



# May 5, 2025 Governance Committee Agenda

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

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

Questions may be directed to [councilclerk@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:councilclerk@portlandoregon.gov)

## Monday, May 5, 2025 2:30 pm

---

**Session Status:** Adjourned

**Committee in Attendance:**

Councilor Elana Pirtle-Guiney

Councilor Dan Ryan, Vice Chair

Councilor Olivia Clark

Councilor Jamie Dunphy

Councilor Tiffany Koyama Lane, Chair

Councilor Koyama Lane presided.

Officers in attendance: Keelan McClymont, Council Clerk

Motion to reorder the agenda to hear Item 3 before Item 2: Moved by Ryan and seconded by Pirtle-Guiney. (Aye (5): Pirtle-Guiney, Ryan, Clark, Dunphy, Koyama Lane)

Committee adjourned at 4:33 p.m.

## Regular Agenda

1

[Adopt committee rules](#) (Resolution)

**Document number:** 2025-166

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

**Time requested:** 5 minutes

Previous agenda item

**Council action:** Referred to City Council as amended

Motion to send Resolution, Document Number 2025-166, to the full Council with the recommendation that it be adopted: Moved by Ryan and seconded by Pirtle-Guiney. (Aye (5): Pirtle-Guiney, Ryan, Clark, Dunphy, Koyama Lane)

2

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

**Document number:** 2025-037

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

**Time requested:** 15 minutes

Previous agenda item

**Council action:** Continued

3

[Amend Council Organization and Procedure Code to include Council rule on tie-breaking.\(amend Code Section 3.02.030\)](#) (Ordinance)

**Document number:** 2025-186

**Introduced by:** Council Vice President Tiffany Koyama Lane

**Time requested:** 1 hour

**Council action:** Referred to City Council as amended

Motion to amend Exhibit A, Code Subsection 3.02.030 J.1. to strike resolutions and reports: Moved by Ryan and seconded by Pirtle-Guiney. (Aye (4): Pirtle-Guiney, Ryan, Dunphy, Koyama Lane; Nay (1): Clark)

Motion to amend Exhibit A, Code Subsection 3.02.030 J.2. to strike everything after the first sentence and amend first sentence to strike "result of the tied vote is deemed inconclusive" and add "vote fails": Moved by Ryan and seconded by Dunphy. (Aye (4): Pirtle-Guiney, Ryan, Clark, Dunphy; Nay (1): Koyama Lane)

Motion to define a tie vote as receiving specifically six affirmative votes on final passage: Moved by Koyama Lane and seconded by Dunphy. Motion withdrawn.

Motion to amend Exhibit A, to add Code Subsection 3.02.030 J.3. In determining if a vote is a tie, absences, abstentions and vacancies will be counted as no votes: Moved by Koyama Lane and seconded by Clark. (Aye (5): Pirtle-Guiney, Ryan, Clark, Dunphy, Koyama Lane)

Motion to send Ordinance as amended, Document Number 2025-186, to the full Council with the recommendation that it be passed: Moved by Ryan and seconded by Dunphy. (Aye (5): Pirtle-Guiney, Ryan, Clark, Dunphy, Koyama Lane)

4

[Discussion about scope of work for HR&A Portland City Council Transition Roadmap](#) (Presentation)

**Document number:** 2025-187

**Introduced by:** Council Vice President Tiffany Koyama Lane

**Time requested:** 15 minutes

**Council action:** Placed on File

Portland City Council, Governance Committee  
May 5, 2025 - 2:30 p.m.  
Speaker List

Name	Title	Document Number
Tiffany Koyama Lane	Council Vice President, Committee Chair	
Keelan McClymont	Council Clerk	
Elana Pirtle-Guiney	Council President	
Dan Ryan	Councilor, Vice Committee Chair	
Olivia Clark	Councilor	
Jamie Dunphy	Councilor	
Ashley Hernandez	Council Operations Coordinator	
Terry Harris	(Testimony)	2025-186
Robert Taylor	City Attorney	2025-186

## **Portland City Council Committee Meeting Closed Caption File**

**May 5, 2025 – 2:30 p.m.**

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

**Speaker:** Good afternoon everyone. I called the meeting of the governance committee to order. It is Monday, May 5th, 2025 at 2:32 p.m. Keelan. Will you please call the roll?

**Speaker:** Pirtle-guiney.

**Speaker:** Here.

**Speaker:** Ryan.

**Speaker:** Here.

**Speaker:** Mark, here. Here.

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

**Speaker:** Welcome to the meeting of the governance committee to testify before this committee in person or virtually. You must sign up in advance on the committee agenda at w-w-w dot gov slash agenda slash governance committee. Or by calling 311. Information on engaging with this committee can be found at this link. Registration for virtual testimony closes one hour prior the meeting in person. Testifiers must sign up before the agenda item is heard. If a public testimony will be taken on an item, individuals may testify for three minutes unless the chair states otherwise, your microphone will be muted when your time is over. The chair preserves order destructive conduct such as shouting, refusing to conclude your

testimony when your time is up, or interrupting others testimony or committee. Deliberation will not be allowed. If you cause disruption, a warning will be given. Further destruction will result in ejection from the meeting. Anyone who fails to leave any ejected will be ejected is subject to arrest or trespass. Additionally, the meeting may take a short recess or reconvene virtually. Your testimony should address the matter being considered when testifying. When testifying, and state your name for the record, if you identify the organization you represent. Virtual testifiers should unmute themselves when the clerk calls their name. Thank you.

**Speaker:** Thank you so much, Ashley. All right. So we have a lot of exciting things today. First, we will vote on committee rules a committee rules resolution, which we discussed and amended quite a bit at our previous meeting on April 21st. Then it's planned that we hear a resolution to adopt procedures to establish what comes before council and committees. The next thing on our list is to hear an ordinance to amend council organization and procedure code to include council rules on our council rule on tie breaking. And then we'll conclude this meeting with a preview of a presentation and discussion on the h.r. And h. Portland City Council transition roadmap for our governance work session that we will be having next Monday, May 12th at 2:30 p.m. In councilors, I think that we should reorder the agenda just a bit. So we flip items two and three, because I think the tiebreaking ordinance is really important to make sure we wrap that up before we end this meeting today. And it's something that we have us out of committee if possible and ready to discuss. So we have that when we're working on the budget. So I would entertain a motion if any of you agree.

**Speaker:** So moved second.

**Speaker:** All right. Keelan, will you please read the first item.

**Speaker:** Up? Chair, would you like to call for a vote on the motion to reorder the agenda? Yes.

**Speaker:** Can you please call the roll? Great. Call the vote.

**Speaker:** Pirtle-guiney I brian, I clark, I dunphy, I emily i.

**Speaker:** All right. Now is the right time. Okay. Keelan, will you please read the first item?

**Speaker:** Item number one, adopt committee rules.

**Speaker:** Okay, so at our last governance meeting. Committee meeting on April 21st, we discussed quite a bit and voted in different amendments of this draft resolution, but we did not actually conclude with a vote on sending the resolution to full council colleagues. Do we have any objections to moving forward with calling the vote on the amended draft of the committee rules resolution? All right. If no. May I have a motion?

**Speaker:** Yeah. This is 1116, right? Yeah. Chair, I move resolution document number 2025 166 to be sent to the full council with recommendation to be adopted. Second.

**Speaker:** Moved by councilor Ryan and seconded by councilor pirtle-guiney. Clerk, will you please call the roll?

**Speaker:** Pirtle-guiney I Ryan, I clark, I dunphy.

**Speaker:** I.

**Speaker:** Koyama lane i.

**Speaker:** With five yes votes. The resolution is adopted. Oh, here's the wording the motion carries. And the resolution document number 2025166 will move to the full council with a recommendation it be adopted. Keelan, will you please read the next item?

**Speaker:** Item number two. Adopt. Oh, no. Sorry. Item number three. We're switching the order. Right. Okay. Amend council organization and procedure code to include council rule on tie breaking. All right.

**Speaker:** So now we will start a discussion on amending council code for a council rule on tie breaking. I would like to open the floor for discussion on the ordinance as presented. After discussing the ordinance, we will open the floor for proposed amendments. Councilors, would we like to hear public testimony before our discussion?

**Speaker:** Yes I would.

**Speaker:** Okay. Can we bring forward public testimony, please?

**Speaker:** We have one person signed up, terry harris.

**Speaker:** Okay. We'll call this leading off the discussion. I'm for the record, terry harris. There's some written testimony and there are some marked up version of it attached to that. I'd encourage you to look at it. I'm going to hit the highlights here to stay within my three minutes. The main thing here, though, is to think a little bit about what the charter amendment says and what the code says. The charter amendment says in case of a tie, when the mayor casts the deciding vote, the mayor has a responsibility to do that. But the code says to pass things, you need seven affirmative votes. And so what the charter commission thought it was doing was creating a way for the mayor to come down and cast a seventh vote. What the charter commission language says. But that's only when it's tied 6 to 6. And that's what your language says. Here is only when it's tied 6 to 6, when the vote is 6 to 5, and a councilor has taken a walk to the office for a while, or gone down to the pub for a while, it's not a tie. There won't be a vote by the mayor, and it loses, right? Because seven votes is never achieved. So that's how I read it now. And that would be a tactic I would advise to anybody trying to kill a thing with, you know, six votes

and to avoid the mayor coming down to testify. Otherwise, it seems like malpractice to me. Kind of. So either this is like a real thing and you want the mayor to have a seventh vote, or you want the mayor to never vote. That's a kind of a choice that a council can make at this point. With this rule, I gave you an edit that's declares a tie vote as a vote where it achieves six anything six votes to pass and does not achieve that seventh vote. And that is when you could opt for the mayor to come down and cast that seventh vote. Otherwise, I would again suggest people take a walk, have a cocktail at the pub until it all passes. Another consideration here, though, I would also say, and I and I don't give you an amendment on this, there's a consideration of public comment. You know, the mayor is going to helicopter in here, has not heard debate, has not heard anything, and we'll have to have a vote. I would say that if the mayor would like to have public comment, I think he should be able to do that at a later meeting when it can be scheduled. But I didn't give you amendments on that, and that's just something to consider. And there's other stuff, but those are the main things.

**Speaker:** Thank you so much, as always, for being here with us.

**Speaker:** Any time, any Monday.

**Speaker:** And I know we have councilor canal with us here today. Did you want to say some words to us about this item or the next one or both? Next one. Okay. Wonderful. Well, please put yourself in the queue for discussion. And I want to make sure that everyone was able to access mr. Harris's written testimony. Okay. Sounds like some people are getting it printed out. I have a copy if anyone would like to look at it.

**Speaker:** There's also.

**Speaker:** Bob weinstein. Did you see this? This morning?



**Speaker:** Okay, so it sounds like there are a few pieces of written testimony for us all to review.

**Speaker:** We're in discussion, right?

**Speaker:** Yeah, we're in discussion. And I also just wanted to state before we get started that due to the urgent nature of adopting both the committee rules and tiebreaking practices, my team will be advancing these two documents for a 9/12 agenda at the full council meeting this week. On Wednesday the fifth, our five seven so may 7th, and we'll ask my governance committee colleagues to hopefully be the first five to sign on on advancing these items. The vote will take place in council, depending on where we land with this item, and we'll open this afternoon. All right, councilor Ryan.

**Speaker:** Yeah. Thank you. Chair. I think for me, as you know, I was I wasn't supportive of where this evolved to. I think seven votes is seven votes. And that's what you have to get to pass something forward. If that means that you coordinate to have the mayor come down because you sense that you'll need the mayor's vote, then that's your legislative leadership duty. If you think that you might not have 6 to 7 votes, and you think that if you could work on it a little bit longer, you pull it back into your office. But when I saw that we're doing this opportunity to do revotes, i, I just don't know why that would be a good practice. I, I understood it on our first day when we were picking council president. That was a very different situation. This is ordinances and policies. And your job, when you're bringing those forward, is to try to do everything you can, obviously to get to seven votes and then it's an up or down vote. Either win or you lose and you move on. Maybe that's just the world I'm comfortable living in, because it allows the work to continue to move forward. I've been on both sides of it, and it's just something I accept. When we get elected to make decisions and stand by our decisions, we get paid to think and make

decisions. So I don't really understand how this evolved into multiple votes. So that's my confusion question that I have for my colleagues. And it could be on the dissent on this one, but I just wanted to air it out in public. Thanks.

**Speaker:** Thank you so much for sharing all of that, vice chair. And also wanted to flag that. Councilors received an email from councilor avalos as well, with some different suggestions that I think are also part of written testimony. So we have a few different things that we can lean on.

**Speaker:** If I could just add, I mean, that's what the charter commission passed. They made it really clear that the mayor was there for us for a tie vote. That's the guidance we received. And so we're trying to bring clarity to that. And the first time we had clarity on it was during the council president vote. And we experienced that. And I think that was a situation where the mayor did weigh in that he wanted us to figure out how we were going to pick. But when it comes to ordinances, that impacts the codes that change the practice of the of the organization, of course, the mayor would want to weigh in on that if it's a tie vote. And so I think that it would be the sponsor's obligation to bring the mayor's office along. I think they would be up to date on any testimony and all the ins and outs, because that's their job. When they know it's a tough vote, that we're taking on an ordinance for the city that they're the mayor of.

**Speaker:** Just to clarify, vice chair Ryan, your stance is that if there are only six affirmative votes, then there should not be any voting and it should go to the mayor.

**Speaker:** The mayor. If it's a tie vote, then it's the responsibility of the sponsors to make sure the mayor is ready to weigh in on a tie vote. If they get clear indication the mayor is not physically able to do that, they might pull it back to their office and wait until the next meeting. That would be their choice.

**Speaker:** Thank you, councilor dunphy.

**Speaker:** Thank you. I, I largely agree, I think, that we are creating new processes that are not in the plain text of the charter. I think it's getting a little convoluted, and I think it is the responsibility, as dictated by the charter, that the mayor is able to make an informed vote. That's his responsibility to follow up on these things. And the further we get towards a lot of votes and new processes and differentiating between non emergency ordinances and emergency ordinances and final passage versus other things, I think we're just we're getting lost in the weeds and we are. It seems pretty clear to me that an affirmative vote of something requires seven yeses. And I don't also particularly like the idea that if something gets six yeses, it automatically dies either. I think the mayor's role is pretty clear in the charter. So I have some concerns with with the framework of what we're trying to put in place. Yeah, that's all I have to say. Right.

**Speaker:** Councilor dunphy, do you have concerns with changing the language to make sure that it it clarifies that it doesn't need to be six six, but that from changing it to six affirmative votes.

**Speaker:** I mean, I guess I always assumed that that was part of it, that that we would need that, that the process of taking a walk and reducing the. The number needed is, is pretty un. Undemocratic in a lot of ways. I think that there is a responsibility of the sponsors to try and see also. This is also part of the problem we have with our public meetings laws right now is that we're unable to be able to meet with our colleagues sequentially in a way to understand some of these hard, nuanced policy conversations before we get here. And so the only people who suffer in this are the staff who have to sit here and watch us vote again, and the public because nothing gets done. So I do have some concerns about that. I think that I think that I mean, I think that confirming that a passage requires seven

affirmative votes for. Regular passage is reasonable and that the mayor needs to be available for that. Yeah. I would not be comfortable with with making something, you know, it being a majority of the present or moving to a 65 situation that would not be.

**Speaker:** 7 to 7.

**Speaker:** Yeah.

**Speaker:** Councilor clark.

**Speaker:** Thank you, madam chair. I really understand the sense of urgency here, particularly as we get into the budget. I think that's probably the driver. But at the same time, I'm really struggling with this. It seems like the mayor's veto authority was really meant to expedite the process, to just keep us moving so that we don't get bogged down. And this language is just a little bit too convoluted for me, just too much process. And I'm sorry I didn't come with alternative language. So I'm really held up on that.

**Speaker:** And councilor clark, can I ask a clarification? Sorry. When you said veto, did you mean typewriting.

**Speaker:** I mean tiebreaking?

**Speaker:** Okay, sorry.

**Speaker:** Just sorry. There's no veto.

**Speaker:** On veto.

**Speaker:** Sorry. Just slipped out. I don't know why, but no tiebreaking. Sorry, but that that was really meant to expedite the process. And I think I agree with councilor dunphy that this is just making it a lot more complicated than it needs to be. And I do, you know, woe is the public that has to watch us go through this. So I'm I'm sorry I didn't come in with language. I feel like we need to streamline this. It's a little too complicated. I thought that councilor avalos comment on maybe an off

ramp was kind of interesting. Can there be an off ramp? Or if the mayor is not available, does something just die if it's 6 to 6, I mean that that's one off ramp. And I feel like we just haven't had enough discussion of that. But I don't want to see this go on and on and on. Waiting for the mayor. It just doesn't seem efficient. And I will admit, I'm not ready to vote this out. As it stands, and I'm still wrestling with what the charter actually said, that there really there really weren't any qualifications in the charter. And I know we're trying to put some meat on the bones here, but I'm I'm just really not sure I agree with all all of this, this meat. So I'm not ready to move. As it stands.

**Speaker:** Councilor pirtle-guiney.

**Speaker:** I'm hearing some concern from some of my colleagues, and I will admit to a bias in that it makes my life significantly easier if we vote this out before we're considering the budget. So I want to suggest that we think about a few different pieces of where we're trying to get and figure out if there are some areas where there's clear direction, where we're all on the same page, some areas where there's not, and figure out if maybe it's possible to get somewhere quickly. Today. The chair is open to that. The first is I see this as the first paragraph j one as an opportunity to provide further clarity of the mayor's role because we have had questions come up about the mayor's role, and I think we all are gaining an understanding of when the mayor breaks ties and when the mayor does not break ties. But having that clarity in code or in our rules, in this case, in code, I think is helpful from my perspective. I am curious just an asterisk to that about emergency ordinances which are not listed here, either positively or negatively. And I'd love to hear from our attorney at the appropriate time about where emergency ordinances fall. The second bucket, to me, is this issue that mr. Harris raised about whether we need to clarify that the mayor does not only break a tie in a 66 vote, but the mayor has the

opportunity to weigh in. If there are six positive votes for something and whether that's something we want to take up and clarify, or whether we don't feel the need to clarify that and we're okay with it remaining. The mayor only weighs in when it's a 6-6 vote specifically. And the third bucket in my mind is this idea of what happens if the mayor isn't available, because I think under what's been proposed, if the mayor is available, there's no revote and reconsideration other than the regular process that's allowed for somebody to ask to change their vote. I think this is just what happens if the mayor isn't available and does it die, or is there a formal process that we move through? And it could be that we say that if the mayor is not available, it just dies and somebody would have to change their vote and ask for a reconsideration to be able to keep it alive at the next meeting, which is certainly a reasonable process. But I wonder if we could think about those three things separately to see if we can get somewhere. If the chair is willing.

**Speaker:** Yeah. Is this the time that we could have Robert Taylor come respond to that? Answer some questions.

**Speaker:** Record Robert Taylor, city attorney very good conversation and necessary. The where I start when I think about this is the new charter did contemplate a very limited role for the mayor in terms of interactions with council. So no veto, mayor is not a member of council, mayors, the head of the executive branch, not part of the legislative branch. The. There is some authority for the mayor in the charter to introduce items to council, and also to break to cast the tie breaking vote where that's the deciding vote. And that was really intended for the supposed to be the sort of stopgap, safe harbor for the budget, to be honest with you, because that's something that we have to pass every year. It can pass as a nonemergency ordinance and be effective immediately. That's in the charter. That's a specific provision for the budget. And so the charter does use the word tie. We have

advised that that means equal number of votes on each side. So for example, if it's an emergency ordinance that requires nine affirmative votes to pass, if it's an 8 to 4 vote, the mayor doesn't come in and cast the ninth vote to pass the emergency. So if it's a 6 to 5, vote on a non-emergency, that's not a tie. The now mr. Harris brings up a good point. Doesn't that open it up to kind of gamesmanship on council. And if somebody decides to take a walk or to leave, that type of gamesmanship has happened at the legislature. There is a procedure at the legislature. There's also a procedure in our code for this, which is the council can compel the attendance of absent members. So that gives council the ability to say, we only have 11 people here. We think this will be a close vote. We're going to compel the attendance of the councilor that we think is absent right now, and make them come and participate in this process, so that that would be one way to address that type of gamesmanship. If our council ever devolved into what we see sometimes at the state level.

**Speaker:** Could there be a situation where there is a councilor that's truly sick or unable to attend?

**Speaker:** That could happen? The other thing that can happen is there could just be a vacancy, right? We've we've had that situation in the past on council where a member passes. And so you'd have to wait until that seat gets filled. So that would cause a challenge. I think we could be an 11 member council for a while until that vacancy is filled. I think on this question of 6 to 5 votes and whether the mayor can pass the can cast the deciding vote, I think if you're inclined to want to go in that direction, I think I'd like to think a little bit more about that and how to square that result with the language in the charter.

**Speaker:** Thank you so much. Councilor pirtle-guiney.

**Speaker:** I'm sorry, mr. Taylor. I can't help myself. What tools do we have for compelling somebody to attend a council meeting?

**Speaker:** Well, the first way to do it is you just it's sort of the. The public shaming of it. That's the first way to do it. We have 11 people who came here and want to participate on behalf of those who elected them. We have an 11th member who we are told is at the restaurant or at a political event, and they need to be here to participate. We, as the council will vote to compel them to be here. Right? That, I think, is one way to do it. You know, at the state level, there's always questions about what can we send the state police to go pick somebody up or not? I don't think we'd want to think through that a little bit more before we ever got to that in Portland. But I think the main thing is, if you have 12 elected members of the council that are currently seated and we start having a situation where some of them are intentionally leaving the room or intentionally trying to avoid votes, the answer to that under the charter and the rules is council gets to make people show up and do their job as as councilors. And the most important job is to cast their vote, especially on the most difficult items.

**Speaker:** Thank you.

**Speaker:** Vice chair Ryan.

**Speaker:** I'm actually moving towards a motion based on what I'm listening to, but to me seven is seven. It takes seven votes to pass something. Period. End of story. And so I don't know why we're rehashing that right now. And I think it's really clear that the mayor can break the tie at a 66 vote. For me, when I saw the only thing that I wanted to edit before all this stuff was added last time we talked, I was good up until we got to. Basically the only thing I wanted to talk about was resolutions of reports. Like, I was really clear that for ordinances and for quasi judicial matters, that we really needed the mayor to weigh in on that because we need to pass the, the, the business of the organization. I did want to have a conversation about resolutions because that's us advising basically the mayor and the organization. So



it's a little odd that they would want to weigh in on that. It's like we either need to come up with seven votes to influence the organization or not. And I kind of felt the same way about reports. So for me, I was really good with all of this until we started adding all of this stuff in number two, where we go into where the vote on the final passage is. I just want to like, take all that out. And I was moving towards seeing if there was appetite for an amendment that would make this, I think, more clear and concise about what it was saying before we added all that and not have the repetitive votes. But I did want to ask you about your opinion, your opinion, your thoughts on if I'm reading ordinances right compared those two resolutions and comparing those to reports. Resolutions were inspired. Direction. They were never in code to put into the organization's practices be changed. It was to get things moving. Reports, in my opinion, have been more for us to receive the information and to either accept the report as it is or not, but I never thought of it as being something urgent that we would need the mayor to break a tie on.

**Speaker:** Thank you councilor. It's a that's a great conversation about the difference between ordinances and resolutions and reports. And I think we'll hear some more about that today. But the short answer is that ordinances have the force of law, right? Ordinances are used to adopt and amend the city code. The city code has the force of law. Resolutions do not have the force of law. They are used to express council's opinion or or policy, but they don't have the force of law. And then reports are used to. As a vehicle for council to express its particular action. So the previous form of government, they were used quite a bit in the procurement process to approve the report regarding a procurement or an award of a contract. Council doesn't.

**Speaker:** We had executive oversight.

**Speaker:** Correct. So we don't you're not going to see this new council isn't going to see that as much. But reports are also used now to confirm appointments for example. So it's really just a vehicle to do that. I think you're you know, your your broader point though is a very, very good one, which is and it's something I think this new council needs to be very mindful of. When you rely, when you come to a habit of relying very heavily on the mayor breaking a tie on final passage of any item, the 12 members of council are ceding a lot of their legislative authority to the mayor. If they're going to use the mayor that way and rely so heavily on it. And so I think the point of trying to get the council to seven votes helps maintain council's legislative prerogative.

**Speaker:** To move the business forward for the city with ordinances and with the judicial. It does make sense that we keep that active to engage the mayor. If in case if there is in fact a tie, because we have to move forward with the business of the city.

**Speaker:** Yes, I think that's a good point. I, I do think that the other part of this conversation is around just the kind of the practicalities of it. And I think you're right that if you if you sense that it's going to be a close vote, it's good to get the mirror engaged and let them know, hey, you should be watching these hearings and listening to the public testimony because you might be called upon to do this. But again, the mayor is not supposed to be a member of council. It's not supposed to come and attend every meeting. The mayor is supposed to be running the executive branch, so the mayor might miss some of that. We've had instances even where i, I don't think we were anticipating a tie vote, but it happened, and the mayor's not here. And what do we do about that? And so I think you have to think a little bit about the logistics of there's a tie vote on something. We didn't think it was going to be a tie. Mayor's not here. What do we do about that.

**Speaker:** And was if that was an amendment correct. That was an amendment.

**Speaker:** That was an amendment.

**Speaker:** Yeah. And i, I know we've had conversations. Boy, have we had conversations about the distinguishing between the amendment and the actual ordinance.

**Speaker:** Yeah. Yeah. That's right.

**Speaker:** That is that the mayor doesn't need to weigh in on the details of that legislation and the amendment, but if it's still six six at the end, then that would make sense on an ordinance. Okay. I haven't proposed the amendment change yet because I kind of was just a little surprised when I saw this earlier that so much had been added. I think it's mostly about cutting. I just wanted to do a temperature check and see how other people thought in the discussion, because I think we could save a lot of time and provide a lot of clarity. If we simplified this.

**Speaker:** Councilor pirtle-guiney.

**Speaker:** A couple of things are on my mind right now. Councilor Ryan, I had started thinking that we did need the mayor to be able to break the tie on resolutions and reports, but as I think more about that, as I reflect on that and hear your discussion, having the mayor break a tie on something that is direction to the mayor, or that is accepting something from the mayor, as reports often are, feels like doubling up on his power. And so I would be amenable to limiting this to just ordinances and quasi judicial matters. In fact, I don't love giving away our power on quasi judicial matters. But I do think that you make a good point that those are things that need to move forward expediently. And so we probably should include that. I would ask that if we have a narrowing amendment, we do include a j2, which addresses what happens if the mayor is unavailable. But it could be as simple as saying if the mayor is unavailable either in person or virtually, then the item dies or

without reconsideration. Without a move to reconsider by a council member, the item dies or something that addresses what happens. So there aren't questions, even if addressing it is just stating what what would happen now? I think it's important to just call out so that there's clarity that if the mayor isn't here, the mayor isn't here in the instance that you and mr. Taylor were referring to where we had a tie recently and the mayor wasn't here. I'm not sure if folks know this, but I actually seen that coming. Had reached out to the mayor's staff during during the meeting.

**Speaker:** This was for an amendment.

**Speaker:** It was. But we didn't know at the time that the ruling was going to be that it wouldn't matter for an amendment. So I had reached out during the meeting to his staff to say, where is he? Is he available? And mike jordan had actually gone upstairs to try to find him for us. I don't think there's any reason that somebody presiding over the meeting couldn't call a recess to find the mayor, to see if he was available, even if he wasn't here. So I'm comfortable narrowing item two, if that's the will of the committee. As long as we have something there that just clarifies for our colleagues what happens if the mayor is unavailable and maybe even language that says if the mayor is unavailable upon councilor attempts to bring him to the meeting, this is what would happen.

**Speaker:** I hear what you're saying, but this was on an amendment. Do you have an opinion on if we should do that with amendments as well as with the general?

**Speaker:** I know i, I am, I am supportive of maintaining the interpretation that our attorneys have given us, that the mayor only weighs in on final passage. I'm just using that as an example of the fact that even if somebody has not done their homework and gotten the mayor here, there is opportunity either during the

meeting, if the presiding officer or somebody else sees where the vote is headed or through a recess to try to.

**Speaker:** Get, I want to make sure we're on the same page, because the example you're using was actually one that we're not lifting any longer. So but now we know we won't let that happen again.

**Speaker:** Councilor clark.

**Speaker:** Well, I just I'm not sure I agree with our attorney on giving away power. I think that it's not a question of giving away power. I think it's the mayor sides with a certain six, and there's a that's a political issue. It's not that he has the power. She has the power. I guess I would just turn that around a little bit. I'm interested in I came in here really not wanting to give up anything and really respecting the fact that the charter had no qualifications. So now what I'm hearing is other committee members want to even narrow it further to only include non emergency ordinances. Correct me if I'm wrong, and quasi judicial matters and that's it.

**Speaker:** Remember that non-emergencies require nine. Sorry emergencies require nine votes.

**Speaker:** Okay. That's right. Gotcha.

**Speaker:** I have a role in that.

**Speaker:** Okay. Gotcha. So you want to narrow. You want to narrow. Jay one is what I'm hearing. I'm you know, if this is really driven right now by the budget, maybe we should just say something about the budget. You know, that the mayor, the mayor has the authority to break a tie on the budget and then come back and revisit this later. But just another idea. I mean, if that's what the driver is right now. Comments.

**Speaker:** So we're on number one and it seems like we're we're getting some consensus on number one at least, is to take out strike out resolutions and reports.

**Speaker:** I think I heard that councilor clark might not be in agreement.

**Speaker:** With that. That's what you were saying about the. Okay.

**Speaker:** I'm just I'm just.

**Speaker:** Saying that i. I'm thinking that the charter is much broader than that, and I'm I might withhold my vote on that. I understand the desire to make sure that we have the mayor's tie breaking on the budget. That's what's driving this conversation right now. But I think that maybe we need more time on the other pieces. I mean, we definitely have some disagreement on the council around the interpretation of the charter and his agreement with our esteemed city attorney. So I'm I might withhold my vote on that. But because I really I feel the urgency around the budget.

**Speaker:** Tell me more why you would want to keep it open with resolutions, since that's just us basically lobbying the mayor. And we should probably get to seven or we wouldn't be successful in that endeavor, right?

**Speaker:** No, I agree with you, but I'm just I'm just saying I'm not sure that the charter is this specific, that I mean, I know we're putting meat on the bones. I think all I want to do right now is just move on the budget. If that's the driver here, that that the mayor breaks the tie on the budget and come back and revisit this. I'm just not comfortable with with the narrowing generally.

**Speaker:** And when you say the budget, you're referring to a nonemergency ordinance.

**Speaker:** I guess that's what it would be.

**Speaker:** Councilor I think that the I brought up the budget, because that's kind of what I'm looking at looming. But I do think at this point, we've gotten the direction from our attorneys that gives us, for the most part, what we need to be able to understand the mayor's role in the budget. I believe the urgency here. The driver here was the incident that we had recently. Where to councilor Ryan's point, it it's

moot at this point because that was an amendment. But I think it was a moment of about where the next conflict could come up, which is what do we do if the mayor is unavailable. And so I think that was the driver in the expediency of having this come forward, if I remember correctly.

**Speaker:** So that's really j2.

**Speaker:** It is, which I think we've heard that councilor Ryan is proposing narrowing. And that's where I had suggested, even if we don't have an alternative method in place, we should probably clarify what happens if the mayor is unavailable, since that seems to me to be the next big point of conflict around how this is interpreted.

**Speaker:** Colleagues, am I hearing that any of you have a motion to make for j1? Any amendments?

**Speaker:** Yeah, I can I move that. We amend number one by striking in line for resolutions comma reports comma.

**Speaker:** Second.

**Speaker:** The reason I'm pausing awkwardly right now is we had a little conversation about emergency being added. We did. We need to.

**Speaker:** I don't believe so because mr. Taylor clarified that since that is a93. That's right. There is no tie.

**Speaker:** All right. Councilor clark, is your hand up for discussion? No, sir. Without seeing any hands up. Keelan, will you call the roll, please?

**Speaker:** Yeah. And just to clarify, the motion was moved by Ryan, seconded by pirtle-guiney.

**Speaker:** Yes.

**Speaker:** Thank you. Okay. Thank you. Pirtle-guiney I Ryan clark.

**Speaker:** No.

**Speaker:** Dunphy i.

**Speaker:** I four yes votes. The motion carries.

**Speaker:** Is there any more discussion on j2 and how we might want to amend it.

**Speaker:** Easy part.

**Speaker:** Okay I will say there have been multiple times with the full council where we come to six six on something and then people are kind of rolling their eyes or like, what are we going to do? And so it does seem to make sense that we have some sort of plan for moving forward. So there isn't frustration or difference, too many differences on on what happens in that moment. Councilor pirtle-guiney.

**Speaker:** Could I ask our attorney a question, please? I apologize, I am I am going to ask this. If we were to strike two altogether, and we were in a meeting and there was a66 vote and the mayor was not here to break a tie or there was a66 vote. The mayor was here, but somebody didn't actually want the mayor to break a tie. What tools? Under our current rules and robert's rules of order do we have available to us if we don't provide further clarification?

**Speaker:** So on a 6 to 6 vote on a nonemergency ordinance and the mayor isn't here to break a tie, then the result of that vote is it fails. The item fails. There is a procedure to reconsider the vote. And if you if you adopt a motion to reconsider, that revives the item as if it had never failed. So it just comes back alive. The what is can be tricky about a motion to reconsider is under our rules, the person making the motion to reconsider must have been on the prevailing side, which means they must have voted no. And the way that and counselor Ryan will recall this, the way that would often play out in the old council, would be somebody who would otherwise be a yes vote, voting no on an item for the purpose of having voted on the side that that voted the item down, so that that person could then make the motion to reconsider. So, for example, when previously the mayor would always



vote last, the mayor would know the mayor was going to vote yes on something. The mayor would realize, okay, this item is going to fail, or we're not going to be able to pass it as an emergency ordinance. And so I'm going to need to make a motion to reconsider. The mayor would say, I am supportive of this, but I am going to vote no. The item fails. Then the mayor moves to reconsider and then council votes to reconsider it. At that point, the item is back in front of council as if it had not failed. So. So if the 12 member council has a 6-6 vote, the item will fail and you could then rely on the procedure to reconsider that item. But one of the people that voted no is going to have to make that motion to reconsider.

**Speaker:** Can one change their vote? So if it is six six, somebody who voted yes could ask the clerk or the presiding officer for permission to change their vote, change to a no vote, and then move to reconsider? Or would it have to be effectively the presiding officer who did that since they vote last?

**Speaker:** So great question. So under Robert's rules of order, any any member can change their vote before the roll call is over.

**Speaker:** So before the clerk says the final vote is correct.

**Speaker:** So anybody can change their vote at any time before that, after the result has been announced, a member has to ask for unanimous consent to change their vote in a 6-6 tie. It could be difficult to get unanimous consent to change your vote.

**Speaker:** Be the polite thing to do. But in something contentious, your colleagues might not grant it to you.

**Speaker:** Correct? And so that's why, under the old council where the mayor voted last he would cast, he would sort of change his vote from yes to no before the result was announced, for the purpose of having the ability to make the motion to reconsider.

**Speaker:** I don't know if this provides clarity or helps my colleagues think about our options here, but I know I had this conversation previously with mr. Taylor, and it helped me think about what do we need, what happens if we don't do anything, and what might we want to put in place?

**Speaker:** Councilor dunphy.

**Speaker:** I forgot what I was going to say.

**Speaker:** It happens to us all. Councilor Ryan.

**Speaker:** Yeah, I'm close to that because this reconsider conversation was so fascinating. So when we're on number two, as it's written now, I'm letting you know where I'm at. I will vote yes on this only if it ends at the end of the first sentence. I don't understand the rest of it to be necessary at this time. Based on the dialog we've been having, I do want you to know, council president, when you brought up the reconsider conversation, I don't know if that's another item or if it's blended into number two. But I do know this, that if the mayor is unavailable, either in person or virtually, to cast the tie breaking vote on the final passage during the meeting, the result of the tied vote is deemed inconclusive. That I know to be true right now, and so I will support that.

**Speaker:** Vice chair Ryan, may I follow up and see if I understand what you would believe should happen after that? Does that mean the mayor will vote at some point, or can the mayor just keep hiding if they were to want to and not vote?

**Speaker:** My experience would be if I was a sponsor of the legislation, I and I think you can tell pretty much if it's going to be a tight, close vote. I would be in communication with the mayor's office, and if they weren't supportive of what I was bringing, that would be new information to know that I'm okay with them hiding a if I knew they were supportive of it, I would make sure that it was only delivered at a time that I know they'd be here, so I would have the choice to pull it back to my

office if the mayor wasn't going to be there that day, and I would probably hold it until I knew they were going to be there for the vote. And that's just how it works. And it seems like that's not broken. I feel like I don't know what I'm missing here.

**Speaker:** I guess I'm wondering if then some people could interpret it, that then it's dead and it's done.

**Speaker:** If it would be dead, if i, if I chose to do the vote as a sponsor and it didn't get seven votes and I couldn't find the mayor, and I thought the mayor was going to be supportive, I would I would wish I would have pulled it back to my office. I guess my point is, I would never bring the vote up if I was counting on the mayor's tie breaking vote, if I didn't think they were going to be here. That's on me as the sponsor.

**Speaker:** But but could you.

**Speaker:** Couldn't you vote to reconsider or vote to send it to committee? Or you could do something.

**Speaker:** You can pull it before you're saying after it, after the vote.

**Speaker:** After the vote.

**Speaker:** I just I'm used to that. It you know, it lost. I guess I'm in the world of acceptance of this this job that we have. Like, you don't win all the time. And so if I can't get seven votes, I can't get seven votes.

**Speaker:** Isn't there some procedure you can do after that? I mean, you don't have to wait and wait and wait, which this assumes. It seems like there are other options.

**Speaker:** Councilor pirtle-guiney.

**Speaker:** It's my opinion.

**Speaker:** You could call for the motion to reconsider. I believe that once you've had a negative vote, an item has died. You could not then have a vote to send it back to committee, but our attorney will nod his head one way or another. If I'm

wrong, you could always reintroduce an item. I wanted to try to respond to councilor Ryan, though, who asked why this was necessary, and I don't know that I necessarily agree with this language that's here, but my understanding was that after some of our previous conversations and council, we had some colleagues who were interested in council essentially having a second chance at coming to agreement ourselves before we turn to the mayor. I know, councilor Clark, you said that you don't think it's a giving up of power to have the mayor weigh in, but I think some of our colleagues may disagree with that. And I believe that this was an attempt to say, if the mayor's here, we don't get that second chance. If the mayor is here, he's here. He votes. That's what it says. But if the mayor is not here, perhaps we use that as an opportunity to try to work it out ourselves before the mayor weighs in. And again, I don't I'm not saying that because I necessarily feel strongly that that's the direction we should go. But that was my understanding of why this language was considered. And I wanted to make sure, councilor Ryan, that you had an answer to your question of where did this come from?

**Speaker:** Councilor Dunphy?

**Speaker:** Thank you. You know it, councilor Ryan. The way you framed it sort of made something click in my brain a little bit that the earlier part of this document very explicitly says that procedurally non-emergency. Non-emergency ordinances require seven affirmative votes. A number of times. It says that seven affirmative votes are required for different things. And it occurred to me that if I were bringing an ordinance forward and three of my colleagues who I knew were going to vote for it were absent that day, it's incumbent on me. It's not a procedural thing. And if even one of them is absent from sickness or whatever reason, that that doesn't create a crisis. And if there happens to be another person available to make that seventh vote, that is the role of the mayor, but that if they aren't there to vote, then

that that's just how the bill dies or whatever it may be. But I think anything beyond that at this point, and I think also, I really do appreciate that we have narrowed it in the in the realm of things, because it doesn't make sense for the mayor to weigh in on how we are advising him. So resolutions and reports and things like that. I feel really comfortable with having gotten to the point where the mayor is the tie on non-emergency ordinance and anything shy of that, I mean, if I guess that, well, does this would this compel the mayor to vote, then if he is in the room and we hit a tie? I mean.

**Speaker:** I believe.

**Speaker:** The current code or the current charter language already compels the mayor to vote. I remember.

**Speaker:** The charter says the mayor has the responsibility to cast a vote in the case of a tie, whereas the deciding vote, if the mayor is, if the mayor is not present and is not available, then I think you have I think you have two choices. One is you could do as councilor Ryan suggests, which is he's not here at six six, the item dies, period. Or you could have a procedure that says, okay, the mayor's not here. Maybe he didn't know he should be here. Maybe it was a surprise that it was six six. Let's have some procedure about when that item is going to come back, when the mayor can cast the tie breaking vote. And that's the decision for you all to make. You and you can you can make either decision in the rule.

**Speaker:** Councilor dunphy, is your hand still up? I'm sorry.

**Speaker:** I kind of feel like the mayor should have to vote. It's hard. Councilor clark.

**Speaker:** Well, I was going to say.

**Speaker:** I'm okay with one more try. I mean, I get what you're saying, councilor Ryan, that it's dead. You had a responsibility. Couldn't get the mayor there.

Whatever. It's dead and you give up. And certainly that expedites things around

here. But I would be okay with one more try. So one. One out, but not 3 or 4 times. And, you know, chasing the mayor around town. I'm not I'm I'm not interested in that. I'm not sure about the language about changing your vote, but I'd be okay with one time.

**Speaker:** Thank you. So when we are talking about the procedural scenarios that you mentioned, attorney. I think that's what we were used to having that tool. And so I could see the council president having that tool. But it's different of course, because it's 12 and it's six and six. But what if the council president had the authority when they're noticing that something's looks like it's headed towards a tie? And for some reason the mayor had an emergency and they're not going to be here. And instead of having it die, just like the former mayor had the authority to pull something back procedural. So it would come back to us before we finish the votes. See, it's tricky because they didn't they don't have the same authority as the mayor had when it was five, because it was an odd number. But we're missing that tool that the person that's presiding in the meeting has to manage this. And I'm starting to get into the weeds. But you know what I'm trying to get at. So we had a the person conducting the meeting had authority to figure out how to keep it moving forward in a way that the current council president, who's now running the meeting doesn't have with even number. And so when could that person who's the council president weigh in to do something similar to what the mayor and the old form was able to do? And I think that's the little that's what's gnawing at me right now. And I don't know what language is going to provide that at the moment. Did that make sense to you?

**Speaker:** It did make sense. It did make.

**Speaker:** It might be the only person that understood what I was saying. Did that make sense to my colleagues? Council president should like this.

**Speaker:** And I think the situation you're describing is when we're having a roll call vote on final passage, and it becomes clear at some point that this is going to be a tie. And if we're going to rely on the rule that requires a motion to reconsider, to revive something, if it dies, then who has the responsibility to make sure that they vote no so that they can make a motion to reconsider? In the old form of government, that was the mayor, usually because the mayor was going to vote yes on most everything. So yeah, and the mayor voted last here.

**Speaker:** It was. So it was easier to implement this strategy with five and then being the final vote. So I'm trying to find a way to implement that strategy. So these numbers.

**Speaker:** Yeah what I what I would and this will take I think some learning from the council. But what I would suggest and it's this I think goes to the bigger point you're making, the proponent of the legislation, the person that voted yes and that wants this thing to pass, they need to be paying attention and counting the votes. And they will have voted yes. They will then realize this is going to die 6 to 6. I, as the proponent, need to change my vote from yes to no, and I need to do that before the vote is announced. And when I change from yes to no. Now I'm eligible to make the motion to reconsider. We can bring this thing back to life, hopefully.

**Speaker:** And that's what's usually happens at the state legislature. That's the way they usually do it. I thought you were talking about going upstream that before we even got to the vote. No. You would talk to the council president and say, hey, can we pull this from the agenda and put it off?

**Speaker:** Ideally, that is what would happen, like if you knew before the vote, which you should if you're leading the legislation, you have a pretty good sense of what's going to pass or not. If you are clear that you don't have the votes yet or you're it's going to be six six, maybe, but you have good indication that the mayor is

supportive, then you're going to want to pull it back to your office until, you know, the mayor can break the tie. But in this one, it's there were moments in real time, like we have a couple weeks ago, where the mayor, in real time, was able to make a maneuver that allowed it to be sustained in terms of dialog conversation. Keep moving the legislation forward. And then they had that opportunity to pull that. And I'm trying to find that same opportunity for the person, the council president, who now conducts our meetings. And Robert Taylor succinctly described how that could occur.

**Speaker:** Would it be okay if I give the council president a chance to direct respond?

**Speaker:** Absolutely.

**Speaker:** It's interesting as I listen to this, because under the old form, under the commission form, with the mayor as number five, generally nothing went on the agenda unless the mayor was supportive. And in this form, you could have a council president who held something to the 90 day mark if they weren't supportive. But at that 90 day mark, they are compelled to put it on the agenda. So there could be something on the agenda that a council president doesn't support, and that a council president would want to let die six six if the mayor wasn't here. So I think relying on the council president is different than under the old form of government relying on the mayor. Now, if you were presiding in kind of a neutral sort of way, you might do that as a courtesy to your colleagues anyway. But there is a little bit of a different dynamic. So I think Mr. Taylor's suggestion that it be the person who brought forward the measure is an important one, right? I mean when there's a vote happening that I think will be close, I'm tallying. I think we need to suggest to our colleagues that they do that as they're listening to the vote count. That's important.



I think it is in line with what you're saying. Councilor. I just want to point out the difference in the political dynamics with the way that we've set up.

**Speaker:** I don't think it's that much different. I don't think the mayor used that procedure. If they weren't supportive of the end result.

**Speaker:** So maybe it's not different at all. Maybe there were things before that the mayor didn't support and didn't use that.

**Speaker:** But I think that what you're talking about doing, excising everything after the first sentence, is really putting the onus on the person who's advocating for that particular policy.

**Speaker:** That's their job.

**Speaker:** That's their job. I think we're all kind of kind of maybe coming to that conclusion that there isn't another out that you can't rely on. The council president, that it's, you know, no offense there, but that it's really the carrier's responsibility. Yeah. And it certainly would expedite things, wouldn't it? I mean, that things wouldn't just be hanging around, meeting after meeting after meeting, hoping that somebody changes their vote. And what we've got here is language that you can change your vote in anyway. I mean, the opposite direction. So I mean, I'm I'm fine with what you're recommending.

**Speaker:** I think.

**Speaker:** Pirtle-guiney and I would just encourage us, if we have colleagues who are concerned with this, to remind our colleagues that you can always refile something. Yes. If something dies and you want another bite at the apple, there is nothing that says you can't file the same thing the day after it dies again. There's always the opportunity to bring something back for more work.

**Speaker:** Sounds like my colleagues are going in a different direction than maybe I like, but I will respect that. I do worry about. This leaving a pathway for possibly

some bad behavior. I don't know if we're always going to know that it's going to be six six. This means that there could be some loopholes, right? Where if some people chose to walk out of the room, you make something die. Even if we up here don't would not do that. I think our job is to try to close those loopholes and make sure that we are. Making sure that things are running as well as possible, even if there is uncertainty. I do like the idea of there being a chance to do it one more time. I think there's something about like having some hope in our body to kind of like, have a little bit more discussion and work together and try it again. I'm not set on what that number of times is, but I also will respect what my colleagues think and feel.

**Speaker:** Vice chair Ryan.

**Speaker:** Yeah.

**Speaker:** Thank you. Chair koyama lane I really appreciate what you just said. And I will say this every time someone pulled it back to their office, that legislation got better and it tended to either die because it just wasn't going to work, or it became a vote that had even more votes than they would have ever thought possible, because they reached out to their offices and got their voices in on it. So my experience with when something's pulled back because it's tight is that it's been better legislation. And so I just wanted to add that I think governments benefited from those moments, not anything else. And I think that the council president reminding us that you can always recast is something that was really helpful to all of us to hear at this time. I also will say that for me, this is so objective. I mean, i'll just say if you do the numbers where some of my votes land, they're not usually with the vast majority. So i, i, you know, I'm not looking at this as what's good for me. I'm being a governance public servant right now and looking at what I think would allow us to have bylaws, if you will, that allow us to be have a good civics exercise on how we work with each other and trying to eliminate too many. Too

many new hoops. And I think the clarity is just what's so important right now is what I'm experiencing. So I am supportive and I appreciate that we're simplifying this at this time as we move forward.

**Speaker:** Councilor dunphy.

**Speaker:** Thank you, councilor Ryan. I'm leaning towards supporting what you said, you know, removing everything after the first sentence. But I wonder if it wouldn't behoove us to put something in there along the lines of I'm thinking out loud and that's dangerous. But in the event of a tie, the sponsor of a of a and the mayor is unavailable. The sponsor of a piece of legislation may have the automatic opportunity to pull it back to their office or something, rather than letting it die. Meaning if a vote ends in a tie and the mayor is not available, rather than it just being dead, I say my bill that I've introduced, I now have the option. Instead of it dying and having to refile, I have, as the sponsor have the option to maybe either intervene and say, I would like to pull this item back to my office, saying as an alternative to it just dying. I mean, that maybe that that is the, you know, in the result of an inconclusive vote, the sponsor can pull the item back to there.

**Speaker:** Instead of pulling it back to the office before the vote, pulling it back into the office after it passed.

**Speaker:** Like if it is deemed inconclusive, a66 vote with no mayor and in the result of an inconclusive vote, the sponsor chief sponsor has the option to pull it back to there.

**Speaker:** And this is an ordinance.

**Speaker:** That's what I would. Yeah, okay.

**Speaker:** Well, what if what if.

**Speaker:** It seems, I don't know, could you weigh in on that? I didn't experience that. But I'm not saying that's good or bad. I also wasn't on the council when there

was only four people. It probably that became more of a habit when there were four people. When after commissioner, that void between commissioner fish and the new person being elected.

**Speaker:** I think that is a helpful suggestion. If you were going to in two, if you're going to delete everything after the first sentence, I think it would be good to explain. What do you do with an inconclusive vote? And if and if it says is deemed inconclusive, and the chief sponsor may request that the item be referred back to their office? I think that's good. I mean, the other alternative to that would be delete everything after the first sentence and then modify the first sentence that just to just say the result of the tied vote is the item fails, period. Because that's you don't need to say it's inconclusive if you decided it fails, if it's six six and the mayor is not there.

**Speaker:** Councilor dunphy, just clarification. Would you see this as the next item? So would be the number three?

**Speaker:** Yeah, maybe.

**Speaker:** Can I offer some language? So j three is in the event of an inconclusive vote. I'm sorry, not using our attorney's language. In the event of an inconclusive vote, the chief sponsor has the option to reintroduce the measure at a later date.

**Speaker:** Councilor pirtle-guiney.

**Speaker:** Councilor dunphy took 90% of what I was going to suggest, and I so appreciate that. I want to offer a slight alternative and happy to go in this direction if you all want. But because we don't really have a process of something residing in your office the way that it did under the old commission form of government, I was thinking about suggesting that in the event of an inconclusive vote, the sponsor carrier, we don't actually have language right now, but the person who brought the measure forward may request that it be referred that it that it be automatically

referred. So not needing a vote but that it be automatically referred back to the committee which moved it to council. And then it would stay alive. It would sit in that committee. At some point we'll need to think about when things disappear if they've been sitting in committee for too long. But we haven't gotten to that point in our rules yet, and it would provide an opportunity for more work to be done on on the ordinance.

**Speaker:** It may not it may not have been referred by a committee. I would just I would just leave it that the chief sponsor gets to reintroduce it somehow later.

**Speaker:** That feels predominantly the same as introducing something new to me, the way that our current system works. I'm not opposed to doing that. I just don't I don't know if it solves the problem I thought I heard.

**Speaker:** Councilor Ryan.

**Speaker:** Oh well.

**Speaker:** Thank you, chair koyama lane koyama lane sorry, I am just struggling with how many times then this could keep coming back. So maybe I'm just bitter. I'm comfortable. Comfortable with things not passing when i, you know, accept defeat. I don't know what's going on here, but I in my opinion, as a legislator, it's my job to get seven votes. If I can't get seven votes, it doesn't pass. And I would pull it if I knew the mayor wasn't going to be or if it was a close vote. So I think I'm just struggling with the second and third chances that I'm hearing right now.

**Speaker:** That's fine.

**Speaker:** I hear you, vice chair Ryan, and I know that it's also on our topic list. The question of how does a bill die? Council president, I have talked about this. I suggested the word die sounds so sad. I was like, how about does rests in peace? I don't know, I do think we need more conversation around that and could be another another thing we take up as governance.

**Speaker:** Can I just say I I'm fine with stopping after the first sentence. I would bet you dollars to donuts though. When it gets to the full council, there's going to be other people that are going to want another option. So when we bring this to the full council, I can just imagine we might want to have something in our back pocket.

**Speaker:** Councilor pirtle-guiney.

**Speaker:** Is the word inconclusive defined anywhere else in our code, or are we bringing something to council that is actually not defined and provides no more clarity than we have now? Because I would really like us to not do that, especially because our chair and vice president is talking about bringing this on a 9/12 agenda item to a council meeting that is very packed. I have left room for this knowing that that was her intent, but it is not a lot of room, so I would love for us to either define that word or not include that word if it's not already defined in code.

**Speaker:** My staffer is smiling because she's messaged me. This does inconclusive mean it fails? Okay. All right.

**Speaker:** Great question. Inconclusive for purposes of this rule is a bespoke word offered by your attorney to try to allow for the inconclusive vote, and then you get to take a couple of more votes to see if you can get it passed. If you're no longer interested in having a couple of more opportunities to vote on something, then you know, I think you could either define what you mean by inconclusive or just drop that term altogether. If it's 6 to 6, the mayor's not there. It dies. Fails, rests in peace.

**Speaker:** Just like what Keelan says when she when a vote fails, the vote fails.

**Speaker:** Yeah, yeah.

**Speaker:** Yeah. Gentler than dead. Thank you, council president. I was had my hand up for the same thing. This word's got to be. We got to talk about this word. It's not working.

**Speaker:** Council president.

**Speaker:** Okay,

**Speaker:** Chair, it seems like we have three paths before us. We can figure out. Do we like the idea of an automatic revote? And if so, what are the measures and how many times which councilor clark has hinted at? We can move to keeping the word inconclusive. And that meaning this goes somewhere else off of the agenda for more work to be done, whether that is back to a councilor or to the committee it came from, or to councilor clark's point. It may not have come from a committee. So perhaps we say to the committee that it came from, or to be referred to the most appropriate committee by the council president. Whatever it is that we want to say, there some definition or I think we need to remove the word inconclusive and say is deemed to have failed, but I think we need to take one of those three paths.

**Speaker:** I vote.

**Speaker:** For failure.

**Speaker:** Oh my god.

**Speaker:** Sorry. Okay.

**Speaker:** Is that a is that a broader statement or just about this measure?  
Councilor clark.

**Speaker:** Naming your album?

**Speaker:** Okay. Councilor Ryan.

**Speaker:** So it would read the vote fails after if the mayor is unavailable, either in person or virtually, to cast the tie breaking vote on the passage during the meeting. Comma. The vote fails. Period. That's what you're that's what you're saying, right? Yeah. And you guys have a lot of nonverbal going on.

**Speaker:** Yeah.

**Speaker:** So is what I'm hearing that I have some colleagues suggesting that if. There's a six to something vote on council and the mayor is not around, it fails, it dies. I don't feel great about that. I. Yeah. Because what does that mean? It goes back to committee it. And are we are you do you still agree that councilor clark that you're okay with one additional revote or have you changed?

**Speaker:** Well, I could be, but I think this is very elegant, and I think that we're a smart people and that we can figure it out. I, I mean, we can talk about it when it comes to the full council that, you know, you have options. We don't have to spell everything out for you. We don't have to dictate the process. You can go home and rework your resolution or whatever it is and bring it back in another form, or go to committee and try something different. I mean, there's all kinds of options, but we don't have to spell it out. I guess that's how I feel.

**Speaker:** Councilor dunphy.

**Speaker:** Yeah, i, I am increasingly convinced specifically because it refers multiple times in our code that seven affirmative votes are required for passage of anything that a, that means that a66 means that it fails. And on thinking about my own recommendation, about automatically referring back to a councilor, I am convinced also that there is that is a distinction without a difference between just reintroducing it. Again, it's not like I have to rewrite the findings I got. I'll likely have a word document on my computer. I can just change the thing and we can start again. But I am increasingly convinced that the right answer is it is the responsibility of an elected official to count to seven. And if you don't count to seven, that is the end of the legislative goal, the legislative process. And as councilor Ryan said, historically, when a bill goes back and gets a second draft, usually it's better. So I am I'm I would be supportive of an amendment to strike everything after the



second sentence and to change the ending of the first sentence to just say the vote or the vote fails.

**Speaker:** Councilor pirtle-guiney.

**Speaker:** Just in the name of transparency, because I've been told that sometimes it's not clear where I am on things. I'm happy to see this move forward, saying the vote fails. I am also happy to continue talking through some definition of inconclusive that would kick it back somewhere for more work. I think that as we talk about this, I prefer both of those paths to an automatic revote, because I do feel like we have that option through reconsideration, though I have heard our attorney say that that's a complicated option. So I just want to be clear.

**Speaker:** Councilor Ryan.

**Speaker:** Yeah, those.

**Speaker:** Propose a motion for this number two amendment to read number two, if the mayor is unavailable, either in person or virtually, to cast the tie breaking vote on final passage during the meeting, comma, the vote fails, period. And everything else is strike. Strike everything else.

**Speaker:** Second.

**Speaker:** All right, now we'll have some discussion. I'll look my hands up. All right? I worry about the count to seven piece. Because of serial quorum, we literally are not supposed to be counting to seven, so that's tricky if you don't get that seventh vote, because literally the mayor's just not accessible. That seems. Out of someone's control. So I would feel more comfortable with one more possibility of voting again. I could I could be moved on that, but I feel more strongly that it should get referred somewhere, either back to the sponsors office or back to a committee, or to a future council meeting. I don't feel super strongly about that, but I am worried about it. The word fail and with this expectation that people can count to seven

when we're not supposed to be counting votes to seven. Any other discussion?  
Councilor clark?

**Speaker:** Well, with all due respect, madam chair, I hear what you're saying, and I think you're trying to give your colleagues more direction options. And I guess I feel like we can talk about that with them. We don't have to have it here that we are grown ups and we can figure it out. I understand you're you're being really nice and trying to provide guidance. And I guess I'm feeling it's like every person for themselves.

**Speaker:** I hear you, councilor dunphy.

**Speaker:** I think for the purposes of today, in bringing this forward to the full council for broader conversation, I would be supportive of the motion that I seconded with the open invitation to all of my colleagues and myself included, and my staff to think about this and be ready, because when this comes as a 9/12 agenda item, I want to be done with it at that point. So I would be comfortable with moving forward with a vote and then turning the decision over to the all 12 of us.

**Speaker:** Councilor pirtle-guiney.

**Speaker:** Could somebody.

**Speaker:** Please restate the motion on the table?

**Speaker:** Keelan do you want me to or do you have it?

**Speaker:** I what I have is motion to amend exhibit aj2 to strike everything following the first sentence and amend the first sentence to say vote fails.

**Speaker:** So after the comma it says the vote fails. Period. Okay. Yeah. That's it.

**Speaker:** Great. Do any other councilors are your hands up for discussion? Are we ready to vote on the amendment? Keelan, will you please call the roll?

**Speaker:** Pirtle-guiney i.

**Speaker:** Ryan. I clark,

**Speaker:** I. Dunphy i.

**Speaker:** Know the motion carries with four yes votes.

**Speaker:** I move to add what mr. Harris suggested, which defines a tie vote as receiving specifically six affirmative votes on final passage.

**Speaker:** Second.

**Speaker:** Councilor pirtle-guiney.

**Speaker:** To offer.

**Speaker:** A friendly amendment, which is that if we are adding aj3 that says a tied vote is any vote which receives only six affirmative votes, that we should also amend j one where it says where the vote by council is tied 6 to 6 to say where the vote by council is tied with six affirmative votes. For consistency's sake.

**Speaker:** I would take that friendly amendment. Councilor vice chair Ryan.

**Speaker:** Well, I think I think we're on the same page. I think that the people down here are confused of what we're trying to do here about the six vote thing.

**Speaker:** So mr. Harris had added in. A different j one, explaining that a tie vote means you have six affirmative votes. So we are talking about how you need seven. The focus is seven. So if you do only have 511 people present and it's 6 to 5, this is a explaining that it doesn't have to be 6 to 6. It has to be six. Affirmative.

**Speaker:** If it's defined as a tie, doesn't the mirror come in and break the tie? I mean, it's not a tie. It just fails.

**Speaker:** Yeah.

**Speaker:** I believe that. What mr. Harris was suggesting, that our chair and vice president is moving forward. Is that we could establish something in our rules that would prevent the scenario of somebody ditching for the sole purpose of ensuring that a vote is not a tie, and therefore, the mayor can't break it. That councilor clark, if you really didn't want something to pass, you thought that the vote would be six

six and you thought the mayor would support it. You might find yourself wandering across the street to starbucks for a bevvy, rather than sitting here with the rest of us to vote no, and this would ensure that that did not stop the mayor from voting and stop something from moving forward that had the support of six of your colleagues, plus the mayor.

**Speaker:** Or a maybe more generous interpretation is you have someone on council who is ill or has passed away, and the mayor can still be the seventh vote.

**Speaker:** I would suggest that it's a pretty significant shift in terms of thinking about the procedural opportunities that one has. Perhaps not a bad shift. I don't say that negatively, but I do think that it's a pretty significant shift.

**Speaker:** Councilor Ryan.

**Speaker:** The whole.

**Speaker:** Premise was around tie votes until now, so there's a reason why we're pausing. And I think we've made some decisions that will obviously have some debate on the ones that we've already passed. I don't feel comfortable changing the first one since throughout the charter it talks about seven, seven, seven. So and I get that this gets to seven again. But then we're in the I guess it's like any walk up amendment, I just need more time to think about this one. It doesn't feel exactly the same to me.

**Speaker:** I hear that in respect.

**Speaker:** I haven't experienced this in the same way.

**Speaker:** I think.

**Speaker:** Maybe if someone wants to explain this to me, what's the downside to defining the tie vote as only six? Affirmative. What's the. I think there's a piece there that I don't quite understand.

**Speaker:** Is that a question? Yeah. Yeah. She's asking.

**Speaker:** It just doesn't really. It's not tying.

**Speaker:** It just six to fives. That tie.

**Speaker:** Just.

**Speaker:** Councilor clark, I think your microphone needs to be on when you say that for the benefit of everybody else.

**Speaker:** I need to be brought along on this one more. It's like we've been talking about timeouts, timeouts, timeouts. Now we're talking about in the unlikely event of someone doing that, then we have this opportunity to get to seven. I don't want to stop the work of the organization because of this vote right now, and I get where it's coming from. I just don't know if it's in the same exact box as this at this moment, maybe because my head has just been hurting on what I read this morning about everything else. Sorry I didn't get to yours, so I need to be brought along. I guess at this moment I'm gonna know until I'm brought along.

**Speaker:** Yeah, yeah.

**Speaker:** Councilor pirtle-guiney.

**Speaker:** Mr. Taylor. Does the charter use the word tie? And do we need to worry that something like this might create conflict with the charter? I just, I I'm not opposed to this direction, but I'm worried that procedurally, we can't actually move in this direction.

**Speaker:** I don't believe the charter defines what a tie vote is.

**Speaker:** I.

**Speaker:** I believe the council, under its authority to adopt its rules of procedure, could provide a definition. One way to reconcile those definitions with what it sounds like you might be interested in doing is to say tie vote is 6 to 6, where vacancies, abstentions or absences shall be deemed a no a negative vote. That's quite elegant. Thank you councilors, that actually helps me think about this

differently that a tie vote is a tie vote that is 6 to 6. We are not changing the definition of a tie, but that absences and we already as a city I believe count abstentions as a no. I think I've asked that question and been told that abstentions are a no, but that we would clarify that absences that that for determining a tie absences, abstentions. And there was a third piece I apologize I didn't track it are considered no votes. And that is what would allow us to move in the direction of what councilor koyama lane is describing.

**Speaker:** For me to share my thoughts. Yeah.

**Speaker:** Sorry.

**Speaker:** Just okay. We're just we're just sorry.

**Speaker:** We're just. No, I think that what mr. Taylor has offered is, is elegant, as you said. And as long as it's we're not. I mean, because 6 to 5 is just not a tie. So if there's another way of explaining it and doing what you would like to do. Madam chair, I think that's a good idea.

**Speaker:** Should I amend my amendment or take it off the table or.

**Speaker:** I, I don't think oh, yes. Because you motioned councilor dunphy.

Seconded. I think you could probably withdraw your motion and then we could make a new one.

**Speaker:** Okay, i'll withdraw my motion and make a new motion to add a new add. J3, which is the language from mr. Harris. A tie vote shall be declared by the presiding officer when a nonemergency ordinance or quasi judicial matter receives only six affirmative votes on final passage, and adding. Can you help me add nice language there?

**Speaker:** I think.

**Speaker:** With what mr. Taylor suggested, we actually could do it differently and have a j3 that just says in counting. In the event of. In determining whether a vote is

a tie, absences j3 in determining whether a vote is a tie, absences, abstentions and vacancies. Vacancies shall count as negative votes and that that would solve mr. Harris's concern with the language that mr. Taylor has suggested.

**Speaker:** That's what I'm motioning Keelan. Would you like council president to write that up? Would you guys like to see that?

**Speaker:** Could could someone repeat.

**Speaker:** Yeah.

**Speaker:** Could someone please repeat the motion?

**Speaker:** J3. In determining if a vote is a tie, absences, abstentions and vacancies shall count as negative votes. Is that accurate. Negative votes as opposed to no votes. Does it matter?

**Speaker:** I don't think it matters.

**Speaker:** Okay, Keelan I can put this in a message to you if that's helpful.

**Speaker:** Yes. Thank you.

**Speaker:** That's it.

**Speaker:** Our second. Do we have a second?

**Speaker:** Any more discussion on the amendment, which will explain that in determining if a vote is a tie, absences, abstentions and vacancies will be counted as no votes. So if you're not there it's a no. You're not able to vote. Absences. Vacancies. Abstentions.

**Speaker:** Abstentions.

**Speaker:** And that's.

**Speaker:** Just for the purposes of determining a tie, not for the purpose. Like if I'm absent and something gets unanimous votes, Keelan wouldn't have to say 11 to 1. The vote fail or vote passes, right? Like it's only for the purposes of determining something as a tie.

**Speaker:** I've proposed putting this in this j section, and specifically using the language in determining if a vote is a tie. So I don't believe that that broadly defines a tie differently elsewhere in code.

**Speaker:** Okay. Thank you I think what oh.

**Speaker:** My next.

**Speaker:** Yeah.

**Speaker:** Council perez I think what you're getting at is you're giving the legislator who say the sponsor of this legislation another tool if they didn't get to seven. Or why else would we vote on this.

**Speaker:** To define a tie?

**Speaker:** Well, no, I think what we're defining is you shouldn't be penalized for not getting to seven because one person wasn't here.

**Speaker:** Correct.

**Speaker:** So I'm trying to get to the heart of the matter of this. And so you're giving the legislator a tool to get to seven.

**Speaker:** We're ensuring.

**Speaker:** If they they can figure it out by what you just said.

**Speaker:** Yeah.

**Speaker:** All right. We're ensuring that the rules are applied consistently. And we are taking away a game that one of your colleagues could play to deny you the opportunity to get to seven.

**Speaker:** Future colleagues. None of us would ever do that.

**Speaker:** Councilor.

**Speaker:** I'd just be sick.

**Speaker:** Councilor Ryan, did you want to say anything else?

**Speaker:** Oh, no, that was okay.



**Speaker:** Is there any more discussion? On what? Council president just stated? Keelan, will you please call the roll?

**Speaker:** Yeah. And then once again, just to clarify, moved by koyama lane and seconded counselor dunphy. Okay. Thank you.

**Speaker:** Councilor.

**Speaker:** Counselor. Clark.

**Speaker:** Councilor. Clark. Okay. Thank you.

**Speaker:** For clarity purposes, could you please read what we're voting on one more time?

**Speaker:** Yes. So it's a motion to amend exhibit a to add j3 in determining if a vote is a tie. Absences and abstentions and vacancies will be counted as no votes.

**Speaker:** Thank you.

**Speaker:** Pirtle-guiney I Ryan.

**Speaker:** I clark, I dunphy.

**Speaker:** I.

**Speaker:** Koyama lane I the motion carries with five yes votes.

**Speaker:** Okay. May I have a motion?

**Speaker:** Yeah. Chair. Thank you, madam chair. I would like to make the following motion. Now that we voted on three amendments, I move that ordinance document number 2025 186, as amended, be sent to the full council with a with a due pass recommendation.

**Speaker:** Councilor Ryan moves the ordinance document number 2025186, as amended, to full council with a recommendation it be adopted.

**Speaker:** Second.

**Speaker:** The motion has been moved by councilor Ryan and seconded by councilor dunphy. Is there any discussion?

**Speaker:** Oh, sorry. No legacy.

**Speaker:** Not seeing any hands in the queue. Will the clerk please call the roll?

**Speaker:** I Ryan,

**Speaker:** I.

**Speaker:** Martin,

**Speaker:** I.

**Speaker:** Dunphy. I koyama lane i.

**Speaker:** The motion carries with five votes in favor and the ordinance document number 2025186, as amended, will move to full council with a recommendation be adopted. Keelan, will you please read the next item?

**Speaker:** Yes. Item two adopt procedure to establish what comes before council and committees.

**Speaker:** All right. With just 15 minutes left, this is a resolution that was made a while ago and is having a comeback. It is a it is pretty outdated and needs some work on it. I am inclined to say that we table this. I also know I'm seeing a nodding. I know that one of our fellow councilors is here to talk about this. Is that okay? If we move this to a future meeting? Okay, great. Do I need to? Do I have unanimous consent to move that one? Keelan. Do I need to do anything else?

**Speaker:** No. I think you've announced that this item will be continued to a future committee meeting date. That's sufficient.

**Speaker:** All right. Can you read the last item, please?

**Speaker:** Item for discussion about scope of work for hr and a Portland City Council transition roadmap?

**Speaker:** Okay, great. So. All of my colleagues I really believe, are committed to doing their best work on behalf of Portland. I genuinely feel lucky to be serving with the councilors who sit on this dais. And even after only four months, we have lived

experience that's leading us to reflect on how we're doing well. And I do believe that we're doing the work of the people. Questions and curiosity about our committee structure, our practice, our agenda, our kind of popping up as we're actually doing the work. And I think it's really healthy. And much of these thoughts are being shared with me as the chair of the governance committee. And while I know this is an incredibly busy time for council, this is maybe our busiest month we've seen yet. We have our first budget process requiring many additional hours of work sitting in these chairs here. I do at the same time also believe that we must also be moving forth the work of building our collective governance practices forward at the same time. So i, along with my wonderful co chair or vice chair, councilor Ryan, and also with council president pirtle-guiney, have identified an opportunity to work with a national consultant group whose mission provides mission supports elected leaders in local jurisdictions across the country. They do work in helping groups succeed and implementing reimagined forms of democratic governance. As I believe this has been shared with all the councilors and their offices. The group, which is called h and h, has offered their services to City Council free of charge. We've spoken with administrative staff and we can simply just accept the work being offered with an agreed upon scope between us. Last week, I spoke with a number of elected of officials who actually, in other bodies in different cities, have worked with h h and heard positive things about the impact of as a result of their work. And I know I bring a healthy skepticism to this. No one group or approach will be the answers to all of our different questions. I'm willing to engage with any and everyone who shows up to contribute to our work. And honestly, this feels like a wonderful opportunity. It's also one that if we start doing work with them and it's not feeling right, we can back out of it. As you know, we've repurposed our next governance committee may 12th meeting into a full council

work session for the purpose of meeting hr and a and beginning our work together. So principles from hr and a will be here in person and remotely to present their proposed scope of work will begin to align their skill sets and experience with our desires in terms of continuous improvement at that meeting. And so now, if there's anyone that wants to if you want to have some discussion around this, there's no official motion needed for this item. But this is the work that I or my team has come and talked to you all about, about supporting us in getting to a place where we can work on some agreements with each other, how we work together. There was some conversation when we started talking about decorum, and having that be something that's written down as a resolution, an ordinance about how that's actually work, that we should be doing on our own, more as like a retreat. It's something you might remember in December, I was kind of pushing, but I wasn't chosen by my peers yet, and so I didn't feel like I could be like, we need some agreements. So this is hopefully they'll be able to provide a space where there's some facilitation where we can do that work in following what our attorney tells us, but might be able to do some of that agreements work not here on the dais. If we have an attorney there making sure that we are in compliance. Yeah. Does anyone have any any thoughts they'd like to share, any questions, any hopes of places where you would like us to? We'll be able to say this next week too, but any places you'd like to see them support us in talking about our what we all need. Councilor dunphy.

**Speaker:** Yeah.

**Speaker:** Do you envision this as more of our, like, the nitty gritty of day to day, turning a bill into a law sort of deal? Or is this also more focused on the community agreement side of things and the interpersonal relationships, or is this also like, is this a place to also talk about, like, do we have our our committee composer

composition sort our committee composition? Right. What's the I guess how do how are they approaching it.

**Speaker:** They're really going to let council president and I have input in what we want to see. I'm assuming that we're going to hear from the attorney that the only work we can really do behind closed doors is the agreements interpersonal piece, which I do believe is really important. So it would if we do, if we have any talking conversations around a bill becoming a law, or should we rethink our committees, we'd have to ask our attorney for even allowed to do that behind closed doors. My guess is that most of that is going to have to be daylighted. It might be that they can add, or they can start some conversations around what's coming up, around what we do need to work on. And so I would say primarily, I'm hoping for support around the agreements about how we work together. And then discussion from there about what are the things that that are coming up the most that we could work on. Maybe if we're able to do some of that, as in more of a retreat style, that's up, that's I'm open to that. It might also be what are the what then do we bring to our governance committee or what do we bring to a full council governance style work session? Councilor Clark.

**Speaker:** Thank you, madam chair. It seems to me the way you've described it, some of the things that I think we need to work on are not things that we can work on in a retreat. I what comes to mind immediately for me is what hampers us, which is some of the how we're hemmed in by some of the government ethics laws, the way we talk to each other when we can talk to each other, our committee composition, which I was hoping that we would take on maybe before the end of the year, the number of meetings the council has, those kinds of things, those structural kinds of things are seem to me to be impediments to our smooth sailing here, I guess I would say. And none of that, I don't know, those things don't seem

like they fit in a retreat. The retreat sounds more like a little more touchy feely. You know, I like you. You like me. I'm okay. You're okay kind of thing. Which is. Which is fine. I mean, we could we could use some downtime to do that kind of bonding, because more and more we spend time in our committees. We don't get to watch what happens in the other committees. We don't get to watch other styles. All we know is what's in our committee and what's in full council. So I think that could be helpful. Are you thinking of a in this summer or for a retreat or what? What's your thinking?

**Speaker:** I don't have any set times. Exactly. I know that may is extremely full. I would love to be able to even just get some things on the calendar. That could be June. It could be July. And I do. While I know it can be seen as touchy feely, I do think that being able to talk about our values, talk about what we need from each other, talk about where our values overlap and what we can expect from one another. I do think that's really important, foundational work. And what I did here is while we presented a code of conduct draft, is that most councilors feel more comfortable with that work being something that is more between, between ourselves, between each other. That is work that actually council president and I have gotten to do with the mayor and with the city administrator. And I do think that would be it was pretty fruitful, I think. I think it could be healthy for us to get to do that as well. I'm not set on it has to happen at a certain time.

**Speaker:** Do thank you for that, because some of the things I mentioned are really I'm hoping we can do them before the end of the year and then come up with a lobby scheme on the on the ethics side. But I think it would be interesting for me anyway to know if we did like a myers-briggs or absolutely enneagram or something like that.

**Speaker:** Leadership style. Yeah.

**Speaker:** Just to learn more about each other. I mean, some of it's pretty obvious, but I think it would be fun to have it validated. Don't don't be laughing over there, council president. You're laughing.

**Speaker:** What if I'm on the record?

**Speaker:** I'm.

**Speaker:** I'm just laughing at.

**Speaker:** Enfj borderline.

**Speaker:** I yeah, esf. Okay.

**Speaker:** So maybe we don't.

**Speaker:** Need to do that. I know. So at this next meeting, I am hoping that you can bring all of these questions because they will come before us and we can also talk about I mean, there is this feeling. I don't think it's a secret. There's a lot of committees. There's possibly too many. And I think we started off in the right way, which was starting with having more and being able to put people in places where they could really thrive and shine. I think it's we're hearing that we need to look at that again, and we also need to look at how do we have what we need, the number of meetings, how frequent. So that could be part of the work. We could bring that up to them too. And we could ask next week, is that something that you would help facilitate? Could should we do that as a work session. And I think it's really up to us. But we can ask some of these questions next week to.

**Speaker:** Go ahead.

**Speaker:** Okay. Last question. Budget question. Is this costing us anything.

**Speaker:** No it's free okay. I mean they they we did some some googling around this this organization gets a lot of councilor first like who are their donors. It was very smart. So we looked into that. And it's a lot of like the ford foundation, a lot of like high level democratic. Yeah. Donors and again, at the same we can also see

how next week feels. And we're not tied to anything. We're not paying anything. Councilor dunphy.

**Speaker:** Thank you. Just whether it's our interpersonal agreements and our leadership styles or it is the minutia of how a bill becomes a law or the details of our committee composure, I just want to make sure that we are bringing in voices that have got best practices in place, that, yes, we have a new form of government here, but we're not reinventing the idea of government. And every time we try to reinvent the wheel in the city of Portland, it just takes ten years and results in a beautiful pdf that nobody ever reads. I just want to make sure that we are leaning in to what has worked elsewhere, and let's use that as a starting point for everything we do. But that said, this all sounds like a great opportunity because I know that I'm too close to the work to know my own blind spots, to know my own needs, and to know how to fix the things I'm doing stupidly. So it sounds great.

**Speaker:** Councilor councilor pirtle-guiney.

**Speaker:** But you know your enneagram and that makes you a step ahead of me. So you're doing well. I just wanted to make sure to say on the record, councilor clark. Yes. Completely heard that. We need to look at how we are spending our time. And I think it's even more complicated than what you put out, because we have the balance of councilors who want more time in committees, but also want more time not on the dais to be in districts. And how do we balance all of the different things that we need to be doing? So I know that we have a lot of folks who want us to reconsider how we use our time. I think folks want to pull us in different, sometimes competing directions, sometimes the same people want to pull us in competing directions. But I certainly, you know, look, when we can shift committees at any time by a vote of this body. And my assumption is that at the start of the year, when we have our leadership elections, we would. Also vote again on our



committee structure and membership. And I also have had conversations with a few of our colleagues about their interest in potentially having a vote on making some changes even before then. And once we get through the budget, it's something that I'm happy to put some time into.

**Speaker:** Vice chair Ryan. Thank you. Chair, I want to just acknowledge that when you brought this to my attention, yes, I did. I was cynical, so I wanted to know where the money was coming from because nothing's really free. And I think the timing is what got me in a good way. We're going to buckle up over the next six weeks and do really hard work for the city of Portland. We're all going to do the best we can to make those tough decisions with a lot of tradeoffs. And my experience in life is after you do something like that with a body, it would be a great time to take a breath. So this is only by one point and f and I am a complete middle on j and p like 5050. Good luck with that. So I do think it has merit. At first I was a little cynical, but I think that to your point, we could we'll probably be able to do the more challenging logistical, technical stuff if we take a breath together. Is my hope and inspiration on this. And so I do support you and I appreciate you also, chair, for looking into these resources and making a suggestion that's a little bit out of the box, and I really value that. You lifted this and I think it will be a fascinating work session and we'll see where it goes. One one meeting at a time. Correct. Anyway, so I just wanted to say that I've been brought along on this a little bit and I appreciate it. Yeah. Not like we had other things on our plate, but you have brought this to my attention and I fully support that we can move this forward. And yes, no budget implications were quite helpful. Thanks.

**Speaker:** All right. Thank you so much, colleagues. So next Monday, May 12th at 2:30 p.m. We will be having a full council work session during this same time. So we will meet with hr and a and we'll talk about kind of a roadmap for our governance

work. And then our next meeting, our next governance committee meeting will be June 9th at 2:30 p.m. So mark your calendars. Because of memorial day, this is that memorial day meeting we got. We moved that up to today so we can make sure that we got to have. At least one meeting in may around governance committee. Okay. Thank you again to everyone who participated today. Thank you so much, colleagues. And with that, this meeting of the governance committee is adjourned.