thing is dependent upon whether a majority of commissioners like their temporary office space is ridiculous.

Speaker: You asked for a plan and, well, it's in there, as you requested.

Speaker: A plan we gave.

Speaker: Excuse me.

Speaker: This is my vote. And I get to interpret it the way I want to interpret it.

Speaker: Go ahead and grandstand. I want I would just simply refer people to the black and white language of what is now in the resolution is adopted.

Speaker: So that said, I'm an expert at taking garbage and turning it into something great. And michael, you've been doing this for a long time. You and your team will do our best and we will live up to the obligations both of the council's resolution as well as to the spirit of what the voters asked us to do. I vote no. The resolution passes, is adopted. We are adjourned.