



June 20, 2024 Council Agenda

5770

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

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

Questions may be directed to councilclerk@portlandoregon.gov

Wednesday, June 19, 2024 9:30 am

Session Status: No session due to holiday

Wednesday, June 19, 2024 2:00 pm

Session Status: No session due to holiday

Thursday, June 20, 2024 9:30 am

Session Status: Adjourned

Council in Attendance: Mayor Ted Wheeler

Commissioner Carmen Rubio

Commissioner Dan Ryan

Commissioner Rene Gonzalez

Commissioner Mingus Mapps

Mayor Wheeler presided.

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

Item 547 was pulled from the Consent Agenda and on a Y-5 roll call the balance of the Consent Agenda was adopted.

Council recessed at 11:35 a.m. and reconvened at 11:48 a.m.

Council adjourned at 1:45 p.m.

Communications

541

[Request of Carolyn Brunett to address Council regarding two proposed ideas related to graffiti](#) (Communication)

Document number: 541-2024

Disposition: Placed on File

542

[Request of Portland Advocates for Leadfree Drinking Water to address Council regarding Water Bureau failure to protect public health](#) (Communication)

Document number: 542-2024

Disposition: Placed on File

543

[Request of Christopher Hale to address Council regarding lack of follow through on proposed infrastructure for pedestrian and cyclist safety](#) (Communication)

Document number: 543-2024

Disposition: Placed on File

Melissa Kostelecky presented to Council for Item 543.

544

[Request of Kristen Bakouros to address Council regarding postponing statue replacement](#) (Communication)

Document number: 544-2024

Disposition: Placed on File

545

[Request of Tyler Hardy to address Council regarding Urban Alchemy](#) (Communication)

Document number: 545-2024

Disposition: Placed on File

Time Certain

546

[Authorize three-year Homelessness Response System Intergovernmental Agreement with Multnomah County](#) (Ordinance)

Introduced by: Mayor Ted Wheeler

Time certain: 9:45 am

Time requested: 45 minutes

Disposition: Passed to second reading as amended

Motion to amend Directive B.7. to "The HRS SOC will expand the SOC to include (1) business sector representative (1) behavioral health expert who is not a current service provider and (1) individual taxpayer who currently pays Supportive Housing Services tax.": Moved by Ryan and seconded by Mapps. (Y-Ryan, Gonzalez, Mapps; N- Rubio, Wheeler)

Motion to amend the Ordinance to include new Directives A and B and change the original Directive A to Directive C: Moved by Wheeler and seconded by Mapps. (Y-5)

Passed to second reading as amended June 26, 2024 at 9:30 a.m.

Consent Agenda

547

[Direct staff to submit a proposal for the 2027 Sundance Film Festival](#) (Resolution)

Introduced by: Mayor Ted Wheeler; Commissioner Carmen Rubio

Bureau: Prosper Portland

Disposition: Referred to Commissioner of Finance and Administration

Item 547 was pulled from the Consent Agenda.

548

[Approve findings to authorize an exemption to the competitive bidding requirements and use of the alternative contracting method Construction Manager/General Contractor for fleet maintenance and headquarters repair for an estimated amount of \\$42,016,303](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 191795

Introduced by: Mayor Ted Wheeler

Bureau: Management and Finance; Facilities Services

Disposition: Passed to second reading

Passed to second reading June 26, 2024 at 9:30 a.m.

549

[Authorize Bureau of Environmental Services to acquire certain permanent and temporary property rights necessary for construction of the Carolina Trunk Sewer Rehabilitation through exercise of the City's eminent domain authority \(BES Project E11004\)](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 191796

Introduced by: Commissioner Mingus Mapps

Bureau: Environmental Services

Disposition: Passed to second reading

Passed to second reading June 26, 2024 at 9:30 a.m.

550

[Approve findings to authorize exemption to the competitive bidding requirements and authorize competitive solicitation and use of alternative contracting method of Best Value in connection with the West Lents Floodplain Restoration Project for estimated amount of \\$7,360,000](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 191782

Introduced by: Commissioner Mingus Mapps

Bureau: Environmental Services

Second reading agenda item 509.

Disposition: Passed

Votes: Commissioner Dan Ryan Yea

Commissioner Rene Gonzalez Yea

Commissioner Mingus Mapps Yea

Commissioner Carmen Rubio Yea

Mayor Ted Wheeler Yea

551

[Authorize grant and intergovernmental agreements related to the Community Watershed Stewardship Program up to \\$100,000 per fiscal year for five years beginning FY 2024-25](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 191783

Introduced by: Commissioner Mingus Mapps

Bureau: Environmental Services

Second reading agenda item 510.

Disposition: Passed

Votes: Commissioner Dan Ryan Yea

Commissioner Rene Gonzalez Yea

Commissioner Mingus Mapps Yea

Commissioner Carmen Rubio Yea

Mayor Ted Wheeler Yea

552

[Endorse findings and next steps identified in the Westside Multimodal Improvements Study lead by Oregon Department of Transportation and Metro to inform planning and implementation efforts](#) (Resolution)

Document number: 37666

Introduced by: Commissioner Mingus Mapps

Bureau: Transportation

Disposition: Adopted

Votes: Commissioner Dan Ryan Yea

Commissioner Rene Gonzalez Yea

Commissioner Mingus Mapps Yea

Commissioner Carmen Rubio Yea

Mayor Ted Wheeler Yea

553

[Authorize transfer of the Menlo Park Tank Property from the Water Bureau to the Housing Bureau for development as affordable housing](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 191784

Introduced by: Commissioner Mingus Mapps

Bureau: Water

Second reading agenda item 517.

Disposition: Passed

Votes: Commissioner Dan Ryan Yea

Commissioner Rene Gonzalez Yea

Commissioner Mingus Mapps Yea

Commissioner Carmen Rubio Yea

Mayor Ted Wheeler Yea

554

[Authorize Bureau of Planning and Sustainability Director to execute grant agreement for \\$400,000 with SOLVE for FY 2024-25](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 191785

Introduced by: Commissioner Carmen Rubio

Bureau: Planning and Sustainability (BPS)

Second reading agenda item 518.

Disposition: Passed

Votes: Commissioner Dan Ryan Yea

Commissioner Rene Gonzalez Yea

Commissioner Mingus Mapps Yea

Commissioner Carmen Rubio Yea

Mayor Ted Wheeler Yea

555

[Approve Council Minutes for May 2-30, 2024](#) (Report)

Document number: 555-2024

Introduced by: Auditor Simone Rede

Bureau: Auditor's Office; Council Clerk

Disposition: Approved

Votes: Commissioner Dan Ryan Yea

Commissioner Rene Gonzalez Yea

Commissioner Mingus Mapps Yea

Commissioner Carmen Rubio Yea

Mayor Ted Wheeler Yea

Regular Agenda

556

[Award contracts related to grantmaking management services for individual artists and arts organizations](#) (Report)

Document number: 556-2024

Introduced by: Mayor Ted Wheeler; Commissioner Dan Ryan

Bureau: Management and Finance; Revenue and Financial Services

Time requested: 10 minutes

Disposition: Accepted

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

Votes: Commissioner Dan Ryan Yea

Commissioner Rene Gonzalez Yea

Commissioner Mingus Mapps Yea

Commissioner Carmen Rubio Yea

Mayor Ted Wheeler Yea

557

[Amend Price Agreements with Interlaken, Inc., Titan Utilities and Iron Horse Excavation LLC, dba Oxbow Construction for \\$1,500,000 per agreement to provide additional construction services \(amend Price Agreements 31002237, 31002238 and 31002239\)](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 191786

Introduced by: Mayor Ted Wheeler

Bureau: Management and Finance; Revenue and Financial Services

Second reading agenda item 523.

Disposition: Passed

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

558

[Initiate foreclosure action on 1445 SE 174th Ave for the collection of delinquent City Liens placed against the property](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 191787

Introduced by: Mayor Ted Wheeler

Bureau: Management and Finance; Revenue Division

Second reading agenda item 526.

Disposition: Passed As Amended

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

559

[Amend NE Couch – Davis Street Local Improvement District boundary and reduce system development charge funding by \\$1 million in exchange for system development charge credits with no change to pending lien amounts \(C-10068\)](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 191800

Introduced by: Commissioner Mingus Mapps

Bureau: Transportation

Time requested: 10 minutes

Disposition: Passed to second reading

Passed to second reading June 26, 2024 at 9:30 a.m.

560

[Authorize Intergovernmental Agreement with the U.S. Forest Service to improve post-fire simulations of sediment delivery in the Bull Run Watershed based on field observations following the 2023 Camp Creek Fire for \\$180,223](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 191788

Introduced by: Commissioner Mingus Mapps

Bureau: Water

Second reading agenda item 516.

Disposition: Passed

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

561

[Authorize competitive solicitation in support of the Portland Clean Energy Community Benefits Fund's Climate Investment Plan Strategic Program 10: Community-Based Organization Capacity Building Program not to exceed \\$2,500,000 over five years](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 191789

Introduced by: Commissioner Carmen Rubio

Bureau: Planning and Sustainability (BPS)

Second reading agenda item 498.

Disposition: Passed

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

Portland City Council Meeting Speaker List

June 20, 2024 - 9:30 a.m.

| Name | Title | Agenda Item |
|---------------------|--|-------------|
| Ted Wheeler | Mayor | |
| Rebecca Dobert | Acting Council Clerk | |
| Dan Ryan | Commissioner | |
| Rene Gonzalez | Commissioner | |
| Mingus Mapps | Commissioner | |
| Carmen Rubio | Commissioner | |
| Naomi Sheffield | Senior Deputy City Attorney | |
| Carolyn Brunett | (Communications) | 541 |
| Melissa Kostelecky | (Communications) | 543 |
| Skyler Bocker-Knapp | Senior Policy Advisor | 546 |
| Sara Morrissey | Mayor's Deputy Chief of Staff | 546 |
| Antoinette Payne | Finance Director, Joint Office of Homeless Services | 546 |
| Dan Field | Director of Joint Office of Homeless Services | 546 |
| Anna Plumb | Deputy Director, Joint Office of Homeless Services | 546 |
| Tony Garcia | Chief Deputy City Attorney | 546 |
| Robert Taylor | City Attorney | 546 |
| John DiLorenzo | (Testimony) | 546 |
| Tiana Tozer | (Testimony) | 546 |
| Cody Hermeling | (Testimony) | 546 |
| Angela Todd | (Testimony) | 546 |
| Loretta Guzman | (Testimony) | 546 |
| Steve Jackson | (Testimony) | 546 |
| Chris Kleronomos | (Testimony) | 546 |
| Daniel DeMelo | (Testimony) | 546 |
| Tiffany Hammer | (Testimony) | 546 |
| Ted Pyle | (Testimony) | 546 |
| Jess Cline | Procurement Manager | 556 |
| Jeff Hawthorne | Analyst, City Arts Program | 556 |
| Andrew Aebi | LID Administrator & Project Manager, Portland Bureau of Transportation | 559 |
| Matt Kelly | Project Manager, Portland Bureau of Transportation | 559 |

Portland City Council Meeting Closed Caption File

June 20, 2024 – 9:30 a.m.

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

Speaker: All right, why don't we go ahead and get started, rebecca. Good morning, everybody. This is the June 20 at 2024. Morning session of the Portland City Council. Good morning, rebecca.

Speaker: Please call the role. Good morning, Ryan. Here. Gonzalez. Maps. Here. Rubio here, Wheeler. Well, now here from legal counsel on the rules of order. Good morning.

Speaker: Good morning and welcome to the Portland City Council to testify before council, in person or virtually. You must sign up in advance on the council agenda at [Portland.gov/council/agenda](https://portland.gov/council/agenda). Information on engaging with council can be found on the council clerk's web page. Individuals may testify for three minutes unless the presiding officer states otherwise. Your microphone will be muted when your time is over. The presiding officer preserves order disruptive conduct such as shouting, refusing to conclude your testimony when your time is up, or interrupting others testimony or council deliberations will not be allowed. If you cause a disruption, a warning will be given. Further disruption will result in ejection from the meeting. Anyone who fails to leave once ejected is subject to arrest for trespass. Additional counsel may take a short recess and reconvene virtually. Your testimony should address the matter being considered when testifying, state your name for the record. Your address is not necessary. If you were a lobbyist, identify the

organization you represent. Virtual testifiers should unmute themselves when the council clerk calls your name. Thank you.

Speaker: All right. Thank you. First up is communications 541 request of carolyn brunet to address council regarding two proposed ideas related to graffiti. Good morning. Welcome. Thanks for being here.

Speaker: Good morning everyone. Happy summer. Yes I'm here to propose two solutions for dealing with our graffiti problem, first I want to tell you about a product called vandal guard. Vandal guard is a clear, durable coating that repels graffiti. Similar products are offered by other manufacturers such as sherman williams. It protects outdoor surfaces from defacement by tagging. Once applied, it discourages further vandalism because it allows graffiti to be quickly washed off using a citrus based cleaner and water. So often graffiti is left up for weeks or months. With our severe northwest weather conditions making cleanup and repainting even more challenging. Once covered up, graffiti is soon replaced by more tags. And because colors are often hard to match, tags are often covered with paint that is so mismatched it becomes an eyesore itself. Vandal guard can be used to protect one of our city's greatest assets. Its many beautiful murals, which sadly have been defaced, deface at an alarming rate. It can also be applied to traffic signs, outdoor public structures and other difficult to cover surfaces. Vandal guard is invisible and does not alter the color of the coated surface. It's a much cheaper alternative to the cost of repainting or replacing outdoor surfaces and signs. Vandals claims it can last up to five years and withstand many washings. My request is that the city of Portland graffiti program, in cooperation with metro's paint program, purchase vandal guard or a similar product in bulk at wholesale cost using the Oregon cannabis tax revenue program and make it available to private parties and organizations at minimal cost or through community grant support

programs. My second proposal is to create a program, also paid for by the cannabis tax revenue program, that employs unhoused individuals, peoples, people in drug recovery, or anyone else needing employment to apply this protective anti-graffiti coating to murals and all other appropriate surfaces in our public spaces. This activity can be performed under the supervision of graffiti removal experts already under contract to local governments or other program managers. Knowledgeable in graffiti abatement. The Oregon cannabis tax revenue program was designed to help fund rehabilitation and recovery programs. This would be an ideal use of those funds. In conclusion, making anti-graffiti protective coatings like vandal guard available at low cost to the public and employing unhoused and recovering individuals to apply it under the supervision of city contractors, all funded by the Oregon cannabis tax revenue program will provide a low cost means of preserving the appearance of our beautiful city, discourage further graffiti, and perform a valuable social service by creating meaningful employment for those in need. Thank you folks. I submitted this to the public record and I sent it to all of you individually and we appreciate it.

Speaker: And commissioner Mapps has a comment.

Speaker: Sure, miss burnett, I just want to thank you for, coming in today and offering these important insights. We're very much on the same page, on this one, i'll tell you over at pbot, we've been, applying anti-graffiti coatings since 2016 for new signs, frankly, I'm not sure the degree that we've gone back to, quote the old signs, I don't, over in rac, I believe rac has been requiring new murals to, to get graffiti coating, but I don't know that for sure, but I can assure you at least in the public sector side, or at least the transportation side, we've been doing this, it's definitely a good practice. And I think a standard practice now, also important to recognize that anti-graffiti coating tends to only go so far in this space. So it helps.

But it's not a perfect solution. But it's one we're implementing. And I love the idea of maybe going back and trying to retro coat some of our old signage and I'll, direct my teams to go to, take a look at that and at least let me know where we're at.

Speaker: Thank you so much.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Appreciate your time. Next individual please item 542 request of Portland advocates for lead free drinking water to address council regarding water bureau failure to protect public public health.

Speaker: They've canceled their request, next individual 543 request of christopher hale to address council regarding lack of follow through on proposed infrastructure for pedestrian and cyclist safety.

Speaker: Good morning. My name is melissa kostelecky. I'm here in place of christopher hale, who couldn't make it today, mayor Wheeler, commissioners, thank you for your time. I'm a parent of two young children, a graduate student at psu studying transport nation, and a volunteer transportation ambassador for pbot. Commissioner Ryan, a few weeks ago, you asked a bike advocate who was here testifying how Portland's neighborhood greenways network fares as bike infrastructure. And I'd like to add my \$0.02. In general, I like and use the greenways. I appreciate having calm low traffic, low traffic streets to travel, especially when I have my kids on the back of the bike. I find greenways far safer than streets where nothing separates me and my kids from fast moving traffic other than a strip of paint, the frequent diverters and other traffic calming infrastructure are key to keeping them safe. So I'm a big fan of the greenways, but there are a few ways in which they fall short. The network of greenways is often hidden away, even to those of us traveling by bike. Wayfinding is not always obvious, and because of their nature as low traffic streets, those traveling by car often don't know the greenways

even exist, making it less likely they'll give biking a try. Routes along the greenways are also often indirect and require a lot of zigzagging back and forth. There's also a lost opportunity for the city. Neighborhood greenways often pull bike commuters away from commercial areas where we would otherwise be exposed to businesses, and be stopping in to spend some of that. Roughly \$12,000 a year. We save by not traveling by car. There are a few exceptions here. On my daily commute from woodstock to psu, I travel along the clinton greenway, where I pass by local small businesses that I would never have found by traveling in a car. These have become some of my favorite places to eat, drink and shop. Some of the places on my route where I've become a regular are clinton street coffee house, my favorite brunch spot, which is broder cafe pinwheels, where I get nearly all of my kids clothes, and the ice cream shop 50 licks, where my kids bug me to stop nearly every time we ride by. I even found a physical therapist after biking past a free coffee table that the clinic's owner had set up one morning in the plaza at clinton and 26th. But clinton is an outlier. The greenways are a missed opportunity because most run through residential areas, not business districts. Those of us on bike do spend money at local businesses. Studies show that bike commuters tend to spend less per visit, but make more visits and end up spending more overall than drivers. At least once a week, I find myself using the 40 greenway, but there are so few businesses along the nearly four miles that I travel that I can't remember a time I've ever stopped by for some food, a drink, or to shop along the way. We can and should expand the greenways, improve crossings that intersect with high speed roads, and improve wayfinding. But we can't rely on neighborhood greenways alone. If we want cleaner air, safer streets, less congestion, happier, healthier Portlanders, and more prosperous businesses, we need to blanket the city with bike routes that also include protected lanes on major routes and through business

districts. Streets like sandy are a great place to start given the direct route between large swaths of northeast Portland and downtown. The high multifamily and mixed use development, and high population density. In some. I ask that you consider the greenway as a place to start, but build out the network of bike infrastructure to include protected bike lanes on major streets to allow those of us on bike to spend our money on Portland's businesses as well. Thank you for your time.

Speaker: Thank you for your testimony. Appreciate it. Thank you. Next individual please.

Speaker: Rebecca 544 request of kristin baker to address council regarding postponing statue replacement.

Speaker: Are they online? No.

Speaker: Kristen appears not to be with us.

Speaker: All right. Very good. We will move on then to the consent agenda, I would like you to read five, four, seven.

Speaker: Mister mayor. There's one more communications slot. Four. Five. Four.

Speaker: Five. Yes. Thank you.

Speaker: Request of tyler hardy to address council regarding urban alchemy. Good morning. Tyler also appears not to be.

Speaker: All right, so we're obviously ahead of ourselves here. So let's move to the consent agenda. I'd like to pull item five, four seven back to my office. Have any other items been pulled from the consent agenda?

Speaker: No other items are pulled on the consent agenda.

Speaker: Ryan I Gonzalez, I maps, I yea. Rubio I Wheeler I the consent agenda is adopted. I will go to the regular agenda item 557. A second reading.

Speaker: Amend price agreements with interlochen inc, titan utilities and ironhorse excavation llc, dba oxbow construction for \$1,500,000 per agreement to provide additional construction services is any further discussion on this item?

Speaker: This is an item that's already been heard. We've taken public testimony. Please call the roll. Ryan hi, Gonzalez.

Speaker: Hi. Maps

Speaker: I want to thank the mayor's team for their help, on this particular project, you know, the funds that flow through this will allow, bts to improve and, fix things like our pump stations and deal with sewer breaks. It's very important. Bread and butter. Government stuff. Thank you, mr. Mayor. I vote I Rubio I Wheeler.

Speaker: I want to thank commissioner Mapps right back at you. Thanks to you and your team and all the folks who work hard in our utility bureaus. Often thankless work, most of the public doesn't recognize the good work they do until something goes wrong. This is true. And passing this ordinance is one of the things that we will do to ensure that that never happens. We would like them to continue in their anonymity. We'll be there doing the great work that they do, the amend ordinance is adopted five, five, eight. Also, a second reading, initiate foreclosure action on 1445 southeast 174th ave for the collection of delinquent city liens placed against the property. Second reading any further discussion? Seeing none, please call the roll.

Speaker: Ryan Gonzalez. Hi maps I Rubio Wheeler I the ordinance is adopted 560a second reading authorize intergovernmental agreement with the us forest service to improve post-fire simulations of sediment delivery in the bull run watershed, based on field observations following the 2023 camp fire for \$180,223 commissioner Mapps, did you have your hand up, not intentionally, I apologize on this item.

Speaker: Please call the roll.

Speaker: Ryan. Hi, Gonzalez. Hi. Maps it looks like this thing is going to pass. I want to thank my colleagues for that. You know, this is some very important basic scientific research that will help us understand how forest fires impact or have the potential to impact our drinking water supply, by virtue of doing this research, we can take important steps towards securing a safe and clean drinking water supply for centuries to come. Which is why I vote yea yea. Rubio a Wheeler.

Speaker: All right.

Speaker: The ordinance is adopted. 561. A second reading authorization authorize competitive solicitation in support of the Portland clean energy community benefit fund's climate investment plan.

Speaker: Strategic program ten community based organization capacity building program not to exceed \$2,500,000 over five years.

Speaker: Any further discussion on this item? Seeing none, please call the roll.

Speaker: Ryan. Yeah. Thank you. Commissioner Rubio, for bringing this forward. I'm looking forward to seeing how it evolves and especially seeing how diverse revenue streams emerge for the organizations we're investing in. I vote yea gonzales, i, I yea. Rubio I'm excited to see this launch, and I know it will be a great benefit to pcef grantees and increase our increase our climate impacts, also want to say thank you to sam and angela for their great work, and I look forward to hearing back on their progress, I vote aye.

Speaker: Wheeler, I vote I the ordinance is adopted.

Speaker: It is now 9:45 a.m. We'll go to the first time certain item, please. Item number five for six. This is a first reading of a nonemergency ordinance authorized three year homelessness response system intergovernmental agreement with Multnomah County colleagues, we know that the homelessness crisis is the number

one issue facing the city of Portland. It is the number one issue from the perspective of our residents. We hear it through constituent emails, public meetings, conversations with business owners, and surveys. We also hear it from the outreach staff, first responders, public health workers and others who indirectly work with these or directly work with these most vulnerable populations. I want Portlanders to know your elected leaders. Do understand the gravity of the situation on our streets. This is why today council is hearing the homeless response system intergovernmental agreement with Multnomah County. This critical iga represents a pivotal step in our collective response to homelessness. From the beginning, I've been clear in my work as mayor of Portland that it was necessary for any homelessness response to be guided by clear and measurable outcomes, informed by meaningful data, and address the broad range of issues facing those who are living unsheltered on our streets. I'm happy to share that for the first time, this plan provides a unified strategy that not only sets specific, achievable goals, but also covers critical areas. Previously neglected, including behavioral health, a first in the response to homelessness. What distinguishes this plan are its clear, quantifiable objectives and policy goals aimed at reducing both unsheltered homelessness as well as homelessness at large. These goals are supported by precise timelines and designated agencies and partners, ensuring accountability and collaboration across the board. Moreover, this plan underscores a commitment to and to enhancing data systems as well as transparent, enabling us to monitor progress effectively to regain the public's trust. It emphasizes eases the coordination and linking of care systems, from shelter and behavioral health beds to housing vouchers and health care investments, ensuring a more complete support network for vulnerable individuals. I'll now welcome sarah morrissey, my deputy chief of staff, and skylar knapp, my senior policy adviser, to give us a

presentation on this item. I also want to thank dan field, director of the joint office of homeless services, for being here today. To answer specific questions related to the joint office of homeless services. Good morning again.

Speaker: Good morning, so good morning, commissioners. Mayor, we are here to present an overview of the homelessness response system intergovernmental agreement to you all today. So let's go to the next slide. So we will start with providing an overview of the iga, listing out some of the primary achievements that we have will go through the key components within the document itself. And then we will do a short compare and contrast versus the existing iga that we have currently in place with Multnomah County on the joint office of homeless services. And we will close with a quick overview of the budget related to this iga as well. Next slide. So the overview begins back in June of 2023 when we presented the 17th amendment of the existing iga to council. We voted. We provided some amendments to do a one year amendment to the existing contract to really work in partnership with the county and put together a different construct of an iga that had better data, clear goals, different participation from the city. And so we went into the negotiations with that as our lens, we began with a group of we hired facilitators and partnership with the county. The chair's office and the mayor's office led the process. We worked really closely. We met every other week. We had multiple work sessions with you all as well, where we had joint work sessions with the county and the city to go over the work that we were doing. Updates on the joint office work, including the shelter strategy plan, and then the development of the homelessness response system and action plan. So this iga replaces the existing joint office, iga between the county and the city. It is a three year agreement. So from July 1st, 2024 to June 30th, 2027, and it establishes the homelessness response system, which has an action plan, which has a list of

deliverables and is more expansive than just the joint office. It includes behavioral health, it includes affordable housing, and it's really looking at the continuum of homelessness and how we can work to solve this for the community. The other piece is that we really wanted to have actionable items in there. So clear goals and metrics we wanted to be able to monitor with quarterly updates, public dashboards, and additionally really change the governance structure of this work. Next slide. So some of the achievements that this iga includes. So we do have shared goals and outcomes. So one of the goals and we presented this to the council in one of the work sessions with the county back in December of 2023. So focused on helping 2699 unsheltered people get off the street and into housing or shelter with within this time period of the iga adding 1000 shelter beds by December 31st, 2025, we set up a new governance structure, which includes a steering and oversight committee, which has two. It has the mayor and a commissioner from the city. From the county. It has the chair and a representative from their commission and then a representative from east Multnomah County. Whether it's a jurisdiction or a city, we also work to have an implementation subcommittee. So this includes the city administrator for the city of Portland, the deputy city administrator for public safety, fb, as well as the Portland solutions director and a few other groups of the city in partnership with the county, who has behavioral health on that committee. The director of the joint office and other components that are really working to implement these different projects. And it includes representatives from the state external partners. And it's a really comprehensive group. We've met twice to go over the wrap and really working through the goals and making sure everyone is clear on what the deliverables deliverables are and who is accountable to deliver what on which timeline. We also have a community advisory subcommittee. This is a group of about 14 members,

and they have lived experience, business sector, nonprofit sector. And it's a very wide range that is outlined within the iga. And then in terms of accountability, because we heard from council, this was a really critical component to include in the iga. We included the by name list, which is how we got the number for 2699. We have a shelter bed availability tool, which we are hoping to pilot. The joint office is hoping to pilot this fall. A performance dashboard with data and metrics, a public budget dashboard showing where all these investments are and how they have been used. And then also, like I said, the action plan that has dates and responsible parties on all of the deliverables. Next slide please.

Speaker: Thanks, sarah, mayor and commissioners, some of the key components, to this plan and in this iga, as sarah has laid out, are key terms that are clear, and actionable. All we heard from council, a desire for clarity, compared to the last extension of the iga with the joint office of homeless services. So we made sure that there are clear key terms and definitions that everyone can understand when reading through this agreement, it also has a clear wind down and termination agreement. Previously, both parties would have had to agree there was a financial penalty determination. There was also mandatory mediation that was required. Now either the city or the county could terminate the agreement. If it's not serving the purposes of the council or the commission, and it has clearly delineated, program and process for that to occur that will not require any financial penalty or a mediation process, it also clearly delineates jurisdictional roles and responsibilities for each party and what they're responsible for and how the funding flows to each party and what they're using it on. It also establishes, as sarah mentioned, the homelessness response system. And through that homelessness response action plan, we have up to 100 action items that are clear goals with strategies each one will require its own work plan. We've already started

on many of these goals, to actually meet the timeline. That's associated, December of next year, 2025, for a lot of these goals to be realized, some within the next three months, and some have already been actually accomplished. So you can see that online. We'll have that performance dashboard that Sarah mentioned. Also, the governance structure that Sarah outlined. So the steering and oversight committee and then the implementation subcommittee and then the community advisory subcommittee. So those three committees will be able to govern, the budget process, the implementation of the different programs, really follow along with the process and the goals that we're looking to accomplish throughout the next year and a half. It also monitors, and establishes processes for monitoring a lot of these goals and action items. So an annual review, which will really correspond with a lot of the budgeting and implementation processes for the council and the commission on, what's working, what's not, should we pivot? Do we need to change, do we need to double down with funding on a specific program because it is working well, stuff like that, annual program plans as well on performance and spending and making sure we're hitting those metrics of getting money out the door and funding the right programs, getting money in the hands of contractors and providers and whoever we're using to accomplish this work. We it will also contain those performance and public budget dashboards that Sarah mentioned. So there's publicly facing dashboards we've heard from you all from the county commission, from a lot of stakeholders, from the public, repeatedly a desire for transparency and a desire to be able to follow along with a lot of these goals, to see what we're accomplishing, what we're not. Why we aren't accomplishing those goals, or why we've actually exceeded them. And everyone will be able to follow along with that process online. Next slide please. We've set up kind of a compare and contrast slide. Apologies for all the text, but from the existing joint office iga

between the city and the county and the proposed iga that you'll be voting on today. So a few of these aspects are, we heard clearly that there were vague terms, not measurable goals and metrics in the existing iga and council's desire for those clear action items, with those responsible parties, with those clear dates, associated with the plan, the termination clause that I mentioned, was unacceptable to the council, and we've negotiated with the county for clear termination terms and a process by which to accomplish that termination, there was no shared governance structure. The city did not feel like it had enough oversight or clarity about its role besides funding the joint office. And so we've established an entirely new governance structure that will allow the city to participate at every step of the process. As sarah mentioned, representatives on the community advisory subcommittee on the implementation subcommittee, as well as obviously, the steering and oversight committee, reviewing all the programmatic details as well as the overarching budget and funding strategies, there was also no process for implementation other than the joint office. And so the joint office was tasked with accomplishing quite a few, deliverables that they didn't necessarily control, and for that reason, we've included healthshare, the and continuum coordinated care organization. Sorry, the coordinated care organizations within the county, as well as trillium and our behavioral health department within the county, the we will also have mike myers, who will be representing some of our first responders on this committee. So really trying to create a comprehensive implementation subcommittee that will have all that representation and hold different jurisdictions and programs and bodies accountable in a way that they haven't been before for our homelessness response system and for implementation of these solutions, there were not specific action items and of clear lack of data or public facing, transparent kind of communication, whether it's a dashboard or something else.

And so we've clearly established that in our new iga, as you've all seen, creating that holistic strategy that will be public facing for every single aspect of this plan, there will be a lot of information and a lot of details for folks to dig into and review and follow along. And there was also no description of funds or budget reporting. And so now we sarah's going to go over, how different money is flowing. And then you'll be able to review that online. And the public will be able to review that online throughout the course of a year, not just at the budget processes once a year. So we also were asked by the city commission, to remove joint from the joint office of homeless services. Name. It is a county department and we wanted to reflect that. And so that is also in the iga next slide please. Okay.

Speaker: Great. So this is just a slide that goes over the two years this upcoming fiscal year. So 2425. That'll start July 1st. And then what the city is contributing within this structure. And then what the next fiscal year for 2526. So starting July 1st 2025. So this year to the joint office and this is it outlined what this funding is going towards in exhibit two of the contract. The city is allocating 25,186,923 of ongoing funding to the program. It is primarily funding adult emergency shelter. So approximately 20 million in terms of cost for that outreach and engagement and then transitional and permanent supportive housing. The details on the breakdowns within those program offers can be found in exhibit two, but like I said, it's primarily congregate shelter and outreach. That's the 25 million, which is primarily general fund with a little bit of recreation, cannabis tax. The second piece in the city's budget that is very closely tied to the work, on homelessness, is the funding of alternative shelters. So the safe rest village program and the temporary alternative shelter program sites. So that's currently funded with a mix of general fund, one time arpa dollars, state of Oregon, which is through an Oregon all in grant and then metro supportive housing service tax, which we received from

Multnomah County. So the operational program that is being funded through those different sources in the city budget. So that was in the mayor's proposed, adopted, and so those are the two different buckets in terms of shelter type that the city is funding this fiscal year, upcoming for next year, as outlined in the contract for 2526, the city is allocating 31 million to Multnomah County. The joint office will be providing a detailed breakdown similar to what's in exhibit two for this year. On how those funds will be used, and then the cost for the temporary the alternative shelters with safe rest villages and tasks will be transferred. Both the management of those sites and the funding liability for those sites goes to the county. And those could be funded with shs dollars, with a portion of the city's allocation. It's really going to come through the steering and oversight committee, but will be reflected in the chair's budget. And that's what an updated exhibit two would include for next year. On how those dollars are going in. But the city will not be contributing. The floor is really 31 million, so I know it's I just wanted to make sure that was clear. And I was going to take any questions.

Speaker: Yeah. Let me jump in here and take a question. This has been one of the areas in this agreement where I've sought some clarity. So historically, the dollars that the city gives over to the joint office has, in practice, been spent on congregate shelter, so moving forward, forward first. And, and I recognize we've got a three year contract. The first year is kind of a transitional year, second and third year where do those dollars go? Does the city get to, have any influence over? Well, let me put it this way. It was my understanding the first year of the contract, the city's dollars go to support congregate shelter. Second and third year, they go to support, kind of the baseline funding for tasks and, for tasks and rv sites, it seems like you're saying something different today.

Speaker: No, I'm saying the same thing. I'm saying. So the 31 million that will go to the county for next year, not this fiscal year. We have made it very clear to the county that our preference is that that fund the operational costs of alternative shelters like tass and sb, the cost to operate those is above 31 million. So they will have to supplement that with shs or other revenue sources that that is a that is in the contract itself that the city's preference is to use the funding on shelters, emergency shelter specifically, as well as, outreach. And so the other piece is that the homelessness response system, through the soq, there's an annual review process. So the whole group will get together. And we kept it broad because we want the funding to go to where the need is. And so we didn't want to be prescriptive because in three years there's a decision at the soq to move away from alternative shelters and use the majority of that money into rental vouchers. That could be a decision that the soq make and recommend to the whole plan. So that's a little different in terms of the way it's currently structured. But the 31 million, we have been clear that our preference would be that it goes towards alternative shelters that cost that we're covering right now in the congregate would also have to be covered by the county through shs dollars, because ours would be going to alternative shelters.

Speaker: Is preference the same thing as an earmark? Like if I were if in the end in this, it's a conversation that, you know, if I'm around, i'll definitely have with the county. I'm going to sit down, two years from now with the county and say, where did the city's dollars go? And let's talk about accountability measures. I think one of the ways in which I've been trying to get to accountability is for there to be a clear understanding of where the city's dollar, which funds, which programs the city's dollars are going to, I will tell you, I've been thinking about my portfolio. You know, infrastructure gets a lot of igas. It is extraordinary. If not, I don't think we ever just

hand over \$30 million to another government agency without having clearly specifying where those dollars are getting spent. We essentially kind of earmark them for particular purpose. And in this space, I've I'm still not quite clear if we have clear understanding for years two and three in terms of where our dollars go, are they going to safe rest villages and test sites or, or is that too strong of a language, given what, is in the contract?

Speaker: Yeah, sure. Thanks, commissioner. So for years two and three, I think what we have laid out is, I would say most likely will go to safe rest villages and test sites, for example, if all those leases, are terminated for some reason, we no longer have those sites for any other reason, they're no longer the preference of the community. And the soq decides we actually need to fund something else. There's a little bit of wiggle room there, basically, for the soq to determine. This is how we're going to use those dollars. However, unlike previous years, as you mentioned, we now have a breakdown of exactly what our dollars are being spent on, and that will continue through that public dashboard process. So all of those meetings between the soq and the implementation subcommittee and the community advisory subcommittee as well, will have clearly delineated funds basically from each jurisdiction, from each funding bucket, if you will, to determine to show where that money is going to be spent. And so we'll have that clarity of where it has been spent if we want to change that. That's a discussion for the soq. But we have laid out the groundwork to say we would like these, this 31 million, at least for the foreseeable future, to go to the safe rest villages and task sites. We also know that things happen. And so we don't necessarily want to say it has to go there and then we don't. We no longer have those alternative shelters in existence for whatever reason. Or maybe we have three of the nine. And so we need to scale down kind of our funding levels and use some of that money for something else. So we wanted

to leave a little bit of room for the steering and oversight committee to do what they're tasked with doing, which is to determine where that funding is going to go and, and how we're going to be using it. And the most effective way possible, okay. This is a little bit different from my understanding of where we're at, so I'm just going to share that with you in real time. And the arrangement that we seem to have settled on here is a little bit. I'm not entirely sold. You know, one of the things I want to do as a city commissioner is to be able to turn to my constituents and say, hey, when we hand out these dollars over to the joint office, this is what it's going to be spent on. And on top of that, I can give you some assurances that the programs that we're going to spend spend them on work fairly effectively. And I think, you know, thanks to the mayor's leadership and commissioner Ryan's leadership, we've stood up this pilot project with task sites and safe rest villages. They seem to be effective. They get people off the street after about three months, stabilized, you know, being stabilized in this space, we're finding that people are ready to move on to supportive housing, I am very comfortable investing in that system. And frankly, I'm I doubt that we're going to solve homelessness in the next three years. So I suspect there's going to be a need for at least those 665 beds. And if those are just the last 65, you know, if we only if two years, three years from now, we discover we only need 665 beds. We can go down and have the, the task sites and the safe rest villages be the sort of last shelter that we have there. Like, we all know that that's not going to be the situation that we're in, so I those are my concerns at this moment. But thank you for, thank you for clarifying all of that, commissioner Ryan.

Speaker: Yeah, thank you, mayor, good to see you. Both. Skye and Sarah and I have a lot of empathy for the hard work you've been doing as the office that was in your seat a couple of years ago. It. Since we're on the budget, I wanted to level set where we are with that today, I think one of my frustrations when I was in your role

is where we adapt to current reality, both in terms of the conditions on the street and in terms of the budget. So when we started this right in 2016, I think it was, there was no largesse, money coming from taxpayers like we have with shs in the city was the big donor, if you will. That got us into it. So we have a route that was budget focused today. How much money is going to the county from shs in one year's time?

Speaker: And I would request that dan field, or someone who runs that programing could probably give that detailed answer.

Speaker: Dan and it seems like a relevant question since we're talking about budget, correct?

Speaker: Dan. The question was how much funding from shs is going to Multnomah County, mr. Mayor, commissioner Ryan, can i, can I piggyback on your question and ask just a it's can they answer it? I think it's part of the same thing. So, if we have the county's budget experts over here, in addition to hearing, the answer to commissioner Ryan's question, I'd be interested to know the percentage, you know, I think the county the city spends over 25 million, 30 million over to the joint office. What percent of the city's how much, what percentage of the joint office is the city funding? But certainly answer mr. Question. Mr. Ryan's question first, and if you have a chance, just very quickly to know if it's like 90, 10, 2, that'd be helpful.

Speaker: So good morning. For the record, my name is antoinette payne. I'm the finance director for the joint office of homeless services. To answer commissioner Ryan's question for next year, it's forecasted for shs that we will receive 149 million of ongoing funding, as well as we have some one time only carryover that we are expected to carry over to fy 24 of about \$148 million. So in totality, our shs budget for next year is about \$304 million.

Speaker: And that does not include any of the city's money. No. Okay. Thanks.

Speaker: And to your questioner, commissioner Mapps, so for next year, our shs budget is about 75% of our overall ball joint office budget. So the city is probably somewhere maybe less than 10% of the overall budget.

Speaker: Thank you. That's very helpful. Great.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Appreciate it. Thanks. How just how much time?

Speaker: I think it's with you all in the negotiations. How much time then did we spend on these budget issues?

Speaker: No, I mean, we talked about budget frequently, we also talked about the change in bringing shs as a funding source. We talked back into how the city and the county operated with shelter management prior to the joint office being established, we really pushed on making sure the budget dashboards and the clarity around how the funding would be used and quarterly reporting. That was a very long conversation as well, but I do think because of the position that the city was in prior to going into, the negotiation, we did believe that the city had a financial contribution to commit towards shelter services. And whether it's to the alternative shelter sites, so that is we talked about it probably every meeting. I would say, and just in differing ways at the hopefully there's also a lot of dialog about the fact that these practices were getting better results than other things.

Speaker: We were spending money on in terms of shelters. So was that lifted as something we must contribute to, not not the city, but the big we because that's what the money's coming from. Shs through taxpayers.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: So yes, that was definitely part of the discussion, commissioner. And I would say additionally also a large discussion of, what we're seeing on the ground if we offer an unsheltered individual, a panoply of options, we are often seeing folks

who are interested in alternative shelter sites. And I think that was something that we really wanted to make sure was continued to be funded to commissioner Mapps point, we're just seeing those results on the ground right now that people want to be in those sites. And for a lot of reasons and the success that you mentioned as well, we also saw substantial investment in those sites from the county through those shs funds as well in the last year. So we're really appreciative of that and wouldn't have been able to stand up nearly so many without those investments.

Speaker: Clarify that was for services that we promised to those that would come into the shelters. Yes. Okay. It's great to know that what we, i'll just say what what I was really involved with in 2021 to not a lot of fanfare in both at the county nor at in the neighborhoods is actually getting the results and the proof points that we need. So now that it can be, operationalized in the long term and no matter who's running it and where we end, the money that the taxpayers are providing can go towards those practices. Right yes.

Speaker: Commissioner Gonzalez just a couple of things. Level set where we're at right now. Is there, has there been any funding this last year or projected in the next year, from the joint office for either Portland street response or chat outreach for homeless services? No, no, no, these are just for the record, substantial funds the city of Portland is spending on homeless outreach in various degrees that were footing the bill or going to get other funding sources outside of the joint office, are you familiar with the joint office in their support of the city of gresham outreach? Just curious, what you know about how funds flow to the city of gresham?

Speaker: Oh, i, I know about the program, and I know how, how how it interacts with the joint office and their staff, I believe they receive some financial support, but I don't know the specific numbers.

Speaker: Skyler, that might be an appropriate question for the joint office. Dan do you have the answer to that question?

Speaker: And I'll ask a follow up. Dan can come on up. It's a compound question here. Just trying to understand what clackamas county is now doing with their cities and their jurisdiction in terms of the, the new funds that are flowing directly to city outreach in those areas. So really, it's trying to put in context, you know, we're somewhat unique in that we're contributing to the county for, homeless outreach and looking at what other cities are doing with respect to their counties and what types of programs those counties are supporting at the city level.

Speaker: Good morning. I'm Dan Field, director of the joint office of homeless services. Good to be here with you today. I had some prepared remarks, but we'll jump right into questions. We have a really strong partnership with the city of Gresham and in the coming fiscal year, we'll, share with them just under \$1 million, directly to the city to fund some of their outreach and navigation efforts, city of Gresham, like city of Portland, also benefits from the larger investments that the county makes in terms of, rental vouchers, eviction prevention and some of the other investments we've made in permanent supportive housing and in fact, in shelter, where, for example, city of Gresham outreach workers are referring to, county supported shelters like Bybee Lakes. So they benefit from the larger system. But there are pieces of the system that they are running themselves that we fund through QSS\$

Speaker: And those are it sounds like that's outreach workers. What are the other examples in Gresham, mainly it's outreach. It's a couple of employees, really, just a handful of employees who make contact, do the outreach and then help navigate people into shelter or into permanent housing.

Speaker: Got it. And, you know, there was recently announced and I recognize this is in your jurisdiction, but just would appreciate your feedback is the best. You understand it. What clackamas county is doing with some of the cities and towns in their jurisdiction, how you know, how money is flowing from clackamas county to those towns and cities, and for what purposes could I could I suggest we finish the presentation?

Speaker: It's a good question. And I do want to hear the answer, but it's are you done with your presentation? Yeah. Okay. Great. Go ahead. I'm not super familiar with that. My understanding just, for those who aren't familiar, I believe they gave a series of small grants, they have a large number of cities in the county. We only have five. And we're in deep partnership with the two largest city of Portland. City of gresham. And we have an emerging partnership with the three smaller cities in in Multnomah County. I guess there's actually six if you include. Yeah, so my understanding is they gave grants to some of their smaller cities, and that was a way for them to, share those shs dollars, with the cities directly and allow them to, to do some targeted local investments. I'm not sure beyond that, that's on top of more traditional investments that the county is making, primarily in support of housing.

Speaker: Got it. Well, and it you know, it's fully recognizing we have a unique history in the city of Portland here with the joint office and homelessness. And i, I think one of the fundamental philosophical questions is this, in fact, the right model in a shs world, right, that we put in place a program that was innovative at the time to try and solve a complex problem, but we have a whole new source of funds that are now flowing into communities. And, and whether the city should in fact be sending, you know, that's sort of the, the bigger picture I'm trying to get at, I guess a question for skyler and sarah is, you know, you look back at the last year, since we

just extended this agreement, I think, you know, the city run test sites and safe rest villages are successes in many respects. We're cleaning up the city in a much more aggressive way. And, you know, I think that's showing some progress on the streets from your vantage point. Like, what are the big achievements, the joint office and homelessness in the last year? And is the unsheltered problem getting better, or is the homeless problem getting better, over the last 12 months worse? The same, yeah. So I think it depends which aspect you look at, are there more individuals who are unsheltered on the streets? I think probably, yes. The numbers would bear that out, the inflow is definitely something that we've seen, especially after the pandemic, folks who lost jobs and could not pay rent, folks who were evicted, and so there's been an incredible amount of work and I would say one of the successes is the prevention strategy that's happened, connecting people who are seeking legal representation, free kind of paralegal assistance. And when they seek that out, they're immediately connected with potential opportunities for rental vouchers or a subsidy so they don't lose that home so they don't become unsheltered. So I would say the prevention strategy is something that I've seen really become more robust, especially with arpa funding. There was an influx of available funding for a lot of that work, and I think the joint office has gotten that money out the door very quickly, even when, through Oregon, all in those vouchers and then some prevention money that came from the state as well. That money was the first out the door. There were already processes in place. There were already systems in place and programs that were highly effective, that actually kept people housed. So that they didn't flow into homelessness, that would be one that I would lift up.

Speaker: But but I that's great. But I want to start with the first part of your answer. The homeless problem hasn't gotten better in the last year since we

renewed this agreement. Is that a fair. I don't want to put words in your mouth. I just want to take.

Speaker: Yeah. So i, as you know, commissioner, so i, when I started two and a half years ago, there were a lot more tents out on the street. It was much more visible problem. I would say in a lot of ways it's still visible, but I think it looks a little different now, so in that way, I don't necessarily think it's worse. I think we've gotten an incredible amount of people into shelter and into housing. And so in those ways, I think those systems are starting to work at a faster clip. A lot of the work that commissioner Ryan is doing and has done through the safe rest village program has gotten a lot of those processes in place. I also think bringing urban alchemy, into the community to help administer and kind of be a provider in this community has made a big difference as well, but yes, I do think the inflow, just shows numbers wise that there are more individuals who are homeless.

Speaker: And just to be clear, I don't mean to ask leading questions. I'm just trying to level set when we in our role as stewards, as we're making this determination about further investment of city dollars, it's just begging the question, are we on the right path or not? Recognizing that this new agreement has shifted some things, but it's sort of as a check in to sort of, you know, are we are we making the best investments we can successfully do task sites and safe rest villages on our own. Then you know, then why don't we just keep doing it, it, is the county really adding anything to that equation outside of the wraparound services that they need to be providing anyways?

Speaker: And may I add, I mean, from my observation, I think one big shift has been when director field came on board and we have seen a culture shift in terms of participation and support in building the homelessness response system and action plan that had not been guiding this work. It was very segmented and it was

fractured. There were different investments happening without clear guidelines, goals or clarity around data and metrics. I think we're laying the foundation to actually make improvement within the structure, and we have not had that clarity for, I mean, since I've been in this position and even before, so that's three plus years. I also think that the, the way in which we're building the system, with both from the work that sky and the sac, the street services coordination team and the outreach team are doing on the ground to getting people into alternative shelter and then receiving wraparound services from joint office contractors and then moving into units that the Portland housing bureau has built. It is a much more comprehensive ecosystem than we have been able to work within. In the past, five plus years. And I think that is going to make a measurable difference. And so that culture shift and the partnership and the commitment to goals, data and outcomes is different than what we were seeing a year ago. And dan, if you want to add, yeah, may I jump in and answer that?

Speaker: I want to first, thank you for answering or asking the question that's on everybody's mind. People watching, people in the audience. We're all wondering the same thing, is the is the model with the joint office and the partnership with the county, the right model and stock market terms? Are we a buyer or we a sell? And I'm here to tell you we're a strong buy. This is the right model. And it is working and we are building momentum. And I want to just if I have a minute, I want to talk a little bit about expand on a little bit of what sarah said, we came together just over a year and a half ago, with a new tone set by the mayor and the chair, and they they asked us to set aside old disagreements and conflict and move forward together. And I heard a couple of things met with each of you a year ago. And I heard some things loudly and clearly. Number one, the issue that commissioner Mapps raised, we want to know where the city dollars are going. We need full accountability and

transparency. Since then, we've met with each of you or your staffs individually, we're on call for you at any moment to show you exactly where the \$31 million are. And I think we've been super clear about that. And we will continue to be clear about that, that financial transparency will only be stronger under this agreement with direct city oversight through the governance model that, sarah and skye outlined. Second thing I heard, and this goes to commissioner Ryan's question. You asked through the mayor for the county and the joint office to prioritize our support for city initiatives, particularly the three task sites and the safe rest villages, he said. This is our strategy, and we want you to fund it and support it. And we've made a strong commitment to those efforts this year alone, in the fiscal year that's just ending. We gave the city \$21 million to support just the task sites alone, and there were dollars beyond that to support the safe rest villages. And I think you don't often say more importantly than the money, but this time, more importantly than the money, we actually are investing our infrastructure in those safe rest villages we are co-managing with city staff. Many of those villages, including the Multnomah safe rest village, menlo park, sunderland and several others. And I know for a fact that city and county staff are working hand in hand, I would say today we're well on our way to a collaborative, coordinated, led shelter system in our community that comprises the svcs, the task sites, motel shelters, congregate shelters, severe weather shelters, all of which will form our community shelter system. They may have started in very different places. They may have been funded very differently, but we're steadily bringing them together in a model that will be much stronger together than it would be apart. And I would argue that that shelter system that includes the svcs and the task site, that collaboration will be even stronger, under the agreement. And then third, I would just say, the thing I heard loud and clear was we wanted to see a plan. And to sarah's point, we want to

understand where is the joint office headed? And do we agree with that? And do we have input into that, we spent the last year developing not only the iga, but the homeless response action plan, as noted, has measurable objectives on multiple fronts. We have a clear plan that commissioners Ryan and Rubio were personally involved in developing, to add over 1000 shelter beds in the next year and a half, and to house the target number of people that sarah mentioned. And the plan also for the first time, addresses behavioral health beds and targets, sources of new homelessness inflow by focusing on individuals who are exiting hospitals, foster care or correctional settings. For years, we've known that people come into homelessness. From those settings, we had no clear plan, no clear metrics to say we need to stop the inflow from foster care, from castle settings, and from from health care. Those are all clearly called out, and I think that the plan that will be overseen by the robust governance structure now will be able to hold all of us accountable to those metrics. So I would just say, even as we acknowledge our progress over the last year, I want to just clearly say, for the record, we understand the breadth of work that's still ahead of us. We have a homeless management information system that we have, managed collaboratively and now sits with the county. It's outdated, doesn't give us the data and the analytic capabilities that we need. So we have a journey to replace that, our community as the mayor stated, lacks short and long term treatment and recovery resources as, the ej and the homeless response system set us up to deliver that, through the county and through the state with city support, I want to acknowledge we must develop, commissioner Gonzalez a shared, community wide approach to managing our public spaces, we have to deploy outreach and navigation workers according to a plan, and I'm committed to that. That's a particular interest and passion of mine, we have to be clear about what the pathways are from chronic homelessness and from

the street into shelter and into housing. We have to be working in sync with each other and not at odds. And we're headed in that direction. But I'm not here to tell you we're there yet, and then, of course, I think the final piece of this, which tends to get short shrift, we have to work together to expand, supportive housing and affordable housing. And that's clearly in the plan, it doesn't all lie with this part of the city team or with the joint office. It lies with other parts of the city and the county. We've been engaged with commissioner Rubio in particular around our supportive housing strategy. What does that look like going forward? County has committed a lot of additional money in the chair's next budget to expand supportive housing. We want, and we have your partnership in designing that that expansion. And I think that will continue under the new iga model as well.

Speaker: I just two more quick ones on the on the new agreement. So just speaking to so we have a plan, we have a form of a governance model, but what happens if we don't reach our metrics or our goals. Right. Is there, what are the are all the ramifications essentially discretionary, or are there, trying to understand what the teeth in the agreement are if we don't meet our goals? So the joint office or the what are we now calling? It's no longer the joint office. What are we calling it?

Speaker: It's still the joint office of homeless services. The overarching umbrella structure is the homelessness response system.

Speaker: Okay, so but with respect to the joint office and the agreements were signing, if we don't meet our goals, what is there any ramifications other than what goes to the you know, what the oversight committee decides, yes. So I would say, at the far end, the kind of nuclear option is we can always terminate, but just to be crystal clear, there's no automatic ramifications.

Speaker: We would have to rely on our someone making a decision to pull a trigger. There's no automatic pull back of funds. There's no, if metrics aren't met. Correct.

Speaker: And I think also the public facing performance dashboard. So we'll be these teams that are working on this will be held publicly accountable to the goals that are outlined in this plan, which I think is another ramification in and of itself. But that termination clause, being able to pull out separately and kind of on our own volition, if we so choose to do so, would be the biggest ramification. Yeah.

Speaker: But we just go through this dance, right? We, we, we threaten to terminate and we hear what shelters are going to be closed and it becomes the Washington monument discussion. So i, you know, it it, may, may. Yeah. Go ahead. May I just.

Speaker: Yeah. Commissioner. So different than the past because we now have clarity around the funding. If the termination language basically says the city shall take back the safe rest villages and the alternative shelter sites, that's what the agreement states. So in terms of that pointing to other shelter beds, we would basically be funding those operations, moving forward. And so that's what we've agreed upon in terms of what the clauses of termination, because in the past it has not been clear what the termination requirements would be. So that is a clarity that has not existed before. And would we close those? I think that's the question that would sit to City Council in the budget that we're in, because that would be where our funding would go towards.

Speaker: Yeah. And I don't mean to steal commissioner Mapps thunder. And this is a conversations we've had about you know, how how this could play as played out when these discussions have occurred in the past. So I let him add but one last piece on this. So we have obligations under the ada lawsuit. Tozer limits when we

can distribute tents as a city and applies to our service providers, our contractors. Is there anything in the current agreement that addresses our city's obligations under the ada lawsuit, so, oh, and I don't want to quote it directly, but there is language that speaks to city funds not being used for, supplies, I think is the word, but it's basically ten tarp and harm reduction kit distribution. But it doesn't prescribe, it doesn't hold the joint office to the same obligations the city is under.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Commissioner Gonzalez, can I ask a qualifying or, expand on that particular question? So one of the things that I've been wondering in the space that commissioner Gonzalez was talking about, and I apologize, commissioner Rubio, I do recognize waiting a long time, but sorry, it's building on this last particular point in section 8.2, 8.21 of the contract. There's language about, the county indemnifying and holding the city, harmless, and the space of doing this work. And one of the things I'm wondering about and I will actually not ask you to respond to now, but maybe I see robert out there. So I'm trying to figure out, what section 8.21 of the contract, which talks about the county indemnifying and holding the city harmless, and the space of doing this work in spaces like the ada, contract, I think it addresses some of the issues that commissioner Gonzalez is talking about, but, I will not take your answer now. I'll give robert a chance to ponder that, and I will turn the floor back over to the mayor and commissioner Rubio.

Speaker: Commissioner Rubio, thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, so I have a couple, questions. First, I want to say, I appreciate that you mentioned cultural shift because that's really, really important. As an organizational leader, I'm very acutely understand what that means. So that was great to hear, but what can you tell us about what we can expect to see in a year from now, like from the public perspective? And then what can we expect to see

different in terms of, governance, a year from now? From the internal perspective, too? I just want to get a picture of what your ideal or expectation is, and then I have a follow up question after that.

Speaker: And to be clear, are you asking about the homelessness response system or the joint office or both? Both. But let's start with the joint office specifically, because that's what what we're talking about today.

Speaker: Yeah, I can give mine, assessment and then maybe director field as well, I think my ideal scenario, is a continued culture shift. Like sarah mentioned, to the point of being transparent to those metrics and all reaching those goals, and maybe even exceeding those goals in a lot of different ways. Those a lot of those are floors and not ceilings and showing the clear process, I think. So, as director field mentioned, the integration of the joint office staff with other jurisdictions, with partners in the community, other stakeholders, behavioral health, which just really hasn't been as connected as before, we're seeing some of that already. I think one of our biggest, wins of the last year is the mobile medical vans from central city concern that the joint office funds and that serve our different alternative shelter sites and safe rest villages, as well as other shelter sites. They have a psychiatric nurse who comes on site and can prescribe medication. It's really something that you don't see across the entire country, and so we're piloting a lot of those programs, and we're seeing that shift in taking ownership of the complexities of homelessness, I think, within the joint office. So before, as sarah mentioned, there were a lot of silos between behavioral health, between hospital systems, other stakeholders, nonprofits that weren't affiliated with any public entity and our joint office contractors. And so now we're seeing more of an integration. And I think I hope we'll continue to see more of that and be able to tell the public clearly, kind of to commissioner Mapps point, this is where the money is going, this is how

someone who's chronically homeless moves through this system, and these are all the support mechanisms that we have to deploy to really get somebody to get off, stay off the streets, be successful, and get into permanent housing.

Speaker: But how will that what will that look like? Like what will the impact be like on the street? Like how will that manifest out.

Speaker: So right now, for example, I think there are a lot of instances where different outreach workers will contact somebody. A first responder will contact an individual at multiple different points. So over the course of 3 or 6 months, somebody living on the street, they would have contact with a lot of different individuals and no clear mechanism for this is what we can offer you right now. This is where you can go. This is what you're going to see. These are the supports we can offer. We're going to get you on ohp. We're going to get you on federal benefits. We're going to connect you with that psychiatric nurse if you need or other medical care that you might need. And we're going to connect you with a housing voucher. We are unable to do that for the majority of humans right now that are living on our streets. We have just started really showcasing what's possible with those wraparound services and with our comprehensive strategy. But this homelessness response system is intended to pull all of those pieces that we currently have that have been disjointed and just not connected, and make sure that they're actually all working together to get somebody off the street, because I think we have a lot of missed opportunities, and we spend a lot of money and a lot of time with best intentions, but not accomplishing or effectively managing the crisis on the ground.

Speaker: So the coordination could potentially free up more capacity than to do more, more quick response. Yes.

Speaker: And I and I think the folks on the ground would see, you know, if you think of it as kind of like a client model, we'd be serving that client in a much better

way. So clarity of this is your case manager, this is your outreach worker. We have data that can help you. We know what services you've engaged with before. We know what you need, we can actually connect you with everything along the way that could help you succeed. Instead of having a disjointed system where no one is talking to each other and there's no, ability to understand the exact opportunities we currently have in the system right now. No bed. Is empty, kind of for a night. We can actually connect people to whatever they might need, whether it's behavioral health services with a family member, with a shelter space, with a voucher for housing. And I think we're not maximizing and efficiently accomplishing kind of a lot of those system practices right now. And I think we're it's a, something that I hope we can work on over the next year through this system because we'll be meeting with the implementation committee. We'll be meeting with the steering and oversight committee. And those continued kind of processes of really digging into what's working, what's not pivot. Don't wait a year to see if you should fund something a different way. Let's change it. Now. Let's meet with a provider. Let's connect these two individuals, we'll treat it like a true emergency and actually be able to connect everybody.

Speaker: I love this guy shared that example, I am actually having lunch today with doctor mendenhall from central city and doctor bruno from the county health department to make that connection more strongly and to set a vision for pairing medical services, including the central city mobile mobile medical van, it drives me nuts that it was so hard, but thanks in large part to the city support, it was so hard to connect medical services to the task site and I don't want to wait a year to do the second one. We've got to have a plan to really quickly spread that connection across all of our shelters. And we're not there yet. But that's the kind of thing that's happening as a result. Commissioner gonzales, you had the question about

whether or not the city could set up the task site in the clinton triangle. And the srvs on its own and in large respect, it did that. The question now is, where do we go from here? And the mobile medical van is a great, small example, perhaps, but life changing for people whose medical and behavioral health care is addressed by that mobile medical van. We also had. And it wasn't always smooth, but change is not easy. We had to figure out the connection between, people at the task site wanting to enter into housing, which is supported by the county, and now we've started to build that, strengthen that. We'll continue to expand that across all of our shelter sites so that we have a clear and transparent pathway. Those are resources that come from shs\$ they need to be paired with the shelter strategy and have a close connection. And that's the kind of thing that we've had progress on this year. If I can take just a minute and go back. Commissioner Rubio, to your point, I think the best way to think about where we're going to be a year from now is think about where we were a year, a year ago, the joint office was leadership. Plus, we'd been a year without a permanent leader. We'd been through a series of deputies, interims. Excuse me. Not only did we not have a director, we didn't have a permanent deputy director. We did not have a permanent finance leader. We have a great leadership team in place, you know, some of them pretty well, they're here today. We have a good leadership team. Even beyond the three of us that are here. We've set a stable foundation for the joint office now to engage, consistently and effectively with the city on some of our shared priorities. We also, quite famously and quite publicly, were not able to effectively manage our shs dollars in metro, felt it necessary to put us in a corrective action plan. That was a year ago. We're getting ready to come out of that. I'm pleased to give you a preview that when we report our year end financials in a couple of weeks, we will have not only met our metro set spending goal, we will have exceeded it. And that reflects, consistent hands on day to day,

month to month management of those dollars, I don't confuse spending with outcomes. Let me be clear. But you're not going to get outcomes if you're not managing your spending. So the first thing you had to do was stabilize the joint office, stabilize our spending, and be able to be accountable to the city, to metro, to the governor and others for how we're managing those dollars. And I think we're absolutely there. And then the last piece is the piece we've been talking about here. It's building the partnership around rental support for those city sites. It's building the mobile medical partnership so that people aren't just being warehoused in a shelter, but they're actually getting their needs met and preparing them to move into to permanent housing. And I think a lot of work to go on that front. I don't want to have anybody think that I'm raising the flag of success. But what I'm telling you is we have that foundation in place. You've seen that culture shift. You've seen the results of what it looks like when an agency can stand up and say, here's where the money's going, and here's where we'd like to have it go in the next year, very quickly, to answer your question directly, a year from now, I think we will see a continued growth of permanent supportive housing. We have a number of units coming online in the coming weeks. I think some of us will be together at one out on southeast powell here next week at grand opening, we'll continue those investments. We will see a coordinated shelter entry system, which we do not have now. We will understand what the shelter availability is across our community and be able to have all providers direct people there, whether that's through a shelter app or other technology. We will finally have a coordinated system that says, whether it's a, city originated shelter or county originated shelter, regardless of who's paying for it. Private sector, we're going to understand what the inventory is and how we can help navigate, people to that, we will have expanded medical support for people in shelters as we've talked about. And we will be able to say, if

you come join us in this shelter, in this transitional housing site, we'll be able to meet your medical needs. And I think that's something to keep an eye on for a year from now.

Speaker: Thank you, just a couple. Follow ups to on culture change or connected to it, in in one of the recitals, you talk about how we engage together moving forward, and that is something that, to be frank, I've been hearing in the community as I talk to neighbors and I talk to stakeholders, concern about the city and county and how we work together and how we publicly talk or communicate about each other's work can you talk a little bit about that theme of culture change and what how is that showing up in these recitals specific to how we engage together around this work, both publicly and on a governance level? And then my last question after that is then how can we expect to see or how can we be assured that this culture change will penetrate down into middle and front line implementation on the county side, because as culture as we know, you know, it's not just it is about the leadership, but how do we how do we as a city, how are we assured that, things are not going to be stalled out in implementation in I'm just going to be frank. Yeah

Speaker: I'll share. I mean, for my perspective, working with the chair's office, I we have a very strong connection in terms of communication. When we have challenges or issues, we quickly raise them. We have a very direct line of communication and they take our concerns seriously, address them, follow up. And so that has been a shift. And I believe in a very positive way. And we've seen that responsiveness from the chair's office, sky can probably speak more on the operational side, but to me that really signals the importance of collaboration between our two jurisdictions. And the key needs to make sure that this plan can actually be successful. I mean, it's all going to come down to a lot of those relationships and the implementation ability. But we've had very frank and direct

conversations. There are times at which we've disagreed, and we've come to a resolution, but we still have that foundational relationship. And so it has been positive. It has been, different than what we've seen in the past. And I would say in a very, in a very strong way.

Speaker: Yeah. And I can speak to the relational piece. I think, with the joint office specifically. So, director field and I have met regularly since he was hired, but I will just say, as one example, I think I met with 5 or 6 county staff on Tuesday alone. So you know, half of my meetings are probably with county individuals and folks working at the county and not city staff. So we're keeping those lines of communication very open. You know, text or call regularly. If there's an issue, we immediately contact the other party, and so or if we have a quick question, anything like that. And so I think I know quite a few individuals over at the county and have worked deeply to hold up those relationships and make sure that we're meeting all of the goals that we've set out to achieve that we've been very public about as well. So I think I hope that continues to grow and increase, and we continue to build those relationships as we coordinate all of this work together, and I've been really grateful for, kind of the difference in the tone and the dedication of the joint office leadership staff since director field has been brought on, and he's really, like, ensured that my calls are always answered, that my emails are always responded to that. Any question that the mayor or other commissioners or other city staff have, we have an immediate response. And yes, to sarah's point, I think we disagree. We can, have an intense discussion about how we should accomplish something, but we can always have that discussion. And that was not true when I first started this job.

Speaker: I appreciate that, and I will tell you why I'm confident about culture change. Commissioner Rubio, one, I mentioned that one of the things I heard from

you all was we need a plan. I actually heard that from joint office employees as well. And we've spent the last year putting together, and putting in place a clear plan on a new shelter strategy. As an example. That's a 40% growth in shelter beds. That's a major investment in our community right now in close partnership with the city. We now have that plan. Every single employee at the joint office understands that plan. If that's not the plan, they want to work on, they have other options professionally. I hope that none of them would leave us. We have a great team there. I want to be clear about that. But they now have a strong and clear direction, and it's up to all of us to push in that same direction. And I'm quite confident we'll be able to do that in the coming year. It's harder to do that when people aren't sure what's being asked of them and what they're supposed to be working towards.

Speaker: Okay, thank you, commissioner Ryan.

Speaker: Thank you. I want to start off by acknowledging that I have seen the difference since you've come on board and built a leadership team. I witnessed firsthand the I guess we're calling it the culture, of the joint office prior to your arrival. And so I will say thank you for turning the ship in the right direction. I wish it was going from good to great, but I will be honest, I think it's going from a much lower level of expectation and it's on the right track. So I do want you to know that I see that, I've said multiple times, as you know, mayor and meetings with you and your chief of staff, bobby lee, that I was when the mayor would asked, what are some of your concerns? And I would say, I think we're still stuck in a budget dialog as opposed to a role and responsibility dialog, interm or a dialog that's about just focusing on how to have a work plan that gets results, and I think I continue to be confused on why we didn't decouple the budget from the actual work plan, if you will, and I and I tried to let that go, but I really asked the question because I wanted to know the exact answer. But hearing that half of the money hasn't been

expended, 148 million has not one. 49 was spent, raise the point that if in fact we see some best practices occurring, such as the srvs and the test sites, then wouldn't that largesse money just naturally go towards those? Those practices that are getting results? Like, why would we even need to be in a dialog anymore? That dates us back to pre shs funding. I did that, I'm continuing to be confused why that wasn't a premise of this new agreement.

Speaker: Let me just address the numbers, because I think we may have miscommunicated that the 148 numbers and the 149 that that's, shs dollars one time only and carry over budgeted for next year. It's my understanding we don't have that amount of money that is unspent, that that plan is what goes into the budget for next year, and we are doubling rolled over is what I was told. That's carryover. That's rolled over from the beginning of the measure. We're just we're just coming to the end of year three of a ten year measure. Really the problem, the challenge anymore. And I think I think the strategy, the trap and the iga, and that's why we're here to tell you about our plans to spend those dollars on expanded supportive housing, expanded shelter, expanded support for s.r.v and test site growth. Okay it was just confusing hearing the what we'll spend money on and what you'll keep.

Speaker: And I didn't want to be in a place where we're in fear of getting this agreement done because the srv and the test sites wouldn't be funded when we know that shs could obviously fund something that's getting results, because that's when people went to the ballot in 2020, spring of 2020, that's exactly what they wanted was those types of services. So to me, that should have just been off the table. Done. We're going to support these and then we would get really clear on what our strategy is to keep moving forward with results. And I know I've said this to all of you in person.

Speaker: So I just thought, well, and I want to publicly acknowledge your work on srvs. Actually, the county has a new site in montavilla and it started out as a safe park site. That was the original plan. And it actually morphed in response to the success we're seeing with srvs and the pod villages. We just released an alternative shelter report recently that documents that these are effective, shelter modalities, if you will. And so we have modified the plan for that montavilla site to include people not sleeping in their cars. They'll be able to park their cars there, but they will sleep, be sleeping in pods, and it will become a pod village that's totally apart from the city, but that's evidence that we are moving towards a shared view of how this work should be done. We are moving towards a shared model, and in that case, the county was able to adapt its plans based on learnings, in part from the city's rv experience. I'll back to the culture, mindsets and cultures can change, i'll tell you, in 2021 it was all shelters are bad. Was all I heard at the joint office. So it's great to hear that the mental model of the joint office is seen that if you actually have a shelters with services with on ramps to housing, they're it was a much needed part tool that was needed in the system. So I'm glad that the culture has changed in that regard. Let's stay in culture for a second. I think when I think of culture, I what I hear and what I witness and, and I've experienced that with you as well. When I went to meet with you once, there was no one in the office, like, not like you were it at the joint office. And I keep hearing that from people out in the community that the joint office and the providers are at home quite often still working in covid protocols, what percentage culture? There's a culture question. What percentage of, joint office employees and providers are now actually working directly with, people who really need their services? Yeah and not at home doing whatever zoom meetings.

Speaker: Just a reminder, the joint office doesn't provide direct service, so we're basically a large bureaucracy that does, administers the contracts and the funds with providers. So for the provider question, I'll defer to them in terms of the joint office that has been part of the culture change. About seven months ago, we moved offices, from some rented space to a county owned building right next to the tpd headquarters down by union station. It was important for us to be sort of in the heart of things, if you will, and to have our employees, office in the part of town where we were trying to support a lot of those organizations, including tpi and others, I would invite you, commissioner Ryan, or any of you come by and visit, we have a large hybrid workforce, and we use in person for group meetings. Team meetings? Mini retreats, conferences, etc, there are people there every day. It's a changing sort of cast of employees as they mix their time between off site, on site, and then, of course, working directly on site with providers. But it's a much more vibrant office culture than we had a year ago, and part of that is we're in a better space. Part of that is we're working better together as a team and so, I would I would invite any of you drop in, we'll glad to invite you over. And you can see how the joint office is working together, in in that setting.

Speaker: Okay. Thanks. And, it would be great if there could be a survey of the provider network to see how many of their case managers are actually out working with the participants on the street. That would be great. And I'll my bias has been about this. It's been evident for a while. I think it's because of background in performing arts and sports. It's just when teams prepare and practice together, they tend to execute much better. And so I have been really concerned about that. Back to culture, last year I was really, attached to an amendment that did pass, and it was about trying to get accountability from the provider contracts and I want to know if, what how that is going. So it's one thing that we have it in the big picture,

community wide indicators here. But if I'm a provider and I'm getting a big grant from the joint office, I want to know what they're measuring and what sub indicators that they're focused on so that they can keep improving and actually move the needle on something. I failed to see if that's actually happening. And that's been a little frustrating when I dig into that. But maybe I'm missing something.

Speaker: Yeah. And I want to be careful. I don't know how much time we have that really deserves given the question, it deserves a deeper dive. I will tell you a couple quick things, and I'm glad to follow up with you that, as I said, that deserves a more thorough follow up with some other people, I got to be careful here because our Multnomah County auditor is an independently elected official, and I don't want to jump the gun on her, but she's about to release an audit that shows that the joint office contract monitoring is very effective. And we are one of the most, if not the most of the five county departments that she surveyed. We are doing the most effective monitoring of our contracts, and you'll see that when that comes out, all of our contracts have outcomes attached, and we have discussions throughout the year, involving me and certainly at the management level around providers who are not meeting their outcomes. We don't talk about that publicly. We don't want to embarrass providers in the public realm. But please know, that we use all the tools at our disposal up to and including, diverting funds away from organizations that are not performing. And at any given time, we have several organizations who are under very close monitoring and who are at risk of losing their funding, and again, we tend not to talk about that publicly, but glad to come back and perhaps walk through the way we incorporate those outcome measures into our contracts and the way we use the monitoring process to measure people's progress against those outcomes.

Speaker: And for me, it's just you can't really figure out how to move forward unless you know where you are. And so I'm not as attached to seeing, failing grades on whatever the metrics say, because I think everyone knows they might be. It's more about how we're improving each, each year and what we keep learning as we innovate forward. So, please, no accountability to me is just an opportunity to actually lean in and improve, I think when I also reflect on culture, this would be my last culture question is when I heard 100 goals, that kind of surprised me, I think, you know, because we've worked together in the past, that, we, narrowing that down is often a really good idea. We work together. I remember the good people at psu gave us, like, 90 some goals and metrics. We're like great academics, but that doesn't really digest well when you're trying to actually move work culturally. So we had to narrow that down so we could focus, do you am I missing something? Why is 100 goals a good idea? And are these big picture goals are they are they very? Do they vary in degree of impact? I think I just need some more understanding of why 100 goals is good.

Speaker: Yeah, yeah, and I would I feel like we went from 0 to 100 and I just like would love to know what that's like.

Speaker: Yes I can speak to that commissioner. So and I might have misspoke. So the 100 action items are in the homelessness response action plan. We have overarching goals that are kind of at the front end of that plan. So it's not 100 different goals, so those are kind of some of the ones that sarah and I spoke to of, meeting a couple of those metrics, like the 50% reduction in unsheltered homelessness in a year and a half, but the action items are really kind of how we accomplish those different goals. So it's also holding different jurisdictions and different parties accountable for those specific metrics, and then developing additional work plans for each one of those metrics to meet the needs of the

community, as well as meet those goals and hopefully exceed those goals that are listed kind of at the front end of that plan, that plan is also one of the exhibits to this idea for a reason. We wanted to demonstrate all the different pieces and all the work that's gone into, coordinating all the different parties. So the joint office is one of the parties under the homelessness response system, it will have a lot of action items. It's already working on a lot of those work plans, but in conjunction with other parties, on that implementation committee. So for example, metro is on that implementation committee, home forward, the housing authority is on that implementation committee. The state in various aspects with oha oaks and a lot of those state agencies are a part of that, implementation committee. And so we are holding all of those different parties accountable. Some action items require three different stakeholder groups or jurisdictions to work on that plan together. For example, I am currently working on a sighting project, to determine to create a tool with our folks at, the bureau of planning and sustainability to do what we did for land availability for affordable housing construction, and do that for shelter construction, and probably for behavioral health facilities. So we have a tool in our toolbox for if the state were to increase funding for a project under one of those criteria, or we have shs funding that like we want to spend in a certain way, we have a list and a way of running a tool that will show us where the available facilities or land is. And that's just one action item of those almost 100 action items and will require kind of its own, work plan that that will have to work through in order to actually create that tool. It should be unveiled in August, I believe. And so that's just one example. But that helps meet the overall goals that are stated kind of at the beginning of the homelessness response plan.

Speaker: And i'll just add, commissioner, it's about its five goals for the ej itself, for the homelessness response action plan that we're trying to meet, which you can find on page 21 of the document.

Speaker: Okay. Thanks. This is my final question. And he actually got my interest going when you mentioned the auditor. And now I feel like I have to be careful. Trying to find. But I won't be, and so my question is, you said the auditor's will have some feedback, some findings that suggest that the joint office is doing a great job of working with their vendors and such. Is that okay, what I haven't I think a lot of us are wondering about this, and that is we don't hear enough about mental health and behavioral health. I'll never forget my first meeting with the mayor gave me this assignment in fall of 2020. I asked that time chair, where where are the professionals from behavioral health and mental health? And I was told it's a separate office or division and they're not in these meetings. And it was kind of like this big. Like, no wonder you're seeing what you do. So what is the integration like with those offices and what how are they being embedded into this new plan. Because it still feels like the 2004 housing first blueprint. And obviously things have really changed since 2004. So I'm just trying to get a sense of how that integration is taking place.

Speaker: I don't know if you want to speak to the way behavioral health is, is embedded in the trap. I will tell you, at the county level, this has been a priority for the chair, and she's developed the mantra one county. And one of the things we've done, which we're doing for the first time going into this next fiscal year, is use those shs dollars in coordination with the other county departments. Joint office doesn't need 100% of those dollars and can't do 100% of the work. We have an entire county and also city bureaus that need to lean into the plan. So using shs funds, we've done things like funding the lolo pass, purchase, which the city

participated in as well. And then those services will be provided. Those behavioral health and recovery services will be provided. That really is more of a county health department and behavioral health, function. Then joint office. Joint office was the vehicle to get those dollars out to central city concern. But really the ongoing partnership will not be with the joint office. So I just give that as a recent example of where, to your point, commissioner Ryan, we absolutely have to think more broadly, and we have to understand that this work is going to require a lot of lifts from departments outside the joint office. And we are not only open to that, we're driving in that direction.

Speaker: Thank you, director field. And I want to say I really appreciate that you got trimet to the table and personally attached that because I did the connector meeting with you and sam. And as I often say, it is our number one shelter. And that exists in our market are the max train. So it's good that they're at the table.

Speaker: One of the reasons that, commissioner berm edwards and the chair are not here today. I think they're going to join you later as they have a county commission hearing, and they're talking about an eastside strategy that includes a partnership with trimet and some of that was from the original meeting that you facilitated with the trimet leadership.

Speaker: Commissioner Mapps, then commissioner yea. Rubio. And then I've got a couple of questions as well, thank you very much, I feel like I should just ask a question, which is very much an elephant in the room. I'll tell you, I understand why the city and the county need to coordinate, houseless policy and houseless services, and I am a champion for doing that. We'll always be there for you to figure out how we can work together to get this done, what is less obvious to me, especially on the budget side, is why the city is sending over every year. Let's say \$31 million, to the county to do this work. You know, I think the city's dollars

represent about 7% of your budget. And I think if you take a look at how the county has been able to get dollars out the door, the 38, typically every year there's more than \$70 million, or there's more than \$30 million of carryover year to year, like why director field or city staff? Why do we have why is it necessary to send send city dollars over to do this?

Speaker: Okay, yes, commissioner. So I would say it's not necessary. I think it's a choice. And so I think it stems from a, a historic investment that the city made in adult shelter. Pre-join office of homeless services. And we continue to fund a lot of those adult shelter beds. As we mentioned, the congregate shelter models as well as the outreach services. So that was how we had broken down kind of the funding relationship between the city and the county to really create that partnership between our two jurisdictions. I think it's something that, the city commission will continue to tackle and wrestle with, moving forward, especially under these new funding mechanisms and with additional dollars coming from metro for the supportive housing services measure, however, I also think, part of what's confusing is the intertwined kind of nature of the county sending money to the city for different programs. For example, that \$21 million that director field mentioned, as well as some other services. And, it can get really confusing to try to untangle that one thing that I think is a positive, from that is we really are working together to accomplish all those different pieces, and we cannot do that work alone, we are not funding mobile medical vans. We are not going to provide housing vouchers. We do not get the funding for that process, and so I think it actually helps solidify that relationship because we're all sitting at the table, all being held accountable to maybe not meeting those goals or those action items. And so we're trying to create a more robust plan. So we clearly delineate where that money goes, where it should go, where we want it to go in the future and create a mechanism with a

governance structure that allows us to make some of those decisions and determinations, because it will all affect us. We will not be existing in a silo. We will be working with the county one way or another on a lot of different issues.

Speaker: It's important to recognize the history that skye mentioned, and at the same time, let's recognize a lot has changed in three years. Right? And I think, the work we did with the city this year and next year reflect that. So if you consider all sources general fund ongoing city general fund, one time federal state passthroughs arpa, the city contribution to the joint office is actually dropped, from 58.5 million this year to 44.8 next year. To be fair to the ongoing city general fund is staying level, but those other contributions are going away. I also think it's fair to ask, as we look into the future, the next seven years of shs, what is the right financial mix? What is the right mix of contributions? Let's not leave the state out of this. The state gave the county significant money this year and we spent that in close coordination with the city, through initiatives like Oregon island and housing Multnomah now that housed people out of the clinton triangle. So that level of coordination, regardless of the source of funds, and we certainly hope the governor will step forward in 2025 with additional money. We're preparing that ask, we want to be ready to administer that jointly.

Speaker: I don't under I guess in some ways I'm going back to I think the commissioner Ryan, brought up here. I think there's a difference between coordinating policy and the dollars here, I am 100% convinced on the need to coordinate policy and coordinate services. Frankly, I don't think I've actually heard an argument for why the city, should continue to send over the 31 million other than the historically, that's the way we've done it.

Speaker: And I'd like I'd like to make the case, please. And I'm going to be very bottom line oriented, very pragmatic, and probably completely inappropriate, but

the way I view it is by making this investment, we get to shape policy and priorities at the joint office, and we get access to steering ten times the amount of funding that we are putting in, especially under the new iga. So I actually view it as a good investment, provided that we hold the joint office accountable and continue to be able to shape their work in a manner that's consistent with our goals here at the city of Portland, thank you, mr. Mayor. So when you say that what I hear is \$31 million a year is the ante that we have to pay the county to sit at this table. We choose to.

Speaker: I believe it is worthwhile for two reasons. Number one, all the reasons I just gave, this gives us the seats at the table. And under the new iga, it actually gives us quite a lot of leverage over the policy. And direction of the joint office. And the second thing is that it is being spent on the shelter system that we support. Anyway, this is this is a key ingredient to how we're going to get people off the streets and out of unsanctioned camps and connected to services. So I view it as a very good decision. Plus, if you think about the 31 we spent this year, we already got at least 21 back, as we've heard, just to support tasby, so from my perspective, it's better that we work together. The last thing i'll mention and maybe I should have started with this. We don't provide behavioral health services. We do not provide substance use disorder treatment. We do not have the navigator option to housing reserve for the populations that go through task force rv, so we have to partner the city and the county if we go alone, that that may solve some managerial issues that we've had to deal with or political issues that we've had to deal with, but it ultimately pulls the shelter part of our system. Apart from the service delivery. And I think it's critically important that they be integrated and the data is showing that through the srv and the task sites, it's working well, thank you, mr. Mayor. And I appreciate that. And I recognize the sort of real politics of truth here. I will also

point out that we got igas with the I got igas with the county to manage bridges and rats and mosquitoes and those igas do not include an anti where I have to hand over \$10 million to sit at the table. And I think the fact that we're handing over \$31 million just for the right to sit at the table suggests that there's something still kind of wrong about what we're doing here, especially just to be clear, I did not say it's just so we can sit at the table so that we can integrate the service delivery, and that we have an ability to actually steer a much, much larger pot of funding towards resolving homelessness in Portland.

Speaker: And, mayor, if I may, that 31 million also goes to fund hundreds of shelter beds as well as outreach services. Correct.

Speaker: Do we get to pick which social shelter beds they are, or is that something the county picks?

Speaker: So historically, we've chosen to fund adult shelters that could change in the future.

Speaker: The city who's we in this conversation is a council that picks the beds that we fund, that we historically funded. Or has it been the Multnomah board, county board of commissioners changed over time.

Speaker: So initially, City Council was choosing to fund the adult shelter system within the joint office. And then when it transferred to that new governance structure, they have continued to invest in all adult the adult shelters system, those those same beds over the last six years that they had invested in previously. And that the city had said was kind of their priority, I think the steering and oversight committee, to the mayor's point, will be the mechanism by which the city commission is able to, decide did and, get to, influence where those dollars go in the future. So if we no longer want to fund adult shelter systems, if we no longer want to fund congregate shelter beds, as we've already stated, based on everything

that we hear from all of you, we would rather fund an alternative shelter sites because we are finding those to be really successful. But if that changes in the future, you all are. Whoever is sitting or sitting in your seats could make that decision down the road.

Speaker: Thank you. The city is also handing over. In addition to those dollars, the city is also handing over significant new responsibilities for the county that the county is funding. Here's a couple examples that I happen to have. There was a city constraint, around shelter beds, about \$2 million. County has stepped into that. There were one time only city funds that were used to fund additional shelter beds. 7 million. The county has stepped into that shelter. Wages, navigation for outreach and encampments, the list goes on. So the idea that the city is, handing over money and not clear what happens to that, that couldn't be more incorrect. I would argue not only is the city handing over those dollars, but the county is assuming, responsibility for services and infrastructure much beyond that, I thank you.

Speaker: We're running late today, so i'll. I'll allow the conversation to move. Thank you, commissioner Rubio, then gonzales, then Ryan. Thank you.

Speaker: So, can you explain a little bit more about the by name list? And, are you confident that that's what we've been asking for when we talk about using that and just more pointedly, are we or are we not using built for 0 or 1 of the like, lean management? Those are the ones that I'm hearing about, what are we doing on continuous improvement? And then are we creating any sort of learning hub or institute, not just in the county or not just in the city, but like metro city, county, a shared learning hub for training and best practices, would love to hear about that. I'll talk about lean. Okay sarah's going to discuss continuous improvement, so i'll do quickly. And this I can follow up with you always. Commissioner because I think the by name list, folks get a little confused, so I will do my best, so the by name list, I

think at its most basic, is a part of built for zero. So it's one aspect of built for zero. Built for zero is a program and a strategy that's trying to stem the inflow into homelessness. And really, designate kind of who is coming into the system. Stop that from happening. A lot of these metrics in the trap, the homelessness response action plan, speak to trying to stem that inflow that dan or director field mentioned, so from institutional settings, folks who are leaving carceral settings, folks, in children who are aging out of foster care, and trying to ensure that they are not flowing into homelessness, that is, at its most basic, built for zero is trying to get to that kind of level zero approach so that you don't have folks who are living on the streets because you are stemming that inflow. And also helping get folks in the outflow kind of into shelter or housing, the by name list is the tool by which you accomplish that. So like, I believe the joint office is using that by name list as built for zero intends. They've been working hand in hand with built for zero and their staff for two plus years, I believe. Oh yeah. Thank you, deputy director anna can correct me on these different metrics, but my understanding is they've been working very closely, and now I think they're at 94 to 97% with the latest I heard from the joint office data team of hitting all their metrics that built for zero requires. So it's very data driven. They want you to hit all of these different check all these different boxes to make sure that your data set is actually truly complete. And you can go through this different process. So I believe we are nearly there in terms of going through the built for zero approach. But the by name list already exists, and they've done a really good job of integrating that with from all of the different sources of data. So that includes hnmis but does not only, require kind of hnmis. Is there any dude, good morning, anna plum, joint office deputy director. Everything sky said is correct. I would just sort of clarify the distinction that built for zero is a continuous, continuous improvement process by where you ensure that

your data is continuously improving the by name list is a product of that process, and it's built off of data in hmis. And we do feel confident in that list. Yes. Okay.

Speaker: And I understand that distinction. But I'm asking are we actually putting that into practice then we are. Am I hearing yes. We're apart okay. Yeah we're continuing that.

Speaker: And that's in our processes for next year as well. We are continuing to walk do the built for zero process into the future okay.

Speaker: And then what about the learning institute. So commissioner, my understanding is in the chair's budget, there is funding for spark, which is a continuous improvement process that is going to be housed within the ceo's office at the county, the city I would that question would be directly for city administrator mike jordan.

Speaker: We've talked about continuous improvement and potential hubs. There's some budget notes in the budget that was passed around data management. And how are we doing this work moving forward. So I would leave that to him to answer. But I know in the county there is a program funded through the chair's budget related to continuous improvement called spark.

Speaker: Okay. Well, I would just offer and I hope to encourage that. It's a shared learning because it doesn't help for us to be isolated doing our own processes, if we're doing this shared work.

Speaker: So thanks. Thank you. Commissioner commissioner Gonzalez, just one last, building off the continuous improvement. So that is a county level program, but how does it how does spark play out in the joint office and homelessness? That's the part I'm not clear on.

Speaker: And I would ask the chair's office would have to respond to that.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: We're going to have to come back to you on that. It's a brand new program that just got funded. It's not even up and running yet until the next fiscal year. So unless you know more about it, that we'd have to follow up on that.

Speaker: So it is it fair to say there's not necessarily a formal continuous improvement methodology in operations, but there may be on the data side or is that a fair to say.

Speaker: Yeah. And bill fraser was actually a national, continuous improvement process. And we've been partnering with that national organization for years now. And we will continue to do that.

Speaker: And that's on that's on the data side data specifically. But but in terms of operation and execute on continuous improvements might mean different things to different people. So I just want to be yeah, I appreciated this is this is great question, I would say it's nascent outside the data field. And i'll give you an example, andrew rowe, who some of you know, met with met with him several times, and our staff on the contracting side, one of the, one of the reasons that we've been able to sort of excel on the contracting side or certainly have dramatic performance improvement over the last year and a half, is due to a I won't say it's formal, but it's informal quality improvement process where we are specifically looking at the steps we need to take to improve our ability to monitor providers, monitor the contracting process, and that's produced really tangible results in the timing it takes us to develop contracts and to pay invoices in a timely manner, which is essential to providers. So I don't want to oversell that as a highly formal process. But we do have a aqi process outside of the data system.

Speaker: Got it, got it. Okay, so changing gears, you know, commissioner Ryan asked a lot of questions around culture. And, sometimes I doze off on some of those, but but he gets at the heart of some, some good questions. When you look

at the history of our task sites, you know, I think when sam adams first announced the concept of large shelters, I was on the campaign trail and I said, I think that's a good idea. And I think people called both of us as perpetrators of concentration camps. That was literally the type of language people were using when the mayor's team proposed, you know, large shelters, and I'm looking at an old article. This was back in August, the Oregonian article about the opening of you know, our task site at on powell in skylar. You had some tough comments for the county at the time, and I'd, you know, chief of staff bobby lee had tough comments for the performance of the joint office at that time, I think. Is it fair to say that opened without services on site on day one?

Speaker: Yes. I think fair to say we, almost immediately had partnerships with different organizations, including central city concern. So I think maybe only a couple weeks without any services kind of on site other than the provider and the case management that was on site.

Speaker: Now, if I were to read this article correctly, you had to go find central city and health share of Oregon and care Oregon to provide those medical that's correct services. And I'm going to kind of give you an out right continuous improvement. We're going to continue to do this better. You know, we'll think about how we open these out, more effectively. But I but I also think this gets out of question, commissioner maps is hit out a couple of times. Everyone recognizes we need to coordinate, that the city has certain responsibilities with respect to those on our streets. The county has some. Is really this the best way to coordinate it, and really is. And it gets back to the fundamental question of the flow of funds, because we've had a rough journey on task sites and safe rest villages, including in coordination with the joint office and homelessness and with the county. This is not been a walk in the park. At least my perception, both rhetorically, politically, the

awful things that were said when the city put this out as a possibility. Did anyone dare to possibly support large shelters? There were some hard rocks thrown at all of us on in that process. And you guys lived it in the in the trenches as I lived it politically. And dans lived in different ways. So i, I guess I'm, I'm just submitting that before we get into public comments that, you know, i, I recognize your guys are trying to put on a we're all in it together team, but this has been a rough path over this last year and hopefully we learn from it. And the next time we open a task task site, you know, we're not going to go through this song and dance again of not having services from the county on day one. I mean, that's that's a tragedy and it really can't be repeated again.

Speaker: Yeah. Thank you commissioner. I think, yeah. As director field mentioned, we're opening up our second task site and already building the plan for those wraparound services. So we do not have that same, experience again. And I think i. Yes, very much remember, those difficult, interactions and meetings last year, and I also think that's the importance of leadership. I really want to credit the mayor. And I know commissioner Ryan also, with the safe rest villages stepped forward and said, I think this is actually going to work. And the mayor protected me and other members of our staff and said, I believe in you. And the work that you've done and the research you've done and who you've talked to, and that people really want these to be opened. And we just kept going. And now we have heard from the chairs office, from the joint office, from different members of the community who really doubted whether those sites would work. And they've seen the progress that they've made. They've seen that we proved, that it could happen. And I think we were told to prove the concept, and we did. And so we're very proud of that. And I think we'll continue to improve on those. I would say as much success as we've seen, there are still many different pieces that I want to continue to improve every

day at the safe rest villages, at the task sites with different city processes, we are continuously improving and we're in the trenches every day. This is an emergency situation. It's been an emergency situation and I think we have to keep addressing it as such. And that means that we have to keep learning. We have to pivot. We have to invest differently. We have to make decisions at a moment's notice and make sure that we're helping as many people as we can in the most effective way possible.

Speaker: And I'll just leave with essentially a rhetorical question, but you're free to weigh in if we have as painful as it's been, the city stood up safe rest villages stood up, task sites. Is this the right play for us long term to turn that over to the joint office and homelessness? Is that the right tactical play? There's a lot of argument as to statutorily who is responsible for shelters, and we probably should have that conversation out in the open, you know, at some point, just so that everyone's level setting, because that is an area of ambiguity with or without the joint office and homelessness, you go back to what was done in the early 80s. It is an area of statutory ambiguity from my vantage point. And so, if you don't have clear guidance on from the law as to who's responsible is really the joint office, the right body to be managing safe rest villages and task sites? Given the history to date, here, I can at least speak to deputy director Anna Plum, and I actually had this conversation on Tuesday and we will be working hand in hand with our staffs to make sure that it is the right play.

Speaker: If it's not, we will make a decision to do something else. Pivot. The steering and oversight committee will be largely be, a part of that process to determine whether this makes the most sense going forward. But it will continue to be a process to ensure that that is the right course of action to take. And I think making sure that we're also coordinating what we're doing on the city side with

what the joint office is doing and what the county is doing, and to make sure we can actually build something that's even better than what we have right now, but I'm not going to sugarcoat it. That is a process that will take work. This is the beginning of that work process pop up.

Speaker: And just to be clear, we're not proposing to transfer srv and task until July of next year. Is that correct? Correct. A year and to ensure that this is that's correct.

Speaker: And by the way, that don't let's not presume that there's any specific model. So we've already talked within the joint office and maybe anna and skye talked about this. There's a lot of different models that will be on the table that will require ongoing city engagement and collaboration. It doesn't mean that the city does this, or the joint office just grabs these and we'll spend the next year exploring what is the best model for collaboration around those sites.

Speaker: All right. Thank you.

Speaker: So commissioner Ryan will let you ask your questions. Then we have to take a ten minute break here and give everybody behind the scenes, an opportunity to do whatever they need to do. Commissioner Ryan. Thank you, mayor.

Speaker: I because you brought up the srvs, I want to start with that. It's, it was, spring of or. Yeah, spring of 2021 where we began that journey. And it was obviously a different time, and it was the pioneer work that then led to the task sites. So of course, what I want to get out there is that one thing I was really attached to. So I have some ptsd over this. A and then b, I have some attachment. And so I appreciate a couple of my colleagues, doing that for me. So thank you, commissioner Gonzalez and maps I was really dogged about the data sets. And those are hard to do. And I really want to lift up, I think brandy, I saw her back there in the team at svcs for really trying to figure out how to get something, as I always

say, it's better to measure something than nothing, and we didn't get culturally a lot of support from the joint office about that. So if there's one attachment I have is that can we please insist that we continue to do that work? Because at the beginning and ending of all continuous improvement work is to have some real time data and just some background on getting built for zero, I met Rosanne Haggerty, the head of this organization that birthed built for 0 in 2018, and we were it was a gathering of continuous improvement nerds. So I was there and it made it. She made it really clear that we weren't welcoming, to their work. And so I want to say that it's great to see where we are today and but I also want to say that that was passed in the late winter, early spring of 2021 to work with them. So it's been a really slow journey, and I know it's been accelerated since you've been on board. Danfield. And I appreciate that. That said, that's something that we have to continue culturally to stay on top of my question. Then would be, commissioner Rubio got to this. Is it cultured within the system yet, or is it still more being built by a few people that do data work, or is it something that actually the providers are aware of, that the joint office is aware of? Is it cultured as practice? And the reason I focus on culture, my friend, is because when you're an organizational leader, culture and practice eats policy for lunch. That's what the participants that's what the clients experience. So to me, nothing really matters until I hear it's implemented and it's part of the culture. So are we measuring? Are we doing that type of culture within the joint office and at the providers? I think the answer is probably no. On the second one, at least I want to hear what what you think, how we can get there, sooner than later. Because it's been three years and not much has happened.

Speaker: I can speak for the joint office staff and say that I think the continuous improvement culture is absolutely won. The joint office staff are excited about. They like to be able to show how their work is succeeding and where the challenges

and where it can improve. I think that culture is absolutely there. I think on the case of providers, I think one thing we should acknowledge is that they haven't had the tools in a data system to allow them to do that work very easily. So for example, we know the hmmis system is pretty cumbersome for our providers. It's difficult for them to get the data out. We are doing things now to improve that. We're putting out some virtual training so they have much better access to tools and training so they can use their data more easily and get it in more easily. And I think one of the best things we can do, which we are doing, is that movement we're making to replace our hmmis system so that we can have a better tool at everyone's fingertips to get the data they need to do that continuous improvement. And we have some interim things we're doing as well. In the next six months. We are creating a data mart that allows our team to get data out of the system much more readily to do build the dashboards and the subindicators so we can get more readily available access to our data to support that continuous improvement work.

Speaker: I appreciate that, and I'll just say that what I always found is that it just has to be socialized, if you will, as an important part of your day. Everybody the best data you get are those on the ground that are actually entering into the system. I think we make it too technical, and we act like it's like some kool aid that you have to understand how to drink and then be behind. It's really just about a willingness and putting your ego at the door and having some humility to think differently. And we all know adults are really tough on behavior change. And so it's not easy. So I just hope that we really stay on it. And then we start to see some demonstrated results and some humility in the process.

Speaker: I was really pleased. I know I mentioned this, but I was really pleased when the staff actually came to us and said, we want to change the montavilla model from a safe park site to a village model. That was not something that we

pushed on them, and that was an indication to me that they were seeing the results from the srvs that they were engaged with. They were seeing the results of the alternative shelter study that we did that our team did in partnership with Portland state. And they were thinking through that and saying, this is a model that we need to expand. And I think as we continue to build out shelter beds, it's not going to be exclusively village models, but that will be a critical part of the work. And I think, you know, it's one thing to talk about culture change, but it's another thing to see it actually happen. The growth at the, Multnomah sv, turning that into the second test site in a village, expanded village model, same thing. I think that comes from the original discussions about what do we want these to look like and the way that the model has evolved. And frankly, it's evolved away from the original conception that sam had to a very different model that reflects our learnings from the srvs. And I think it's landed us in a very good space that is not one extreme or the other. And in fact, it's a workable model that brings in the best ideas from people with that may have had very different starting points.

Speaker: All right.

Speaker: So we're at the bottom of the hour here. So we'll take a break. We'll come back at 1145. And just by way of run of show we'll come back. We'll ask if people have further questions they'd like to ask our esteemed panel here, this does complete the presentation, right? There's no more presentation. So we'll ask if there's more questions. If not, we'll move to amendments and then we'll move to public testimony. So that's sort of the run of show from here on out. In the meanwhile, we are in recess till 11:45 a.m. Don't worry about it.

Speaker: I think we had. A good. Time.

Speaker: At this point, for staff. Before we get to amendments.

Speaker: Yeah, actually, i, I do, could we folks, folks in the back. I know it's a little hard to hear in the back. Could we get the panel to come back up? Commissioner Mapps had a question or two. Yeah looks like it's all up to you, scarlet.

Speaker: I'm just prompt.

Speaker: Thanks, sarah. Yeah did we lose dan?

Speaker: No, they're both here. I like dan and anna.

Speaker: Dan I like these chairs. Is dan herding cats?

Speaker: Commissioner Mapps.

Speaker: Yeah, before we get into amendments and public testimony, there's a, I think I think an area or a possible universe we need to explore and, frankly, put put on the table, and that is what happens if the joint office, if this council chooses not to renew, this contract, can i'll turn it over, probably to Portland staff. Can you walk us through what happens if,

Speaker: Legal representation?

Speaker: Commissioner, I'm going to pass this over to tony garcia. Has been the legal representative on this contract. Okay thank you.

Speaker: Good morning, commissioner. Mayor, tony garcia with the Portland city attorney's office, your question is about dissolution under the current iga, or let's just let it expire.

Speaker: So there are two scenarios which I'm trying to think through. And I think sometimes we tend to, co mingle what I think are two different situations. One is this contract is set to expire on June 30, which is in ten days from now, let's say and we, let's say we don't have an alternative contract. What happens in that universe, and then another universe, which i, I suspect will be floated, is that we renew this iga, but we have a check in in mid-October, and, and, if we haven't, if a certain set of benchmarks haven't been achieved in by mid-October, we might walk away from

this. I'm wondering if the if the consequences and, next steps in both of those scenarios are the same. So just let's start with the easy one, or what I hope is the easy one. Let's say this this there is not a consensus on this council to, sign a new iga. What happens? So they're very different processes.

Speaker: So under the current one, if we terminate the iga, which means allowing it to end June 30th, we are supposed to have developed a transition plan. There is a penalty fee for a party that dissolves the agreement without the transition plan, or we could do it jointly. I'm going to presume we're not going to come to some agreement jointly with them before the end of the fiscal year. So we would have to come up with the transition plan. And if we cannot, we would go to mediation. If we can't agree in mediation, then one of us would have to go to circuit court and we would have a judge tell us how to dissolve. So it's a process that could take a long time, and certainly the penalty, I believe it's \$250,000 would be potentially on the table for the city if we are found to be the defaulting party.

Speaker: Well, so even if the court you're saying even if the contract expires and the contract has a sunset date at the end of this month, you're saying even if, we just kind of ride things out? Basically, we have this conversation today, and it just expires. You're saying we still have to pay a \$250,000 penalty and we have to come up with a transition plan, and we have to go to mediation, because i'll be frank, when I look, and I'm not a lawyer in this room, but we got a lawyer at this table, and we have some lawyers in the crowd, when I look at the language in the iga, I don't see that I kind of see how it says this thing expires, and then it's. It seems like it just expires, like every other contract that would expire. On the other hand, there's this other scenario which is i, which I've asked you about, which is, okay, let's say we're going along with the iga. Suddenly at some point, this council decides we don't want to do this anymore. Mid-contract and then we have to do all these other things. But

you're saying that under both of those scenarios, we have to have a transition plan, mediation and pay. 250.

Speaker: Yes. I'm not. I'm not saying that I would concede that the city would have to pay the 250. I think we'd make the best argument we could that we were not the defaulting party under that contract. But I'm just highlighting the fact that there is a the potential for a \$250,000 penalty on the table.

Speaker: Yeah, I'd love to hear from our top city attorney. Is that the advice? Is that also your opinion and your advice to this council and your interpretation that you're sharing with this council in terms of what happens if we just let this expire, yes.

Speaker: Commissioner and robert taylor, city attorney. And I think what we have been talking about today is this question, and, and we have had a very rocky relationship over a number of years. And the question of if we just let this expire, what happens? We have a very messy divorce is what happens. And tony has laid out our legal position of how we think this would get resolved. The county, I'm sure, would have another one and we would end up fighting about what happens if this just expires. So we get a messy divorce. If council approves this agreement today, one one of the benefits is it puts us on a path to have a more orderly separation of the relationship. If council decides to do that, and that is one of the benefits to the agreement that's in front of council.

Speaker: Okay. And i'll be transparent. I think probably before we do a final vote, I'm literally going to have to have the lawyers sit down with me and a copy of the iga because it looks different to me, and I think I've heard other people say something different. I fully recognize I'm not a lawyer. And so there's a bunch of stuff that I don't get here, but that is I think that outcome both strikes me as being kind of outrageous, because contracts expire all the time. If we're still going to get penalized if the contract expires, then like the contract hasn't expired, yeah.

Speaker: And I think part of what makes the divorce messy, if we just let this expire in ten days, is there is a community of service providers and a system that's in place anticipating that this arrangement will continue in some form. So if it just stops in ten days, there is a disruption to those systems and those providers and the provision that mr. Garcia was pointing to was this concept of if it terminates, there's going to be some mediation process. So to minimize the impact on the providers and the system. So that's why I do think if it just expires in ten days, there will be impacts. It will be messy. And that that's one of the reasons, the alternative that's being proposed today is better because it gives us a path to an orderly dissolution. If the city wants to do that, okay, i, I hear you. You're gonna I tell you before we do a final vote on this, we're actually going to have to sit down and do some real, tutoring mingus, with the contract language in front of us, the second question I want to ask is, let's say we, allow this contract to expire, you know, last week, I think we finished our budget process. In the budget, we have tens of millions of dollars that we agreed to send over to, the county, let's say, what happens to those dollars if this contract expires? Do we are we obliged this in those dollars over, or do we claw them back, or is that a policy question that this council decides is there?

Speaker: There would not be a contract governing those funds, so we wouldn't be obliged to send them. Okay so the money that the county is, is relying on when they're past their budget wouldn't be coming to the county. And that's where you start to get to the disruption to the system and the service providers.

Speaker: On the other hand, if we sent those dollars over, even if we didn't have a contract that said, this is how they are going to be spent or whatnot, or at least it's not contained in this contract. Would there still be that disruption?

Speaker: Say that again.

Speaker: Actually, why don't I pause here instead of I see my colleague.

Commissioner Gonzalez has his hand up, why don't I let him get in?

Speaker: Yeah, I just wanted to just clarify a couple of things.

Speaker: So the concept of going to circuit court or mediation, that would have to be initiated by either the city, county or both, right. There's nothing automatic in that process. And I'm just. Well, go ahead. So we let this contract expire. We get its July 1st, yes. We've got some service providers that there's a mess with. I get that. But in terms of automatically being hauled off to circuit court or in the mediation, the county would have to initiate that, or we would have to initiate or we both agree to go down that path. There are alternatives to how we wind that down, correct? Yes. So I just want I want to be clear, it's not like a, you know, we let it expire in our butts in court. It's not it's not quite that simple. The the, the county can choose to try and initiate a process there. That doesn't necessarily mean they will. There may be more efficient ways to quickly wind this down. That's true.

Speaker: And what the world looks like in ten days if we let it expire, is uncertain. And you're right that there are a number of different ways that can go.

Speaker: And then the 250,000 just remind me the trigger for that is, is that a you're reading that as a, a penalty that I'm using that in a colloquial sense, but a penalty that arises for not having a transition plan in place or what's the trigger for the 250,000?

Speaker: I'd have to look at it, but my recollection is that it's for any breaching party as a part of the contract and allowing in your interpreting this to mean that if or you're, you're highlighting as a potential risk, we allow a contract to expire and that constitutes a breach.

Speaker: I think it's the terminating the terminating party pays the 250. So it's the breakup fee. So if you decide you're going to end it, you've got to pay the 250. And

then both sides agree to work collaboratively to have an orderly transition that minimizes the impact on the service providers in the system. So that's the, that is how it is contemplated that the contract will wind up if a party decides they no longer want to be in it, and i, i, I don't know that. And this I think is another reason why the breakup is messy. If we just let it expire in ten days. Is the contract contemplates that a deliberate decision will be made that a party doesn't want to do this anymore. They provide notice and there's a period where they can jointly negotiate how to dissolve it to minimize the impact it. The contract doesn't contemplate that, that there will be an abrupt end ten days before it's set to expire. So that's part of the challenge that we are in, and part of the advice that our office has been giving is if this council no longer wants to participate in the joint office, make that decision soon and give yourself plenty of time to go through the process to make sure you can have an orderly transition.

Speaker: I think that that is sound, legal advice, given the repercussions of not continuing the agreement. But I not sure, based on my reading of the contract, that I'm not seeing the connection. The 250,000, I don't I don't see I I'm struggling to how the allowing a contract to expire expires for is the same thing as affirmatively electing to terminate. Those are those are two different acts and particular, you know, termination during the term. But I it's been a while since I've been through the language of the agreement. So I'm happy to take some time offline, but i, I just want to test that assumption and how it's framed. I would submit commissioner Mapps in the scheme of things, 250,000, even if we had to write that check, like if we're the right thing to end this relationship, I think in the scheme of things, we waste more money. A lot of other ways.

Speaker: We've spent \$250,000 in staff time preparing for this meeting today, although and although I just will I'm. Look, I'm literally looking at the contract here,

and, you know, section 16.1, this agreement shall terminate on the termination date unless extended by mutual agreement of Multnomah County of the Multnomah County board of commissioners and the Portland City Council, you know, i, I don't know, man. It almost seems like we're reading two different contracts, and I know we've, revised this 16 different times, so maybe I'm looking at an old one, but what you're saying just isn't really intuitively obvious to me, right now. So. And we, you know, we'll, we can have we'll have time to have this discussion, but, I'm not understanding. I'm having a hard time relating what you were saying to the, what I see in the contract.

Speaker: I'd be happy to talk to you about that.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Thank you. And just to be clear, are we. Are we still looking at section 16 of the original agreement, or was it an amendment that modified the termination provision that is germane to the \$250,000 question?

Speaker: It's still the original term. None of the amendments modified that provision or commissioner Gonzalez.

Speaker: Are you looking at that section 16.1 I mean, you're a lawyer. What am i, dumb here?

Speaker: I, I think I'd like to take part of the conversation offline with robert, but i, I'm not I'm not quite following that, that we would be on the hook, because I mean, even tie it to. I mean, we're responsible for maintaining our baseline funding amount. That's the. Isn't that the trigger for the 250? And I'm trying to do this on the fly, and I know you guys have had a long time on this, but i.

Speaker: Yeah, if we're talking about the \$250,000, if that's what you're talking about.

Speaker: Yeah, yeah.

Speaker: If we terminate, if we just let it expire, we're not on the hook for 250.

Speaker: Okay?

Speaker: It feels a little bit different than what we just heard.

Speaker: Yeah, if we just let it expire in ten days, we are not on the hook for 250. It is still a mess.

Speaker: What? Why?

Speaker: Because the service providers and the system is anticipating that this agreement is going to continue their budgets have been passed in anticipation of this continuing. And that's part of the reason our advice has been, if you want to get out of this, make a plan for it and don't do it at the very end of every fiscal year. And, and that's that's what we're up against. So you're right. You can let it expire. There's no \$250,000 obligation. But we still have to deal with what the world looks like in ten days. And it's not it's going to be messy, robert, I appreciate that, i'll tell your colleagues. You know, I think there are two, separate, at least two separate processes that are converging here, one is the discussion of what happens with this agreement with the county about how we manage the joint office. Another is a, a budget discussion. And last week we just passed the budget. We agreed to send over \$25 million to the county. I i agree that there is a high probability that if we tried to claw back that \$25 million. Now that would at the very least be obnoxious, so if we've done that, if we even if we step away from this, I think my natural inclination would be to allow that funding to go forward, however, I don't think that I don't see how if we allow this contract to expire and send over the funding that we approved in the budget, how, what harm is done?

Speaker: Well, my legal my legal advice there is, if you're going to send 25 million to the county, you're going to want to have some contract in place with the county governing that, I completely agree. And that is kind of the argument I've been trying

to make with my colleagues over, like the folks who negotiated this and what I'm told in terms of what happens in year 2 or 3 of the contract, I thought it was going to go to safer villages and task sites, but instead, what I learned is, well, we're going to say we have a strong preference that it would go to safer villages and task sites, which doesn't strike me as actually being a contract.

Speaker: Yeah, i, I hear you, I hear you, and I and I think you're right to say, hey, there could be other terms in that agreement that strengthen the county's commitments. And I think that's a conversation this council can have and insist on. But but, if this city is going to send 25 million to the county, we should have a contract that governs that period of time. And if this council is not sure whether they want to continue with the relationship, rip that contract should have a clear path to dissolution. That contract should say these are the things that the city wants to see in the near term, to help us decide whether we want to go on that path to dissolution. And I think those elements are part of what's being proposed to council today, thank you for that clarification, commissioner Gonzalez.

Speaker: And, you know, I appreciate commissioner Mapps questions here. And I just want to be crystal clear on my perspective. If we allowed this to expire, I would least like us to have a conversation about a budget amendment potentially clawing back some of those dollars and not in a punitive way. We want continuation of services. We don't want to disrupt the services on the street. But but I think it's an approach. Great conversation for this council to have with with time to deliberate on what the real impacts of that would be, on, on the ground and we don't want to be punitive at the joint office of homeless. We don't want to be punitive to the county. That's not it's to try and do it in early. But but I think it's legitimate question if we're not going to continue the agreement, should we really, you know, send the whole hog over to the joint office this coming year? Sure.

Speaker: I appreciate that. That caveat. Commissioner Gonzalez. And I don't disagree that we shouldn't have a discussion here. I just want my county partners to know I'm very sensitive to how disruptive it might perhaps be for the city to claw these dollars back at, you know, ten days before the fiscal year, year begins, but I look, if that's if we choose to go the termination route, I look forward to having this conversation with my colleagues, in terms of what the how do we best, provide continuity of services? We're actually on the street. And how do we treat our contractors fairly? Thank you, commissioner Ryan.

Speaker: Yes, thank you. Mayor. It's good to see you, robert taylor and tony garcia. Tony, i'll always be a fan of yours because you were there with us when we were doing something very difficult. And that was opening up the safe rest villages, over two and a half years ago. I have a question about that. What's the process of the amendments today? Change the iga, what happens next as far as if this council adopts amendments to the iga? Right. I assume it goes back to the county. I just want to hear your opinion on that.

Speaker: I'm not sure I follow the question.

Speaker: Could you? So we're having, obviously a really good conversation today. One of the best we've had in a long time about the response to homelessness from local government. And we are entertaining some amendments. So there's an opportunity with that as we try to get to a yes on this side, that it will change the iga with these amendments. What next? If it changes the iga ?

Speaker: So the iga if the amendments that are proposed are adopted, what it does, is it brings forth another meeting before the City Council. I think before October 15th, where this council will then decide whether to terminate the agreement or not. But the iga itself doesn't change just the presentation and the goal. Progress needs to be presented before this council.

Speaker: Could I clarify, because I think the commissioner may be asking a separate question. So I think you're being responsive. Live to the red line amendments to the ordinance? Yes. I think he's asking a separate question. Am I correct, commissioner Ryan?

Speaker: Yeah, I am, I'm asking a question that says that as we try to get to a yes on this side of the river, we could change the iga a bit. And so I assume it would go back to the county. Correct?

Speaker: Oh yes.

Speaker: Yes. Yeah

Speaker: There's two there's two, two different types of changes that could be made. So one type of change is to the iga itself. And if we make those changes that would have to go back to the county for them to agree to those changes. The other type of change that has been discussed, and that is part of what's being proposed, is, if we agree to the iga and there is this path to dissolution in that iga, then this council could direct the city to engage in conversations with the county, try to get some clear understandings by a date, certain. And if we don't get those from the county, and it's clear that this relationship may not be going where we want it to go, then that will inform our decision whether to terminate under the terms of the iga. Okay a quick clarifying question, a point on this, on that question, let's say we pass a modified iga, so we'll call it iga 2.0, send it over the river to our colleagues at the county. Over at the county, they decide, we're not going to vote on this, so in that situation, did they terminate the contract? And do they have to pay us \$250,000? No we'd sure fight about it, i'll tell you that, wouldn't we?

Speaker: Yeah. I mean, that's a great question. I mean, in either case, if we don't have there's no binding agreement at that point. Yeah, it's over, do we have to go to mediation then?

Speaker: It's possible with what would happen, though, is you this council would be faced with the question of what do we do with the funds that we have budgeted? Do we send those funds to the county or not?

Speaker: I say yes, Gonzales says no, but we can sort that out.

Speaker: And my advice to you as your lawyer is don't send the money if you don't have a contract in place that governs it.

Speaker: I think that's sound advice.

Speaker: Alternatives. We couldn't the county withdraw the funding that they have sent our way.

Speaker: True. And as and again it gets messy if that's the road we go down, if workers are impacted on the contracts that the county is on the hook for, based on our on the money that we're putting in, do we have any exposure to.

Speaker: We know.

Speaker: Commissioner Mapps, let me see. I know we're trying to get to a public testimony. I think I'm fine for now, I just wanted to have a clearer understanding of the scenario where we, allowed this, allow this contract to sunset, and I appreciate the discussion. And I still have some questions.

Speaker: We'll have definitely more time to ask questions and have questions answered. Thank you, gentlemen. Appreciate you, thank you to all of our presenters, colleagues, we're going to open the floor to amendments. I'm going to offer some amendments, germane to the conversation. We just had. These are amendments to the ordinance, not the IGA. The IGA is part of the ordinance. What I'm about to propose is, is an amendment to the ordinance. So it would not require us to go back to Multnomah County, since the council passed the joint office of homeless services, IGA amendment 17 in June of 2023, my team has been working with my commissioners and their staffs to ensure that their interests are captured

as best as possible within the new iga. Over the past week, my staff and I have been meeting with my colleagues and their staffs to hear their feedback on this final version, and I want you to all know I appreciate the conversations we've had, and we have heard the feedback that you've provided. Commissioner Mapps has asked for a detailed budget breakdown to explain where the city's funding has been allocated within the joint office budget that is included in exhibit two of this amendment. Commissioner Rubio has been supportive of the effort and has emphasized the need for both clear outreach and engagement strategy, as well as a clear, permanent, supportive housing strategy. Both actions are listed as deliverables in this plan. Commissioner Gonzales has requested a clear policy related to tent and tarp distribution, as well as harm reduction supplies. As Commissioner Ryan would like and would like to see increased visibility into the data system and wants to see clear dashboards that are available to the public in short order. And all of my fellow commissioners have continually emphasized the need for continuous improvement and urgency in developing these strategies and delivering these services to address what is obviously, as I stated up front, Portlanders top concern, which is homelessness. We have to keep this work front and center to ensure that progress is being made. As such, I have worked with all of my colleagues in their staffs to develop a single collective amendment that identifies milestones on which the city must see progress in order to continue within this new contract. We've been working thoroughly on this over the last few weeks, and especially during the last 24 hours, as my fellow commissioners have brought forward new ideas. We think we mainly captured our best thoughts and we're hoping that this amendment is a compromise that works for the majority of the council. The amendment reads as follows. Amend the ordinance to include new direct gives a and b the original directive a now becomes directive c. I'll now read

the new directives into the record. A City Council will meet by October 15th, 2024 to receive a progress report from the city administrator on the homeless response action plan. If the plan is not met, the following contract milestones. City Council will decide whether or not to terminate the homeless response system intergovernmental agreement. At that time, milestones that the City Council will review progress upon. Number one, the homeless responsive system steering and oversight committee will approve a publicly accessible performance dashboard that shows quarterly updates and progress towards a trap. Outcomes number two, the joint office of homeless services will be launched, will have launched a shelter availability application pilot to report available access and appropriate placement spots available to be tracked in real time. Number three, the h.r. Sok, the strategy and oversight committee, will approve a publicly accessible budget dashboard available detailing respective program investments by fiscal year number four, the joint office of homeless services will provide a detailed plan including costs and locations on the 555 beds of additional adult shelter that is planned to be opened by December of 2024. Number five, the joint office of homeless services, will launch a pilot to secure up to 200 block primary leased units to support rapid rehousing placement. Number six, Multnomah County will have completed an analysis of current supportive housing providers and develop a six month plan to bill for medicaid eligible services. Number seven, h.r. Sok. The strategic oversight committee, will discuss determine whether to propose an expanded sot to include one a business sector representative, two a behavioral health expert who is not a current service provider, and three an individual taxpayer who currently pays supportive housing services taxes. Number eight, the hrs strategic oversight committee will approve a policy that governs distribution of tents and tarps by Multnomah County and its service providers within the city of Portland. Nine the

hrs soc will approve a policy that governs distribution of syringes, drug kits and other harm reduction tools by Multnomah County and its service providers within the city of Portland. Number ten, the joint office of homeless services, will finalize an outreach and engaging engagement strategy workgroup and steering committee that includes city of Portland participation. Similar to the community sheltering strategy. And I understand, commissioner Mapps, you would like to add two friendly amendments. Yes. 11 and 12.

Speaker: I would like to add amendments 11 and 12 and colleagues, let me read 11 to you. The hrc soc will provide clear delineation of roles and responsibilities of the city and the county that are related, either directly or indirectly, to homelessness services. That's 11. And now I'm going to read 12, and then i'll circle back and to give you a quick, intuitive understanding of what I'm trying to accomplish here, the hrc soc will determ an agreement an agreed upon number of housing vouchers to be set aside for residents who are housed at a task or s rv site. So here's the intuitive understanding of what I'm trying to accomplish with number 11. A number number 11 basically says, the city and the county at some point have to sit down and have a come to a clear understanding of what's the city's responsibility and the houselessness space and what's the county's responsibility in the houselessness space, which is, frankly, sort of a bottom line red line for me. And, this policy area number 12, basically says, you know, the city and county have to, come up with an agreed upon number of housing vouchers for folks who are in our task systems and or are safe rest villages, here's the intuition behind that for the task sites and safe rest villages to work. One of the things that has to happen is throughput, you know, otherwise those things become permanent housing, what we have proven over time is that, if you put someone in these spaces after 3 or 4 months, they begin to stabilize and they're kind of ready to move on to more stable,

supportive housing, one of the problems that we consistently find is there is not we don't have that, frankly, the rental vouchers to get those move those folks from the safe rest villages and safe from the task sites into, supportive housing situations. So one, moving forward, one of the things I'd like to do is to make sure that at least for this piece of our homeless service systems, we have, it works, from beginning to end, you can move from the sidewalk into a safe rest village. You stabilize, you're going to get out and actually have support to have permanent housing. And that's, that's what I'm putting on the table.

Speaker: All right, commissioner Mapps, I accept your directives.

Speaker: 11 and 12 as friendly amendments. The overall package is Wheeler one. Can I get a second?

Speaker: I will second that.

Speaker: Commissioner Mapps seconds. Commissioner Ryan, you have your hand raised.

Speaker: Yeah, I have a friendly amendment. Mayor, I'd like to introduce a friendly amendment, and I have passed them out to all of you. Here's the amendment. Friendly amendment is to section b, it's item b seven. The hrs soc will expand the soc to include one business sector representative, one behavioral health expert who is not a current provider, and one individual taxpayer who currently pays sales tax. Colleagues, we need good governance model that doesn't include only elected officials. We need to make decisions with and on behalf of the people paying these taxes and receiving these services, not people who are receiving the tax dollars.

Speaker: I'll second that.

Speaker: Thank you, commissioner Ryan moves, and commissioner Mapps seconds. Ryan. One any further amendments? All right. Very good, are there questions on the amendments at this time? And I just have a clarifying question, as

I understand, your amendment, commissioner Ryan, that is a fundamental change to the strategy and oversight committee, which currently is envisioned to only have elected officials. Two from the city, two from the county and one from east county. You are proposing to add non elected officials to that committee, is that correct?

Speaker: That is correct.

Speaker: Okay. And there are other committees and it's also to move it just so I could finish.

Speaker: I wanted the language to not be so passive. I've experienced that for the last two years and it doesn't move anything. So I want to make sure the language was more direct.

Speaker: Okay. And you are of course aware that there are other committees that include business interests and include providers, but it is, I assume, your belief that those committees are not, does not elevate that viewpoint to a high enough level. Is that correct? I believe yes.

Speaker: I think that the balance that we need and the committee that has the most influence, is essential in order for us to actually build that continuous improvement culture.

Speaker: Okay. And who do you envision appointing those three community members to the strategy and oversight committee?

Speaker: We have systems in place for recruitment, and we will then have approval process both from the City Council and from the county board.

Speaker: Okay, and one last point to the discussion that commissioner Mapps had opened with legal counsel, which I found to be a very important and helpful, discussion. My assumption is if your amendment passes, then this whole package would indeed have to go back to Multnomah County for their approval, since it would fundamentally change the iga. Is that correct?

Speaker: Yes, that is correct. That sounds like good government to me.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you, commissioner Mapps, yes. Frankly, I have a question for commissioner gonzales. Do you have are you going to bring forward any other amendments, or does the mayor's, mac amendment, suffice to what you were trying to achieve in terms of coordinating policy on 10th turps and needles?

Speaker: So our, my amendments are still theoretically on the table. They're still filed, I think if we pass, this amendment, with commissioner Ryan's addition, I the need for my amendments would go away. So I'd withdraw them. And, there there is an important difference in the way my amendments are, structured. And what is, in sort of the compromise provision here, we were asking that the policy, for tents, tarps and harm reduction be solidified prior to the mayor executing the new iga. That's that's essentially how my amendments read. With this. We're giving a little more time, for the parties to reach agreement on that, it's and, I'm ambivalent about which way we go, but it's, in the interest of compromise, I'm willing to have, my policies incorporated into into the bigger package. And, with the expectation that this is a real check in in 105 days, that we're having a very hard and direct conversation about whether these milestones have been met. And we walk if there's not sufficient progress across the board on the milestones, or at least we have the opportunity to have the real conversation there.

Speaker: So just so I'm clear, let's say in 105 days, there is not a shared agreement on how to distribute tents, tarps and needles, is that your understanding that then council is kind of walks a terminates the agreement or the what's contemplated is we reconvene to specifically determine whether we're going to terminate the agreement at that point.

Speaker: And I'm a yes vote on termination if we haven't seen progress on tents, tarps, and harm reduction, governance and, and one semantic I don't so much

describe it as a policy to address tent tarpon, tent distribution and, and harm reduction distribution. It's when we're not going to do it. It's the rules as to, what what are the conditions under which it's acceptable and not acceptable in the city of Portland?

Speaker: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate that clarification about where you're at.

Speaker: Commissioner Rubio.

Speaker: So I just want to say, for the record, I think, I think there's all agreement that we're all concerned about tents and tarps, but I think it's really important to state on the record how we build the policy, though itself matters, and there's a few important points. I just want to say how, when and to whom they get distributed matters. And based on that data and when looking at the availability of shelter beds, is how we build this policy, I think responsibly we can balance the accountability part with the reality of needing to protect humans from the elements. That's just real and factual and something that we have to deal with in our in our, in this work. So policy wise, I just want us to be very careful about setting ourselves up for the reality that we could be creating, more harm than good if we do something blanket, there was there have been mentions of blanket prohibition. And I think, commissioner, you said that that's not what you're intending here, but implementing something, a blanket overnight will not be effective, for what we're trying to get at, if a shelter bed is not available, people will seek shelter in other places, so to repeat again, just for the record, as we as we reduce the distribution of tents and tarps, it must follow and be tied to the increase of shelter beds. That's a really, really important piece here that I hope that we explore as this moves forward in any shape it takes.

Speaker: I respond to that, commissioner.

Speaker: Yeah, I appreciate the comment, commissioner Rubio, I also want to be crystal clear. My expectation is we are seeing a dramatic reduction in the in the distribution of tents and tarps in the city of Portland, irrespective as to shelter capacity, this is long overdue. 24,000 tarps distributed in the last year is completely unacceptable under any circumstances. In the city of Portland, having said that, I recognize that a distribution of tents and tarps and cold weather, if a properly insulated tent and tarp in conjunction with other life saving supplies, I think there's a space for it, if the county is firmly committed to camping and supporting that, then they can designated campsites in, in unincorporated Multnomah County, hopefully not in the center of the city, but I'd be supportive of them developing a game plan there for campsites. But the uncontrolled distribution of tents and tarps and harm reduction tools on the streets of Portland must end. And so we'll have whether we agree on this amendment, I think that's a conversation from my vantage point that we have to when we circle back at 105 days to be had.

Speaker: Yeah. And I want to be clear that i, I acknowledge that and i, and I think I support that intention. I'm just saying that what we say in the policy matters in the process, and we do have to tie it to, to an outcome that we can track. And I do think that it's reasonable to look at and explore how it should be tied to more shelter openings. I don't, I don't I don't think it's that different from what what you're acknowledging.

Speaker: I hope one outcome from this. Commissioner Gonzalez. And I appreciate this discussion, is that we get clarity on what the current policy is. Why have so many tents been passed out? Why have so many tarps been passed out under what circumstances have they been passed out and I think that as commissioner Rubio said, you know, a blanket policy may not be the right answer, but a more refined policy certainly is part of the right answer. And I've even wondered why why we're

handing out tents. Why not? Bivvy sacks? If the concern is people being exposed to the elements, why are we handing out ginormous tents that block entire sidewalks? And then, as John DiLorenzo has accurately indicated, that then puts us in a position where we're on one hand, tents are being handed out, on the other, we are subjected to a settlement agreement, which we readily and rightfully agreed to maintain public right of way. So I think it's opening up a really important discussion. And from my perspective, I like the fact that it is in the package of directives that we would then further discuss in October. And with the joint office folks here and present, they're hearing our concern about it. They know we are highly motivated on this subject because the public is highly motivated on this subject. And so that gives us a couple of months here to really see if we can be clear about where it is appropriate, if it is appropriate. Right. So I just want to appreciate your injecting this into the conversation. And I think it's right that we have the conversation about tents and tarps. As, as Commissioner Rubio also alluded to Commissioner Rubio, did you have any further questions, no. All right. Any other questions before we go to public testimony? All right. Thank you, Rebecca, I'll let you run public testimony. How many folks do we have signed up?

Speaker: We have 14 people signed up. All right.

Speaker: Good. Three minutes each. Name for the record. Rebecca will call your name. You do not have to mention where you live in our public testimony, John DiLorenzo. Glad I didn't say nasty things about you. Here you are. I can never say nasty things about you either. It's good to see you, John. Good to see you, Mayor. Thanks for being here, good morning, Mayor Wheeler and council members. I'm John DiLorenzo, appearing here on behalf of the plaintiffs in the recently settled Tozer versus City of Portland case. I'm here in support of Commissioner Gonzalez proposed amendment number one, and I'd like to urge that you reconsider

whether it should be added to the mix, as opposed to what is included in milestone eight, and i'll give my reasons for that, last week we revealed new information concerning the extent to which the county managed joint office was handing out more than 6500 tents and 24,000 tarps at the same time. You were removing 8000 tents or more from city sidewalks per our settlement agreement. Since that time, chair vega peterson, who controls the management direction of the joint office, made clear the county's intent to continue to hand out tents and tarps for the indefinite future. On Tuesday, I sent you all a letter on behalf of my clients informing you of our position that should this contract be renewed, your contractor's intention to continue to distribute tents and tarps to anyone who requests them are inconsistent with the provisions of your settlement agreement, which controls tent and tarp distribution written by you and your contractors, this is why we support the gonzales amendment number one, which will make your approval of the renewal contingent on the county adopting your policy relating to tent and tarp distribution. Milestone eight of the mayor's amendment touches on this, but still leaves the city in a situation where the joint office will be handing out tents throughout the entirety of the summer in violation of your agreement. Now, all that said, distributing tents and tarps is the least humane way to deal with those who need roofs over their heads. We have available indoor shelter capacity. The problem is that the joint office leaves it up to those on the street to choose whether they wish to come indoors. Why do we encourage and enable our homeless population to stay outdoors, when the plan should be to encourage them to come indoors? Last Sunday, nicholas kristof published an editorial column. His column quotes congressman blumenauer as saying that some of our leaders are much more interested in ideology than actual results. I believe the county chair's position is using the columns words infected with an ideological purity that is focused more

on intentions and less on oversights and outcomes. As Mr. Kristof has urged in his column, less purity and more pragmatism would go a long way. I urge you to adopt the Gonzales amendment. Number one. Thank you.

Speaker: John, I just add one comment.

Speaker: Commissioner Gonzalez.

Speaker: I appreciate your testimony, and I just want to be clear as to my thinking here, when the mayor's church heard of my amendments, we had some conversation about, just sort of how the next 105 days might go and, my original amendment, may not give the county ample opportunity to respond to what we're asking for. And so it is it is a concession. It is a compromise. It's in some ways a tip of the hat to the mayor's team that they've done a lot of work in putting in place, this new IGA, I'm still fundamentally ambivalent about the new IGA, but I also want to recognize that there was a lot of effort by the mayor's team, by the joint office, and by the county to try and find agreement on a whole host of other issues outside of tents and tarps. And so I, I this was a compromise on my part to recognize that those efforts, I still am fundamentally ambivalent about the future of the agreement, but I, I did want to recognize the work that had been done by a lot to, to move it from where it was a year ago.

Speaker: Well, commissioner, I completely understand, but what I also understand is that by renewing this contract, the joint office is your contractor and your agreement provides that you're not to deal with contractors who have tent and tarp policies that are not do not comport with yours, the county chair has made it clear that that she intends to continue a policy that does not comport with yours, which suggests to me that you are presently, taking an action, potentially, that is inconsistent with our agreement.

Speaker: Maybe we can create some. Maybe we can hear other public testimony and kind of think through, you know, how we might address that.

Speaker: Well, what might work if you're going to have this cooling off period? Until October to reevaluate what we go a long way would be a written promise from the county chair that until such time as you have your exercise in October, the county's tent and tarp policy will comport with yours. I that would do it.

Speaker: I love the idea. I was thinking along the similar lines. I just want to think of how we actually operationalize that. But I like the idea a lot.

Speaker: Super. Thank you very much.

Speaker: Thank you sir. Mr. Mayor commissioner Mapps here.

Speaker: We don't have to, fully unpack this, but earlier earlier in today's presentation, I raised questions about, the iga and how it deals with the city and county indemnify each other and holding each other harmless, this discussion in particular, when I take a look at the language in 8.2.1, and I hear the discussion that we just had today, it still seems to me like the county should be at least paying lawyers fees and, and damages in situations like this. I'm not sure why it's become this. Why this is the city's role in this space, and as I have conversations with, our city attorney. So I have a clearer understanding of what this contract says and means, I'd like to have some clarity on that. And, mr. Lorenzo, if you have, I won't. We have got other people waiting. But if you want to send me an email on that or give me a call, I'd. I'd hear your perspective, too. Thank you all.

Speaker: Thanks. Appreciate it.

Speaker: Barbara Jacobsen. Keith Martin. Tianna Tozer I'm here. To

Speaker: Welcome. Thank you for being here.

Speaker: Thanks for your patience.

Speaker: I spend more time with you and my family.

Speaker: I know the feeling well. I'm sorry about that.

Speaker: Well, that's okay. Mayor Wheeler, city commissioners, my name is tiana tozer in may 2023, myself and nine plaintiffs reached a settlement with the city to keep the sidewalks clear of tents and encampments to comply with the federal ada. The quarterly reports show the city is complying with our settlement agreement, and that should be enough to keep all the sidewalks clear throughout the city. But the county is thwarting our settlement by continuing to hand out tents and tarps, which the city in turn has to clean up every time I go into work. After report 3 or 4 encampments, it's like whack a mole, but not nearly as fun. On Monday of this week, I actually had a homeless person on my porch drugged out. I asked him to leave and take all his garbage with him. Instead, he left it for me to clean up. Multnomah County just passed their 2024 budget, which includes \$230,000 for approximately 6500 tents, which is about one tent for every single homeless person in Multnomah County from 2020 to 2024, 27,910 tents were distributed along with 81,214 tarps, enough for each homeless person, in Multnomah County at that time to receive five tents and 14.7 tarps. Since the ada settlement in 2023, 6557 tents and 24,172 tarps have been distributed. With the new Multnomah County budget, we will be able to provide every homeless person with another tent, bringing the total number of tents to six per homeless persons since 2020. Tents and tarps are durable goods. Most people own one tent. They pack it up when they break camp and yet here we are finding five tents to every single homeless person in Multnomah County. And it has been reported by outreach workers that they collect tents, that they have 3 or 4 goods provided for free, have no value, as you can plainly see, and this is humanitarian aid work 101 in the documents subpoenaed for the lawsuit, I received distribution records. Those are the documents that I've provided for you. I provided you my tallies from those records, a copy of what those

records look like, and three pages worth of questions about discrepancies in an audit of Multnomah County released on October 24th, 2023, the auditor stated that a government should be able to show if it has actually purchased goods and has actually provided services. We believe that to support transparency, it should be done at the program offer level, not just at the operating fund level of more than 12 years of experience. Auditing grants and contracts. I would not allow Multnomah County to manage \$10,000, let alone 31 million, in grants speak. They are high risk. Do we know what our return on investment is? What are we actually getting? For my money? And my biggest question is how do we monitor subrecipients? Have you looked at any of their contracts? You cannot follow the money. I have spent hours with them. I urge you not to renew your iga with Multnomah County, not just because they are still handing out tents and tarps, but because it is a one sided agreement that favors Multnomah County. I urge you to read closely the written testimony of mr. Fruits. If you do choose to you renew the iga. I would suggest to revise it significantly and would urge you to make it contingent on requiring the county to adopt the same policy on tents and tarps that the city agreed to in the ada settlement. Thank you. Thank you. Lovely seeing you all again. I hope your families are well. Thank you.

Speaker: You too. Appreciate it.

Speaker: Cody hermeling.

Speaker: Welcome, cody.

Speaker: Thank you for being here. Thank you. All right.

Speaker: All right.

Speaker: Well, I won't be too long, but my name is cody hermeling. I'm here basically to just kind of tag along with, what, tiana just said. And john dilorenzo. I'm not in favor of this iga, I we've had some progress, but in the last 2 or 3 years. But

obviously that that bar was just an easy step over to, to get up to, anyway, but, goodness, sorry to do, I'm, I say that you either adopt mr. Gonzales commissioner Gonzalez as amendments or we don't accept this iga, having tents in the sidewalks, consistent over the last few years just takes my roads to wherever I want to go away. I don't have anywhere to walk because I have to walk in the street. As I've explained to you guys multiple times at this point. So I just, it's just not have tents in the streets or in the sidewalks anymore. And, not my best testimony, but that's about all I know what to say right now. Anyway, thank you. Thank you.

Speaker: Kenneth March. Angela. Todd angela is joining us online.

Speaker: Welcome, angela. Angela, can you unmute? Join as an attendee. Are you okay? I'm here. Okay, okay. One second. I actually prepared something today. I'm going to flip my unmute. All right. What a pain. Oh, this is a pain. Okay all right. You guys can hear me. I had to transfer sites. I didn't know this was going to go. I have a 1234. I stepped outside, so hopefully you can see me.

Speaker: Yeah, we can hear you loud and clear. Okay great, my name is angela todd, I'm the voice of pdx railways. It's a series of social media channels with about 200,000 citizens concerned about Portland's livability and governing. I'm troubled that this council continues to fund the joint office of homeless services. As many citizens know by now, the agreement is managed by the county, and the county has in the past, without exception. I'm going to. This is so crazy. I'm going to turn my phone. You're going to have to deal with it. Sorry. The agreement is managed solely by the county. The county has in the past shown, nearly without exception, that their program does not emphasize outcome, but rather output listening to the promises today on the phone, I was likening it to an abuser's promise. They will change, only to return to the same behavior following the trauma they've caused. J os has nearly a ten year record of failed promises, frivolous spending without

metrics, accountability or results in mind. And today we heard they plan to put accountability and visibility in place. Those buzzwords don't mean anything to me based on track record. As a matter of fact, how the metrics will be presented in this dashboard or whatever, it hasn't even been developed. I'm understanding the shelter system continues to be mismanaged. Outreach is nearly nonexistent, and case management is unnecessarily cumbersome, and it's arduous in every chapter for nearly ten years, the county has failed to keep up to avoid things like accountability, best practices from other areas in Oregon and the country with better outcomes. So they're not even paying attention to what's working. Audits and community outcries. Not just the housed citizens, but citizens that are experiencing homelessness, who we feature, who the press features support. The statements that I'm making here. The city of Portland has managed the safe rest villages. Well, you know, mayor, councilor Ryan especially. I just want to acknowledge you in your staff for that hard work. The neighbors near the Clinton triangle, for example, have indicated that conditions in those areas have improved. And my fear is that if we just turn this over to the county, it is going to be handled poorly, just like everything they've handled in the past. Knowing what we know about the county's dysfunctional management, why should the city consider turning these sites over to be mismanaged in sanity? Everyone knows this doing the same thing over and over and expecting results. It's a botched program. It's not helping community livability. I'm running short on time, so I want to say the city gave \$42 million last year to this unworkable accountable plan. Certainly based on our proven performance, their lack thereof, the city could better manage and allocate within the city. I'd like to ask your leadership to vote no for unworkability. It's needed for you to step up into that leadership perspective and it's warranted. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you angela.

Speaker: Loretta guzman. Welcome.

Speaker: Hi. My name is loretta guzman. I live and work here, and I also am a small business owner in the city of Portland. I was born and raised here and I care is why I am. Why I am here. The handing out of tents and tarps has been a failed experiment. If our city continues to fund this experiment, it is our city's leaders failing. Failing. We the people. Once again. We can look around and see it's not getting better. Our streets are not safer, nor nor are they healthier. Many tents have caught fire. Have had large amounts of drugs and guns stored in them in our streets. I have personally had tents and tarps abandoned on my property, and I am left to clean up the mess and dispose of any garbage left behind, including any paraphernalia for the throw up. All that every day I see tents and tarps blocking sidewalks. If our city continues down this road of destruction, a grant to fund the tents and tarps. Our city will be back in court in violation of the ada and of the settlement agreement. We need permanent solutions, transparency, checks and balances, real solutions towards our homelessness. Thank you, thank you.

Speaker: Appreciate your being here.

Speaker: John frederick. Steve jackson. No, don't go straight.

Speaker: Thank you. I see no, no no. Just. Oh thank you, thank you.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Welcome. Thank you for being here.

Speaker: Where's the mic? Okay. Hello. My name is steve jackson, I'm here to, talk about the iga and how I think it is in conflict with the ada lawsuit, I understand that tents and tarps can help people, but I don't believe it's the best way to help homeless people. In the past, I've seen less tents. But walking to work, I run into them still. And I just really think, if you're going to accept this, internal government

agreement, you really need to make sure it doesn't conflict with the ada lawsuit. We've already promised to keep the sidewalks clear, it's not just for me being blind, but people that are in wheelchairs and kids and people that have to go in the street. It's just unsafe. So, please take that into consideration. And and, maybe not hand out so many tents and tarps and. Thank you. Thank you.

Speaker: Chris. Claire moss. Daniel. Demello. Oh, I'm sorry.

Speaker: Chris. Chris welcome.

Speaker: Thanks for being here. Hi everyone.

Speaker: Thank you for having me. My name is chris. Claire. As she said, I live in the northwest district. I spoke here about a year ago. And I think much of what I was going to say has been reiterated multiple times, and I was very happy to hear about the amendments. But sitting back listening, I wanted to bring the focus just to the average person. Right. There's lots of buzzwords, lots of promises, lots of cross your fingers. And it kind of rings of mark twain, right? Lies, lies and statistics. Right? It's just all adaptable. It doesn't really mean anything. I think, mr. Dilorenzo, if I have that right, nailed it. A lot of ideology, not a lot of practicality. When you're talking about in the years since I spoke here last time, I've had over \$10,000 worth of property damage, been confronted. My kids have been scared, but on and on and on, right? Ironically, I had to actually move a very inebriated person off my front gate to even get here this morning. I'm constantly picking up garbage, acting as the police force. If you're going to distribute and there's no question that there needs to be a humane, you know, people need help. There's no question about that. And I think most people would agree with that. But it can't be my burden, right? I can't be picking up needles. I can't be having my dog go on fentanyl for sniffing a piece of tinfoil. That is not realistic. The county does not participate. And I can say this honestly because I have called multiple times. I've emailed multiple times at your

request from my last meeting here. I participate in the problem solvers committees with your staff, who have all been excellent. Jackson dakota, and hill. Amazing people. And we're stymied, right? We're stymied. The average person cannot bear this brunt. Right. We are. And I don't see a successful path when you're, small business owner here, too. I just moved my medical clinic to the pearl, you know, it's very difficult. Nobody wants to come. I you're talking about property values and investment. You're this problem changes people's behaviors, right? In spending, in empathy, and in just their day to day livability in the city. They start ignoring everything, right? City's dirty. I'm going to throw my trash out. I'm gonna, you know, people stop caring, right. And so when you know the city attorney is talking about, you know, a messy divorce, I mean, maybe sometimes that's for the best. Maybe you know, children need structure, right? And maybe that's the maybe that is the answer. Because I have an expectation, too. Same as the county does or the city. But my expectation is that my city and neighborhood doesn't become a third world country. Right, I happen to live near the fred meyers. There \$6.2 million in the hole every year. Bleeding money. And that's an anchor of the neighborhood. So I urge you, I think all of you have valid points, but I urge you to sort of redirect the overall philosophy to the average person and what that means. Thank you. Appreciate it.

Speaker: Daniel demello welcome, daniel.

Speaker: Hi. I'm, that was loud. I'm daniel demello.

Speaker: I'm the secretary of the kerns neighborhood association. I'm the chair of the Multnomah County central community budget advisory committee. And the chair of the joint office of homeless services, community budget advisory committee, which, as you might be aware, could not this year secure a commitment from the county that this homelessness response plan that the, budget even this year, we won't see any reduction in the total number of unsheltered people. We

could not get a commitment to actually reduce the total number of unsheltered people on our streets by even one person over a three year period, but that's not why I'm here to talk to you today, I want to echo the opinions and the sentiments of everyone who's testified before me specifically. I'm here before you today to speak to a particular issue within the IGA that I think has gone underdiscussed, which is that the county already cannot lawfully meet the deadlines established by the homelessness response action plan to create the governance structure. As you're aware, the intergovernmental agreement does not create an intergovernmental entity shared between the county and the city. It merely directs the county to take particular actions as under the Multnomah County code, the to, or rather the Multnomah County charter in section 3.70, requires that the county, when it sets up advisory groups that it do so by ordinance. Now there are three advisory groups created within this homelessness response plan and within this intergovernmental agreement, but the deadline of establishing those by June 20th 30 or 2024, very charitably, it could not be achieved because the county code at section 5.50, like the city, requires two readings and a 30 day delay after implementation. Then, as such, the county even today will not be able to meet those deadlines established by the homelessness response action plan to create the governance groups, required under that and under the intergovernmental agreement. And so I'm before you today to ask that you add an amendment to the ordinance before you today, stating that the either as an amendment to mayor Wheeler's amendments or to the original asking that the mayor or designee or auditor or designee shall provide a written notice to Multnomah County per section 9.1.1 of the intergovernmental agreement initiating a written dispute. If by August first, the Multnomah County board of commissioners has not introduced an ordinance creating the homelessness response action plans soq implementation subcommittee and

community advisory subcommittee, if we don't have this governance in place, then how are we supposed to really get this accountability and transparency that we all recognize is really important to not just addressing and solving homelessness, but regaining the trust of our community that we can solve homelessness. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, commissioner Mapps, just real quickly, thank you for your testimony today. If you have that written down, I'd appreciate it if you could email it to my office. If you haven't done so already.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Echoing I think we're multiple on the same boat, just to make sure we're understanding what the technical the technical piece here and that we're tracking it. We appreciate that. Thank you.

Speaker: Nikki jauron. Tiffany hammer. Welcome, tiffany.

Speaker: Good afternoon, mayor Wheeler and our city commissioners. I'm my name is tiffany hammer. Some of you know me already. I don't usually testify very often, but today I'm going to go ahead and do that. I have not typed out anything, but I'm going to go ahead and just share my experience with you today, as an introduction for folks that do not know who I am, I am a registered nurse in the state of Oregon, I've taught mental health nursing. I help advocate for our most vulnerable population in Portland, predominantly downtown Portland. Lloyd inner east side, northwest district, goose hollow, pearl district, what have you, I'm an independent contractor.

Speaker: I support many of your agencies, your nonprofits, your shelters, your srvs, everyone. But I'm here today to advocate for the most vulnerable population. And that is your vulnerable homeless population out on the sidewalk as we speak today, I am an outreach worker working. And I'm here testifying. What I'm really worried about is, actually, as an outreach worker, I also advocate for transportation

to all these various locations that we advocate for today. I probably spent, on average, \$1,000 a month for transportation to get to detox, sheltering svcs, family shelters, other counties when we cannot meet their needs at the sidewalk level. I do not accept leaving people at the sidewalk because it lacks services. It's inhumane. People die. Our stats support that, but today I'm advocating for the unsheltered because here's the problem. Just by sitting here merely for the last two hours, I've already got two families that are vulnerable right now, and we do not have enough aggregate family sheltering. We, as of April 1st, put away with our emergency sheltering model. And it's not just Multnomah County, it's all the other counties around us Vancouver, beaverton, clackamas. We are all doing the same old practice. We're leaving people vulnerable and I also deal with, in addition to that, I have to figure out where to put those families. Today we do. When I listen to our testimonies by our panel today, everyone failed to mention we're not making those measurements. We're not. And we should be rowing together in terms of our joint office goals. And that is to get the unsheltered connected swiftly, I love svcs, don't get me wrong, everybody wants a tiny home, but guess what? That's the affordable housing. The future model that does not address the true need on the street. When someone cannot get somewhere that night, what we need to do is focus better percentage of the funding on immediate needs. And everyone in this room will tell you we need something to do. Now we do not have a walk up shelter for women. Think on that for a minute. We don't. Our city in general and our county do not have any walk up shelters for men and women, predominantly women. There's some nonprofits out there that will take men, but if we do continue down this path, we'll have the same conversation next year on the joint office iga. It's both our parts to make sure that this this city takes the people I deal with migrant people that are coming from out of state right now to we don't have places for them. We should be

focusing less on srvs because srvs do not take families, don't take couples. Oh, sorry.

Speaker: Thank you, thank you. Appreciate and thanks for your help today, ted pile.

Speaker: Welcome. I was run out of Vancouver after they spent \$5 million fighting my homeless, tiny house village that I owned and occupied, and then one lady that was there lost her toes and entailed a \$60,000. And then, in hospital bills. And colombian said, well, she was better off in ted's illegal tiny house. But the thing that I really want to focus on is houses that went from \$40,000 to \$400,000, that's creates homeless problem. It takes, I talked a lot of young people that have 20, \$30 an hour jobs and said, do you think you'll ever know I can never buy a home, the home dream of America has been taken away recklessly, and I come from germany, and one of the things that I know, hitler outlawed the selling of property for more money than you paid for it. Because, he reasoned, when something goes from 40,000 to 300, somebody made hundreds of thousands of dollars that didn't create and do anything. And now home owners are almost always millionaires, and homeless people can't get into it, and, I used to kid, people when they said, what are you going to do for a retirement? I said, I'm going to take a brick. Well, how did you get a retirement out of a brick? I said, you go up to a federal reserve, preferably in california, where the weather's nice and you throw it through the bank window, and you got yourself a hot and a cot shelter and you're taking care of. And i'll probably be out, tending the flowers. But that is this country is filthy rich, and the building department and the code enforcement, they, they have, destroyed my buildings. They've recently, they put a 72 hour notice on my. I was living on weidler street, across the street from a friend of mine. And, they put a, 72 hour notice in 24 hours later, they towed it off. Then they assured me that they were going to take it

some. They said they had a lot of five. Things, five blocks away from the clinton street place. They put me in the clinton street place where I'm at now. And, the next thing I know, the it was towed to the city police department, and they destroyed it. And I'm going to sue them for the \$5,000 I paid for that, toyota motor home, the, tiny houses and, greedy landlords and the building department, which in Vancouver, they sued me for building houses without a permit, for which they had never given me a permit for it because they don't have a permitting process for tiny houses. So, the government is, in a sense, part of the problem. The building department cost \$15,000 for permits to build a house in Vancouver. So it spreads across all those things and young people have a very bleak future for home ownership. Thank you. Sir

Speaker: That concludes testimony.

Speaker: All right. Very good. Colleagues, any general questions before we get to the amendments, could I ask a quick question? Yeah. You bet. Commissioner Gonzalez for, dan, could I bounce a question off you if it's okay?

Speaker: Are you are you familiar? Does he need to rename it? Restate his name for the record? No. Okay. Are you familiar with the commitments the city has made under its ada settlement?

Speaker: Generally, yes.

Speaker: I'll just. I'll just read you a provision here and indulge me for a second. It says the city and its contractors will not distribute tents or tarps during the term of this agreement, with the following limited exceptions. City employees and contractors may only provide tents and tarps under the following circumstances. There's really three parts to this, but two of them don't apply very often, so I'm going to get to the meat of it. It's when severe winter weather shelters are activated in Portland. This is the primary time that we that the city or its contractors are

permitted to distribute tensor tarps is when it's very cold outside. And, we activate, shelters. There's two other scenarios that we take someone's tent and it's damaged in that removal. We replace it, we give them back a replacement, and there's a third scenario. We're clearing a camp, and we think it's an effective way to induce someone to move. We will sometimes hand them a tent in that scenario. So pretty limited scenarios. But I guess my main question here is you know, you've heard the discussion about, you probably haven't had a chance to read all of what we are proposing, but there's this concept that we'll check in and by October 15th, as to progress on tent and tarp distribution and harm reduction, which isn't necessarily your main space, but the precise question would you be comfortable committing not to distribute except for in compliance with the ada's, obligation here for the city of Portland? Is this something you could do, at least on a short term basis, until we get back to October 15th, until we have more space to develop a policy, we're not. Again you know, if it's really cold outside, this would allow you to hand out tents and tarps, but I guess I'm just asking sort of as an act of good faith. Is this something that the joint office could, you know, and if you go back in the chair, tells you you have to that's a whole different conversation. But, you know, I'm asking you as the head of joint office and homelessness, is that something? Yeah.

Speaker: What I thank you for the question. What i, and I appreciate the passion around tents and tarps, and I understand that. And I've shared, my frustration yea. Ryan. With tents and tarps as a symbol of our inability to shelter people in our community, and so, I think there's not anybody that is actively supporting more tents or tarps. It's clearly a defensive strategy to keep people safe. That said, to answer your question, what I came here today to support is what the mayor's proposing. Let's take the time between now, in October, to convene a group, develop a shared approach to tent and tarp distribution, and I absolutely will

commit to that. Am I going to commit to something today on the spot, unilaterally making a change in policy? I don't think that's an appropriate way to lead the community well.

Speaker: I understand the need for some deliberation. I truly do, but you've you've heard testimony of folks that are impacted by the tents and tarps on our streets, and at least you're generally familiar with our legal obligations as a city at this point, right? You know, if you're deemed a contractor and that's a technical, legal question, whether whether you are our contractor or not. But, we're we're required not to allow you to distribute tents and tarps, except for in compliance with this policy. So I'm just putting that out there. I know I'm not trying to lay a legal trap or anything there. I just, I just but I would also speak as a single city commissioner. It would go a really long way in building good faith, as at least in my, you know, my deliberations about whether to support the continuation of this relationship. If we see meaningful action here and abiding by what we're committed to, what we're contractually obligated to do, at least for some period of time would be of would be personally appreciated, I guess is what i. Yeah

Speaker: One one reason I appreciate that commissioner Gonzalez one reason why it's not, in my power to do that is there was a lot of nuance lost up here, and I'm not going to go through that and try and correct all the facts from some skilled advocates that you heard from who, who really shaped the discussion in a way that I don't think was accurate. Number one, I will make a couple quick corrections. Number one, the joint office doesn't actually hand out tents. We make them available to 88 separate organizations that access our supply center and pick up a wide range of supplies. And I know you know, this, but for the public to understand it, there's thousands of, of other supplies, hygiene kits, female hygiene products, water, just all kinds of things. I don't have time to go through those 88

organizations, in turn, are the ones that decide when and how these tents get distributed and other supplies. Some of those 88 organizations need to be involved in this discussion. It's not up to me to tell. And these are who's among the 88 neighborhood associations, faith houses. And yes, a lot of nonprofits, both some that contract with the joint office currently and many who don't are still able to access our supply center. So I think it'd be a bit presumptive for me at the county to speak on behalf of those 88 organizations, including houses of worship and neighborhood associations, who are accessing those supplies, who may already have those supplies and be preparing to distribute those in accordance with whatever policies or practices they have. The other thing, one quick thing I do have to kind of take a risk here and correct the mayor. He referenced a large tent. I would posit that many, if not most of the tents on the streets of Portland did not come from the joint office supply center. There's a lot of other sources of tents and even if the joint office were to pause or stop distributing tents, that would not change the practice. Of those 88 nonprofits distributing tents to the streets of Portland. So if we want to get to the deeper issue, I think it does require more, more discussion. And the last thing I'd want to do is make a grand proclamation from the joint office or the county about tents, and then have nothing change on the ground. That would be not a great outcome.

Speaker: No. And I think your point about the variety of distribution models for tents and tarps on the streets of Portland is fair. They're not all coming from the joint office and homelessness. Part of the problem, though, is we don't really have a way to quantify why these other sources, at least you we now have things to some good public records, requests and tracking. We have some visibility as to what the joint office does. And you happen to be a, you know, a government partner. So we have very direct access to you and a in a broader relationship, what I would submit,

you know, when we had to take on distribution of tents and tarps inside the fire bureau and the certain extent, drug kits, because we discovered that some of that was happening through Portland street response. We simply took it off the shelves and set a declaration. So, yes, if something's already out to your your partners, you know, that's that's one problem. But taking it off the shelves is a pretty effective way to immediately disrupt those flow. That you could do that tomorrow without having to engage with the ada, at least that's that's what we had to do when we want to put a immediate end to the flow, while we contemplated longer term policy.

Speaker: And again, the joint office doesn't distribute that. So in one sense, we are complying with the, the lawsuit settlement and the fact that the joint office is not handing out tents in violation of that. I really think we've got to get those organizations around the table and get agreement on what a shared community policy looks like with tents.

Speaker: So and you're. Yeah, I mean, I'm not sure it's that that we can turn that cute. I mean, if you're making available warehouse where others can take tents and tarps, that to me that's your facilitating the distribution of those tents and tarps. So, I anyways, I understand what you're saying. You're literally not the ones handing a tent and tarp to someone on the streets of Portland. But you do facilitate a warehouse where people are getting those supplies with the intent to distribute to folks on the street, and we're also to build on your point.

Speaker: We're literally not the ones setting the policy around distribution, those are those organizations who may I don't know, I haven't queried them. They may have their own policies on when tents get distributed, so I again, I think if our goal is to actually address the way tents are distributed on the streets, we've got to engage those organizations. And certainly the joint office will be part of that. And if we

reach agreement around a tent distribution policy in our community, we would absolutely then ask organizations that we distribute to comply with that in order to continue accessing our supply center.

Speaker: So one last question. Is there any existing policy or procedure at the joint office at this point in time that addresses how your partners can distribute or use those tensor tarps?

Speaker: Not to my knowledge.

Speaker: So it's literally they can walk in and take as many as they want. So just walk me through what the you asked about our policy for distributing them.

Speaker: And we don't have one of those. We do have limits on what people can access. And I'm scrolling here through. I apologize, those 88 organizations, neighborhood associations, etc, there's a limit to the number of times they can access the supply center. And when they're there, I think the limit is five tents, per visit. And so the way we sort of titrate distribution is we have limited supplies. And so we limit people's access to the supply center. And of course, when they're there, as I said, they're getting many other supplies, including supplies that we can safely say have saved lives. We distribute a lot of water, which, of course, during the summer we know has, has protected people who can't get to severe weather shelters.

Speaker: Yeah. And I want to be crystal clear that we're I don't want us to combine two different things. I mean, the distribution of life saving supplies, water, hygiene kits, no one's. That's not in dispute here. We're talking very focused on tents and tarps and to the extent you can share anything with our office just on the limits and how that's currently working, that would be great offline.

Speaker: I would be glad to do that. I have a memo just recently finalized, that will give you all that detail. I'm glad to share that with you.

Speaker: Thank you. I'm good.

Speaker: Commissioner Gonzalez commissioner Mapps.

Speaker: Sure, just a quick question, director field. I'd love to get your perspective on, frankly, I think an assumption that I hear on this side of the table that it is possible for the city and the county to have a collaborative, constructive conversation which ultimately results in a in a agreed upon policy for the distribution of tents, tarps and needles. I sure hope so. And I think everyone up here believes that that's the way we should proceed. But I also have to be transparent here, where I have reached out to leadership over at the county and basically said, hey, can we have a collaborative conversation about tents, tarps and needles? And the response I got back was, well, no. Tents, tarps and needles are a public health issue and there are harm reduction issue and public health and harm reduction are clearly county responsibility. So, you know, you know, commissioner Mapps respectively stay in your lane. And I do not, question this. You know, I think, state law and practice and it's a good practice, puts the county in the lead on public health and harm reduction. But if that's the case here, I'm not sure if the conversation that we all assume is going to happen and, frankly, is embedded in these amendments and whatnot can take place. Am I reading something wrong or did I hear leadership wrong?

Speaker: So I'm going to I'm going to pull apart, the conversation I had with the commissioner Gonzalez around tents and tarps. And I am going to have to, defer to the chair. Okay, and the health department on the issue of, needles and other, medical harm reduction. So I'm going to have to unfortunately, I won't be able to respond to that. I think let's remember the idea of distributing supplies to nonprofits and other organizations really popped up during the pandemic. It was a response to the pandemic. We had some outreach before that. But the direct

service shelters operated by the county, needed to have bulk purchasing supplies given to them. It's sort of morphed since then as the pandemic has wound down. It's appropriate for us to have a community conversation about what that supply center looks like, what supplies are distributed, and what the policy is attached to. Anybody coming to the supply center and picking up supplies. I think we're all open to that. The memo I'm going to share with you all, sets a nice table for that conversation. So if that's the question, we're all in on that conversation. What I, what I don't want to do is jump ahead and say, here's where we're going to land. We have 40 different supplies. It's not appropriate to go through and set the policy at the dais right now. But is it time, after four years, to have a discussion about how the supply center should be operating and what rules should apply, including tents and tarps, but perhaps including other items? I'm glad to have that. And I apologize that on the needles, I'm going to I totally understand and I recognize public health is a little bit outside outside of your piece.

Speaker: And I also I want to say I very much appreciate your response because frankly, I think, the response that, you have shared with us is frankly different from at least the feedback that I have gotten from our counterparts over across the river. So this gives me hope that it's possible to have this conversation. Frankly, the feedback I've gotten so far suggests that it's not possible to have a collaborative conversation about tents, tarps, and needles because the county owns the public health and the, harm reduction space, but, director, you've given us some, a north star to move towards, and I look forward to working with the county collaboratively to get there. Thank you, commissioner Mapps.

Speaker: Any other questions, Wheeler one, which is the comprehensive package of directives. Any further discussion, please call the roll. Ryan

Speaker: That was a quick transition. Maybe I'm just so hungry that I need to ask a clarification. Where are we? So we're going to be voting on, the two amendments that are currently on the table proposed and seconded.

Speaker: And then subsequent to that, any closing thoughts anybody has on this, then we'll move to second reading. Yes. Rebecca, you had a no. Okay

Speaker: So I offered a friendly amendment.

Speaker: I'm sorry.

Speaker: Actually. Yeah. Can we do a time out? I think we're some of us are just trying to figure out the process.

Speaker: Commissioner russo, what are we? I'm glad.

Speaker: I'm sorry I missed what you just said.

Speaker: Okay, so we sorry, megan, because maps substituted your. Okay. That's fine, doesn't matter what it's called. We'll call it maps one, which is the comprehensive package of directives. There are 12 directives included. If there's no further questions on that, we'll call the roll, commissioner Ryan put forth an amendment. We will call the roll on commissioner Ryan's amendment. It's my understanding that those are the only two amendments currently on the table. Unless somebody wants to put something else first.

Speaker: Can we.

Speaker: Can we do commissioner Ryan's first?

Speaker: If you'd prefer. I have. No.

Speaker: No problem.

Speaker: Basically, the collective we amendment that we've all been okay, we can move commissioner Ryan's first, then we'll move commissioner Mapps.

Speaker: That makes sense. Second, and then we'll move the entire package. Either way is okay.

Speaker: So good. Up to presiding how we want to take it.

Speaker: All right. I'm just looking at the most expeditious way to move through the two packages of amendments that are currently before us. Then we'll move the whole thing to second reading.

Speaker: Is it would you object to hearing commissioner Ryan's first?

Speaker: I have no objection.

Speaker: That's what we just did, right? Yeah. Okay just want to make. Are we all on the same page since I vote first. That's why I'm a little more sensitive to this.

Speaker: Okay. All right, that's good.

Speaker: All right, so no further questions. We'll go to Ryan amendment number one. And that is with regard to the strategy and oversight committee. Any further discussion? Seeing none, please call the roll Ryan one.

Speaker: Yeah I will clearly I'm going to support this. I think that we have I've experienced a governance system that continues to lack the accountability necessary at that level. And until we shake that up and make it more objective and put in people that have that expertise and independence that aren't getting paid by the system, I think we really risk, having it be outside of what you could really see when it when you, when you want to see real change. So I've been in dialog with the mayor's office about this for a few days. And I know yesterday in the morning this the language that I have in here was there. And then it was watered down a bit. I have watered down ptsd from last year, so I'm going to make certain that we get the teeth back into this. And I'm delighted, therefore, to vote. I Gonzalez I maps, I yea. Rubio my position on this and I just want to say commissioner Ryan, I really appreciate what you're trying to do here.

Speaker: And I really appreciate your focus on transparency and making sure that, we have clear roles and responsibilities, I just have a slightly different view that, the

public's counting on us as leadership to get this done and set this direction and to take responsibility. So for me, it's just a slight difference in terms of, I support expanding. However I think it should occur after there's alignment among leadership, since leadership needs to be responsible and take accountability with the public. So just for that, that that reason, I vote no, but not for long term.

Speaker: Wheeler.

Speaker: So I also appreciate the sentiment. As we discussed yesterday, I'm opposed to this amendment for a couple of reasons, the first reason is what commissioner Rubio just stated. The elected officials are going to be held accountable for either progress or lack of progress with regard to this iga as well as the entirety of the homeless response plan, which is largely driven by the strategy and oversight committee. There was a lot of work that went into the structure of these various committees, and in particular, it's notable that these interests are already represented on other committees that are part of this overall process, as I indicated earlier, I think there may be a lack of clarity on who would serve in these roles, pretty much anybody is a taxpayer, and could serve as a taxpayer on this committee. Similarly, there's a lot of people who are business owners and operators in this community. Are they there to represent business? Are they there to represent people who feel they're paying too much in their taxes? It's not clear to me how they are going to fit into the overall question of strategy. And oversight, and last but not least, and I've not been secretive about this. I think on net it is better for us to be in this iga than to be out of this iga for the simple reason that we do not provide behavioral health services, we do not provide public health services, we do not provide substance use disorder treatment. And the county does. And we're reliant on the county to deliver those services in coordination with us. And I agree with my colleagues. There have been a lot of problems in our interactions

with, and our partnership with the county, but those have largely been personality conflicts. And what we're trying to do here is create a structure of governance so that when a new mayor and a new council and presumably a number of new county commissioners, potentially the majority of the county commission, that we have a structure that is functional, that works for them. And my concern is that with the passage of this, the iga now goes back to the county and our fate is now in the hands of the Multnomah County commissioners. This could prove to be a poison pill that terminates that relationship. And if that happens, i'll commit to the public. We just passed a great budget. It still has the public environmental management office cleanup. It still has the irp to remove problematic camps. We still have full funding for tasks and s.r.v, through one more fiscal year. But in the absence of this partnership, it's not clear to me what the future looks like. So I vote no, that the amendment passes, and then we'll get to maps number one, which is the collective of the collective. Well, actually, let me ask a clarifying question of legal counsel. I believe it is the collective set of directives as amended by the first amendment. Correct? Okay, great. Any further discussion, call the roll. Commissioner Mapps.

Speaker: I'll just deal with it in my vote, perfect. Call the roll.

Speaker: Ryan. I Gonzalez, I want to restate for the record, I have deep ambivalence about the future of this iga for our community, we've seen clackamas and Washington county make progress on homelessness without a joint office on homelessness. And, the basic structure is a legacy of an era that's no longer true. We the county now has a substantial, resource financially outside the city of Portland to support this, the joint office. And I say that all I will continue to have deep concerns, I'm, I'm happy that we have addressed tents, tarps, and, harm reduction in a more thoughtful way. I also want to acknowledge I've compromised here in agreeing to this provision, essentially giving the county another 105 days for

us to see if we can, reach an agreement here. I fully hear commissioner Mapps question, as to whether we're going to be capable of reaching agreement on tents, tarps and harm reduction, there's clearly a lot of work to go. Well, a lot of work to do there, also really wish we wouldn't see tent and tarp distribution by contractors of the joint office and homelessness, while we sort this out, particularly in the summer months when it's not necessary to prevent, serious injury or death from cold weather, it's just not a factor right now. And this would be an ideal time to pause tent and tarp distribution, in many respects, I do want to call out a really appreciate the testimony of those in our disabled community, they show up time and time again, to be an advocate for themselves. And for their community. It's deeply appreciated. And the complex topic of the unsheltered population, we have many constituents whose interests we need to consider. So i, I leave all of that, I am a yes on this, and we'll see how the next couple of months go maps, just for folks watching at home, I think it's important to recognize two different things. We have a couple of different conversations that we still need to get through before we put this ordinance to bed. One are the amendments before us today. And I'm going to pretty much, pretty much focus my comments on that. And then next week or sometime in the future, we'll have a final vote, on the amendments before us today, I do want to very much, express my appreciation to the mayor's staff and the staffs for all of our teams who have literally been working around the clock. To try to build a consensus document in terms of where we can make, how we can make this piece better, I also, I think mr. De mello's, testimony about just some of the business processes over at the county, I think are some concerns. If I understood, what, chair camillo, told us. And if it's true, it seems like the county will not be able to technically comply with, some of the benchmarks and timelines we set up in this document. And that seems to be kind of problem problematic. And at some point,

we probably ought to think about that. But certainly I will support the amendments today, I will also say I'm not I cannot necessarily guarantee that I'm going to be a vote on this. In the end. I will tell you, I came in here today with a couple of understandings about how this document would, works. So, for example, I thought there was a clear benchmark or an earmark that basically said years two and three of the contract are dollars would go to support safe rest villages and task sites, I recognize I think and then I've heard that something different is going on, that disturbs me a little bit, you know, one of my, one of my clear, lines in the sand in this space is that we be able to tell the people of Portland where our joint office dollars are going, at least on the city side, and I there is still more ambiguity in this space than I would like, but in the meantime, we have a couple of at least seven days to sort out that discussion, also, frankly, the alternative, if there's another alternative we haven't talked about where we just strip the money piece out of this and move forward with the larger governing governing structure that's been proposed. I'd be very open to that, but, you know, when I asked staff, you know, why are we putting dollars into the, this system, which we all agree is broken, and the answer seems to be, well, because that's what we've always done. That is not a good or compelling argument, but let's continue to have that discussion. But on the item and ordinance before us today, which is basically whether or not to approve the maps amendment I vote yea Rubio, I just want to say I appreciate the rich dialog today.

Speaker: I really want to thank sarah and sky and everybody that worked on this, this policy and mayor's office, and the work with each of our offices. I just want to also state that just to remember that how we build the policies that we've discussed about really matters. And for us to be thoughtful about also moving forward in this next stretch of time, and with that, i, I vote aye.

Speaker: Wheeler.

Speaker: Well, this is a compromise, and I still support compromise, but I do want to acknowledge the nearly year of effort that has been put in by skyler prosser and sarah morrissey. Bobby lee, tony garcia, michael jordan and others. There were a lot of changes to this, literally just in the last couple of days. They were substantive differences, my comments notwithstanding, on the, strategy and oversight committee, I fear that, you know, we negotiated hard on that point and my team was very successful in getting a strong voice on that. Two city representatives plus an east county representative, that would actually be a majority of the strategy in the oversight committee with an interest in what's happening in Portland and gresham. And I am worried that the amendment that was just put forth potentially dilutes our ability to direct the system in the way that I feel the city of Portland would like to be in a role to direct. But that being said, I hear what my colleagues are saying, and I appreciate the reasoning behind what they're saying. And they and their teams have put a lot of work into this. This is this is a collective blood, sweat and tears effort, and so it is with that hopefulness and optimism that this will be a successful strategy that I vote I on the amendment and the amendment passes. This is a first reading of a nonemergency ordinance. It moves to second reading, as amended. And since I don't have a loud hammer, boom, we have two items. I'd like to suggest we move through them quickly, if that's a possibility. I know there was a call for a break, but I can't. I have a 2:00 obligation. Sure, so we'll go straight to, item five, five, six, and we will keep this very brief award contracts related to grant making management services for individual artists and arts organizations. Okay so i'll turn this over to jess and jeff. You've been very patient. Can I ask you to do this in two minutes or less? I will go as fast as I can.

Speaker: Thank you, mr. Mayor, okay. For the record, my name is jess klein. I am the procurement manager for, procurement services. Sorry. I'm trying to, like, change myself here, on December 18th, 2023, chief procurement officer advertised rfp 2224 related to grant making management services for individual artists and artist organizations. Eight proposals were received and opened on February 1st, 2024. Two proposals were submitted in service area one. Six proposals were submitted in service area two. No proposals were submitted in service area three, which was subsequently canceled on March 14th, 2024, notice of intent to negotiate award was issued for service area one, awarding services to the regional arts and culture council, rac. No protest were received. On March 14th, 2024, notification of intent to shortlist was issued for service area two. Subsequent to phase two evaluations, a notification of intent to. Notification of intent to negotiate an award was issued on April 17th, 2024 for service area two, awarding services to friends of iafo and music Oregon. No protests were received. Awards were made for a one year period, with the option to extend for up to an additional two years. Each contractor will distribute grants into the amounts listed in the table. Included with the report. All awarded firms are a 501 c3 community nonprofit organization and are ineligible for covid certification. All contractors hold current city of Portland business tax registrations and are in full compliance with the city contracting requirements. Procurement services recommends that the council accept this report and authorize the chief procurement officer to execute contracts with the awarded contractors. I am here this morning to or this afternoon to answer any questions that you may have about procurement process. And jeff is here.

Speaker: Jeff, why don't you give us a couple of comments here, only to say that this was consistent with our strategy all along. Once we said that we were terminating the contract with the regional arts and culture council, we decided to

bring in-house the function of awarding large grants to the city's 75 largest arts organizations and to contract out the services for awarding smaller grants between 500 and \$5000 to individual artists and small arts organizations.

Speaker: Yeoman's effort. Thank you both. Do we have public testimony? There's none. Questions. I'll entertain a motion to accept the report. So moved commissioner Gonzalez. Sorry, Ryan. Seconds. Any further discussion? Seeing none. Call the roll. Ryan.

Speaker: Yes. I've worked with the city arts program to reconfigure arts grants that were historically handled with one very large check to a single source maker grant maker. And I'm really pleased that all of you dove in. And we did a really clean, objective process. And I just want to thank, people who aren't here. Charity montez, darian jones, jeff hawthorne, you've really been the point on this, and you've seen it through just elegantly. And thank you, jess, for being here today. And that was really impressive, and I just want to applaud this change, and I appreciate the transparency in this process. I vote yea gonzales I maps I yea. Rubio I want to thank commissioner Ryan for hanging in there.

Speaker: This has been a very long road, and it's a very unique experience, that some only some of us have had, so I just want to appreciate that, I also want to appreciate, jeff and jess for all the work that they've done to get us to this, this point, thank you. I vote yea.

Speaker: Wheeler. Yeah.

Speaker: Congratulations, commissioner Ryan, this is great work. And thanks to both of you. Terrific effort. Sorry you had to follow the ordinance I vote yea. And the report is accepted. Thank you both, gentlemen.

Speaker: Thank you, last item is one of commissioner maps 559. Please amend northeast couch davis street, local improvement district boundary and reduced

system development charge funding by \$1 million in exchange for system development charge credits with no charge to pending lean amounts.

Speaker: Commissioner Mapps.

Speaker: Sure. In keeping with the last item, I'm going to keep it brief, we have Andrew and Matthew here to tell us about a pbot item, which would basically, amend a lid that we have in place, and I'll just turn it over straight to staff. Thank you, Commissioner Matt, for the record, I'm Andrew Abbe.

Speaker: I'm the city's local improvement district administrator. We will be extremely brief this morning. No powerpoint presentation. Commissioner Ryan, I'm sorry we didn't bring lunch for you. I know you're very hungry, but we'll move through this quickly, but we do want you to know what you're voting on, so I'm going to turn it over to, Matthew, who will talk a little bit about the construction. I'll just tell you about the technical amendment to the lid, Matt Kelly with the city of Portland transportation bureau. I'm a project manager. The ordinance is regarding a local improvement district. That's been years in the making. We have reached an important milestone recently where we now have design complete, and we actually expect to start construction on the first phase this summer, as soon as two months from now. This is a really exciting project. It is in the Hazelwood neighborhood of Portland. We'll be making important safety improvements to East Burnside Street. It's a high crash corridor. We'll be adding sidewalk, we'll be improving street lighting. We'll be planting more than 40 new street trees. And this is in the Hazelwood neighborhood of Portland. So very excited that we've reached this milestone. Andrew is going to say more about this amendment for the ordinance before you.

Speaker: Thank you. Matthew. Andrew Abbey, local improvement district administrator. So we did want to have the technical amendments in place before

we issued the notice to proceed for the construction contract and the one other scope element. I just wanted to note that we will be moving forward with is, making an intersection of 97 and burnside safer and working collaboratively with trimet to improve that rail crossing so that they can go ahead and renovate the older section of track on the max blue line. So just for the record, before you turn this over to a second reading, I just wanted to note what is in the ordinance that you're voting on, number one, it reduces pbot ftc funding for this project from \$2 million to \$1 million, and in exchange for that, we would be offering \$1 million in sec credit for the property owners in the lid. You have on the written record one letter of support that represents the majority of the property ownership in the lid. That arrangement helps out pbot with our financial situation, because it's the issue of the timing of up front, \$1 million sec contribution versus the sec credit later. So it's mainly just to help with pbot financing, the other thing that this ordinance does is that it authorizes utility undergrounding work as part of this construction contract that you will be awarding, I believe, next week, next week. And it also builds new water mains and gateway to support the multifamily development, that will be part of this lid. And again, that's part of the construction contract. And then, it also, authorizes pbot staff to vacate to begin the work of vacating two stubs of streets between i-205 and 97th avenue that don't go anywhere since the i-205 freeway is built, was built, and that area that will be vacated under a separate ordinance will provide more land on which to build desperately needed housing. And then finally, what the ordinance does is it adds a new property to the lid that will benefit from these scope changes to the lid. And again, the written record of support on file with this ordinance, support that eventual additional assessment for the lid so that the quick flyover of western this ordinance. So I encourage council to pass this to a second reading and approve it next week. Thank you for your time. Thank you gentlemen.

Speaker: Questions. Commissioner Mapps, I just want to thank, Andrew and Matthew for your patience, frankly, the colleagues, this project is a really good one. It deserves a whole lot more attention than, frankly, we have the bandwidth to do today, but I see you. Great work. It's exactly what we want to do. Especially in the Hazelwood neighborhood. Thank you, we you you have gone above and beyond and many, many ways.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Commissioner, do we have public testimony? We have one person signed up.

Speaker: Great. Joe Pearson. Joe is not with us. That concludes testimony.

Speaker: All right. Thank you, gentlemen. Thank you. Commissioner Mapps. This is a first reading of a nonemergency ordinance that moves to second reading. We are adjourned.