



May 21, 2025 Council Agenda

5808

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

Session Status: Adjourned

Council in Attendance: Councilor Sameer Kanal

Councilor Dan Ryan
Council Vice President Tiffany Koyama Lane
Councilor Angelita Morillo
Councilor Steve Novick
Councilor Olivia Clark
Councilor Mitch Green
Councilor Eric Zimmerman
Councilor Candace Avalos
Councilor Jamie Dunphy
Councilor Loretta Smith
Council President Elana Pirtle-Guiney

Council convened at 9:15 a.m.

Council President Pirtle-Guiney presided.

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

Councilor Zimmerman left at 11:05 a.m. and returned at 11:13 a.m.

Council recessed at 11:17 a.m. and reconvened at 11:26 a.m.

Council recessed at 11:47 a.m. and reconvened as the City of Portland Budget Committee.

Council recessed at 11:49 a.m. and reconvened at 12:02 p.m.

Council recessed at 2:25 p.m. and reconvened at 3:02 p.m.

Council as the City Budget Committee recessed at 5:59 p.m. and reconvened as the Prosper Portland Budget Committee.

Council as the Prosper Budget Committee recessed at 6:23 p.m. and reconvened as the City Budget Committee.

Council recessed at 6:23 p.m. and reconvened at 6:33 p.m.

Councilor Kanak arrived at 6:38 p.m.

Councilor Smith left at 8:22 and returned at 8:28 p.m.

Council recessed at 8:30 p.m. and reconvened at 9:04 p.m.

Council as the City Budget Committee recessed at 9:16 p.m. and reconvened as the Prosper Budget Committee.

Council as the Prosper Budget Committee recessed at 9:37 p.m. and reconvened as the City Budget Committee.

Councilor Clark left at 10:10 p.m. and returned at 10:15 p.m.

Council as the City Budget Committee recessed at 11:09 p.m. and reconvened as the City Council.

City Council recessed at 11:14 p.m. and reconvened as the City Budget Committee.

Council as the City Budget Committee recessed at 11:54 pm and reconvened as Prosper Budget Committee.

Council adjourned at 11:56 p.m.

NOTE: View the last 3 hours of the meeting [here](#).

Pre-gavel

Celebrating Older American Month and Age-Friendly Portland

Speakers:

Bandana Shrestha, State Director, AARP Oregon

Poison Waters, local personality

Agenda Approval

1

Council action: Approved

The agenda was approved by unanimous consent.

Public Communications

2

[Public Comment](#) (Public Communication)

Document number: May 21, 2025 Public Communications

Time requested: 15 minutes

Council action: Placed on File

Committee Referral Report

3

[Committee referral list](#)

Time requested: 5 minutes

Regular Agenda

4

[Add Fair Wage Policy Code for certain City service contracts \(add Code Chapter 5.70\)](#) (Ordinance)

Ordinance number: 192054

Document number: 2025-178

Introduced by: Councilor Jamie Dunphy; Councilor Steve Novick; Councilor Mitch Green

Second reading agenda item.

Council action: Passed

Aye (12):

Kanal, Ryan, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Zimmerman, Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Pirtle-Guiney

5

[Approve funding recommendations of Children's Levy Allocation Committee for July 1, 2025 – June 30, 2028](#)
(Ordinance)

Document number: 2025-207

Introduced by: Councilor Dan Ryan

City department: Portland Children's Levy

Time requested: 30 minutes

Council action: Passed to second reading

Passed to second reading June 4, 2025 at 9:30 a.m.

6

[Grant a cable franchise agreement to Comcast of Oregon to continue access to the right-of-way and operate a cable system for a period of ten years](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 2025-197

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Planning and Sustainability (BPS)

Time requested: 20 minutes

Council action: Rescheduled

Item will be rescheduled for a future meeting.

7

[Authorize the Bureau of Transportation to acquire certain permanent and temporary rights necessary for construction of the NE Columbia – Cully Boulevard and Alderwood Road Intersection Improvements Project through exercise of Eminent Domain Authority](#) (Ordinance)

Ordinance number: 192064

Document number: 2025-184

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Transportation

Time requested: 30 minutes

Previous agenda item.

Council action: Passed to second reading

Passed to second reading June 4, 2025 at 9:30 a.m.

8

[Adopt the Locally Preferred Alternative for the 82nd Avenue Transit Project and Conditions for Approval](#)
(Resolution)

Resolution number: 37706

Document number: 2025-093

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Transportation

Time requested: 30 minutes

Previous agenda item.

Council action: Adopted As Amended

Motion to amend the resolution to change the second to last Whereas statement to correct the name of the report written by the 82nd Ave Coalition and to change the name to the "82nd Avenue Development Strategy": Moved by Clark and seconded by Ryan. (Aye (11): Kanal, Ryan, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Pirtle-Guiney; Absent (1): Zimmerman)

Aye (12):

Kanal, Ryan, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Zimmerman, Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Pirtle-Guiney

9

[Amend fee schedule for tree permits \(amend PRK 2.03\)](#) (Ordinance)

Ordinance number: 192055

Document number: 2025-123

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Parks & Recreation

Second reading agenda item.

Council action: Passed As Amended

Aye (12):

Kanal, Ryan, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Zimmerman, Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Pirtle-Guiney

10

[Adopt rates and charges for water and water-related services for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2025, and ending June 30, 2026](#) (Ordinance)

Ordinance number: 192056

Document number: 2025-132

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Water

Second reading agenda item.

Council action: Passed As Amended

Aye (11): Kanal, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Zimmerman, Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Pirtle-Guiney

Nay (1): Ryan

11

[Revise sewer and stormwater charges and fees for FY 2025-26](#) (Ordinance)

Ordinance number: 192057

Document number: 2025-133

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Environmental Services

Second reading agenda item.

Council action: Passed

Aye (11): Kanal, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Zimmerman, Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Pirtle-Guiney

Nay (1): Ryan

12

[Revise sewer and stormwater rates for FY 2025-26](#) (Ordinance)

Ordinance number: 192058

Document number: 2025-134

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Environmental Services

Second reading agenda item.

Council action: Passed As Amended

Aye (11): Kanal, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Zimmerman, Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Pirtle-Guiney

Nay (1): Ryan

13

[Adopt fees and charges for water system development and water-related services during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2025, and ending June 30, 2026](#) (Ordinance)

Ordinance number: 192059

Document number: 2025-135

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Water

Second reading agenda item.

Council action: Passed

Aye (11): Kanal, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Zimmerman, Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Pirtle-Guiney

Nay (1): Ryan

[*Revise transportation fees, rates and charges for FY 2025-26 and amend Transportation Fee Schedule and fix an effective date \(amend TRN 3.450\)](#) (Emergency Ordinance)

Ordinance number: 192061

Document number: 2025-136

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Transportation

Second reading agenda item.

Council action: Passed As Amended

Motion to amend Exhibit F to increase the TNC per ride fee to \$2.00: Moved by Kanal and seconded by Novick. (Aye (9): Kanal, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Avalos, Dunphy, Pirtle-Guiney; Nay (3): Ryan, Zimmerman, Smith)

Motion to add an emergency clause in order pass the ordinance in time to have a balanced budget: Moved by Zimmerman and seconded by Novick. (Aye (11): Kanal, Ryan, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Pirtle-Guiney; Nay (1): Zimmerman)

Aye (10): Kanal, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Pirtle-Guiney

Nay (2): Ryan, Zimmerman

[Amend Portland Permitting & Development fee schedules to improve cost recovery and service levels for customers](#) (Ordinance)

Ordinance number: 192060

Document number: 2025-137

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Permitting & Development

Second reading agenda item.

Council action: Passed

Aye (12):

Kanal, Ryan, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Zimmerman, Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Pirtle-Guiney

Time Certain

16

[Approval of the FY 2025-26 Budget for the City of Portland \(Council convenes as Budget Committee\)](#) (Report)

Document number: 2025-208

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: City Budget Office

Time certain: 11:45 am

Time requested: 2 hours

Council action: Placed on File

Motion to approve a technical adjustment to update Attachment E: Moved by Novick and seconded by Zimmerman. (Aye (12): Kanal, Ryan, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Zimmerman, Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Pirtle-Guiney)

Motion to approve the changes to the Proposed Budget as presented in the memo titled, "Approval of the Budget for the City of Portland" and attachments: Moved by Ryan and seconded by Kanal. (Aye (12): Kanal, Ryan, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Zimmerman, Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Pirtle-Guiney)

Motion to approve Prosper Portland Resolution 7606 including Exhibit A: Moved by Ryan and seconded by Clark. (Aye (12): Kanal, Ryan, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Zimmerman, Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Pirtle-Guiney)

Motion to move \$999,340 to contingency: Moved by Zimmerman and seconded by Novick. (Aye (11): Ryan, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Zimmerman, Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Pirtle-Guiney; Nay (1): Kanal)

Motion to approve changes to the proposed budget as presented in the memo, in Attachments B and C, to reflect the approved amendments: Moved by Kanal and seconded by Green. (Aye (12): Kanal, Ryan, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Zimmerman, Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Pirtle-Guiney)

Motion to approve the budget as amended: Moved by Kanal and seconded by Zimmerman; Motion withdrawn.

Motion to approve adjustments in Attachments B, C, and D of the memo: Moved by Kanal and seconded by Novick. (Aye (9): Kanal, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Avalos, Dunphy, Pirtle-Guiney; Nay (3): Ryan, Zimmerman, Smith)

Motion to approve budget as amended: Moved by Avalos and seconded by Novick. (Aye (8): Kanal, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Green, Avalos, Dunphy, Pirtle-Guiney; Nay (4): Ryan, Clark, Zimmerman, Smith)

Motion to approve the tax levies: Moved by Kanal and seconded by Dunphy. (Aye (12): Kanal, Ryan, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Clark, Green, Zimmerman, Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Pirtle-Guiney)

[City Council convenes as Prosper Portland Budget Committee to approve the FY 2025-26 Budget](#) (Report)

Document number: 2025-209

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Prosper Portland

Time certain: 1:45 pm

Time requested: 1 hour

Council action: Placed on File

Motion to approve the Prosper Portland Budget: Moved by Morillo and seconded by Kanal. (Aye (10): Kanal, Ryan, Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Zimmerman, Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Pirtle-Guiney; Nay (2): Clark, Green)

Record is kept by Prosper Portland Budget Committee Clerk.

Portland City Council Special Meeting
May 21, 2025 - 9:00 a.m.
Speaker List

Name	Title	Document Number
Elana Pirtle-Guiney	Council President	
Jamie Dunphy	Councilor	
Tiffany Koyama Lane	Council Vice President	
Poison Waters	Pre-gavel	
Bandana Shrestha	Pre-gavel, State Director, AARP Oregon	
Keelan McClymont	Council Clerk	
Sameer Kanal	Councilor	
Dan Ryan	Councilor	
Angelita Morillo	Councilor	
Steve Novick	Councilor	
Olivia Clark	Councilor	
Mitch Green	Councilor	
Eric Zimmerman	Councilor	
Candace Avalos	Councilor	
Loretta Smith	Councilor	
Robert Taylor	City Attorney	
Remy (Remember) Watts	(Public Communications)	1
Pedro Anglada Cordero	(Public Communications)	4
Susan Anglada Bartley	(Public Communications)	5
Lisa Pellegrino	Director, Portland Children's Levy	2025-207
Arika Bridgeman-Bunyoli	Grant Manager, Portland Children's Levy	2025-207
Dr. Carmen Thompson	(Testimony)	2025-207
Michael Franklin	(Testimony)	2025-207
AJMcCreary	(Testimony)	2025-207
Beth Burns	(Testimony)	2025-207
Heather Martin	(Testimony)	2025-207
Sahaan McKelvey	(Testimony)	2025-207
Eric Knox	(Testimony)	2025-207
Mercedes Elizalde	(Testimony)	2025-207
Yonas Kassie	(Testimony)	2025-207
Leticia Longoria-Navarro	(Testimony)	2025-207
Donell T	(Testimony)	2025-207
DerendaSchubert, PhD	(Testimony)	2025-207
AmySabin	(Testimony)	2025-207
LynTan	(Testimony)	2025-207
SonyaDamtew	(Testimony)	2025-207
Meg McElroy	Assistant Director, Portland Children's Levy	2025-207
Christopher Herr	Policy Analyst, Council Operations	2025-184
Claire Adamsick	Policy Analyst, Council Operations	2025-093
Zachary Lauritzen	(Testimony)	2025-093
Ruth Levine	Deputy Director, City Budget Office	2025-208, 2025-209
Jonas Biery	Chief Financial Officer, Deputy City Administrator	2025-208, 2025-209
Sara Fischer	(Testimony)	2025-208

Name	Title	Document Number
Brian Owendoff	(Testimony)	2025-208
Jill Souede	(Testimony)	2025-208
NathanielHudson-Hartman	(Testimony)	2025-208
Travis Johnson	(Testimony)	2025-208
Vadim Mozyrsky	(Testimony)	2025-208
Todd Littlefield	(Testimony)	2025-208
Tiana Tozer	(Testimony)	2025-208
RobertLayne	(Testimony)	2025-208
LanceGoldenberg	(Testimony)	2025-208
MaijaSpencer	(Testimony)	2025-208
BenjaminGilbert	(Testimony)	2025-208
JamesDonley	(Testimony)	2025-208
IsaacMcLennan	(Testimony)	2025-208
KarenSumpter	(Testimony)	2025-208
RachelMuneyyirci	(Testimony)	2025-208
JamesO'Laughlen	(Testimony)	2025-208
DanaGrigsby	(Testimony)	2025-208
PhilKeim	(Testimony)	2025-208
JessicaGreen	(Testimony)	2025-208
JamiePartridge	(Testimony)	2025-208
Akil Patterson	(Testimony)	2025-208
GracieCampbell	(Testimony)	2025-208
MicahMeskel	(Testimony)	2025-208
LydiaKiesling	(Testimony)	2025-208
RubanLawrence	(Testimony)	2025-208
JonaDavis	(Testimony)	2025-208
SarahRadelet	(Testimony)	2025-208
MegGoldberg	(Testimony)	2025-208
AliBerman	(Testimony)	2025-208
Jessica Elkan	(Testimony)	2025-208
AnnKirkpatrick	(Testimony)	2025-208
JeannetteWard	(Testimony)	2025-208
CaseyClapp	(Testimony)	2025-208
LorettaGuzman	(Testimony)	2025-208
Catherine Leathers Self	(Testimony)	2025-208
Mont ChrisHubbard	(Testimony)	2025-208
HerbertBeauclere	(Testimony)	2025-208
LaJuneThorson	(Testimony)	2025-208
MatthewWarren	(Testimony)	2025-208
CarleneJackson	(Testimony)	2025-208
VivianSolomon	(Testimony)	2025-208
JeAmaechi	(Testimony)	2025-208
MadelynPoehlein	(Testimony)	2025-208
NoelleStuder-Spevak	(Testimony)	2025-208
StepanSimek	(Testimony)	2025-208

Name	Title	Document Number
KristenDozono	(Testimony)	2025-208
ERNIEMUNCH	(Testimony)	2025-208
KristinShiga	(Testimony)	2025-208
KathleenMadden	(Testimony)	2025-208
LydiaKoo	(Testimony)	2025-208
IsabelDammann	(Testimony)	2025-208
NoraGessert	(Testimony)	2025-208
KatherineFukuyama	(Testimony)	2025-208
MichelleCrimmins	(Testimony)	2025-208
Christopher Myers	(Testimony)	2025-208
SuzanneBishop	(Testimony)	2025-208
Dr Dennis Scollard	(Testimony)	2025-208
JudithWilding	(Testimony)	2025-208
IbraheemRiad	(Testimony)	2025-208
MiriamWeiser	(Testimony)	2025-208
BrianCavanaugh	(Testimony)	2025-208
Esther Saulle	(Testimony)	2025-208
CarolynLandsverk	(Testimony)	2025-208
JanaRhyu	(Testimony)	2025-208
MadelineCarroll	(Testimony)	2025-208
MichelleMilla	(Testimony)	2025-208
SorayaGo	(Testimony)	2025-208
SaraSalvi	(Testimony)	2025-208
AlexandraBeebe	(Testimony)	2025-208
TimHahn	(Testimony)	2025-208
SamanthaKnofler	(Testimony)	2025-208
MarthaMcCall	(Testimony)	2025-208
Susan Mottet	Director, Small Donor Elections Program	2025-208
Claudio Campuzano	Finance, Property & Technology Manager, Parks and Recreation	2025-208
Adena Long	Director, Parks and Recreation	2025-208
Casey Jogerst	Manager, Permitting and Regulation, Parks and Recreation	2025-208
Jenn Cairo	City Forester and Urban Forestry Manager	2025-208
Mike Myers	Deputy City Administrator, Public Safety Service Area	2025-208
Bob Day	Chief of Portland Police Bureau	2025-208
Mike Jordan	City Administrator	2025-208
Yume Delegato	(Testimony)	2025-209
mark sherman	(Testimony)	2025-209
Benjamin Gilbert	(Testimony)	2025-209
Santiago Vazquez	(Testimony)	2025-209
Je Amaechi	(Testimony)	2025-209
Holly Ong	(Testimony)	2025-209
Shelly Haack	(Testimony)	2025-209
Janna Tessman	(Testimony)	2025-209
Jordan Lewis	(Testimony)	2025-209
TRALICE LEWIS	(Testimony)	2025-209

Name	Title	Document Number
Chabre Vickers	Equity, Policy, and Communications Director, Prosper Portland	2025-208, 2025-209
Tony Barnes	Propser Portland CFO	2025-208, 2025-209
Donnie Oliveira	Deputy City Administrator, Community and Economic Development Service Area	2025-208
Jeramy Patton	Enterprise Services Deputy Director, Transportation	2025-208
Priya Dhanapal	Deputy City Administrator, Public Works	2025-208
Millicent Williams	Director, Transportation	2025-208
Elisabeth Perez	Director of Enterprise Services- PSSA	2025-208

Portland City Council Meeting Closed Caption File

May 21, 2025 – 9:00 a.m.

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

Speaker: Good morning. I am going to call our council meeting to order. It is 902 on Wednesday, May 21st. We have a very long day ahead of us. My guess is that some of you in the room are here for our budget meeting, which will start in a couple of hours, but we do have what I hope will be a relatively short council meeting that we need to get through first, starting with. We were supposed to start with pre gavel before I gaveled in and then I gaveled in. Can we do pre gavel before we take roll. So it's almost like a pre gavel okay. Let's do that. So councilors we do have a pre roll call this morning I am going to turn it over to vice president Koyama Lane and counselor Dunphy to share some information with us about Older American Month and Age Friendly Portland.

Speaker: Okay I'll start us off. Thank you. Colleagues. May is Older Americans Month, and Mayor Wilson has officially issued a proclamation celebrating this fact. Ooh, ooh. In 2002, the World Health Organization declared Portland as the first age friendly city in the United States. And this morning is a pre gavel. We've invited our friends from AARP to come talk a bit about the goal of age friendly cities movement, what the city of Portland used to do as a leader, and what we've lost in the years since COVID. And as a preview, councilor Koyama Lane and I intend to bring this city back to being a leader in the age friendly movement. Before I hand it over to

our friends from aarp, I'd like to give my colleague councilor koyama lane an opportunity to give a few opening remarks.

Speaker: Good morning. As a mom, a teacher, a Japanese American, deeply, deeply connected to my heritage, built upon honoring my elders, I bear witness to the journey of growing older every day. As a City Council member, my leadership is informed by my values of community service and social justice, and a commitment to making Portland a place where neighbors of all ages can thrive. Upholding Portland both as an age friendly city and a great place to raise a family. When our elders have the resources and support to continue living vibrant and connected lives, we all will. We all benefit from that. I'm very happy to join my wonderful colleague, councilor Dunphy, as we take a moment to celebrate honor older Americans month and most importantly, commit ourselves to creating a truly age friendly Portland. I'm honored to welcome our speakers to the table here to share some quick remarks from the state director of AARP and Portland's very own poisoned waters.

Speaker: Woo woo!

Speaker: Thank you for Nancy tonight.

Speaker: Good morning, council president and councilors. I'm poisoned waters from Darcelle 15 and company, the oldest drag club in the whole world, celebrating 58 years right here in the city of roses. This morning. You have a big job to do. But first, a celebration. So let's go. May is older Americans month, which I was unaware of at the age of 57, I am older. This is what 57 looks like and it's so exciting. It's so exciting. Getting older is a privilege, as we know, many of our friends in the 80s and 90s didn't make it past their early 30s in the community I represent. So each year is a cheer for all of us. Today. We recognize those who have been advancing Portland's efforts to become age friendly for two decades now. You'll hear from my

dear friend madonna and aarp Oregon state director in just a moment. But first, my roll call of early leaders includes some folks here today and online jay bloom, ellen de la torre, holden lung, margaret mele, grady. See, the older I need longer arms, grady tarbutton, vicki herson, ken calvin, nancy chapman, carlos crespo, sharon baguette, lydia lundberg, neil negus, jerry cohen, joyce darmanin, and deborah stein. What do you think they knew in 2006 when this whole thing got started? I would guess they thought Portland could use a challenge to stay on the forward looking side of planning for our shared future. I'm most excited about what we'll be able to do for age friendly housing multigenerational households because as we are living longer and stronger, livability in our city is more important now than ever. This would be the time we were going to have an audience participation activity, but we don't have time for that. I'm growing whiskers. We got to go. Three areas to lift up today are housing, inclusion and economic security. The city of Portland is a key force in delivering on many of the area's most critical to making aging easier, no matter what age you are. Now, as we hear so much about, we need housing for all ages and stages. The current bond investments in inaccessible housing, buildings and outdoor spaces are making a huge difference for our residents, and land use changes continue to address the needs. More must be done to keep up with the massive demand for homes here, both affordable and accessible. Continuing efforts on inclusion and equity for older adults fights their isolation. The city has been a great option to work for, a great option for work at any age. Volunteering, civic engagement and leadership roles with the most age diverse council ever, we're able to take in many more life circumstances and points of view in addressing public needs. Older adults power may volunteer efforts that focus on quality of life for us all. More than ever, Portlanders fear their ability to afford aging. Here, city leaders promise to spur economic vitality for people of all ages and abilities. Our

tenuous. With the current economic panorama. But we do have many paying attention to city government for the first time in years. These are just a few ways the city for the city to be age friendly and a great place for people to live and age. There are so many other ways. Now. Bandana will celebrate older adults local priorities that push Portland's find solutions for folks of all ages to thrive here. Thank you for your time.

Speaker: Thank you so much. Poison. It's such a privilege to be here. Good morning. Council president pirtle-guiney. I know I have a hard name and I'm having struggles here, but vice president koyama lane and members of the City Council. Happy older Americans to month to you. I'm vandana shrestha, aarp Oregon state director. It's such an honor to be here today because this is the first observation of older Americans month for this council, and it is really a wonderful opportunity for us to be here. Aarp is a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization. We have 500,000 members around the state and 80,000 right here in Portland. We're wise friends and fierce defenders of people 50 plus in their families. We work on issues that matter to them, like financial security, health security, and livable communities, making our communities age friendly for people of all ages. Older Americans month is a time to honor older adults in our lives, people who have contributed to our, you know, us thriving, our communities thriving, our parents, our grandparents, our neighbors, our mentors. And it's a time when we can really also focus on promoting their inclusion and well-being. This year's older Americans month theme is flip the script on aging, and it invites us to challenge outdated perspectives on aging and growing older. It invites us to embrace a new perspective on aging that's focused on assets, because aging is not a decline. Despite what we think aging is about experience, resilience and contributions. Older adults, as I mentioned, are caregivers. They're advocates. They're problem solvers for the city.

They are workers, they're entrepreneurs, and they are volunteers. We rely on them. They're essential to Portland's past, present and future. And the great thing here is that Portland has recognized this truth for a long time, as has already been mentioned by councilor dunphy by poisoned waters. Portland was one of the first cities in this age friendly movement. In fact, thanks to the Portland institute on aging, doctor margaret neal, doctor alan delatorre, who are with us today, we were one of the only we were the only city that was chosen in the entire us to help formulate the age friendly cities framework. And when aarp and w.h.o. Launched the network, Portland was one of the first cities to join that network. And this early adoption, this early joining, really sparked this movement to make Portland a great city for people of all ages and galvanized champions across the city. Many of them are here today, and I'm excited to be here in this room to witness this. But our work is not done because besides the fact that we are aging and becoming an older society, we're also diversifying. We're becoming a more diverse place. But I always like to give a few facts and statistics. By 2034, there'll be more people over the age of 65 than under 18. This is a permanent demographic shift, and in just five years, Portland is supposed to have 1 in 5 people being 65 and over. But I think we're going to get there even earlier because we're already at 19%. And as I mentioned, the face of aging is changing. 40% of older Oregonians live with a disability, and older adults identify as black. Indigenous people of color, lgbtq immigrants, individuals living on fixed incomes are growing, and many are navigating aging with systemic barriers and financial insecurity, housing insecurity, and food insecurity. Older adults are the fastest growing segment of those who are homeless in our communities. These are our neighbors and their experiences matter. So though aging is not a one size fits all, the challenges we face require solutions that are intentional, intersectional, and equitable. If we want Portland to remain a great

place to grow up and grow older, we must plan for it. Each sector, every domain, needs to be taken care of and looked at. From housing and transportation to health, emergency preparedness, economy to social connections and as poisoned waters. Here said so wisely, with one of the most diverse council in Portland's history, I'm excited for Portland's future and what's ahead. I want to thank councilor dunphy and vice chair koyama lane for being vocal for early advocates in this council for age friendly Portland, and I invite the other councilors to also take on that mantle of being champions for all generations in Portland. As I close, I say, let's celebrate older Americans month. Let's flip the script on aging, and let's work towards an age friendly future for our city. Thank you so much.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Do you have any questions for us?

Speaker: Thank you both for being here and starting us off like that. Any closing remarks? Councilors?

Speaker: No. I look forward to working with my colleagues and the community on regaining the mantle as a leader in the age friendly movement. So thank you all for being here this morning, especially on a busy morning.

Speaker: Ditto.

Speaker: Thank you both for.

Speaker: Have a good day, everybody.

Speaker: For all of us, the that this is older American month and the importance of the work we have to do here rebecca or Keelan we have Keelan today Keelan. Could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Good morning. Canal here. Ryan here. Koyama lane here. Mario. Here. Novick.

Speaker: Here.

Speaker: Clark here.

Speaker: Green present and ready to go. Here.

Speaker: Avalos.

Speaker: Present here. Smith. Here. Pirtle-guiney here.

Speaker: Thank you. Robert, could you please read the rules of order and decorum?

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

Speaker: Thank you robert and colleagues, I know that there have been a lot of conversations off the dais about our own conduct, and I just want to remind everybody that we have people with a lot of different communication styles up here. It's going to be a long day, and I hope that we can treat each other with respect and also respect the different ways in which we all communicate while we

work through everything before us. Today, the first item on the agenda is agenda approval. Are there any requests to amend or reorder the agenda this morning, councilor Ryan?

Speaker: Yes, thank you, madam president. I see that when we passed our much needed clarity on the mayoral tiebreaking rules and ordinance that was passed by governance committee by a 50 vote on May 5th, it's not on today's agenda, which would have been a seemed like the next spot to do the first reading today. We will be fine, as the mayor will not weigh in on amendments according to legislation that we passed. However, we do need this legislation to move forward soon, with decisions looming in June, especially with the adoption of a budget on June 18th. Today, council president, you chose to put this back into your office, and you get to do that. And you didn't allow the first reading today. However, can you tell us our plan so we know when we'll be voting on this much needed legislation? And I hope it is prior to June.

Speaker: I hope to bring it forward as soon as possible. I had hoped we could have had it at our last meeting, but our colleagues declined to add it to the agenda on a 9-12 signature.

Speaker: That's to put something on after the Friday deadline, which of course it was. The meeting wasn't until Monday, so they chose not to allow debate on the first reading two days later. Okay, exactly. And now it could have been on today's agenda. Did I get that? It's busy.

Speaker: I did try to ensure that so that we could get to budget as quickly as possible. Today's agenda was second readings, which generally move more quickly, and items directly related to the budget or looming deadlines. And I've not added anything else that didn't fall into those categories to today's agenda in order to try to move us to budget as quickly as possible. It's unfortunate. I had hoped we would

have been able to take it up before today's work. I don't want to promise the June 4th agenda, because I need to weigh everything that's coming before us, but I do hope that we can get to it.

Speaker: That week, let's remind ourselves that voters were told when they voted yes on the charter. One reason many I talked to voted yes is that they liked that there was a tiebreaker. Many were disappointed there wasn't the mayor veto. And so I think that we must keep the promise from voters intent. So I do hope that in early June we have the first reading. I think it's just good government.

Speaker: Understood. Thank you for asking.

Speaker: You're welcome.

Speaker: Councilor kanal did you have a question or a movement to reorder or amend today's agenda?

Speaker: I have a question that might answer the second part of that, the answer. So my question is, given that you mentioned the first readings, I have two questions. Given that you mentioned first readings, I was curious. The we have three items. The item seven and eight are first readings and then item five. I'm not sure if that's required to get done before the budget is done. So I was just curious if you could speak to why those need to be done today. Because I'm seeing a total of an hour and a half, which could be depending on how many minutes we give each person, 60 to 40 5 to 60 people's testimony today.

Speaker: Item five does need to move today in order to be passed in time for the grants to be allocated. Item seven was posted with today's date by the administration. Because this is an eminent domain issue, they have to post information about it. And unfortunately that posting was for today and we were not able to pull that back in time to move this agenda item. Item eight is a resolution, so

it only requires one reading and this item will be taken up at jpac, I believe later this week. And we need to pass the resolution before it can be considered at jpac.

Speaker: Okay, so then i'll take this opportunity to say I think it's ridiculous that the administration can put out a notice that requires us to schedule something on their calendar, instead of a calendar dictated by the council president, as per the charter and our code. The jpac thing I'm not sure enough about to make any comment there, but I would like to ask just to clarify councilor Ryan's question, are we following the rules that are in an ordinance which has not been approved by the full council yet? The implication, I think I maybe, I maybe I'm inferring incorrectly here is that we're following what governance passed on the tie break.

Speaker: I would you think.

Speaker: That i.

Speaker: The words you said.

Speaker: Sent out, why would you think.

Speaker: That I sent out a memo a week or two ago from robert taylor, our lead attorney, on his current his interpretation of the current state of the rules and law around the mayor's tie breaking authority. And that is the guidance that I will be using today. Thank you. Based on current law, not based on the resolution coming out of governance.

Speaker: Great. Thank you for clarifying. I will not make a motion.

Speaker: Councilor smith.

Speaker: Yes, I think that's based on current interpretation of law. And we disagree with the interpretation that our current city attorney has. And I just want to make that point on record.

Speaker: Understood. And I will be operating under the legal guidance I have been given. But I do know that there are disagreements on council about that, and we

will have ample opportunity to discuss that when the measure comes forward for us to provide some additional clarity there. Seeing no requests to amend or reorder the agenda, do I have unanimous consent to approve today's agenda? Okay. Seeing no objections, we will move on. I believe the next item on our agenda is public comment. Could you please call up our guests?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Thank you. First up.

Speaker: We have remember what's.

Speaker: Hello. Didn't know I was going to be up here alone.

Speaker: Welcome. Thank you for being here.

Speaker: Thank you. For the record, my name is. Remember what's I go by remy? It's a lot easier. And I was coming here today to share not only my experience, but the experience of several of my close friends and colleagues, which is going to sound very trite. And I want to acknowledge that to some of the people in this room. But also it is our experience of being harassed on a daily basis by our next door neighbors and how there are. I have been searching for recourse for the last four years in a very desperate attempt to get my neighbors to stop harassing me, and using public policy and weaponizing public policy meant to protect against me. But I digress. To start, I live in district three. I'm a very proud southeast Portland resident. I have been living in southeast Portland for the last ten years. I like to think that I am a thriving member of my lovely community. I am also a public administrator in the state of Oregon, and I like to have my friends over sometimes. And I have a couple of dogs who like to bark, and I also have next door neighbors who are are very reactive, and I think that they would prefer to live in a rural area. They have my first time ever having people over to warm people over to my house. At 830 on a Saturday night, I had my next door neighbor, murt, yell at me across the

fence about how I was the neighbor from hell. I was entitled and that she would get her revenge and she wouldn't. I wouldn't know when she would get her revenge, but she would get her revenge. And for the last four years she has been getting her revenge. She uses every opportunity to call 911. When my workers that I have hired touch the fence, it is a waste of public resources. It is a waste of police resources and I have interacted with the police way more in the last four years than I've ever wanted to. And I hear from police that this is a very common issue that neighbors in Portland harass other neighbors, and there's really no recourse. I have tried to get a protection order or stalking protection order and failed because she has never hit me. I am also worried that they have guns, but because the state doesn't allow me to search for that. I am not sure if they have guns or not. However, I have looked up her Portland police bureau record and she has a 20 year history of harassing her next door neighbors, including forcing a young black family out of her neighbor's house in 2005, after passing them for two years and getting a stalking protective order against a black man in 2005. For reasons that I don't understand besides the fact that he was black, and I bring all this to highlight some oversights in protection, policy and waste of public resources. In the police. A budget is a moral document. Thank you.

Speaker: And I want to remind everybody during our pre gavel we're a little looser with the rules. But during our council meeting and our budget hearing, if you can please keep your support to silent support. Jazz hands thumbs up, thumbs down if you don't like something that will help us move through the agenda today so that we can hear from as many people as possible, Keelan go right ahead.

Speaker: Thank you. Next up we have alan combs. Alan combs. Next we have jennifer hemp. Jennifer next pedro anglada cordero.

Speaker: Go ahead.

Speaker: Thank you for being here this morning.

Speaker: Sorry. As Susan also testifies as part of this. Okay. So then the last person is Susan Anglada Bartley.

Speaker: Before we start, may I give you the petition with 1900 signatures on it?

Speaker: Yes, of course I can.

Speaker: I only made one copy.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Go right ahead.

Speaker: So my name is Pedro Anglada Cordero. Pedro Anglada. C o r d e r o. Since the creation of ICE in 2003, its presence in every city, including Portland, equals to racial and ethnic violence, constant harassment and intimidation of immigrant communities, violation of human rights. Since the City Council of the city of Portland issued a permit in 2011, allowing ICE to operate a detention facility in Southwest Macadam, its record of human rights abuses as an agency includes rates in workplaces, shifting unaccompanied minors through multiple states, violating the Flores Act, separation of families through a zero tolerance policy. Targeting of students because of their activism and expedited deportations without due legal process. The violence that characterizes ICE makes it a danger to the people of this city. There is no debate about the role of immigrant communities in this in every country, but let's focus on those who are most vulnerable to ICE due to their circumstances and how many are set up to serve the privilege without being reciprocated, with at least safety and dignity. People like to access to have access to high quality foods. People like to afford cleaning services. People and the city like to afford construction services. But all of these things are connected to the work of immigrant communities. There must be a reckoning of how complacent we are with

ice violence as it operates in this town. So being Portland, so-called century city, I wonder what is a century city when we have a detention facility mistreating our communities and make them feeling unsafe? Since the creation, since the permit was issued in 2011, I think it is time that this council. Does not allow that to remain unchecked and that this permit that we can, can actually start a process to have this permit revoked. And at least we, the people in this city have a process, a course to contest that and make it go away. So I hope that with our my participation here, we come here with our petition. The council can actually provide with what does it take for this permit to be revoked. Thank you.

Speaker: So for clarity, we submitted a petition with 1900 more than 1900 signatures. The petition is asking that you pull the permit. Just clarifying that before I start in 2011. My name is susan anglada bartley. In 2011, an all white City Council comprised of sam adams, amanda fritz, nick fish, dan saltzman and randy leonard approved the permit for the ice detention center on macadam in Portland. Since then, the center has continued to be the source of major protests, including the 2018 occupy ice protests, which were the first to cause the closing of an ice detention center in the united states. As I discussed these details in retrospect, I ask you to consider the detention center as the clear nuisance and the protests as sacred acts of a public standing for human rights. Protests have never stopped at the ice detention center, and they never will stop until it is closed. In addition to protests by multiple organizations, members of the school community next door have raised complaints over multiple years. We know you may have been told there is no way to legally revoke this permit, but we know that an appeal is allowed to the original decision in situations where there is a pattern of violations of the original decision, we argue that the original decision was a violation of human rights and of public trust, and that the ice detention center on city property continues to create a

nuisance, to create a public health threat, and to create unsafe conditions for the public and adjacent school community. For those of you who came into public office with the goal of dismantling white supremacist systems, and I don't say this to be rude. So I say this to bring truth. You cannot stop where they want you to stop. If you believe you would be against detainment based on race, ethnicity and language in, say, nazi germany. But look the other way and downplay your responsibility as a city leader when it is happening miles from here, then your human rights record must come into question. When this epic in human history is over and it's time to prosecute the war criminals who facilitated illegal activity by ice, the names of people who authorized this center and did not vote to pull the permit should be on the list. If you say you are for immigrant rights, you cannot also facilitate the operation of ice in your own community. You do have the power to call for an appeal. You do have the public backing to revoke the permit. We have done everything in our power to protest ice. Now we are using your suggested channels by organizing the petition with more than 1900 signatures and bringing our collective power to you. If you want our trust, if you want to claim a legacy of acting in power against ice and neo fascism, you must use the power to pull the permit. Is there any answering here or is anybody going to go ahead? Can you motion here? Can we get an answer to how the process.

Speaker: What is the next step.

Speaker: What's the next step to do 1900 people go ahead and sign that.

Speaker: And we will all look at that petition that you've brought forward. I know that there's only one copy, but i'll ask that our clerk get us a copy at least of the cover letter that tells us the information in the petition that folks signed, even if we don't photocopy all 1900 signatures. So we'll make sure that everybody sees that this forum for public communication is to air new issues for us. So it's not a forum

where we respond and discuss what action will take today. But you've now put this on all of our radars so that we can figure out the best forum to discuss it as we move forward. And I see many of my colleagues who were nodding as you were speaking. So my guess is that we will have further conversation.

Speaker: Thank you. Just one process question. I'll get out of the seat. Is it is it a matter of a council member or some council members making a motion to appeal that that 2011 decision?

Speaker: I'll need to look at what the process is and whether that's something that would come as a policy through a committee, something we would talk to our attorneys in the mayor about and where the power lies there. But I'm sure that I have some colleagues who are going to want to have that conversation.

Speaker: We're definitely seek the answer to that question. Forward to that. Thank you very much.

Speaker: Thank you very much for being here. Signed up for public communication. Okay.

Speaker: Communications.

Speaker: Counselors, the next item on our agenda is the committee referral report. Since our last meeting, I have referred the appointments to the mount hood cable regulatory commission to transportation and infrastructure, reaffirming council commitment to the vision zero action plan to transportation and infrastructure, requiring the city administrator to develop a citywide asset management strategy to transportation and infrastructure. Grant a cable franchise agreement to comcast of Oregon to continue access to the right of way in the finance committee. Reappointments to the development review advisory committee to homelessness and housing. I believe that is the end of the committee

referral list. The next item on our agenda is agenda item four. Keelan. Could you please read that agenda item for us?

Speaker: Ad fair wage policy code for certain city service contracts.

Speaker: Thank you. And councilors, we did discuss this agenda item in your testimony at our last meeting. This is a second reading. So I would are there any additional questions before we move forward with a roll call vote? Okay. Keelan could you call the roll canal.

Speaker: Thank you. I would like to first thank councilors, dunphy in particular, for the work on this particular item, as well as novick and green. Councilor dunphy has been focused on this for a while now. I'm excited to see it get a vote today. Thank you also to seiu, all the folks who've been advocating from the outside for fair wages for contractors. We need to be a city where everyone's job pays enough to be able to afford to live here. That requires ensuring the rent is low enough and that pay is high enough, the latter of which squarely falls within the scope of this document. This is a pro-worker council. I'm a pro-worker councilor and I'm happy to vote yes. Thanks.

Speaker: I'm sorry I didn't hear was that I vote.

Speaker: Yes at the end there.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you.

Speaker: Ryan i.

Speaker: Koyama lane this is so important. Thank you. I'm proud to vote. Aye i.

Speaker: Maria absolutely i.

Speaker: Novick.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Clark i.

Speaker: Green i.

Speaker: Zimmerman I avalos. I dunphy.

Speaker: Thank you councilors green and novick for co-sponsoring this with me I vote aye.

Speaker: Smith i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: The ordinance is passed with 12 votes.

Speaker: Fantastic. Keelan. Could you please read our next agenda item?

Speaker: Item five approve funding recommendations of children's levy allocation committee for July 1st, 2025 through June 30th, 2028.

Speaker: Thank you. And counselors, because we originally discussed this item in a work session and not in a committee meeting, we don't have a committee staff summary. So I am going to turn to counselor Ryan, who brought this forward to see if you have anything that you would like to share with us all. I see our children's levy director up here, but we generally don't do presentations for full council, so I'm going to see if.

Speaker: We don't. On a first reading.

Speaker: We don't usually because we have those presentations either in work session or in a committee meeting. We've been doing committee staff summaries instead. But I'm going to turn it to you, counselor Ryan, to do to share anything you'd like to share with the full council. And then I may ask, since we're we generally don't do a full presentation, but we don't have a committee staff summary. If lisa would just like to share a few words before we take public testimony.

Speaker: Yeah, going with the flow here, I assumed it was a first reading and we'd do the regular thing. I just want to say it's been a pleasure serving. Serving as the chair of the five member allocation committee. It's the governing body of the Portland children's levy. The levy does much needed work, I think, as all of you

know, I also want everyone to remember that it was a really rough year in terms of revenue all over the board. So we found out after the rfp went out that there's now a 20% cut in those in money available. So imagine that going into it. We already had a big cut. We also had more applicants at a much higher rate than ever before. I want to look at you, lisa pellegrino, the leader of the team, and say thank you for incorporating all of the actually tough feedback that you got about five years ago, four years ago from psu, incorporating it really living to the values of what you heard from them, and engaging a community council, really listening to how hard it's been for nonprofits to break into the children's levy giving circle, if you will. And I really have appreciated how tough you've you've taken this. I mean, you've really debated and looked at data and crunched it every different way. And I'm just very proud that you offer one of the best practices available in terms of a thorough and concentrated process. It's really it's really thorough. It's very transparent, data driven. And you also have the courage to do dialog with each and every organization that applied. So thank you for uplifting those that integrity in how you make your decisions. I really appreciate you. And i'll now turn it over to you.

Director pellegrino.

Speaker: So do I understand you don't want to hear a presentation with that? Is that.

Speaker: Generally because we are trying to move work to work sessions and committee, we've not been doing full presentations, but.

Speaker: About five minutes.

Speaker: If you'd like to share just a few minutes of information, knowing that counselors have had an opportunity to discuss this, go right ahead.

Speaker: Okay, I think we'll run through it. It's pretty quick, and I just I know some counselors were not able to attend the work session, so it's really more just for the public and for them. Erika, do you want to start?

Speaker: Sure.

Speaker: Good morning counselors, I'm erika bridgman. I'm a grant manager at the Portland children's levy. I use she her pronouns as as you mentioned, madam president, we did do an in depth review at the work session, so we just wanted to give a little additional financial context. So the current annual budget for can you go to the next slide please. The current annual budgets for large grants is 27.2 million. That's what we're letting out at the moment. The projected average annual budget for large grants over the next three years is 21.56 million per year. That means, on an annual basis, total funds available for large grants will decline by approximately 21% next year. This decline is the result of pcl spending down a fund balance, plus a decrease in property tax revenue over the past two years, which is projected to continue for the next three years. Can we go to the next slide at the same time that pcl has declining funds, we saw an increase demand. Pcl received 168 total applications, which is a 45% increase over the last funding round in 2019 more than \$3 was requested for every \$1 that was available. The number of applications from organizations without current pcl grants tripled compared to 2019, and the combination of declining resources and increased demand for pcl funding made. It made for a really difficult decisions by the allocation committee, which is pcl's governing body. Next slide. So this slide provides an overview of the two year process to plan and implement the large grant funding round. The process began with a new with launching.

Speaker: I'm so sorry. I would like to make sure that we have a chance to hear from you all, but we have a very packed agenda and these are things that were

shared with the public and council at our work session. And so if you can run through these to the things that we need to make sure we hear today as we start our discussion, that would be very helpful.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Maybe we can go to the next slide then just to do the final piece about the allocations. This one shows the number of applications received by program area, the three year funding amount requested, the range of funds originally allocated per program area. I just want to point out that as you can see, the allocation committee ultimately approved grants totaling more than the high end of the range and mentoring and below the low end of the range in child abuse prevention and intervention. And this approach helped us to address the relative demand, because we had more we had community council priorities for small organizations and programs that currently do not receive levy funding, and those were concentrated and mentoring in after school areas. All right. I'm going to pass it to lisa to see if there's anything else she wants to add before you go to public testimony and discussion.

Speaker: I will quickly run through the summary of the decisions. So they're pretty fast. I'm not sure if it's can you go to the next slide? Okay, so most of the applications that the committee approved for funding, 73% scored a median or higher in their program areas, 27% scored under median. They were approved because they met community council priorities, and they balanced the types of services and the populations to be served in each program area. Next slide. This gives a quick overview of the 94 applications approved by the allocation committee. And it shows the different focus populations that would be served by the multiple priority populations. Next slide. So this is the distribution of applications according to their current status as a grantee with pcl and the size of the organization. As you

can see, two thirds of the approved applications are for organizations that currently have a pcl grant, about one third from organizations without pcl funding. Approved applications from organizations with current pcl grant are generally medium to larger sized organizations. By comparison, the applications for organizations without pcl funds currently are generally smaller organizations. Next slide. We can skip this because we went over the role last time. That's fine. I think the council president is clear on what the role is. If there's any questions, we're happy to take them. Otherwise we can move to testimony. Thanks for hearing.

Speaker: Thank you so much for being here. Councilors I see a few people in the queue. Are these clarifying questions before we hear from public testimony? Councilor kanal or would you like to wait until after testimony? After testimony? Okay. Councilor smith.

Speaker: I have a.

Speaker: Clarifying question. I noticed on one of the tables it said that there were 69 organizations that served black youth in children. I don't even know of 69 organizations in in this city that serve black youth. So I'm curious to who those folks were.

Speaker: Can I clarify that that's applications, not organizations. So many organizations put in more than one application. So for instance, sai put in four applications. Oic put in five applications. So there are multiple applications and fewer organizations. Okay. That was the clarifying thing that I needed to find out because I was very I was taken aback to look at the number of organizations or, or applications that served black families in the city. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you for the clarification. I believe we have a number of folks signed up for public testimony. Keelan, could you call up our first panel of speakers?

Speaker: Yes, we have 16 people signed up. I'm going to call up people in groups of five since we have five chairs. First up, doctor carmen thompson, followed by michael franklyn, ajaye mccrory.

Speaker: Plugged into our, you know, 12 hours.

Speaker: It seems like somebody just came off mute. There we go.

Speaker: Beth burns, jenny gilmore. Robinson. Go ahead, doctor carmen thompson.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: I am doctor carmen thompson, constituent of district two and concerned citizen. I ask the City Council to remand the Portland children's levy award decision back to pcl to redirect awards granted to large white led organizations under the hunger relief program that do not prioritize serving black people and award funds to black led, black serving organizations that prioritize black people. For example, an organization like meals on wheels that does good work is a large organization that does not prioritize serving black people. And yet they got one of pcl's largest awards 2.3 million, even larger than they received last year, which is curious given the 20% reduction in pcl awards budget this year. Here's the problem large, white led organizations like meals on wheels can make themselves eligible for million dollar grants as a bipoc organization under pcl's hunger relief program. By partnering with black and brown grassroots organizations. It's like a white owned general contractor who hires a white woman as a subcontractor so they can qualify for minority contract awards. I'm not saying this is meals on wheels intent. Again, I believe they serve a purpose. I only use them as an example to show how pcl awards to so-called bipoc serving organizations are subject to manipulation by white led organizations that use bipoc as an inroad to access equity dollars. In effect, large white led organizations like meals on wheels are are able to double dip

to access both equity and non-equity pots of money simply by claiming bipoc, while black led and black serving organizations, whether because of scale or other institutional biases, do not have the same access to non-equity or white dollars, this is not equity or equitable. I ask the councilors to remand the pcl award decision back to pcl and redirect the awards granted to large, white led organizations under the hunger relief program to smaller, black led, black serving organizations that prioritize black communities, like the equitable giving circle that feeds 400 black and brown families a week, and 1300 people have signed a petition statement in support of their grant application.

Speaker: Make sure we hear, I'm sorry, but we need to make sure we hear from others as well.

Speaker: Yes, and I appreciate that. I like to say that pcl advisors were allowed to have extra time talking about their plan. Was already done. I understand session, so I wanted to finish my statement since they had extra time to do something that was already done in a work group.

Speaker: Good morning. My name is michael franklin. I'm going to speak on the hunger relief program area of the pcl. From what I understand, two anonymous portfolios of grant applications were created and one portfolio was selected for pcl funding for hunger relief during the pcl funding cycle. The prior pcl funding cycle, a total of 11 organizations received funding for hunger relief during this current funding cycle. Ten of those 11 organizations received pcl grant funding for hunger relief. That would seem to indicate those ten organizations were all included in the same anonymous portfolio, which seems odd to me if organizations can only be a part of one portfolio, then a situation was created which would result in either nearly 100% continuity or 0% continuity with regards to providing hunger relief services, depending upon which portfolio was chosen or since, grantee

organizations could submit multiple applications for the same pcl program area. Theoretically, it's possible that some some of the same organizations could have been included in both anonymous portfolios under different grant applications if that happened. I think that's unfair, and that's a way to rig the process to ensure that certain organizations receive pcl funding. As some of the meetings I've attended, I've heard it stated by pcl staff that it is a priority to add hunger relief services focused on black children and their families. If that's the case, why did Oregon food bank receive the second highest pcl grant in the amount of more than \$1.6 million for hunger relief, despite the fact that only 3% of the population that is served during the prior grant cycle were african American children, rewarding osb with the second highest hunger relief grant doesn't align with their priority of adding hunger relief services focus on black children and their families. The pcl website, in its discussion on equity, in part stated communities of color should not be involved in planning for services which should lead delivery, which should lead, deliver, assess and evaluate services. Meals on wheels, osb and sunshine division received roughly 54% of grants last time and 46% of grants, this time for hunger relief, giving about half of the pcl funds for hunger relief services to organizations not led by communities of color contradicts our stated intent regarding equity. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you very much. Go right ahead.

Speaker: My name is aj mccrary and I'm the co-founder and executive director of giving circle. I'm testifying in regarding the Portland children's levy grant, particularly the hunger relief grant. This process, which has been racist, anti-black and inequitable. For a bit of background about me, I have a degree, a degree in african American history, and I'm doing anti-racism equity work. For over two decades in black and brown community members. Each week with food that we

buy from local bipoc farmers. And we've been doing this since June of 2020, among many other community centered initiatives. We feed 400 families, and that equates to about 2000 individuals. Again, we're consistent in this work. Our food programing is consistent, comprehensive, intersectional and forward thinking. Again, we feed over 2000 black and brown community members, the majority being children. Every single week. Our org equitable giving circle has was encouraged by many of city employees to apply for this grant. As per the Portland children's levy values, egc is the exact type of work that they allegedly wanted to invest in. Turns out that was just typical liberal talking points and just talking to be talking vibes. Same old, same old. This all matters because the Portland children's levy is the only designated line item for emergency food system support from the city, meaning that this is the only space that the city is investing in. Food access work food is not a human right and we should all be concerned about that. Process has been supporting the allotment committee, did not take testimony serious in their process, and publicly stated that they knew many of the orgs that were moving forward will struggle with culturally specific equity work. This is egregious and unacceptable. Council should intervene. Reality is, the bulk of the funds that the Portland children's levy is investing in is into orgs that are white, red and white, serving specifically the Oregon food bank, meals for wheels, and the sunshine division, which is a division of the Portland police. This is unacceptable. This is unacceptable. They shouldn't be accessing these equity dollars, this bond that the Portland children levy stewards should be invested in culturally specific orgs that serve marginalized communities, such as e.g.c. As the fund was set up to do so.

Speaker: But we need to hear from other speakers and the time is up. I'm so sorry I've had you run 10s over. Thank you for being here. I'm sorry, but we need to move on so that everybody has time to speak. I know that this is important.

Speaker: And equitable, and I'm.

Speaker: Please go right ahead. I just want to say thanks.

Speaker: To the work of the edc. My name is beth burns. Thanks for having me. For the last 23 years, I've been the executive director of pear. Pear provides education, art, wilderness recreation and job training programs for homeless youth. Youth homelessness is a tragedy. And it's not just a personal tragedy. It's a tragedy for our entire community. Homelessness is one of the most shameful manifestations of inequality in America. When I think about what helps people thrive, I think about the steady presence of others family, mentors, community. No one does this alone. You didn't, I didn't. None of the young people we serve should have to either. Since 2002, pairs day center in old town chinatown has been that steady presence, that connection for Portland's homeless youth a trusted, consistent space offering nutritious meals, wraparound services and meaningful mentorship. We are often the one constant someone has, and I truly believe this has power. This is resistance. This is how we act now to build a future we need and dream of. Pairs. Mentorship is responsive and tiered, meeting immediate needs like food, rest and safety and expanding into deeper support like creative expression, emotional regulation and workforce development. This new investment for pair from Portland children's levy comes at a critical time as demand for our services rise and traditional funding streams shrink. Our mentorship model is not transactional, it is transformational. And with the support of the Portland children's levy, we can build meaningful connections, provide support and direction, and help propel them into their futures. We can make sure that they are not alone. Thanks for your time and for ensuring our communities thrive, and our young people have the opportunity to build rich, fulfilling and luminous lives.

Speaker: Thank you. Thank you all for being here today with us.

Speaker: Jenny gilmore robinson. Heather martin is joining us online, followed by sahan mckelvey, eric knox, mercedes elizalde. Go ahead. Heather.

Speaker: Can you hear me?

Speaker: We can hear you.

Speaker: Great. My name is heather martin. I'm executive director of foundations at legacy health. Thank you for this opportunity to provide testimony on behalf of care's northwest. Cares northwest is passionate about ending child abuse through expert compassionate child abuse evaluation and support services for children and their families. We are Oregon's oldest children's advocacy center, serving children, youth, and families in Multnomah and Washington counties. Over the last 38 years, we have served more than 47,000 survivors of child abuse. Our primary clinic is in north Portland on the randall children's hospital campus. We have requested pcl funding to continue providing therapy to children who have experienced significant trauma, such as physical abuse, sexual abuse, and other forms of maltreatment. Trauma focused therapy has been shown to improve emotional self-regulation and decreases depression, anxiety, shame, ptsd symptoms, and other trauma related emotions and behavioral responses. Helping families heal from violence is a central component of the therapy we provide. Therapists at cares northwest help youth create a narrative of the traumatic events they have experienced, reducing the intensity of overwhelming emotions such as fear, anxiety, helplessness, guilt, and shame. Recognizing the increased risk factors to child abuse for child abuse among vulnerable populations, our therapy program has made significant progress towards meeting the needs of spanish speaking families. Families of color, color, lgbtq, plus youth and their families, as well as children with disabilities and developmental delays. We cannot continue to meet the needs of Portland families and provide this vital community service without funding from foundations,

individuals and resources such as Portland children's levy. Thank you again for your continued support.

Speaker: Thank you for being here. Go right ahead.

Speaker: Good morning. My name is sahan mckelvey and I am the director of advocacy and engagement at self-enhancement, inc. Psi, I'm here today to call out some of the realities of the pcl funding recommendations and what they will mean for all of our community members, and specifically the african American community that psi serves. There are 94 programs recommended for funding. Of these 94 programs, 69 specifically serve african American youth, but only 20 of these are with african American agencies. This sends a clear and loud message to our community that the city does not believe that we can empower ourselves, and the city does not value the leadership, ingenuity and brilliance of our black organizations. Inexcusably, the highest scoring african American agencies in the mentoring category. Pick the after school category rep and the child abuse prevention category psi were not recommended for funding. What makes this worse is that in these three categories, 16 mainstream agencies that scored lower than these african American agencies were recommended for funding. And of these 16 mainstream agencies, nine of them are specifically serving black youth. This means that there are nine examples of the allocation committee telling the black community in Portland that we must look to white agencies to save us, white agencies to teach us, white agencies to mentor us, and white agencies to help us raise our children. When by pcl's own scoring, there are more qualified black agencies who have built decades of goodwill in our community, I believe in the values that pcl is aiming for. I believe in diversity of service delivery and opportunities for all providers to receive funding. One of the slogans is life has options, but new services should be additive for our communities and create more

options for our youth in a deficit budget. When program offerings are being reduced across the board, diverting funding from proven programs that our communities trust is not creating more options, it is eliminating them. Sdi is asking that you reject these recommendations and mandate pcl to implement a process that does not result in these gross and racist inequities. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Go right ahead.

Speaker: My name is eric knox. I am the executive director and founder of hollow and hollow school. We are committed to the power and potential of black and brown youth. I just want to start with a story. Our focus is mentorship and we match black and brown working, professional and college aged students with our black and brown students and children. One of our process is that we always ask our kids when we interview them. As we look to match what we ask, what do you want to be when you grow up? And I remember one eight year old black girl saying she wanted to be herself. And I thought that was pretty powerful because she understood that that would be the fight of her life in a in a world where systems and institutions are not built for her. And because of that, we want to make sure that our black brown brothers and sisters don't have to shrink, code, switch, survive to thrive. And this young black girls statement wasn't just about imagination, it was liberation. And that's the kind of space that we build for mentors. We're not a large nonprofit. We're not a national brand. We don't have a polished brochure. We're community rooted. We're culturally responsive. We walk alongside 125 black and brown students and their families in east Portland. We meet our young people where they're at on school campuses, one on one relationships through campus mentor programs, all built on the foundation of relationship, authenticity, growth, and joy. And we're not, like I said, a large nonprofit. We're small. We're like a speedboat. We're nimble. We can move. We're not like a titanic that's hard to turn.

And that reinforces our ability to have presence and proximity and utilize power not over kids, but with kids. And that's what the Portland children's levy allows us to do. It allows us to expand our program and deepen our connections, strengthen our relationships. Their investment doesn't just keep our lights on, it fuels our dreams identity. It helps kids that like this little black girl that grew up, grows up knowing that being herself is more than enough. And that's what equity looks like in east county.

Speaker: Thank you for being here with us today.

Speaker: Hello, council members, my name is mercedes. I'm the director of advocacy at latino network. Latino network is a culturally specific latino serving organization with a wide range of services for youth and family. In partnership with nearly 50 schools across nine school districts in the metro area. We have deep roots in connection, deep trust with our community, and we're really proud of that. Naturally, we're extremely disappointed that our services through the Portland children's levy will be reduced by about 50% going into the next fiscal year. We estimate somewhere between 200 to 250 youth, and about 100 parents will not receive access to a college prep, campus tours, mentoring, homework support, parent to parent mutual aid and social support, arts and creative expression, high risk behavioral health intervention and diversion, early childhood education and supports for parents to create learning environments for their little one. We're really proud of this work and we will do it regardless. We are deeply resilient and we will continue to try to fill the need in the community. But unfortunately this year we will be doing it in spite of the Portland children's levy instead of solely because of it. Our greater concern, though, is to see that a process was set in place that appears to, by rule, leave every single culturally specific organization who who applied less resilient and immediately in deficit. In reviewing the guides from staff,

staff acknowledged that by taking this approach that prioritized quantity, that no organization would be able to do the work they attested to in their application, and in fact, all applicants would be required to rewrite their scope of work and their budget, essentially redoing the work of the application in order to fit into the new budget allocations. It certainly doesn't help that during the process it was new criteria was introduced, criteria that was not part of the application. So suddenly having the highest score in the published criteria didn't mean anything because it had to be weighed against criteria that was newly introduced, criteria that could have been structured in such a way that you would have gathered information to actually judge an organization's fte count doesn't matter. It doesn't mean anything. But if you want to know things about structure, internal stability, ethos, approach, you could have asked those questions and used them as the guide in the application in the first place. And lastly, this is not going to be the first the only cuts budget you experienced. This is going to be the first of many. How many is the only question? So when you enter into these processes and you are cutting funding from services, you need to ask yourself, are you leaving anything else more resilient behind to make up.

Speaker: The gap? Thank you for being here, all of you. We appreciate hearing from you. We appreciate hearing the concerns so that we can work to do better.

Speaker: Next up we have yonas casey online, followed by leticia longoria, longoria navarro, danielle t, durinda schubert, and amy sabine.

Speaker: Can you guys hear me?

Speaker: We can hear you.

Speaker: Thank you so much. Good morning, chair and members of the allocation committee and City Council. My name is jonas and I serve as executive director of ethiopian, eritrean and cultural resource center on behalf of our organization and

many african immigrant and refugee families we serve, I want to express our sincere appreciation for your past support through the Portland children's levy and to and also to respectfully urge you to approve the current funding recommendation. This funding has had a life changing impact on our community. Many of youths we serve come from families who have experienced war, displacement, and trauma. They arrive in Portland facing significant barriers language, cultural isolation and lack of access to support system. With the help of the children's levy, we have been able to create a cultural specific youth mentoring program that meets, that meets these young people where they are providing mentorship, skill development and a vital sense of connection. While our current resources are limited, they have allowed us to mentor a small group of youth, even with the with that modest support, we have helped them to stay in school, explore stem and leadership opportunities, and find hope and belonging. Imagine the broader impact we could have with full funding. Without these support, programs like our simply cannot exist. And without it, many of these young people could go unheard and unsupported. This is more than a grant. It's an investment in the future of Portland. Please approve the proposed funding so that community based cultural specific organizations like us can continue doing the critical work of supporting the young people who need us most. Thank you for your leadership and ongoing commitment to equity.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

Speaker: Leticia.

Speaker: Good morning, members of the council. My name is leticia longoria navarro, and I'm the executive director of the pathfinder network. We were founded in 1993 to provide justice system impacted individuals and families, the tools and support that they need to be safe and thrive in our community. I know

you all are aware that individuals who are involved and their families who are impacted by the criminal justice system, are some of the most underserved and under-resourced members of our community. With the support of the Portland children's levy at our center for family success in Portland, we have been able to support parents through services that help create stability, reunification and families, and ultimately, family resilience that not only keep parents resourced and give them the services that they need through wraparound support and ongoing community connection. Also, their their children as well to build family, not just family resilience, not just for the family, but for the parents and children as well. Our mission is to provide services at every point of the criminal justice system and beyond. So not just the people that we're working with can be safe and thrive so that our communities can also be safe and thrive. We work with about 397 parents a year, which make up about 350 families and over 550 children with our services that are supported by the child abuse prevention and intervention grant fund through the children's levy, and then our mentoring inside out program, where we serve about 50 young people from the ages of 7 to 18 who have incarcerated parents or systems involved parents, we've been able to see the impacts not just in the people that we serve, but the impacts that those people go on to make in their community, whether it means driving academically for children and reaching new heights in their development, or families and parents being able to be self-sufficient and ultimately be the leaders, and making sure that their families can be resilient and thrive. I just wanted to highlight the importance of these programs and the importance of the continued support of the Portland children's levy.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Danielle.

Speaker: Yes. Good morning, council president and esteemed rest of the counselors here today. I want to say good morning and thank you for having me. I'm the executive director of an organization called elevate Oregon in-school mentorship program that serves the east side of Portland. And parkrose david, douglas and reynolds. I'll quickly just go off and just say, when elevate Oregon first received the Portland children's levy grant in 2020, we served approximately 200 students and navigated a chaos of pandemic era closures of schools closures. Those pcl funds were instrumental in helping us maintain meaningful, consistent relationships with our students during a time of extreme disruption. With the support and encouragement of our mentors, our students attended classes significantly more than their peers and stay connected to their school, communities and educators throughout covid. The small grant also allowed us to deepen our impact and our work in those community communities and equity work, and also provide a training to our mentors with students with disabilities. And also empower kids without disabilities, giving them empowerment to work with students in those particular classes. And I'm going to keep it really short right now and say that when I first started elevate Oregon in 2016, we had eight employees. We were only in four schools parkrose high, middle and elementary is very, very, very small. Today. I sit here today as the executive director. We've grown from 8 to 48 staff members. We're currently in ten schools in david douglas, which we started a pilot in 2023, along with the help with miss smith's spears, the vice superintendent, and david douglas. We also went into two schools this year, also in reynolds. So I sit here today as a black man and I see a number of. Minority people sitting here on this council table. We need your help. We need to continue this and also to continue to support kids of color. So I just appreciate your time. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you very much for being here today. We appreciate hearing from you.

Speaker: Hello. Good morning, president pirtle-guiney and members of the council. My name is doctor dorinda schubert and I am the executive director of bridge meadows. Bridge meadows creates intentional intergenerational communities serving children and families who've been impacted by the foster care system. And alongside them are elders who serve as mentors and support to the families. I want to thank you for the Portland children's levy investment in bridge meadows. Because of you, we have been able to serve children and help make them stay housed. They know where they are going to sleep, they know where they're going to go to school. They know where their food is coming from. They know where their siblings are. These are often things children in foster care worry about. These children experience stability and so do the families, ensuring that they have forever families and that they will not return to the foster care system. The majority of the families who come to bridge meadows are often grandmothers and aunts and cousins. And now we are seeing older siblings raising their younger siblings. This is the support that your your funding provides to these folks. We see the children in bridge meadows come in anxious and nervous, and then their mental health system, their mental health conditions alleviate. We see them attend school on a regular basis and graduate from high school. We see caregivers who now have instead of being isolated, which is a terrible problem in our country. We see them now surrounded by a caring community. I thank you for all of the funding that you've given to bridge meadows. We encourage you to continue to invest in the children of our communities. I know that there's a lot of budget challenges and civic stress right now, but it's never a bad decision to invest in children. Thank you very much for your time and your investment in bridge meadows.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you all for your testimony.

Speaker: Today, amy.

Speaker: Amy sabin joining us online.

Speaker: Hi, I'm amy sabin, executive director at my voice music, mvm. Mvm's mission is to amplify young voices and ignite self-discovery through music. Our purpose is to reach youth with limited access to music, instruction, to cultivate self-expression through song, and provide collaborative opportunities for youth. We believe that every young person, regardless of background, socioeconomic status, or mental health, should have the opportunity to find their voice and build connections through music. We serve over 800 youth a year through internal and external partner programs. Roughly 250 are serviced from mvm studios on southeast 89th and stark, a location intentionally chosen to help improve access for youth from east Portland, a chronically under-resourced region of the city with the most youth of color and the least arts opportunities. Over half of half of the youth who participate in classes at mvm studios received free or reduced tuition. Our approach is designed to foster equitable outcomes using trauma informed, strengths based facilitation. We empower youth to express their identities and cultures. Youth tell us they feel more resilient, confident and connected to others. As one parent put it, being part of mvm has been revolutionary. There's a before and an after of who he sees himself to be, how he expresses himself, and the confidence which with which he moves through the world. This funding is coming at a critical time. We've lost federal funding, and demands for our programs are exceeding our ability to meet them. Thank you for making space. For organizations like ours to receive this funding. For the first time in our 17 years of existence, please support funding for mvm as recommended by pcl staff. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

Speaker: Next. Next up we have Lynn Tan and Sonia Damtew. Lynn is joining us online.

Speaker: Federal funding and demand for our program are exceeding our ability to meet.

Speaker: Then go right ahead.

Speaker: Lynn, can you hear us?

Speaker: See this funding. For the first time in 17 years since exemptions. Please support funding for.

Speaker: Lynn. Lynn, can you hear us? You're. You'll need to mute your meeting.

Speaker: Good morning.

Speaker: City Council members. My name is Lynn Tan, and I'm the director of youth services at the Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization (IRCO), which is a culturally specific organization. On behalf of my colleagues who support youth and families through the Portland Children's Levy, we are requesting that the recent funding recommendations provided by the PCL Allocation Committee move forward without delay. We are currently facing so many funding uncertainties on city, county, state and federal levels. For example, for refugees, which is an identified PCL priority/prioritized community, there is an indefinite suspension of all federal funding for refugee support services. All the more. Therefore, refugees and newcomer immigrants are now relying on local supports from PCL for critical services. IRCO is a long-standing partner with PCL. Last year in a hunger relief project, we distributed over 196,000 pounds of food to 301 separate food distributions, weekend food backpack program we sent home 15,000 pounds of food for food insecure youth, and our mentoring program for immigrant and refugee youth were served through individual and group mentoring activities and in

our after-school programs. Over 400 students participated in our after school activities at two of our community schools. And we also operated inspire, a culturally specific program that supported 160 immigrant and refugee children and their parents across eight schools. We respectfully request that the City Council approve the pcl funding recommendations without delay. This will ensure service continuity and stability for our children and families receiving services. Thank you for your consideration. Ircc looks forward to a continued partnership with pcl to support the many children, youth and families who rely on pcl services.

Speaker: Thank you very much, sonia.

Speaker: Good morning. My name is sonia damtew and I am here and honored to share the powerful impact the Portland children's levy has had on the ethiopian and eritrean community resource center and the african refugees that we serve. Over the past three years, pcl support has been nothing short of transformative. This investment has provided consistent, culturally responsive teaching and mentoring to children and their families. This project has been a lifeline to help them learn to navigate the social, educational, health, and employment systems through mentoring. 90% of the youth refugee youth we've served have improved their grades and school attendance. Eight students have graduated high school and seven are now in college and university on full scholarships. The rest of them are on positive trajectory to success in graduate from high school and beyond. These are young people who arrived in the us just before and since the pandemic, many with limited english and facing trauma from war and displacement. Their success speaks to their resilience and what becomes possible when a community is given real support. But this program is more than about academics. Our youth build up leadership skills, explore career path and develop a stronger sense of identity and cultural pride. They lead civic projects with the city of Portland bureau of

transportation, engaged in environmental justice work, and participated in lifelong life changing workshops on conflict resolution and substance abuse prevention. And perhaps just as importantly, they got to be kids. They laughed and made memories visiting the zoo, skating, watching movies for the first time. These joyful moments helped them heal trauma and show our youth that their future can be bright, safe, and full of hope. These are only a few of hundreds who need support. We humbly request that you continue to support the pcl program so that we can expand the vital work, reach more youth at risk, and build stronger, more connected and resilient generation of leaders. And thank you and thank you to all the pcl projects out there to help our youth.

Speaker: Thank you very much for being here.

Speaker: That completes testimony, counselors.

Speaker: This is a first reading. We are not going to take a vote today. So this is an opportunity for discussion. Any questions that folks have before we set this aside to second reading for our next meeting? Councilor kanal.

Speaker: Yeah, I have several questions. I'm not sure if the first one is for pcl staff or the attorney or for you, madam president. I know the others will be for staff, so if you could come up, the first question is just process oriented. How does this work? Is it that we have to have either a motion to accept or remand and then whichever passes happens, or is it a vote on whether to accept and if it fails, it's remanded. How does that work? Procedurally.

Speaker: I would accept either motion, not today, but when we do a second reading, either a motion to pass these recommendations or a motion to remand them, whichever motion is made first, we would take up first.

Speaker: If hypothetically, it was remanded, what does that do to the timeline for distribution of grants?

Speaker: I'm going to let staff speak to the timeline and how quickly changes could be made if there was a remand.

Speaker: It would partly depend on what the instructions were on remand, but the allocation committee would need to reconvene and reconsider its decisions.

Speaker: Yeah, I heard that. Thank you. Are we allowed to remand one category or is it all or nothing?

Speaker: One category you may remand.

Speaker: Sorry, could you say that again?

Speaker: You can remand one category.

Speaker: Okay. My more substantive questions. Can you tell me about the expected proportion of grant funding that should go towards administration, including administrative staff? Do you have a criteria for how much money goes towards staffing?

Speaker: We allow up to 15% of the grant award to go for administration, which follows the county's current policy as well.

Speaker: Okay. Can you tell me about the grant to the sunshine division specifically? Does any of this pay for administrative overhead, and in particular, does this pay for the three city employees who are involved in this work, two of them who are board members and one who's listed on their staff?

Speaker: No. I would let meg speak specifically to that grant. It is specifically that grant funds weekend food bags at the community transitional school, which is a school for homeless youth. So you want to speak to the staffing for the grant?

Speaker: Sure. Nearly 70% of the grant.

Speaker: I'm sorry. Could you introduce yourself? So we haven't had you up here for the record?

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. Yes, my name is meg mcelroy, assistant director with the children's lobby. To answer your question, councilor canal 70% of that grant budget is used to purchase food that is delivered to weekly to the community transition school, which is a school in northeast Portland and the cully neighborhood that serves homeless children. Children are bussed there from area shelters and other locations around town, so sunshine division uses the grant to purchase that food, pack it up into bags that is delivered to the school, and then school staff help send it home with children. So 70% of the budget goes to purchase the food. Up to 15% is charged for administration, and the small bit of staff from sunshine division. Off the top of my head, I don't know the names of the people, but one is a delivery driver who drives the food from sunshine division to the school, and the other person is the main point of contact between the school and sunshine division. To my knowledge, they are not city employees.

Speaker: Okay, that adds up to 85%.

Speaker: Excuse me.

Speaker: Said 70% for the food and 15% for administration. What's the other 15?

Speaker: The little bit of staff that the coordinating program staff who coordinates with community transition school and the driver.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: You're welcome. And then the last question I had, I guess is can you speak to we had a testifier here who is I want to point out someone whose organization is receiving funding, which I think is very notable, stating that the highest scoring african American lead agencies in the mentoring category, the after school category and the child abuse prevention category were not recommended for funding, and that specifically nine examples of the allocation committee telling the black community in Portland that african American led organizations would not

get the that there were examples of non-african-American led organizations getting who scored lower getting recommended for funding. Can you speak to that?

Speaker: Yes. I mean, there's different reasons for different applications in terms of why the allocation committee did not vote to continue them. So some of the organizations, some of the grants, some of the applications you're referring to that were higher scoring, had performance issues because they were ongoing grants, and we did not. The allocation committee did not vote to continue them due to the performance issues. So there were and I will let erica talk to in the mentoring area, specifically around organizations that are funded, the ci is recommended to receive \$1.9 million over three years for a funding. So I don't know that that is a that the committee perceived that to be substantial support for ongoing programing for the black community, that they they fund, they deliver programs with pcl funds in multiple program areas. So not just after school, but also in foster care and child abuse prevention.

Speaker: I didn't.

Speaker: Actually understand all of that point about the nine counts that the public testimony made. But what I can say in in mentoring is, yes, there there was one african American specific organization that we had been funding in the prior round that we did not recommend for funding, and that was due to performance issues. Without getting into it, like they, for example, had a lot of staff instability in that program and they were to provide both individual mentoring and group mentoring. And they did not. They did zero mentor to mentee matches in the previous year and provided no individual mentoring, as well as having a lot of staff turnover. So because of the instability in that program, despite the fact that their application was strong, we had concerns about continuing funding for that. The ci application and in mentoring was a new grant to the mentoring category. We had

not been funding them in mentoring before, and it was not one of community council's priorities to fund new grants to existing organizations. We did fund other 18 to 24 year old programs that provided a wide range of services, and that served african Americans, as well as other cultural groups in that age group. The ones that received the most was one that could provide. They provided ged's on site or high school diplomas on site or fully certified pre-apprenticeship programs on site that were accepted directly into the vocational schools, as well as college and career. So those were that gave the youth who participated in that program a wider range of options to be able to go into getting living wage jobs after the high school age is over, I guess. So those were some of those reasons for funding. Also, just due to lack of the mentoring. Had the lowest allocation one of the lowest allocations in terms of actual dollars. So to be able to fund an additional large program, we would have had to not fund several other programs, and we just didn't have the money available to be able to do that, to be able to fund that program in a meaningful way.

Speaker: Thank you. In the interest of time, I won't ask any more questions. I'll just note my interest is in getting more information on all of this, but in particular the hunger relief section. I found the equitable giving circle component of this pretty compelling as an organization in my district.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: I'd be happy to provide that.

Speaker: Thank you, counselor.

Speaker: Councilor morillo.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I have less questions and I guess more concerns to state i, I will say, I think our procurement and grant process at the city is pretty messed up. And I've heard that across the board for a lot of different things that have come up this week, I find it deeply concerning that so many

organizations of color that are doing work for our black, indigenous, latino, asian American communities are not getting grants. And I've heard a lot of concerns that the majority of the board tends to be the people reviewing the grants tend to be white. There's just not a lot of diversity as far as perspective for the people that are reviewing the grants. I also have a lot of concerns that for smaller organizations that aren't deeply, you know, that haven't existed for generations, which are obviously going to be white led, that they sometimes struggle with our grant process because we don't have any way in the city to really facilitate and help people with a grant process. So that in itself creates a barrier. There's just a lot of barriers that I see here, and we know that outreach works best when it's people within your own community doing outreach to you because you understand each other, you have bonds already. And so I will say that I don't feel comfortable with moving this forward. I understand we're in a first reading and it will go to a second reading, but I would like to see this maybe remanded and reviewed, and I understand if that's not possible for this process. But overall, I guess I would urge my colleagues that if we can't change this right now, then we definitely need to assess this process as a whole going forward, because things can't continue on like this, with having community organizations being surprised that they're not getting grants or procurement processes, that they find out about things last minute. That and overall, I've just seen in a lot of these systems as well that it is inconsistent. Sometimes people who are doing the review, they don't even follow the template that we have, or different organizations are measured differently than others, and those happen to be black led organizations. So yeah, I guess I just I have to say, I can't in good conscience really push this forward today, and I would push to remand it.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor councilor koyama lane.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. Thank you for being here with us today. To be honest, the testimony about the awards to non-black and african American organizations to mentor and serve black african American children, families and communities is concerning, especially that piece. The assertion of scoring inequity. I share the concerns by that were just shared from my colleagues. Councilor kanal councilor morillo would love further information before the vote to adopt. And my question is about how these performance issues were addressed. If you can share that with us, with these organizations.

Speaker: We do an annual performance review of all organizations, and we give that to them at the end of each year. And the performance assessments are based on whether they meet their grant agreement goals. So the goals are set for the number of children to serve the number, the amount of service to provide and the participation goal that they have for the for the families or the children to come to the program and the outcomes that they achieve with the families of the children, depending who they're serving primarily. So those are the grant agreement goals that we have. We are assessing whether they meet those goals or not. And we work with people. Typically people get funding for five years, so we are working with them over a period of time. If they're not making their goals, we're working with them to try to figure out how we could adjust things or do things differently so they can make goals and we adjust goals for people if needed. So the situation, by the time we are not recommending something for because of performance, it is usually had significant issues over time. So that's kind of our standard, I would say. And that was what was published in the application, that we would look at performance over time to make recommendations. So those were criteria that were available to all applicants.

Speaker: May I add a point of clarification? Because when I heard councilor morillo, I realized there was something that I left out, as well as listening to councilor koyama lane and just that in the mentoring category, when we most of the smaller organizations that that were funded, the reason that smaller organizations were a priority in this round, because they had been facing barriers. And so two of the people who gave public testimony, hala and elevate, are culturally specific african American organizations who were funded through having that or recommended for funding by the allocation committee through that process of trying to reduce barriers for smaller organizations. So there are a lot of like smaller, culturally specific organizations who have not had access to funds before that, through this new process, have been able to gain entry.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor koyama lane any follow up or okay. Councilor green.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president.

Speaker: I was in the queue to say things that have already been said by colleagues, so i'll just echo what councilors morillo and koyama lane have raised. But I do have a process question. So if we if someone were to make a motion to remand, would that be appropriate in this space and what would the impact be? I guess is my question.

Speaker: I'm going to look to our attorney, but I believe because this is a first reading, that that would be an appropriate motion at our second reading. I'm not sure, though.

Speaker: Sarah ames is also in. Sarah has been advising.

Speaker: I appreciate that if it's the sense of counsel today that they would like to remand a category, you can remand by category. So if counsel would like to remand a category, I think it would be appropriate today for and then proceed with

the allocation on the remaining categories so they could proceed through the grant making process. I think it would be appropriate today for there to be a motion to amend the ordinance to remove the categories that you want to remand, and then re and so motion to amend to strike those categories and remand those categories to the, the, the committee. And then that would allow the remaining ordinance with the other categories to proceed to second reading and approval. And then council would get those remanded. Decisions would come back to council later.

Speaker: Okay, counselor, does that fulfill your question? Okay, councilor smith.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I too am concerned. I'm concerned at the prioritization of new and small organizations and the use of the scoring process, where lower scoring grantees are proprietary or prioritized over some higher scoring grantees. It's almost like a deion sanders effect where effective long term, large black serving, black led organization, they were impacted negatively. And I want to address a comment about one of the groups you mentioned. Ci got 1.9 million. That is true. However, if you look at the allocation they received from the previous past years, they lost 1,000,002 in this grant process. So that doesn't make up for an organization who has been in operation for over 40 years. And mentoring is their book of business. And they were not even considered. I don't know what. The percentages were, how far they were down from the other, but I do know it is very troubling, and I'm not entirely convinced that the selection criteria in the large grants round will lead to effective and equitable outcomes. So i, I understand what the consequences are if we remand this back. I'm just taking the temperature because I am too really troubled by this.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor councilor kanal. I'm going to move on to our colleagues who haven't spoken yet. Councilor zimmerman.

Speaker: Thank you. I appreciated, you know, our last work session where we asked some tough questions. I appreciate everybody's responses and the work. So I am appreciating this this dialog as well. And i'll just be really clear. I'm definitely looking to the direction setting by councilors Ryan and smith, given their history with pcl, their involvement with a lot of these groups. And so I am in an area where I am trying to interpret what we're hearing. I also want to make sure that we don't overemphasize just those who came to testify, but that we look at the full list of everybody who was awarded. And there are some groups who didn't come here today and maybe didn't feel like their allocation was was also in jeopardy. I if we take a movement or we move in a direction where we're not going to go forward, I guess what I would hope is that we fully post all of the grading criteria sheets, and I mean the handwritten notes. And I say that as a person who has graded some stuff, as a person who has read some stuff, but. I think that level of transparency will be helpful when it comes to evaluating effectiveness and being clear that that sometimes things come off a page. And I think it's just hard to evaluate. There's a long list of a lot of organizations, and I think that I'm very interested in all their programs, what they're doing. But if we're going to truly open this back up, I think that we have to be prepared for some grading criteria or some some factual statements that maybe aren't aren't the most flattering, that maybe comes off the page, but also it gives us the chance to say, boy, look at this, this this looks like skewed grading, but I'm not there yet. I'm looking to see where other folks are at. But if we do do that, I would look for that level of transparency, because between those applications coming in and us, this has now gone through some steps of evaluation and we're the last in many. And so i, i, I'm not looking to overly open this back up, but I'm sensitive. If there are an overriding group of concerns here with my colleagues. Thanks.

Speaker: Councilor Ryan.

Speaker: Yes, thank you, madam president. And thank you again, director pellegrino. I'm sorry there was a miscommunication about not being able to do the presentation. I know you did it at the work session. The majority were here. Some went in and out. And I think that's part of the challenge here today is that you didn't have a chance to, again, fully repeat the process in that presentation. I think all of us are disappointed that there's over 20% revenue drop, and no one saw that coming a year ago at this time. So let's just always remember that's a factor here. I also want to acknowledge that your organization is only 5% on admin, and that you walk a very strict talk in terms of how much you can spend on on that. And my question to you is how many years have we have you been hashing out the new criteria?

Speaker: How many years have we been hashing?

Speaker: This is a new criteria before the last allocation. And when I came into the allocation committee, there was active dialog about the new criteria. How many years with allocation committee, with all the volunteers, with the community board. Have you been in dialog about the criteria in which you used as a lens to make these decisions?

Speaker: I mean, three years, basically, yes.

Speaker: Okay. So it's been a three year process.

Speaker: Starting in late 2022. Yes.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you. And how many volunteer readers again looked at each application. And did they look at four anonymously?

Speaker: There's four readers that read each application.

Speaker: For each application, four different people read it and they were they didn't know who the organization was.

Speaker: They didn't know who the organization was. The readers see the full application.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: So the what is anonymous was the community council. So the.

Speaker: Community council doesn't have.

Speaker: Any council did not review any actual applications. They looked at the high level. So their their prioritization. So the community council specifically prioritized new organizations that are not funded by pcl currently and smaller organizations because those organizations were perceived to have barriers in our process. So they specifically recommended we give extra priority to those organizations. So that was the process of the community council. So that's 13 community members who are coming together to give advice on policy and process.

Speaker: And how would you describe the process of recruiting the community council and the demographic makeup of the community council?

Speaker: Do you have stats on demographic makeup? Because I'm not sure I do have my fingertips.

Speaker: You speak to recruitment while I pull that up. Yes, yes, bear with me, I have it.

Speaker: And this is new, correct? We didn't have a community council last time these decisions.

Speaker: Came to the community council was advised. Was community feedback basically community engagement, feedback that advised us to create a council. So we did that in preparation for this funding round so they could be actively engaged from the very beginning. So they helped design the community engagement, they

helped design the funding application. They helped design the priorities for funding at the end of the process. So they were with us for the ride.

Speaker: There are 13 members of our community council, and 77% of them have professional or lived experience in one or more of our six program areas. So that's after school mentoring, child abuse prevention, intervention, foster care, early childhood and hunger relief. 69% identify as black, indigenous or people of color, and 92% have professional experience working in advancing racial equity. 15% identify as LGBTQIA to plus, 46% have professional experience working with the queer community, and 8% identify as having a disability and 23% identify as a caregiver of someone with with a disability, and 31% have professional experience working with the disability community.

Speaker: Thank you for that. And when it came to the council, the allocation committee, the council's recommendation, that was very helpful for me as an allocation committee member, knowing that that was a new part of our system. And my point is, this was so thoroughly vetted in a very transparent process over the last few years that I experienced when I've been on this allocation committee. And I just want to remind my colleagues about how much work has gone into this. And I know it's not easy when you just get the information at the work session, which I hope that you were able to engage with, and then repeat that here. I've also found all of the staff to be very helpful in terms of honestly answering questions. I found watching the testimony from the applicants to also be successful in terms of forming an opinion. So I just urge my colleagues to go through some of that step. If you want to challenge these very difficult decisions at a time where there's just not enough resources. Thank you so much, staff, for your professionalism today.

Speaker: Councilor kanal just wanted a quick clarification. Note this is not something that we get to do annually, right? This is a four year decision. Is the is the intention that this would be revisited annually or in four years?

Speaker: The grants are for three year periods initially, and then people can request a renewal if they want to renew their grant. And so then the council would then come in again at renewal time to approve grants that are recommended by the committee for renewal.

Speaker: So once the this document is acted upon or accepted, whether it's amended, remanded and then comes back or whether it's accepted as is, we would not see something about this again for three years.

Speaker: Correct.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor smith.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor zimmerman. I, I appreciate your asking for direction. I. I understand I support the Portland children's levy. I think the work that's being done by the organizations and the dollars that we have spent over the years and have supported it through their. Levies on the ballot. I am particularly concerned that if we stop this now, that will hinder the folks who need the money. Starting July 1st. I'm concerned about that and how this process will prolong not just the folks who are reduced, but the folks who, who, who are even smaller organizations who can't absorb. A hit like that. So this is this is very like I said, it is concerning to me and knowing that we won't be able to come back for another three years to be able to course. Correct. I don't like to Monday morning quarterback. And I believe that folks that we have worked with at pcl, they're professionals. And sometimes you you know, you have to, you know, swallow a

hard pill. But it's still very concerning. And I'm not sure. If the unintended consequence will create more harm by opening this up. Really.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. I've been trying to keep myself out of the queue in the name of time, but I do have a quick question. The process of review. Did the community council review happen before the scoring, or was that after the scoring?

Speaker: After the scoring?

Speaker: So there was scoring and then that was further weighted by what the community council recommended.

Speaker: There was a score for the application. We worked with the community council. They did not review the applications and they did not see the applicants. They made their we work with them at a higher level here. What are your priorities at the high level in terms of and the main ones that they came up with were making sure that programs were focused on bipoc populations, that we included small organizations, and that we included organizations that did not receive current pell grants.

Speaker: So that didn't affect the scoring. But the reviewers at the level that councilor Ryan sat on.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Took that as essentially an overlay to the scoring. Yes. Okay. Thank you for clarifying that. Councilors. This is a first reading. So at this point we can close discussion and pass this to a second reading unless there is any more discussion or debate or interest in making motions, not seeing any hands in the queue. Councilor morillo.

Speaker: So I think the questions that councilor smith posed are really important as far as what happens if these dollars don't get out the door, even if there are big structural issues that we need to address, if we send it back for review today, well,

are we allowed to do that on our first reading? And if so, would that give us enough time to just get that looked at before the July deadline where the funds need to be released?

Speaker: Lisa, I'm not sure how quickly you could pull things together for that. Can you let us know what your timeline would be, and then we can figure out how that would overlay with our council agenda timeline?

Speaker: I think there is at least one more council meeting on June 4th, before the July 1st deadline or the June 30th deadline.

Speaker: We'll have two council meetings in June. I'm just trying to figure out when we could have information back from you and your process.

Speaker: I'd have to see if I could get the allocation committee together in time to reconsider based on what you instruct.

Speaker: Councilor I'm not sure if that's a clear answer to your.

Speaker: I don't have I mean, I can't speak to people's availability because I haven't asked for it.

Speaker: I think that's a I think that's an unknown is what I'm hearing.

Speaker: Okay. I don't know what to do with that, but yes. Thanks.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Councilor kanal do we not have three council meetings in June? Can we add a June 11th meeting?

Speaker: June 11th? We will be meeting as a budget committee. We don't have a full council meeting, though. I will flag that. I believe we will be coming in on June 5th, the Thursday after our June 4th meeting, for some specific agenda items. And I suspect that we'll need to use the Thursday time after our June 18th meeting as well, just to catch up a little bit.

Speaker: The Friday time.

Speaker: Oh good gracious, you're right. That is the Thursday that we don't have. We'll have to figure that out.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor smith.

Speaker: I would I would consider if we're it's the 20th of may. Now if we could expedite some sort of process with your reviewers so that we could meet the June 30th deadline. I don't want this to be hanging out there as a thing that we did not try to fix.

Speaker: So would you want you would want the allocation committee to meet before June 4th and make different recommendations for you to consider at your June 4th meeting.

Speaker: Not different, but make recommendations and consider the applications fully, and consider organizations whose book of business has been with after school programs, who they scored higher than some of the lower, smaller organizations, and still they were not given the funding. And so that's what that's what I'm trying to reconcile with. I can't reconcile that.

Speaker: Okay. Is that is that what I should be asking for, trying to get the committee together before the fourth.

Speaker: Councilor are you are you looking for information so that we could remand a portion of this back, which would then. Lead to a different approach or further discussion by the allocation committee? Or are you looking to just have additional information provided to us before the second reading?

Speaker: I don't know what our. Statutory. Options options are.

Speaker: So we have two options. We can pass the recommendations or we can remand them. And we specifically are limited to remand, not because we don't like the results of the review, but if we think that the review is not applied appropriately

or that the criteria were not applied fairly, or that there was some sort of process breakdown, and I I'm sure we can get the specific language. I'm paraphrasing it there. So I think at this point, I hear folks who have a lot of questions about the results. And what I'm trying to figure out is whether there is a question about the process such that folks are interested in remanding part of this, or whether folks are interested in or leaning toward passage and not remand, but just would like some additional information before the second reading. Does that give you a little more to go off of here?

Speaker: Yes, it does, but it still leads back to the same. Alternative. If they're not, if we don't, if we're if we're asking for them to rereview it and take into consideration some different. Multipliers, I don't know. I don't know if we can actually do that. And. Attorney Taylor, could you please advise?

Speaker: Would be helpful for me to just state the criteria that.

Speaker: If you have it in front of you and would like to read the remand criteria, sure.

Speaker: So the authority to remand by funding category means that the council may send the allocation committee decisions in an entire program area back to the allocation committee for reconsideration. If those decisions were not made based on the application scores and other community conditions. To foster a balanced and integrated citywide system of services, and as the remanding body, the council does not have the authority to substitute its own decisions for the decisions made by the committee. Does that make it more clear?

Speaker: Yes, and I just want to make sure that the legal counsel is in in accordance with this. Is this.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: I agree with that statement. If it is, you can remand by funding category and then the children's levy can assess can reassess to make sure that the decision was based on the application scores and other community conditions to foster a balanced and integrated citywide system of services. So that would be their remand to go reassess, to make sure that that criteria was met.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Councilor kanal, we've had you in the queue a few times. Did you have an additional thing?

Speaker: I just wanted to point out that the two things I raised were both process concerns, not outcome based. One about whether or not we're funding city employees specifically in the hunger relief category, and one about whether the scoring criteria was applied as the primary criteria.

Speaker: Absolutely. Councilors. I'm not seeing anybody in the queue asking for an amendment to separate this out. So I am going to have us move this to a second reading, I think, lisa, you've heard some requests for some additional information between now and then to help make sure folks are comfortable with their vote on that day. And counselors will move forward and have an opportunity to. Consider votes between now and our next meeting.

Speaker: Provide that information to the council offices as you requested. Thank you for your time and your thoughtful consideration.

Speaker: The next item on our agenda, item number six, the administration has asked for us to pull back. This was a. A right of way agreement that needed some additional information, I believe. So we are not considering that today. That means that the next item on our agenda is item number seven. Keelan. Could you please read that agenda item?

Speaker: Authorize. Authorize the bureau of transportation to acquire certain permanent and temporary rights necessary for construction of the northeast columbia cully boulevard and alderwood road intersection improvements project through exercise of eminent domain authority councilors.

Speaker: This is a first reading of an ordinance that is coming out of the finance committee, which I believe was also. Information was also shared with the transportation and infrastructure committee. We have christopher here, here to give us a committee staff summary. And then I will turn to our committee leads to add any information that they'd like to share. Christopher. Go right ahead.

Speaker: Good morning, madam president. Councilors. For the record, my name is christopher hare, council policy analyst, and I serve as staff to the finance committee. The ordinance before you document number 2020 5-184 was considered in the finance committee on may 5th, where it was referred to council with a recommendation to pass. The ordinance authorizes the Portland bureau of transportation to acquire specific, permanent and temporary property rights necessary for the implementation of the northeast columbia intersection improvements project through exercise of eminent domain. The ordinance grants the bureau of transportation and the city attorney's office the authority to negotiate and offer just compensation for the required property interests. If negotiations are unsuccessful, the ordinance authorizes the initiation of condemnation proceedings to determine just compensation through the judicial judicial process. This authority does not extend or alter the jurisdiction of the courts beyond what is appropriate or reserved for City Council determination. The ordinance further authorizes the creation of a sub fund in the amount estimated to be the just compensation for each interest property, which, if necessary, shall be deposited with the clerk of the court where an action is commenced. The full impact statement on this item

includes a financial and budgets impact and analysis, and information on potential community impacts and community involvement. There was no verbal or written testimony on this ordinance prior to committee action. This concludes the committee staff summary. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Christopher. Councilor zimmerman, anything you'd like to add?

Speaker: Just that this item received a support across finance and that members of this district were present for that and appreciated the way that the staff approached it and kind of walked us through this process. So no concerns from my chair.

Speaker: And councilors. I just clarify in christopher's report, he said there was no testimony. There was an opportunity for testimony, but there was no testimony submitted. Yes. Any questions for either christopher or counselor zimmerman? Okay. Because this is an eminent domain item in district two, I want to see if anybody from district two has any comments that you'd like to add. First, before we go to general discussion and public testimony. Not seen either of my colleagues jumping forward. Keelan is there any public testimony on this agenda item?

Speaker: No one signed up.

Speaker: Okay, councilors, is there any discussion on this agenda item? I'll put myself in the queue just to say, as a district two representative, I know this area very well. I drive this area regularly. I have crossed one of these intersections with a group of ten young children that is going to see an improvement. These are predominantly industrial properties. I, as a representative of this district, haven't received any concerns or complaints from any of those property holders. And this does seem to me to be an important project. Councilors, if there is no other

comment or discussion, we will move this to second reading and move to the next item on our agenda. Keelan could you please read agenda item eight?

Speaker: Adopt adopt the locally preferred alternative for the 82nd avenue transit project and conditions for approval.

Speaker: Thank you colleagues. This is a resolution that means that we do vote on it today. The reason this is on our agenda today is it will be before jpac, our regional transportation body, I believe, later this week. And they try to have input from all of the affected communities before they take up an issue. This did come through the transportation committee, and claire is here with the committee staff summary for us.

Speaker: Good morning, madam president and councilors. For the record, claire adamchik, policy analyst and staff to the transportation and infrastructure committee. The resolution before you document number 2025, dash 93 was heard in the transportation and infrastructure committee on March 24th, where it was referred to council with recommendation it be adopted. The resolution confirms the city's adoption of a locally preferred alternative, or lpa, for the 82nd avenue transit project as non-binding city policy. The lpa recommendation proposed by the 82nd avenue transit project steering committee is for frequent express or bus rapid transit along 82nd avenue between clackamas town center transit center and northeast kelly boulevard and northeast killingsworth street. Through this resolution, the city accepts a proposed lpa map and conditions of approval identified by trimet metro, the city, and other regional entities. The full impact statement on this item includes a financial and budget impacts and analysis, information on economic and real estate development impacts and community impacts, and community involvement. Five people testified during the committee on during the committee meeting on March 24th. No one submitted written

testimony on this item prior to committee action and the general themes of the testimony the committee heard included emphasizing the importance of sidewalk connectivity to bus stops. In particular, if stops are consolidated, highlighting concerns about the potential negative impacts of eliminating bus stops on people with disabilities and aligning improvements with the 82nd avenue equitable development strategy to support local workforce opportunities and prevent development related displacement. And that concludes the committee. Staff summary. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, colleagues. This came out of the transportation and infrastructure committee. Councilor Clark, would you like to add any information to Claire's report?

Speaker: Thank you, madam chair. Yes, this is actually a fabulous project. It's really transformational infrastructure. We now own 82nd, by the way. We it's been transferred from the state and improvements were already being made before this proposal came forward. So it's an excellent ten mile alignment. It's going to do a lot for the community. I do need to offer an amendment to this resolution. However, the Ipa, the locally preferred alternative, it currently refers to a community produced report. It's called the 82nd avenue equitable development strategy. There is an 82nd avenue coalition that includes a porno, verdi, Oregon walks and other organizations. And they're asking us to change the name of this report to the 82nd avenue development strategy. And I believe we've filed the amendment. I believe that, Keelan you have the amendment. And they they feel that they want the change. It's not currently accurate in the resolution. So I would like to offer that amendment to the resolution. Do I need to move that?

Speaker: I will have you move that. I want to make sure there aren't any questions on the committee staff summary before we move that amendment. If that's all right

with you colleagues, are there any questions on the committee staff summary that claire has provided or the additional information that councilor clark has shared before we get to councilor clark's amendment? Okay, seeing none, I Keelan do we have public testimony signed up?

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

Speaker: Why don't.

Speaker: We have councilor clark move for amendment, see if there's a second. And then before we debate the amendment, hear from the public. Go ahead. Councilor.

Speaker: I'll let me repeat that. So I move that we amend the title to change the name to the 82nd avenue development strategy.

Speaker: Is there a second for this motion?

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Okay. We're going to hold that amendment on the table, but let folks know that that is there. And then Keelan, if you could please call up the individuals who have signed up for public testimony, we'll hear from them and then move into debate.

Speaker: Thank you. Zachary lauritsen and jorge sanchez bautista. Elana, welcome.

Speaker: Thank you for being here. I don't see jorge in the room. Is he online?

Speaker: I'll check.

Speaker: Okay. Go right ahead.

Speaker: Good morning everyone. Nice to see you, everyone. Zachary lauritsen at Oregon walks. We're also the host of the 82nd avenue coalition. We've met with all of you, and we really appreciate your time. Kind of in the lead up to this, just a few comments that I wanted to make this morning for you. The first is to just support councilor clark's amendment. There's some history behind that, but the short

answer is it is the right thing. We'd like for you to adopt that for a couple years as a coalition. Since the transfer of this road, we've been doing outreach along the community amongst the core organizations, but organizations up and down the corridor. We've heard these themes over and over about what people are excited about. They're excited about repaving. They're excited about trees. They're excited about trails. They're excited about more housing. Seeing 82nd avenue as a housing spine of east Portland. They're excited about a safer street. They're excited about a street that is a magnet for people can spend time, not a place that they are fearful to spend time, especially with their families. They're excited about this Ipa, about this transit project, because we think that that is going to be one of the key vehicles in order to do this work, to making 82nd a safer, more accessible, more multimodal street. And as we've spoken to you before, we also recognize that when you invest almost \$1 billion of public dollars in a corridor, and that's what we think is going to happen in the coming years, and you do that fairly rapidly that you can cause displacing pressures. And so we are also and that's what this development strategy is about. It's about trying to make sure that we allow people who want to stay on 82nd avenue to stay on 82nd avenue, because we've helped them earn more money through workforce development. We've helped them find places to live because of a housing development that we've done, the things that people can enjoy, the investments that we are making as a public entity. The last thing i'll leave you with, which is if you're interested in this transit project, and one of the granular things, which is in dedication about 82nd avenue, that decision is going to be made in the in the coming weeks. And so if you're interested, reach out to pbots leadership and have that conversation be informed and voice your opinion. We'd we'd love for you to know that. Because as constituents, that's something we hear all the time. People want to talk about that topic. Thank you very much and for your support.

Speaker: Thank you for being here.

Speaker: Jorge sanchez bautista, that completes testimony.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilors. We do have an amendment proposed and seconded on the table. This is a resolution. So we will pass this today. Councilor kanal are you in the queue to speak to the amendment?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Go right ahead.

Speaker: Question about it. So can you speak to as I understand it's not you're reacting to someone else's request. Can you speak to why those groups would would want the report to be retitled to not include the word equitable? The list of groups you mentioned seem. That was a little surprising.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor kanal I can't give you all of their reasoning behind this. I'm really following their lead. They are. They are the lead on the project and pano verde. You heard from Oregon walks. So this is something that they want. I don't know if zachary wants to address it.

Speaker: Would you like to come back up and speak on behalf of the organization, since you may have an answer to this.

Speaker: Great, great question, here's the reason we are applying for funds from the feds to do this transit project. And as you know, the trump administration doesn't like the word equitable. So it's purely a strategy. Yeah.

Speaker: Thank you for that concise answer. Councilors, I do not see anybody else in the queue for discussion on the amendment. Going once, going twice. Keelan could you please call the roll on the amendment?

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Yes. Ryan i.

Speaker: Koyama lane I morillo.

Speaker: Let's get that bag i.

Speaker: I I'm sorry.

Speaker: Novick. Thanks. Clark. I green zimmerman avalos.

Speaker: I dunphy.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Smith i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: With 11 eyes. The motion carries.

Speaker: Thank you very much, counselors. Counselor. Clark, are you in the queue to speak to the underlying resolution? Yes. Thank you.

Speaker: Madam chair. I would actually without. Unless people have questions, I would just assume we can move the resolution.

Speaker: Okay, I have a motion.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: I actually don't.

Speaker: I don't think we need to do that, though.

Speaker: No, I don't.

Speaker: Think we need a motion on this, but I am not seeing anybody else in the queue for discussion, so with no further discussion, Keelan please call the roll.

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: Yeah, thanks everybody. I will vote I on this.

Speaker: I koyama lane I morillo. I novick. I clark.

Speaker: Here's to transformational infrastructure investment.

Speaker: I green I zimmerman.

Speaker: Voting yes on the amendment. Yes on the overall.

Speaker: Avalos i.

Speaker: Then i.

Speaker: Smith i. Pirtle-guiney with.

Speaker: My gratitude for what I think is the most efficient debate, discussion and vote we have had yet. Councilors i.

Speaker: 12 I vote the resolution as adopted or as amended is adopted.

Speaker: Thank you councilors. The remaining items on our agenda are a series of fee bills, which we first read at our previous meeting. We were able to have deep discussions on some, but not all of them. My intent is to move through them as quickly as we can, but leave a few of them open where there might be conversations about fees. During our budget debate later today that could lead to amendments. I believe most of these we can close out and vote on before that, but I will be asking us to leave a few open. And then at the end of this meeting, we will recess rather than close the meeting so that we can move back to those if we need to make amendments. If we don't need to make amendments, that's fantastic. We'll move back into the council meeting and just vote them through as is without amendments and close the council meeting. But where I have heard you all bring up potential fee discussions, we'll leave things open so that we have that that opportunity to align everything today. Keelan could you please read the first fee bill item nine.

Speaker: Amend fee schedule for tree permits.

Speaker: Thank you. And because this is a second reading and we did hear the overview at our previous meeting, we don't have a broad overview. But councilor zimmerman, this came out of your finance committee. Do you want to give folks just a 32nd reminder of which fee bill this is?

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. So just a quick reminder. This is a fee structure that pertains to our title 11 tree code. The finance committee adopted

two changes to that. And those came forward to you in this in what we heard in the first reading. And I think i'll keep it there.

Speaker: Councilors, I don't believe I've heard any proposals for fee changes that would affect this ordinance. So I am hoping we can complete our discussion and then take a vote on this. This morning, councilor green.

Speaker: I was actually in the queue to see if we needed to take a recess. I don't know how long this chunk is going to go, and I don't want to miss the vote. If we think we can move fast, i'll hold. I'll hold it.

Speaker: But.

Speaker: Councilors, you have a request from your colleague to move quickly. Councilor smith.

Speaker: I'm getting some some head shaking, so i'll motion for a seven minute recess.

Speaker: Yes, yes.

Speaker: Okay. I was hoping to move us through, but, councilors, if folks would like to take a recess, let's take a seven minute recess. That would put us back here at 1124. I will start right at 1124. Thank you, councilor, for letting us know your needs. And I will see you all in a few minutes.

Speaker: Transparency.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Oh, yeah.

Speaker: I believe 123456. We are now at a quorum, so we are going to reenter debate on agenda item nine, amending the fee schedule for tree permits. Councilor smith is not here. Councilor kanal. You are first present in the queue.

Speaker: As I take a bite of apple. Thanks.

Speaker: Sorry about the timing.

Speaker: Was there any additional update I'd asked earlier if there was conversation with pccp? Pcf sorry about the 400,000. I think it was, and I just wanted to see if there was any new information on that from those who talked to the pcef committee, but I don't know if anyone's here to answer.

Speaker: Do you remember who you asked that of, and who was going to have that conversation with the pcf committee?

Speaker: I will get my notes.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Is that something that you had taken on? A conversation with the pcf committee about some of their funding as it relates to the tree permit fee schedule.

Speaker: Those 400,000 that was being this document, which transfer \$400,000 from pcf to urban forestry. And I just wanted to see if they had thoughts on it that subsequent to our last meeting that you or anyone else was aware of, it wasn't specifically directed at you. So.

Speaker: Hey.

Speaker: Councilor green is on that committee, which is why I looked to him. I have not had any additional and gotten any additional information there. Councilor. Councilor smith, you are out of the queue now. Okay, councilors, is there any additional discussion on agenda item nine amending the fee schedule for tree permits? Councilor smith.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: So I just have a couple statements about the permits between nine through 15. Is this the appropriate place?

Speaker: Statements about the agenda items generally items nine through 15.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Just concerns.

Speaker: Go ahead.

Speaker: And I think I've made my feelings known about the fee increases on east Portland residents. I think it's so important that I speak on the inequity in the service areas. Portland Portlanders depend on, and our constituents in district one. For those of you who may not know are economically vulnerable, and we must acknowledge this at every opportunity and keep this front of mind with every decision that we that we make. And I have to vote to support these items, because the prospect of firing even more critical civil service staff, it would wreak havoc on our infrastructure and the services that provide quality of life to our neighbors would have a huge impact. But we haven't been given another good option in terms of how to balance our budget, as the mayor's proposed budget depends on these fee increases. To balance the budget, I look forward to presenting new revenue driving legislation that adds value to our constituents, not just extraction of resources. So I know that we'll never cut our fee the way that many do as a business, or to see what's sustainable. But for me, making sure that I speak up on how it is very difficult with all of these fee increases for the constituents in district one, I invited some middle school students here from from reap and our district. They came to my first town hall meeting, and I told them that I would invite them to the budget meeting and they didn't believe me. And so they are here today. So I appreciate these are the folks that I am fighting for. So can all the reap students raise your hands? Thank you so much. Thank you for attending. And this is what civic engagement looks like. Thank you very much, madam president.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor. Councilor green.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I I'm drinking my water. I've had my break. And now I remember how to answer your question. The pcf aspect of this, when we talked about this in the finance committee, there was some discussion in my, my

takeaway from that was that I supported them using the \$400,000 to sort of offset the loss of application fees, compliance fees. I think it shows an attempt to sort of recognize that there is a balance between the regulatory barriers in terms of cost for compliance, and that pcef funds would be a good use of that, because you do want people to comply with this program. So that was the nature of that discussion. That's why I supported the fee package. In terms of that, there was amendments that were not related to the pcf aspects, but I just wanted to share that back.

Speaker: Councilor and councilors, I'm going to pause for a minute because I was remiss in not giving our students a warmer welcome. After councilor smith introduced them, I had written down to do a welcome at the beginning of our budget committee meeting. But you're here now, so thank you all for being here. This is some interesting work that we're taking on today, and it's great to have you here to see it. I hope you'll be able to stay as we get into the budget work, so that you can see the process as we hear from community members, about some of the most important decisions. We'll make us glad that you joined us at city hall. I know we sometimes hear about the distance between east Portland and city hall, and everyone here is committed to doing more to come to you and make sure we hear from you in your community. And we are so happy to have you here with us in city hall today. So thank you for joining us. Councilors. Councilor smith, are you back in the queue or is that previous hand okay? Seeing no other discussion, Keelan could you please call the roll on agenda item nine canal.

Speaker: I Ryan.

Speaker: Yeah, I really appreciate the fee burden and the less permitting on Portlanders due to the continued reforms here and the use of pcef dollars to help with these. One of our greatest climate assets trees. I'm a big proponent of simplifying the code and making it easier for the public to engage with the city, and

I do think these changes proposed by the finance committee are a step towards achieving this. I'm grateful for the work. Same time, I had a little bit of challenge with anything over 2% that will come up later, but on this one I vote i.

Speaker: Koyama lane. I morillo i. Novick a. Mark, i.

Speaker: Green. I zimmerman.

Speaker: Thank you to the finance colleagues for adopting my amendment and sending this forward. The era of having to pay your government to prove you did nothing wrong is over when this passes. Thank you i.

Speaker: Avalos i. Dunphy. I smith i. Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: With 12 I votes. The ordinance is passed.

Speaker: Thank you Keelan. Could you please read agenda item ten?

Speaker: Adopt rates and charges for water and water related services for fiscal year beginning July 1st, 2025 and ending June 30th, 2026.

Speaker: Councilors. This is one of a series of water, sewer and sewer and storm water fees that we did have an opportunity to have some more significant discussion on at our last meeting. It is here before us on second reading, and I don't believe any of our conversations later today will affect it. So I will be looking for us to pass this agenda item after our discussion. Counselor zimmerman. Same courtesy. If you'd like to say anything introductory on this agenda item. Otherwise we can move to discussion. Councilors, any further discussion before we move to a vote? Keelan, could you please call the.

Speaker: Roll.

Speaker: And i'll.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: I Ryan.

Speaker: Yeah, i'll be voting no on many of these. Anything that went over 2%. So I vote. I think there's just too much burden right now on working class people in Portland. I vote no.

Speaker: Koyama lane i. Morillo i. Novick i.

Speaker: Clark. I green, I zimmerman. I avalos. I dunphy. I smith. I pirtle-guiney. I the ordinance is passed with 11 yes votes and one no.

Speaker: Thank you Keelan. Could you please read agenda item 11?

Speaker: Revised sewer and stormwater charges and fees for fy 2025 through 26 counselors.

Speaker: Again, this series of agenda items, which we were able to discuss previously and I don't believe this will be affected by any of our discussion later today. Is there any discussion? I'm going to put myself in the queue. I think we have seen some articles, probably heard from some people about increasing costs. I know I've heard about increasing costs specifically around sewer, stormwater and water rates, and what I also saw in the finance committee is that when we don't increase, at least with the increase in the costs to perform the work, when we don't increase the fees to keep up, what we see is dramatic increases a few years later to make up for that or decrease in service that leads to failure down the line. And while I share concerns about the increase in costs on our constituents, I don't want to see those dramatic increases down the line, which is why i'll be supporting this entire package. Councilor green.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. Echo. But then I also want to flag that I think we do need to get our rate trajectory under control. And I think that's through cost management. I think that's through asset management. But we don't sacrifice public works to get there. I've introduced a budget note that I hope we can vote on today that calls for a rate design review, and I'm really looking forward to that. I

think I've got the partnership of the public works service area leadership on that. So thanks.

Speaker: Councilor. Seeing no one else in the queue, I'll move us to a vote. Keelan could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Can I.

Speaker: Just clarify? This is agenda item 11, right?

Speaker: Yes it is.

Speaker: I'll make sure for the folks following along, I.

Speaker: Ryan again listening to my fixed income neighbors, I vote no.

Speaker: Koyama I vote I.

Speaker: Morillo.

Speaker: I think just given that everything that the council president laid out and that when we don't increase these fees right now, it's going to impact future and younger generations and our lack of infrastructure desperately needs this. I think we have to approve it now, but I look forward to voting in favor of councilor greens amendment to revise some of our sewer rates and make sure that we find alternative ways to support our budget.

Speaker: I novick. I mark.

Speaker: I just want to remind everyone that we do have a great affordability program in the utilities, and I vote I.

Speaker: Green.

Speaker: Zimmerman. I.

Speaker: Avalos. I dunphy. I smith. I pirtle-guiney. I the ordinance is passed with 11 yes votes and one no vote.

Speaker: Thank you. Keelan could you please read agenda item 12.

Speaker: Revised sewer and stormwater rates for fy 2025 through 26.

Speaker: Councilors, I am looking for discussion in the queue. This is another that we have discussed in the past. Seeing none Keelan could you please call the roll.

Speaker: And i'll. I know. Koyama lane I morillo i.

Speaker: Novick I apologize. What are we voting on now?

Speaker: This is agenda item 12, which is the third in a series of four water, sewer and stormwater.

Speaker: I thought i.

Speaker: Clark.

Speaker: I,

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Zimmerman, i. Avalos i. Dunphy i.

Speaker: Smith i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney. I the ordinance is passed with 11 yes votes and one no vote.

Speaker: Thank you. Keelan. Could you please read agenda item 13.

Speaker: Adopt fees and charges for water system development and water related services during the fiscal year beginning July 1st, 2025 and ending June 30th, 2026.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilors. This is, I believe, the last of our water and sewer related agenda items. Seeing no one in the queue for discussion. Keelan could you please call the roll.

Speaker: Canal yeah.

Speaker: I voted I on all these. I'll vote I on this in a moment. I just wanted to know. I also support the budget note to look at this. And just for everyone paying attention here, we're in a situation where we're reactive to context. That was set before we got here. I know that not only the council, but also the dca in public

works and that entire team are focused on ensuring that we're looking at the rate, the rate of rate increases and fee increases as well. And I'm excited to get to that. Unfortunately, we just couldn't have that have a better result for today's budget. So I vote aye.

Speaker: Ryan. No. Koyama lane i. Morillo i. Novick i. Clark I green.

Speaker: I zimmerman. I avalos. I dunphy. I smith. I pirtle-guiney. I the ordinance is passed with 11 yes votes and one no vote.

Speaker: Thank you. Keelan. Could you please read agenda item 14.

Speaker: Revise transportation fees, rates and charges for fy 2025 through 26 and amend transportation fee schedule and fix an effective date.

Speaker: Colleagues.

Speaker: We did begin discussion on this agenda item at our previous meeting, and this is an agenda item that I think we should leave open, just in case our conversations later today affect it. But if there is discussion broadly on what is before us right now, I'd like to have that discussion now so that when we return to this later, it's either to amend or to pass without amendment. And we've had the underlying discussion already. Councilor novick.

Speaker: I withdrawing councilor.

Speaker: Yes, this is I want to flag something. It's kind of a question, but. The mayor's proposed budget assumes that we pass an amendment to this schedule. Right. This is the this includes the tnc fees.

Speaker: This does include the tnc fees. And to be perfectly honest, most of his fees were captured. But there was one that was not. And I had this conversation two weeks ago, so I'm now trying to scramble to find the information to remember if this was the one that was not. So let me check that really quickly. Did you have a second question?

Speaker: Well, my second question is a little more philosophical, which is if you propose a budget that doesn't have the resources of adopted and that you don't vote on that budget to change those resources before the budget's been approved, proposed. Have you proposed a balanced budget?

Speaker: That's a very fair question, and it's one that I have also asked councilor.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilors. Is there any other discussion in the queue? No. Okay. I am going to have us hold over a vote on this agenda item. We're going to keep that open and move on to agenda item 15. Keelan. Could you please read agenda item 15.

Speaker: Amend Portland permitting and development fee schedules to improve cost recovery and service levels for customers.

Speaker: Thank you. And councilors. This is one that we did not get to have significant discussion on previously. We just touched on. I believe that we can pass it before we do our budget work. Is there any discussion on agenda item 15? Counselor green, are you in the queue for this legacy? Okay. Counselor green.

Speaker: Thank you. I just want to note I'm going to vote on this today. But we absolutely have to find a different revenue model for permitting. We cannot have a revenue model that is pro cyclical where, you know, when you have a downturn, you lose your ability to fund your permitting development. You want to be countercyclical, I think in some degree. So let's let's fix that.

Speaker: Counselor zimmerman.

Speaker: Counselor on the previous.

Speaker: Okay. Councilor kanal.

Speaker: This is the document that has the short term rentals in it, correct? I believe that's in here, the short term rental fees. Just making sure I didn't.

Speaker: Believe it is. Yes. Would you like us to keep this open?

Speaker: I don't know that there's anything specific that that has been proposed for, for this, this cycle yet that I'm, I'm not aware of one, but I do think that it's worth looking into on those because we've seen in other cities the implications of making policy changes in terms of putting more of the units that already exist back into the market for long term rental and outside of short term rentals. And I'm interested in pursuing that here, because often we've talked about we have a building problem and we do, but we also have a distribution problem. And this is the same conversation that other conversations we're having around long term vacancy rates, for example, long term vacancy fees sorry is designed to address. But the short term rental usage is also conversation as well. So I just wanted to flag that if there's something that that is being proposed this year, that I'm happy to keep it open, but I'm not requesting that at the moment.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Councilors, anybody else with discussion or any requests to keep this open before we move to a vote? And councilor kanal, I hear you on having further discussions on this as we move forward. I absolutely think that that's in order. But if it's not part of what we may do today, then I think we should take the vote here.

Speaker: Can I ask one more question?

Speaker: No one else is in the queue. Go right ahead.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: I did also want to ask a question around the noise variance fees and if the conversation there was just the same as all the others of the blanket increase, or if there was something more to it in the finance committee, or I guess.

Speaker: I'm looking to our chair, I don't remember.

Speaker: I don't.

Speaker: Remember any specific discussion on that point, councilor.

Speaker: Okay. Well, I will.

Speaker: Leave.

Speaker: That there then.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Okay, counselor, seeing no requests to keep this open and no other discussion, Keelan, could you please call the roll on agenda item 15?

Speaker: I brian, i. Koyama lane i. Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick i.

Speaker: Clark. I green.

Speaker: I. Zimmerman i. Avalos i. Dunphy i. Smith i. Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: The ordinance is passed with 12 yes votes okay.

Speaker: Counselors, I believe that takes us to the end of our council agenda. With one item left open. We are going to recess our council meeting. And. Open a meeting on open a meeting as the budget committee of the Portland City Council and counselors. I know we just took a brief recess, but I know that some folks have materials they need to switch out and may need a break for other reasons. So I am going to have us take a ten minute recess when we come back from that recess, just to give a brief run of show before we leave. So pause please. For folks who are here with us in the audience when we come back from that recess, we will do a few housekeeping items that we need to do. There are some specific things that I need to read into the agenda. We'll then take public testimony. And I want to say this now so people have time to prepare. We are going to be very tight on time. We have 7.5 hours of public testimony signed up. Right now, we do not have 7.5 hours for public testimony. If you would also like us to be able to debate some of the amendments that are before us. There are over 120 amendments before us. So I

am going to be asking folks to keep their testimony to 90s. I'm going to be asking that if you're here with a group, you choose 1 or 2 representatives from your group to deliver your message. I'm going to be asking that if you have submitted written testimony and spoken at our budget hearings throughout this process, that perhaps you leave your remarks to those things and make room for other people today. And I'm going to be asking that if other people who you didn't come with as a group have already said what you are planning to say, you perhaps hold back and leave room for others, or come up and say, I agree and nothing more than that, so that we can get through as many people as possible. We'll be cutting testimony at about two hours so that we have time for our debate. My hope is that through those methods, we can get through the bulk of people who are here today. So with that, let's take a ten minute break. Let's call it an 11 minute break. That would put us back here right at noon. And we will get started with our budget committee work. Thank you all for your patience with that quick break while we regroup some things. Let's see. So do we have ruth in the room yet? Oh, you are here. Perfect. You're up there. So we have called to order. We have convened our meeting of the Portland budget committee. I am going to turn it over to our budget director, director levine, for an overview of the hearing. And then we will move into a few other technical items before we get to public testimony. Director levine, go right ahead.

Speaker: Thank. Great. Thanks.

Speaker: For the record, my.

Speaker: Name is ruth levine.

Speaker: I'm the.

Speaker: Director of the city budget office.

Speaker: So this.

Speaker: Afternoon you'll be.

Speaker: Sitting as the city.

Speaker: Of Portland.

Speaker: Budget committee to. Hear and consider changes.

Speaker: To the proposed budget and the.

Speaker: Approved budget as.

Speaker: Filed.

Speaker: Which will then.

Speaker: Allow us to send the report to the tax supervising. Conservation commission tomorrow. And after that point. You'll be considering the.

Speaker: Actual adopted.

Speaker: Budget in June.

Speaker: So for.

Speaker: The hearing today.

Speaker: You will.

Speaker: Be doing.

Speaker: A few different things.

Speaker: The first.

Speaker: Piece is.

Speaker: You have to have a.

Speaker: Hearing on the uses.

Speaker: Of state shared revenue.

Speaker: This is a standard. Procedure and council president.

Speaker: Will talk you.

Speaker: Through that. After that.

Speaker: You'll close the hearing on state shared revenue. And you will move.

Speaker: Into public testimony.

Speaker: Once public.

Speaker: Testimony has completed. Sorry, you will first. Vote on the changes to the proposed. As filed, which. Are i'll describe once we get there.

Speaker: There are a couple.

Speaker: Of minor technical changes and then you will bring further amendments and. Discuss those after that. And the public testimony have concluded. And at the end of that.

Speaker: You will.

Speaker: Vote on those amendments, and then you will. Vote on. To and then you'll vote to approve the budget as amended. Finally, before we leave, you will vote to approve tax levies, and then you will adjourn the meeting as the budget committee.

Speaker: Thank you, ruth, and I'm realizing, Keelan, I believe we need to call roll separately for this meeting. Is that correct? Before we move any further, could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Ryan koyama lane here.

Speaker: Morillo here. Novick here.

Speaker: Clark. Here. Green. Here. Zimmerman. Here. Avalos. Dunphy.

Speaker: Smith here. Pirtle-guiney here.

Speaker: Thank you. So, as director levine went over, the first thing we do is open a hearing within this hearing to discuss state revenue sharing. So I am now opening a hearing to discuss possible uses of state revenue sharing in compliance with the provisions of state revenue sharing regulations, or s221770. This will allow Portlanders to comment on the possible use of these funds in conjunction with the annual budget process proposed as proposed for council adoption, the fiscal year

20 2526 budget anticipates receipts of 21 million from state revenue sharing, as has been standard in prior years. It's proposed that this revenue be allocated in equal parts to support fire prevention and police patrol services. Keelan is there anyone here who wishes to provide public testimony on this subject?

Speaker: We didn't have anyone sign up.

Speaker: Okay, so I believe I now close the hearing on possible uses of state revenue sharing. Director levine, do I hand it back to you now to describe the approved changes as filed?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Thank you. Okay.

Speaker: So there were there's one change in the document as filed that was to add in the sorry to the approved to the proposed in the approved as filed, which was to add an interfund loan between parks and the fire police disability retirement fund. This is a standard thing that we do each year. The amount is about \$50 million, and this is a standard thing that we do each year because of the timing of when property taxes come in, compared to the payouts that are made out of out of fpd. And so this is a technical thing that we need to include at this stage so that it doesn't trigger the 10% rule in the adopted. So that was entered into the approved as filed council president. There's also. Sorry just pulling it up small amendment that we need you to make.

Speaker: Okay sorry that's okay.

Speaker: To update attachment e.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: And is this the technical fix to the tiff budget correct.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Okay. So councilors, it looks like attachment e that is listed on our our clerk's online system needs a technical fix so that the tiff budgets are in alignment with what council has previously authorized regarding tax increment financing districts. This doesn't authorize any new revenue and aligns with what we previously authorized to the budget. And ruth, is that technical fix filed online so that folks can see it as well. Or can you describe it for us?

Speaker: It updates what's called the u r 50 urban renewal certification form. It's listed as attachment e. It just adds the new plan areas in part five of that attachment. But it looks exactly the same as the attachment that is filed. So we will send that to the clerk. But we need you to motion and second that and vote on that okay.

Speaker: Councilors, is there a motion and a second for this technical adjustment? I think folks are trying to find it. Okay. We have a motion from councilor novick, a second from councilor zimmerman. Any discussion?

Speaker: Councilor?

Speaker: I'm sorry.

Speaker: No. That's okay. I'm looking at my colleagues for the queue because my computer is having issues. Councilor green, are you in the queue for discussion here?

Speaker: Not on this item, but I am on the interfund loan.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Get there, counselor canal.

Speaker: I was also on the interfund loan, but while we're here, I just want to understand. What are we? Can you repeat, ruth, please? What? We're what this motion was to add to exhibit. It's just to.

Speaker: Sorry. It's just to swap out attachment e. It just is to correct part five of attachment e as filed to include the new tif districts. It just it was an error on our part to not include the new tif districts in attachment e, so we just need to swap those out. And because we didn't post it, we just need you to vote on it to do that.

Speaker: Okay. What's the dollar amounts. Because part five has cully tif district 2.575 million. The others have numbers associated with them to.

Speaker: Yes, I can read them out or we can send them to you. They're just they represent the tif districts as you all already approved them. It's just a sort of clerical fix.

Speaker: I think what I'm hearing is that an old document was uploaded that didn't have the numbers that this council has previously approved. Is that accurate, ruth?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Okay. I want to make sure folks know what they're being asked to vote on. Is there any councilor? Smith, are you in the queue on this agenda item?

Speaker: Yes. So can we just say what the number is and what it was changed to?

Speaker: Sure. I can read them out for you.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: The cully tif districts 2.2575000 275. Sorry. The 82nd avenue tif district is 975,000. The east side east 205 tif district tif district is 1,575,000. The sumner park rose tif district is 625,000. Lloyd holiday is 325,000. Central eastside corridor is 210,000 and west side tif district is 450,000.

Speaker: And that's the current. That's the real number or that's the wrong number.

Speaker: That is the corrected number.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: That is what we are voting to amend into or to replace this attachment with.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Okay. Councilors. We have a first and a second seeing no one else in the queue. Keelan could you please call the roll?

Speaker: I Ryan. I koyama lane.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Mario. I novick.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Clark, i. Green i.

Speaker: Zimmerman i.

Speaker: Avalos i. Dunphy i.

Speaker: Smith i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: Motion carries with 12 votes.

Speaker: Thank you. And it sounds like there were a few councilors with questions about the previous item on our list here. So I do want to return and make sure that we have an opportunity to answer those questions. Councilor kanal.

Speaker: So there was an interfund loan from parks to npdr, which is because npdr distributes funds prior to tax property tax collections. And I just wanted to get some clarity as to whether or not the creation of a separate fund, should it be capitalized at the same level at some point, would offset that, because I have a note to do that and the goal. So I'm just going to ask probably ruth, as we get to that point, to know how we make sure that we don't have to do this from parks in the future by ensuring that there's a fund for this specific use. That's it's canal 14 for reference.

Speaker: Jonas, would you like to introduce yourself and answer that question?

Speaker: Sure. Thank you. Director.

Speaker: Sir.

Speaker: I would suggest, councilor, that we probably need to have a more robust discussion. I mean, this is I don't I don't know that I have a lens yet on how we capitalize. That, I guess is how I would answer. So certainly appreciate the potential benefit to avoid this annual renewal. It's sort of a technical the genesis of this need is sort of a technical glitch in the charter language that allows that requires that the dollars that are collected in the levy so collected in November only be spent that calendar year, which means we have a gap in funding those benefits. Technically, from July 1st until that collection of the levy in November. This is just a bridge to sort of meet that at a low cost, essentially cost neutral mechanism, so open to entertaining other thoughts. But but that's what this amendment does.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor green. Did you have questions there as well? I apologize that we rushed through that with computers spazzing. I did not see the hands in the queue.

Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, madam president. I do have a brief question. So this I know we've used this before to fix the very technical cash flow thing. Jonas. Is this so? This is governed by finance policy 2-1822 2.18 interfund lending is this type of interfund loan in the same category that that city policy sort of governs? I'm just trying to understand if this is something that we can we do interfund loans in this budget amendment process.

Speaker: This would fit in that policy. We don't necessarily always do interfund loans within the budget process. We do some, as ruth indicated, because this is an annual need, not a one time event. It is something that's a little more accountable in the annual budget process. I would also just note for the record, in the past

we've not done this via interfund loan. We've done it via external market borrowing, which has additional costs and additional process. So this strategy both kind of keeps it in a cost neutral state to the city and produces some efficiencies from an authorization standpoint.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Thank you counselors. No one else in the queue I am going to move us through these technical pieces. Let's see. Okay. Actually, I think that moves us to public testimony.

Speaker: I have to vote.

Speaker: On the approved.

Speaker: We have another vote to.

Speaker: Make on the approved as filed.

Speaker: Plus the amendment you.

Speaker: Already voted on.

Speaker: Okay. So we are voting on the I'm sorry, ruth, can you describe to folks what the action is here that we're taking?

Speaker: You are you're going to seek a motion to consider changes to the proposed budget, as described in the memo titled approval of the budget for the city of Portland and those attachments. So that is the approved budget as filed. That sort of sets the baseline before you consider further amendments.

Speaker: Okay. So counselors, we are essentially accepting that this is what has been proposed to us, which then moves it into a space where we can amend it. Is that correct?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Okay. Counselor smith, are you in the queue for discussion on this?

Speaker: Yes. Just a quick question. How do we know we had the wrong numbers up?

Speaker: Are you moving back to the previous the attachment?

Speaker: E yes.

Speaker: I knew that because I was handed a script five minutes before walking in here that said that we needed to make this change.

Speaker: But I want to know from ruth, how did we know that we had the wrong numbers up? When did you discover that?

Speaker: This morning. Sorry. We just. It was just an error in what got uploaded.

Speaker: Okay, okay. Thank you.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Any discussion before we vote to accept the proposal before us as the document that we are working off of for any further amendments today? Okay. Seeing no other discussion, Keelan, could you please know.

Speaker: Did we have a motion and a.

Speaker: Second a motion? Okay, we need a motion in a second on this. I apologize.

Speaker: So moved second.

Speaker: Thank you. Both counselors Ryan and canal.

Speaker: So I have counselor Ryan moved and councilor kanal second.

Speaker: I believe so.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you.

Speaker: Canal i.

Speaker: Ryan. I koyama lane I morillo.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Novick i.

Speaker: Clark i. Green i. Zimmerman i. Avalos i. Dunphy i. Smith i. Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: The 12 I votes the motion carries.

Speaker: Okay I believe we now can move into public testimony. I'm seeing head nods fantastic. So counselors we are going to move into public testimony. And as I stated previously, we have enough people signed up that at two minutes each, if everybody spoke, it would take 7.5 hours. And while I know there are so many important things that we need to hear from Portlanders today as we go into this work, I don't think that we can spend 7.5 hours doing that. So I am going to have us take two hours of testimony. We may run a little bit over if we're in the middle of a panel, and in order to fit as many people as possible into those two hours, I'm asking folks to shrink your testimony to 90s. I'm asking that if you are here with a group, you pick 1 or 2 representatives to provide testimony on behalf of your group. Generally, we don't have folks stand in chambers, but as the people who are in your group are coming up to the panel, if you want to stand to let us know how many people they represent, and then please sit back down as they start speaking, or as the panel starts speaking, they may not be first on the panel. That's fine. The jazz hands and thumbs up are a good way to let us know you agree. If folks have spoken who have said what you need to say, and you have already shared your voice on those same topics through written testimony or through our budget listening sessions, if you could make space for others to speak today, we would appreciate it. So that in totality, through all of the opportunities we have had to hear from the public, we can hear from as many, as many people, as many distinct voices as possible. I know I would appreciate it. I'm sure my colleagues would as well. So with that introduction, Keelan, if you could call folks up 3 to 5 at a time so we can move as quickly as possible, that would be fantastic.

Speaker: Great. Thank you. Our first five testifiers are sarah fisher, brian ohlendorf, jill slade, nathaniel hudson hartman, and travis johnson. Repeaters.

Speaker: All good.

Speaker: Go ahead.

Speaker: Good afternoon.

Speaker: City Councilors.

Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Speaker: I'm the reverend sarah fisher.

Speaker: I'm an.

Speaker: Episcopal priest.

Speaker: And.

Speaker: I pastor a street. Church in district three called hope and bread.

Speaker: Made up of mostly.

Speaker: Unhoused people. I'm here for them and for their friends. I am a voice crying in the wilderness, asking you to amend this budget to move dollars from overnight shelters to alternative shelters like pods and villages, to continue to fund a congregate shelter system with a known minimal success rate and no place in a street to housing continuum suggests that we care more about cleaning up the streets than about the people who are suffering on those streets. Congregate shelters are not only ineffective but harmful, especially to our most vulnerable unsheltered citizens. Bipoc women, lgbtq individuals, and immigrants. People who live unsheltered are not a monolithic them. They are individuals with universal needs for privacy, safety, dignity and hope. Congregate shelters provide none of these. There are proven, evidence based pathways to housing success. None of these pathways emphasize overnight shelters the way our current budget does. If you want to invest in our city, please invest in solutions to homelessness that

actually work. We have all heard that budgets are moral documents. Please do the right thing. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you counselors for your time. Brian Orndorf district four Portlanders have made their priorities clear. They want more effective policing, enhanced public safety, and a meaningful reduction in violent and property crime, according to an April 2025 polling by dhm research, 69% of voters support a ballot measure to require the city of Portland to maintain police force no smaller than national average. For a large U.S. City, that would literally mean doubling the size of our police force today. Despite this, some on council are proposing to slash critical public safety funding by redirecting portions of the police and fire bureau overtime budgets into discretionary council controlled fund. This is reckless. It ignores the urgent reality that both departments are critically understaffed and rely heavily on overtime to maintain basic emergency services. Portlanders voted to remove councilors from direct oversight of bureaus. This proposal runs contrary to that decision. Rather than addressing the root problem. Chronic understaffing this proposal would further weaken our already overstretched public safety services. The solution is straightforward fully support both bureaus with well-trained professionals so that they can serve our community without overreliance on costly and unsustainable overtime. I urge you to adopt a back to basics economic development. We need to retain and attract businesses. Portland not creating is Portland's not creating enough living wage jobs to afford a cost of living, largely due to inefficient policies. The funding \$11 million from prosper Portland, as proposed by the democratic socialist council members seeking to dismantle capitalism, is a grave mistake. It reflects a lack of real world private sector experience and a misunderstanding of how our constitutional republic operates. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Go ahead. Joe.

Speaker: Oh. Okay.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: First of all, I'd like to level set. Councilor Smith was correct.

Speaker: Last week.

Speaker: When she was speaking. With our city manager.

Speaker: I'm sorry. Can you introduce yourself?

Speaker: I'm so sorry.

Speaker: We would have \$100 million available if the county would do its job. And to do public health and safety, which in my estimation.

Speaker: Also includes Portland.

Speaker: Street response.

Speaker: Why the city is funding Portland street response. I understand.

Speaker: There was an urgent need and we met it. Now it's time for the county to take over and do what they are supposed to do, so that you all can do what you're supposed to do, which is public safety in this city. Instead of drawing 12 individual lines in the sand, please use your power as a collective to demand action from the county to do their job so that you can do your job. This budget is a missed opportunity, plain and simple. It fails to meet the moment with the urgency and clarity our city so desperately needs. Spend five minutes in almost any other functioning city and you'll understand what Portland is missing. People return to cities when they feel safe. Businesses invest, families linger, workers commute, and tourists spend. When there is a baseline sense of safety and order in Portland, that trust has been eroded. And it's not perception alone. It's lived reality. Businesses aren't imagining the loss. They're packing up. Entire buildings downtown are going dark. Let me remind you, councilors, 94% of all establishments in Multnomah

County are small businesses. These aren't faceless corporations. These are our neighbors, our friends, our family. Yet some of you persist in treating local business owners as if they're exxonmobil or enron, as if they're part of some extractive machine instead of the backbone of our economy and the employers of our friends and neighbors. It's tired, antagonistic rhetoric, and it's harmful. Please stop pitting us against each other and focus and work together to get the job done that you were elected to do. Thank you.

Speaker: Nathaniel.

Speaker: I'd like.

Speaker: To start.

Speaker: Out by wishing a happy heavenly birthday to my sister, heather. I love you and miss you. Salon and greetings, president pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: Vice president.

Speaker: Koyama lane the rest of the band. I'm nathaniel hudson hartmann, proud.

Speaker: Eight year.

Speaker: Rideshare driver and advocate with driver's union Oregon, the.

Speaker: Voice for fairness.

Speaker: For thousands of essential mobility providers in the rose city. Mayor wilson also.

Speaker: Chao.

Speaker: You've seen us in pbot's driver's advisory committee. And last summer, when over.

Speaker: 100 of.

Speaker: Us encircled this very building, honking their horns, protesting the injustices of uber and lyft against us, our merry band of rideshare drivers, largely

low income and of black and brown and immigrant communities, provide essential mobility services to.

Speaker: People who live.

Speaker: Work and play here. And we're fighting.

Speaker: For.

Speaker: Fairness and equity for the same rights that all workers deserve fair pay, protections, benefits, and a voice in the decision making processes. And we have serious concerns about the negative impacts. The proposed increase of the per trip tnc fee will have on our driver community. Unless the city of Portland also considers ways that support the struggling drivers whom without there is no rideshare economy. We understand the city has roads to figure out and not just west burnside. However, the essential. Worker shuttling folks around town safely. We've got holes to fill to. We've reached.

Speaker: Out.

Speaker: To all of you and you to mayor wilson, and we're eager to collaborate, discuss, and support solutions that ensure rideshare drivers not only have a seat behind the wheel, but at the table as well. Let's go to work. Gracias por la oportunidad. Buenos tardes. Councilors. Mayor wilson.

Speaker: Thank you. Hello.

Speaker: My name.

Speaker: Is travis johnson.

Speaker: I'm in district two, north Portland. I'm a father of three young children. I'm here to urge you to vote no on amendment 45. Amendment 45 would close funding for the community music center. My seven year old son, daniel, has been attending community music center.

Speaker: For the.

Speaker: Past two and a half years. He just performed in his fifth concert just two weeks ago, and what he's gained there goes far beyond music. He's grown in focus and confidence and.

Speaker: Joy, and.

Speaker: It's become a place where he really feels. Proud of himself. This is my four year old son, nicholas. He can't wait to start next fall when he turns five, and we've already been practicing at home for his orientation and fall for my family. The community music. Center is our only path to music education. We can't afford private lessons, probably. No. It's very expensive to get private lessons. And so closing these centers, closing community music center would mean closing the door to music not just for my children, but for countless working families in Portland like mine, who have nowhere else to turn for affordable music education. So please vote no on amendment 45. Please keep the community music center open, and let's keep music alive in Portland. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

Speaker: Next up we have vadim mazursky, todd littlefield, tiana tozer, robert lane, lance goldenberg. Go ahead. Vadim.

Speaker: Thank you very much. City Councilors mayor.

Speaker: Appreciate it.

Speaker: Very much.

Speaker: I'm here.

Speaker: Speaking on my own behalf. But as you all know, I'm part of.

Speaker: A neighborhood. Association and have been a long time.

Speaker: Many of.

Speaker: You all have been in.

Speaker: Front of neighborhood associations.

Speaker: Councilor zimmerman is. Actually supporting them in some of these amendments. What we.

Speaker: Do is talk.

Speaker: To.

Speaker: People and we sometimes speak with the police. Those sessions.

Speaker: Are.

Speaker: Some.

Speaker: Of the.

Speaker: Best attended.

Speaker: Sessions we have.

Speaker: They're both.

Speaker: Q&a sessions and.

Speaker: Unfortunately now have become.

Speaker: Counseling sessions because so many people.

Speaker: Come in and talk about how they've been victimized.

Speaker: How their apartments.

Speaker: Have been broken.

Speaker: Into.

Speaker: Their cars have been.

Speaker: Broken into condos.

Speaker: Houses.

Speaker: And what they can do and.

Speaker: Ask.

Speaker: What can the police.

Speaker: Do for us?

Speaker: And the answer.

Speaker: We get.

Speaker: Is we're trying, but there's not enough police.

Speaker: Out there.

Speaker: So I'm here to. Support the mayor's budget when it comes to fully funding the police, so we can hire the amount of people that we need to support Portlanders and the victims that are here. As you all know, the police are understaffed. We have 1.2 police per 1000, which is half.

Speaker: The.

Speaker: National average. And it's odd that after the police budget has been cut in recent years, once again, we're talking about defunding. And so mayor wilson is upholding the promise that was made over the prior City Council, prior mayor, to fully fund the police. I learned today that two businesses are closing because of security concerns, dutch brothers on west burnside, as well as next level burger, Seattle next level burger is doing great. Austin next level burger is doing great. 1.9 police per 1000. Seattle and austin 1.2. Here the quote from next level burger is we made a difficult decision to close our west burnside location due to ongoing security concerns in the surrounding area. Let's stop the doom loop here.

Speaker: Let's go forward and not backward.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

Speaker: Todd, please.

Speaker: First.

Speaker: I want to thank all the councilors who have.

Speaker: Spent time.

Speaker: In the mayor, in the community the last several months engaging with and listening to the people. One councilor has repeatedly asked for a study to ask the people and businesses who have left Portland, why did you leave? This is the

paramount question and must be a front of mind for each of you. Public safety, livability, quality of life. Drugs. Crime, homelessness. Taxes, fees. Regulations, the anti-business environment. Your sole focus must be to fix these issues. Do this and the economic doom loop in Portland will end the barrier head. Pretend it doesn't exist. The more difficult will be to stop government's core responsibility. Your core responsibility is public safety. This most important basic service is not being met by any measure. We've seen hundreds of businesses and move or close hundreds more on the brink of closing. If and when interest rates fall below 4%, you will wish we had the current budget shortfall we have now. The exits will be in mass. Does the city of Portland the highest, the second highest tax residence in the nation, have revenue problem or a spending problem? I know you have a long day ahead. Please put your personal biases aside. We need pragmatic, moderate, common sense nonpartisan solutions to solve and answer this question. Why are people in business left Portland? Thank you.

Speaker: For your eight seconds. Tiana tiana tozer, district. Two councilors, mayor.

Speaker: The mayor and.

Speaker: His staff have put.

Speaker: Forth a budget that. Addresses public safety funds, police.

Speaker: And Portland street response and will move Portland forward. It is pragmatic and rational and I urge you to. Adopt it. The mayor's. Budget represents.

Speaker: All Portlanders.

Speaker: Not just.

Speaker: The loudest voices. The amendments offered to cut public safety are neither pragmatic nor rational, particularly if we want. Portland to recover. Councilor morillo.

Speaker: Falsely stated that multiple.

Speaker: Surveys showed that if they had to choose, Portlanders would cut police to save parks first.

Speaker: There were only two professional surveys.

Speaker: The survey, commissioned.

Speaker: By. Councilors novick and.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney, clearly indicates that Portlanders value both police and parks. However, when forced to choose, the majority of Portlanders surveyed do not want police funding cut 34%. The second survey found that. 69% of Portlanders support maintaining a police force equal to average large cities, which would mean doubling the police force. Most notably, districts one and four, particularly one, bear the brunt of traffic and. Gun violence, and they are the districts that pulled the most strongly for not cutting police. Almost all gun violence is in east and north Portland. 41% of shootings happen near or east of 82nd avenue. 47% of traffic deaths occur in district one, and east Portland bears the brunt of traffic violence. These are also the most diverse and low income neighborhoods. The most important things to fund are the police and Portland street response. You asked the question. Portlanders answered don't cut police. You said this new form of government was about listening to us and Portlanders have spoken. No cuts to the police budget.

Speaker: Robert.

Speaker: For the record, my name is doctor robert lane. I'm employed as the senior communications strategist for humanitarian operations within Portland solutions.

Speaker: And in my.

Speaker: Position, I'm essentially the city's point person for communication. On its response to homelessness. I work closely with multiple offices, including the

county's homeless services department, the mayor's office, and with many of your staff members to craft messaging, strategy, communication assets, as well as engage in media monitoring and response. And I'm speaking today in my capacity as a cp member and an interested party in your passage of this budget. Of the 27.

Speaker: Fte in.

Speaker: Portland solutions, 21 of us are cp members that do the city's work in coordinating shelter, managing camp removals, conducting outreach and solving problems that our city faces all. Tasks and services that are of substantial importance to this budget, and many of which have been lauded by this very council.

Speaker: If the.

Speaker: City were to force cp to strike essential services, such as setting up and coordinating the mayor's overnight shelters, responding to unsanctioned camping, as well as engaging in outreach to our city's most vulnerable, would be immediately and drastically impacted due to the time sensitive nature of our work. I urge you to create a budget note directing our mayor to provide financial authorization to the city labor relations team to settle cp contract, as our union has been negotiating and bargaining with the city for more than 400 days, it seems that only with your direction that the city labor relations team can get our contract settled without catastrophic impacts to the policies, budget and programs that you are looking to pass.

Speaker: Joining online. Lance, go ahead and unmute.

Speaker: Okay. Can you hear me?

Speaker: I can hear you.

Speaker: Great. Okay. Good morning. My name is lance goldenberg. I live in southeast Portland, and I stand with the overwhelming majority of community

members, which is to say, those of us who support increased public safety funding. As others have mentioned here, Portland currently has just 1.2 officers per 1000 residents. That's half the national average of 2.4 officers. As I hope everyone in this room is now aware, recent research poll found that an overwhelming majority of Portlanders, which nearly 70%, according to that poll, support a ballot measure to increase public staffing to match the national average of other large u.s. Cities. It's a little mind boggling to me that this isn't a no brainer simple cause and effect, and it breaks my heart to see our city repeating variations of the same mistakes over and over again. I hope that the council will do the right thing. We may not have many more chances. Thank you for your time.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Next up we have maya spencer, benjamin gilbert, james donnelly, isaac mcclymont, and eric dewey.

Speaker: And while.

Speaker: Folks come up, I was remiss to not point earlier to the attachments with our amendments that have been pre filed online. So for folks who are testifying, we've already heard some people do this, but please know that we are happy to hear not just about the underlying proposal from the mayor, but also any of the attached any of the amendments in attachments i, j and k that councilors have pre filed as well.

Speaker: Great. Thank you. For the record my.

Speaker: Name is maya spencer.

Speaker: I'm a 20 year city employee, a district two resident and a member of the. Cp union. As mentioned we don't have a contract yet. I'm speaking today on my own behalf. I support the amendments that were filed that reflect the value of cp staff and the services we provide, specifically under administration. Morillo nine

restores two cbo analyst positions under community engagement and equity canal one restoring equity and human rights positions. Koyama lane one and dunphy three. Restoring lgbtq staff position and novick five restoring two ada positions. These are critical to our community also economic development. Dunphy seven. Restoring a nurse's office coordinator one. And under public safety. Novick three. Restoring pbem funding. Additionally, I also recommend combining three different budget notes about the city administrator's proposed enterprise efficiencies 20% cuts. Those are under an administration. Morillo ten, pirtle-guiney six and under community engagement and equity. Avalos nine. These notes demand a clear strategy, oversight and transparency in these key workforce decisions. You can only have two of the three good, fast or cheap. So let's choose good. Finally, I leave you with the cp union haiku for your enjoyment today. If we have to strike, the city doesn't work well without us. A pause. Thank you for your time and thank you for this hard job and serving our community. Thank you.

Speaker: Benjamin.

Speaker: My name is ben gilbert and I'm a tenant in district four and a member of the Portland democratic socialists of America who brought out, I think, about 20 people to testify today. I just want to say it's a challenge for working class Portlanders to take time off work to come testify.

Speaker: And it's. Disappointing that we weren't properly.

Speaker: Informed prior about the limit to testimony. And this is why we need participatory budgeting in the future. I think it's really important that we protect.

Speaker: Parks, maintenance and.

Speaker: Programs beyond summertime. Protect and expand Portland street response, protect the Portland clean Portland clean energy fund climate

investments plan from cuts. Or amendments, increase resources for renter protections, activate public spaces downtown, and increase the city's capability for.

Speaker: Zoning and.

Speaker: Code changes to expand housing production. I also support the amendment to raise fees for public golf courses, raise fees for lyft and uber, and shift how the city funds prosper. Portland. Thank you.

Speaker: James.

Speaker: Oh.

Speaker: I'm james donnelly.

Speaker: I live in east Portland, the hazelwood district.

Speaker: I'm here just.

Speaker: For myself.

Speaker: To say.

Speaker: Support the mayor's budget, keeping the.

Speaker: Public safety.

Speaker: Portion at least stable, though I wish it actually were increased.

Speaker: But if the choice.

Speaker: Comes between. Parks and police, I would think the cuts. Need to fall in the parks. There's little benefit to having. Parks if parents and their children don't feel. Safe there. As far as redirecting funds from the.

Speaker: Public safety budget to, say, public housing, I don't. I'm not for that either. There's little benefit to that. If there's no jobs. Because of business closures from vandalism. Theft or just people staying away. I've noticed that when I'm well, actually, i'll just leave it there. Thank you very much.

Speaker: Isaac.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Good afternoon. My name is isaac mcclymont. I roseway neighborhood resident in district.

Speaker: Three, firefighter district one. I represent.

Speaker: Portland firefighters association.

Speaker: There's 765.

Speaker: Members.

Speaker: Many of.

Speaker: Whom are working.

Speaker: Here today and protecting us as we do our job here. And you all, I want to rise to support.

Speaker: Mayor wilson's budget.

Speaker: It's a it was.

Speaker: An excellent.

Speaker: Budget, I think tackled the big problem.

Speaker: And as firefighters, we definitely need.

Speaker: The support of council and the mayor in order to do our jobs effectively and safely. And I understand.

Speaker: You know.

Speaker: I read through all. The amendments last night and this morning, and I really appreciate all.

Speaker: The work and dedication.

Speaker: You all. Do to the preservation. Of our community.

Speaker: There were, you know, one. Particular troubling amendment from commissioner.

Speaker: Avalos regarding.

Speaker: Overtime, and I'm concerned.

Speaker: About that ability. To restrict. Overtime specifically.

Speaker: So our ability to.

Speaker: Staff fire stations effectively.

Speaker: And having council.

Speaker: Control over that.

Speaker: Rather than the fire chief is deeply troubling to me, and especially when we.

Speaker: Just want to do our jobs.

Speaker: That's all we want to do. So with that.

Speaker: The last thing I would add.

Speaker: Before I go back is I do understand.

Speaker: You know, the.

Speaker: Need to pass these amendments.

Speaker: And I read.

Speaker: Through council president's amendment package.

Speaker: And that looks.

Speaker: Like a reasonable compromise to the 126 other amendments that were posted. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you to everyone who was up here for your testimony,

Speaker: Eric, do. Next we have karen sumter, john alston jr, jessie bontekoe, rachel. Muni, jessie. Karen is joining us online. Go ahead. Karen.

Speaker: Hi.

Speaker: My name is.

Speaker: Karen sumter. I am a Portland resident in near rocky butte. I'm would just I'm just here to speak against councilman novick's amendment to close down the

Multnomah arts center. I have been going to that center ever since I came to Portland eight years ago, and I am aware of what a tremendous benefit it is to the community, especially to a lot of the underserved part of the community. It's a wonderful resource, and I very much hope you can find some way to keep it open. There are arts are as important as other actors in this city, and it is, as I said, a wonderful resource for the community. It's a I can't say enough about how much it has meant to me in my life, and I hope you will consider keeping it. That's it. Thank you.

Speaker: Go ahead. Excuse me. Go ahead.

Speaker: Hi, my name.

Speaker: Is Rachel.

Speaker: And I'm.

Speaker: Here also.

Speaker: To speak on the closure of the Multnomah.

Speaker: Art center and the. Community music center.

Speaker: My children have participated.

Speaker: In both and I participate.

Speaker: I was.

Speaker: Not able to find any arts.

Speaker: Programing.

Speaker: Especially in the ceramics field that was under. 350 to.

Speaker: \$500.

Speaker: A class. I looked for ten years, and this has been an opportunity.

Speaker: For.

Speaker: Us to be engaged in a community. We're in.

Speaker: An incredibly diverse.

Speaker: Body of people. We have access to elders, and those elders. Also depend on these. This center, there's a senior center there. I don't know if there are plans for something that would replace it, but I know that they rely on community and senior services that they get there, as well as all of those.

Speaker: Of.

Speaker: Us who rely on the arts programing. The loss of this would be huge to the community in terms of, I believe, community health equity for.

Speaker: Those.

Speaker: Of us who can't access other things, and also despair, which causes a litany of other health and social problems that would come. I don't think it will equal out. There is no private sector, nothing that can contribute as much. Programing that's already here and sustainable. And the taxpayers have voted here and spoken that this arts programing and access to it and equitability is important for our city and important to all of us. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

Speaker: All right. Double checking john alston jr. Jessie bontekoe. Next, we'll move on to james o'laughlin. Dana grigsby, time jessica green.

Speaker: All right.

Speaker: Thank you. Council.

Speaker: My name is james o'laughlin. I'm a city.

Speaker: Worker and laborers representative. I'm here to encourage council to pass councilor novick cbo corporate tax and restore funding for parks maintenance and recreation programing. I also recommend the council restores funding for pbot's.

Speaker: Essential sewer.

Speaker: Maintenance.

Speaker: For just \$800,000.

Speaker: We could retain the sewer. Specialists who prevent raw sewage from overflowing into our streets and homes. That money could easily be pulled from environmental services. \$312 million.

Speaker: Contingency fund.

Speaker: Finally, I want.

Speaker: To talk about an.

Speaker: Amendment that.

Speaker: Proposes cuts to urban forestry.

Speaker: Those cuts would undermine the.

Speaker: City's values as established.

Speaker: In the clean energy fund. We won't save.

Speaker: The environment. By firing the lorax. I'm happy to speak with council and staff in. Detail about these topics whenever you're available. Thank you.

Speaker: Go ahead.

Speaker: I'm dana grigsby. I live in district four.

Speaker: I want.

Speaker: To also rise to oppose amendment 45. Which would close.

Speaker: The Multnomah.

Speaker: Arts center and the community.

Speaker: Music center.

Speaker: My family has.

Speaker: Found so much value there. My son went to preschool there. My older child took their first ceramics.

Speaker: Class there.

Speaker: And.

Speaker: Now has a.

Speaker: Partial scholarship.

Speaker: For university.

Speaker: Because of that art background that was nurtured, I myself. Do drawing and ceramics now as well. There is no other resource in Portland that. Can meet the. Needs of.

Speaker: The community that has.

Speaker: Built up around the mac.

Speaker: It is.

Speaker: So intergenerational and.

Speaker: So intersectional in so many ways. The elders who.

Speaker: I make.

Speaker: Ceramics with share.

Speaker: On a daily basis. The community.

Speaker: Is so.

Speaker: Strong. And for that to be just disposed.

Speaker: Of with what felt.

Speaker: Like so little notice. Only a few of us.

Speaker: Were able to come.

Speaker: Today to.

Speaker: Testify.

Speaker: Because this news.

Speaker: Only actually.

Speaker: Got out on.

Speaker: Friday, so I suspect.

Speaker: There's a lot of written testimony.

Speaker: About this. I encourage you, I implore.

Speaker: You to.

Speaker: Visit the mac before you make a decision.

Speaker: Like this. It is not something that can be replaced.

Speaker: Easily or casually. And if you don't.

Speaker: Have a plan to.

Speaker: Support the arts.

Speaker: In Portland. It will cost in.

Speaker: So many ways.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Good afternoon, council president pirtle-guiney vice president koyama lane members of the council. My name is phil kime. I live in. District two and testifying on my own behalf today as a cannabis advocate for the last 15 years. For the last two years, I've served as a policy coordinator in the cannabis program coordinator two position with cpw. That's going to be eliminated in this budget cycle. It's concerning that my position is being eliminated and that fees are increased every year. Community members have expressed these concerns to me, but today I'm not here to talk about my position. I am here to advocate for greater city support of Portland's cannabis community. With representative blumenauer's retirement last year, we lost a national cannabis advocate, and we need Portland leaders to step up and fill those big shoes. We legalized cannabis for adults ten years ago, but we still have a lot of reforms that need to be made. Two immediate asks on this budget. The community members have expressed to me, public safety is a big concern for cannabis businesses, so please reflect public safety resources of all kinds in this budget and also support prosper Portland's funding for small business assistance. Their inclusive business resource network already does great

work helping cannabis businesses, so we need to build on that work. We have 353 licensed cannabis businesses in the city of Portland. They're targeted for crime disproportionately, and we need a lot of support from City Council. Thank you.

Speaker: Jessica.

Speaker: Thank you. Council president, councilors. Mayor Wilson, my name is Jessica Green. I'm the executive director of the Portland Parks Foundation. I understand this is a difficult budget year, and we recognize that we are going to have to work together to find solutions in order to keep our parks system healthy. That's why the Portland Parks Foundation raises funds day in and day out, why we have thousands of volunteers in our parks and over 200 partner organizations working in our parks. That's why our board voted unanimously to support City Council in a future parks levy campaign. Once referred to voters. We need all of this and we need more. And I'm here to talk to you about the future of our parks system. Even beyond this budget. I'm asking for a unified vision of the parks system that we want, and to work together to advance so that we can work together to advance that within city policies, budget decisions and partnerships. I'm asking you to have bigger conversations about public private partnerships to identify what's working and what isn't. Be honest, opportunistic, and innovative. And then let's chart a strategic path forward. I'm asking you to stop whittling down the percentage of general fund that goes to parks each year, and not to backfill what should be funded by our core budget. With voter approved levy funds. Voter funds should be used to add to a solid foundation, not to fill the cracks. I'm asking you in the future to commit to making the investments in our existing pools and community centers so they don't become unusable. Hazards. Parks are now part of our infrastructure portfolio, and we need to treat them like critical infrastructure. Even while we're

digging ourselves out of this hole. I'm asking you to commit to prioritizing investing in parks beyond today in a way that makes us proud to live here.

Speaker: Thank you all.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: We have jamie partridge, Seattle thompson, akil patterson, cola hash, gracie campbell. Go ahead, sir. Excuse me. Go ahead. Go ahead.

Speaker: Jamie.

Speaker: Greetings, councilors. I'm jamie.

Speaker: Partridge I'm a.

Speaker: Retired letter carrier in northeast Portland, district two. I speak in favor of councilor green and dunphy's amendment to reallocate prosper Portland funding public dollars require public control. I've lived in the inner east side of Portland for the last 57 years, and I've seen prosper Portland, formerly Portland development commission, use tax dollars to fund urban renewal urban renewal programs that have displaced black and low income communities. Since its rebrand in 2017, it has presented itself as a champion of equity and wealth creation for underserved communities, but it continues to operate without meaningful public oversight and prioritizes wealthy interests over the common good. The council, green and dunphy's amendment eliminates the city's annual allocation of general fund dollars to prosper. Portland roughly 13 million and redirect those resources to community priorities like maintaining parks programs. It also directs prosper Portland to use a portion of its \$50 million strategic investment fund to fully fund all of its ongoing programs for the next year. This amendment does not cut any programs. Prosper is currently offering. It simply directs prosper to tap into its own slush fund, rather than relying on general fund dollars needed to shore up critical city services. Thank you.

Speaker: My name is akil patterson. For the record, I am an employee with the prosper Portland and I oversee the cannabis business liaison, and that is my job. But today, I'm not here as part of my job. I am here as just a community member in a district for resident, and it is a little fearful of me at times to be sitting here, but I do know that it must be done. Mr. Mayor, I want to point out that I'm very excited that you used coach pittman's response. And honestly, coach pittman reaches across the united states. I'm from baltimore, and I met him when I was 14 years old. So that tells you how much coach pittman can mean to a lot of people. I want to thank you all for your continued leadership and your advancing and thoughtful approach, but we're moving too fast. This budget hearings and committees and for you all to get through \$8.5 billion in just a few short days is not reasonable, and we must reevaluate how our system is done. I don't think mr. Green is wrong about having a participatory budget, but what does a participatory budget look like? What would that mean? I think that we should be investing in our communities and we do invest in our communities, sir. We do. Most of the nonprofits that we help support are for the marginalized over prosper. But I'm not just talking about me. I'm talking about us and we. And we have to find a better system, one in which management, city leaders, and those practitioners who understand the industries are in front of you so you have a better and complete understanding of how we operate. Thank you.

Speaker: Hello, my name is gracie campbell and I am here in response to the potential closure of mac and the community music center, I'm here today to urge you to sustain the programs at mac and cmc. No matter what you do with the buildings. I understand the buildings are a budget drain. I'm a student at mac, and I'm keenly aware of how profoundly my life has been uplifted as a direct result of the classes there. These two facilities house incubators for hundreds of people,

from toddler to senior, to congregate, to participate in artistic expression. The arts programming at these centers fulfills important functions for all of us. Engaging with art is a safe and supportive and safe and supportive environment, stimulates the brain's ability to adapt and form new connectors, and is absolutely crucial to mental health. Mental health is no less important than physical health. Good mental health is currently a crisis in our society, including Multnomah County. The center's arts program enable us to learn new ways to express ourselves, to slow down, experiment and to share our individual perspectives and to understand others perspectives. We learn to look and listen at others unique ways of expressing themselves. This brings us to a greater understanding, compassion, and cooperation, no matter what our differences. Through the arts. At mac and cmc, we are building a broader sense of community in challenging times. I urge you with my heart not to put them in jeopardy. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you all for.

Speaker: Your testimony today. Let's try to keep support to jazz. Hands. Thumbs up, thumbs down. Not clapping.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Just checking. Seanna thompson cola hash. We'll move on to ian. Would lydia kiesling, micah meskill, vivian solomon, reuben lawrence. Mike is joining us online. Go ahead. Michael or micah?

Speaker: Council.

Speaker: My name is micah and I'm representing the alliance of Oregon. And our 10,000 local members. I want to acknowledge and appreciate how difficult your task is today and into the future, and I really appreciate the collective effort in finding the innovative, innovative ways to maintain services, especially in the parks department, which provides so many services to the community and the collective

environment. Many of your amendment proposals center on the continuation of important park services and the necessary maintenance that will benefit all of the community. Today, I really want to draw attention to a very problematic amendment proposal that, if passed, would have huge negative implications on the city's efforts to protect and equitably grow the city's urban forest. Council councilor zimmerman's amendment two and three would have a catastrophic impact on the city's effort to protect and plant trees across the city's entire program tree program. It puts implementation of programs at risk that would increase tree plantings in east Portland, as well as efforts to reduce the cost burden of tree maintenance on all of Portlanders. It also significantly reduces the city's tool to protect the existing tree canopy. I urge you to vote no on zimmerman two and three, and you'll hear from many other tree advocates. Alternatively, I want to instead want you all to instead consider concepts like avalos one and two, green. Dunphy four, dunphy eight. Canal four. Morillo one, novick one. And lastly with councilor novick's amendment eight. As a. I'd like you all to consider that as a last resort to fill the parks budget and to really follow the pcf committee's lead in drafting that ordinance.

Speaker: Thank you. Go ahead.

Speaker: My name.

Speaker: Is lydia.

Speaker: Kiesling.

Speaker: And I'm a district three resident mom of two.

Speaker: Young.

Speaker: Kids in pps.

Speaker: And a member.

Speaker: Of.

Speaker: Portland dsa. I'm also a writer and last year reported on measure 110 for the nation magazine. I had the privilege of speaking with many experts on the issues of homelessness, substance use disorder, and mental illness. I learned a lot from them about the ways Oregonians have been set up to fail by decades of underinvestment in programs that build healthy communities, the suffering on our streets that has led to Portland's doom loop discourse is rooted in problems that the mere presence of police cannot solve. Police cannot solve our housing affordability crisis. Luxury apartments sit vacant while people languish on waiting lists for affordable housing. Police cannot change the fact that Oregon was number 49 and 50 in the nation for substance use and mental health treatment access. Police cannot answer phones for the overworked case managers, juggling three agencies to get their clients into housing. Police can't open a spot in a treatment program or give traumatized people therapy after years of sleeping outside. Police also can't watch your kids when the school day ends at 230 or 1150 today, and after school programs can cost hundreds of dollars a month. Police can't rent summer camps, which can cost \$300 a week and still don't cover a workday. Police can't unlock the bathrooms in a public park or clean them. Police can't give swim lessons. They can't staff our community centers. They can't make a sidewalk safer for a wheelchair or a stroller, and they can't fill a pothole. It is a fairy tale that policing, combined with crowded, temporary shelters, can fill the void where a strong social safety net and affordable housing should be joyful, accessible community programs and spaces are crime prevention strategies. Please reject quick and brutal fixes disguised as safety, and save the fairy tales for storytime and a fully funded community center. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: For joining us online. Go ahead ruben thank you. Oh you're muted. Will you please unmute.

Speaker: I'm here today in support of most of the mayor's proposed budget for fiscal year 20 2526. I do support an increase in funding for Portland police bureau because they can help get the drugs off of our streets, as well as Portland street response. I support continued funding for filling potholes, removing graffiti and derelict rvs and vehicles. I'm concerned about reduction in funding for park maintenance, particularly cleaning bathrooms and removing trash. I do support cuts for staffing where it makes sense, like bloated communication, staffing, members management, heavy departments, administrative staffing bloat. I would support councilor zimmerman and or councilor green's proposals to fund parks and maintenance. I do not support those councilors who want to cut the police budget to do this, nor do I support council having this kind of control over a bureau, a power we voted to remove in our new form of government. Thank you.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: All right. Just a second. Okay. Checking for ian. Would vivian solomon. Okay. Moving on to jeanette ward. Sarah radley, gina davis. Kelly. Ian spar, mark mowbray.

Speaker: Ellen. John is online. I don't know if we want to start online.

Speaker: Thank you. Yeah. Go ahead. John.

Speaker: Good afternoon. Councilors. For the record, my name is john davis. I serve as the executive director of the northeast coalition of neighborhoods. Your district two coalition office. And I am here. And for full disclosure, I also serve as the second vice president of the naacp and the vice chair of Multnomah County's advisory committee to sustainability and innovation. I'm here before you today to

speak to you and to encourage you to make sure that in all of your debating that you are considering an equity lens and that the funding be restored as recommended in Zimmerman, the amendment. Zimmerman six the motion to amend and restore not only the DC OH our program, but also the diversity and civic leadership funding, as well as the motion to restore. Avalos six the amendment to the budget to restore us to the budget and nine critical to our future would be making sure that community members have a seat at the table in the process to decide the future of civic engagement. And so I would recommend taking a strong look at the motion put forth by clerk amendment number three, to have civic engagement as one of the things that you look towards community to help plan for the future. Thank you so very much. Yeah.

Speaker: Sarah is joining us online. Sarah. Go ahead.

Speaker: Hello.

Speaker: My name is Sarah Radley.

Speaker: I live in District Three.

Speaker: I'm a.

Speaker: Land use planner with more than 25 years of experience. I'm testifying today about the negative impacts to building permit timelines, with proposed cuts to land use planning.

Speaker: Staff and PND.

Speaker: I understand six land use planning positions are proposed to be cut from RP, and even after recent extensive layoffs, and I recommend that the City Council reconsider these cuts for the following reasons. The current land use planning, staffing levels, and PND are at historic lows after recent layoffs, and project review and permit issuance are consistently delayed because there is not enough staff to meet timelines and cumulatively can result in months of delays. The city and state

officials have expressed desire to spur development, especially housing development programs such as sdc. Waivers are exciting and could help to encourage more housing. However, if land use planning staffing is further reduced, there will be even more of a slowdown in review times and permit issuance. This is particularly important if more projects are expected to be submitted spurred by the sdc waiver program. An effective way to encourage housing development is to have a staff planning section of rp that can review permits and land use reviews quickly and effectively so that we can achieve housing goals with timely issuance of permits. In summary, to encourage and facilitate development, especially housing in the city, pad needs to be adequately staffed to enable prompt review and permit issuance so that our city can achieve the housing that we so need. I encourage you to retain the land use planners that are currently on staff, so that at least the timelines permit issuance will be maintained as they are now, and delays will not get worse. Thank you for your time.

Speaker: Okay, checking jeanette ward, kelly spar, mark mowbray, followed by ann kirkpatrick, meg goldberg, jessica elkin, ali berman.

Speaker: Good afternoon, councilors.

Speaker: I'm meg goldberg.

Speaker: I submit.

Speaker: A testimony online.

Speaker: So I'm going.

Speaker: To go ahead and give up.

Speaker: My time.

Speaker: Thank you very much. And I'm opposed. Steve councilor novick.

Speaker: Amendment 45. Thank you, thank you.

Speaker: Go ahead ali.

Speaker: Good afternoon. My name is ali berman and I'm the vice chair of the Portland parks and recreation board. However, today i'll be speaking on my own behalf. Portland parks and recreation manages and cares for 15% of Portland's land. That's more than 18mi² of property, including green spaces, baseball fields, skate parks, community gardens, hiking trails, pools and dog parks. Parks are Portland's backyard and immense source of pride for the community. So when I saw that the mayor's proposed budget aimed to gut penner's already thin maintenance budget, I saw the future degradation of a massive swath of our city. These cuts include the elimination of the shifts of the swing shift crew, reduction in hours for cleaning, trash removal, bathroom cleaning, turf renovations, and garbage pickup. I'm heartened by the amendments that attempt to right that wrong. Reducing the parks maintenance budget is going to cause more problems than it will solve, especially around safety and cleanliness. Please find a way to protect our parks. I also want to adamantly oppose councilor zimmermann's amendments two and three, which propose an 86% staff reduction to the tree code regulatory team of Portland's urban forestry program. This would throw the city's tree programs into chaos, dismantling decades of work to protect and equitably grow its urban forest. Portland has spent years expanding its tree program, knowing that trees help lower temperatures in the era of climate change. I can't fathom a reason Portland would back away from our urban forestry goals now. Thank you.

Speaker: Go ahead.

Speaker: Jessica.

Speaker: Go ahead.

Speaker: Yes, yes.

Speaker: Go ahead.

Speaker: Great. Good afternoon, City Councilors.

Speaker: My name is.

Speaker: Jessica elkin, and I'm the executive director of the james beard public market, a soon to be seven day a week public market.

Speaker: That.

Speaker: Will celebrate.

Speaker: Oregon's agricultural bounty, foster small business growth and draw international. National and regional visitors to our downtown city center. Thank you to council president for adding \$500,000 to the amendment package. We appreciate your support and urgency. However, it is critical that the city invest the full 1.5 million requested in the budget. Public markets are proven engines of economic development. Pike place market in Seattle draws more than 20 million visitors a year, creates thousands of jobs and creates hundreds of millions in economic development. The james beard market can do the same for our city. With budget shortfalls looming, we need to act with urgency to make investments that create jobs, support small business and generate tax revenue. Downtown Portland has long been challenged by the loss of foot traffic and vibrancy. James beard public market is the economic development project that will change that, with investments from private and public supporters. We've purchased a historic building just steps from pioneer square. More than 100 small businesses have already applied to be permanent vendors in the market. Nearly half of those are bipoc and women owned. These small businesses are ready to invest in our downtown now. We need to support them and invest in this budget. We are asking for a one time investment of \$1.5 million that will unlock 25 million in funding from the corporate, philanthropic and state. Please support this critical investment in Portland's people and future. Thank you.

Speaker: Anne is joining us online.

Speaker: Good afternoon.

Speaker: Mayor.

Speaker: Wilson, and hello to our City Council.

Speaker: My name.

Speaker: Is ann kirkpatrick. I'm a resident of the hazelwood neighborhood in district one. I'm speaking with you today to urge you not to adopt amendment 45 to the city's budget, seeking to close the community music center and the Multnomah arts center. I will leave. Closing the Multnomah arts center would be a heartbreaking mistake. I began taking art classes at the Multnomah arts center in the fall of 2021. After a year and a half of pandemic lockdowns, I was looking for a way to reconnect with other people and build community after so many months in isolation. It was the best choice I could have made. Since 2021, I've been visiting the mac on a near weekly basis. Through various classes, I built meaningful friendships with members of the fiber arts community across generations. This past summer, I joined the Portland handweavers guild, which meets monthly at the mac and shares invaluable resources and tools among its members in order to pass on knowledge and keep this art form thriving. Closing the Multnomah arts center is not an acceptable strategy for balancing the parks budget, losing a wide array of arts classes and studio space would deal a devastating blow to Portlanders of all ages, seeking community and connection through creative skill building. Once again, I urge members of the City Council to vote against this amendment.

Speaker: Jeanette ward has joined us online. Jeanette, go ahead and unmute.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you council. My name is.

Speaker: Jeanette ward and.

Speaker: I lead. New project, a.

Speaker: Portland nonprofit.

Speaker: As you.

Speaker: Look at budget recommendations.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Want to. Speak for the Portland community. I serve. Small neighborhood, family owned. Cannabis businesses. Each year, Portland cannabis businesses contribute approximately 5 million in taxes. New money to the Portland budget. Portland city voters approved the collection of tax money because they voted for those taxes to support minority and women.

Speaker: Owned businesses.

Speaker: Of the.

Speaker: Millions in taxes paid by cannabis businesses. Last year, 420,000 went back to cannabis businesses to fund technical assistance programs and loans and grants. Did you.

Speaker: Know the city.

Speaker: Of Portland has a cannabis revolving loan fund for cannabis businesses? A growing pool of money for lending to an industry that otherwise does not.

Speaker: Have enough.

Speaker: Capital to fund its growth and potential boom. New project has funded \$2 million in loans and grants to Portland's cannabis community. The small dent is a lifeblood for businesses who have used the money to hire employees and expand operations. 80% of loans went to minority owners, 40% to women. I understand.

Speaker: Cities have.

Speaker: To cut budgets. As you.

Speaker: Listen to the.

Speaker: Community, I'm here to say, don't throw the baby out with the bathwater.

Speaker: Portland is.

Speaker: Funding programs.

Speaker: To small.

Speaker: Businesses that are working.

Speaker: Plus you don't.

Speaker: Throttle startups. You feed them seed capital, increase.

Speaker: Funding for.

Speaker: Cannabis businesses to invest more seed in an industry economists all agree is poised for explosive growth. Today. We are funded through prosper Portland and its inclusive business resource network, which is.

Speaker: On the chopping block.

Speaker: I close by asking you to be surgical with your cuts, not blunt. We can find ways to increase funding to cannabis businesses and increase the economic outlook for cannabis tax revenue.

Speaker: While.

Speaker: Meeting. City budget demands.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Next up we have melissa gordon, catherine leather self, loretta guzman, casey clapp, mont chris hubbard.

Speaker: Good afternoon everybody.

Speaker: My name.

Speaker: Is.

Speaker: Casey clapp and I am representing the urban forestry commission that I sit on. It's a volunteer group. The urban forestry commission is deeply concerned

by councilor. Zimmerman's proposed amendment to reduce urban forestry, permitting and regulation staff from their current 37 positions to five. If implemented.

Speaker: The.

Speaker: Additional reductions would have an. Immense negative impact on. Portlanders today and, more importantly.

Speaker: Portlanders tomorrow.

Speaker: It would.

Speaker: Hobble the critical.

Speaker: Infrastructure services that urban forestry provides. The urban forestry commission is a community advisory group that serves Portlanders by advising City Council on matters relating to urban forestry. And trees. We're advising you now to reject this amendment and retain this critical work group so that core functions of the urban forestry program continue to serve Portlanders. Our urban forest, Portland's tree canopy, is widely seen across the nation as a hallmark of our city. Our tree code, title 11, is often.

Speaker: Seen.

Speaker: By other jurisdictions as the. Gold standard in municipal tree regulations. The praise and our nationwide reputation as an arboricultural leader were not earned by accident, and they do not persist without the efforts of the workgroup that is proposed to be cut. Briefings have been provided for each of you that explain the functions of each specialized team within this group, and I expect that those have helped make clear their importance to the healthy and efficient functioning of our city's urban forestry program. So again, we strongly urge you to vote against the proposed amendment to remove urban forestry regulatory work group. This reduction will create frustration and unresponsiveness when

Portlanders try to reach out to the city about a tree issue, it will damage our urban forestry and affect the livability of our city for decades. Thank you.

Speaker: Go ahead. Loretta.

Speaker: Hi, my.

Speaker: Name is loretta guzman. I'm the owner of bison.

Speaker: Coffee house. I was born.

Speaker: And raised here in the city.

Speaker: Of Portland. I live in district two and my.

Speaker: Business is.

Speaker: In district two.

Speaker: I am speaking because I do want public safety as well.

Speaker: As the.

Speaker: Need for property damages to cease.

Speaker: Our our police force.

Speaker: Is.

Speaker: Small for a city our size. That there is not, that.

Speaker: There is.

Speaker: Not much presence, that crimes are taking place with no accountability. I am not.

Speaker: In.

Speaker: Favor of the council wanting to control the ppb and fire budget for the overtime.

Speaker: Both these bureaus need to be fully staffed.

Speaker: So we don't need overtime. As as overtime causes burnout and then people are leaving. Some of you will not admit that we need public safety, as it is a fundamental right to we the people without public safety. Safety. I have

experienced grave consequences from my nephew being shot and killed to this day, no accountability. My property was just vandalized again yesterday morning at 1:25 a.m. No accountability. We have experienced common sense in the past and therefore we know that what works, what gave us safety and a way to thrive. Last month in my neighborhood, I heard gunshots on a Saturday at 3:31 a.m. I went to open my eyes and I was immediately paralyzed. I couldn't move. I see all these amendments and the money involved and wanting to make change, changes or charge us more on our water and electric. It just keeps growing and no progress. Make the right decision. Give us life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Thank you.

Speaker: Catherine is joining us online. Catherine, please unmute.

Speaker: Hi, my. Name is catherine herself. I was born in Portland. I'm a resident of district two and I own a business in district two. I have a cannabis business with two retail shops, a wholesale license and a processing license. I'm not very different from many people in my industry who have been facing organized and armed crime recently. There's been a ring of organized crime that's been targeting cannabis businesses. One of my close friends has been robbed so many times he's been considering closing his doors at our site. We were rammed into our building with six cars. They took product and they tried to return multiple times. These aren't isolated incidents. I was recently at a public safety meeting for cannabis businesses on Friday, and while I was in that meeting, I received a call that one of my workers was attacked. One of our staff, while they were leaving the building. That was at 230 in the afternoon, and the person that had attacked them had just been released ten minutes earlier. This this person is, you know, I worry a lot about my staff and I think that public safety is really important, and I hope that you'll keep that in mind before cutting cutting funds for public safety. Thank you.

Speaker: Ma'am. Chris hubbard.

Speaker: Good afternoon, councilors and mayor wilson, my name is chris hubbard. I'm a resident of district two, and I'm the secretary treasurer of the musicians union local 99. I'm speaking to express our support for three specific proposed amendments. First is dunphy two, which would fund much needed arts economic development. The second is dunphy seven, which would restore the position of noise office coordinator, a position that is crucial to the equitable application of noise regulations. The third is green six, which would provide a grant to Portland center stage, our largest theater company and one of only a few in town that have committed to providing union wages to all of its artistic professionals. And I'm speaking against the proposed amendment to shutter the community music center and the Multnomah arts center, which are both jewels of our parks and rec program. I do want to express our appreciation to all the City Councilors for your openness and commitment to creative and collaborative problem solving, and best of luck today.

Speaker: Next up, well checking melissa gordon magnus. Okay, jared. Bo. Herbert. Bo. Claire. Matthew. Warren, June. Thorson, carlene jackson.

Speaker: Well.

Speaker: Folks make their way up. I will flag that we are about 50 people into a list of 220 with about an hour left.

Speaker: Go ahead, sir, go ahead.

Speaker: Hello.

Speaker: My name is herbert bocclair. I am a small.

Speaker: Business owner.

Speaker: Here in Portland, Oregon and I relocated here about 15 years ago in efforts to get closer to the footwear industry. I found my way here by joining the

athletic and outdoor young professionals at prosper Portland, in which I led me to an opportunity to work for pensole academy. During my time there, we had placed over 500 aspiring professionals into the footwear industry free of charge, free of tuition and pensole received some great resources from prosper. Some of those resources were cut and they relocated to detroit. I later then started my own business called sneaker week pdx, in which we continue to amplify the opportunities here within the footwear industry in hopes to bring folks like myself that wanted to get closer to the industry, closer to those jobs. And I've received some support from prosper and with that support, have been able to connect over 10,000 career connections for aspiring professionals. We've also been able to help launch 13 footwear related businesses, and I believe, reducing resources to prosper would potentially eliminate similar stories to my own. Thank you.

Speaker: Hi, I'm Iijun Thorson as president. I'm president of the downtown neighborhood association. And I'm speaking on behalf of the DNA and the district four coalition. Today, I'm here to support councilor Zimmermann's amendment regarding neighborhood associations. You get a big return on your investment in neighborhood associations when you want volunteers to step up and help with public events, pick up trash, look out for the well-being of our neighbors. We're there to help. We educate our neighbors about city government and how to participate. We put eyes and ears on our local streets, and we keep our neighbors informed about what's happening in our neighborhoods. And additionally, and very importantly, we want to help each of you, mayor and councilors, meet our shared goals for our neighborhoods and the city we love. Please make the district, coalitions and neighborhood associations whole by maintaining our budgets. And if you can, please find \$80,000 to provide insurance for our volunteers to help us

continue our work. Please support councilor zimmermann's amendment to support the district coalitions and neighborhood associations. Thank you.

Speaker: Matthew warren is joining us online.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Council members. My name is matthew warren, and I serve as the.

Speaker: Executive director.

Speaker: Of the united states tennis.

Speaker: Association.

Speaker: Pacific northwest. I am speaking today in support of councilor Ryan's motion number five, adding a budget note regarding Portland parks tennis partnership, the united states tennis association pacific northwest is an Oregon based 501 c3 nonprofit organization.

Speaker: With the.

Speaker: Mission of growing tennis to inspire. Healthier people and communities everywhere we serve as a governing body of the sport of tennis in Oregon, Washington, alaska and idaho. With the lens focused on accessibility, we serve over 1.1 million tennis players and support 500 partners, including cities, schools and private.

Speaker: The private sector.

Speaker: Given the city of Portland's budget constraints and deferred maintenance.

Speaker: Across all.

Speaker: Parks.

Speaker: We seek to.

Speaker: Develop a.

Speaker: Mission aligned partnership and provide a solution that will both address substantial related tennis related deferred maintenance costs and build an accessible tennis service model for inclusive, affordable and high quality tennis programming across the. Entire city. There are currently 84,790 active tennis players in the. City of Portland, and there are additional 77,697 residents who are interested in playing tennis, but lack adequate access to play opportunities. On behalf of the united states tennis association, pacific northwest and the over 150,000 Portland residents who have an interest in tennis, we are grateful for councilor Ryan's leadership and ask the council to support this motion.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Carlene jackson is joining us online.

Speaker: Hello. My name is.

Speaker: Carlene jackson and I live in district four.

Speaker: I'm asking you.

Speaker: To please.

Speaker: Vote no.

Speaker: Again on amendment number 45. Please.

Speaker: Please.

Speaker: Do not close the.

Speaker: Multnomah arts center.

Speaker: Part of what makes Portland beautiful is its amazing culture of arts and music. I don't think I would even want to live in Portland if there was no more. No more art center. I have taken many classes there, and I get an enormous sense of community and well-being while taking these classes. I also think it's important to think about the effects participating in music and arts programs has on our local economy. I have shopped at many local bookstores, yarn stores, music stores,

many other local stores to support the skills I have gained from taking classes at Multnomah arts center. I would not have been shopping these local businesses had I not learned to weave or play the guitar. So I'm asking again, please vote no on amendment number 45. Please, please don't close the arts center. Thank you.

Speaker: Vivian solomon has joined us online. Vivian, please unmute.

Speaker: Thank you. This is vivian solomon. I am a female.

Speaker: Small business owner.

Speaker: In the city.

Speaker: Of Portland.

Speaker: I'm also a. Member of or a resident of district four.

Speaker: And I agree with the previous speaker. I ask you not.

Speaker: To close the Multnomah.

Speaker: Arts center, but the reason for my testimony today is I want. To express strong support for increased public safety funding. I believe in maintaining mayor wilson's public safety budget. I think there's an urgent need to address rising crime and to support struggling small businesses. I used to work downtown a couple decades ago, and it was a lot different feeling than it is now, and I would like everyone now to experience what I experienced there in the 90s and early 2000. I also support the pro safety and pro prosperity amendments from councilors Ryan smith, clark and zimmerman. Please listen to those of us who are not special interests. Thank you for your time.

Speaker: Checking. Jared. Bo. Next up we have madeline. Koyama lane, jen kerns, marjorie hutsell. Jay amaechi, noel studer. Spivak. Jay is joining us online. Go ahead jay.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Hello.

Speaker: My name is jay mckee. I'm organizing director at unite Oregon and I'm in I live in district two but I work in all the districts. So Portland is as at a crossroads as you know. And while.

Speaker: Millions are.

Speaker: Funneled into expanding the Portland police budget, our parks are crumbling from neglect. Traffic fatalities rise due to outdated infrastructure, and thousands of neighbors remain unhoused or housing insecure. True safety cannot exist when we underfund the very programs that create thriving, resilient communities. So councilor murillo's amendment number one could offer a transformative path forward by redirecting police resources toward restoring park maintenance. We invest in green spaces that unite neighbors, provide respite, and reduce violence through community connection. And by exploring evidence based interventions, we can design public spaces to deter violence through accessibility and communal care, not surveillance. I also support avalos amendment three, which would reduce overtime funding for police. The city audit found that Portland police has continually failed to manage overtime effectively. They continually lack effective data collection and reporting on overtime, making it near impossible to manage costs and identify areas for improvement. We can't afford to be this fast and loose with millions of dollars. And lastly, I endorse novick amendment two, which calls for redirecting welfare checks from armed police to trained unarmed crisis responders. During these calls, law enforcement, who often lack specialized training in de-escalation and mental health, can heighten tensions and endanger lives. Unarmed responders are equipped to address crises with empathy and expertise, and are far more likely to resolve these sensitive situations safely and effectively. That's all. Thank you.

Speaker: Madeline is joining us online. Madeline, please unmute.

Speaker: My name is madeline. Can you. Hear me?

Speaker: We can hear you.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Hello.

Speaker: My name is madeline pauline.

Speaker: I live in. District three.

Speaker: I just want.

Speaker: To echo all of the testimony urging.

Speaker: City Council.

Speaker: To vote no on budget amendment. Number 45 and not cut.

Speaker: The community music.

Speaker: Center and Multnomah arts center.

Speaker: Similarly to.

Speaker: A.

Speaker: Lot of. People who.

Speaker: Have spoken. I took lessons there.

Speaker: When I was a kid.

Speaker: I've been taking adult group. Classes and.

Speaker: Utilized the access.

Speaker: Discount program so I can afford.

Speaker: These classes.

Speaker: It brings me so. Much joy and community.

Speaker: Connection with people of all ages. So many.

Speaker: Kids in every.

Speaker: Council district would.

Speaker: Be impacted.

Speaker: If.

Speaker: These sites were.

Speaker: To be closed.

Speaker: Also.

Speaker: So many.

Speaker: Seniors would be.

Speaker: Denied this. Continued skill development.

Speaker: And social interaction, and many teaching jobs for Portland's musicians would.

Speaker: Also.

Speaker: Be taken away. So yes, again, I urge you to. Vote no on amendment. 45 and not.

Speaker: Cut the cmc and.

Speaker: The mac. Thank you.

Speaker: Go ahead. Ma'am.

Speaker: Mayor wilson, chair.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney and.

Speaker: Councilors.

Speaker: My name is noel studer. Spivak. I live in cully. Today I'm speaking on behalf of over a.

Speaker: Dozen health.

Speaker: Climate, watershed and livability organizations. The shade.

Speaker: Equity coalition.

Speaker: Came together after the deadly 2021 heat dome.

Speaker: It was no accident.

Speaker: That dozens of Portlanders died.

Speaker: We had maps.

Speaker: Predicting where the.

Speaker: Deaths would happen.

Speaker: Primarily in districts one.

Speaker: And two. We're determined.

Speaker: To overcome the systemic injustice. Portland leaves public street tree maintenance up to private individuals. This is rare among American cities of Portland's size. For over 80 years, Portland has been searching for a way to fund street tree care. This is a list of everything from the city archives. Finally, last year, pcef funds were approved to start maintaining vital street tree infrastructure. Our coalition urges council to reject councilor zimmerman's amendments two and three, which will hobble the central nervous system of urban forestry that's essential for infrastructure maintenance. We are on the brink of finally resolving a long term injustice for Portlanders of today and tomorrow. Please vote with care. Thank you for your time.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Okay, I'm checking for jen kerns, marjorie hutsell. Okay. Moving on. Stepan simek, geoffrey ren, ernie munch, carolyn landsberg, kristen dozono. Go ahead sir.

Speaker: Hello. My name is stefan trimet. I live in district two and I'm here to vehemently oppose the amendment calling for the closure of the community music center and the Multnomah arts center, and I do urge you to vote no on it. You have already heard some very heartfelt testimonies about the importance of the two institutions, and I'm sure that you will be hearing more. However, I would like to talk about the larger issue as well and remind you that closing the community music center and the Multnomah arts center would be really no different from cutting the

funding from pbs and npr, the national endowment of the arts, the dictatorial overtake of the kennedy center and other anti arts and anti-education crusades that are led by the barbaric hordes of ignorant philistines that are currently living our country, where the council indeed to accept the amendment it would also partake in the wholesale destruction of culture, arts and human decency as perpetuated by the federal administration. And it would align itself with the totalitarian regime in dc. Portland is better than that, and I urge you to vote no. Thank you.

Speaker: Kristen is joining us online. Go ahead unmute. Kristen. Go ahead kristen you're muted. Oh maybe she can't hear us.

Speaker: Sorry I thought. I was.

Speaker: Like six people after.

Speaker: Hi my name.

Speaker: Is kristen dozono. My first. Time here. And kind of nice to be. Able to.

Speaker: Hear everybody talk.

Speaker: I'm speaking because.

Speaker: I'm on the golf action committee. I just rejoined.

Speaker: It.

Speaker: And I'm told that there is an amendment to move \$5 million from our reserve fund over to fill some gaps in budgets.

Speaker: For parks. I'm super.

Speaker: Disheartened by this. In the last.

Speaker: Like 10 to.

Speaker: 15 years, we've.

Speaker: Worked super. Hard to.

Speaker: Have golf.

Speaker: Be seen.

Speaker: As something for everybody. Our public.

Speaker: Golf courses.

Speaker: Are a really great example of that.

Speaker: When i.

Speaker: Joined the golf committee maybe 15 years ago, the city took \$500,000 of our piggy bank, which I believe was half of what we had. Then proceeded to kind of talk about golf course shutdowns and, and, and we thought golf was dead. So we've worked so hard to, to make it accessible to everybody and affordable for everybody. And I feel like we're just now starting to look at golf as something that everybody can do. A friend of mine went out the other day and was so surprised that she could pay like \$12 and hit a bucket of balls. So I'm really against raising the fees. We're just starting to overcome the stigma of golf as just an all white man's sport. There are leisure. Our junior and african-American golf group that practices and our public courses, and we have a mentorship program between public golf and leisure junior. There's also first tee, which is for youth, lots of women's groups. Again, this is just something that we I feel like we're being punished for saving money. And we've got a lot of deferred maintenance as well.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Ernie munch is joining online.

Speaker: Ernie munch.

Speaker: Yes. Are you okay? Great.

Speaker: My name is ernie munch.

Speaker: District four.

Speaker: I'm here.

Speaker: To.

Speaker: Support the mayor's public safety budget. And i. Personally think.

Speaker: That the they should be given resources.

Speaker: The mayor and the chief of police to.

Speaker: Go.

Speaker: Out and.

Speaker: Recruit another 200 officers.

Speaker: Train them and get them on the streets. We're way below. Where we should be.

Speaker: And to.

Speaker: That.

Speaker: You know.

Speaker: Supporting the amendments offered by commissioners zimmerman.

Speaker: Clark.

Speaker: Smith and Ryan. I also want to speak in terms of in support of maintenance, not only of our parks, which are essential to Portland's brand and neighborhood livability, but also the street maintenance, which is the infrastructure is really needs a lot of attention. Pot patching potholes doesn't work, really, just literally moves the pothole down the street. We have to be more aggressive and deal with that in terms of need. And I think what thank you. I think what needs to be done when you see proposals that you have to look at the broader range, unintended consequences that might occur, funds fund things that attack problems more than solving more than one problem and are just neat ideas that somebody has that they've read about or want to compete with another city. Thank you for your time. Thank.

Speaker: Checking. Geoffrey wren, carolyn landsberg. Next we have andrew schenker, kathleen madden, adam levy, lydia qu, kristen shiga. Go ahead. Kristen.

Speaker: Thank you for hearing testimony.

Speaker: On this. Important topic.

Speaker: My name is kristen.

Speaker: Shiga and I'm a longtime.

Speaker: Homeowner in district two.

Speaker: I'm here to urge.

Speaker: You to. Vote no.

Speaker: On councilor. Novick proposal to close Multnomah arts center. I've been. Teaching in various programs at.

Speaker: Mac since 2001.

Speaker: But today I'm here testifying as a concerned citizen.

Speaker: Others have already.

Speaker: Cited the importance.

Speaker: Of the arts in Portland.

Speaker: But.

Speaker: The list of services provided.

Speaker: For thousands.

Speaker: Of Portland.

Speaker: Families by mac over the.

Speaker: Years also.

Speaker: Includes exposure to visual and.

Speaker: Performing arts.

Speaker: For all ages, accessible family.

Speaker: Programing.

Speaker: Community building. And rental space for local guilds, food assistance programs and more. Child and elder. Care professional skills development.

Speaker: As in the metalsmithing.

Speaker: And.

Speaker: Jewelry program established.

Speaker: In.

Speaker: 2001 at mac.

Speaker: Exhibition and sales opportunities.

Speaker: For entrepreneurial.

Speaker: Artists and much more, mac's unique services contribute to Portland's status as a desirable place to live. There is no question about the need for.

Speaker: Its.

Speaker: Programs, as.

Speaker: All of.

Speaker: Our.

Speaker: Classes are.

Speaker: Full with.

Speaker: A wait.

Speaker: List days after the.

Speaker: Registration goes live.

Speaker: Mac also has provided hundreds of jobs to teaching artists over the years, who with the Portland parks and recreation administrative staff that run the center, will be jobless if the amendment passes. Lastly, the proposal to permanently close mac as a cost saving measure is extreme. Problem solving skills are at the foundation of arts education, and any.

Speaker: One of our.

Speaker: Students can tell you there are creative ways to increase revenue and decrease expenses that would not eliminate mac completely. At a time when the country's executive leadership is characterized by destabilizing, unilateral cuts is even more crucial for state and local leadership to remain measured in their response.

Speaker: Thank you. Very much. Unprecedented budget challenges. Thank you.

Speaker: Okay. Checking andrew schenker, kathleen madden, adam levy, lydia couch, moving on to isabel damon. Oh, wait, I think I see oh, go ahead kathleen.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: I'm kathleen madden here to challenge proposed budget amendment 45 to close the Multnomah arts center in the community music center. For years, mac's been a beloved parks asset in southwest Portland. What you may not realize is that over the last several years, we've developed 15 partnerships throughout the city in communities, parks, centers as underserved and vulnerable. An example is the rosewood initiative in outer southeast Portland. Thanks to financial support from macca, mac's friends group, of which I'm a member. They now have a house, a piano lab where music lessons are taught by both cmc and mac teachers. This is an example of how mac's outreach program works to serve all Portlanders. Partners ask for the arts services they need. Mac staff provides them at their sites. Think of mac as a hub and partners as the spokes on a bicycle wheel. Last summer, mac provided art projects to over 4000 children as part of parks free lunch and play program. During covid times, children got take home art kits, an example of the creative way mac brings art and fun times to Portlanders. Mac staff created free first Friday family arts for all on site. Not only is it a no barrier program, but free food is provided with board support. Stop by sometime. Yes.

Speaker: Thank you very much. I'm sorry, but we need to make sure we have time for everybody.

Speaker: Who is joining us online.

Speaker: Hello?

Speaker: Can you hear me?

Speaker: Yes, we can hear you.

Speaker: Oh, great.

Speaker: Hi.

Speaker: So my name.

Speaker: Is Lydia.

Speaker: Ku, and I have my.

Speaker: Son, Addison couch with me. We live in district three, and I'm here today to urge you to vote. No on amendment 45, which threatens to eliminate the community music center and the Multnomah.

Speaker: Arts.

Speaker: Center. Two programs that.

Speaker: Are absolutely essential and truly irreplaceable. My children have been students at this at the community music.

Speaker: Center for years.

Speaker: It's where they discovered their love of music, gained confidence, and found a creative outlet for my family. And for many.

Speaker: Others across.

Speaker: Our city. This center is the only.

Speaker: Affordable access to music and arts education outside of school, with school based.

Speaker: Arts.

Speaker: Programs shrinking due to budget cuts, these community centers fill a critical gap. Their sliding scale, tuition, and income based discounts ensure that families of all backgrounds can participate. That's what true equity looks like. A great city invests in its people. Our music and art centers have created safe, inclusive spaces where youth. And families and seniors are engaged and supported and inspired. These centers offer a positive alternative to isolation and a meaningful path forward. Passing amendment 45 doesn't just remove a budget line, it removes access to the arts for low income families, opportunities for youth to grow in enriching, structured environments. And then addison reed.

Speaker: This community. Music arts centers.

Speaker: Are making cities stronger, more vibrant, and.

Speaker: More humane. Once they're gone, they're.

Speaker: Incredibly difficult to.

Speaker: Rebuild. Vote. Please vote no on amendment 45. Protect the community music center.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Go ahead.

Speaker: Hello. My name is.

Speaker: Isabelle dammann.

Speaker: I'm a resident.

Speaker: Of district.

Speaker: Three and I am.

Speaker: An employee of.

Speaker: The city.

Speaker: Of.

Speaker: Portland at the.

Speaker: Community music center. But I am.

Speaker: Testifying today as a.

Speaker: Private citizen. To vote.

Speaker: No on amendment 45.

Speaker: Again.

Speaker: I began weekly violin. Lessons at the community.

Speaker: Music center.

Speaker: In 1999 at the age of five, and.

Speaker: I went back.

Speaker: Every Tuesday for 14 years until i.

Speaker: Graduated from cleveland.

Speaker: High school in 2012. Through these lessons, I gained a love for music, and I formed lasting connections with both my teachers and.

Speaker: A.

Speaker: Lot of other students. My lessons at the community music center were heavily subsidized, like they are for so many cmc families, and are what allowed me to gain a scholarship to a music conservatory and go on to perform professionally and teach students of my own, which I have now been doing for the last eight years. My family would not have been able to afford private lessons without the community music center. I owe my entire career and my musical upbringing to this place. The cmc has been a key resource for affordable and accessible lessons. For 70 years. We just celebrated 70 years this year. Please vote no on amendment 45 to close the community music center. And Multnomah arts center. These are such important places so that students from low income families like myself, can continue to learn music for generations to come. Thank you.

Speaker: Next up we have meg doherty, brianna tarnower, nora gessert, catherine fukuyama. Nora is joining us online. Go ahead.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: My name is nora gessert.

Speaker: I'm the resident of Portland district one, and I'm the president of the Portland handweavers guild. And I'm also here.

Speaker: To.

Speaker: Talk about.

Speaker: A vote no on amendment 45 at Multnomah arts center. Portland. Hand weavers has over.

Speaker: 250 members, and we hold.

Speaker: All.

Speaker: Of our.

Speaker: Meetings, events and workshops and classes at Multnomah arts center. We also rent space for our library. And as you heard from very several people, that we've really been a kind of a gateway into other arts and programs at Multnomah arts center. I'm not really clear what the reasoning behind closing mac is. Some people said they heard last week. We got notice yesterday that.

Speaker: It will.

Speaker: Close as of September 1st. I do understand the need to save money, but I also think that it's, you know, need to be really clear that if we close mac, there's programs that are going to impact children and adults of all ages and the elderly. A lot of our members are elderly and mac is accessible. So I really want to make sure that you keep that open and really see it as an asset to the community that you all are supposed to serve. So thank you for your time.

Speaker: Catherine fukuyama is joining us online.

Speaker: Hi.

Speaker: My name is cathy.

Speaker: Can you hear me?

Speaker: We can hear you.

Speaker: Great.

Speaker: Thank you for listening to all of us. My name is cathy. I live in district four and I'm here to speak on behalf of my beloved, our beloved Multnomah arts center. I have been active.

Speaker: At the center for 47 years.

Speaker: Attending classes. Teaching classes. Our two children have attended.

Speaker: Preschool. Which rented space.

Speaker: For mac. I've been to. Numerous performances.

Speaker: And parties and recitals in their auditorium. What I believe.

Speaker: Mac is.

Speaker: It provides a. Safe and. Welcoming place for us to.

Speaker: Connect and create.

Speaker: I agree with so many of the others who have spoken on behalf.

Speaker: Of it, and i.

Speaker: Urge the council.

Speaker: To vote no on amendment 45. Thank you.

Speaker: Okay, checking for minority brianna tarnower suzanne bishop, christopher myers, michelle crimmins. Kayla sanford. Michelle. Go ahead. Michelle.

Speaker: Good afternoon. My name. Is michelle.

Speaker: Crimmins.

Speaker: And I've been a resident of.

Speaker: The. City and.

Speaker: An active voter for 25 years.

Speaker: I live in district.

Speaker: Four, and I'm.

Speaker: Testifying against.

Speaker: Amendment 25.

Speaker: That. Would close.

Speaker: The Multnomah arts center and.

Speaker: The community.

Speaker: Music center.

Speaker: This would.

Speaker: Be.

Speaker: A very short.

Speaker: Sighted decision that would significantly.

Speaker: Damage arts.

Speaker: Culture and community.

Speaker: Life in Portland.

Speaker: I've been.

Speaker: A.

Speaker: User of the mac for.

Speaker: More than.

Speaker: Two.

Speaker: Decades and many.

Speaker: Phases of life.

Speaker: I attended classes with.

Speaker: My kids.

Speaker: Together when they were little.

Speaker: They went to classes all throughout their youth.

Speaker: And I've.

Speaker: Taken many accessible.

Speaker: And.

Speaker: Reasonably priced.

Speaker: Classes of various types.

Speaker: As an.

Speaker: Adult.

Speaker: Just for fun and just.

Speaker: To connect with my fellow.

Speaker: Citizens doing something creative.

Speaker: I didn't need to buy.

Speaker: Any special.

Speaker: Tools i.

Speaker: Could share the ones available.

Speaker: The space offers excellent and.

Speaker: High quality. Learning opportunities, instructions that.

Speaker: You simply.

Speaker: Can't get.

Speaker: Anywhere else.

Speaker: And they'll just.

Speaker: Disappear as.

Speaker: Long, you know.

Speaker: With the jobs.

Speaker: Of the people who provide them and associated small businesses.

Speaker: I attend.

Speaker: Classes. As do others, to learn something new and challenge myself in a positive environment. There are so few opportunities.

Speaker: To do that in.

Speaker: Modern society anymore.

Speaker: This is one of the last.

Speaker: Remaining places and it truly is a community center. It's not just.

Speaker: For people in district four.

Speaker: People come from.

Speaker: All over.

Speaker: Our city to take these popular. Engaging classes. They dance, they sing, they act, they they work together, they.

Speaker: Build empathy. And it's safe.

Speaker: For kids after school and a great place for our elders to connect.

Speaker: In my last class, I sat next to a college student.

Speaker: A retiree. A person from the safe.

Speaker: Rest village and many others. Please keep it open.

Speaker: Go ahead.

Speaker: Good afternoon.

Speaker: My name.

Speaker: Is chris myers. I live in southeast Portland and I'm a lifelong Portland resident. I'm here today to add my voice to the robust chorus, urging you.

Speaker: To fully.

Speaker: Fund the community music center in the next budget cycle so that Portlanders of all ages and from all socioeconomic backgrounds can continue to benefit from this rich, unique and important cultural and educational institution. I attended classes and performances at the cmc as a child in the 1970s. In this

century, my three children, now ages 27, 25 and 23, took group classes and individual violin lessons, played in various ensembles, and attended countless concerts and recitals at cmc from their toddlerhood through high school. The services that the community music center provides are invaluable and very cost effective. That beautiful old firehouse has been the launching pad for hundreds of careers in music, but more important is what the center does for those like me and my sons, who don't become career musicians, it instills and fosters an appreciation of music, and music, in turn, expands minds, enriches lives, and makes hearts stronger. Now is not the time to disinvest in the arts. Thank you.

Speaker: Go ahead ma'am, go ahead, go ahead. Yeah.

Speaker: Hello, council.

Speaker: My name is suzanne bishop. I'm here representing.

Speaker: The.

Speaker: Portland parks alliance.

Speaker: And I'm.

Speaker: Testifying to support dan Ryan's budget. Note number two, outlining a path to explore a public private partnership with the pacific northwest.

Speaker: Tennis association.

Speaker: To run the Portland. Tennis center.

Speaker: While the alliance.

Speaker: Is not in a position.

Speaker: To comment.

Speaker: On the specifics of this proposal, we encourage council to aggressively pursue this and other efforts where citizens and non-profits are willing and eager to provide capital, maintenance, repairs. And programing opportunities.

Speaker: In lieu of.

Speaker: The parks department. Thank you very much.

Speaker: Next up we have kayla sanford, elana, nezo medianova. Doctor dennis scollard, judith wilding, ibrahim riad. Let's see if we. Doctor dennis scullard is joining us online. Go ahead and unmute. Let's go.

Speaker: Can you.

Speaker: Hear me okay. Now.

Speaker: Yeah we can hear you.

Speaker: Oh great.

Speaker: Thank you so much.

Speaker: I'm going to be part.

Speaker: Of the chorus.

Speaker: The community.

Speaker: Music center.

Speaker: And the Multnomah County arts center.

Speaker: Are known throughout.

Speaker: The nation for.

Speaker: Being.

Speaker: Really outstanding and unusual. In what it provides to the members.

Speaker: The community.

Speaker: Music center has been going on for 70 years.

Speaker: It provides. 8000 hours of classes.

Speaker: And events.

Speaker: And opportunities.

Speaker: For.

Speaker: People to.

Speaker: Delve into music.

Speaker: Throughout the year.

Speaker: The Multnomah.

Speaker: County, the Multnomah arts center does serves 150 students per week.

That's not a small number. Councilor novick I know you've talked about the importance. Of the Portland parks recreation. I've met you several times and I really. Respect you. I just don't understand this one. It doesn't make sense to me. And I would say, please vote, visit these centers so you really find out what they provide. I treated brain injury patients, many of whom I could refer there to, to receive services and enjoy meeting other people. And learn ways of. Communicating and.

Speaker: Interacting with.

Speaker: People despite their brain injury through music and art.

Speaker: And thanks.

Speaker: Everybody for your hard work. Really appreciate it.

Speaker: Judith wilding. Judith, go ahead and unmute. Hello.

Speaker: Thanks for hearing me today. I'm judith wilding. I live in district three from 2016 or 2010 to 2016, I worked at the mac as a customer service representative, a writing teacher and an administrator, and during that time I met thousands of diverse community members. As people have said, mac is not only for artists, but it's one of the few affordable rental venues in Portland. I saw diwali celebrations, quinceaneras easter wedding, celebrations of life, ramadan celebrations, birthdays and after leaving mac, I worked at a title one school in southwest Washington where my kids had little to no access to incredible art programing like we had in southwest Portland. I saw my kids struggle from time to time, and I had a kid die of fentanyl. And in my heart of hearts, I do believe that arts and vibrant arts education would have provided another lifeline to the kids. In 2023,

I joined the mac board. To shut down a community for artists and makers, as well as an affordable community hub that serves thousands of folks each year, not just at mac, but across the city all the way to far out east. Portland is shortsighted. Please vote no on amendment 45 and protect our vital arts culture that makes Portland special. Thank you.

Speaker: Ibrahim. Riyadh is joining us online.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Hello. My name is ibrahim riyad. I live.

Speaker: In district four. I'm a parent.

Speaker: Neighbor and I'm the president of the. Maplewood elementary school pta. I'm here today to testify as a private citizen, and I'm incredibly frustrated and upset that the city is considering closing the Multnomah arts center. The center is a cornerstone of the maplewood and Multnomah village communities. My kids have taken classes there over the years. It's where they've learned new skills. They built confidence connected with other kids outside of their school. This last year, our pta even rented out the space to host our school auction, where we raised essential funds to support our students, teachers, and families, including the direct support for families in need in our community. This center made that possible, and it's more than just a building. It's a place that brings people together and provides a sense of connection for people from all ages. The fact that this proposal was only made public less than a week ago feels incredibly reckless. It's hard to believe that the full impact of this decision has been thought through. Communities that rely on this space would have a hard time weighing in and preparing, and not how a responsible public process should work. I honestly don't know if this is proposal is real, or if it's just a tactic to stir up public outrage, but if in any case, it's a dangerous game to play. And in the meantime, our kids and communities are the ones who

are losing. Cuts like this, degrade the quality of life in Portland and erode our sense of community. I understand there's a budget crisis, but cutting something that works and strengthens our community is not the answer. I urge the council to vote no on the 45. Thank you.

Speaker: Checking for kayla sanford and nova. Moving on to mackenzie god.so, jessica dupree, brian cavanaugh, miriam weiser, esther saul.

Speaker: And with less than a half an hour and more than 100 people still signed up, I really do want to ask folks if what you are going to say has already been said to please make sure that you make space for folks who have not had an opportunity to have their concerns aired.

Speaker: All right. Looks like miriam is joining us online.

Speaker: Hello. My name is miriam weiser. I live in Multnomah village. I'm testing today in opposition to amendment 45 to close Multnomah arts center and the community music center. I'm begging you all, please save the back. Multnomah arts center is a cornerstone of our community. It provides classes to all people for all ages. Social connection for seniors, many of whom are on food stamps or have disabilities, and employs artists and teachers from all over Portland. It directly supports our local businesses as parents, shop or eat in our restaurants while their kids are in class or summer camp there. I personally have taken classes in painting and ceramics there, and I sing in the Multnomah chorus community choir with members of all ages and demographics, which has been gathering at the mac for going on 15 years. My host, and my wedding reception in a rented ballroom there. My synagogue held services there when we were between buildings. Closing the Multnomah arts center will be devastating to our community and to me personally. Please vote no on amendment 45 and save the mac.

Speaker: Brian cavanaugh is joining us online.

Speaker: Hi. Thank you.

Speaker: Good afternoon, mayor and council members. I'm testifying today to urge you to vote no on amendment 45 proposed by council councilor novick, which would permanently close the community music center cmc, a vital part of Portland parks and recs, music programing and irreplaceable resource for our city's youth and families. My own daughters, age 18 and 15, have been going there for over ten years and continue to do so, and their music education would not have been possible without cmc. Cmc provides critical access to music education for Portlanders of all backgrounds as part of Portland parks and recs music program, cmc offers affordable rental instruments, lessons, ensemble experiences, public concerts, while its financial aid program ensures that no student is turned away due to inability to pay, eliminating cmc would directly harm hundreds of families across all districts who rely on this access for their children's artistic and personal development, and should be said that the benefits of early music education are well documented. It enhances brain development, improves academic outcomes, fosters creativity, supports emotional well-being, cnc's programmatic programing supports these outcomes in a welcoming, community based setting. A model of public service that reflects the values of inclusion and opportunity that Portland holds dear. Closing cmc is a short sighted decision that undermines the long term educational and cultural health of our city. I ask you to preserve this decades old institution and protect equitable access to music and future generations. Please vote no on amendment 45. Thank you.

Speaker: Go ahead ma'am.

Speaker: Hello. My name.

Speaker: Is esther.

Speaker: Saleh and I'm a resident of district two. I'm here to urge you to vote. No on councilor novick. I'll conceived amendment calling for the closure of the community music center. For the last 26 years, I've been taking classes at the community music center, and I got hooked on playing renaissance music. As a newcomer to the city, I made lots of connections in the music world by taking classes with helene gayle newman, and I felt immediately embraced by the community I'm now playing with. I'm now playing music with various music ensembles and groups where all my fellow musicians are, in one way or another, connected to the community music center. In fact, more than half of my closest friends are those I met at cmc when I was younger and had small kids and had to organize a babysitter. It was an extremely daunting to for me to make it to my weekly classes. I often arrived harried, worried, exhausted, tired. But I always left my class in an elevated mood, happy, restored, and feeling reinvigorated. The classes at cmc were better than any therapy, and I will forever be grateful for every single minute I spent in that building. While this is a personal recollection, I'm more than certain that anyone you talk to about their experiences would tell you the same story. Cmc creates a world of music making, friendship, community building, continuity and closing it down would deprive the city of an important cultural and community hub.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Checking. Mckenzie got so jessica dupree.

Speaker: I'm carolyn.

Speaker: Landsberg.

Speaker: District four.

Speaker: And I urge.

Speaker: You to vote no.

Speaker: On amendment 45.

Speaker: The community.

Speaker: Music center.

Speaker: And the Multnomah arts center.

Speaker: Are true. Gems in.

Speaker: The city of Portland. They must.

Speaker: Not close.

Speaker: The community music center is a unique resource.

Speaker: Where else can students get.

Speaker: Education music.

Speaker: Instruction from top notch professional.

Speaker: Musicians.

Speaker: Many of.

Speaker: Whom perform.

Speaker: With the Oregon symphony and.

Speaker: Other professional groups.

Speaker: And this is all affordable. No one is turned away.

Speaker: From by inability to pay.

Speaker: And cmc is accessible and welcoming.

Speaker: To all.

Speaker: I know that because our youngest son, who is now 39, is on the autism spectrum and is learning differences since preschool, he's benefited from classes at the community music center. He still participates weekly and in fact, a member of our family has been taking classes at the community.

Speaker: Music.

Speaker: Center for 41 years.

Speaker: Without the break.

Speaker: Multnomah arts center is also a gem, a valued resource to Portlanders. In addition to its many other programs, it is home to voices unlimited, a choir and theater troupe of 50 adults who are neurodivergent or have learning differences, such as down syndrome. We founded this nonprofit 14 years ago in the Multnomah arts center has been our home ever since. Every Saturday afternoon, the 50 members of voices unlimited gather to rehearse at mecca. Become by trimet lift standard trimet or rides from providers and family.

Speaker: I'm very sorry, but we need to make sure we have time for everybody.

Speaker: Thank you. All right.

Speaker: Vote no. Next. Next up we have jenna, ryu, madeline. Carol. Otis. Rheubottom. Sariah. Hopner. Diana. Sellers. Jenna is joining us online.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Very.

Speaker: Much, mayor wilson.

Speaker: Commissioners, for the opportunity.

Speaker: To speak today. My name is jenna ryu. I'm a resident.

Speaker: Of.

Speaker: District four.

Speaker: I'm here, as many others.

Speaker: Are, to.

Speaker: Urge you.

Speaker: To vote no.

Speaker: On amendment. Number 45.

Speaker: My husband.

Speaker: Paul and I have two kids.

Speaker: Eliana, age ten, and.

Speaker: Nico.

Speaker: Age seven, who.

Speaker: Have enjoyed diverse programing.

Speaker: At.

Speaker: Mac, including.

Speaker: Music classes, art and pottery. And my.

Speaker: Daughter was really.

Speaker: Interested in signing.

Speaker: Up for improv theater classes this fall. As a Portland.

Speaker: Resident and a parent.

Speaker: Whose.

Speaker: Children have flourished through the classes.

Speaker: At Multnomah art.

Speaker: Center, I urge you to reconsider the proposal.

Speaker: To permanently.

Speaker: Close this vital.

Speaker: Community resource. The mac.

Speaker: Center is.

Speaker: A place where families.

Speaker: From.

Speaker: All backgrounds come.

Speaker: Together to learn, create.

Speaker: And.

Speaker: Build the kind of strong community.

Speaker: Fabric that makes.

Speaker: Portland unique.

Speaker: It's a source of pride for our family.

Speaker: And I've.

Speaker: Mentioned it to many friends and family members who live in cities around.

Speaker: The us and.

Speaker: In other countries as.

Speaker: A beacon.

Speaker: Of what.

Speaker: Good community.

Speaker: Support looks like in practice.

Speaker: In addition.

Speaker: To being a parent, I'm a senior.

Speaker: Director of. Product for a national nonprofit that builds.

Speaker: Government capacity to.

Speaker: Implement technology solutions.

Speaker: As such, I deeply understand the value of technology as well as the.

Speaker: Critical importance of encouraging creativity and critical thinking.

Speaker: In an age where. Technology and artificial intelligence are rapidly. Transforming our world, it's more important than ever to invest in spaces that nurture creativity, critical thinking, and.

Speaker: Human connection.

Speaker: I definitely understand needing.

Speaker: To be fiscally responsible and well versed in making tough decisions to balance goals.

Speaker: Budget.

Speaker: Resources, and I'm happy that you all are carefully. Considering all the options.

Speaker: As you've.

Speaker: Heard from many others today, amendment number 45 is.

Speaker: Not the right answer.

Speaker: This isn't. Just about.

Speaker: Art and music classes.

Speaker: It's about ensuring.

Speaker: That every. Portlander has a place.

Speaker: To grow, express themselves. Please vote.

Speaker: No on 45.

Speaker: Thank you, thank you.

Speaker: Madam carroll.

Speaker: Is joining us online.

Speaker: Hello.

Speaker: My name.

Speaker: Is madeline carroll and I live in the. Woodlawn neighborhood.

Speaker: In district two.

Speaker: I'm a member of showing up for racial justice surge pdx. The new city charter in.

Speaker: This city.

Speaker: Council marks the first time in my 20 years in Portland that i, that.

Speaker: I. And many.

Speaker: I know, have felt real hope. That we may have a budget that reflects the. Progressive values we hold. The shared.

Speaker: Hope has brought people out to engage.

Speaker: In this.

Speaker: Budget process. Many of us, for the first time, please cut the police budget and tax the wealthy to fully fund parks, housing and social services. Fully fund the new police accountability board as required by the charter, and please fully.

Speaker: Separate Portland street.

Speaker: Response from the police. We want alternatives to the systems of policing that, despite the huge proportion of funds, they continue to spend. Even the people here in support of police have admitted they cannot solve. Invest in the things that can. I'm here to remind this council that we know the solutions the criminal legal system offers actually makes systemic problems worse. We know that police have broad immunity to harm and kill community members without accountability. We know that most people the Portland police arrest are homeless and otherwise vulnerable. Police and the systems that they are a part of ultimately make us less safe. The safest, the safest communities have the most shared resources, not the most police. Thank you so much.

Speaker: Next up, checking otis rheubottom sariah. Hoppner, diana. Sellers. Erica qanats, emily. Lou, michelle miller. Genevieve gahagan michelle is joining us online. Go ahead. Michelle.

Speaker: Hi.

Speaker: Oh, me. Sorry about that. Good afternoon.

Speaker: Councilors and mayor.

Speaker: My name is michelle miller. I live in the. D4 stadium neighborhood.

Speaker: We're holding our.

Speaker: Breath over here.

Speaker: Councilors avalos.

Speaker: And morillo. Are crossing a.

Speaker: Line right.

Speaker: Now and steering money away from.

Speaker: The police bureau. In their proposed.

Speaker: Amendments, they're.

Speaker: Pushing their.

Speaker: Dsa agendas by trying to.

Speaker: Control public safety funds and funneling them into pet projects.

Speaker: And that's exactly.

Speaker: The kind of political overreach that voters. Rejected when we chose to limit council control over city bureaus.

Speaker: The recent.

Speaker: Research poll.

Speaker: Shows nearly 70%.

Speaker: Of Portlanders support a ballot.

Speaker: Measure to increase police. Staffing and.

Speaker: To meet.

Speaker: National averages.

Speaker: That support. Stay strong, even when voters are told it could impact other city.

Speaker: Services in the stadium neighborhood.

Speaker: The civic.

Speaker: Retail center now has 0% occupancy.

Speaker: And we just. Learned that the dutch brothers coffee place is also closing, citing. Safety concerns. Safety is a pre-req for every city service to function if you cut public safety.

Speaker: Now.

Speaker: Your green lighting.

Speaker: Collapse wilson safety budget gives us a shot.

Speaker: At rebuilding prosperity. The amendments from councilor, smith, Ryan, clark and zimmerman, however, point us in the right direction. You all get to decide whether Portland pulls itself out of this doom loop. Please protect and augment our safety budgets. Thank you.

Speaker: Okay, checking. Erica. Emily. Lou. Genevieve. Gahagan. Moving on to john hook. Joan glassell sarah salvi is joining us online. Okay. Sarah, please unmute. Why don't we go to sarah? Go.

Speaker: Hi. My name is soraya. Go. District four, a lifelong citizen of Portland and specifically Multnomah arts center, this center nurtures the health of every person who walks through the door, brain and body as a rainy state. It's an indoor sanctuary that keeps people moving through the dark months and allows people the bravery of showcasing what they've learned. When spring comes with all their loved ones, it's a place to learn, express, recover and build friendships and identity. And as a registered nurse, I can't emphasize enough how the Multnomah arts center supports mental and physical well-being through the social connections and the sense of community it creates. This is evidence based practice, with results from over 3000 studies identifying a major role for the arts in prevention of illness, promotion of health and management, and treatment of illness across the lifespan. This is not just evidence based practice. This is my practice with my patients and my family member with dementia. This is your practice. If you've ever sought relief from a long day in music, dance, or any other medium, this city needs an expansion of community centers, not an erasure of them. And I testify in supplication that you consider how many lives you will be altering for the worse. If you decide to take

away a center that is a source of education, friendship and activity. For many, this issue we are voting on today is a microcosm of one that faces the entire country, and we must fight to promote the arts on an individual and local level in order to contribute to national difference. Multnomah art center keeps Portland vibrant and lively, and does its job in taking care of her people. And I implore you to do the same and vote no and save our precious mac. Thank you so much.

Speaker: Sarah is joining us online. Sarah, please unmute.

Speaker: Hello? Can you hear me?

Speaker: We can hear you.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, councilors and mayor.

Speaker: Regarding the proposal to close the Multnomah.

Speaker: Arts center.

Speaker: I believe.

Speaker: This is a terrible.

Speaker: Shortsighted idea.

Speaker: That would.

Speaker: Close a wonderful.

Speaker: Very successful.

Speaker: Nonprofit community. Center in the area. It is.

Speaker: The heartbeat of Multnomah. And yes, our city faces fierce budget shortfall.

Speaker: But closing.

Speaker: This vital, thriving arts program that serves so. Many people of all ages.

Speaker: Does not seem to be the right answer. In addition.

Speaker: It shares space.

Speaker: With a number of important.

Speaker: Other nonprofits.

Speaker: Already.

Speaker: The arts have been under.

Speaker: Assault from our. National government. Is the city of Portland really.

Speaker: Anxious to pile.

Speaker: On to the.

Speaker: Disregard of.

Speaker: The importance.

Speaker: Of arts in our lives? Our adult son lives with.

Speaker: Us and.

Speaker: His mental illness.

Speaker: The arts provide a wonderful outlet for him to express himself. He has taken many classes at Multnomah arts. Center that have enriched his life. He has always been treated with the utmost kindness.

Speaker: And dignity.

Speaker: I can tell many stories of the way people there, and his experience in various classes have been meaningful to him. The arts are important for all people, regardless of age and even talent. Their pursuit offers intrinsic rewards in a non-judgmental way. We must try to preserve this for places like the Multnomah arts centers that build community around them. Thank you.

Speaker: Checking john hooke, joan glassell next up, we have tim hahn, alexandra beebe, pearl shapiro. Nick savage, karen lee. Please.

Speaker: My name.

Speaker: Is alexandra beebe, and I'm a junior at mount holyoke college. I am speaking up against the closure of the mac and the cmc, and I feel the need to

speak today because the kids from the studio theater program at the mac sent me here. After I joined that program as a fourth grader. It carried me through elementary, middle, and high school. I have been in over 30 fully staged, fully costumed plays there. I met all of my best friends there when I was a senior in high school. I started mentoring the current students, and it's been the most rewarding experience of my life. Three middle schoolers once made me a bead bracelet that said, mom, the mac has always been a place for outsiders, for people who feel misunderstood or discarded, it is a neighborhood bastion. I often hear people older than myself talk about how we used to have communities, and people used to care about each other. The Multnomah arts center is the only place where I have found that. To put it bluntly, my entire life was built in that building by the people inside. I work with so many tweens who deserve to also have ten wonderful years there. These are kids who are bullied at school. These are kids who spend lunch in the library. These are kids who have lost a parent or whose parents are divorcing. They count down the days until they can come back to the mac. I want it to be there when they arrive. Today, you will make a decision that will define their lives, and tomorrow I will have to go to rehearsal and explain it to them. I really, really hope I can give them good news. Thank you for your time.

Speaker: Go ahead sir.

Speaker: Hi.

Speaker: My name.

Speaker: Is tim hahn and I'm in district three. And I brought along something to share, but i. Have heard.

Speaker: So many voices raised.

Speaker: Against amendment.

Speaker: 45 that I have. Nothing more to say.

Speaker: If you aren't convinced.

Speaker: By the voices you've.

Speaker: Already heard.

Speaker: There's nothing.

Speaker: More I can say.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Checking. Pearl shapiro, asian savage karen lee. Next up we have lawrence cusack, rebecca heisel, samantha knopfler, martha mccall, stacy clark. Go ahead.

Speaker: Good afternoon.

Speaker: Council members. My name is samantha knopfler, and I'm a rising senior at lewis and clark college here.

Speaker: To.

Speaker: Speak on the proposed closure.

Speaker: Of the community.

Speaker: Music center and Multnomah arts center. I've been going to the Multnomah arts center since before I can remember. I was a shy kid.

Speaker: And had.

Speaker: Trouble making friends, so my parents, both public school teachers, signed me up for a bunch of camps to help. I remember years of looking through the catalog with the list of classes and circling which ones I wanted to.

Speaker: Take, like.

Speaker: Toys at christmas. They were right.

Speaker: I did.

Speaker: Find my friends at the macc. I found an incredible community.

Speaker: In their theater and.

Speaker: Music camps.

Speaker: That brought.

Speaker: Me out of my shell and introduced me to wonderful people.

Speaker: Who.

Speaker: Over a decade later, I still consider to be my closest friends. One of them testified earlier today, I cannot count how many plays and recitals I've had at the mac, nor can I count how many Saturday mornings and weekday evenings spent in rehearsal or classes. When I was at my lowest, I always felt at home at the mac, the Multnomah arts center, and the people inside it have made me who I am as a person and helped inspire and cultivate my passions. In our current world, community is hard to come by, and shutting down the mac would be taking community away, not only from the people who use its classes and resources, but the community at large. The mac's the heart of Multnomah village and brings together people from all over the city that share that sense of community and appreciation for the arts that are often overlooked. Today, I am a double theater and computer science major at lewis and clark college, and will be acting in and co-directing euripides medea with the art collective in building five later this summer. Though I do not take classes as often as I used to, I carry the lessons the Multnomah arts center taught me in my personal, educational, and professional life. The arts are so important as a means of community and expression. Humanity.

Speaker: Thank you so much for being here with us today.

Speaker: Martha mccall is joining us online.

Speaker: Hello. I'm also I'm marty mccall. I'm from district four, and I'm also speaking against amendment 45. I wanted to talk a little bit about.

Speaker: The.

Speaker: Facilities, because the state of the assets is stated as a reason for the closure of mac and the cmc. At the mac. There are facilities for jewelry making, metalsmithing, ceramics, spinning, weaving, etching and printing and dance and performance. It's not like you can just move these somewhere else. They're there and they're all active and they're well maintained. So i, I did want to I urge you to visit the facility and take a tour of all these of all these things, but also to, to be aware of if there is an issue with structural, structural information, the building planning committee and the people that are working on these, this has been so sudden that there hasn't been time to say, well, what are the issues and how can we solve them? I'm confident that we can and that we don't have to pit the existence of the cmc and mac against park maintenance. So I thank you. And that's that's the extent of my time. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you all very much. Unfortunately, we are at a little over two hours. And while I would love to hear from everybody who has signed up to testify, I also want to make sure that we have time to robustly debate some of the issues before us, and unfortunately, we won't have time to have meaningful discussion if we don't take a bit of a lunch break and then start to enter the amendment portion of our day. If you did not get a chance to testify today, first of all, my apologies that we didn't have time to get to everybody. It is important to hear from as many community members as possible. That's something that I take seriously, and I know my colleagues do as well. We will be looking over the written testimony that was submitted. While many of our our opinions will be made clear today, we don't take a final vote until next week. And I think we can keep the written testimony open until the end of the day today. Is that Keelan possible? So we'll keep that written testimony open until the end of the day today, so that if you are not able to testify

orally, you can submit something in writing for us to look at before we take our final vote.

Speaker: And I will add to that, I believe the city budget office has provided a form for folks to be able to submit written testimony throughout the process. So I think that is available to folks even after today.

Speaker: So even after we close the testimony on the clerk's web page, there is the form that's available on the budget office web page where folks can continue to submit testimony as well. We hope that you let us know what your concerns are, or what items in the budget that you support. Even if we weren't able to hear from you today, councilors, we are going to take a half hour break so that folks can get some food. Our support team can get a little bit more of a break than just the five and ten minute breaks, and we will meet back here at five minutes to three. I will see you all.

Speaker: Then you can ask questions.

Speaker: Counselor. Thank you all for everybody.

Speaker: Who showed up on time. I think that we have adopted all of the amendments that we need to. Are we ready to move forward? Just kidding. I'm just. Folks who show up. It matters. Thank you all. Welcome back. Folks are trickling in from a quick lunch break. I will talk a little bit about what we're doing next. So it's 3:00 already. We need to talk about some amendments. We need to hear the prosper budget and actually make final decisions there. Today, the most important things for today are the things that could throw a fund out of balance. So what I think I'd like to do so that we can get through our must do's, is talk very briefly about the president's package. And then talk about the things that could. I know I said we were going to do these in order of policy area, but I think that at 3:00 we can't do that. So talk about the things that could lead to some big swings in funds.

Talk about prosper, open up prosper Portland and then go back to talking about things by policy area. Councilor Clark, I see you in the queue.

Speaker: So if we have things that don't knock the balance out, are we going to be able to propose those or to move our amendments or budget notes?

Speaker: I sure as heck hope so.

Speaker: Okay, because there are those that don't do there are okay.

Speaker: There are. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: So, so colleagues who just came in, I was saying that because of the time and we actually have to make our final decisions about prosper today, and we have to make any final decision that could change a fund balance by more than 10% today, that I believe we need to change up our order a little bit. So I would like to talk briefly about the president's amendment that was filed last night. I apologize that that was filed so late. And then talk about the things that rather than go in order of policy area, talk about some of the funds where there could be big shifts and see if folks want to introduce any of the amendments that would affect funds where there could be big shifts, then come back and depending on the timing, talk through potentially a couple of policy areas and then get to prosper as soon as possible, because today is actually our one shot with prosper, whereas we will return to amendments to our budget on the fourth of the 11th. Rather, I apologize on the 11th. I hope we can get through a fair amount still today though, so I had told you all that I would try to bring forward a president's amendment that captured things that I thought had pretty broad support, based on how I saw folks react here, what folks flagged for me as things of concern, what folks flagged in your public communications as items of concern, and some conversation at the finance committee. And that got posted last night. It is an amendment that is

slightly net positive. It balances with a little bit of extra money. It did not include some things that I thought there might be broad support for, but that we're going to be harder to balance. It is an amendment that actually leaves us a little bit of flexibility, because while the total dollar amount is only slightly net positive, it shifts a fair amount of funds from ongoing to one time, which either gives us flexibility in other fund areas this budget or starts us off next year with less of a cliff. And I focused on things that I've heard many people talk about across this dais, things that I think increase oversight, accountability, and good government. Things that especially look at accountability within our park system that begin to address some of the economic development pieces that I know folks were concerned weren't in the mayor's budget. And that takes a stab at the park maintenance issue that I know many of us would like to fill the gap in. The goal was to offer something that could cut down on the time for debate, because we have 120 amendments before us. So what I would like to do is get a sense of whether this can do that or not, because if this can't cut down on debate time, then it's probably not worth moving as a package. But if it can, and that might save us a little bit of time and get us started on our work. So I guess what I'm looking for right now, and I should say, in light of the fact that I heard just this morning that there is a piece in there that some folks had concerns with that I hadn't heard in any of those formats. What people have said publicly before today, but I don't know how broad that concern is. So what I'm looking for before we start to debate on this is a bit of a head nod of if this feels like something that could cut down on time or not. So if this looks like an amendment that you think might cut down on time, if I could just get a head nod yes, that will help me get a sense of where we're going. Okay.

Speaker: Next problem.

Speaker: I'm seeing a lot. I'm seeing a lot of mix. I'm seeing a lot of split here. And I see our folks in the queue on this amendment or our folks in the queue generally.

Speaker: Just point of information.

Speaker: When you say amendment.

Speaker: Do you mean.

Speaker: The president's package?

Speaker: Yes, okay. I do.

Speaker: Which I believe is posted as pirtle-guiney 32. Councilor clark, were you in the queue on this amendment? Yeah, I'm thinking that we don't have the go ahead, that it's going to free up time. But why don't you?

Speaker: Well, thank you, council president. I just want to say that I appreciate your effort here, that I don't agree with everything that's in here, but I'm willing to suspend my, I guess, my feelings about it and move ahead with this. And because I think it's very balanced, I don't feel like I need to pick it apart at this point. And it leaves us time to actually go through other people's amendments.

Speaker: Councilor smith, were you in the queue on this or on something broader?

Speaker: Yes, yes, madam president, thank you. I do agree with councilor clark.

Ditto. I could support this. I have some concerns about a couple of things, but I'm not. It's not a deal killer. So.

Speaker: Councilor dunphy, were you in the amendment on something broader?

Speaker: No, it was to the.

Speaker: To the amendment. Okay. I am not able to support the package of this. I do appreciate the effort that you've tried to put into this, but there are just a few things in this that I couldn't I can't support. I also have some concerns about the framing of it. It looks as though there are a lot of our members, our colleagues who

did not have almost any representation in this. There are many major agenda items that are from other committees that are not present. And I just i.

Speaker: Yeah, there are major agenda items not present because I was trying to look at things that we had spoken to.

Speaker: I also, I do think it is worth noting, though, that 90% of the amendments in this did come from white members of council, and 75% of it came from male councilors, and there's no representation of any of the amendments from district three, and only 10% are coming from district one. Councilors, i, I would like to have a broader conversation.

Speaker: And like I said, I if this doesn't help us move quickly, we won't. I do just want to flag that there's language in here from at least seven councilors. And at least two of the ideas in here were put forward by multiple other councilors as well. So I'm not sure where those numbers came from. Councilors i. I'm going to move us forward with some other things, I think, because I don't want us to get in a debate over something that is supposed to save time if it won't save time. So we have. A few funds. I'm sorry. Councilor Ryan.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Is it dead?

Speaker: I, I haven't asked for a second on it, and I saw in head nod that I don't think it's going to save us time. So while I would love to consider this at some point, I want to move us to think that are are time pressing first. If it's not going to save us time, okay. The we have a few funds that folks have raised amendments on that I think we just need to knock out whether we're going to get seconds and move those forward or not, because they could adjust funds by more than 10%. So I know we're taking this out of order from what I suggested we would do, but given where we are at time wise, I think we need to do that. I want to start with the let's start. I'm

going in order of fund number. So that would put us after general fund talking about the transportation operating fund. And director levine, I'm looking to you. You had said that a 10% year was \$35 million. Are there any amendments on the table that would adjust that fund by that much or more?

Speaker: I don't believe, I don't believe so for the transportation operating fund.

Speaker: I'm going to skip us past that one 214 public election fund. Do we have any amendments on the table that would address the public election fund by more than 130,000? Yes. Is that the morillo amendment?

Speaker: I believe there's two public election fund amendments.

Speaker: Okay. So, councilors, if you have an amendment that would adjust the public election fund, now is an opportunity to put that forward and ask for seconds on it so that we can see if this is a fund that could be adjusted significantly, which means it's something we would have to address today and could not wait on.

Speaker: Point of information. I'm sorry, I'm unclear what.

Speaker: We're doing.

Speaker: Could i.

Speaker: Get an.

Speaker: I had said as folks, twice as people were walking in that because it is already 3:00 and there are two things that we have to do today. I was going to adjust the order some. I had said we would take things in order of policy area, but instead, because there are two things we have to do today, we have to make sure that if there are funds that are going to be adjusted by more than 10%, that happens before we send this to tsk tomorrow, and we have to do our work on the prosper budget. Those two things can't wait. So I've asked us to reorder and do those two things first. So right now what I'm doing is looking at the list of funds which our budget director has generously flagged for me, what funds we have

budget amendments proposed that would address so that we can see if there is any interest in adjust in amendments, which would adjust funds by more than 10%, which is one of the things we have to do today. We cannot do after we go to tsk unless we want to go to tsk a second time. So right now I'm asking if there is anybody who had pre filed an amendment on or was planning to bring forward an amendment today that would affect the public election fund, who is interested in introducing and asking for a second on those amendments so that we can consider those at this time.

Speaker: Are you saying the public election fund because that is over the 10%? And also, I don't know, do we have a list of what the 10% things are?

Speaker: Sorry.

Speaker: I there is I have a list of funds that I asked our budget director for and. It is also if you look at your budget documents, there's a list of all of the funds. I believe there many of those funds. There are no amendments proposed that would address the funds. There are amendments proposed which would address the public election fund. And director levine just said that some of those could. Adjust up that fund, could increase that fund by more than 10%.

Speaker: Yeah. So just to clarify, I believe the only two amendments that would trigger the 10% rule, as we call it, are morillo six and avalos seven, and those both concern the public elections fund. And that's just because it's a smaller fund.

Speaker: So at this time, if either councilor morillo you are interested in introducing your amendment six or councilor avalos you are interested in introducing your amendment seven, or if anybody else was planning to bring a floor amendment that addresses the public election fund, the small donor election program, now is the time to do that. And I'm sorry for the change in order. I hope

this makes sense to folks, but I want to make sure we get through the critical things today that have to be done today.

Speaker: Okay, I'm happy to introduce morillo amendment six. It supports a small donor elections program, and it's a motion to allocate \$825,000 by \$825,525 of one time resources to the small donor elections program.

Speaker: Second are we is that what we're doing? Second.

Speaker: Do we have a second for that motion? Second okay, so, counselor, would you like to speak to this amendment?

Speaker: Yeah, this is so this is going to be funded. My amendment is funded from the golf fund, which I know is somewhat controversial, but it's in the amendment as written right now. And it would the golf fund currently has 7 million in the bank. And their contingency they're only required to keep 1 million there. We've cleared it with the city attorneys that it is okay to move those expenses. I think at a time where our democracy is at risk, this is a really highly important thing to push for in the next year. We have seen a level of engagement and a different type of person being able to come into office because of the small donor elections program. So I think it's really important. This is a very small amount of money to ask for in exchange to preserve our democracy.

Speaker: Thank you. I see hands in the queue. Counselor smith, are you speaking to this amendment? Councilor morillo. You just spoke to the amendment. Counselor clark, are you speaking to this amendment? Go right ahead.

Speaker: Thank you, madam chair. I just wanted to ask councilor morillo, what does this do to the overall budget for the sdc? I'm not sure. Is this these funds, are they needed? Is this because I'm not sure what the impact would be of the current budget proposal? To give me some context, maybe.

Speaker: Yeah. I believe during the last administration they really greatly reduced the small donor elections program, which essentially guts it in a way that makes it ineffective. I think the point of the small donor elections program is sort of to equalize voices across the city and make sure that we have a democracy that is led by people that are, you know, not bought by big money. And it was specifically requested from the small donor elections office as well.

Speaker: Councilor green.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. Just to follow on to councilor clark's question, you know, the next elections in the fall of 2026, and I think it would be difficult if we waited a year to consider making sure that fund was whole. And so I think taking from the golf fund at that level does an obligate sort of sort of general fund allocation this year or next year. I think that's why it's a little prudent. That's why I'm prepared to support it.

Speaker: Councilor morillo did you want to add something?

Speaker: Yeah, sorry, just to make sure I articulated it correctly. So this one time funding to meet demand and not have to this is a one time funding mechanism to meet demand and to not have to substantially lower match cap and match rates in the upcoming election cycles. So this is pretty critical to ensure the stability of the small donor elections program.

Speaker: I have myself in the queue. I'm not sure if we have anybody here who can answer this. Councilor morillo maybe you can. I'm looking to see if there's anybody. Yes, I do, great. If you want to come up, that would be great. I am wondering to the point about the caps that you just mentioned. I remember when we got the presentation about this fund thinking it's lower than it was previously, but last year we had four seats up and this year there will only be two seats up. And I'm wondering at current funding level, what. And we're extrapolating because there

will be funds in next year's budget too. But at current funding level, what the expectations are around matches and caps and how that would change under this amendment?

Speaker: Sure. It's not turning on. Can you hear me?

Speaker: I lean forward a little more. It should pick you up and go ahead and introduce yourself.

Speaker: Okay. There. It's on.

Speaker: So the program has.

Speaker: Been I'm sorry, can you introduce yourself for folks who are watching online?

Speaker: So susan.

Speaker: Mattei, director.

Speaker: Of the small donor elections.

Speaker: Program.

Speaker: The small donor elections program.

Speaker: When it was.

Speaker: Passed in 2016, was estimated. To need 0.2%. Of the. General fund annually.

Speaker: To be.

Speaker: Solvent through.

Speaker: The four year election.

Speaker: Cycle, during which all 14.

Speaker: Well at the time not 14 but now 14.

Speaker: City offices are elected.

Speaker: At 1.3 million, which is what its proposed funding.

Speaker: Level is.

Speaker: That is 0.13%.

Speaker: It's almost funded.

Speaker: At almost.

Speaker: Half of what it needs.

Speaker: To be.

Speaker: So as a result of this.

Speaker: Funding level.

Speaker: It's just received cut, cut cut cut cut after.

Speaker: After years.

Speaker: And it all compounded together at.

Speaker: This. Funding level.

Speaker: The Portland elections commission has already announced that unless it receives increased funding, the match caps for 2026 and 2028 have been lowered to 35% of the total, down by 65% to.

Speaker: 35%.

Speaker: With an additional approximately \$900,000. The. The estimate is that the match caps for 2026 and 2028. If that were ongoing, not one time would be able to be 100% 100.

Speaker: When you say 35% and 100% of the total, can you help me understand?

Speaker: Oh, sure.

Speaker: So in the statute.

Speaker: The mayor's match cap is 750,000 and the auditors is 100,000, and councils is 100,000.

Speaker: 200,000, 300,000.

Speaker: Depending on if.

Speaker: They're.

Speaker: In tier one, 2 or 3. So 100% would be the statutory amounts. But because of consistent program underfunding for the last few years, those caps have been reduced by 65% down to 35%. So for the I can't do the math, I don't remember the number on the fly for the mayor.

Speaker: Instead of 100, 200, 335.

Speaker: 70, 105,000.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor kanal.

Speaker: Yeah, I just want to say that as someone who this will not directly affect for a while, because to the left side, as the viewer looks at it, we're not up in 2026, the six colleagues on your right are left as well as the auditor are up. I think it's really vital that we continue to have a representative council and a functional small donor election program. Is vital for that. We may disagree with each other up here, but I think it's really important to remember that all 12 of us represent a real constituency. And I don't know that that's always been true in the past. And I think that that's because of the reforms to our elections that have happened over the last several years. And so although this will not directly affect d1 and d2 in the 2026 elections, I'm strongly supportive of ensuring that small donor elections can be successful. And I'm grateful for the amendment coming forward. Thanks.

Speaker: Councilor avalos.

Speaker: Yes. Thank you. Definitely. Ditto to what my colleague councilor kanal said. And I think ultimately, one quick stat that i'll say is out of everybody that was elected here, 87% of Portland voters have at least one person on this dais that they voted for. That's huge. That is a big increase in representation. It is felt in our community when people feel like they have somebody here. And in order to

continue to encourage that kind of representative government, we need to make sure that we have a strong small donor program, especially in the face of gestures that everything in Portland. I think we need to really double down on making sure that our ballot box is accessible, that folks can see their dollars maximized in trying to advocate for their voice. And in this form, this new form of government, it's meant to go hand in hand with exactly what the small donor program does. So if we cut down that program, I think it really hinders our ability to continue this structure that we have been championing, because, again, it really represents a lot of Portlanders. So I am fully in support. And I think that we and the last thing I'll say is the reason why it's important to do this now and not next year, is that if we wait until the next cycle, next, let's talk like what? Next may? Next June, those candidates, all of you on that side of the dais, are going to be up in a few months. And that is a really unstable place for you guys to be as far as what the funding availability is. So I think it's important that we invest now and we invest next year, because what I'm also understanding is that we need to we are so under invested in that, that it's going to take time for us to build up that fund. And so I think we need to start now so that we're not putting our colleagues in a really hard spot during what will likely be another budget shortfall, so that they can have a successful election. And not just them, but just, you know, anybody who wants to represent districts three and four. Thanks.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor smith.

Speaker: Yes, thank you, madam president. And I just want to say ditto, ditto, ditto to what everyone has said. We have to do this. There's no sense in starting something that you can't finish. And it is it is helpful when we make sure that all of our residents in, in the city of Portland, that they participate. District one had the lowest voter turnout period. Now, if you go in district one, people know that they

have three people representing them. They know that we've been out to neighborhood associations. We've been to small group meetings, large group meetings, business association meetings. They know who we are now. And so I guarantee you that folks are going to come out and do their civic duty. And I think we need to do it now. But I have a question. Is, is Jonas here?

Speaker: Jonas is here. And we do. I'm not sure if you can see her from where you are, but we do have director Levine up with us.

Speaker: I'm sorry, Ruth, but that's okay, I didn't. Okay, so we're attempting to take this out of the golf fund. In 2017, the golf fund had to be bailed out by city general fund. So you may know this, Ruth, I know you probably know this. Kay Jordan. And I was just wondering, how did the golf fund get \$8 million? And they were just bailed out in 2017. What have they done since then to create such a bloated fund and just merely five years or councilor?

Speaker: It's a great question. I don't know that I'm equipped to answer what's happened, but I believe that that's an intentional plan to plan ahead for capital investment needs within the golf system. So I believe and if there's parks folks in the room who can help us support or deny that, that that's part of the intent to avoid that, that.

Speaker: Their budget went up in the last couple years. And I'm trying to figure out where that money came from. Is that from former mayor Ted Wheeler? He put money in there and stashed it away. I don't understand how they. Okay, that's a different story. But anyway, I have no problem with taking the money out of the out of the golf fund because whatever they're doing, they need to keep doing it because they have \$8 million in such a short period of time.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor, councilor Zimmerman.

Speaker: I'm a little disappointed. And it's not the council's fault, just in terms of order that the first thing that we're debating is about our own election pot. I find that quite uncomfortable. And it's not the council's fault, it's just the order of things. But given that I've got the mayor's proposed budget here, I'm trying really hard to find your line item so I can understand the number that's in it today and why this is so necessary today, and I cannot find it. Please direct me in the mayor's budget where your line item is.

Speaker: Do you know where?

Speaker: So I don't.

Speaker: Have my. Sorry, I just posted up here. Not on my laptop in front of me, but it should be within in this budget, the city operations service area. I believe under the small donor elections program. And if I recall correctly, the total budget for the program was around 1.2 million. As proposed, the 800 ish increase, I believe, increases the amount to 2.2 million, which is the amount recommended by the Portland election commission to fully fund the program in their in their estimation. So I've looked in there. I'm not seeing it. I'd love it if you could tell me, but I think that the 1.3 seems enough to me. This is a very representative council that was elected in a amount of time with the with a reduced amount of match, and it worked. And in the next election, we expect at least half of the number of people running. So I'm not inclined. I'll just also say golf is funded by the people who play golf, right? We have increased the fees for our public courses over the over the previous years by a significant amount, and there are more people who are going to try and do that today, but it is paid for by the people, the kids, the adults, the grandfathers like mine, who took me to learn on Portland owned golf courses. And they pay that fee without moaning about it, because they know that that fee goes to maintenance of that asset. And we are now going to rob that asset to pay our own

election coffers. And I think that's wrong. I also think that and because i, I am in support and will support an a funding package that makes sure small donor is alive and well and it can be. But in a world where another a number of people have said we shouldn't hit someone else's contingency fund to pay for another unintended group sighting, pcf, we're now going to do it against this group, and pcf is not paid for by the people who play pcf. But golf is paid for by the people who play golf. I don't know that they're going to enjoy a golf increase. If we then say your increase is going to pay for other things, particularly City Councilors, election funds, i'll vote no on this. And I also think with a \$4 million ask in this budget package of amendments and additional increases to golf, that I am concerned that this is just the first of 100 amendments to increase this budget and put us more out of balance.

Speaker: Thank you councilor. I don't believe you've spoken to this issue yet.

Speaker: I have.

Speaker: You have. I apologize, councilor Ryan.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I don't disagree with the concept. What we're discussing right now. I don't feel comfortable with where we're taking the money from. It seems like I'm supporting it from existing, using a program revenues from for a totally different purpose. It just seems like a slippery slope. I'm trying to just second what I just heard from councilor zimmermann. And again, we're going to have much less than half the amount of people and there's no primary. Correct? Correct. Still no primary. Okay.

Speaker: That's all been lower.

Speaker: Lower participation, fewer seats elected. All of these things have been factored into what is a very conservative estimate for what they need.

Speaker: I just think it should go against it seems like it goes against policy to take money from an existing program. Like it was said earlier.

Speaker: Councilor. Councilor green, I don't believe you've spoken to this issue.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I'll just note for the record that in 2017, the city of Portland, the City Council approved a transfer from the general fund to the golf fund of \$800,000. That's it.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor morillo, you're back in the queue.

Speaker: Yeah. Thank you. That is correct. When the golf fund needed bailing out during an emergency, which is nothing like the level of emergency that we are seeing in our city today. They did get that \$800,000 bailout. And that's okay, because I think part of making tough decisions with our budget right now means that we are making a lot of tough decisions with a lot of beloved services, and. We are in a moment of crisis, or else we wouldn't be having some of the unsavory conversations that we are about to have. And part of leadership is making those tough decisions. And I just want to flag that. All of these points were articulated in the Portland elections commission letter that was submitted to the mayor and council that was titled, quote, annual small donor elections funding needs notice, March 20th, 2025. So this is a critical and articulated need to get us closer to a people centered election. And we are allowing neighbors to help neighbors. When parks bailed out golf, guess what golf is parks cousin. Okay, that's what that's what we're doing today with a lot of our resources. And this is this is democracy in action. So people can hem and haw, but we don't have a lot of good choices before us. And I think that this is really critical. And I bet all the people that golf love to vote. So I hope that they'll get to use this fund.

Speaker: Thank you councilor, I'm back in the queue. Just to echo my colleagues who have concerns about pulling from this specific source, I'd be interested in

additional conversations about a different source, but I when we are when we are saving for a rainy day, I struggle to pull from that for something like this.

Speaker: Councilor kanal yeah, I think there's a couple things about this in the special appropriations on city operations, but that's separate from the fund itself. And I also can't find the fund in here. But I did read the document. And so that that councilor morillo was talking about, and I think, as miss put it, is relatively conservative and based off of the number of, of positions that are up, which again is seven, the auditor is up as well. I think I'm very interested in the conversation about another funding source, but I also want to note that if this is not a rainy day, I don't really know what is like the broader context of the budget. It's pretty rainy. So I think like there's we've had a lot of conversations about these funds that are just kind of there around the city. And I'm not necessarily saying this is the best one. I'm going to I'm going to vote for this, but I'd love to hear if anyone has another idea. But my point is broadly that we should be looking at these funds, the ones that are not voter approved, to look and see. Is there a better use of some of this? Thanks.

Speaker: Councilor Ryan, are you back in the queue?

Speaker: Yeah. I just want to say two things. One, I don't golf. I think there's sometimes assumptions. And two. I just can't get behind taking revenues from a totally different purpose for elections. So golf, elections, it's just such a stretch. And this council in the past has gotten in trouble for doing just that. And so I just it doesn't pass the smell test for me. Thanks. I'll be voting no though I get the need. Thanks.

Speaker: Councilor clark.

Speaker: Here. If this is not a rainy day, I don't know what is, but next year it's going to be pouring. I mean, it's going to be pouring buckets, I think so, you know, buckle up. I'm less concerned about the source than I am, how much money we

really need and the 1.3 million. Let me see if I understand. Susan. It's I think there's going to be fewer candidates. There's only two City Council districts up. So if we keep it at 1.3 the fund, are we pretty much staying at the same match rate, the same levels? What what changes if we don't if we don't do this.

Speaker: The matching funds are less available. There's gonna be less available. It was brought down to 40% for 2024 for council and even less for the mayor's race. But that was building off of some carryover funds from prior years. The program typically carries over funds for multiple years in order to be able to afford an election year, because the program was so underfunded for 2024, it spent its carryover funds down to almost zero, hoping that it could get sufficient funding in the next few election cycles to be able to afford 2026 and 2028.

Speaker: I'm not sure you answered my question.

Speaker: So, yeah.

Speaker: So I mean.

Speaker: If we only have 1.3 in the next cycle, are we at the same level in terms of match or lower? Okay.

Speaker: Not the match rate, but the match caps. That's the match caps help us manage fiscal exposure of the program. The match rate doesn't affect that as clearly.

Speaker: Can you.

Speaker: Specific example?

Speaker: Sure. If we lower the match rate instead of the match caps similarly, then it would be instead of a 9 to 1 match on the first 20, it might be a 3 to 1 match on the first 20, but we don't know how much that will save us. If candidates will just hustle harder. So what we do is we lower the match caps, and then we know that as soon as the candidates hit a certain amount, we're not going to pay them more, no

matter how hard they hustle. So that's how we that's why the Portland elections commission lowers the match caps instead of the match rates.

Speaker: Okay. Thanks.

Speaker: And councilors, I had hoped that we would do a bit more of a debate style, but there weren't many hands in the queue for this one. So I'm going to mix this up a little bit when we get to the next thing. I'm just flagging that now.

Councilor smith and then councilor morillo.

Speaker: Thank you. I just want everybody to understand that all of this is general fund money, and the small donor elections is just another bureau. You're putting more into it than need be. It is at a bureau that is legal, that has to be funded just like any other bureau. Take the politics out of it. But what you're going to do is if we don't fund this out of state and in-state super pacs and dark money will control our City Council races, I guarantee you. So we better get smart and fund our own elections. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor morillo. You're the last one in the queue.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor. Thank you, councilor smith. That was beautifully said and I completely agree. I really appreciate that. I agree this isn't my first or favorite thing to have on the agenda, given all of the things that we have moving forward. But I think we should call the question because we have a lot of other hard things to bring forward today.

Speaker: Thank you councilor. We do have a first and a second on the table. There is nobody else in the queue for debate. And councilors, I apologize that this is the first thing in starting with funds. This just happened to be the first fund that that director levine said. Yes, we could be hitting the cap too. So it was not at all intentional to start here. Keelan could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Thank you for this amendment, I vote aye.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Koyama lane i.

Speaker: Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick.

Speaker: I certainly agree that we should keep the small donor elections program going strong. I hesitate to use this funding source for that purpose. I'm interested in the argument that the parks bailed out the golf fund in 2017, but that makes me think that we should think about having golf repay parks for maintenance rather than for elections. But I look forward to thinking about other ways to raise the money for this purpose later on. Nay, clerk.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Green.

Speaker: Councilor Ryan said it i, I can't resist. Appearances can be misleading. I am a golfer, but I'm also one of the one of the dsa people that's been mentioned times I vote yes.

Speaker: To parks repaid the loan that was noted earlier. All 800 of it, I vote no.

Speaker: I dunphy.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Smith I pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: No.

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

Speaker: We did something. I'm not. No, you can do this. Okay. I'm looking through this fund list for councilor avalos. You did have a related amendment. I'm assuming that you are not putting that on the table. Okay, so that's avalos seven, I believe. Okay. The next fund highlighted here is the city wide obligations reserve fund. I

think we're going to come back to that because what we do with reserves will probably be affected by other things that happened today. And I haven't seen any big amendments to put things into reserves unless somebody has something they were planning to bring from the floor to put over \$1 million more in reserves.

Councilor Kanal are you planning to put more than \$1 million more into reserves?

Speaker: So I have an amendment that I have pre filed. It is. I'll give you the number in a second here. Or seven. Yeah. So my understanding. So it's canal seven. It adds \$3.4 million of one time funding to the citywide obligations reserve fund into the community board for police accountability sub fund. And then it also designates directs us to stop designating the \$3.4 million of ongoing dollars that are going to independent police review as part of the ocpa budget, the office of community based police accountability. Okay, and I am happy to give just a little info as to why and then ask for a second. My. The plain text of the charter says that the board, the new community police oversight board, which is now called the community board for police accountability, must have a budget that is proportional to 5% of the police. Portland police bureau's budget, which is proposed at \$318 million, which makes 15.9 million. The city obligation. They've set aside 10 million for it in the in a fund and budgeted 2 million for it 2.1 million for the actual bureau, the remaining 3.4 million they're using to designate it for something outside of the scope of the board of the community police oversight board, which is the old system of police accountability that's being replaced. The charter does not allow for that. In a plain text reading of section two, dash ten. And so my amendment is to restore that funding. With the help of the city budget office, I was able to understand that that would only require one time funding, and that's good to know. And so that was what the amendment does. And again, this is not about, you know, should we or shouldn't we. It's we have to comply with the charter as far as I'm concerned. And

I'm going to give you the exact section. Here it is. Section 2-1004. Funding for the board shall be proportional to no less than 5% of the police bureau's annual operational budget. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you counselor. Now would be the time for a second if anybody is interested in seconding canal seven, the motion to amend the budget to comply with the charter on funding requirements for the office of community based police accountability.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor avalos. Councilor smith, are you in the queue on this amendment?

Speaker: No, ma'am.

Speaker: Councilor zimmerman, are you on the queue on on this amendment?

Speaker: We've heard time and time again from our city attorneys and from our city deputy city administrators and our city administrator, that we are meeting the need. This is a rejection of their legal opinion and rejection of their professional opinion about how this fund has been organized. I think we are meeting the letter of it, and I encourage us to move on quickly and vote no.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor. Seen no other debate in the queue. Keelan could you? Oh, hold on, councilor Ryan.

Speaker: I'm just curious based on what I just heard. Councilor kanal have you spoken to robert taylor? Does this concur with his understanding?

Speaker: I think what councilor zimmerman said is accurate in the sense that i. I do disagree with that legal advice because, again, I read the exact words funding for the board shall be proportional. And when we had a work session on this, we invited up heidi brown from the city attorney's office, who also did note that the independent police review is not subsidiary to the board in any way. So it's not

something that could be considered a part of it in an org chart sense. My concern with this is broadly that at some point when you start wearing down what can be considered allowable or what not, what is not allowable under the charter, we start to think about things like, could we start to say, oh, it's okay if it funds our compliance with the settlement agreement? Oh, is it okay if it funds some of the other advisory boards which are run out of a different bureau? Oh, is it okay to fund body cameras? Right. These are the sorts of things that are completely outside of both the spirit and letter of the charter. In this particular case, it is definitely outside of the letter. So this is that and the way to get around it is and to comply with the law is the 3.4 million of one time funding.

Speaker: So i, I asked councilor kanal question. You said that in fact, our legal counsel did not agree with you that.

Speaker: That is correct. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor. Morillo.

Speaker: So to clarify, is this where is the funding coming from or is there no funding source?

Speaker: As I said in the last work session, there is not a funding source for this because this is something that the city is obligated to do. This is something that that I believe the mayor's proposal should have had funded in a different way because, again, to comply with the law.

Speaker: I just.

Speaker: Want to reiterate that we do have a legal opinion saying that the mayor's budget did do this in allowable way. I don't say that to counter what you're saying, but just to make sure that we have it on the record, that we do have that legal opinion, I think in part because in this first year, in this transition year, there were. Interpretations that we are doing that oversight work in a different way. In the first

part of the year. I'm looking to robert taylor, who's nodding yes, as I say that. So thank you.

Speaker: Okay. Can I ask a clarifying question on what that means exactly. From robert taylor.

Speaker: Mr. Taylor.

Speaker: A little more clarity.

Speaker: Yes. Thank you, counselor, as as.

Speaker: You correctly.

Speaker: Recalled, we did have a discussion here at a work session around the legality of the mayor's budget and how it's been budgeted. I'm happy to go through that analysis again. But you and I have an honest disagreement about this. I think the way the mayor has it budgeted is legal. I think what you have proposed to do in your amendment is legal counsel. Council can choose between those two legal options.

Speaker: Sorry, can I clarify? Just you mentioned that we're doing it in a different way. That's the question. I was trying to clarify what you meant by in a different way.

Speaker: In this first year. We haven't started that new board yet.

Speaker: Got it. Thank you.

Speaker: Counselor Ryan, are you back in the queue?

Speaker: I am just a quick it's more of a process question as we do this long day evening, is there an expectation that we'll have a funding source when we bring such amendments to the table?

Speaker: You know, if there is not a funding source, we will need to identify one later. And if we are not able to identify a funding source, we will have to have a very hard conversation about taking out an amendment that we put in without a

funding source. So I am not going to require that everything we consider have a funding source. But if at the end of the day, we are not balanced and we have been able to say yes to more than we've been able to say no to, I will ask us to start voting to remove things.

Speaker: As I said last week, that's a discipline that i'll put in motion. Thanks, counselor.

Speaker: Seeing no one else in the queue. Keelan, could you please call the roll?

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Yeah. Thank you. This is a deeply held belief for me, and that's why I put this forward. I recognize that there's a challenge with the funding. And this is my only unfunded amendment. Unbalanced. Sorry. Amendment. I vote yes.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Koyama lane i.

Speaker: Morillo I hope that we can talk about some of the cost saving options that we have soon, because I think that will inform the rest of our discussions. But with that, I vote i.

Speaker: Novick nay.

Speaker: Clerk no.

Speaker: Green. A zimmerman. No avalos. I dunphy.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: No pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: With the.

Speaker: With the direction from our attorneys that what is currently there is okay, I vote no.

Speaker: The amendment fails with a split vote of six.

Speaker: I don't believe we have anything else that would affect our reserve fund by more than 10%. Seeing nobody bringing anything from the floor, the next fund that is touched by some of the amendments that have been brought previously is the gulf fund. If the gulf fund is increased by more than 1.6 million, it would affect the 10%. We have a couple of proposals to increase gulf fees, increase the gulf fund and then transfer those funds to other purposes. Does anybody want to bring any of those proposals to the floor?

Speaker: Madam president, I'd like to bring a proposal with councilor dunphy and i. I forget the name of it, but it is the raise the gulf fees proposal. I'm pulling it up here.

Speaker: The green. Do you know if it's under your name or under councilor dunphy's name? In our list of amendments?

Speaker: I think it's dunphy.

Speaker: Dunphy?

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Is this green dunphy for motion to amend the budget to increase. Increase gulf tea fees to \$5 to support parks investments.

Speaker: It is. Yes.

Speaker: Okay. Go right ahead. Why don't you describe this to us? For us?

Speaker: Thank you. I when we received the guidance from the mayor and the mayor's proposed budget that had a \$1 increase, which, you know, and I think, think was necessary in this period where we're facing a very tough fiscal space and we need to think about how we're going to fund the broad set of priorities. And as a golfer, I thought, you know, if you can afford one buck, you can afford five for this. So I thought, let's raise it an additional \$4, create some incremental resources. It looks like the city budget office has estimated that will increase another million

dollars relative to the mayor's proposed. I don't think that there is a I don't think there is a specific use of those funds attached to this amendment. So it's a net add.

Speaker: Thank you. Counselor.

Speaker: Anything, counselor. Okay.

Speaker: Anything to add.

Speaker: Excellent job, counselor green.

Speaker: Colleagues, I am looking to the queue for debate and what I would like to do when the queue gets busy is go support and oppose on these. But so far, the queue hasn't gotten busy all at once. Okay.

Speaker: Here.

Speaker: Any question from our clerk?

Speaker: Just was there a motion and a second for this one?

Speaker: Or we had a motion from second okay. Second from dunphy. There we go. Apologies I apologize, I had just assumed that you were there.

Speaker: I forgot.

Speaker: To.

Speaker: Say it.

Speaker: Thank you. Okay, Keelan, could you please call the roll canal?

Speaker: This is on green and dunphy for correct?

Speaker: I believe so.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: I and I'm flagging that on one of the spreadsheets. It was misnamed canal for apologies. Canal your canal for is just below this one.

Speaker: Sure.

Speaker: Yeah. On green and dunphy for I vote.

Speaker: Irene dunphy for Ryan.

Speaker: No. Koyama lane i. Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick i.

Speaker: Clark. No. Green zimmerman.

Speaker: This is shaping up to be the greatest increase on the individual Portlanders. Any budget passed in the last 30 years. We should vote this down. No.

Speaker: I'm going to vote aye.

Speaker: Dunphy,

Speaker: I smith.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: No. The colleagues I want to flag that I would consider a smaller increase as we move through the day if we need more revenue.

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

Speaker: Councilors, I believe that is the end of the funds, that there are significant amendments around. So. Not yet to 4:00. I think we have a little bit more time to start working through things before we need to open up the proper budget. So I'm going to move us back to some conversations around budgets.

Speaker: Oh wait, I have another amendment.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: I do it now.

Speaker: I apologize.

Speaker: No, sorry, that was my bad.

Speaker: Let's hear your golf. Let's hear your golf amendment.

Speaker: Sorry, guys. It's a golf heavy day today. So this.

Speaker: Amendment name please.

Speaker: Yes this is morillo for golf fund reduction to support park services. So this is a motion to allocate one time resources from the golf fund by \$4 million to fund parks maintenance within Portland parks and rec. If the parks maintenance deficit is filled by other measures, these funds will be available to offset other amendments. Five and eight. Right now, it's important to know that the golf contingency fund has \$7 million in it. They are only legally required to have \$1 million in it and that, in my opinion, our golf courses and our parks are the same thing. They are natural spaces that the public gets to enjoy. And it is. We're desperate. Times call for desperate measures. So I'm really interested in freeing up some money to ensure that we can save our parks so that we can save our parks employees and offer this up as an option.

Speaker: And councilor, this is morillo four. Is that correct?

Speaker: That's correct.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: So is there a second for this motion?

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Councilor smith, are you in the queue for debate?

Speaker: Yes, ma'am.

Speaker: Go right ahead.

Speaker: Ruth, I need someone to tell me how did the golf fund get so high? Because it's important. Because if they if they can actually raise that kind of money and that kind of income comes through that fund, I would make some different choices. But I'm concerned that they were in a negative in 2017, and I don't know how they got \$7 million especially we were over covid. So I don't know. Nobody was out there golfing for 3 or 4 years.

Speaker: Or maybe.

Speaker: They were.

Speaker: It was coming up. I think actually a lot of people golfed during covid, which was part of which is part of why they raised so much money that apparently it snowed a lot one year. So they lost a bunch of money. And then we got covid and everyone played.

Speaker: Golf and that's over.

Speaker: So that's the story.

Speaker: And that's over.

Speaker: Claudia camposano, finance.

Speaker: Property, technology.

Speaker: Please go ahead. Claudia.

Speaker: Yeah, so.

Speaker: That's actually.

Speaker: Pretty.

Speaker: Much the story. Covid brought out golfers.

Speaker: In droves.

Speaker: The weather was great during that. Time where there's a real big, real big factor. And i'll note that that during.

Speaker: That.

Speaker: Time.

Speaker: It was also recognized that the program.

Speaker: Did need to.

Speaker: Do a lot of capital maintenance on its assets. And because it is an enterprise fund, it needs to rely on its own resources in order to do that capital work. And so it started to build up that fund. And I think we've provided some information about the capital capital.

Speaker: Maintenance plans.

Speaker: Associated with that.

Speaker: Yeah. And I think that was a once in a generation kind of health pandemic that we're not looking forward to having again anytime soon. And so to be able to have that kind of cushion again, and I think it would be reckless for us to just because by law, they can they're only really required to have \$1 million. You will never get this again. And I did support the 800,000 coming out because I wasn't aware that this was going to be an issue. And I know you all borrowed from the general fund in. Commissioner Fritz was not happy about it, and she said that that would never happen again. But while we do have this money, I'm not in the mind to take you all the way down to \$1 million. It's just ridiculous. Just because it is there. I appreciate the pandemic that that was able to give you a kush. And I can imagine if there's a lot of deferred maintenance in our other public works, I imagine there are a lot of deferred maintenance in the golf courses. And so that is so important. I'm a big supporter of leisure. Our African-American golf club that really supports the junior leisure hour to bring young people into the sport and to make it affordable. And I think you need to have that push to continue to make golfing affordable to communities of color in a way that we haven't been able to. And if we start raising the golf fund, taking and raiding from a small I mean, I know where there's several other multi hundred million dollar reserves that you can take from, but this seems a little bit much just because and I think golf has done more than enough. You've paid back the 800,000 to the general fund with the elections, and I don't think you need to pay any more. So I will not be supporting this.

Speaker: I councilor I'd like as much as possible when we have multiple people in the queue to hear from somebody supporting and then somebody opposed, so that we can hear multiple opinions and not just a rush to the queue. Councilor

morillo I know you want to respond. You've already spoken, so I just want to see councilor zimmerman. Are you in the queue in support? Okay then let's go to councilor I am colleagues, I am not making assumptions today. Councilor morillo, let's go to you then for a response.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Really, zimmerman. We have our matching barbie outfits today. What's going on? All right, we'll go on a round of golf.

Speaker: Cost us \$5 more.

Speaker: It'll cost us \$5 more. We'll split it 250 each. So I think something to point out with this amendment is that we're still leaving the golf fund with \$2 million, which is double what they're required to have in their contingency. It's not like we're robbing them blind. And on top of that, they have a this is essentially just going to stop them from having instead of three construction projects, they're going to have two. That is the number that we were given when we asked what the impacts of that would be. And I think at a time where we are struggling with maintenance of our parks and our services, we shouldn't be creating new construction projects that we don't have maintenance funding for anyways. So I think the real question is that the council needs to decide at this time is what is more of an emergency to you, parks having to lay off staff and to stop cleaning playgrounds or the golf fund doing two construction projects instead of three? That is the question that is before us. And to me again, golf is parks cousin. We are all part of the same unit and we are in a dire emergency, and we're having to lay off employees at the city of Portland that do critical work for us. So whatever it takes, we have to make sure that we get that done.

Speaker: Councilor zimmerman.

Speaker: So obviously, you know, I disagree with raising this fund since we have other contingencies, who some of you are willing to just lay yourself out on the dais

for. But I will also say we have other proposals in this package to fund park maintenance at a higher rate. And so I don't think it's necessary because I believe in the park maintenance aspect of that. I think we can agree on that. But the need to raid the golf fund is unnecessary given the other park maintenance restore packages that exist. So I hope that we can consider that where there is more broad support, I think we can be just fine. But reducing this by \$4.8 million is a real affront to a lot of people who are just doing a little bit of recreation. And I think that it's good that they're solvent.

Speaker: Councilor koyama lane are you in the queue in support?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Go right ahead.

Speaker: Some of you might know that in addition to the outreach that we have done to our constituents around the budget, my office also has done door to door canvassing in order to hear directly from our constituents about their budget priorities. And parks and green spaces.

Speaker: Are were.

Speaker: Are really high priority. And specifically something that has connects to this is I heard from folks in madison south who live near the rose city golf course, that they specifically value that space as an accessible green space for the whole community, not just for golfers. So I appreciate councilor murillo's comment that our golf courses are part of our green space network, and that our parks have supported our golf courses when it needed to. So for those reasons, I intend to support this.

Speaker: Councilor I'm in the queue in opposition. When I read the full amendment, it says that if parks maintenance is funded in another way, these funds would be redirected to other amendments that we haven't yet considered. I

also think it's too high a number. I will flag that we just raised golf fees by \$1 million, and if we wanted to talk about diverting \$1 million to parks maintenance from this fund, I would be supportive of that. But I'm not supportive of taking \$4 million that at some point we know we will need, and we probably won't have the money to put back in, which means we will have another failing asset in the future if we take these funds at this level. Councilor novick, are you in support?

Speaker: No opposition. So.

Speaker: Councilor green, are you in the queue in support? Go right ahead.

Speaker: Madam president, just in response to your last comment, the increase in the golf fees won't be instantaneous resources for today. They will accumulate over the course of a year. And so we can't really fund parks maintenance right now with that money. But the increase in the golf fees raises \$1 million per year. So that's enough to replenish the golf fee fund. So there is a revenue source backing up the golf fee fund. And that's why I support it.

Speaker: Councilor novick you're in the queue in opposition.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I don't give a darn about golf, but I'm persuaded on this issue by the email we, some of us got from the former parks director who cares deeply about parks maintenance. And she said, look, the golf board did what the city as a whole should be doing on everything transportation, parks, etc. They were responsible. They started saving money in order to address their own maintenance deficits. And I my understanding is they have about 22 million of deferred maintenance. This it covers seven of it, which is a minority, but a lot larger percentage than we have teed up to pay for any other kind of maintenance. So just as a principle that I don't think we should, as former director

sanders said, we should not be punishing people for being fiscally responsible. I'm compelled to vote no, even though I don't give a damn about golf.

Speaker: Councilor morillo are you in the queue?

Speaker: I am, because I just want to respond to a few things. So for one thing, one of the few amendments that is laid out today to save parks, which we have not completed yet, would be councilor zimmerman's urban forestry amendment, which is highly controversial and unclear if it's going to get votes. No offense. And so we still have a big parks budget gap to fill. And I would say that this is not punishing people for financial for good financial stewardship. We are giving golf a chance to save parks. And this is something that has been highly requested of our community at this time. We can amend out the point on these funds covering other amendments and the events that the golf that the parks maintenance is funded. But at this time it's not. And some of the other amendments that I have forward to try to save parks are going to get us potentially another 2 million if possible, but that's not guaranteed that it will pass. I'll also say that councilor zimmerman's tree code enforcement amendment. I've gotten very mixed information about how much it actually saves us in the general fund. So that means that I've heard anything as low as like 200,000 to then 2 million. That's not going to be enough for us to save parks. So I understand that these aren't savory choices for people. I'm not a golf lover. Councilor green is, though. There are a few of us here that are, and these are the choices before us. So I just want to say, you know, that's that's what we have to work with today.

Speaker: Councilor clark, are you in the queue? Opposed?

Speaker: Yes, madam chair.

Speaker: Go right ahead.

Speaker: I used to golf, but I got rid of my clubs. I think golfing is a way to really ruin a nice walk. But I have to say that I really agree with my counselor to my right that this is really a disincentive to be prudent. It's a disincentive for people to care for their assets. And I think we actually had a witness, if not two today, who said that they are being very responsible. They've been building up the fund to deal with their asset management. And so I hate the thought that we're penalizing them, particularly to this degree, with \$4 million out of their fund. I'm a no vote.

Speaker: Seeing no one else in the queue. Keelan could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Canal. Sorry.

Speaker: Canal i.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: There's a 16 to 22 million deferred maintenance at our city's golf courses. No.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick I first just want to note that the phrase golf is a good walk. Spoiled is a quote attributed to everyone from mark twain to oscar wilde. Its true origin is uncertain. Nay.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Green.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Avalos i.

Speaker: Dunphy.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Smith.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Point of order, madam chair. I would like to change my vote from yes to no.

Speaker: Okay, go right ahead.

Speaker: To vote no on this so that I can move to reconsider in a moment.

Speaker: Thank you. Counselor.

Speaker: All right.

Speaker: The amendment.

Speaker: One can only. I'm sorry. Go ahead. Keelan.

Speaker: I was just going to. The amendment fails with five yes votes and seven no votes.

Speaker: Colleagues, one can move to reconsider a motion later in the agenda if one has voted no. But only somebody who has voted no under robert's rules can move to reconsider a motion. I saw a few people ask why when councilor kanal changed his vote. Counselor clark, are you in the queue for something before we move on to the next?

Speaker: I am the queue.

Speaker: Okay. Councilor kanal, are you in the queue for something before we move.

Speaker: On a point of information and then possibly a motion? Madam president, you mentioned that if we were going to take \$1 million out, you would support it. This would have failed six six. So I would like to move to. I'm considering moving to reconsider, to amend it from 4 million down to 1 million, if that would affect the outcome of the vote. Am I am I explaining that clearly?

Speaker: You are explaining that clearly. Because we just voted to increase the amount of money going into the fund over the course of the year? Not immediately. That is something that I mentioned I would consider. Yes.

Speaker: I move to reconsider.

Speaker: With the council president.

Speaker: Sorry.

Speaker: Keelan I we have a motion to reconsider by councilor kanal, but I don't think.

Speaker: We need a second.

Speaker: I'm sorry.

Speaker: We would need a second in order to recap exactly.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Call the question.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Well, you're calling the question on the original. No, there was a there was a motion to reconsider. And a second. So I want to be clear, you're calling the question on the original language.

Speaker: Isn't that what we were reconsidering?

Speaker: Yes, we are.

Speaker: The question.

Speaker: No. Aren't we calling the question on the amended 1 million.

Speaker: Is not we have not debated. We have not had an amendment presented, debated or adopted. We just had the question called.

Speaker: I'll hold the call, the question till the amendment is properly read. And if there's no change, okay. And then I would like to call.

Speaker: We have we are under reconsideration of morillo for as moved by canal and seconded by. Was that morillo or koyama lane? Okay.

Speaker: Point of order, madam president. Yes, we have a confirmation because this will likely come up again. Do you need to have the floor in order to say call the question?

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Yes, yes.

Speaker: You should be recognized by the chair to call. The question is not also right now, I believe there's a motion to reconsider that's been seconded. You can vote on the.

Speaker: Motion to reconsider. If that receives.

Speaker: Sufficient report.

Speaker: Then the amendment will. Be back in front of the body in its original form. Then that could be amended to reduce the dollar amount. And then.

Speaker: You can take.

Speaker: Action on that amended proposal.

Speaker: So we have a motion before us to reconsider. Keelan, can you please call the roll on the motion as to whether or not we should reconsider morillo for.

Speaker: Canal? Hi, Ryan. No. Koyama lane i. Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick nay.

Speaker: Clark.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Green.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Zimmerman.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Avalos i.

Speaker: Dunphy I smith.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: Hi.

Speaker: Could i.

Speaker: Hi.

Speaker: There's an eye and a sigh.

Speaker: The motion.

Speaker: Carries the motion. Councilor canal you have moved that we can reconsider this. The floor is yours.

Speaker: I move to amend the amendment to reduce all iterations of 4 million to 1 million.

Speaker: Are you also moving to remove the last clause here or not?

Speaker: The update attachments a to h.

Speaker: If the parks maintenance deficit is filled by other measures, these funds.

Speaker: Yes. Thank you.

Speaker: So would you like me to repeat the amendment? The amendment is to reduce the expenditure to 1 million. So motion to allocate one time resources from the golf fund by 1 million to fund parks maintenance within the parks, Portland parks and recreation, and then to strike the next sentence, I believe, which currently says if parks maintenance deficit is filled by other measures, these funds shall be used to offset morillo amendments five through eight that would be struck. And in the next two bullets, four would be decreased to one increase, one time

cash transfer by one decrease, golf fund contingency by one. The third and fourth bullets would remain the same. Is that accurate? Councilor kanal?

Speaker: Yes, madam.

Speaker: Second, I don't know.

Speaker: If there any discussion on the amendment before we vote on the amendment. Seeing none Keelan, can you please call the roll. Canal. Hi Ryan.

Speaker: This point I need to go golfing. No.

Speaker: Koyama lane i.

Speaker: Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick forgive me. Do we vote on the amendment and then vote on whether to pass it as amended?

Speaker: Or if the amendment passes, then yes, we would vote on whether to pass it as amended. This is just to vote on whether to add the amendment to the amendment i.

Speaker: Clark.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Green. I zimmerman.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Avalos i.

Speaker: Dunphy. I smith.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: The motion carries.

Speaker: Colleagues. We now have before us an amended version of morillo for councilor zimmerman. You're in the queue.

Speaker: Like a legal opinion about whether or not enterprise funds can be used for other city general fund operations.

Speaker: Robert, I believe that you have answered some questions from the budget office on this already. Could you address this for us?

Speaker: We have advised that. The golf.

Speaker: Fund could be.

Speaker: Used for this purpose. I have a follow up question.

Speaker: Go right ahead, counselor.

Speaker: What then? Robert, is the purpose of enterprise funds in local government?

Speaker: The.

Speaker: The policy purpose behind an enterprise fund is to have a self-sustaining source of funding to run an ongoing operation.

Speaker: Councilor morillo.

Speaker: Golf is also, quite literally, part of parks. That's all.

Speaker: So in that.

Speaker: Councilor, you're not in the queue right now, I see no one else in the queue. So Keelan, could you please call the roll? And councilors, we are voting on the amended morillo for amendment and whether or not to add it to our budget package.

Speaker: Canal i.

Speaker: Ryan again 16 to 22 million in deferred maintenance, I vote no.

Speaker: Koyama lane I morillo. I novick.

Speaker: I like it. They're voting up front on one of the big revenue possibilities, and I'd love it if we just moved ahead and vote on all the rest of them next to nay. Clark. No green, a zimmerman. No avalos, I dunphy. I smith. No pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: I. The amendment is approved with seven yes votes and five no votes, as amended.

Speaker: Counselors, do we have anything else on the table which would affect the golf fund? Okay, counselors, I don't have any other funds identified from our budget office that would be significantly affected by amendments on the table other than the general fund. So I am going to move us back to the order that we were going to take things in. And we're going to need to break in a little bit to discuss prosper. But I want to move us through a little bit more of our budget first. So we are picking up in the administration portion of the budget, and we have a number of folks with amendments in the administration portion of the budget. What I'm going to do, there are some amendments that work together as a package and some that are standalone. I'm going to ask that if you bring forward an amendment or a package of amendments related to administration, that you then after we debate that, wait until your colleagues who also have amendments here have a chance to bring forward their top priorities so that we can hear from a number of our colleagues. So I would entertain a motion to discuss amendments that fall within the administration category.

Speaker: So moved.

Speaker: Are you moving a specific amendment?

Speaker: No, no. I thought.

Speaker: You know, I'm looking for somebody who has an amendment. Counselor zimmerman.

Speaker: Madam president, I would move to hear pirtle-guiney. I think you cited 13 the package.

Speaker: Okay. We have a motion on the floor. Do we have a second?

Speaker: Second?

Speaker: We have a second. Pirtle-guiney 13 is the president's package. So it is not in the materials that you likely printed that were posted previously. It is posted separately online. I believe it is under attachment i. Am giving people a minute to find that. So motioned by counselor zimmerman and seconded by counselor smith.

Speaker: One of information is this the version? Is this the version that was updated that's on the internet?

Speaker: There were some changes to some of the budget numbers around the parks portion of this amendment. It did not change any of the. Functional narrative portions. I just had to do with the numbers around some of the numbers that moved. And director levin, I believe what's posted does not have those updates. So could you share with folks because counselors have all been emailed the updates. But folks who are following following along online don't have that. Could you share with folks what those updates are?

Speaker: I can, I'm wondering. Counselor zimmerman, do you want to speak to it because it's to the it's it changes to the ones that were originally filed under zimmerman.

Speaker: Okay, counselor zimmerman, then why don't you speak to your motion?

Speaker: Thanks. So I just appreciate the work that went in by the council president to bring together this package. I thought that a package that generally paid for a number of initiatives that were put in here by a lot of members of this, of this group, in particular, the things where multiple people mentioned it, like neighborhoods, the diversity and leadership office. There was a version that went out that by just a mistake of how some interpretation was happening. And so I just want to make sure that folks understand two important parts. And I'm going to speak to them because they came from mine. The reduction of the tree regulation and the urban forestry funds. I want to be very clear that the. The reduction urban

forestry is three main divisions. You've got the tree maintenance division, you've got the science outreach planting. Right. The people who are increasing the canopy. And then we've got the regulation division within that council president accepted an amended version of what I've read last week, which is continuing to have code compliance and continuing to have the capital projects team that exists. That's the ones who help protect trees when there are capital projects or sidewalks going in and moving them to pad. That's a \$1.5 million move. It's not a decrease, it's just a move from regulation over there. The remaining \$5 million in that fund, which is general fund and parks levy, would move in this package to the parks maintenance, and they could rehire up to 30 of the fte that they are laying off currently in the mayor's package. What that does is it preserves all of the pcf dollars that urban forestry currently has, and it allows those dollars to still be used in their same way and puts the general fund and the and the levy dollars in maintenance, which is a perfectly acceptable use. There was a version out here that had 7.4, and if that's the one you're holding in your hand, that's what I'm saying is erroneous. That was just a mistake by some, you know, back of office stuff. But the real numbers, though, are a \$5 million restore package to the cut package. The mayor had proposed to parks maintenance and a reduction of the tree regulation division within urban forestry, and the duties of tree regulation for code compliance moved to ppe. And where my opinion for that is that I think they can be done in a little bit more of a holistic manner related to other code compliance and other permitting operations. So I just wanted to clarify that I care about it a lot. But given what we've we've seen, I care about preserving the urban forestry mission of tree canopy, tree maintenance and education and planting. And I think this can do that while backfilling the deep cuts to park maintenance and those those line employees there, the rest of it, I appreciated that the council president included a number of items, I think, that get

us a little bit further on on a number of initiatives that this group went forward, and I would appreciate conversation regarding the package overall. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor morillo, are you in the queue to speak for or against this amendment?

Speaker: The amendment being the entire president's package?

Speaker: The package?

Speaker: Yes. I appreciate the work.

Speaker: I'm sorry. We're we're switching for and against. I'm trying to figure out if you're in the queue to speak for or against it.

Speaker: I am against it.

Speaker: Okay. Go right ahead.

Speaker: I appreciate the effort that was put into this and the attempts to save us time through a very difficult discussion. Part of the reason I am a no is some of what was stated earlier by councilor dunphy, which is simply that not all of our councilors had any say in what was in this package. It's my understanding that. Me, councilors novick, koyama lane and avalos didn't have any of our amendments represented here. I know it was a tricky situation with some of us reading things in committee, some of us reading things during council sessions. And then I would say, frankly, a kind of questionable head nodding gauge gauge metric to figure out what had popular consensus. But I frankly have things that have at least seven votes that are going to get passed today that are not included in this. So I don't think it's reflective of consensus. And some of the things that are listed in here were shown to us just yesterday or sent out to us just yesterday. So I don't know how that could have possibly been viewed as an item that has consensus, given that we weren't all given time to discuss it on the dais. So for those reasons, I'm going to be voting no on this package.

Speaker: Councilor clark, are you in the queue to support the amendment?

Speaker: Yes, madam chair.

Speaker: Right.

Speaker: Thank you so much again. Thank you for bringing this together for us, pulling all these disparate pieces together. I think you've done a great job. And like councilor morillo, not all of my amendments are in here either, but I think we still have time to deal with them all separately. I do have a question for councilor zimmerman on number five. The tree regulation piece. Is that a 5.8 million or is there a different figure? Did it come to 5.8? It's number five I think.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Okay. It is. Thanks. So I definitely support this. And like I said earlier it doesn't. There are things in here that I would not vote for. But as a package i, I can go.

Speaker: Councilor I'm sorry, 6.56.5 is the size of the tree regulation division in budget right now. Sorry.

Speaker: Then what goes to.

Speaker: 5 million of that in the designation? 5 million of that goes there and 1.5 retains the tree code enforcement officers and the permitting specialist for capital projects into pd.

Speaker: Got it. Got it. Okay. Thank you. I appreciate the clarification, but just i'll just conclude by saying that again, there are things in here that I do not support that I would not vote for if it weren't in a package. And i'll just leave it at that. I do support the package.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor novick, are you in the queue to oppose this amendment?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Okay. Go right ahead.

Speaker: First of all, similar to councilor morillo, the only item here that I am particularly inclined to support as a priority is the restore noise office coordinator position. But also, I'm still really confused about councilor zimmermann's amendment. I thought I heard the other day that there's actually only 2 million of levy and general fund in the tree in the tree code regulatory office, and also I have no idea what the implications will be for the customer service aspects, for how quickly permits get processed. It's just I mean, I'm just this is something which actually I'm willing to keep on learning about. And I understand that councilor zimmermann has some frustration with getting good information from parks about it, but it's something that I'm a no on today. So. So if I'm a no on this, then I have to be a no in the whole package. But I'm interested in continuing to talk about it. And we do have another shot at this on the on the 11th.

Speaker: Councilor I see that we have some folks from parks up here. Do you have specific questions that you would like to ask them, or should we move forward in our debate?

Speaker: I would like to ask if it's how much general fund and levy is in the tree code regulatory office at 5.8 million or is it two?

Speaker: Sorry.

Speaker: I believe that's actually a question that we can direct to director levine, because there's some some fund movement here.

Speaker: Yeah. Just sorry. Just and happy to have you all jump in. I just because I was involved with helping provide the numbers for the package, I just wanted to be clear about what was moving in the package. So the way these numbers came about is the levy. So it's \$756,398 of general fund discretionary. That is the total general fund discretionary that exists in all of urban forestry. So for those who are

not intimately familiar with the urban forestry budget, as councilor zimmerman said, tree regulation is a subset of urban forestry. So we looked at across all of the urban forestry program, how much general fund discretionary is there? 756,000. How much parks levy is there currently in the mayor's proposed it's about \$5 million, just over \$5 million. And so we took those numbers as the full sum total that would be reduced out. The third piece of this puzzle is the pcef. So there's about \$15.7 million of pcef in the urban forestry program in the proposed budget. Of that, 3.6 million lives in tree regulation, this amendment, as councilor zimmerman spoke about it, would move 1.5 million of that pcef that currently supports tree inspectors over to rp, and with those same tree inspectors that are currently supports, the rest of it would be left in urban forestry, where there is other pcef supported activity already happening. So the reason that the numbers you've heard are smaller than the total numbers is because of the way that it was budgeted within urban forestry. So I just wanted to clarify the sort of three pieces of the puzzle that we're moving in that amendment.

Speaker: Thank you, director levine.

Speaker: Does that mean that we'd be taking a bunch of money out of levy, money out of urban forestry? That has nothing to do with tree code regulation.

Speaker: Yes, but then it would be backfilled in part by pcef, which is already supporting urban forestry.

Speaker: But it would be new pcef money, additionally supporting urban forestry.

Speaker: No, it's the same piece of money that's already in urban forestry, just moving from tree regulation to other urban forestry work within parks.

Speaker: There are four divisions within urban forestry. What this would do is it would shift around some of the fund types within urban forestry parks, has multiple funding streams, including levy general fund, discretionary and pcef, which

can be used for different things but also can be interchanged a fair amount. And this would retain pcef money for urban forestry within urban forestry. In order to do that, there would be some shifting. It sounds like between the divisions within urban forestry in terms of the makeup of pcef versus general fund, discretionary versus levy funding, is that accurate?

Speaker: Correct.

Speaker: Councilor does that help?

Speaker: Not much.

Speaker: Not sure. Okay. Do you have additional questions, councilor? Councilor novick should we move on or.

Speaker: Can I ask questions of the parks people that are here or just of director levine?

Speaker: That was a very good attempt at getting away, but I think you may need to stay.

Speaker: Director long, could you quickly describe what you think the implication of this amendment would be?

Speaker: I can.

Speaker: And i.

Speaker: Also have.

Speaker: Casey jogerst.

Speaker: Who is the program.

Speaker: Manager of permitting.

Speaker: And regulation.

Speaker: And jen cairo.

Speaker: Is the city forester.

Speaker: Who could.

Speaker: Probably do a much better job. But I will start I will say a few words. So permitting and regulation.

Speaker: Essentially is.

Speaker: What's implementing the title 11. Tree code that's.

Speaker: Preserving and protecting.

Speaker: Our and.

Speaker: Growing our tree canopy.

Speaker: But in addition.

Speaker: To that.

Speaker: They're also doing work related to, i'll.

Speaker: Say. Customer service, but it's really not.

Speaker: It's a single point.

Speaker: Of contact. So anytime anybody has.

Speaker: Any question, request.

Speaker: Etc, they can call. Or email what.

Speaker: We call.

Speaker: Spoc.

Speaker: That's our acronym.

Speaker: And they.

Speaker: Will get a response.

Speaker: Within days, usually within one business day. And so.

Speaker: That's included.

Speaker: In.

Speaker: The permitting and regulation team.

Speaker: Also this.

Speaker: Team is paramount to our emergency response. So 24 over seven. Tree emergency.

Speaker: Response for.

Speaker: Storms and other emergencies.

Speaker: What am I missing.

Speaker: Jump in.

Speaker: Casey jogerst. Urban forestry.

Speaker: Permitting.

Speaker: And regulation manager.

Speaker: I I'm.

Speaker: Not.

Speaker: Sure i, i.

Speaker: Completely and fully understand.

Speaker: The.

Speaker: Amendment, but what.

Speaker: I haven't heard.

Speaker: Being discussed.

Speaker: You know, director.

Speaker: Long talked.

Speaker: About our single point of contact.

Speaker: But also.

Speaker: We have a non development team that.

Speaker: Does.

Speaker: All of.

Speaker: Our permitting for.

Speaker: All.

Speaker: Of the residents.

Speaker: So any property owner. That wants to.

Speaker: Needs to. Remove a.

Speaker: Tree wants to plant.

Speaker: A tree.

Speaker: Prune a tree.

Speaker: That team.

Speaker: Hasn't been discussed.

Speaker: And so i. I can.

Speaker: Only assume.

Speaker: That.

Speaker: That means that.

Speaker: That's a team that.

Speaker: Would be.

Speaker: Cut along with that customer service team.

Speaker: I also.

Speaker: Just want to mention.

Speaker: That the capital.

Speaker: Projects component.

Speaker: Of it. That would. Be the.

Speaker: Only bureau.

Speaker: That would.

Speaker: Have capital.

Speaker: Review happening.

Speaker: Within pnd.

Speaker: Each of the infrastructure bureaus have.

Speaker: Capital teams.

Speaker: That do their. Capital projects within the infrastructure bureau. What pnd.

Speaker: Does is.

Speaker: Primarily private.

Speaker: Property development.

Speaker: And so. It's been a little bit difficult.

Speaker: To.

Speaker: Follow. The code compliance team that we have is. Specific to that. So they aren't issuing permits in any way. They are only responding to compliance. So alleged violations, illegal removals.

Speaker: Dangerous tree.

Speaker: Situations, they aren't issuing permits. And so that's the component.

Speaker: Of the team.

Speaker: That I haven't really heard.

Speaker: Much discussed as.

Speaker: To what would happen and who would be.

Speaker: Issuing those permits. And councilors, I can add jen cairo.

Speaker: City forester, title 11 trees.

Speaker: Which was first.

Speaker: Passed by then council in 2012.

Speaker: And implementation.

Speaker: Began in 2015. Provides for an integrated. Approach to the forest.

Speaker: Portland, and it sought to. Put the elements of.

Speaker: Regulation, maintenance, planting.

Speaker: The science. Behind those, the.

Speaker: Public interaction and communication in one.

Speaker: Place so that.

Speaker: Those.

Speaker: Could all be consistent.

Speaker: And linked from beginning to end.

Speaker: From planting.

Speaker: To tree decline, removal and replacement. For example, to use an analogy, and this. Is similar whether one feels that green infrastructure is the same as of the same value as gray.

Speaker: Or not.

Speaker: It's a similar setup as we have.

Speaker: In the city of Portland.

Speaker: For the bureau of transportation in regards to streets or the bureau of environmental services in the one water water bureau and bureau of environmental services delivering water related.

Speaker: Services to Portlanders, those.

Speaker: Are all housed in the same place, because it's the same technical knowledge and the elements of those, whether it's private property, public property, a permit planting, emergency.

Speaker: Response are.

Speaker: All very connected.

Speaker: Councilor are you ready for us to move on or do you have additional questions?

Speaker: Ready your questions.

Speaker: Yeah, okay.

Speaker: Thank you all. Councilor zimmerman, you spoke to this, so I'm going to jump over you.

Speaker: I think.

Speaker: I should be.

Speaker: Able to respond. Back.

Speaker: Well, we've been going back and forth with different speakers. Do you have something specific and technical that you want to respond to on this piece of it?

Speaker: Sure. So I just want to highlight for a second I think we have to question why Portlanders have to get a permit to trim a tree in their own backyard. This idea of, oh my gosh, the sky is falling. Who's going to do that? Work is exactly the question I'm calling, because I don't think that that work is doing right by Portlanders today. In fact, I think that the code changes that we're going to see, likely in September, are probably going to tell us that this is the same group who set up here a few months ago and said they were unaware of the family who asked for a permit, and then that tree crushed their home when they said, we know we have a dangerous tree. I'm sorry, that group is incredible. They lied about the number of inspectors at the finance committee. Let me tell you about the doubling or more than doubling of their staff since 2019. In a few sections.

Speaker: Councilor.

Speaker: Can you.

Speaker: Please keep this to a technical response so we can continue through the debate?

Speaker: Technically, they have more than doubled their staff in there.

Speaker: How about, let me say, an abbreviated response? How about that word? An abbreviated response?

Speaker: Technically an abbreviated. They have more than doubled their staff in non permitting and inspections since 2019. And in capital and in the 823 tree line, which, by the way, is a duplicative service to 311. So when I tell you that they have increased their footprint and serve Portlanders poorly, I am not lying to you. Lastly, I want to respond just a couple things. Not in the tree part of this package. This is the other thing I'm a little disheartened about that's being read in about the president's package. First, I also asked for a lot of options and got nothing back from parks I tried. I have increased my hold of their technical programs by double from my original amendment to get closer and preserved all pcf, which was at the request of many of you on this dais. But lastly, madam president included \$500,000 for the james beard public market. That original proposal, at a higher cost, was from councilor green. I thought that was a smart move, madam president included at a smaller amount, but included the restoration of the noise coordinator that was from councilor dunphy. Madam president included \$150,000 from councilor smith for summer works expansion from what's already in the budget, madam president included councilor avalos restoration of the diversity and civic leadership program, and councilor avalos, restoration of the \$300,000 in grants and operating funds for our neighborhood coalitions and neighborhood associations. And while I know that the big package in this came from me, and that's getting a lot of attention, this package also served a lot of needs of other councilors across this dais. And the cut to the community and civic life bureau is paying for a lot of those. That is why I want to support this package, because it accomplishes a lot of important things that I want to support, but I don't know how to pay for later on in this budget. That's my response.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilors. I usually wait to the end, but I'm next in the queue and since this has my name on it, I think I need to speak to it. A few folks

have said there are things that aren't in here that have broad support, and that's absolutely the case because there are things that come with complicated funding mechanisms that were part of broader packages that I didn't want to try to put in here. There are things that I thought might have broad support, but I hadn't heard from very many people about them, so I didn't put them in here. There are things that were new that I put in here, because they're topics that I know councilors have discussed in other forums not related to the budget, such as the asset management pieces, numbers one and two in this package. So while we hadn't discussed those two budget or budget amendment and budget note, I suspected that there would be strong support given the strong support I had heard from many of you for other asset management pieces. I put this together to try to save us time and to try to move forward. Some things that I had not heard concerns on. There clearly are concerns on a couple of pieces of this that were not expressed before today. But I do think that if the plan is for this to be something that could save us time, we should move forward. So I would call the question. Mr. Taylor, you're looking at me. Am I not allowed to do that? As the presiding officer?

Speaker: You may.

Speaker: Is there a second?

Speaker: I believe I heard a second.

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: This is.

Speaker: To vote on the motion to call the question correct. As per usual, I'm going to vote no on every motion to call the question. I encourage someone to move to limit debate to those currently in the queue. After this. If it should fail. No.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: I have to excuse me. I have to vote no because i. I'm undecided about something and I didn't get a chance to ask the question.

Speaker: I'm i.

Speaker: Maria.

Speaker: I'm happy for us to move along from this because clearly the fact that the biggest item in this package has garnered this much debate means that it is not a consensus package, and that people don't understand what's being brought forward, and that there's even debate within parks and other experts about what this amendment, one of the biggest amendments in the package, actually does. But I also think that this is an immense waste of time on a day where we have to get out of here by midnight at most. So yes, to what am I voting on? Yes. To end this? Yes to call the question, let's end this.

Speaker: Novick i.

Speaker: Mark. A green. I zimmerman.

Speaker: I'll go ahead and. Respect council question I vote no.

Speaker: Avalos.

Speaker: I'll vote no.

Speaker: No, no.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Dunphy I vote.

Speaker: No smith.

Speaker: No pirtle-guiney i. The motion fails with a split vote. Sorry.

Speaker: Councilor. Morillo. Are you in the queue to speak against the amendment?

Speaker: Yes. Okay, i'll just say more then i.

Speaker: Were you not in the queue? Sorry. Your hand?

Speaker: No, I was in the queue. And then we called the question. So i'll stay in the queue and answer this then. Yeah. I think the fact that there is this much debate about the largest item in the package means that this is not a consensus package. And again, I understand, you know, councilor clark said, okay, this isn't my dream package. It's not everything I want. But you do at least have a few amendments in there. There are some of us, namely me, councilor, novick, councilor, koyama lane and avalos. I think maybe there was one that was kind of combined with councilor zimmerman, or you guys had the same idea on something, and that's why it's in there. But this is largely reflective of folks who sit on the finance committee. There's a bunch of room councilor zimmerman and very few from other people. And that's fine. I think it's great that there's a lot of research done, but I just don't see this as reflective of the whole. And I think the fact that the majority of the amendments, when broken down by race and ethnicity as well, majority come from white councilors, 18 from white councilors, two from councilors of color, 14 from men, six from women. I think people did this breakdown earlier. That's just cannot be reflective of what we need to do. So this to me, this is actually at this point, I think, a strategic time wasting measure. And I would like for us to end the debate on this package that is not going to pass, and we already know is not going to pass, so that we can start talking about the real amendments. Thanks.

Speaker: Councilor Ryan, are you in the queue to speak for or against the measure?

Speaker: I'm undecided and here's why I found out one. The big concern I have is I was made aware this afternoon that the police funding swap of ongoing to one time general fund will result in 17 officer positions being cut. What i.

Speaker: I think we have folks who are trying to make a little more space in the gallery, and it was getting a little bit loud.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Go ahead councilor.

Speaker: Okay. Yeah, I'm undecided. And here's why. I have a big concern that I was made aware of this afternoon, and that is the police funding swap of ongoing to one time general fund will result in 17 officer positions could be cut. Can someone from public safety come up and speak to this? I think I see you, elizabeth perez. Is it okay for you to come to the councilor?

Speaker: We actually have a response from our budget office on the budgetary impacts here. So while I would welcome having elizabeth come up while she does that, I'd like to ask director levine to respond as well.

Speaker: Sure. So I think the question that got posed earlier was whether this amendment would sort of force police to take ongoing funded positions and convert them to limited term. And I think the answer is no. And here's why. I think basically, the way that police budgets their overtime, in part, is by pulling from their vacancy savings. So they have 24, an estimated \$24 million of vacancy savings. This in the in the proposed budget that back ongoing expenses of that 24,000,014 million goes into the overtime expense. So the rest of that of their roughly \$20 million in overtime. So about \$6 million is backed by one time funding. So this would sort of I think in essence, there's there is a fiscal cliff for the police budget in 26, 27. That was already true. And the idea, as sort of posited in the mayor's proposed, is that they would reduce their ongoing overtime expenses beginning in 2026, 27, in order to reduce their expenditures. And this would kind of make that cliff bigger, or, in other words, increase the pressure to reduce their overtime expenses, to reduce their expenses in 20 26, 27. I don't think it would be needed to transfer positions from ongoing to limited term. As a result of this amendment. It just. That's that. Part of the a function, excuse me, as a function of how the public

safety budgets. It's not not just police frankly there there are other bureaus that have sort of unfunded vacancies, as it were, that they have to either City Council would have to add money to their budget in 26, 27, or they would have to reduce their expenditures. So they'll have to have a balanced budget in 26, 27. But I don't think it would require them to switch to limited term positions.

Speaker: Council. Thank you.

Speaker: We now have people. We do have folks from public safety up and I'm happy to chief day or mr. King have you all respond or I know elizabeth, you were up here as well and have been talking to some folks about this. What is it from your perspective that we're looking at here?

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: I think d.c. Myers wanted to chime in and then we'll turn it over to chief.

Speaker: Maybe.

Speaker: Elizabeth.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: For the record, my.

Speaker: Name is mike myers.

Speaker: I'm the deputy.

Speaker: City administrator for the city of.

Speaker: Portland for the public.

Speaker: Safety service area.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Madam president. Councilors.

Speaker: Thanks for having me here today.

Speaker: So I was.

Speaker: Just had.

Speaker: An opportunity.

Speaker: To kind of talk to the chief a few minutes.

Speaker: Ago about the potential of.

Speaker: Of this.

Speaker: This amendment.

Speaker: Coming forward this afternoon. I first want to say, i.

Speaker: Think this is important.

Speaker: To know. We have a lot.

Speaker: Of difference for all of you, for all of the council members, the amount of.

Speaker: Work that we know goes into.

Speaker: Putting amendments.

Speaker: Of this caliber forward. We know the amount of effort.

Speaker: That you put into bringing these ideas.

Speaker: And changes.

Speaker: To council. And it's not easy when.

Speaker: We put the public.

Speaker: Safety budgets together. I've been here for about ten years.

Speaker: We've put.

Speaker: You know, put a lot of fire budgets together. This is now working on some police.

Speaker: And fire budgets.

Speaker: They are.

Speaker: Put together. Over years.

Speaker: And years and years of time.

Speaker: So when we bring.

Speaker: A.

Speaker: Budget together and we're.

Speaker: Starting to talk with the mayor, it's.

Speaker: 90% done.

Speaker: It's the same.

Speaker: Budget.

Speaker: As we had last year because we're it's operationalized. We just.

Speaker: Talk about and.

Speaker: Negotiate and fine.

Speaker: Tune the.

Speaker: Last little bit. And it's important that we, you know, that we did. All of that. Work with.

Speaker: The. Mayor's office.

Speaker: Already to get to.

Speaker: The mayor's proposed.

Speaker: We've set the.

Speaker: Performance expectations with the chief.

Speaker: He is we've talked about with the.

Speaker: Demands will be.

Speaker: With the.

Speaker: Chief and what money we will need to accomplish.

Speaker: That, that i.

Speaker: Think we all know that already. The conversion from ongoing to one time.

Speaker: Funding removes.

Speaker: The structural stability. Needed to support permanent staffing levels.

Without consistent annual funding, the bureau would be unable to maintain these

positions beyond the current fiscal year, leading to reductions in service capacity, diminished support for public safety programs, and a potential decline in responsiveness to communities needs. The loss of these positions could also disrupt key initiatives or units that rely on experienced personnel and continuity of operations, ultimately affecting the bureau's ability to meet its public safety mission. Moving the Portland police bureau's 2.5 million in ongoing funding to one time funding status will have significant operational and staffing impacts. Specifically, this shift could result in the equivalent of approximately 17.5 full time positions. As councilor Ryan suggested the effect positions. Affected positions are likely to include both sworn non-sworn roles and are currently sustained by ongoing general fund support. I think the chief is in the room. He's just able to make it back from a prior meetings. But but thank you for allowing me to comment today.

Speaker: Thank you, dr. Myers. Chief, did you have anything to add?

Speaker: Yeah. Thank you, madam president. And every.

Speaker: Time I see the back. Of my head, I can't believe.

Speaker: How bald I'm getting.

Speaker: Really.

Speaker: Really disappointed.

Speaker: Like another.

Speaker: Shot at that.

Speaker: No offense, councilor zimmerman, but.

Speaker: The question before. Us is really about. Our prioritization around.

Speaker: Public safety, specifically.

Speaker: The police department. And we have been.

Speaker: Talking about this.

Speaker: Since the 1st.

Speaker: Of January.

Speaker: And.

Speaker: We've been.

Speaker: Talking about.

Speaker: This.

Speaker: For almost.

Speaker: 35 years of my service.

Speaker: In.

Speaker: The police bureau.

Speaker: And the.

Speaker: Reckoning is it a priority or is it not? I believe it is. I believe.

Speaker: It.

Speaker: Is based.

Speaker: Upon not only my experience, but based upon the.

Speaker: Numbers.

Speaker: The facts, the conversations, the relationships, the sadness I see and hear in the victims voices at their lack of services or lack of responsiveness, our inability to.

Speaker: Engage.

Speaker: Our inability to provide the level of. Service that Portlanders deserve and expect. And that is consistent. And one of the reasons why that is the case, and not just this council.

Speaker: Many prior.

Speaker: Councils have looked at one of the largest, most expensive bureaus in the city and seen it as an opportunity to balance the budget on their backs. And we

have been down this so many times that I'm just about done having the same conversation about making a decision. The reality is that any reduction in funding to the police bureau will be a reduction of services. I understand the argument that this is one time funding. The reality is, if we take those 17 positions away and the police bureau is aggressively attempting to hire and rehire and retain, first of all, it impacts the ability to recruit. It sends a message at a time when police services are in high demand. And there are many, many agencies attempting to hire that we don't value the Portland police bureau, we don't value the work that the men and women are doing. The Portland police bureau, and we don't think that you should come and join the Portland police bureau. So that's the first message. It makes it more difficult to actually fill the vacancies that we are trying to so desperately do so that we can reduce overtime. The second thing that this does is, in effect, we are maybe successful, maybe we overcome that and we continue to hire, I can assure you, because cbo has done this for many, many years, that as we hire and as we get closer to the new cap, which would be about 860 versus 870. So if we hire 2030 people, which we have about, I'm estimating we'll have another 20 plus hires this summer, probably another 20 or 30 by the end of the year as we get closer to that eight 5860 number, they're going to tell me to stop hiring and they're going to tell me to stop hiring because I've been paying for the work being done on those vacancies. So that money, even though we say it's there, it's not really there because it's one time funding and I can't hire into one time funding. So this vote would essentially put us into the position to where we could potentially not have to not be able to hire, which is the antithesis of what I am hearing across the board, from community, across all of your districts. Now, we can roll the dice. We can say, chief, I don't think you're going to be able to hire. I don't think you're going to be able to get to that number. That's certainly a possibility. I can't sit here and predict

the future. What I can tell you is applications are up, interest is up, hiring is up, and we are seeing progress and success. What I can also tell you is that the overtime strategies that we implemented in January are working, and it's a model that I intend to keep in 25, 26 as we rightsize the bureau budget, as we look to see what do things really cost. We haven't done that for years. We haven't seen what does it really cost to do this? I had a conversation, or at least a voicemail exchange with councilor novick. I'm looking right now at a burglary program, but before I can commit to a burglary program, I want to know what's it going to cost years past? We need a burglary program. We grab a bunch of people and we just do it, and we maybe drive burglary down, but we also blow out our budget. So we are taking practical fiscal steps. But this amendment will in fact reduce services and will not allow us to be able to continue to be effective. And I'm going to use one real time example that's happening right now as we speak. Commander hughes at central precinct has taken on incredible initiative this week, five days straight, focusing on various parts of district four with the mobile precinct, with officers that have adjusted their shifts to limit overtime. I appreciate their sacrifice, but still, when I called him on Monday and we've already put over 20 people into deflection in the last two days, we've seized firearms and guns and made several successful cases with a focus on outreach, but it's costing about 30 hours of overtime a day. But before he launched that, we looked at the numbers. Can you do this? Can you absorb it? And he's staying within his budget. So this is not those programs we would discontinue because we need the overtime. And we could say it's one time funding, but if I continue to hire I'm going to be told I can't hire. I'm going to have less money in those vacancies. I'm going to have less money to be able to do the work that we're doing. So I appreciate it. I understand the conversation. I understand the argument that councilor kanal is making. I understand the points

that director levine is making, but I fundamentally disagree with the ability to continue to maintain the level of service that we have been providing. If any cut is made and lessens the number of officers or the ability to do our job. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilors. We are debating pirtle-guiney amendment 13. We clearly on a piece of this have a difference in opinion between how the budget is looking and what the impacts of that would be between our bureau and our budget director. This is one piece of the program. We are in the middle of debate. Councilor Ryan, did you have additional comments or questions, or should we move on to your next.

Speaker: Colleagues in the package? I would be a no. If I could do an amendment to pull out item 13, and i'll go ahead and put that on the table second.

Speaker: Councilors.

Speaker: We have an amendment and a second before us. Councilor novick, are you in the queue to debate the amendment?

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Councilor kanal are you in the queue debate to debate the amendment?

Speaker: Sure.

Speaker: I'm going to just ask three questions and two of them are going to be to director levine, and they're going to be the same question. So the first question is, could you repeat what you said about whether this amendment would cause 17.5 positions to be converted into limited duration?

Speaker: I don't think that would be. I don't think it would be necessary to convert the positions to the limited duration. I defer to chief day on the impact on hiring. Obviously his ability to recruit, but in terms of actually managing the positions, I don't think it needs to be limited duration. Again, this is there is already one time funding that will go away at the end of 2025, 26 in the police bureau's budget, and

they already have unfunded vacancies with on time with excuse me with based on their ongoing funding level. So even without this amendment as it is, they would have to hire additional officers on the expectation that either they would reduce their overtime budget in 2627 or council would provide them with additional funds. And so I don't think that this fundamentally changes that relationship. It increases the magnitude. But the relationship is already that that that issue is already there without this amendment.

Speaker: Thank you. So my next question is going to go to chief de. Thank you for being here. Or as well, mr. King, there is a decision package on page 20 of the decision packages in which the requested budget added \$9.35 million to police staffing of ongoing money. That was changed by the mayor to 8.05 million, with an additional 4 million hired in one time funding. So again, in aggregate, that was 9.35 million of ongoing, replaced by 12.05 million in 1 time. That is a very large number. How many positions would you have to convert from permanent positions to limited term? As a result of that change?

Speaker: I don't know. I'd have to do the math. I can't do the math in front of me right now, so I don't have a number for you for that.

Speaker: If the number were to be proportional to the 2.5 million, it would be, I'm guessing. So just for purposes of assumption, here in the ballpark of 65 to 68 positions that that would do. And I'm I'm profoundly surprised to hear that because I have been deferring to the cbo analysis this whole time. And I'm it would very much bother me if that was to move 68 positions, in addition to possibly 17 more. But what I am actually going to say is I do trust the city budget office. And so i'll ask ruth again, if you could just answer in one word, please. Would this cause 17.5 positions to have to be converted from ongoing to limited term positions.

Speaker: For the purposes of budget management? No.

Speaker: Thank you very much, madam president.

Speaker: Councilor smith, are you in the queue to the amendment?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: To the I apologize to the amendment to the amendment to remove item number 13 from pg 13.

Speaker: Yes. I'm trying to be clear on what the conversion is. Is there a 31 conversion rate from limited to ongoing, or why are they using the word conversion if it's just a 1 to 1 match?

Speaker: Is that a question for director levine or for.

Speaker: Director levine?

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: I'm sorry, could you repeat the question?

Speaker: I'm not clear when you all are talking about converting. What does conversion mean? I mean, do you get more money for ongoing? Is it three times the amount?

Speaker: No, sorry. It's 1 to 1. So basically it would be. So we allocate general fund in two different what are called commitment items for general fund ongoing and general fund. One time because we have to track our general fund ongoing budget so that we stick to the number that's in the five year balanced forecast. And so and the mayor's proposed budget fully allocates that general fund ongoing number. So basically this would it would just swap the revenue that backs the expense for, for overtime in the amount of \$2.5 million, so that the what's currently backed by general fund ongoing would be instead backed by general fund one time which allows that ongoing to be spent somewhere else that would otherwise only be backed by one time.

Speaker: And so the way I understood ongoing was that you had to back it with 3 to 5 years of future operating expense.

Speaker: That's that's right. And that's why in the five year balanced forecast, there's a total general fund discretionary ongoing figure of about \$752 million. And that number assumes five years of inflation into the future. And that's how we balance our forecast. So we look at the whole general fund. We say, do we have enough revenue projected in this forecast to support this, this expense into the future for five years? And that's that's why we track the ongoing number.

Speaker: Right. We used to track it by three at the county. I just wanted to get to see if we were on the same page, because I don't think people understand the difference between general fund ongoing and general fund. One time only. That is what I needed to clarify. Madam president.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor novick, I apologize, I think I skipped over you. Are you or you had said that you were not in the queue for this. Okay. Councilor zimmerman, are you in the queue for the amendment to remove bullet point 13 or numbered item 13 from the amendment?

Speaker: Yeah. Thanks. Madam president, I think this conversation is enlightening and a little alarming in my career. It's the first time where I've had such disagreement of the impact of a budget amendment within the administration, or different branches within the administration. I came into this, I think, supportive of it being included in the package. And I think of what councilor kanal what you were doing. But now this is quite alarming as the person who motioned for the package from council president to be on this, I'm not sure procedurally here, but I would say I don't feel like the package nor this amendment has support at this point, and I would be comfortable pulling it off the table. But frankly, given this kind of discrepancy between budget office and our departments, it may be more wise for

us to take what has already been passed and get back to the main question and pass this proposed budget as amended. Because if this type of disagreement occurs all night long, I don't know where we're going to be at.

Speaker: Councilor. I hope that this type of disagreement does not happen all night long, and I certainly hope that if there are disagreements like this, council is given more than a few minutes notice about them by the bureau. If you are the motion maker, I believe that you have the ability when you are recognized, which you have been in the queue to remove your motion at any time. So if you would like to do so.

Speaker: I would, I would motion that.

Speaker: You don't even need to motion. You just remove your motion.

Speaker: Remove the motion.

Speaker: Whole thing drops and we are back to the underlying councilors. I was hoping we would get a little bit more done before we needed to move into discussing prosper, but we do actually need to pass something for prosper Portland tonight. Point of order. And then I'm going to finish my sentence.

Speaker: I'd like to request that we limit debate on the underlying motion before we table to the three people currently in the queue at.

Speaker: The motion has been withdrawn.

Speaker: Or in the queue for the underlying. The mayor's proposed.

Speaker: Councilor morillo. Are you in the queue for the mayor's proposed mayor?

Speaker: I don't.

Speaker: Know where. I don't believe anybody.

Speaker: Want people to start? I'm saying no table, I don't.

Speaker: So I do not want to talk about this anymore. The president's package does not have the votes.

Speaker: We're not. We're not talking about the president's package. It's been pulled off the table. Okay, so, councilor canal, are you saying that you are in the queue? Not on any amendment, but to discuss the current proposed, which is what the mayor put forward with, I believe, three amendments that have been adopted into it. Okay. Councilor morillo, are you also in the queue for the okay council? Councilor Ryan, are you in the queue on the mayor's proposed with the three amendments that have been adopted into it?

Speaker: I just want to make a comment that I think is relevant.

Speaker: Is it to the underlying amendment.

Speaker: A technical budget matter? And then we heard another opinion that was operational and in budget development. I'm going to trust the leadership of the bureau about their operational viewpoints over a technical read by an accountant. I just wanted to seize the moment because that was a very big contrast in opinion councilors.

Speaker: I see the queue lining up and we need to move to the prosper budget and then hopefully get back and do some things here. So I am hoping that anybody in the queue is in the queue with comments that are not related to proposing new amendments right now. On the mayor's proposed, with the three things that have been adopted into it. Councilor kanal is that the case for you? Yes. Thank you. Go right ahead.

Speaker: Yeah. Thank you. First, I want to just express appreciation for the city budget office. You are much more than just accountants. Thank you so much for the assistance you provide to us. Secondly, I appreciate the conversation. I appreciate councilor zimmerman's choice to withdraw that motion. I would have voted no on the underlying package for unrelated reasons to either that amendment or the one that you were previously addressing. And but I with relation

to the underlying question of where we're at right now, I think the issue is we still haven't provided the certainty to the chat program. We still have the underlying need that half of the chat program is going to be not funded as it would have been with ongoing dollars. And so every April they'd be looking for new jobs. We still have 600 something thousand dollars that could be funded with ongoing dollars for the grant programs that the office of violence prevention and ceasefire, which would allow for more certainty there, more stability there in the underlying ability to do longer term planning. And most egregiously of all, we wouldn't have eight of our limited term telecommunicators at 911.

Speaker: Councilor.

Speaker: I believe.

Speaker: Speaking to canal five.

Speaker: I'm not. I'm saying I'm speaking to the suggestion from from councilor zimmerman that we would at some point vote on what we have now. And I think those eight telecommunicators need to be made permanent, because we're going to talk about response times. The person on the other end of that phone call is the first person we talk to. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor green. Are you speaking to the underlying.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Madam president.

Speaker: Please keep it quick.

Speaker: Yeah. I just if your intention is to move us to the prosper Portland budget, I would note that there is a significant prosper Portland budget amendment for the city's budget that would affect adoption of the prosper Portland budget. I just would like some clarification on that.

Speaker: There sure is. I was hoping we would get that far in these amendments. First. Councilor clark.

Speaker: Thank you, madam chair. I'm just trying to understand where we are. And we if we do move ahead with the mayor's budget, which I think that's what we're talking about.

Speaker: I don't believe we are talking about moving ahead with the mayor's budget. We have many hours before it.

Speaker: Sorry.

Speaker: Okay, okay.

Speaker: My mistake, I thought. Okay. Never mind.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Councilor smith.

Speaker: Thank you. I'm trying. I'm trying to get an understanding of where we are. Are we going to go? I thought we had a time certain of the prosper budget at 145.

Speaker: Time certain is. Certainly something it would be nice to stick to, but my goal was to make sure we got to it by about 4:00 today. We're well past that, so I'd like to move us there right now.

Speaker: But what I'm saying is you can't put something on the agenda and say it's time certain and don't bring them up. We should have had this a long time ago, and it really messes up the flow and it messes up the rhythm. And I know some of this stuff has to be past in order to pass the mayor's budget as it is written. But I'm going to go back to where we were before. There are a lot of things that we could be paying for if we were not spending all this money on homelessness, that we should not be paying for, that Multnomah County should be paying for.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor green, you raised a very valid point, which is that we do have overlap between our general fund conversations and our

prosper conversation. In order to have that conversation fully, we would need to take up every potential revenue generating matter. And in order to really understand what we're talking about here, we would then need to make sure we talk about the parks maintenance pieces that are on the table. That is a lot to do before we get to prosper. So I am going to move us into our conversation about prosper so that we can.

Speaker: Take a clarification.

Speaker: I'm going to move us into our conversation, our our budget hearing on prosper so that we can take that public testimony, because we do have folks signed up for public testimony there.

Speaker: Madam president.

Speaker: And i.

Speaker: Have a privileged motion.

Speaker: I am going to finish this sentence and then get to you, councilor. I expect when we are talking about prosper, that there will be some conversation that has some flow between the conversation about prosper and the conversation about the general fund. And we will need to figure out navigating between those two things. But both hearings will be open. Your point of order.

Speaker: The amendment, the dunphy green amendment on prosper Portland is just it has nothing to do with the other subsequent amendments in the general fund. Now, people may respond to that as such with the resources that that may or may not create. But we have to take this up before we move on to the prosper Portland budget, because if we do not take this up, then we there's no way to address this. This would this would basically close this out and remove it from debate. I think that's wrong.

Speaker: I'm sorry. What would close this out and remove what from debate.

Speaker: If we if we discuss prosperous Portland budget and then take a vote on it, then we cannot vote on this amendment.

Speaker: I believe that we could and I believe that we can go back and forth given conversations that I have had. However, if we can do this quickly, let's take that amendment up first. And after that, we are going to move directly into the prosper budget, because we have folks who signed up to testify who were told that we would get to that around 4 or 430, and it is now 520. So, councilor, I believe you are talking about, I'm looking for the number here. Dunphy. I believe it's under dunphy, not under green.

Speaker: It's dunphy green one.

Speaker: Dunphy green one. Thank you. Councilor. So, councilor green, have you made a motion here?

Speaker: I'm going to let my colleague make the motion.

Speaker: Yeah. Colleagues, I move that we adopt dunphy green one, which is to reduce the prosper Portland general fund grant to zero and prioritize Portland economic development through the use of transferring dollars from the strategic investment fund.

Speaker: Is there a second? Okay. Moved by dunphy, seconded by green. This is the dunphy green one amendment. Councilor dunphy, you moved this. Would you like to speak to your amendment?

Speaker: Absolutely. Thank you. Colleagues, the amendment at question zeroes out the general fund allocation to prosper Portland and directs the prosper Portland to transfer the 2324 equivalent funding from the strategic investment fund to their general fund in order to fully fund our economic development efforts within prosper Portland. As we know, the mayor's budget proposes a cut to those in line with all of the city's amendments. This amendment prioritizes our ability to

address the \$93 million budget shortfall while preserving prosper's economic development programs by temporarily backfilling prosper's budget using the strategic investment fund. This is a targeted, responsible step that allows us to redirect \$11 million in general fund dollars to keep Portland parks open, shore up our permitting system, and invest in true economic development. And please let me be clear prosper is not being defunded or dismantled with this amendment, but we are in a moment of real financial strain, and every bureau is being asked to do their part. Every couch cushion is being checked, and no one else has the luxury of protecting resources. While frontline services are being cut. Seaf has gone from \$6 million in 2022 to over \$53 million in 2024 from expiring tif districts and the sale of public property, which we have more on the way, it will be replenished and no other revenue proposal is going to save the programs that Portlanders depend on at this moment. This is the best savings opportunity we have today to keep our community whole and continue to invest in economic development. And let's also be honest, what's happening right now? No other city agency would blast emails to every past permit holder or program attendee and be disingenuous about a proposal facing this body. That's not collaboration. Prosper must be a cooperative arm of Portland values and priorities, not a siloed entity defending its own turf. This amendment restores alignment between prosper's work and the city's urgent priorities, and gives us time to thoughtfully assess what economic development should look like under our new form of government.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor. Councilor green, you're in the queue. Actually, councilor green, I apologize. We just had somebody speak to this amendment. Are you in the queue to oppose this, councilor?

Speaker: Just checking.

Speaker: Okay. Given that there is nobody in the queue in opposition, councilor green, go right ahead.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I echo everything he said. My colleague said I don't need to reinforce it. I just want to talk a little bit about the opportunity cost and the intent. There's a budget note at least a couple times in this stack of amendments and notes that one of mine calls on sort of council's expectation that the mayor's proposed in 2627 has ongoing resources for economic development, replaced the intuition here. And I'll just say, I know it's scary to lose ongoing allocation for a bureau. I you know, no question. It's also scary to lose your job. There are 145 net ftes losing their job in this budget, and over two thirds of those are represented employees. And so we're living in a world of second bests here. The opportunity cost for this, the city chief financial officer did some analysis. And we're looking at the upper end, \$880,000 in fOregone interest for one year. In exchange, we can use \$13 million to settle the balance of our amendments that we would like to settle tonight. We can restore the \$2 million that was defunded from the proposed budget by prosper Portland this year. So this is about trade offs. It is my firm belief that, you know, I'm back in the mayor's sheltering plan because it was sold upon a temporary surge model, and it it will not be an ongoing cost in our budgets going forward. And so while we provide those surge resources this year, it's reasonable to have the support that so we can have a foundation for economic development, because there will be no economic development in this city if we cannot address our livability concerns. So that's all I'd like to add to this, this discussion, and then i'll stop.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor smith, are you in the queue in opposition?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Go right ahead, councilor smith.

Speaker: So what's not being made clear is that those programs, along with the marijuana general fund money, what's not being made clear is you said that there's \$13 million of amendments that we can put in there, but what about those programs that are that are currently paid for with the \$13 million? What's going to happen within you assume that they're going to take that 13 million and take it from cif and replace it with those programs. But looking at a memo that I saw from shay said they weren't going to do that. So I'm concerned. And I'm very troubled because this is really going to hit vulnerable small businesses, particularly in my district. And that's why I have an amendment to put \$5 million from the joint office fund, actually, not the joint office fund, but the cdbg, which is the community development block grant. Back in to prosper. So I'm concerned they've already put on record. Even if we take this away, they're not going to backfill it with cif. And that's a problem.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor morillo are you in the queue in favor.

Speaker: In favor. Yes.

Speaker: Go right ahead.

Speaker: Well I think that they're doing what good negotiators do. And a good negotiator is going to say, I'm not going to do anything you want unless you give me 100% of what I want, knowing that you're going to negotiate down. Right. So I would call their bluff because I don't think prosper Portland wants to be hated by the entire community because ultimately it is their choice. If they choose to defund all of the community programs, the business support that we have for bipoc businesses, they get to choose what to do with those dollars. It is my understanding that councilors green and dunphy have provided something that is supported by one time funding, and that they are using something that has a budget. Note that explicitly states, explicitly states that we are going to be returning the funding when

we have more revenue. And councilor green, I will remind everyone, is one of the only people besides councilor novick who I'm very excited to support. His ceo tax, who is actually thinking about revenue raising measures in this city and trying to address our problems and provide alternatives so we can hem and haw about the decisions that are before us. But the choices are that we are going to be laying off a lot of city staff. We're going to be cutting off a lot of city resources. Desperate times call for desperate measures, and we are asking this one agency to not to be treated with kid gloves, much like I guess it's prosper in the police get treated with kid gloves and everywhere else we cut 8% and we take away our staff and we take away all of the public support. So I think that this was something that was put together that councilors green and dunphy intend to make good on their word. And it's something that I'm going to be supportive of because my constituents are asking me to defend the programing that supports their day to day lives, and that is what is needed right now. Public dollars should be in public hands. And I think that we have a broader question as well about how these funds are going to be used moving forward. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor kanal are you in the queue in opposition?

Speaker: Don't take this as more than it is, but yes.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Go right ahead.

Speaker: I'm a little concerned about something and I want to get maybe some clarification. Was the implication or just to clarify what councilor smith said was the implication that the executive director of prosper Portland was saying that they would violate what we, as their budget committee, approved. That seems pretty startling.

Speaker: So they can determine what happens with cif. We determine what happens with the general fund. But there was a memo that sent out that was sent out to us that said, you take that money and we're not going to backfill those programs that are being paid for. I am concerned and I'm very troubled by it.

Speaker: So then just to finish, continue this clarification question for mr. Taylor, my understanding is can you speak to which parts of this as the City Council sits as the prosper budget committee, you know that in terms of moving money from the cif to the prosper general fund. Can you speak to that aspect of this? Because this is sort of has to be made multiple motions because it's in different parts of it. So but it's helpful to have the context of the other.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: For the question. As councilor smith mentioned, we provided a memo on this topic.

Speaker: They.

Speaker: Council, as the prosper Portland budget committee, has the authority to revise prosper's.

Speaker: Proposed budget.

Speaker: Before approving it. The budget. Committee may revise the. Budget by reducing revenue. Due to elimination of the general fund allocation from the city, with a corresponding decrease in expenditures. The budget committee may reduce the amount in the. Strategic investment fund and. Increase the amount in the. Prosper general fund in a corresponding amount. And the budget. Committee can add notes directing prosper how to use the money move from cif to the prosper general fund. Once the budget. Committee transmits the.

Speaker: Budget back.

Speaker: To prosper as the governing body for that entity. The expenditures within those funds.

Speaker: May.

Speaker: Be.

Speaker: Decreased so long as they.

Speaker: Remain in.

Speaker: Balance and expenditures may be increased in the funds, so long as they do not exceed the greater of 5000 or 10%. While prosper's.

Speaker: Board may only.

Speaker: Increase a fund and amounts consistent with the state law, there are no limits on prosper's ability.

Speaker: To make.

Speaker: Changes to the. Notes specifying. Specific expenditures of money in the prosper general fund. I believe counselor smith correctly summarized that memo.

Speaker: So to clarify that last little piece that they can they can does that mean they can take the money that we move from the cif into the general fund, the prosper general fund, and move it back into move 5000 of it at most back into the cif and the rest would remain in their general fund.

Speaker: They could they could.

Speaker: Adjust the.

Speaker: Fund balance. By 10%. But they do not have to follow council's direction on how you would like them to reprogram the funds.

Speaker: And that's 10% of what it was, what it would be at the start of that conversation.

Speaker: There's two different issues. One is the fund balances and how much they can change the fund balances. And they're they are limited in their ability to

change the fund balances. But as councilor smith noted, the budget committee can tell them, we want you to spend the cif for the general fund in a particular way by a budget.

Speaker: Note the.

Speaker: Prosper when they sit as the governing body.

Speaker: They can delete. That note. They can.

Speaker: Replace that note and do something different.

Speaker: With it.

Speaker: Something else within the general fund.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Thank you. The prosper general fund. Thank you. So for me, the reason for my opposition is solely to the amount that we're talking about here. And I'm very open to having a conversation around the dollar amount. And the specific reason for it is twofold. One is they would lose at least I think it was 1.1 million was the estimate we got in in. In interest or investment income off of the fund in a year. And the other reason is because I am very, very sympathetic to the argument that once something is zeroed out in the ongoing general fund, it is very difficult to come back. So those two things are my concerns. I think there may be somewhere in between zero and all of it that we can hopefully come to. That's a very large range, but that's my rationale and I'm interested in coming up with an idea with with my colleagues. Thank you, madam president.

Speaker: Councilor green, I believe you've spoken to this amendment. Councilor morillo, I believe you have not spoken to the amendment. Are you in the queue in favor?

Speaker: Sorry. Councilor kanal proposed an amendment.

Speaker: Councilor kanal did not propose an amendment. He signaled an interest.

Speaker: Oh, our the amendment overall. Sorry, I thought there was an amendment to an amendment situation happening. So I guess what I'm hearing overall though, and correct me if I'm wrong, but it feels like an unelected board in prosper Portland is entitled to hold a city government hostage in our efforts to exercise oversight and guidance during what is one of the most brutal and difficult budget discussions we are having currently and will have in the next few years. We are being asked to make drastic cuts to services that impact our constituents day to day lives. We're talking about letting our parks fall in disrepair. We're talking about cutting community programing that feeds school kids. We're talking about cutting a lot of things that are absolutely essential for regular Portlanders. And an unelected board is able to hold us hostage and say, no, we're not going to do what you say. I think regardless of how this ends up tonight, there is a broad and big discussion that needs to happen about how public dollars are used and who has power over them, because we, as the budget committee, who were actually elected by Portlanders, deserve to have some say over how something as large as this level of funding is used. And I will emphasize again that that also means I want to make it very, very clear the decision rests with prosper Portland about whether or not they use those funds to protect those services ongoing. For businesses of color. It rests with them. If they choose to do layoffs, it rests with them. Whatever happens moving forward, because we have a commitment here from the council that we are going to raise more funding and that we're going to restore those funds. So I just want to be clear about who is responsible for what happens here on out.

Speaker: Colleagues. I think I'm the next person in the queue in opposition. I want to put our work in the context of cuts that were already made, and we're talking a lot about changes we make to the mayor's proposed. But the mayor's proposed already includes cuts in some cases. And in this case, I believe there was a 13% cut

in the general fund going to prosper that was already made. This isn't an entity that is free from cuts. And while it is true that the board at prosper would will decide what to do with any additional cuts that our body makes or transfers to other fund types, it is also true that the budget we have been handed the proposed budget from the mayor does very little around economic development. At a time when we hear repeatedly that we need investments in good jobs, we need support for small businesses. If we want Portland to look like Portland again. And those are the types of things that are funded at prosper that I wish we were talking about doing more of, as opposed to just transferring funding types around. It is also true that when you pull money out of cif, there is less money earning interest, which will lead to further reductions in the future. And so while I wish we were having a conversation about whether it was worth that risk to fund additional programs and do more in economic development, I'm being asked if I would be willing to pull all general fund out, which, by the way, will mean we have less control over this entity, this entity that I believe we all want more control over the programs within. And if we want to have that conversation about more control over economic development programs, I think we need to be having that conversation, not pulling out the one tool, the one point of leverage that we have to have some control over what programs happen within prosper Portland. For all those reasons, I am going to be a no on this amendment. Councilor avalos, are you in the queue to speak for or against this amendment.

Speaker: Against?

Speaker: Okay. Councilors green and morillo have already spoken. So while it is two against in a row, I believe councilor avalos, the floor is yours.

Speaker: All right. I'm going to try to put my thoughts in a cohesive manner. But let me start here. I this discussion around, you know, if we direct prosper to do

something and they don't do it and we're wrestling control and you know honestly like I hate that and I agree that that's bad. I don't like that. The first reaction from prosper was something that we're all familiar with, which is, well, we're going to do this thing you don't like if you do this thing we don't like. I agree that that is tricky. And I have expressed to my friends at prosper that I didn't like that. Put all of that aside, my issue is really not that I also well, one more caveat to say, I also agree with my colleagues that we need to have a serious discussion about the relationship of the city to prosper, of where economic development work lives. I would love for that to come into an office of economic development. But that's actually my point. This would be different for me if it was. We're going to zero out their general fund dollars putting those programs at risk. I think it's really unfair to say that people are being hysterical when they feel that they are being defunded. They feel that way because once you take one time or once you take ongoing money and turn it into one time, it does change the relationship of that budget. And these are communities who are being told that we care about economic development. We're going to make them whole again. Putting aside the whole drama around prosper, not yes or no. Wanting to take it out of cif, even if they did take it out of stuff that's going to run out eventually. That is a limited pot of money. So even if it's not in one year's or it's in two years, then what? It would have been really different for me if this proposal had come to me and said, come to this body and said, we have a plan for where those things are going. We've talked with community about what that looks like, and we're moving forward with something that is going to, you know, really bring everybody to the table because I think everybody does want to be at the table. I have heard people amongst the prosper crowd, people who receive benefits from prosper, who we all agree prosper is no angel. Okay. I have been fighting with prosper for years. Ask them. I have been wrestling with them around

larger issues, but at the same time we have been working with them. You know, we spent six years creating the tif, which is a whole new way to do to change a tool that has been used for gentrification and turn it into the opposite, and an anti-displacement tool that, as I've said on the dais, is to be seen. There's a lot that we are. That is a theory. That is, there's a lot to be seen on how we make that a reality. But it was really important work that community brought together for six years to create a new charter, a new way of doing tifs. And now we've launched all these new tifs, whether we like it or not, they're there, but they have this new way of going or a new way of doing business that I think the community has really fought hard for. And I think the fear that people have when they see zeroing out that budget and being told we're going to replace it, these are communities who have been told over and over and over and over and over again that things are going to get replaced or that it's going to get replenished, or we have a plan and there's no plan. So this again, I would have gladly considered this if I felt like I was seeing an actual plan forward. I'm hearing a promise of a plan. To me, that's not good enough to put communities who have worked hard for those dollars hang them in the balance for the next year. And, you know, there's this discussion around, oh, well, they don't have to fire people. Sure. But if you are, you know, you don't know where your budget's going to come from. If I'm an employee, I don't know if I'm going to stay. You know, it's like, do I have certainty in my job? Right? It creates a cultural office cultural thing that I have an issue with. Okay. I'm trying to get all my thoughts in one thought, but I think ultimately the reason I can't support it is just because I don't believe we have fairly offered a partnership, a collaboration, a plan to make sure that those dollars that people fought really hard to put into prosper's budget. Because without those dollars, that general fund money, they're just a development commission. They're just that's it. Right? It's just a tool of gentrification. That's what

it's been used for in the past. And so that's why I can't support it. Not because because I genuinely do agree with my colleagues that I don't like the response from prosper. I don't think that this whole, you know, fight around who gets to say, what about the dollars? I hate that, but this isn't really it isn't about that for me. It's about the communities that are relying on ongoing dollars and us leaving them hanging with no plan. And these are people who are used to being left without a plan. And those promises not being kept. And so that's what concerns me about doing this. So that's where I'm at.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor, councilors morillo and canal, you've both spoken to this, so I'm going to ask you to keep your comments short so that we can move to a vote. Councilor morillo. Go right ahead.

Speaker: I really appreciate this discussion and I would like to move to amend councilors. Dunphy, dunphy and greene's amendment. Is this an appropriate time to do that?

Speaker: Is an appropriate time to do that? Yes.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: So I will read it off and then maybe I can send it to somebody over there. Would that be helpful? Okay. So you'll have the language. So the I would like to move to amend dunphy green one to add quote except venture Portland in the title change 11,054,000 \$195,000 to 3.5 million and change 15,000,400 and jesus christ. 417,954 to 6,263,719. I'd like to further add, use the recovered general fund dollars for these core economic development amendments, \$1 million for morillo morillo five amendment rental assistance and eviction defense, 750,000 for dunphy two arts package 750,000 for green to james beard. Market support 500,000 for avalos for housing preservation, 500,000 for councilor Ryan's one restore and repair program, and 2 million for parks. And I added that in the event that parks is fully

funded by some other mechanism, that I would like 2 million to go to the permitting department.

Speaker: Councilor could.

Speaker: You read off those numbers and amendments again, that you would be folding into this for us?

Speaker: Yes. Morillo five for rental assistance, 1 million. Dunphy two arts package 750 k green two. James beard market 750 k. Avalos four. Housing preservation 500 k. Ryan one. Restore and repair program 500 k. And then 2 million for parks. In the event, parks is already fully funded, which I don't believe that it is, but maybe someone out there tracking it can tell us. Then we will move that to permitting and development. So I want to emphasize that the dollars that are being moved are also going to help with economic development, and they help a variety of our colleagues with some of their goals.

Speaker: And councilor, can you please talk through the first part of the amendment, what the money moves are that you are proposing?

Speaker: Yeah. Let me chat this to you because it's written.

Speaker: Can you send it to haley as well? Haley, you can find her on chat too.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: And she will try to get it up for us so that everybody can look at it.

Speaker: Hang on.

Speaker: Everybody give me a second to send this.

Speaker: I'm going to send this to haley councilor. Okay.

Speaker: Here. I got it to her.

Speaker: Okay?

Speaker: Yeah, I'm adding.

Speaker: It in now. So.

Speaker: When you said accept venture Portland in the title, where in the title would that go. Is that prioritize Portland economic development except venture Portland or is that reduce prosper Portland general fund grant to zero accept venture Portland.

Speaker: Accept venture Portland. And I think councilor green would you like to help out with some of the amendment changes that are made?

Speaker: Sure, if I understand the spirit of what you're doing there, it would be the second bullet in the original. Dunphy one. Green, dunphy green one where it says direct prosper Portland restore economic development program to 2425 levels, except for venture Portland, because I think that was in their last year's budget. Is that what you're trying to do?

Speaker: Yeah, yeah.

Speaker: Meaning that it would be restored to those levels. But for venture Portland, which is still zeroed out. Okay. Haley, does that help you find the right place to put that?

Speaker: Yeah, it's up right now. We're just. Oh sorry.

Speaker: For venture.

Speaker: Portland one.

Speaker: More time.

Speaker: So in the second bullet, it would say after the comma after levels 20, 24, 25 levels, comma. Except the venture Portland program would remain zeroed out.

Speaker: Second. Second. Was that.

Speaker: A question about whether we had one or was that a second?

Speaker: That's a second.

Speaker: Okay. Second from councilor koyama lane. So this is a proposal for councilors to continue the general fund level to prosper. Portland. -3.5 million, which would be pulled back from prosper Portland. Is that correct?

Speaker: I'm sorry.

Speaker: This says decrease ongoing general fund discretionary and prosper Portland by 3.5 million. So they would retain the rest of their general fund. They would lose 3.5 million in general fund. Is that correct?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: And the one. Time 2 million.

Speaker: And they would be losing the one time 2 million. So it's a \$5.5 million decrease in general fund to prosper Portland.

Speaker: Correct. So it's considerably less than what was put on on the table overall earlier. I'm going to see if staff can get some exact language to you. Haley, if that's a little bit easier.

Speaker: Councilors I would like in order for folks to process this and to not make our guests wait too long, what I'd like to do is take public testimony, open up. Prosper, take public testimony. We can move back. After taking public testimony to our debate on our city budget, so that we can finish this discussion and do any other discussion around economic development that might affect, prosper, and then go back to prosper to vote. But I would like us to not make our guests wait any longer.

Speaker: I think we're almost done here.

Speaker: Haley. Are you do you need more time? More than about two more minutes.

Speaker: No. Just getting.

Speaker: The.

Speaker: Titles in.

Speaker: Point of information. But are you suggesting to take testimony so that the people can respond to this?

Speaker: I am suggesting that we have folks who have been waiting to provide testimony for almost two hours, and I would like to get to them as soon as possible. So not specifically to this, but we have, I believe, 22 people who are signed up to testify to the prosper Portland budget, perhaps on these topics and perhaps not. Did you have another question, councilor? How are we doing? Haley.

Speaker: Angelita sorry, councilor.

Speaker: Morillo do you have.

Speaker: Specific language. For the.

Speaker: Parks piece?

Speaker: The 2 million for parks?

Speaker: Yes, I do want the parks piece that says that in the event that parks is not fully funded by the end of this discussion, then 2 million goes to parks. But the in the event part is meant to for it to go, to be dedicated to permitting so that if parks is fully funded by some other mechanism, by the end of this discussion, we can ensure that our permitting is actually going to be efficient at the city of Portland. So to clarify what this amendment does, it removes 3,500,000 in general fund support from prosper Portland and 2 million in one-time support from prosper Portland. Simultaneously, it replaces it with a one time 6,263,000 in internal resources, including revenue from the strategic investment plan investment fund. Apologies.

Speaker: Can you confirm the parks?

Speaker: Otherwise everything.

Speaker: Else.

Speaker: Is in.

Speaker: Doctor levine, do you need anything additional?

Speaker: No. That's fine. I'm not 100% clear where the 2 million number comes from for parks, but that's fine. You can use 2 million. I don't know if there's anything specific that it's tied to. Okay. That's fine. We're good.

Speaker: Okay. Councilors, we have a motion on the table. Actually, we have an amendment on the table. Councilor kanal, are you in the queue to speak to the amendment? Councilor smith, are you in the queue to speak to the amendment?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Go right ahead.

Speaker: So the money that's coming from cip, it was my understanding that we can't direct funds into the general fund of prosper.

Speaker: We can, but there is no guarantee if we don't coordinate our conversations with the board, that they would retain what we propose.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Councilor kanal, are you in the queue to speak to this amendment? Councilor kanal is no longer in the queue. Councilor morillo, are you in the queue to speak again to this?

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Okay. Seeing no one else in the queue. Keelan, could you please call the roll.

Speaker: Canal canal.

Speaker: On the amendment to the amendment, I vote I Ryan.

Speaker: Was that. No, no. Sorry. Thanks. Koyama lane I morillo.

Speaker: I novick.

Speaker: I'm in no today. But I think it's an interesting amendment and I think of all of today's being a preview of June 11th and on both, for example, on councilor

zimmerman's tree code thing. And on this I think I need to learn more. And I'm willing to have continuing conversations. And as the council president said, I think that conversations with the prosper board are going to be fruitful. So I think that councilor murillo's proposal is a good starting point for those discussions. Though I might note today I'm a yes to exploring it.

Speaker: No. Clerk.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Green.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Zimmerman.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Avalos.

Speaker: I'm voting on the amendment. Right. So I'm voting.

Speaker: On the amendment to the amendment. Correct the proposal from councilor morillo.

Speaker: Track changes.

Speaker: I think the reason I'm struggling with my decision is. I don't even really I don't know where I'm at on either of them, to be honest. And. I think because I don't support the larger cut, I'm inclined to say yes to the amendment just so that we can have the discussion about a smaller one. But I'm not sure yet if I'm going to vote for the smaller cut. So I think I will say yes to the amendment so we can have that discussion. I haven't decided yet if I feel that these investments are worth making that cut to prosper. So I will say yes for now. Have not decided on the rest of it.

Speaker: Dunphy I vote yes on the amendment to the amendment.

Speaker: Smith.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: I appreciate that we're having a conversation about further economic development, investments with our economic development dollars. Colleagues, it feels too large to me. And while I want to find a way to fund parks maintenance, I don't want to pull economic development dollars to fund parks maintenance.

Speaker: No amendment fails with a split vote.

Speaker: Councilors. That puts us back to a debate on the underlying amendment. Dunphy. Green one. Is anybody in the queue to discuss dunphy green one or should we move to a vote? Councilor kanal.

Speaker: So I I'm not 100% sure where we're at on the budget as a whole right now in terms of additional commitments that we are needing to fund, but I am interested in understanding if there is a lower dollar amount that maybe or perhaps not restricting the use of parks, for example, the use of the money for parks that helps to make this a conversation that is worth having or if it's not worth pursuing at all, because I listening to the justifications, I'm not 100% sure if it's too far too little on the amendment to the amendment that just failed. So I'm trying to understand that from everybody. Thanks.

Speaker: I think that's a conversation to have. Further as we move further into our debate. But right now, seeing no one else in the queue. Keelan could you please call the roll on the dunphy green one amendment, which is an amended from its introduced form.

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: Reserving the right to move to reconsider later. I'll vote no, Ryan.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Koyama lane.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Morillo.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Novick.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Clark.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Green.

Speaker: The mayor's proposed budget draws down over \$30 million in contingency balances, which is not something that's ideal. There are a number of not ideal situations in this budget. Because we are in a crisis. We are in a crisis in the city where we're very close to a doom loop, and there can be no sustainable economic development project that is new if we cannot solve our crisis. That is why I backed this and helped draft this amendment. That's why I'm voting yes.

Speaker: Zimmerman.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Avalos.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Dunphy.

Speaker: I'd just like to point out to my colleagues that this a note that by rejecting this amendment, we are cutting venture Portland. We are reducing the staff at the office of film and events, and we are reducing the inclusive business network grants by almost 20%. I think that those are programs worth trying to save. And I vote yes on this amendment.

Speaker: Smith.

Speaker: Listening to the conversation, there was no conversation about what was going to happen with the 13 million that we would lose, because prosper has already said that they're not going to backfill it. And that was going to have a definite impact on bipoc communities, businesses. And do I think we need to have another conversation with prosper? I do we need to have a conversation to make sure that we're getting the, the biggest bang for our economic dollars that we have in our general fund. And I do want to have that conversation. I do think we need to have economic development done out of the city of Portland because as you see right now, we're at a standoff on whether or not we can direct prosper to send their cif over. Now, mind you, I want to keep one thing in mind. Prosper has not had this account, but two years where it came from and how it got there. I have no idea. So this is not a long standing fund that they've had forever. It just appeared two years ago. So for me, I question that. I question how we got here, but I'm still going to vote no for this. Thank you.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney no.

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

Speaker: Councilors, we are going to. I think officially we are. Do we have to recess, robert? Okay, we are going to recess our budget committee meeting. I am going to move us in to our convening as the prosper Portland budget committee. I hope I'm saying that correctly. Keelan. Can you please call the roll canal.

Speaker: President Ryan. Here. Koyama lane.

Speaker: Here. Mario here novick. Here.

Speaker: Clark here.

Speaker: Green here.

Speaker: Zimmerman. Here. Avalos.

Speaker: Present.

Speaker: Dunphy. Here. Smith.

Speaker: Here.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney here. So we are convening the prosper Portland budget committee for the purpose of approving the fiscal year 20 2526. Prosper Portland budget. The budget committee received exhibit a to resolution 7606, which illustrates the proposed budget summary, appropriations by fund and appropriation category. On may 13th, 2025, the prosper Portland budget committee received exhibit b to resolution 7606 on may 6th, 2025, and conducted a hearing to receive public testimony on the proposed budget on may 8th, 2025. Exhibit a corresponds to the proposed budget received by the budget committee on may 6th and presented to by staff on may 8th. It aligns to the total appropriations included in the mayor's proposed budget for the city of Portland general fund and recreational cannabis tax funds. I am not going to take a motion. Well, I guess I will take a motion to approve resolution 7606, including exhibit a and a second. We are not taking a vote right now. We are just taking a motion to have it open before us. Do I have a motion? This is a motion so that we can put the prosper Portland budget on the table. Thank you. Motion by counselor Ryan, second by councilor clark. Thank you. So before we move into discussion on this budget, I know there is work we still need to do in our council budget, our city budget. But I would like us to be able to hear testimony from folks on this budget for the next couple of hours. I just want to lay out the plan so folks can make their plans for dinner. I plan on us hearing testimony on the prosper budget. We will then take a quick, let's say, seven minute break so that folks can have a chance to stretch your legs, refill your drinks, use the restroom. I'm hoping we can then come back and reconvene as the city budget committee, work through some more amendments and take a dinner break sometime around 8:00. We'll break for about a half an hour

then, and then come back, do a little more work on amendments for the city budget. Then we can move back in, address anything else we need to in the prosper budget. Actually, we need to do that. Last, we'll need to pass our last. We'll move back into a council meeting after we finish our amendments for the city budget to pass our final rate item, then move back to a city budget meeting to pass our city budget, then move back into the prosper budget meeting to adopt any conforming amendments we need to in the prosper budget and pass the prosper budget. So Keelan, could you please call up any guests who are still hanging on here to testify on the prosper Portland budget?

Speaker: And then council president just confirming it's 90s for testimony.

Speaker: Yes. Like with the city budget meeting, we will do 90s.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you. First up, we have mark sherman, benjamin gilbert delgado, keith eisner.

Speaker: Welcome. You may.

Speaker: Should I go or should I go?

Speaker: I guess it'll be me.

Speaker: Council president.

Speaker: Councilors.

Speaker: For the record, my.

Speaker: Name.

Speaker: Is.

Speaker: Umay delgado.

Speaker: I'm here.

Speaker: In my.

Speaker: Capacity as.

Speaker: Vice president of ask me 3769, which represents.

Speaker: The employees.

Speaker: Of. Prosper Portland. Thank you for your. Vote on the green and dunphy amendment. And we.

Speaker: Would ask you.

Speaker: To.

Speaker: Pass a clean budget.

Speaker: For prosper Portland, abrogating our general fund. Commitment to economic development will impact our staff, our programs, and our ability to keep.

Speaker: Promises to community.

Speaker: I grew up in northeast Portland.

Speaker: My dad.

Speaker: Was.

Speaker: A.

Speaker: Small business owner.

Speaker: When business dried up, he lost his house. He lost his health insurance.

Speaker: And then we lost him.

Speaker: He could have used an agency like prosper Portland. Sometimes it felt like the city gave up on us. But I tried not to give up on it. I've tried to step up when the city has asked me.

Speaker: As a.

Speaker: Volunteer.

Speaker: As an.

Speaker: Employee, and as the leader of a union, that I feel wildly unqualified to lead. At prosper, I found an agency that I'm proud to belong, to, work I'm proud to do, members I'm proud to represent. Those members have similar stories. Our partners have similar stories. My members are fighting to keep the promises that

they've made to community. That's why they've shown up in the way they have for the last week. They want to make sure that they can keep doing this work. They say a budget is a moral document. So councilors make this budget an affirmation of your values. Tell our staff and our small business owners that they belong in Portland, that you're not giving up on them. Thank you.

Speaker: Mark sherman is joining us online.

Speaker: Members of the Portland City Council, I totally thank you for your hard work, and I'm glad I wasn't elected to the City Council. Angela davis said. I am no longer accepting the things I cannot change. I am changing the things I cannot accept. I want to acknowledge all of you who are trying to bring positive change to things you do, to things you do not accept. Take a breath. You're all doing great. Prosper Portland may be managing great projects. You're about to vote on funding mechanisms that include tif and enterprise tax exemptions. These there are. There is ample research that indicates tif funding mechanisms create long term deficits and increase gentrification. If you are not enjoying your current budget shortfall, don't make it worse. If you are unfamiliar with the negative short and long term impacts.

Speaker: Of.

Speaker: This type of funding, and perhaps you are not ready to make an informed decision in that case. Table or vote no until you understand the implications of tax free zones.

Speaker: And tax giveaways.

Speaker: Regardless of the deadline, you do not need to adopt this budget. Today. I may ask. I'll skip.

Speaker: That since I'm out.

Speaker: Of time.

Speaker: Finally, the purpose. Of public comment is to listen to the public. That takes time. Two minutes isn't enough. Time limit to limit the time further is unacceptable. If you want to shorten public testimony, why didn't you simply put the mat closure on hold? You could have had a two hour lunch. Unless you are restricting lobbyists to two minutes to plead their case, you have skewed the political process.

Speaker: In.

Speaker: Favor of.

Speaker: Those with the deepest pockets. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you benjamin.

Speaker: Hello, my name is ben and I'm a tenant in district four and a member of the democratic socialists of America. In this historic budget crisis, city.

Speaker: Council should.

Speaker: Remove 13 million from prosper. Portland's general fund allocation and use it to pay for vital.

Speaker: Programs that directly.

Speaker: Support Portlanders and their families. I know the amendment just came up, but it could. Come back. Prosper Portland can use its \$50.

Speaker: Million.

Speaker: Strategic investment fund to pay for. Its existing small business programs with no reduced service. And going forward, all Portlanders deserve greater voice and vote over how community and economic development dollars are spent through participatory budgeting. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Checking keith eisner. Next we have nina nishida, eric caravana, pallavi pandey, trellis. Louis santiago vasquez.

Speaker: I'm sorry. You gotta go.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Good evening, mr. Mayor.

Speaker: Council.

Speaker: Council and members of.

Speaker: The public.

Speaker: My name is santiago vasquez. I'm the business development coordinator at native American youth and family center, aka naya. I'm a resident of district four. As well, and I fiercely oppose amendment one dumpy green to slash \$1 million from the fund. You've heard from naya and from scores of our entrepreneurs and community members already on this, and I'm here to back them up. People are livid at even the whiff.

Speaker: Of this.

Speaker: Amendment passing it. When I started nine years ago, you could count native American owned storefronts.

Speaker: In Portland.

Speaker: On one hand. And through this programing made possible by the general fund, we now have bison coffee house at 234, ball was life cultural blends heavily indigenous 90 black pearl acupuncture, soma wellness and healing. I could go on but time. I've personally supported all of them. In the large scheme of \$1 million is a modest, I'd say very modest but very wise investment in our small businesses, which are the beating heart of our city. All these businesses, they give scores of employees great living wage jobs. Those wages are then reinvested into our local economy. That's easy math. I work with dozens of clients who are working on their own dreams to further fuel the economic engine that moves our fair city forward, and I have faith that this council will not throw sand into the gears of our local

economy in this way and crush those dreams. The effect of what you're doing is what counts, and you're voting to rob the city's hardest workers of the ability to produce tens or hundreds of millions of dollars of revenue to the city, depending on how you note that I'm out of time, so I just I'm here to vehemently ask you that you please vote no on this amendment.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Nina. And eric. Caravan. Pallavi pandey, charles. Lewis. J. Amaechi. Holly ong, shelley hack j is joining us online.

Speaker: Hello again.

Speaker: Portland is suffering rapidly. Rising inflation is causing families to choose between medical needs and groceries. Parks are in disrepair, housing insecurity is surging. And in this time of crisis, we've all had to make some really hard choices. Why does prosper Portland think they get to be exempt from this? In reality, prosper Portland threatening to slash bipoc and equity programing rather than tap into their enormous strategic investment fund, is giving up the game. Their commitment to marginalized communities is hollow. If they do choose to cut this programing, rather than tap into the huge \$50 million pot, they are revealing their true priorities for decades, prosper Portland, formerly the Portland development commission, has operated as a machine of displacement. Its legacy is etched in the ruins of albina and into the stories of families forced from their homes. Today, we see them weaponizing business owners of color as shields against accountability. While city services bleed, prosper threatens to gut the very programs they're using to rehabilitate their foul legacy. This is a textbook example of manipulating public outrage, but the premise is false prosper is binary framing. Cut funding or protect black and brown wealth is a fabrication. They have the funds, they refuse to spend

them justly. And now the same institution that displaced generations dangles minority entrepreneurs as bargaining chips. To those entrepreneurs. You're being manipulated, you're being tokenized, and they parade your survival as proof of their equity, while hoarding resources that could be used to fund housing assistance, schools, parks and other necessary city services. Prosper is trying to claim that we're defunding them. We're not defunding them. And defund was a black led movement, and they have no right to co-opt that movement. So vote yes on this amendment and.

Speaker: Stop letting you prosper.

Speaker: Hold us hostage. Thank you.

Speaker: Holly.

Speaker: Hi. Hi, everyone. My name is holly young. I'm the chief maker and co-founder of cbo, a singaporean award winning startup that started here in Portland, Oregon, where 100% female and asian owned and we just turned five years old. So our multicultural singaporean food is proudly crafted here in central, east side and north Portland, in the corridor near north lombard street. There are many things I don't understand or know how to run a city, but I can tell you with certainty that if it was not because of prosper Portland funding, accelerator and incubator incubators.

Speaker: Like accelerate.

Speaker: Women and build Oregon, I don't think we would be here today. These grassroots incubator groups have helped me and many of our diverse makers community through direct and indirect coaching sessions and created real commercial opportunities with buyers at local retailers like new seasons, market of choice, and activities like my people's market. We recently got into whole foods in the pacific northwest, and that's a national distributor. I would like to have it noted

that I am one of the 800 people and businesses who have signed a community letter to support prosper Portland. We are small, but together we add a lot of richness to the food tapestry that Portland is known for. So prosper Portland's investments uplift small businesses like mine and stimulate your tax base with job creation across our community. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. My name is shelley hack and.

Speaker: I'm here in my. Capacity as.

Speaker: Excuse me, president.

Speaker: Of afscme.

Speaker: 3769.

Speaker: I'm going to abbreviate.

Speaker: My comments.

Speaker: Considering the prior vote, I guess i. I walk into this with.

Speaker: Not a whole.

Speaker: Lot of.

Speaker: Political acumen.

Speaker: But what I've.

Speaker: Heard through.

Speaker: This process and.

Speaker: What.

Speaker: I'm taking away from it.

Speaker: Is that.

Speaker: There's a.

Speaker: Whole lot.

Speaker: Of.

Speaker: Lack of understanding of who prosper.

Speaker: Portland.

Speaker: What prosper. Portland is today, that there's.

Speaker: This.

Speaker: Image of a bunch of, you know, out of touch rich people. That are.
Controlling the organization.

Speaker: And that's just wrong. We have one of the.

Speaker: Most diverse.

Speaker: Boards in.

Speaker: In in a public agency.

Speaker: We also have.

Speaker: One of the most diverse program.

Speaker: Staff that are highly skilled in economic development.

Speaker: And so.

Speaker: I ask.

Speaker: You to.

Speaker: Take the time to learn more.

Speaker: About what we.

Speaker: Are.

Speaker: What programs we're.

Speaker: Operating now, and.

Speaker: How we. How we.

Speaker: Engage with.

Speaker: The community to do so.

Speaker: And then then one last.

Speaker: Thing.

Speaker: Is, I believe that there's a misunderstanding.

Speaker: About what the cip.

Speaker: Fund is. Fundamentally, that fund was.

Speaker: Established with resources.

Speaker: That came.

Speaker: Through expiring tif districts to. Fund a.

Speaker: An investment fund.

Speaker: That.

Speaker: Is specifically.

Speaker: Reserved for investing in small business development as well as.

Speaker: Strategic real estate.

Speaker: Development projects.

Speaker: Such as.

Speaker: Short stack. And so to take those funds.

Speaker: And move them somewhere.

Speaker: Else is to take those away from.

Speaker: Investments in those businesses.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Next up we have jana tessman, joma, ren mohammed akbar chishti, gavin gentry, janice joining us online.

Speaker: Hi.

Speaker: I'm jana tessman for the record. So quoting from the willamette.

Speaker: Week article from.

Speaker: February this year, the city's.

Speaker: Economic development.

Speaker: Agency approved. A \$7.

Speaker: Million loan.

Speaker: To an ambitious.

Speaker: Athletic apparel incubator in.

Speaker: Old town.

Speaker: In approving.

Speaker: The loan.

Speaker: Prosper Portland.

Speaker: Flouted its own. Guidelines for.

Speaker: Commercial loans written just.

Speaker: 11 months before.

Speaker: The loan is.

Speaker: Bigger for a. Longer duration.

Speaker: And at.

Speaker: A lower. Interest rate.

Speaker: Than the.

Speaker: Agency's guidelines.

Speaker: Would suggest is prudent.

Speaker: In March.

Speaker: 2020, prosper established.

Speaker: New commercial loan guidelines.

Speaker: The maximum loan.

Speaker: Should be 5 million.

Speaker: The interest.

Speaker: Rate should read ten year construction payback period should not exceed five years, but the loan instead. It's like 15 years long. It's the loan exceeds the.

Speaker: Maximum commercial amount and.

Speaker: It has a 3% interest rate callback. But the most. Alarming part was that.

Speaker: This paid.

Speaker: 7.4 million for two buildings that were appraised at 3.8 million. Who the hell did I just bail out with my tax dollars? Who? Whose real estate investment portfolio now looks better so that people are dying in the streets to pay for that? Like what is going on? It is not fair for prosper to get the best of both worlds. They get subsidies from the public sector to assure their functioning without the public oversight, and then they get the profits of the private sector without the risk. Why are we bailing out business owners? Why can't they bail out themselves with their millions of dollars, \$50 million? Thank you.

Speaker: Checking. Joe moran, mohammed akbar, gavin gentry, next up, jordan lewis. Karen. Babs vanelli.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: James. Edamame. Catherine townsend. Council president. That completes testimony.

Speaker: Pausing for 30s because I saw some folks moving upstairs. I don't know if anyone's coming down.

Speaker: Okay, I can I can run through the names again.

Speaker: Run through the names one more time just.

Speaker: In case.

Speaker: Yep. Joel moran, muhammad akbar christie, gavin gentry, jordan. Lewis. Karen ray, babs vanelli. James. Edamame. Catherine. Townsend.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Hello. City Council. My name.

Speaker: Is. Jordan lewis, and.

Speaker: I'm a goose hollow resident and member of Portland democratic.

Speaker: Socialists of America.

Speaker: As a.

Speaker: Socialist.

Speaker: I don't like to cut. Programs or believe in austerity. I want to make it clear that we don't have to.

Speaker: Live like this. We're here.

Speaker: Because one state law actually reduces our tax revenue.

Speaker: In service to property.

Speaker: Owners, to the previous council used one time covid funds on ongoing expenses. Three the mayor's foisting an unfunded shelter.

Speaker: Plan on us, and four.

Speaker: Businesses scabbed and flaked into the suburbs during covid, gutting our tax revenue. There's a timeline where we aren't here, but we are here nonetheless. And I'm noticing a troubling pattern. The mayor proposes cutting parks and reliances and show up and get that reversed. Council proposes shutting community centers. Citizens show up and get that reversed. Council proposes that prosper Portland share the cuts. Reliance citizens show up and get that reversed. And yet the \$90 million deficit persists. No one is going to let you touch their budget. Your job is council is to show some damn leadership and balance the budget. And just my concern is that if we don't touch prosper Portland's budget at all, how many services are we going to cut, and how reliant are working Portlanders on those services? I don't want it to be a zero sum game, but that's the situation that we're in right now, and I just want the fun. I just want the cuts to be shared, that's all. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

Speaker: We had charlie lewis join online. Please go ahead and unmute.

Speaker: Hello.

Speaker: Hi.

Speaker: Can you guys.

Speaker: Hear me?

Speaker: We can hear you.

Speaker: Hello. Hi.

Speaker: Well thank you.

Speaker: And I appreciate you. I'm sorry that I couldn't. Attend in person. I couldn't find anybody to cover my store. But I appreciate you guys for hearing me out. And I just.

Speaker: Want to say.

Speaker: It is really important for, as.

Speaker: You can see.

Speaker: Small businesses like mine, I am the only black owned wig store here in the pacific northwest, and I myself and.

Speaker: So.

Speaker: Many other small businesses rely on my people's market and it is so important to the community to have these markets. And this funding is so important. This it helps to my business to cover the rent it brings together community. It helps people. My small business, to.

Speaker: Just.

Speaker: Sustain. I rely, it helps market my business in so many other businesses. So if you guys take away this funding, it's going to not. We're dealing with enough already. With the pressure of what already is going on in the world. So I'm going to ask to you whatever as you go to bed tonight with this on your heart, that you really consider, you know, that we as small businesses and trying to grow and everything

that's happening that you do not cut these budgets keep us on your heart and help us don't take away. Don't take away the fun.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

Speaker: Sorry. Council president, we have someone who said they might be online. If you're online, please raise your hand. Okay. I think that completes testimony.

Speaker: Thank you. Thank you to everybody who is able to hang with us until we could get to public testimony. I know it was significantly later than we thought it would be. Counselors, as I laid out previously, I will have us take a seven minute break until 630. Right now. Actually, before I do that, I'm going to recess the hearing as the prosper Portland budget committee and reopen our our session as the Portland city budget committee of the City Council. We're now back in our city budget committee meeting. I'm going to have us recess until 630. We'll come back. We'll work through some more amendments. And if you are planning on figuring out when to get food here, plan on us breaking between 8 and 830 for a dinner break.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: And you?

Speaker: Sorry. See you.

Speaker: All right?

Speaker: So whatever I say, I'm going to have to repeat, I'm sure. Colleagues. Welcome back. It is 630. We are coming back. We are in session as the budget committee of the Portland City Council. We are going to try to do about two hours of work before we take a dinner break. So before I paused us to do a couple of other things, our original plan was to go section by section. Allow anybody who has an amendment in a section to put forward their most important amendment, or if

it's a package package of amendments and just move through with everybody's most important things section by section. So starting in the administration section, if you have an amendment that you would like to put forward in the administration section. Councilor clerk I see that you are first in the queue.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. This is exciting. Under the administration, I have two related pieces. It's clerk five and clerk six, which I'm rapidly turning to. These both involved involve asset management and the first one. Clerk five should I just go ahead and present it? Clerk five is just a budget note to support the development of an asset management strategic plan, which has several parts. And the accompanying piece is to allocate out of my office budget \$30,000 to work on facilitation for the asset management strategic plan. And I don't know if people need to know more about that or less. This actually is a resolution. There is a resolution coming in the future from the transportation infrastructure committee on asset management. But just as a backup, I wanted to have this budget note with the accompanying \$30,000 out of my office budget.

Speaker: Councilor clerk has moved amendments. Clerk five and clerk six. Clerk five is a budget note. Clerk six is what I believe is a budget neutral amendment. Yes. Is that correct? Ruth clerk six councilor zimmerman, are you seconding one or both of those? Okay, we have two amendments open clerk five and clerk six. Counselor, clerk, do you have anything else you'd like to say before we move on to discussion and debate amongst your colleagues?

Speaker: No, but happy to answer questions.

Speaker: Okay, counselor zimmerman, are you in the queue to support these amendments, or are you in the queue for another purpose?

Speaker: Different purpose. Once this one's done.

Speaker: Okay. Counselor green, are you in the queue on these amendments?

Speaker: Different amendments.

Speaker: Councilor morillo, are you in the queue on these amendments?

Colleagues, we have clerk five and clerk six open. This is a budget note and a budget neutral amendment, both of which deal with asset management. They've been moved and seconded. Councilor morillo, are you in the queue on these?

Speaker: No, they look fine to me. Sorry, I had my hand raised.

Speaker: Okay. Counselor smith, are you in the queue on these amendments?

Speaker: Yes, counselor.

Speaker: Smith.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Go right ahead.

Speaker: I'd like to support both of those amendments. As a member of the transportation committee, we had a discussion about the asset management, and I think that that would be a great use of your funds. And thank you for being so smart about that, counselor. I wish I had thought about it, but thank you. Yes, I do support it.

Speaker: Being no one else in the queue to speak to these amendments. Keelan could you please call Keelan? Could you please call the roll on? Clerk five for my colleagues who just walked in, clerk five is a budget note having to do with asset management, strategic planning.

Speaker: No. Ryan.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Koyama lane.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Morillo. Yes.

Speaker: Novick.

Speaker: I clark. I green.

Speaker: Never been more excited to support something. Yes.

Speaker: Yes i.

Speaker: Did that work i.

Speaker: Thanks, dunphy.

Speaker: I smith.

Speaker: I pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: Competing with councilor green for excitement.

Speaker: I 11 votes the amendment is approved.

Speaker: Thank you. Keelan. Could you please call the roll on clark six. Canal councilor. We are voting on clark six, which is a budget amendment to fund facilitation of an asset management strategic plan. It is budget neutral because councilor clark is paying for it from her current year's budget.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Koyama lane. Yes.

Speaker: Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick i.

Speaker: Clark i.

Speaker: I zimmerman. I avalos i.

Speaker: Dunphy i.

Speaker: Smith i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: Amendment is approved with 12 I votes counselors.

Speaker: That's the most efficient work we've done since the last thing counselor clark brought to us. For counselors who walked in in just the last few minutes while we were in the middle of that debate. What I've asked is that in each policy area, counselors who have amendments in that policy area have the opportunity to bring forward their priority amendment, or, if it's a related package, a package of amendments. We are beginning with administration. So we have colleagues in the queue to bring forward their priority amendment or package. Not everything you've put forward that's unrelated, but priority, amendment or package within the administration policy area of the work that we're looking at tonight, we're going to try to get through a few things in the next two hours, making sure that everybody has a chance to bring forward your priorities in any given policy area. Councilor zimmerman, are you in the queue for an amendment in the administration policy.

Speaker: To move zimmerman for the title of which is motion to amend the budget to eliminate the assistant city administrator? This frees up an additional 147,000 in the general fund.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: That has been moved by councilor zimmerman and seconded by councilor green. Councilor zimmerman, would you like to speak to your amendment?

Speaker: Yes. Thank you. It what it does, is it reclassifies the position to the equivalent of a mayor's chief of staff, instead of being an assistant city administrator? Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Council green, you just seconded that. So you are not in opposition? Councilor morillo, are you in the queue to speak to this amendment?

Speaker: No. Should I just put my hand down for. I'm I'm.

Speaker: It's okay, it's okay. You're you're in the queue for an amendment that you have. And councilor smith, are you in the queue on this amendment?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Okay. Go right ahead.

Speaker: I support this amendment. And thank you for being efficient. Councilor zimmerman.

Speaker: Councilor canal, are you in the queue on this amendment? Councilor avalos, are you in the queue on this amendment?

Speaker: Yeah, I just.

Speaker: Speaking for or against.

Speaker: I just have a question.

Speaker: Okay. Go right ahead.

Speaker: I guess I just wanted to learn more about the logic for this council.

Speaker: Zimmerman, would you like to speak more to your reasoning here?

Speaker: Yeah. Great question. Having come from that industry of city management, I believe that we are being served just fine at the dca level. And i, I do not see the reasoning behind an aca level, which is being used in our organization as an in-between between our city administrator and our dcas, and without operational programs directly reporting in there. I'm not seeing a level why that has to be a higher a higher caliber, higher rank, if you will, of employee. I also think that the job duties and roles and wait, I've seen it administered in the last few months reflects more of what a mayor's chief of staff caliber does in terms of serving the city administrator's office versus having their own book of business. So that was where I was coming from.

Speaker: And a quick follow up does the amount that it is reducing, does that mean this position is just taking a pay cut? Is that what this does?

Speaker: If the if the city administrator keeps the same thing? Yes, that would be, I guess, the practical sense of it, but it is an entirely. We have different classifications in our schedule. Mayor's chief of staff is a programmed hr recognized that has a range of salary. According to it, the assistant city administrator is also a recognized duty within our schedule of classifications. It has a range to it. This right now, the assistant city administrator for the program cost is \$392,000. A mayor's chief of staff classification is 245 and the savings is 147.

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

Speaker: I was in the queue to ask a question relating to this amount.

Speaker: Okay, go right ahead.

Speaker: If he doesn't mind being on the spot, could we ask the city administrator for his thoughts on this amendment?

Speaker: City administrator jordan, would you like to weigh in?

Speaker: The council has every priority to appropriate funding.

Speaker: For a particular service within.

Speaker: The. City administrator's office.

Speaker: It will.

Speaker: Require me. To go through.

Speaker: Hr to reclassify.

Speaker: The work that this position does. It is not.

Speaker: The same work.

Speaker: As the mayor's chief of staff. And so hr will have.

Speaker: To go through.

Speaker: And look at the position and the work that.

Speaker: Is currently assigned to the position.

Speaker: They'll have to.

Speaker: Do.

Speaker: A market analysis, and they'll.

Speaker: Have to do an equity. Analysis against.

Speaker: Other positions that have.

Speaker: Similar spans.

Speaker: Of control.

Speaker: In the.

Speaker: City, and then.

Speaker: They'll let us know if.

Speaker: What the classification will have.

Speaker: To be based on what is now it looks like.

Speaker: If this passes.

Speaker: Based on the salary range. Actually, that's the fully loaded cost of that position. So the salary is lower than that. I won't say how much.

Speaker: Could you quickly articulate some of the differences between the responsibilities of this position and those of the mayor's chief of staff?

Speaker: The mayor's chief of staff.

Speaker: Does not have director.

Speaker: Level positions reporting to them.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor Ryan, are you in the queue on this amendment?

Speaker: No, I will be supporting it, but I'm in the queue for amendments later.

Speaker: Councilor Koyama Lane, are you in the queue on this amendment?

Speaker: I am.

Speaker: Okay, are you in the queue to oppose this amendment?

Speaker: I'm not sure how.

Speaker: Okay, let's go with the question then go for it.

Speaker: Adding on to what councilor novick was asking mr. Jordan, I also am wondering if you can lay out a little bit of the pros and cons for us, and I know that you respect us to make this decision, but maybe some of the intention about, if you know how it was decided originally to make this aca roll. And what the support would look like for our our next city administrator, if this if we have a city assistant city administrator versus a chief of staff, can you paint that any more for us?

Speaker: Just to give you context, the.

Speaker: The work that was done back in 2023.

Speaker: To bring the original framework for the restructuring of the city to the previous City Council, there.

Speaker: Was a pretty significant.

Speaker: Debate about. What services. Or functions should be in the. Executive office versus should they be. Within the service areas. And we ended up with a number of this. Council knows that we ended up with a number of officers in the executive office, which have enterprise wide spans of control, and we ended up with a few offices, office of government affairs, office of equity and human rights, that reported. Needed to report into the executive office under that framework. And we created the assistant role to both.

Speaker: Oversee those.

Speaker: Offices.

Speaker: But also.

Speaker: To be my second, if you will, when I'm not available. And we have found in 4 or 5 months, almost now that there is a lot expected of that office in relationship to the council and council president's office, the mayor, there's a lot of expectation in that office. And so that's how we got where we are. And to continue

what I said before to the previous question, with the lower salary, i'll need to go through hr and have an assessment done of how that salary range compares to equivalent work within the city to try and establish what the appropriate span of control should be, and the appropriate duties for that classification level. So that's where we are.

Speaker: Thank you. City administrator councilor did you have.

Speaker: I'm wondering if you know, or if councilor zimmerman has in mind who would step in place if we didn't have a city assistant city administrator?

Speaker: I great question. I think ultimately the cca has got to determine that. But if I was looking at the rank order, if I was sitting in mr. Jordan's chair, I'd say the deputy city administrator for operations is my most next likely. Chain of command. Okay.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor smith, are you in the queue on this amendment?

Speaker: Yes. I just have a question. Councilor zimmerman, with your amendment, does it totally take away the position of assistant city administrator? Totally. Or does it just add the chief of staff to the administrator?

Speaker: It eliminates the a, a role and reclassifies that role as a mayor's chief of staff. And to mr. Jordan's point, the appropriate thing would be to go through an hr analysis for a term that meets the span of control. But at about that level of employee is what I'm seeking, which is similar to some of our other management and lower low level directors. Low ranking directors is a better term.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor avalos, are you in the queue to this amendment? Councilor green, are you in the queue to this amendment?

Speaker: Yes, madam president, I am. Thank you. Councilor zimmerman. Just a few questions. Is your intent here to kind of rightsize the administrative overhead of this organization?

Speaker: Yes, sir. And thank you for the question. I think that this is partially a response to some of the concerns about how much the dca, aca, cca, all the administrative growth that occurred in our government over the last year. This is a direct response to that, and i'll leave it there. Thank you.

Speaker: Thanks. And just a follow up question, because I haven't had time to do this because I've been all this other stuff. What is the salary for this role? What's the range for the aca?

Speaker: So I'm I'm going to talk about instead of salary just fully loaded meaning benefits etc. Is 245. That's the change. And so. I usually use the factor of 1.5 or 1.45 to the salary, and that equals the fully loaded package.

Speaker: Thank you. That answers my questions.

Speaker: Councilor kanal are you in the queue to speak to this amendment?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Okay. Go right ahead.

Speaker: I'll be supporting this amendment. I think this is our organizational chart needs to look like a pyramid and not like a pillar. And we need to look and be very specific about where we're going to be trimming the administrative side of the house, the management part of this, before we start looking at laying off more and more and more frontline workers. I'm grateful to councilor zimmermann for putting it forward. Thanks, councilor.

Speaker: Seeing no one else in the queue on this amendment, I will ask Keelan to call the roll.

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: I koyama lane know.

Speaker: Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick no.

Speaker: Clark i.

Speaker: Green i.

Speaker: Zimmerman i.

Speaker: Avalos no.

Speaker: Dunphy.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Smith i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

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

Speaker: Councilor morillo. Are you in the queue to propose an administration policy amendment?

Speaker: I am so I have a package that's kind of centered around good governance. So I have four to read off. Apologies, but not really because it's important to take up space. So morillo three reestablishes independent programmatic analysis with the city budget office. This is a budget note, and this is a motion to amend attachment d and add a budget note to reinvest in the city budget office. In past years, the city budget office and right now plays a critical role in providing independent analysis of. Of sorry excuse me of bureau budgets to inform council decisions and the reductions in their scope of reviews and analysis have really limited our ability to assess trade offs and make evidence based investments. So this budget note will, among other things, restore cbo's core

functions, ensuring transparency, routine analysis that supports fiscal accountability and sound governance. Should I read all of them first, or do you?

Speaker: If it's a package, yes. Let us know what they all are so folks can. Okay. Morillo nine is an amendment. So this would restore the city budget office analyst position. So it's a motion to restore the financial analyst and performance analyst positions in the city budget office that were proposed for elimination in the mayor's proposed budget. So that's an increase in general fund discretionary resources by \$350,000 for bureau program expenses in the city budget office, and the position authority would increase by two fte. The next one is morillo ten. This is a budget note, and this is about enterprise efficiencies oversight. So this is oversight framework for the mayor's enterprise efficiencies. And essentially it's just asking that there are guidelines to govern the mayor's process for discovering enterprise efficiencies. So I really want to ensure that his team checks in with council at regular intervals with temperature checks, decision points and data driven presentations that very clearly outline for us the impacts on programs and individuals that are going to be subject to cuts. We have a lot of jobs and employees that are on the line, so I don't like hearing about theoretical impacts. I want to make sure that we're really precise in our discussion about which employees are vulnerable and what alternatives there are. I also really want to emphasize that there has been a lot of discussion as as we're forming this new form of government about legislative authority versus executive authority, and the council needs to be involved in these processes. This is really high stakes, and we have equities that we care about as a governing body. We want to protect jobs. We want to retain state capacity instead of contracting out, potentially at higher cost. And council has the power of the purse. So we can't be presented massive cuts without a lot of data behind them to understand what it is that we're doing, we need time to decide, and we want to be a

really critical partner on the budgeting process. So that's part of what this one is for. My next one is a morillo 11. This is also a budget note policy and budget transparency package.

Speaker: Councilor are. These each individual packages or is this one package all together? I'm trying to make sure that we don't have folks trying to do everything while we make time for everyone, but that if you have things that go together, we take them together.

Speaker: I mean, I think these are all related to good governance, so I think it could be a package.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: And this is the last one. So i'll stop torturing everybody. This council. Okay. Sorry. Let me start over. So this is the policy and budget transparency package. Our council again was elected to serve our constituents. And we set the legislative agenda and how the executive executes. So we need information from on how the bureaus are functioning and how the budget is broken down in order to deliver good policy for the people. So council needs to see where the money goes. This note directs the budget office to present redesigned options for the budget format, so that council can clearly see spending at a program level. That's been an issue that's come up multiple times, where we haven't had line item details on some of these items, and it's been really hard for us to make these decisions in the course of a week about some major decisions that are going to impact us and our employees and our constituents. We also can't legislate in the dark right now, council members have been blocked from getting basic information from bureaus because there is a an entire chain of command that people have to go through to get information to us. That makes it too hard for us to get the necessary information to put our things together, and that this is also about checks and

balances. The mayor runs the executive branch, but we have to have independent access to information to fulfill our legislative duties. And because I think that good policymaking requires that we have all of the information before us to make these decisions. So with that, those are all of my that's my package that I'm proposing altogether.

Speaker: 11 councilors councilor morillo has moved morillo nine, ten and 11. Is there a second on any of those?

Speaker: I'll second all of them, but I think morillo three is on there too.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Sorry.

Speaker: I apologize. Three, nine, ten and 11.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Yes. Correct.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Thank you. I just forgot the check mark on one of those. And councilor canal, are you sending all four of those?

Speaker: My understanding. There's a package and I'll second the package.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Okay. Councilor Ryan, I think you're in the queue to make a motion later. Is that correct? Okay. Councilor avalos, are you in the queue on these amendments? I'm going to make a list of folks who are in the queue to offer your own amendments so that we don't have confusion here, so I have. Ryan epp. Avalos. And then you can pull yourself out of the queue. I have you written down. Councilor kanal are you in the queue on these amendments?

Speaker: I'm in.

Speaker: Queue to add my own.

Speaker: Okay. Councilor green, are you in the queue on these amendments?

Speaker: No, no.

Speaker: Green councilor novick, are you in the queue on these amendments?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Okay. Councilor novick, please go right ahead.

Speaker: Question for councilor morillo. The. I'm curious to what extent you think

that your other amendments are dependent on morillo nine in order to do them?

Like, could you imagine cbo doing some of these things without additional personnel, but not all of them? Because not knowing where we'll find the money for

the positions. I'm hesitant, although I approve. I like everything you're doing here.

I'm just wondering, would you say, well, without those positions, we'd still be reasonable to vote for ten and 11, but not not three or something like that.

Speaker: They are not dependent. It is preferable that we actually fund those positions, but they are not dependent. But I think that it's important to establish, codified in some language, about what our powers are as the legislative body that has the power of the purse and what information we need to do our policy.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor smith, are you in the queue on this amendment?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Go right ahead.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor morillo, I wasn't clear. Where are you getting the funding from to pay for this?

Speaker: For morillo nine, there is not identified funding.

Speaker: And what about the other two?

Speaker: The others are just budget notes. They do not have any additional funding attached to them.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Councilor kanal, are you in the queue on these amendments? Go right ahead.

Speaker: Yeah. I'm really grateful that these have come forward. And I do think that they form a coherent package of good governance work. I think our colleagues, we've all heard this, but I think councilor zimmermann most recently had raised the issue around how we understand the budget, how much information we give. I believe councilor smith has done that, too. I certainly have, and I think that those that information is dependent both on a framework of communication and on the appropriate staffing and the motion. Number nine does that. 11 does that as well. And I believe three does it also. Yeah, those three things really help to bolster the city budget office. When I've spoken to them they have asked for this and they do need it, and I'm inclined to support them on that. Although it is a slightly different situation with ten, I think it's important that we get more information on this specific thing, because it is such a big deal this year about how the budget is being managed, and so I'm very supportive of these as a whole, and I think that it they link together as well. Thanks.

Speaker: Point of information. You were calculating people. You were writing people down just a minute ago that were in the queue. Do you want us to take ourselves out of it or like, how do you want to go about?

Speaker: I've written folks down who are in the queue to bring their own amendments so that if you would like to comment on another amendment, you can put yourself in the queue to do that. So feel free to take yourself out. I have a list. Ryan pirtle-guiney avalos canal green who have amendments in the administration.

Speaker: So you'll just go in that order then. Like after we do this, we'll just go that way. Is that correct? Okay, thanks.

Speaker: Amendment.

Speaker: Do you have a clarification? Yes.

Speaker: Yeah. I just wanted to clarify. So while I have not identified funding for item morillo nine, I will say that this is restoring a cut that was made in the mayor's budget with the cbo. So it's not new staffing, but we don't have additional funding that I was able to identify based on the things that did or did not pass earlier.

Speaker: Thank you counselor. I have a question, and I think it is probably actually a question for either the mayor or the city administrator. If either of you are willing to entertain it. I'm wondering, with the efficiencies that are going to happen within city government and the work to centralize some of the core services of the city, if there are going to be positions identified that are doing budget work in other bureaus, that would then add capacity to the budget office without this amendment, or if it is likely that we won't be able to restore the level of service that we have in the budget office without this amendment. I wasn't sure if that was on the list of things that you all are looking at.

Speaker: Budget and finance is one of the systems that we're going to take a look at, and we will look at it enterprise wide. It would be speculative of me to say that there are positions that possibly could be shifted from somewhere in a bureau to the cbo office, but it's possible.

Speaker: Okay. But that is a place where we're going to be looking at how we do our work and doing it more efficiently. Yes. Thank you, counselor, I want to note that a lot of the work that you are proposing in morillo, I want to make sure I get the numbers right. 11 and three is work that I know the finance committee has talked about, ensuring occurs between now and the next budget cycle. I think it's

fantastic to see budget notes, to ensure that we get the responsiveness that we're looking for there, and I love when I see lots of people trying to get the same things. So I really appreciate you bringing these forward to complement some of those conversations. I think that it will be really helpful. So thank you. Councilor Clark, are you in the queue?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Thank you, madam chair. I appreciate these budget amendments very much. I think as we've gone through this budget process, we've learned a lot about the improvements that we need, and we've had an ongoing conversation about executive versus legislative. So I appreciate that. I'm I just have one question and then another comment is, did you talk to anybody in CBO about these in advance or is this new to them as well?

Speaker: I was out sick, so let me see if my team had discussed this with them. But at the end of the day, this is restoring core functions that CBO did before our government shifted. So when I worked in city hall before the way that CBO, the information that our offices received was far more in detail, my office confirms, yes, they were checking in with people and checked in with CBO staff. But the level of detail that you used to receive, line item detail that I think Councilor Smith has really asked for numerous times, and that a few of us have asked for numerous times, allowed us to actually make informed decisions as the legislative body. And I think that, you know, we fought really hard to make some good decisions in this budget, and we shouldn't have to fight that hard to get that information and to make these decisions. So the, the, the city budget office, as far as I've learned, they are extremely supportive of these amendments.

Speaker: That's terrific. Just one other comment I could foresee in morillo 11 where you talk about a working group, I can see that that would involve the

governance committee potentially, as I think some there's some parallel conversations going on in governance. So I think that's excellent. And we should have that sort of cross fertilization, maybe governance committee should be included in that work group along with finance. It is a pretty tight timeline that they're to get back to us in September, maybe with an initial report, but that's going to be ongoing. I assume.

Speaker: I'm fine with that. Yeah, I see this as something that needs to continue to evolve as our government evolves and we figure out what we need as a body. So yeah, I'm okay with that.

Speaker: Great. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilors. Seeing no one else in the queue for these amendments. If you are in the queue and I'm not realizing it for this, please let me know. Okay. Keelan, could you please call the roll? Why don't we just take these in numerical order?

Speaker: So for morillo three is the first one.

Speaker: Morillo.

Speaker: Three.

Speaker: Canal I Ryan.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Koyama lane.

Speaker: I. Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick I would be a yes if we had funding for the positions, but this seems like it would take a lot of work. So for the moment that I'm no on June 11th.

Speaker: Them separately.

Speaker: And i.

Speaker: Know the only one that has a budgeted position is morillo nine.

Speaker: I know, but I'm saying this this morillo three. I think that it seems to me like it might take a bunch of work for them to do. So right now I'm a no. I might change in three weeks.

Speaker: Clark.

Speaker: Green. I zimmerman, I avalos i.

Speaker: Dunphy. I smith.

Speaker: I would like I have the same issue with the. With the amendment that's going to require funding and I support your budget amendments. But if you don't know where you're getting the money from, it's going to be hard for me to if you could, if you could take this one out of it and then I could support the other two.

Speaker: So we're.

Speaker: Doing okay.

Speaker: We're just voting on three.

Speaker: Okay, great.

Speaker: I pirtle-guiney i. The amendment is approved with ten yes votes and two no votes.

Speaker: Okay. Councilors, I believe that moves us to morillo nine. This is the amendment with the position restore.

Speaker: Canal. I Ryan.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Koyama lane i.

Speaker: Morillo I novick.

Speaker: Nay.

Speaker: Clark.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: All right with that I no, no. Okay. Thank you. Green.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Zimmerman.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Avalos i.

Speaker: Dunphy i.

Speaker: Smith.

Speaker: Again, you have to say where your money is coming from and that you're going to take it away from what's existing. And that's how you have to phrase it. You have to do two things. You have to take it and then say you're going to use it for this program when you write it. So I'm going to be a no pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: I'm sorry, this is nine. No.

Speaker: The amendment fails with a split vote.

Speaker: Could you please call the roll on morillo 11? This is the enterprise efficiencies oversight piece.

Speaker: Of ten.

Speaker: There's ten and 1111.

Speaker: I meant I'm very sorry. Morillo morillo ten. The enterprise efficiencies oversight piece of the package.

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: I know koyama lane. Yes. Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick i.

Speaker: Clark I green. I zimmerman.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Avalos i.

Speaker: Dunphy i.

Speaker: Smith i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney no.

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

Speaker: And finally morillo 11 policy and budget transparency package.

Speaker: Canal i.

Speaker: Ryan. No koyama lane. I maria.

Speaker: We deserve as a legislative body to make sure that we have more transparency and information so that we can make informed decisions as a legislative body. I.

Speaker: Novick i.

Speaker: Clark. I green.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: I avalos.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Dunphy I smith. I pirtle-guiney. I approved with 11 yes votes and one no vote.

Speaker: Thank you councilor councilor Ryan you were next here for an amendment in the administration. Bucket.

Speaker: Before I go on, I have a question. Could we consider doing the budget notes that don't have budget impact later? We just have to do that by June 11th.

Speaker: We do just have to do that by June 11th. We also should be through the things that have to be done on the budget side before June 11th. I think you could make that request to your colleagues. Certainly, though, i.

Speaker: I don't want to slow down the process by having a debate over my question. I just think that if we want to save time.

Speaker: Tonight, I don't think we should debate. I think that it's fair to ask your colleagues to do that to save time. I've changed our direction a few times, so I don't want to change my official direction again, is all.

Speaker: Colleagues I holding going for these budget amendments, because I'd like to save some time tonight, and I think it'd be thoughtful if we went into the ones that have budget impact. That's a motion. I call the question. I someone help me here just again remy.

Speaker: I'm not sure that's something we would vote on. No, I think it's just a request to make to your colleagues.

Speaker: Information, though. What? When would we come back to them?

Speaker: On June 11th. We will. We will approve our adopted budget. So tonight what we are doing is putting together our approved budget, which is let's do the bulk of what we can. Let's do the big things. It then goes to tsk, which is the oversight body of the county that makes sure that we are generally right track and not doing anything crazy with any of our funds. And then we come back and finish our work. After that, though, there are limitations on what we can do within funds, which is why I started us out with those big fund changes to approve the adopted. There is much I know. So councilor Ryan, did you have an amendment in the administration bucket that you were bringing forward?

Speaker: Yeah, that went over well. So let's do this. Ryan budget note one city and prosper Portland grants inventory. This budget note directs the city operations deputy city administrator and prosper Portland editor to produce an inventory of the grant agreements for which the city and prosper Portland are granters of funds to community organizations. The inventories will be developed into a joint report and then presented to the City Council at a work session before December 31st, 2025. This inventory will be provided to the City Council in advance of fiscal year

2627. Bureau budget submissions to help inform budget council as they engage in budget development. The inventory will include the following elements grantees. Grant period. City grant manager contract. Amount of grant funding. Source. Brief description of the grant. Scope of work. I want to thank sheila craig, the grants manager, for your collaboration on this with our office.

Speaker: And colleagues. This is Ryan for and councilor. This is technically listed here in economic development, but I see your point that this is also a very administrative function. So we'll take it in administration.

Speaker: I couldn't keep track of all the matrix.

Speaker: So that's okay Ryan for.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor zimmerman, are you in the queue on this amendment? Councilor green, are you in the queue on this amendment?

Speaker: I just wanted to say that you shouldn't have given up so early, because I think everyone's going to go along with your budget note guidance. I intend to follow that practice tonight. It's a good idea.

Speaker: Hold the note.

Speaker: Councilor smith, are you in the queue on this amendment?

Speaker: Yes, councilor Ryan, so I'm trying to figure out, are you trying to get an accounting of the grants that are coming into the city, or are you trying to account for the money that's going out that we're spending on grants?

Speaker: The money that's.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor. Thank you, councilor smith. It's the money going out.

Speaker: And I have a I have a.

Speaker: It's to get some guidelines and some consistency. Discipline.

Speaker: Yes. Have a very similar budget note okay. But I hear what you're saying, I just want to make clear because our original our 9/12 that we did, we're supposed to be getting an accounting of all grant monies that come in. But you want to have an accounting of who has contracts. That's, that's that's a little different. Yeah. Having the agreements, those are generally not. Given out to the public. The agreements with with non-profits or others, but my I think it's important. No, no, no, no, I have something very similar to that about agreements and contracts and having. Since we currently don't right now, we don't approve them, so we don't get to see them. So I see what you're doing. It's the same thing that I was very interested in too as well, but I appreciate it. I don't know if we want to combine our two together.

Speaker: I'm I'm open to that. The context of this is my experience over the last four and a half years is we don't have a lot of discipline on our guidelines, and it's difficult to track. It's confusing for everyone involved. And I've always thought it was odd that private foundations have more guidelines that are transparent and clear than we do when we give out money to the community. And this is a taxpayers money, and we deserve that type of transparency and discipline in our guidelines.

Speaker: Okay. So would you be interested in adding a friendly amendment? Because I think this kind of goes together just in the interest of fiscal transparency and ensuring responsible governance. And this is a this is an amendment that has not that was not pre filed, but the motion would be to adopt the requirement that the mayor and the city administrator disclose all contracts, agreements or commitments exceeding \$50,000 prior to their approval and execution at a City Council meeting or special work session. And the reason why I want that done is because. We don't approve contracts anymore, like we did in the previous council. And so the current charter allows the mayor and the city or the city administrator to

execute contracts, and they can execute any contract without our permission. But I would like them to be disclosed that they are going to do it within the next week, so that we understand the financial climate and ecosystem that we're in as the policymakers. So it may be a little different, counselor Ryan, but this is something that I think is also a part of this whole good governance. And I see that we're all struggling to get information from the administration in a way that that's meaningful to us to be able to process it. And I see everybody coming up with some sort of good governance kind of thing, particularly after we've been here for four months. And, and it's been difficult. So I don't know if you want to add that to yours or if you just want me to do it separately.

Speaker: I want to say yes just to save time. But I think what you're what you're talking about are contracts like to contractors. It's more in the private sector. Yeah. And this one that I'm bringing up is more in the philanthropic space.

Speaker: Yep yep yep.

Speaker: No, I hear you.

Speaker: I could see where.

Speaker: It's a grantee. You're talking about grantees that grantees. So yes okay. All right. But we're we're on the same. Conversation on the same train.

Speaker: You work that out.

Speaker: Yeah okay.

Speaker: So we're moving forward separately. Is that correct? Yes. Okay. Councilor avalos, are you in the queue to speak to this amendment? Okay. And councilor green and zimmerman just reconfirming you are not in the queue on this councilor green. You are. Okay. Go right ahead.

Speaker: I, I strongly support this budget note I think this is good. This is good intuition for my colleague on the arts and economy committee. We have to know

more. The questions that we get from our constituents about the different grants and loans that I know you're focusing on grants, but it's the inventory piece that's really important. That would help me answer those questions. And I'll also note that the charter chapter 15, section 105, I believe, requires that prosper Portland produce a report after their fiscal year ends within a timely fashion of their previous year activities, which they're not really doing right now. So this is in the spirit, I think, of moving us closer to a good space. So that's why I support it.

Speaker: Councilor seeing no one else in the queue on this Keelan could you please call the roll?

Speaker: I, i.

Speaker: Koyama lane morillo. I novick clark. I green. Hi zimmerman I avalos. I dunphy.

Speaker: You know colleagues, we got to watch out because prosper might simply ignore us on this budget note, as we learned in previous conversations I vote i.

Speaker: Councilor smith. Was that too much levity for you at this hour of the night?

Speaker: I hear him, i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: The amendment is approved with 12 yes votes.

Speaker: And councilors. I do think I saw a lot of nods there to hold on budget notes. So if you did, I did see a lot of nods. So as we move forward, if you are willing to prioritize your amendments, I think that would be great. Okay.

Speaker: I'm out of the queue now for the next one because that's more of a budget. Note.

Speaker: Councilor zimmerman, you said you were in the queue on something else. I had written down a list of folks who were in the queue previously to bring

forward their amendments. Were you hoping to get on that separate list, or did you have something else you wanted to speak to before we move on?

Speaker: Mine was for amendments that I tend to do in the next section.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Which is community engagement, right?

Speaker: We're still in administration and I have written down my amendments. Avalos. Canal green. Smith.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Point of information. I think that's why I'm confused because I thought we were in administration.

Speaker: We are. And councilor Ryan's amendment had been grouped in economic development, and he was making the argument that this was an administrative function. I seemed faster to move along with that than to have the debate about where it belonged.

Speaker: Okay, so we are still in the administrative.

Speaker: Administration.

Speaker: And is it that people are feeling like no to budget notes?

Speaker: Sounds like people are feeling like wait on budget notes until later tonight or the 11th. Okay. Councilors, I am moving the package, the notes of which I have somewhere up here that includes pirtle-guiney seven, eight and nine. I'll start with pirtle-guiney eight because that is where the funds come from. We have. A number of folks who support the work we do, who have asked for increased budgets in order to ensure that we can do the work of taking in public comment, holding enough meetings, doing the work. And some of those were included in the mayor's budget and some were not. Those are the other ones I'm proposing. But in order to fund that work, I've asked all of us in pirtle-guiney eight to take a slight

reduction in our own budgets. I know that asking elected officials to take a hit in their budgets is controversial. It's rare, I think, in this one case I would not bring it forward another year. But in this year where we are just getting started, we felt out our needs and we felt out the needs of those who support us. I think it is necessary to shift toward those who support us very slightly. Pirtle-guiney eight asks for each of us to take a \$200,000 reduction in our own budgets. I believe right now we have 1.5 million each in our budgets. Pirtle-guiney seven increases the council clerk's staff by two. That is a 338 and change thousand dollar increase. Pirtle-guiney nine replaces a position within council operations at a cost of 23,770. The and the package also covers the cost of what was put in the mayor's budget to increase a few positions within council operations to increase our open signal contract to and to fund security and technology services and others so that we can have additional night meetings. Having heard that our committees need to sometimes take testimony in the evening as well. The total cost, if you include those packages from the mayor, comes to 1.6 million. This would then have a bit of extra. And because 1.2 million have already been covered, it would back that cost out of covered general fund and free up some dollars. This package as a whole would reduce \$2.4 million in costs, and add \$362,000 in costs. I would look for a second second. I've never had so many councilors be so excited to support me at one time. Keelan I'm not sure if that was councilor novick or councilor koyama lane. Rock paper scissors I think novick for volume is claiming it. I councilor zimmerman are you in the queue for debate?

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Go right ahead.

Speaker: How is this covering something that's already in the mayor's proposed budget? If that mayor's proposed budget is balanced?

Speaker: You know, I put this together before we received the mayor's proposed budget and decided to move forward anyway. It would essentially free up. Think of it. We talk about fund shifts. It frees up additional general fund.

Speaker: So if I'm doing the math, though, it looks like if you halved this, that that would still take care of the new staff for the clerk's office that you noted, but it takes it from 2.4 to 1.2, because I already see it paid for in the mayor's proposed. So I'm just doing some clarifying because I was having a tough time reading and tracking with you.

Speaker: You could scale this and still cover what is not yet covered, if that's what you're asking.

Speaker: Thank you for the.

Speaker: Clarification.

Speaker: Councilor green.

Speaker: I, I am open to this. If it's going to free up on net resources for some priorities, I've got some priorities, like some things for Portland street response that we do not have a funding source for. So I'm going to try to find the funding source for that during the balance of this evening. And so I'm leaning I'm leaning, yes.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor clark.

Speaker: Thank you, madam chair. Thank you for bringing this forward, particularly number eight pirtle-guiney eight. I think it sends a very good message to the public. I've actually gotten constituent emails about our budgets. Why aren't we cutting our budgets? So I really I think this is sends a good message. I appreciate the optics and I am happy to support it. And being one of the more frugal members of the council.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor smith, are you in the queue in opposition?

Speaker: Yes, ma'am.

Speaker: Okay then. Great. You are up.

Speaker: I just hate doing math in public.

Speaker: Here we are in a budget committee meeting.

Speaker: I know, i.

Speaker: Know.

Speaker: But I'm not the cfo, so that's good. Is jonas here or ruth? So, ruth, I just want to make sure that I'm correct. Our budgets are 1.6 million. Correct.

Speaker: Think about 1.5 million.

Speaker: Okay, that's even better yet, 1.5 million. What is 8% restraint on 1.5 million?

Speaker: 120 20?

Speaker: 120,000.

Speaker: It's about 120.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: So for me. We have several agencies. By the way, let me just say this. First, we have the lowest budget of anybody in the city of Portland, period, 1.5 I don't know any other bureau who has a budget that we have in the responsibility that we have. I am not willing to take more than what other people have taken. I don't think that that is right. I don't think it's correct for us to take \$200,000, because right now I don't even have \$200,000 in my budget. It is not my fault that others on this diocese did not get an office. I did, and I hired folks to do the job of communicating with my constituents in east Portland. And I do recognize that all of you were so gracious when we did this budget. And you said, give the money to district one because they really needed office. Give it give. And I was so I mean, I was really touched by that. But I think going forward, you all have not spent an

entire year. So it is not fair to look at this budget right now to take \$200,000 off and to take more than any other bureau in the city, when some bureaus didn't take anything. So I think that's wrong. I think that. While I appreciate your leadership, madam president, I think that my commitment still remains steadfast to my constituency and empowering my constituents and ensuring their vote, their voices are heard. It is important that I have a budget. True leadership is reflected in meaningful engagement and tangible improvements that enhance residents lives. I have made a significant progress in district one, hosting town hall meetings to address community concerns, organizing events that foster connection and civic engagement, attending neighborhood association meetings to strengthen relationships with local leaders, and prioritizing critical infrastructure projects, including new sidewalks and street light replacements to improve walkability and safety. These initiatives go beyond policy discussions. They are about meeting people where they are, amplifying their voices and taking decisive action to address their needs. This is more than infrastructure. It's an affirmation of the trust placed in leadership and re-affirmation of the dedication to east Portland. Historically, district one has experienced a low voter turnout and has long sought greater attention and support from city hall in Portland's new governance structure. We have exemplified the commitment by remaining present in the district, ensuring residents have genuine reasons to engage civically and participate in shaping their community. Community centered leadership requires an unwavering focus on residents needs. I am dedicated to upholding that standard. East Portland deserves a government that invests in people, not just buildings, and I will continue working tirelessly to ensure the voices of my constituents that they remain strong, clear and heard. I have a thriving district office. I have people working, going to neighborhood association meetings every week, and I think this should be voluntary. If folks feel

like they want to give back their budgets, let them do that. But at this point, I don't have \$200,000 to give back.

Speaker: Madam chair, may I ask a question?

Speaker: I believe, councilor? I'm trying to figure out where we are in the order because there's a lot of hands doing different things. I believe we are in councilor avalos though. But I will get back to you for your question. Councilor avalos.

Speaker: Yeah. What I'm trying to figure out in this package, what I would like is if we're going to cut our council office budgets, I want to make sure that those dollars are going to increasing capacity in council ops. So I'm seeing some of that. But I think what's hard is as I'm looking at all three, I guess I'm not clear. Are you like is your your the one about I guess eight is just simply doing the reduction and then nine adds in three new staff right to council ops.

Speaker: Some of the council ops additions were covered in the mayor's budget. Some were submitted in time for that and some were not. So the costs of seven and nine are actually \$362,000, 600, \$362,660. If you include the costs that were covered in the mayor's budget, the total cost for council operations, clerk, council ops, open signal and increases in security and overtime would get us to 1.6 million. So if we want to do a direct relationship, that would be a reduction in our council budgets of \$133,451 each. To balance that, if you're just looking at what wasn't covered in the mayor's budget, it's a much smaller amount. Is that.

Speaker: I'm trying to put it all together in my head. Let me let me let this marinate and i'll come back.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Point of order. Yes.

Speaker: It would have been wonderful to have a conversation before this. So do we have to can you actually is it legal for you to put that in about our budgets?

Because we already have passed a. An amendment ordinance that gave us a specific budget. So is this the appropriate place to change our budgets, or do we have to come back and do an ordinance to change our budgets?

Speaker: Our attorney has not flagged this for me as an amendment that would require an ordinance, but I will look to mr. Taylor to make sure that we didn't overlook anything.

Speaker: Please advise.

Speaker: To. Previous action by council.

Speaker: Amended the current.

Speaker: Fiscal year budget. Correct. Action you're taking today.

Speaker: Is regarding.

Speaker: The next fiscal year's budget. So you would be taking.

Speaker: An action to.

Speaker: Cut the budget in the coming fiscal year.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: So I believe we are in councilor canal councilor. Absolutely. Councilor kanal.

Speaker: I have a question.

Speaker: I'm not sure if we're on for or against right now, so I'm just going to.

Speaker: I'm also not sure I'm going to ask a question. So I just want to make sure I heard you correctly, that the new costs not covered in the mayor's proposed is are 361 663.

Speaker: The total cost of seven and nine combined is 362,660. Unless my math very late last night was wrong.

Speaker: Okay, in that case, I'm my concern and I'm probably going to offer an amendment to the amendment here is that there's another amendment that also

proposes to cut our council budgets coming up. And I think that that goes to fund public safety and specifically emergency management. I'm generally more supportive of that than putting extra money into the unspecified pool, which is what the 200,000 would do at present. And so retaining the right to look at that, although I'm not I have questions about that one when it comes up as well. That's novick three for the record. So I'm, I think we would need to take \$30,222 each out of our budget to cover these two new asks, and I think that might be something that I'm I'm interested in, but I don't know what would, because right now, if we were to take out the 2.4 million, the remaining money is unassigned, and I'd prefer to look at it. Another option that has public safety. Do you have a response to that, or is my math right? Before I say anything else.

Speaker: I wasn't writing it down specifically, but it seems about right. You know, i, I we are a body. We decide together. So then my hope had been that if this was amended down, it would be amended down, frankly, to the level that covered all of the needs of the folks who support us.

Speaker: But yes.

Speaker: That I think we've.

Speaker: Yeah. And that appears to be 30,222 each. So if I'm going to not make the amendment right now, but I do want it to float that around here, especially for those who are interested in the novick three amendment. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you councilor.

Speaker: Solis are back.

Speaker: In the queue.

Speaker: Okay. I'm looking for folks who have not yet spoken to this, I believe. Councilor morillo, have you spoken to this? Not keeping?

Speaker: No. I think I was a little bit confused. So number seven, the funding goes to the city auditor's office. Number eight. I guess maybe number nine is the one I'm the most confused by. What is the purpose of changing? A council ops admin and making them an analyst? What does that accomplish for us?

Speaker: As we have had conversations about the various needs in council operations, it became clear that what was most needed, what our council operations manager felt was most needed, was a different type of position. Somebody who could work with the other different entities that support our work. So somebody in council operations who could be working on behalf of council to coordinate things amongst the clerk and open signal and security and bts and really doing that coordinating work amongst bureaus as it relates to the needs of council. And that is more of that higher level position than an admin position. When you look at the descriptions within h.r. Of the positions and the work that they do.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you for that clarification.

Speaker: Councilor novick.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. So as councilor kanal referred, referred to, I have a proposal to decrease council budgets by \$3.3 million and allocate the vast majority of that money to the Portland bureau of emergency management. And however, not knowing whether I'd be worried about voting no on this proposal and then getting a no vote on my proposal and winding up with nothing. So my inclination is to support this proposal and then ask for more money later and fight for pbem to get get get the money period. But so I just want to take this opportunity to say we voted to give ourselves a bunch of money at a point. And the rationale I heard at the time was, we can't get by. And with more than one step, with only one staff person. And I agreed with that. But I thought we shouldn't still make it our first move to increase our own budgets out of the gate. I thought that it

was reasonable for us to have three staff people, because that's what I saw when I looked at denver, Seattle, san francisco. I knew I was a no vote, so I didn't look at the details of how much money we were getting. I was actually shocked when I learned how much it was several weeks later. I mean, in our office we have right now have two people, but we're we figure that if we had three people all paid reasonably, plus me staff cost would be \$750,000. Then the city charges us in kind of rent and materials about \$230,000. So that's a total of a million, give or take. That leaves \$500,000 left over. After having three staff people at peace. I realize people want to have district offices, but I would think that you could rent a decent office space for \$150,000 for three three councilors. The idea of having \$500,000 for materials and services when we are laying people off, when we are cutting parks, maintenance, when we are talking about reducing the police budget to pay for parks maintenance, which I support, and when we have a Portland bureau of emergency management and earthquake country that's lacking the resources to perform critical functions, I think it's just unacceptable. So I think that it would be a black mark in this body if we did not reduce our office budgets. And so that's why I'm going to be pleased to support this proposal.

Speaker: Councilor koyama lane.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. Councilor novick said a lot of what I was going to say, even some of those exact numbers, as I was building my estimated office budget for next year. Similarly, I see that I can have 3.5 staff and still have a lot of extra money, about 500,000. I appreciate you bringing this forward, madam president. I think it's responsible. I like how it connects to also some like it provides some solutions for things that we all know we need. We need more of we need some more meetings. We need to make sure that our clerks have what they need. And this makes it makes a lot of sense to me, the fact that there are many offices,

including my own, that has, that have hundreds of thousands of extra dollars, that we're able to kind of choose where we're putting that to different, different projects. That's been great to be able to have that option, but I think that is a sign that we have more than we need right now. As we're talking about how this is a dire time, I think our council offices need to treat it that way. So I plan to support this. And I'm just wondering, madam president, if you can really clearly explain the three fte and number nine, maybe I'm being a little yeah dense here but so it's and the three positions and are they supporting the full council. What will that look like exactly. Is it more supporting the council president's office which I do actually I'm not opposed to. You are oftentimes working a lot later than many other councilors.

Speaker: So pirtle-guiney nine is actually just the up classification of one of those positions. We did add three positions to council operations in the mayor's budget, but this is just the up class of one of those positions. From the administrative to the analyst classification, those three positions that were added in the mayor's budget were the communications positions. Who we work with is the person currently in that position. That was a limited duration position, a one time position. That's somebody who serves all of council. And it was making that a permanent position. It is another another analyst policy analyst to do to support the other policy analysts who support our committee work. I am trying to remember what the classification of that third position was that was in there, but that may be the administrative position that we're up classing. I can try to pull the package. I apologize, I didn't think I was.

Speaker: Going, it's fine. So it's one policy for the whole council, for committees, one comms person. And then that third one is also.

Speaker: I believe that third one is this position that we're up classing, which is the position that will probably work predominantly with the council president's office.

But on behalf of council, that's the person who will coordinate when we're trying to figure out there's a holiday on a Monday. So we reschedule a committee meeting to an off week, things like that. Doing that coordination with all of the various support entities that serve us right now. It's a combination of my staff and the clerk and some folks in council ops playing double duty, trying to do that coordination work.

Speaker: Thank you for clarifying. I support those. I believe at this point we're back to second round in the queue for everybody. So I'm going to start back at the beginning. Councilor zimmermann.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: I'm a big believer that the relationship of a council office counselor's office budget is between them and their voters and their district. I come from that. You know, just if I take a look at myself with I've hired three people. They're doing a great job. I'm very proud of my team. You have four staffers in your office, madam president, I do. Councilor novick has a couple. So I think that that is and that is all. Okay. And I think that we all have a relationship with our with our voters in our district. I also am very just like I was at the beginning of this year, I'm very cognizant of the need for east Portland and district one. And while I think that they've been put through some situations out there that they've got to manage with respect to the office stuff, what I would offer here, folks, is I think that it is responsible to give this a pause for so we can be in a full year cycle to better evaluate how this can happen. Saying that, I would like to offer an amendment to madam president's \$200,000 reduction to each office and change that to a \$120,000 reduction to each office, which I think is more closely aligned with the amount that you've laid out, madam president, and your other ones still pays for it, but does not create a new surplus of general fund. And I would ask for a second to that second. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilors. There is a an amendment on the floor to reduce pirtle-guiney eight to a reduction package of \$120,000 reduced per office, instead of \$200,000 reduced per office, and a second on that. I know we still have folks in the queue for discussion on the underlying, but.

Speaker: I just to that amendment, i, I wanted to note that I appreciate that part of your job is as council president is to do some of the administrative technical right, that 23,000 or so I consider that technical, not a baby of elana pirtle-guiney. Right. I know you've got that duty, and I appreciate that the work with council to rightsize the support staff that makes this council possible, and it's going through flux. And so I just also want to say if we can pass it this way, i'll be supportive of the next few amendments that staff us up at the clerk and council ops.

Speaker: Thank you councilor, I'm going to run through the queue here to see if there's any discussion on this amendment. Councilor green, are you to this amendment, councilor clark?

Speaker: Thank you, madam chair. I just support the amendment.

Speaker: Councilor koyama lane.

Speaker: I don't support the amendment because if I were to make an amendment, I would want to go higher and cut more from our offices.

Speaker: Councilor smith.

Speaker: There are a couple of things here. You can bring it down to 123,000. I, I do have five staff. And in the office that we spend somewhere about 50 to \$75,000 a year. And that is not a lot of money. In fact, we probably need some more money because we don't even have security where we're at. And I find it very troubling that people who have been told that they were going to do certain things when they came here, they didn't have to be over bureaus, but we ended up getting eight committees. Which four of those committees we have to do a lot of work for. And I

don't know about you, but I try to be very thorough in what I do. And just because one councilor is okay with 1 or 2 people, I am not. Because I try to be thorough. I am not okay with not having anybody out in the field, talking to folks and being in the community, letting them know that we are there for them. So where you all who haven't done what you said you were going to do, you all said you were going to go get offices and you didn't. So now you want to chastise me for going and doing what we said we were going to do, and you all didn't do it and say, I need to cut 200,000. I don't have it, madam chair. I don't even have the 133. Eric. And so, excuse me, councilor zimmermann. He's a good friend of mine. But I'm just trying to say to you, let us be the good stewards of our own money. If we feel like we have extra money to give back to you, we will. That money will go back. But I don't have any of those sums that you all say. And yes, I did. I hired five people and no, I did not hire them at the top of the range like some of you did my staff. I don't have a bunch of folks making 100 and some thousand dollars in my office. They do the work because this is what they like to do, and they are committed to the vision that I have set out for this district from commissioner smith's office. So I really find it very troubling that you all have decided to renege on what you you were going to do and you failed to connect with your constituents because most of my family lives in district two, and they're not hardly coming down here to see none of y'all. But if you had a district office like you said you was going to do, they would go, they're not coming across the river. So you are giving them a disservice by not doing what you said you were going to do and making us give an expanded council operations. That's only going to support the president's office. So no, I don't like it.

Speaker: Councilor canal to the amendment.

Speaker: Love following councilor smith, because I can say ditto to 99% of that. I do want to council district office in district two, by the way, and I'm hoping that we

get there. But that's the 1%. But the 99%, I agree. And specifically people I think misunderstand what council staff are there to do. Council councilors, staff are there to do. If you want a response to your emails, you want us to be staffed. If you want us to schedule a meeting with the people reaching out, you want us to be staffed. There's no scenario where one person can check all these emails, and the 311 calls that are coming in alone, there's just no scenario. There's no scenario we can do all this policy work alone. This is not about the 12 of us up here. It's about the 600. And however many thousand people are out there. And if we're failing at that, then there's a ways to address that. If we're not doing enough. And, you know, certainly this week, I'm sure there's a lot of people feeling we could do a little bit more on being responsive to emails, the thousands of them about the prosper amendment and all the other things. Right. So I get that. Having said that, there are specific reasons that I think it makes sense. I my question is, I'm still not sure whether so 120,000 each would be \$1.44 million. I'm still not sure where the other one point, a little over a million would go, because there's 362,000 for the two new things here. If it was going to something that would pay for something that's already funded in the mayor's budget, then it's freeing up that money. So I'm not sure where that would go. Could you speak to that a little bit more, please?

Speaker: It was a compromise. Councilor that was all.

Speaker: Councilor we have actually already done some things today that freed up some money without it going anywhere. And I suspect as we move through our discussions, we all may appreciate that.

Speaker: Absolutely.

Speaker: And I am not opposed to it in principle. My reason for concern is the novick three amendment, because I really want to fund pbem, and I'd love to find another way besides that particular funding mechanism, but we haven't found it

yet, so that's my concern specifically about it. I'd be interested in this if it got it down to the 30 whatever thousand I said earlier, and I think I'd be willing to vote for it in that scenario. Thank you, madam president.

Speaker: Councilor avalos, to the amendment to the amendment.

Speaker: Yeah. Well, yeah. So the amendment to the amendment is you're bringing it from 200 to 120, right? Okay. I guess what I want to ask more. So to you, councilor president, is I'm trying to keep track of like there are some increases that are already being proposed with the mayor's budget. Right to. I'm sorry to council clerks and council ops. Right.

Speaker: Correct.

Speaker: And then in addition, with your amendment or with your cut, you want to fund more positions. This is where I keep getting stuck. And I can't figure out what you're saying. I'm sorry.

Speaker: This was built to cover the cost. Before I knew if things would be in the mayor's budget. Of all of the increases to council.

Speaker: I see. So right now it's just going.

Speaker: To go back and then a little bit. And if we do this, what the functional effect of passing these three amendments, if we reduced to the 120,000 reduction as proposed, would be, and I don't have the numbers on that in front of me, but essentially it would be that we would cover the cost of pirtle-guiney amendment seven and nine and we would free up. Probably about \$1 million. Again, I have not redone the math at this level. I did the math at the proposed level, and at \$133,000 cut each, but probably about \$1 million. That would then be available. We would be out of balance to the positive.

Speaker: Okay. And so then you said it would cover 7 to 9. So seven is adding two positions and nine is adding one position or reclassifying position correct. Which

means it is paid more correct. Okay. So I guess how I'm feeling about this, first of all, as it relates to the larger discussion on whether we should cut the council budgets, I mean, I honestly feel conflicted about it. Yes, I do think that we could withstand 200,000. And so I'm not necessarily against that. I think more so i, I would want to reduce my council budget if I felt like I was putting that towards increasing our capacity to do our work, which to me is more clerk, more council ops. Those analysts that councilor morillo brought up would be a good example of that because I don't I am not in support of cutting the council budgets to fill in all the other holes. I think there's other sources that we can address for that. But because this is like ops to ops, essentially, I feel that I'd prefer that it go to that. So I don't know what to do with that. I feel like I'm trying to decide, like if I need to make propose another amendment that would direct those dollars specifically, since some of this is just going straight back to the fund, is what I'm hearing. Like it's going to cover those things, and then there's more money left over in the decrease that you don't have assigned. Right. So did I get that wrong? God damn it. Okay. I can't figure.

Speaker: It out. It's not it is not assigned. It does essentially do what you say. There are increases. If we pass pirtle-guiney seven and nine, plus the increases to support our capacity that we're in the mayor's budget, which are already included in what's before us. That's an increase of about \$1.6 million in order to support our work.

Speaker: Let me ask it this way. Actually, do you believe that with the increases that are proposed via the mayor's budget and this, that like, what is the outcome we are getting? Because the outcome I want is more meetings, more council meetings, more committee meetings, more staffing for other things, more analysts to help us, you know, do budget stuff, more policy analysts. That's my outcome that

I'm trying to accomplish. So I'm trying to figure out if this is accomplishing that.
Does that make sense?

Speaker: That went into the mayor's proposed and that are in pirtle-guiney seven and nine would give us two additional clerk, an additional policy analyst and council operations continue the capacity for a council wide communication staff person. Give us a staff person who legitimately this one would help my office now and whoever is council president next more than council as a whole because it's somebody to help coordinate when we're doing other things, making sure we have all of the supports that we need in place, it would add the funding to maintain our open signal contract, which we are way over budget on right now, and it would address some additional evening meetings. My thought when I put that in was that some folks had asked about capacity to have occasional evening testimony for committees, but we will, of course, as a group, figure out what that looks like as we move through the process of figuring out what our committee makeups are and what our council meeting schedule is moving forward.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Madam president, I call the question.

Speaker: I believe that you need to have the floor to do that. But if you believe that debate is out of order, you could call a point of order and say that we need to close debate. And therefore you call the question, or you could get in the queue. I'm councilor. Morillo is next in line. Perhaps she'll call the question on your behalf.

Speaker: I will, yeah, you guys, it is 8 p.m. I got a lot more amendments. Raise your hand if you haven't given your amendments for this section. Okay, so let's move on. I'm calling the question on zimmerman's amendment to the amendment. Is that where we're at?

Speaker: Yes we are. And in order to call the question, I believe we need to take a vote to call the question.

Speaker: Oh, jeez.

Speaker: Is that correct? Okay. Unanimous consent.

Speaker: Can second.

Speaker: Yes, sir.

Speaker: If we.

Speaker: Do.

Speaker: Unanimous consent, you could.

Speaker: Is there unanimous consent to call the question?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Councilor kanal. I'm looking at you.

Speaker: Do?

Speaker: Anybody else waiting to speak right now?

Speaker: People who are in the queue nodded yes to unanimous consent.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Let's do it.

Speaker: Okay, so we are voting now on the amendment to the amendment to reduce pirtle-guiney eight to a reduction of \$120,000 for each council office. Keelan, can you please call the roll?

Speaker: I think it should be lower than this, but I'm still going to vote. Yes.

Speaker: Ryan?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Koyama lane I think 1.5 million is too much for each council office. No, maria.

Speaker: I know.

Speaker: We're voting.

Speaker: On the amendment to the amendment.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: I novick.

Speaker: This still leaves us with, what, 1.38 million for our council office budgets? I don't see it. Nay.

Speaker: Clerk a.

Speaker: Green because we need the resources to pass any kind of these amendments that are remaining, I vote yes.

Speaker: Zimmerman.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Council president, will this amendment not accomplish everything we just talked about? If it so, then no.

Speaker: Dunphy.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Smith.

Speaker: So this kind of goes back to what I'm saying. So basically what you all are saying with this, with this vote is that east Portland doesn't matter, that our constituents doesn't matter, even though we are the less likely to go out and vote and to participate. And when we're trying to meet people where they're at, you're reducing a budget for district one that is going to have some unintended consequences. You all don't want to be held responsible for your lack of commitment to your constituents and being in your neighborhoods, and that's not my problem. That's not what we said we wanted to do, the charter said. We wanted to have district offices. You all voted for it, and now you're trying to balance the budget on the backs of council operations. No no no no no no no, that's not going

to happen. Because what we know is we're spending over 100 and some odd million dollars for homelessness. And until we get this homelessness budget together and pay for the 8.9 million, the \$9.5 million for the permitting, folks, and we're, we're we're cutting people off. You're trying to pay for some incidentals and council operations that the mayor already has. And so for me, this is so weak, this is a very weak proposal to take money from our folks. To balance the budget. That's his job. That's not my job. You're not going to get anywhere near you where you want to be with taking \$100,000 from us. What's going to happen is now I'm going to have to put some people on the unemployment line because of what you all are doing. And it goes back to what I said in the beginning. Whenever people who are underserved, who are not served, who are people of color, when you see something, I think I'm the only one. I don't know if district three has. And you can roll your eyes if you want to, but this is real. This is really real. We try to take it back from them. And so if you can feel good about yourselves, council president, you got all the infrastructure around you. You may not be the president long, but you got all kind of infrastructure that you're building around yourself and you're taking it away from us. And it's not funny. It really is not funny.

Speaker: I apologize, councilor, I was laughing because I've joked many a time that after this budget process, I probably I may not have the support here. So I believe we need your vote, councilor.

Speaker: No,

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: I can I change my vote to yes. Can I change my vote to yes.

Speaker: Yes, yes.

Speaker: Thanks.

Speaker: Okay.

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

Speaker: Okay. Pirtle-guiney eight has been amended. It has been reduced to a reduction package of \$120,000 per council office. Counselors. Is anybody in the queue to debate these? Amendments, or are we ready to vote on them? Counselor? Where's the start of the line? Counselor zimmerman, are you in the queue? Counselor? Green. Councilor clark councilor kanal.

Speaker: So the only thing I'll say is if this motion and someone's unmuted if this motion were to pass, I am going to try to look at getting that this extra \$1 million devoted to pbem specifically. And I just want to flag that in advance.

Speaker: Councilor koyama lane.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: I'll be fast. I want to clarify, counselor smith, I agree with you and I hear you. And if we had more time, I actually would like to spend some time on talking about an amendment where other districts take cuts, but district one doesn't. And I think we should have done that in the beginning. I think. That if there's appetite for it, I'm ready to go. But I think that will take more conversation.

Speaker: Because you don't care about underserved folks. That's why you don't have the conversation. It's a quick conversation.

Speaker: You're impugning your colleague's motives right now. I believe that's against our rules. I'm sorry.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president.

Speaker: Councilor koyama lane. Counselor smith, you're in the queue.

Speaker: I'm willing to have that conversation if you're if you're serious about it.

Speaker: Counselor smith, are you proposing an amendment or should we move to counselor Ryan?

Speaker: Vice president. She brought it up.

Speaker: So we're in the middle, are we? Do we finish our vote?

Speaker: We voted on the amendment we are in on. We are back to discussion of pirtle-guiney seven, eight and nine moving toward a vote on pirtle-guiney seven, eight and nine.

Speaker: I'd like to be recognized.

Speaker: Oh.

Speaker: I'm sorry, zimmerman. I called your name previously and you said you were not in the queue for this. Are you in the queue for this? Councilor I believe we are on counselor smith, but when she is done, I can back up. If I skipped you. And then I do still have counselors. Ryan and morillo in the queue.

Speaker: Madam president, I can defer to council, miss zimmerman.

Speaker: Counselor zimmerman, did I inadvertently skip you?

Speaker: I think it's time to vote on the overall amended package that's been proposed.

Speaker: I agree.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Would encourage us to call that question.

Speaker: Are you calling the question, or should I move on to counselor Ryan?

Speaker: I'm going to I'm going to call the question.

Speaker: Counselor morillo. Are you good? Okay. I don't know if counselor Ryan and morillo are good. We don't need to call the question. They are the only ones left in the queue. How about that? Okay, Keelan taking these in numerical order, could you please call the roll on pirtle-guiney seven? This is the council clerk staff addition. To ensure that our clerk's office has the staff they need to properly support our work.

Speaker: Canal on pirtle-guiney seven, i.

Speaker: Ryan I koyama lane.

Speaker: This just seven i.

Speaker: Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick i.

Speaker: Hi.

Speaker: Hi,

Speaker: Zimmerman.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Avalos i.

Speaker: Dunphy i.

Speaker: Smith no.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

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

Speaker: Thank you. Could you please call the roll on pirtle-guiney eight canal.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Koyama lane.

Speaker: I'm hoping to talk more about this on June 11th. I vote no for now.

Speaker: Morillo.

Speaker: Agreed. I'm hoping to talk about this more on June 11th.

Speaker: No novick.

Speaker: I just have to note that councilor smith has said that she's hired five people who aren't paid very much. We've got three people in my office who are paid pretty decently, and the cost of them plus me is 750,000. So let's say councilor

smith is spending a million on staff, and she said she's spending 50 to 75,000 on an office.

Speaker: No, I didn't I didn't give you a number. I said.

Speaker: I wasn't.

Speaker: I heard \$100,000. Don't tell stories on me.

Speaker: How much is it?

Speaker: I didn't say, I said, I don't have folks making 100,000 plus at the top. That's what I said. Stop it. Just stop it.

Speaker: I'm saying.

Speaker: I have your own business.

Speaker: We are in the middle of a vote right now.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: We are in the middle of a vote. Let's not make assumptions about what our colleagues have said or are saying.

Speaker: All right.

Speaker: What I will say is I have not heard anybody explain how they spend \$1.5 million. No, clark.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: What's the question, counselor?

Speaker: We are voting on the amended pirtle-guiney eight, which is a reduction of \$120,000 per office.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: I heard some great ideas about thinking about something on June 11th that's going to take more time than we have tonight. You've raised some very, I think, legitimate concerns, councilor smith, about the it's not equitable necessarily, that district one and district four have the same budget. And I'm willing to have that

kind of conversation. I know that these two are going to be a little frustrated with me for saying that, but I vote i.

Speaker: Zimmerman.

Speaker: I avalos.

Speaker: I dunphy.

Speaker: I appreciate that we amended this down to the 8% that everybody in the city is taking. I vote i.

Speaker: Smith no.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

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

Speaker: Keelan. Could you please call the roll on pirtle-guiney nine?

Speaker: I'm still a little confused about this one too, but I think from what I understand it makes sense. So I'm going to be voting I on it.

Speaker: Ryan spent a lot of time on \$23,770 i.

Speaker: Koyama lane i. Maria i.

Speaker: Novick i.

Speaker: I green. I zimmerman a. Avalos I dunphy I smith. No pirtle-guiney. I amendment is approved with 11 yes votes and one no vote.

Speaker: You councilors. I believe that councilor avalos was next for bringing an amendment in the administration bucket.

Speaker: Mine is a note, so I will pass.

Speaker: Okay. Councilor kanal, you are next for an amendment in the administration bucket.

Speaker: I have two questions before I do it. One is did we do pirtle-guiney ten as well?

Speaker: No, I would love to come back to that at a further time, but I asked everybody to choose one amendment or package and that was not part of this package.

Speaker: So thank you. My other question is I understand the conversation around notes. I have a kind of like councilor morillo, a package that includes both an amendment and a related note, and I am hoping for some guidance on whether or not that would be acceptable to do together.

Speaker: If it is more amendment than note, i.

Speaker: I think it is I colleagues.

Speaker: Okay. We had asked each other to hold to no notes. Councilor kanal has a package that is one amendment and one note.

Speaker: That's fine.

Speaker: If it's a package.

Speaker: Go ahead.

Speaker: So I'm going to move canal one and canal eight. And I want to note that canal one has two parts to it. And I think based on one of those parts, it was categorized in community engagement and equity. But because of the other part of it being administration and the attached note being about administration, I'd like to propose these together.

Speaker: As canal one and canal eight.

Speaker: Yes, madam president, okay.

Speaker: Go right ahead.

Speaker: Is that acceptable?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Thank you. All right. So canal one is, if you're looking for a short version, the robinhood amendment, it is looking at our management positions at the top.

We used to have bureau directors that reported to elected officials. Now there are two layers in between those those layers of our management. There's a city administrator and deputy city administrators. We also had deputy directors alongside it. Some of these deputy director positions are in bureaus that have 15 to 25 people total in them. So much in the same way that mayor wilson proposed the reduction over time of the different lines of businesses with a 20% goal, and assuming to get about half of that over the course of this year. We asked about the non public safety general fund bureau deputy directors, and we were told that from the budget office, it's about \$2.1 million of expenses on that. And we asked the this motion would propose doing a reduction or reclass of those positions over the course of the year. And the estimates we got was between 5 and 600,000, depending on how rapidly that would go. So the motion in canal one is to do that process to either reclass down to managers or reduce the deputy director positions in general fund bureaus that are not public safety. This would not do anything to the public safety bureaus. I want to be very clear about that, and to transfer that money to the office of equity and human rights to restore the positions that are being cut there, the positions that are being cut. There are a portion of the ada compliance in the office of equity, a portion of the lgbtqia to plus program, and the entirety of the racial equity plan staffing, which is one person. And it would make the two that are temporary ongoing as well as restore the related administrative assistant. So that's a move of \$600,000 out of these management positions and into the for frontline workers at the office of equity canal eight asks for the city bureau of human resources. This is the note part to review the overall classification series of deputy directors, to see if it's still something that we need, as well as look at bureau director pay, which was not adjusted in any way, or, as far as I can tell, even evaluated during the course of the transition. If the answer comes back that they're

being paid the right amount or even that that pay needs to go up for bureau directors, I'm open to it. I'm just we're just asking what the what the positions are and if they're commensurate to the size of the bureau. So that's the note component of it. And the two go together because they're both related to making our org chart look more like a pyramid and less like a pillar. Thank you, madam president. Oh, and I'd ask for a second.

Speaker: Thank you. Counselor. Is there a second?

Speaker: Second?

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: We have a motion and a second for. All eight and canal one councilor. Ryan, are you in the queue for discussion?

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Counselors. Is there any discussion?

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Counselor. Avalos. I'm sorry. My thing here. Oh, I apologize, colleagues. I was on the wrong page of hands. Counselor zimmerman is not here. Counselor green, were you in the queue for discussion? Counselor clark, are you in the queue for discussion? Counselor avalos, go right ahead.

Speaker: So I'm understanding that 1 in 8. I guess what I'm hearing is that eight is to ask the city administrator to study the whole deputy director, infrastructure and all that. Right. But one is to do it anyway. Help me understand the difference.

Speaker: So one is to do it for a very specific subset of bureaus, the bureaus that are funded out of the general fund. So separate from like water or sewer or things like that, and also the bureaus that are not public safety. Okay. So it starts the process there. Often these bureaus are among the smaller ones, 15 to 25 total fte in some of them. And the ones that have more and have a need for it, there's the

opportunity in the scoring for the mayor to reclassify them as manager. Series. I'll note that a manager two is paid the same range as a deputy director one. A manager three is the same range as a deputy director. Two so it doesn't even necessarily come with a pay cut. And there's some built in flexibility there for the mayor to do those reductions. But to get away from the practice of having a deputy director by default, because we've been hearing loud and clear, I think, from our city employees that they're seeing the cuts happen at the front line, and they're not seeing it happen at the management level. And so this is a I looked at the different manager positions. I looked at the city org charts that our staff provided. Thank you for that. And started to look and see, you know, bureaus need a director that in order to be a bureau you need a director. But where else can we look? And the upper management needs to also bear the burden that we're all, you know, looking to bear in here.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you for clarifying. I think i, I support eight because it is to, you know, asking that we explore it and see where the efficiencies and all that. I can't support one because I need eight first. So that's kind of how I'm seeing it. I get your logic. I also, you know, not sure. I generally understand what you're saying around like we don't need deputy directors, but I just don't know enough about how that structure works. I want to give the mayor and the ceo a chance to really unpack that, which is why I support eight. But and, you know, I have never been a bureau director, but I have been an executive director. And I know my deputy director was super important to the infrastructure of how we ran our organization. And I see a lot of parallels there. So that's why I have questions, and I'm uncomfortable making this decision. Now, before I get clearer answers from with the help of the administration, who is already doing all these efficiencies. So that's kind of where I'm landing.

Speaker: Thank you, counselor.

Speaker: For that feedback.

Speaker: Counselor. Novick.

Speaker: Yes, I just wanted to say that I instinctively support this proposal, but somebody made the point to me yesterday that, well, maybe there's a bunch of deputies where their title is deputy director, but they have a bunch of substantive responsibilities and they don't just deputy direct all of the time. So since there's a limited number of bureaus, I'd actually like to spend some time in the next couple of weeks going through and looking at the actual jobs and maybe making a decision on June 11th, unless you've already done that, counselor.

Speaker: I have.

Speaker: Looked at the list and I can give you my opinion. I'd prefer not to do that because it might sound like a criticism of someone's individual performance, and I don't want to imply that. But I will say that if somebody has a substantive management role, that the this builds in the ability to reclass them to a manager three which is again the same equivalent as a deputy director.

Speaker: Two thank you.

Speaker: Madam president.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Counselor clark, are you hoping to speak to this now?

Speaker: Yes, I am actually I want to agree with counselor avalos. I think that number one is really putting the cart before the horse. So I absolutely agree. And it's beginning to feel like I may have some of the same sentiments that you have, but I feel like we're beginning to micromanage, and I want to leave this up to the administration. So i'll be voting against one and for eight.

Speaker: Councilors. I don't see anybody else in the queue. Councilor kanal are you in the queue? Okay.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: So I want to note that on the I think it's a very valid question that both the colleagues have raised about whether or not this is micromanaging. I would argue that dictating which positions would be eliminated would be more more micromanaging and saying, here's a universe of options. We're asking you to reduce it the same way that we are considering approving for those seven different lines of business, right? Engagement, communications, equity. It's look within it. You have to please reduce by 20%. This is the same concept. And it even also assumes the same because of the reclassification option, which doesn't save as much money. It assumes less of the full 2.1 million, because some of those folks will remain employed. They may just be reclassified to the same pay scale. So that's the that side of it. And for the other point, I'd say, I think it's fair to say that this, that it might be better to wait for having all the potential information, but I would offer that we have heard a great deal of information from the public already as to their views on management and frontline workers, and not approving this would mean that we're okay letting racial equity plan plan the staff for the racial equity plans at the office of equity disappear entirely, that we would be okay with the lgbtqia, plus folks being cut in half, and that we'd be okay with the ada program losing staff. And i'll just remind everyone who the president of the united states is and say, do we really want to do that right now?

Speaker: Counselors? Thank you. Seeing no one else in the queue, I believe, to speak to this, pausing to make sure no one jumps up and down. Who's there on other things? Keelan can you please call the role again in numerical order canal one first and then canal eight.

Speaker: Canal councilor smith isn't here, so i'll do my best to say to channel that and say, if we're going to say that we care about equity, we need to work to ensure that our equity employees are funded, including. This is the only amendment put forward that relates to racial equity in the whole process. Over 120 amendments, I vote i. I.

Speaker: I'm experiencing amendments that are more detailed than I experienced in the commission form of government. I vote no.

Speaker: Koyama lane I morillo.

Speaker: No novick.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Clerk.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Green.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Zimmerman. Avalos.

Speaker: One.

Speaker: White one. No.

Speaker: Dunphy i.

Speaker: Can't get there. Sorry. No.

Speaker: Smith. Pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: The amendment fails with three votes and seven no votes.

Speaker: Could you please call the roll on canal eight?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Koyama lane.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Morillo.

Speaker: Yes. And I just wanted to add that I hope that we have more time to discuss some of this before June 11th. Just to wrap our heads around the discussion.

Speaker: Novick.

Speaker: Ditto. Yes.

Speaker: Clark.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Green.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Zimmerman.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Avalos i.

Speaker: Dunphy i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

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

Speaker: Thank you counselors, we're at 826 and I had said we would try to break for dinner, I believe around 830. I was hoping we would be through administration. Green and smith both have amendments. They wanted to move forward. So. Green is here. But we need to give folks a break for food.

Speaker: So we'll let.

Speaker: Him.

Speaker: Say what.

Speaker: Councilor green, can you tell us what your amendment is first, that you would be moving forward fast?

Speaker: Mine is just a budget neutral rollover of \$75,000 of my balance. To continue the conversation I've had with pbot, I'm trying to get some stop signs built in my district near an elementary school. We didn't get the estimates in time. I'm amending this to roll it over so I can pay for those safety improvements for those children.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Counselors, I think we can do this in five minutes or less. That's a challenge. I have a motion and a second on the table. Counselor zimmerman, are you in the queue for discussion?

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Counselor green, are you in the queue for discussion? Counselor clark, are you in the queue for discussion? Seeing no discussion. Keelan, can you please call the roll?

Speaker: I'm sorry, council president. Can you tell me which one this is?

Speaker: Green for? Which was seconded by councilor canal.

Speaker: Okay, great. Thank you.

Speaker: Canal. I Ryan. I koyama lane. I morillo.

Speaker: This is so wholesome i.

Speaker: Clark i.

Speaker: Green i.

Speaker: Zimmerman.

Speaker: So just to note, I think we need to have a discussion in the future about what eo is versus these types of amendments because this has been spattered about of course I'm going to support it, but we've got conflicting guidance across

the administration on how to do this. And that's not okay, mitch, of course I'm going to support you. So yes, thank you alice.

Speaker: I dunphy,

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Smith. I pirtle-guiney. I the amendment is approved with 12 yes votes.

Speaker: Councilor smith is your administration amendment one that we think we can do in five minutes or less.

Speaker: It's a budget note.

Speaker: Okay. We are holding on budget notes, I believe right now. So let's hold on that. Counselors, does anybody who has not had the opportunity to move an amendment in the administration category wish to do so? Dean. None. We're going to recess for a half an hour so folks can have some food, walk around, get a break. When we come back, we will take on another policy area. I will see you all at 9:00.

Speaker: 36 k, right?

Speaker: Yes. And that was one of the craziest games.

Speaker: Evening. I hope everybody had a lovely lunch break.

Speaker: That was the appropriate response. But I mean what is.

Speaker: What is a meal.

Speaker: So.

Speaker: Counselors we continue to be in our budget committee meeting for the budget committee of the City Council. We have gotten through the administration section. We did not make this announcement before we left, but counselors were all informed that we are going to start with economic development and then move to transportation. We have three things we have to do tonight. We have to figure out what we're doing with transportation and the tnc fee, so that we can pass that fee bill. We have to pass a prosper Portland budget, and we have to pass a

balanced council. Budget, which we will then be able to come back to on the 11th. So in order to do that, we really need to get through economic development and transportation policy areas.

Speaker: So where does public safety fit into this?

Speaker: If we can get through those two on time, we can then take on other policy areas, including public safety. And if we can't do that tonight, then we will do it on the 11th.

Speaker: Well, I have something that frees up \$2 million for parks.

Speaker: Parks also we will do if we can get to tonight and if not, we will do it on the 11th. I am trying to move us councilor as fast as I can. Are there?

Speaker: May I ask you a question?

Speaker: Yes I do.

Speaker: Is there an opportunity to do all the oios?

Speaker: So I was just informed that oios can happen on the 11th, but if we get through economic development and transportation, we could just very quickly run through the eo's as well. But I want to get through those two things that we know we have to do. When I see everybody shaking their head upset, I know I'm doing something. Something, I'm doing something. So councilors, what we did previously was ask everybody for their top priority or if it's a package that goes together, your top priorities and not doing budget notes. Those can wait. Councilor zimmerman, are you in the queue on economic development or were you in the queue previously? I thought I saw your hand up when we left.

Speaker: I thought the next section was community engagement according to the prefilled list.

Speaker: So that.

Speaker: Let me check the economic development one.

Speaker: That is what it was going to be. I know that councilor koyama lane wanted to throw something out early on, but.

Speaker: So within economic development. Zimmerman 12 I moved to motion to amend to provide 225,001 time general fund for the downtown marketing initiative as previously funded in the special appropriations bill.

Speaker: Councilor. Does that have a funding source attached to it?

Speaker: Nope.

Speaker: Zimmerman 12. Is there a second?

Speaker: Second?

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Is there I said that it doesn't have a funding source attached to it. When we do do the community and economic development, excuse me, the community engagement one, my amendments in that do create a surplus since the things that I had said could get paid for in the package are no longer the case. So there is a surplus.

Speaker: Thanks councilor. I'm not sure if we're going to get to community and economic development tonight, and we need to have a balanced proposal. Do you want to hold zimmerman 12, to see if we get to that part of our work tonight, and then with your community and economic, your community engagement package.

Speaker: No, I'm going to keep it as an amendment now.

Speaker: Counselor clark, are you in the queue to speak to this amendment?

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Councilor koyama lane, are you in the queue to speak to this amendment? No. Councilor kanal are you in the queue to speak to this amendment?

Speaker: No.

Speaker: I am writing down a list so you don't have to stay in there. Clark koyama lane canal. If you want to leave the queue, I have you written down to bring your own amendments. Councilor morillo are you in the queue to speak to this amendment?

Speaker: No, but it doesn't have a funding source, so let's just call the vote.

Speaker: Councilor Ryan, are you in the queue to speak to this amendment?

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Councilor smith, are you in the queue to speak to this amendment?

Speaker: No, ma'am.

Speaker: Does anybody in the queue to speak to this amendment see nobody in the queue to speak to this amendment. Keelan, could you please call the roll canal.

Speaker: Can I just.

Speaker: Can I clarify? We are voting on zimmerman 12.

Speaker: We are. Okay.

Speaker: Sorry. Yes.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Koyama lane.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Morillo.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Novick.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Clark.

Speaker: Let me just remind everybody how important the downtown is to our tax base, I vote yes.

Speaker: Green.

Speaker: Ditto. Yes.

Speaker: Zimmerman.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Dunphy.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Smith.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: Yes.

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

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Where the mic. On councilor. Clark, you were in the queue. Did you have something?

Speaker: I think it's a budget note, so I believe it can wait. Is that what you're asking for? I am, yeah, i'll defer to the 11th. It's my amendment okay.

Speaker: So we'll hold till the 11th on that councilor koyama lane.

Speaker: I will get back in the queue.

Speaker: You're going to get back in the queue. Okay. Councilor Ryan councilor koyama lane organizing some things.

Speaker: Great. Okay.

Speaker: So we're.

Speaker: Going to talk about supporting our storefronts. Repair and restore grants is the first one. This is a there's a package of three. It's a sos. Save our storefronts. I think everyone can have dialog with their main streets and their districts. They

know that they felt unseen for too long. And this package, these packages all come together to be responsive to them, basically demanding our attention. And it's been really slow, in my opinion. Here's what we're going to do. We're going to do one tonight because we have a funding source and we'll do the other two later on as we work that out before the third is at the 11th.

Speaker: The 11th. Right.

Speaker: So the first one is allocate 1 million from prosper Portland's. They're doing an internally. Siff is back resources to the restore and repair grant. It was at 1.5. I put it down to 1 million because I'm being a team player here looking at the other needs that are on the table. The program is funded in the 2425 with one time funding, and no funding is included for this program at the current moment. In prosper's 2526. Proposed budgeting. I've been here like four times in a row, the last four springs asking this to be replenished, and it always gets used. In fact, it usually runs out about halfway through the year. The local small businesses expand and repair. Restore grant program provides funding to small businesses located in the city of Portland that have sustained physical economic damage due to break ins, vandalism grants assist eligible businesses to remain open and operational and contribute to maintaining a healthy street environment. Eligible entities may receive up to 25,000 over the life of the program for eligible repairs. Prosper Portland will provide the grants on a reimbursement basis. Just a few data points. We've been collecting data from some of our main streets, and one in particular in northeast Broadway in the area over the past three years, they report from the 11 who responded, 44% have experienced break ins, 55% have had theft and burglary, and 100% have experienced vandalism. Smashed windows and graffiti over the last three years. And when and when reviewing this more, we saw that 67% chose not to repair due to cost, and they also couldn't get their insurance claims met. So

that's why we see, of course, so many boarded up windows in our city all reported increased costs and spending for security. Said 78% have been spending a lot more money on security, and this is dramatically decreasing their profit margins. Again, that's a big factor in why our storefronts aren't renewing their leases. I think this is just us being responsive to our local main streets across the city, and I hope my colleagues will agree. Thanks.

Speaker: Thank you councilor. Is that a motion or because this is a prosper Portland? Do we need to take this within the prosper budget? Councilors, we're entering a messy period where we have some economic development. Things that are are more appropriate and prosper.

Speaker: Yeah, we went out of that. Okay, great. You wanted me to do this when we started the session.

Speaker: That's okay.

Speaker: Just having a moment with you.

Speaker: We're figuring out the order of things here.

Speaker: Donnie, do you have an opinion?

Speaker: Councilor koyama lane has a point that she's nudging me on.

Speaker: So to add on, we have had conversations about prosper, and there have been some I've had some conversations with leaders at prosper. They appear ready to support an additional sift draw of about 3 million for economic development within prosper, not backing out of any general fund. And I propose that we consider these items in prosper now.

Speaker: So thank you.

Speaker: We do have prosper open. We've recessed that to enter this meeting. We have a number of economic development items. But I'm hearing that there may be some that we want to take within prosper. So.

Speaker: And this is all been discussed with people at prosper. And they, they, they approve this message.

Speaker: Per million.

Speaker: For how much? Oh, okay.

Speaker: It sounds I'm sorry. Councilor kanal did you answer councilor smith's question? Okay. I'm looking at shabri just to get a nod that there's some comfort here. Would you like to come up? Sure. Sabri is here.

Speaker: Thank you sir.

Speaker: And councilors, what I think I might do is as long as robert taylor doesn't give me an I say and I can't. I may move us into recess this meeting and move us into the prosper budget meeting for a few minutes. Let's do it. I'm getting nods that that's okay. So I'm going to recess our budget meeting of the City Council and enter us back into the budget meeting as the prosper budget committee. Fantastic. So, councilor koyama lane, do you want to speak more to what you were saying? And we have folks here from prosper. If we need nods or thumbs up or details.

Speaker: Yeah. The only other piece is conversations included that money funding the james beard market, the broken window fund. Increasing summer works, youth employment won't be able to do that full amount, but about 500,000 and also about 500,000 for the office of film and events.

Speaker: Okay, so it sounds like we might have some agreement here. Councilors. Before we were dealing with some prosper things where we didn't have agreement. It sounds like we may have some agreement here on a package that would be specific things within prosper budget not backing out general fund that folks have put on the table. We've had one of those moved from councilor Ryan. So I believe if folks are interested in moving forward in this conversation, what we have is Ryan was that Ryan one? Is that this one with Ryan one. And now I'm going to need to

look to our attorneys and ruth because Ryan one I don't know if we have to list it differently. If it's an amendment to the prosper budget, we can still call it it's Ryan one on our sheets, but this would be an amendment to the prosper budget now as opposed to the city budget.

Speaker: I believe.

Speaker: That's appropriate.

Speaker: To increase. We may have to do some additional wording here on this because it was written a little differently. But to increase or refund, I guess because it was defunded, but to refund the repair and restore grant program within prosper Portland at a level of \$1 million, funded by an additional draw on city funds, is that is that accurate, counselor? Yes. Okay. Is there a second to councilor Ryan's amendment?

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Okay. I think councilor koyama lane beat you to it. Councilor kanal is there any discussion?

Speaker: Council president.

Speaker: Just for.

Speaker: Clarification.

Speaker: The.

Speaker: Language we have is 1.5. Is it 1 or 1.5?

Speaker: It's one. One. I changed it to one.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Point of information. So what just happened? It's a 1 million is coming out of the package that you're talking about. Or is that what you said.

Speaker: We're still working on.

Speaker: I think.

Speaker: I think councilor koyama lane described a package that it sounds like she had some conversations with folks about. And councilor Ryan's amendment is a part of that package. So we need to work through these amendments one at a time, unless we'd like to vote on it all as a package. But I think we have one before us that's been made.

Speaker: Point of clarification can we go over the total of the three? What how does the three break down?

Speaker: Absolutely. Councilor koyama lane, would you like to walk us through this?

Speaker: Sure. 1 million to james beard. 1 million to broken windows fund. 1 million to. Summer works youth employment initiative and sorry, 500 to the summer youth employment initiative and 500 to the office of film and events.

Speaker: I'm sorry, some questions. Do you want to go through that one more time?

Speaker: 1 million to the james beard market. 1 million to it might have a different name. I'm just calling it broken windows fund.

Speaker: Repair and restore.

Speaker: Repair and restore 500,000 to the office of film and events. 500,000 to the summer youth employment initiative.

Speaker: Councilors, we might speed this up. I don't know if it would help. Would folks nods of heads, yes or no be interested in voting on this in one fell swoop? I'm seeing more yeses, no nos and no.

Speaker: All right.

Speaker: So we have a no from somebody who brought forward one of these proposals. So let's take them one at a time. So we have an amendment and a

second on the table. Is there discussion on the amendment. And second from councilor Ryan Ryan, one which has now been slightly changed. So we can reduce that to.

Speaker: It went from 1.5 to 1 million.

Speaker: Okay. 1.5 to 1 million.

Speaker: So a team member with everybody to get to the three okay.

Speaker: Councilor zimmerman, are you in the queue on this amendment? Go right ahead.

Speaker: With this amendment and the others. I guess I'm just curious what changed.

Speaker: Asking questions.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Good afternoon,

Speaker: Commissioners. For the record, director.

Speaker: Of equity policy and communications at prosper Portland.

Speaker: And again, your question.

Speaker: Was with.

Speaker: This particular.

Speaker: Amendment, what changed?

Speaker: We heard a lot earlier in the evening about not not touching the \$3 million amendment that was made about prosper general fund. And now I see you sitting, and it looks very supportive of a \$3 million general fund change to prosper. So I'm really curious. We understand.

Speaker: The amendment.

Speaker: It wouldn't.

Speaker: Affect the.

Speaker: General fund appropriation.

Speaker: It would be for sif.

Speaker: It would be for sif. Correct. Which your executive director has said your board will need to approve in order for that to be the case.

Speaker: Correct. So we've.

Speaker: Been working.

Speaker: With. Our board, and our.

Speaker: Board is.

Speaker: Absolutely looking forward to being collaborative with all of you.

Speaker: We look forward.

Speaker: To meetings. We could meet.

Speaker: As often.

Speaker: As.

Speaker: You would.

Speaker: Like, and.

Speaker: We're committed.

Speaker: To that and have been doing that.

Speaker: As we.

Speaker: Speak tonight. And so with conversations with our board, along with our executive director and team, yes.

Speaker: This sif.

Speaker: Movement is something that we are.

Speaker: And of the 3 million shabrie, what are. What what will not be included in the sif current plan?

Speaker: So are you saying like how.

Speaker: That when that draws down from sif, what does that mean? So it is.

Speaker: What are you giving up to be amenable to this? What are you giving up? Absolutely. Councilor tony barnes, for the record, tony barnes, cfo, prosper Portland. So there will be an opportunity cost of ongoing interest, earnings and interest from loans that could be made from that \$3 million. We anticipate that would be in the time period will be ongoing next year throughout in perpetuity. Since it's a one time cost, it's not going to be replenished. And then. The \$3 million will not be available for small business loans or other loans. Other investments that could be made, I guess I'm looking for an idea of. I usually do ten a year. Now I only do seven. That's what I'm kind of looking to hear. We have the. Capacity right now to do, I think, 19 to 21 loans in the next year, and the year after that, it will start impacting year three, four and thereafter. So it just is a drawdown of available financing, and we won't be able to do any acceleration of financing if needed if the demand is there.

Speaker: And with the average loans.

Speaker: At about \$600,000.

Speaker: I mean, that's.

Speaker: You can't, you know, match.

Speaker: That up with how many.

Speaker: Excuse me, businesses would be.

Speaker: Coming.

Speaker: To us for that.

Speaker: So that's the.

Speaker: The loss.

Speaker: However, what we've heard from.

Speaker: The counselors is about.

Speaker: Reinvesting in economic development. Through repair.

Speaker: And restore through workforce.

Speaker: Excuse me. And James Beard and.

Speaker: The summer works.

Speaker: Program in the film and event.

Speaker: So that to us.

Speaker: Feels aligned.

Speaker: With much of what advanced Portland calls out and our board.

Speaker: Is supportive of.

Speaker: Thanks for clarifying that and I so I just want to make sure I understand.

Councilor Ryan, your amendment is not only changed at 1 million, but it's now changed in the CIP language because you had general fund identified in there, but it's actually, it sounds like. Okay, thanks for the clarification.

Speaker: Councilor.

Speaker: Councilor Ryan, this is your piece. Councilor Smith, are you in the queue to speak to Councilor Ryan's amendment?

Speaker: Yes. Thank you. I heard about summerworks. I didn't that wasn't what I was interested in because I'm more interested in making sure that the co-op program that took the money from next generation for 600,000, that that money be put back to help those organizations that help with apprenticeships and do the wraparound support. So we had 600,000 taken out. And I would much rather have that 600,000 put towards next generation that was cut out of the out of the Prosper budget.

Speaker: Councilor I believe as part of the 12% reduction that Prosper that was included in the mayor's proposed budget, there was, I think, a \$200,000 reduction to.

Speaker: It was 600. Next generation was 600. It was 112.

Speaker: 112 participants.

Speaker: That's right. Yep.

Speaker: I think.

Speaker: It was 600,000.

Speaker: That's correct.

Speaker: Yes. Yes, sir.

Speaker: Sorry.

Speaker: That's okay.

Speaker: Let me double check.

Speaker: It's been.

Speaker: A long day, but we'll.

Speaker: Check the numbers right now.

Speaker: No worries.

Speaker: Councilor comments to the.

Speaker: Tell them that I didn't want okay summer works. I wanted the coab because that is the workforce development. Those 112 are more important at this time.

Speaker: Councilor I think the conversation was around workforce development and if the wrong thing got labeled.

Speaker: Workforce co-op next generation is workforce development.

Speaker: I think.

Speaker: That I think that the conversation was around workforce development, and if the wrong thing got labeled.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: So let's change it.

Speaker: We're still on the.

Speaker: And I'd like to I'd like to have it at 600,000 because that's what was taken from the budget.

Speaker: Councilor. So as part of the 12% reductions, there was a \$200,000 reduction in workforce as part of the initial.

Speaker: I sure. What was the 600,000?

Speaker: We also had reductions.

Speaker: In councilor I this seems like an important conversation to have, but right now we're debating councilor Ryan's amendment. So I'm wondering if this is something that we can have a couple of folks figure out while we continue the debate on the amendment around.

Speaker: So does that include everything that they talked about summerworks or just his james beard?

Speaker: Just. No, this is just on repair and restore grants, which is an amended. Yeah. Oh, I'm sorry you had asked to break this apart into pieces, rather to do it rather than to do it as one package.

Speaker: I am.

Speaker: Councilor that's okay. Councilor morillo did you have a comment on Ryan? The what was Ryan one? It is now a different version of restore and repair grants.

Speaker: Yeah, I just wanted to say I think this is a good idea and it makes sense. While our small businesses are struggling in Portland, and I hope that as other things come up in the budget, that we also consider that there are amendments that will help our constituents who are struggling with things like rental assistance. So when we do socialism for businesses, we should do it for our constituents too. Thanks.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor dunphy, did you have were you in the queue for councilor Ryan's amendment? Councilor green, were you in the queue for councilor Ryan's amendment?

Speaker: Yes. I just I think this is really important. This is one of the key hurdles for business activation, which again, as we've talked about, is the ingredient for our general fund revenues. So I support it.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor canal councilor clark, are you in the queue for councilor Ryan's amendment? Seeing no other discussion on councilor Ryan's amendment? Keelan, could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor Ryan, for putting this forward. I was hoping we could get a half a million. And getting a million is great, I support it. Thank you so much. I vote i.

Speaker: Ryan,

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Elaine. I maria.

Speaker: I'm really supportive of our city using our dollars to help people out when they're having hard times.

Speaker: I novick. I clark.

Speaker: Small business is critical, so thank you councilor Ryan.

Speaker: I green.

Speaker: Thanks for having those conversations with your board and supporting us.

Speaker: I zimmerman.

Speaker: I. Avalos i.

Speaker: Dunphy i.

Speaker: Smith i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: The amendment is approved with 12 yes votes.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilors look at us getting things done. Councilor koyama lane. What was the second piece of what you put forward.

Speaker: To the james beard market? 1 million. It's getting late.

Speaker: The decimals are moving, folks. The decimals are moving. Councilors, do we have councilor dunphy? I know you had no councilor green. I'm sorry. Had brought that forward. Did you want to make the formal motion here?

Speaker: Thank you. Yes. I move the motion \$1 million to james beard. Original green two is 1.5. But this is. This is better than zero. Second.

Speaker: Oh, councilor kanal. I'm going to give that to councilor clark since it's her district. Okay. And, councilor green, what was your original amendment number? Just so I can track for us. I know this is a bit changed at this point.

Speaker: The original amendment number was green two.

Speaker: Thank you. I'm going to find that while we're talking. Looking for anybody in the queue for discussion on this amendment. Councilor, there are folks whose hands are not coming down, councilor clark. Councilor dunphy. Oh, your hand is down. Councilor kanal. No. Councilor smith, is your hand in the queue on this amendment?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: I have a question. So that was in a another amendment for 1.25 million. Councilor green, the.

Speaker: Previously I had an independent amendment for 1.5 that I was going to try to fund. If we were successful in the earlier prosper amendment. So this is now

a sort of different, different offer here. And so my amendment is actually now reduced down by 500,000.

Speaker: Right. And where did I see this before? I think that was madam president. It was in her package for 500,000. Right.

Speaker: Correct.

Speaker: Okay. I tried to.

Speaker: Put in something there because I thought there was broad support.

Speaker: Yes. So how did they determine which ones got the million dollars and which one got the 500?

Speaker: Councilor, i.

Speaker: Sorry.

Speaker: Is that.

Speaker: A question for. For prosper?

Speaker: We can certainly offer. So repair and restore. We know with those numbers in the past. And I'd love for you to talk about your the programmatic team having at least that amount to what folks have talked about truly helps us. Support those businesses, whether.

Speaker: If it's.

Speaker: Just excuse me, window breaks or as we're really looking at the expanded restore program, do you want to share a little bit more about restore and why that \$1 million.

Speaker: That's that's fine. So what I want to do is I just I did check it out. It was 200,000 for next gen. I got the confirmation on that. And so and then the other 300,000 can go to summerworks.

Speaker: Okay. Yeah. I'm trying to wait okay.

Speaker: So 200.

Speaker: So councilor, it sounds like 200. We're good on this on this amendment. Okay. Councilors I'm not seeing anybody else in the queue. Councilor green.

Speaker: I just I do want to clarify something because the city attorney came up and said, you should probably clarify this, which means I probably clarify it. My original amendment had the 1.5 coming from the city of Portland's general fund. This would now come directly from seaf. So that's the change, correct?

Speaker: So much for saving me from clarifying that. So, councilors, that is the amendment before us that change that councilor green just referred to, to this being funded and \$1 million and seeing no one else in the queue. Keelan could you call the roll?

Speaker: Canal i.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: I just have to say I'm very excited about this. Thank you, councilor green, for your collaboration. And what I hear from good sources is this will leverage hopefully 10 million from the state.

Speaker: I koyama lane. I morillo. I novick. I clark. I green. I zimmerman. I avalos. I dunphy.

Speaker: I smith.

Speaker: I pirtle-guiney. I amendment is approved with 12 votes okay.

Speaker: Councilor koyama lane. I think you have our running list, but I've seen you running around a little bit. Where are we at here?

Speaker: I propose an amendment for 500,000 to go to workforce, a workforce development project, 450,000 to film an events and 500,000 to the large event stability grant.

Speaker: I believe that last one was 50.

Speaker: To add up.

Speaker: You said 500, but if it's adding up, it's.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Okay, 500 workforce for 50 film and events, 50 large events stability grant program okay.

Speaker: So councilors there is second. Okay. And do we need some color around the workforce piece. Councilor smith and how that's broken down. Or are those just dollars for workforce programs at prosper Portland?

Speaker: I thought it was on the second one. So are we on this one for the for the 500 to 200.

Speaker: 403 hundred summer works? Yes.

Speaker: Perfect.

Speaker: So I believe I'm going to I'm going to try to I'm going to try to capture this. An amendment for \$300,000 to summer works, \$200,000 to next gen, \$450,000 to film and events, and \$50,000 to.

Speaker: Large event.

Speaker: Stability grant coming out of cif. All within prosper. Keelan and haley, do you need that in writing or do you have it?

Speaker: What was the.

Speaker: Next gen amount?

Speaker: 200,000 300,000. I believe we have a motion and a second on the table. Councilors. Is there any discussion? Seeing none. Keelan can you please call the roll.

Speaker: Canal i, i. Koyama lane i. Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick I clark. I green. I zimmerman. I avalos. I dunphy. I smith. I pirtle-guiney. I amendment is approved with 12 yes votes.

Speaker: Councilors. I think we just gave councilor clark a run for her money for efficiency. Nice job. Councilor koyama lane. Happy to help. I am going to back us

out of the prosper hearing back into the council hearing. So, councilors, I am going to recess the budget committee on prosper Portland's budget and reopen the budget committee of the Portland City Council. We have taken a number of these economic development amendments off the table. If there are economic development amendments that relate not to the prosper budget, but to the city budget that we should consider. I would entertain folks entering the queue to propose amendments again for the city budget related to economic development. Councilor zimmerman, is that why you are in the queue?

Speaker: Next topic.

Speaker: Councilor clark. Is that why you are in the queue? Councilor dunphy is that why you are in the queue?

Speaker: Yes, ma'am.

Speaker: I dunphy. What say you?

Speaker: What? Say me. I would like to consider dunphy amendment seven. This is a amendment to restore a one fte a coordinator, one position at the city's noise office and its \$146,000. And it is drawing from the ppe and contingency second.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: I'm skipping councilor zimmerman and clark. Councilor smith, are you on the queue on this amendment?

Speaker: Could you repeat the amendment again?

Speaker: So this is dunphy, number seven. I'm going to read off of my remarks that I was supposed to read. I apologize. It's a motion to restore a coordinator. One position in the city's noise office within permitting and development. It's a core element of our regulatory capacity in the city's nighttime and music economy. This increases the bureau program expenses within Portland, permitting and development, the development services fund by \$146,000 to restore this

coordinator one position. It decreases contingency within the development services fund of Portland, permitting and development by \$146,000 to balance. Update attachments a through h as needed.

Speaker: Question where is the money coming from to pay to restore it?

Speaker: This is coming from the contingency fund.

Speaker: Okay. How much is in that fund.

Speaker: I don't know.

Speaker: De oliveira. Oliveira, could you please come forward and help us with that question, which I think may be relevant for further amendments as well?

Speaker: Thank you. Councilors. Daniel, for the record, councilor, your question is.

Speaker: Regarding the development services.

Speaker: Contingency fund. We're projected to have an ending balance at the.

Speaker: End.

Speaker: Of the fiscal year.

Speaker: So this is.

Speaker: When that would be contemplated.

Speaker: At approximately.

Speaker: 13 million.

Speaker: But of course, that.

Speaker: Depends on.

Speaker: Our revenues.

Speaker: For the coming months.

Speaker: But I think 13 million is.

Speaker: A.

Speaker: Reasonable forecast.

Speaker: Councilor smith, do you have any further questions?

Speaker: No, no thank you.

Speaker: Councilor novick, are you in the queue on this amendment?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Go right ahead.

Speaker: I wanted to add dc oliveira. I mean, what does this mean? What would this mean we will have less money for.

Speaker: Daniel. For the record, councilor, the reserve.

Speaker: Is established.

Speaker: To backfill when we have a.

Speaker: Shortfall in our forecast of revenues.

Speaker: So in this case. It's a contingency.

Speaker: Fund, a reserve.

Speaker: So in theory we would.

Speaker: Just have less to draw down, you know if.

Speaker: If the need came up.

Speaker: Question for the council president how do you see this interacting with your proposal. And paddy.

Speaker: I'm so glad you asked councilor. This my understanding is and I would look to our deputy city administrator to confirm this, but my understanding is that this is one of the positions that would be restored, at least temporarily, and then potentially in an ongoing fashion under my two budget amendments, pirtle-guiney one and two. That asterisk there, of course, is because I restore funds for the first three months of the fiscal year, and then we ask the bureau to come back to us with a report on economic conditions and whether they think they will need continued funding after that in the second amendment. But it is one of the positions that is covered in those amendments.

Speaker: And are you okay with this?

Speaker: I would hope that if we pass this and then pass mine, we would back some amount of money out of mine in order to account for that.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Councilor clark.

Speaker: I'd just like to ask councilor dunphy, can you tell us a little bit about what does a noise office coordinator do and why is it important?

Speaker: Absolutely. So under state law, we're required to regulate noise as part of our duties for health. And historically, the office has had a pretty robust team of folks to be able to issue permits. If you're going to get a barbecue and have a loudspeaker system or something like that. In addition to responding to noise complaints for the last decade or so, it has historically been a one person office. We have a noise officer who's been with the city for 20 years, but he does a great job. A couple of years ago, this office was expanded into two positions, plus a director, plus an admin. And this coordinator one is primarily, as I understand it, she's primarily in charge of the permit issuance to be able to get if you're going to have an event, to be able to have a noise variance, to be able to do a public event while the noise officer goes and responds to built environment complaints.

Speaker: Can we have that many applications.

Speaker: Hundreds, thousands of individuals, not thousands, but hundreds certainly.

Speaker: So there's a range of events. I mean, everything from schools that throw, you know, need, need amplification. And there's plan reviews, there's inspections to the counselor's.

Speaker: Point.

Speaker: But it.

Speaker: Is a robust city need.

Speaker: Councilors. Is there any other discussion or debate on dunfee seven?

Seeing none Keelan could you please call the roll?

Speaker: I know. Koyama lane i.

Speaker: Mario.

Speaker: It's really important that we move away from having police respond to these type of calls. So i.

Speaker: Novick come feel the noise. Girls rock your boys i.

Speaker: I green.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Zimmerman I hope this stays in there, but we're tackling some pretty small stuff before some very big things. And I imagine that this is one of those that I don't know if it makes it through the of the night. I'll vote. I we've run this credit card. Let's keep doing it.

Speaker: Swipe i.

Speaker: I smith.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

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

Speaker: Ironically, I think I'm next in the queue on this. Councilors, I would like to turn your attention to pirtle-guiney one and pirtle-guiney two in the economic development area. I'm pulling up my notes so that I know which is which. Bear with me for a moment here. Pirtle-guiney one would allow Portland permitting and development to draw \$450,000 each month from their bureau to retain 31 of the fte, which were previously cut for a three month period for the months of July, August and September in order to retain staff as we move through things like the

conversation, the mayor would like us to have around sdc waivers, which might lead to more applications for permits. This is a package pirtle-guiney two would ask us to find \$4 million in our reserves, which we could draw on if economic conditions warrant us continuing those positions through the rest of the fiscal year. I do not have a funding source for pirtle-guiney two. I had proposed some other amendments that did leave us with surpluses. One of those was cut down significantly today, but I didn't have a funding source tied specifically to this. I acknowledge that this is a large amount of money to not have a funding source tied specifically to it. It is funding in contingency. I get nervous about tying up too much contingency to specific projects, but that is of course an option here. I would entertain a second on pirtle-guiney one and two.

Speaker: Second, second.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor zimmerman, are you in the. You're in the queue for discussion.

Speaker: All right.

Speaker: So I think this is the what I like about packages is that sometimes you vote for things maybe that you're not totally in love with in order to move an entire thing through. And that's where I was supportive of pirtle-guiney one in the package. As it stands, not being part of a package, not really getting us anything. I think this is a bad amendment. I think it's strings out the transition and the right sizing and all the things that I've spoken about before. And so without that, I won't be supportive of number one on position number two on pirtle-guiney two, \$4 million. And you used two different words. And I really think you need to clarify, you first called it a reserve, which is different than a contingency because at the end you called a contingency. And if it's a contingency, then we need to find a place to put this money or get it from. Excuse me if it's a reserve that is saying it's a draw from a

reserve, and I don't think you'd have to identify it. So I think that's important to identify. And what you mean there. But I would again say that i, I don't understand this. I've also never seen any government organization all of a sudden hit a metric that then they have to go and exceed and, and drive \$4 million worth of hiring. So this to me seems like it's sending a signal, but will be it will cause us to find \$4 million in the general fund to put into contingency, to then never be executed. And I worry about \$4 million of cuts to programs to fill a contingency just to sit there, because this is never going to get executed. So I don't think either one of these should pass.

Speaker: Councilor zimmerman. My understanding from our budget office is that at the city of Portland, contingency, which is set aside for a specific purpose, is called a policy reserve. I find it confusing that we use those two words interchangeably as well, but that is why I use them interchangeably. Okay.

Speaker: But it still means four more million dollars of general fund has to be found. If it's that.

Speaker: I appreciate.

Speaker: That de oliveira has come back up to the front. Very frankly, I reached out to our deputy city administrator, who oversees pnd and said, we have a big cut in pnd, and we know that there is sometimes a lag where because these positions are funded by fees, we when permit applications start going up, we don't yet have the fees collected to hire up. So there's a lag there. And I said what would we need to do to with as few resources as possible, knowing that resources are tight, help to address that lag so that the things that we are doing to try to spur development aren't met with a brick wall of us being the slowdown in permitting, given all of the layoffs. And this was the solution that our bureau brought forward.

Speaker: So I understand that. But that is what a contingency is.

Speaker: I understand.

Speaker: Use it later in the year. We already have a \$3 million contingency that's unrestricted.

Speaker: That's what it is.

Speaker: I give that introduction because I would love to have de oliveira share any remarks that would be helpful at this time.

Speaker: Thank you, council president.

Speaker: So. Councilor zimmerman.

Speaker: You're you're flagging.

Speaker: The dilemma that we're. Experiencing here as we're.

Speaker: Introducing interventions.

Speaker: And products that we're hoping to spur development, that lag.

Speaker: In implementation.

Speaker: And realities, that.

Speaker: If.

Speaker: We laid off.

Speaker: And I want to.

Speaker: Acknowledge this, talking about layoffs in a sort of flippant way is not my preference. But I just got to talk about it in this real way. If we laid off 53 people.

Speaker: On July 1st and then.

Speaker: Come November, we see an uptick and.

Speaker: Development and permitting.

Speaker: Now we're at this, this point that council president just flagged where we're trying to catch up with. Hiring by using the reserve policy for the first quarter of the year. It extends those 31. Staff and the bureau.

Speaker: And i.

Speaker: Think director kuhnhausen is in the room to describe those positions that we're. Keeping will allow us more time to see the forecast. So we come back to.

Speaker: You all in.

Speaker: The fall.

Speaker: We'll have higher.

Speaker: Fidelity on what the future looks like. And it may be. And this is where I don't I'm saying this uncomfortably that we still have to look at laying off more staff, but at least it gives us a little bit more time to get a little bit more information to see if the sdc moratorium, some of the other interventions around self-certification or third party certification, if those start to generate more interest in development in Portland. And that's what we're solving for.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: And the second one would be once we get to that point, we have that information, then you all can contemplate what makes sense to introduce that contingency, that general fund contingency into the bureau, to keep those staff on board.

Speaker: Councilor you made the point that this is what we have contingency for. And while I would prefer to pass pirtle-guiney two so that we have that money specifically earmarked for this purpose, and also we have some metrics for when that would happen. We could rely on our contingency, knowing that folks may be coming forward with an ask.

Speaker: I don't want to embarrass folks here, but there's a lot more at play here. And I think we are wading into something. And I think that you've got to seriously consider pulling back number four or the 4 million. Excuse me.

Speaker: I appreciate your input. Councilor councilor novick. Are you in the queue on these amendments?

Speaker: Yes, I was I'm still just want to be sure. I think that the budget director said earlier that we can't just create 4 million out of thin air. And so if we voted for number two, we'd actually have to find 4 million.

Speaker: That is correct.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor morillo.

Speaker: Know, I was in the queue for something.

Speaker: Else.

Speaker: Councilor smith.

Speaker: Yes, thank you for your amendment. I just don't think it goes far enough. I think we need to give people an opportunity because 63 people are losing their jobs, not 31. And I believe instead of spending 1.35 million, which is 450 times three. We need to be restoring the entire 9.5 million until we can identify if there's going to be an uptick. If we're going to have folks, it's we're not going to have time enough to hire back all those folks if we get rid of them. When, if, when the budget suggests the mayor's budget suggests so. I like what you're doing. I like we're going to we're going along the right track, but I don't I don't think that it goes far enough. And I have an amendment in that would address this. And so I am going to see what everybody else thinks about this. But I just think it just it just does not go far enough.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor, councilor green.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I support I support pirtle-guiney one for all the reasons that we've discussed. I think we need to keep the capacity in our permitting bureau to be able to execute when we've changed the conditions. I think the sdc thing has a big opportunity to change those conditions. I think. I don't know

if I'm there on number two just because I we have a pretty scarce pool of money, and I know my colleagues have other things they'd like to fund. So you have my support on number one.

Speaker: Thank you councilor. I keep hoping we can alternate between pro and con, but I can't get to that point because there's pro on one and con on the other. So I'm continuing down the list. Apologies for the inconsistency. Councilor canal.

Speaker: What councilor green said. Councilor clark.

Speaker: Unfortunately, ditto to councilor green I and I hate to say this, but I feel like we're prolonging the inevitable. I sound like debbie downer, but it just feels like that to me. But I'm I'm I'm ditto to councilor green. Councilor avalos.

Speaker: I am definitely supportive of your goals. And so I want to support I'm definitely going to support one. I want to support two. I'm just worried. I don't know, like what's going to happen as the night goes on. If I support that then at the end are we going to just have to come back and then do cuts? So that's like just a big one. We've already been swiping the card, as councilor zimmerman said, but some of those were a lot smaller. So I just want to understand better. Like, what do you think would happen then? Like, would we have to? Yeah.

Speaker: Councilor avalos I do strongly believe that we need both of these amendments. I also would very much understand if we chose to pass pirtle-guiney one tonight and wait on pirtle-guiney two until the 11th. I do think we need to pass it. I think that might make some folks nervous if we do that, but I understand that that could be the more fiscally responsible path to take tonight.

Speaker: Yeah. And then on that note, if let's say we put up two for a vote and it fails, would you not be able to bring it back next time?

Speaker: If I put up two for a vote and it fails, somebody who voted no would be able to bring it back for reconsideration. And I could also change my vote to a no to

do that. I also vote last so I could just vote no against it. Councilors councilor councilor novick. Are you back in the.

Speaker: My question is sort of generic, but how far out of balance are we right now?

Speaker: Director levine could we get an update? I believe we're actually in the positive still.

Speaker: That's correct. On the general fund side. Year to the good by about \$300,000.

Speaker: And how much of that is the council office budgets, though?

Speaker: Well, that amendment passed. So the if you took that away you would be to the bad.

Speaker: That's actually what I meant though is I know the council office budget money can't be used one for one for anything except another overhead bureau.

Speaker: The discretionary portion can be used. So I'm that that number I quoted you. Sorry I should have been more clear is just general fund discretionary okay. There's more in overhead. So I'm assuming that you were putting it towards something that is not overhead. You're to the good by \$300,000.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Councilors, I believe that is everybody who's in the queue for debate. Councilor zimmerman, would you like. I can't tell when you're back in because you're not lowering your hand ever. Councilor.

Speaker: Of course not. Because I got a bunch of amendments in the section that was supposed to be called three hours ago, so I still want to be first in that one. All right. So I appreciate and I have said over and over that I think that we've got to get serious about these, the inevitable happening a better time. But I've been open

until the October 1st timeline. I hear that budget number one, that the president's proposed isn't going to cost any more money. And I think we can get there. But I appreciate what some councilors are recognizing that \$4 million for number two is a ton of other general fund that we've got to go cut if that thing gets passed tonight. So i'll support one. But boy number two.

Speaker: Councilors, I believe I don't see anybody else in the queue for debate. Keelan could you please call the roll on pirtle-guiney one?

Speaker: No,

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Ryan no. Koyama lane i. O'Neill I novick.

Speaker: I mark. I green. I zimmerman.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Dunphy. I.

Speaker: Smith no.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

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

Speaker: Thank you counselors I hear the hesitation on pirtle-guiney two in the name of time. I am happy to pull it back. I will be bringing it back forward on the 11th. I believe I'm losing our place in the queue here. Councilor morillo were you next in the queue for an economic development proposal?

Speaker: How many people have left are left with economic with this portions proposals.

Speaker: I believe I see you and canal and smith in the queue, and then we will close this out and move on to transportation so that we can get back to that fee bill.

Speaker: Okay. So I have a motion to move the amendment topic area, the next one to parks, because it's a high priority area. And it's something that the

community has been asking for this entire time as a top priority. So I don't know why we're pushing it off to the 11th.

Speaker: Councilor we need to get back to the fee bill, which is why I have asked us to do transportation after economic development. Are you suggesting that we do parks after transportation if there's still time tonight, or that we do it before transportation?

Speaker: I'm suggesting we do it before transportation so that you guys can have a little hustle in your step. Because that's.

Speaker: Get back to this after we finish economic development. And I will call on you first when we are done with the economic development proposals.

Speaker: Yeah. But if you guys start slow rolling stuff, I'm going to be annoying about it.

Speaker: I'm not sure who you're referring to when you say you guys.

Speaker: My fellow councilors.

Speaker: Try to refrain from impugning each other. Councilor canal, do you have a proposal on economic development? Okay, councilor smith, do you have a proposal on economic development?

Speaker: Yes, I did a pre amendment for 1.6 million and I want to take I had 600,000 for next gen. And so we kind of. Can you tell us which amendment number this is please.

Speaker: It is smith one okay. Works and youth employment. And so I want to scratch the 600,000 for the next generation. And I want to take the 1 million for summer works out of the contingency for the opioid dollars. There's \$2 million in contingency. Increased funding for summer works youth employment initiative by reallocating or allocating \$1 million from the contingency fund for the opioid litigation and take away the 600,000. The second one I want to scratch. Smith two,

for increasing funding for prosper Portland office of small business. I guess we kind of handle that as well. And then ten, which is very similar to what council president just did. But I go a little bit further, counselor.

Speaker: We're we're looking for either a package that's related or one top priority so that we can get to everybody and get through as much as possible.

Speaker: So I'm.

Speaker: Going wasn't clear.

Speaker: So I just eliminated two.

Speaker: Oh so eliminating smith one.

Speaker: I eliminated part of smith one and I eliminated smith two okay. And so the third one in the last one that is very similar to yours I don't think that we're going. It's called smith ten to increase the fund and resources for the Portland permitting and development to preserve the 63 folks who are in the staffing and permitting operations. I want to restore 9.5 million to Portland, permitting and development. I want the general fund to come from 4.5 million to come from the joint office account, and the 5 million to come from pnd reserves.

Speaker: So it sounds like councilor smith has moved to amendments. A modified version of smith one. Which lowers that amount to \$1 million, and smith ten. Is there a second on either.

Speaker: Smith two? That's done.

Speaker: Got it.

Speaker: Councilor smith.

Speaker: Councilor smith.

Speaker: Do you have a.

Speaker: Language that you.

Speaker: Could share with me for.

Speaker: Smith ten.

Speaker: Yes. Ten is smith. Ten is to increase. And. Well, actually it's to restore 9.5 million to Portland permitting and development. They were cut out of the mayor's budget. And the 4.5 coming from the joint office and the 5 million coming from the pnd reserve.

Speaker: Is there a second for smith? One.

Speaker: Yeah, i'll second.

Speaker: Is there a second for smith? Ten? Councilor smith I'm not seeing a second for smith ten. Why don't we take up smith one okay. Councilor kanal not in the queue for that. Councilor avalos, are you in the queue for smith one.

Speaker: Yeah, I guess I'm trying to understand what we just did not too long ago with 500,000 for something that I forgot. And how that relates to smith one.

Speaker: The 500,000 councilor avalos was 200 for next gen. That's for workforce development and 300,000 for summer works.

Speaker: So that's why you amended this down to one?

Speaker: Yeah, that's why I amended it to.

Speaker: 1 million.

Speaker: Correct.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Okay. Thanks.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor I'm next in the queue. I have a question for director levine. Smith. One pulls money from the opioid settlement dollars and.

Speaker: Contingency from the.

Speaker: Contingency for the opioid settlement dollars. Can you help me understand how much is in that contingency? What are the limitations on it?

Because I know there are limitations on other dollars. What does that contingency set aside for? I need to understand the implication of this amendment.

Speaker: Yeah. And I'm not sure I have to. I'd have to check on if it's budgeted in contingency or where it's budgeted. But my understanding is that. That there is about \$1 million that's expected. Sorry, I'm just pulling up the information. That's expected for between what what has been unspent so far and what we expect to receive next year. The. Thanks. Yeah, just just over \$1 million. The restrictions are set by. The I think it's schedule e of the. Opioid settlement. And I don't know robert, if you have it in front of you and can speak to this the eligibility of this use.

Speaker: And I'm sorry you said there was how much in the contingency right now.

Speaker: I don't know that it's actually in contingency, but it's the amount that we expect plus the amount we have left from this current fiscal year is 1.02 million.

Speaker: So we are expecting we don't know if we'll get it yet, but we are expecting to have just over \$1 million. Correct. That has not yet been allocated to other uses.

Speaker: Correct.

Speaker: Okay. Robert, do you have information on the limitation and uses?

Speaker: Yes i.

Speaker: Do.

Speaker: And ruth is correctly.

Speaker: Identified the limitations in the settlement agreements.

Speaker: You know.

Speaker: In general, the use of those funds needs.

Speaker: To have. Some nexus.

Speaker: To the prevention or treatment.

Speaker: Of opioid use disorder. So if it's just general. Workforce development that that.

Speaker: Appears that the funds would not qualify for that. If it's workforce development, for additional professionals who. Work with people with opioid use disorder or co-occurring substance abuse or mental health conditions that would qualify training and scholarships for behavioral health practitioners or workers would qualify.

Speaker: Programs aimed. At preventing opioid use.

Speaker: Including youth focused programs designed to prevent. Drug misuse, could be funded. Also, an allowed.

Speaker: Use is. Providing education.

Speaker: To youth focused programs to discourage or prevent opioid misuse.

Speaker: Thank you, robert councilor I don't think I have ever turned down an opportunity to support workforce development in my entire career.

Speaker: Before you say that, let me tell you something. Before you say that. So here's here's.

Speaker: The councilor.

Speaker: So summer works is a very comprehensive program. We have a readiness training that we train kids on how to be ready in the workforce. We also have a component about drug and alcohol prevention. We huddle up every day and talk to the students. And just just from a standpoint of bipoc communities. Fentanyl and substance abuse in bipoc communities is very high. And so knowing that this will be a way to have some sort of opioid justice in making sure that those kids understand the dangers of opioids, understand the dangers of fentanyl prevention strategies, prevention strategies, how educational initiatives can change their day. I have never seen a kid doing a drive by or smoking drugs on their way to work. I just haven't. This has been a huge deterrent using this program, and this will be an excellent opportunity for us to expand it with these opioid dollars because it has

impacted particularly the black community really, really heavily. And so this will be an opportunity to have some sort of social justice while we're educating the kids. When they come in the summer, they're with us for a couple of months and we're training them. We're with them every day.

Speaker: So thank you, counselor. And I am a huge supporter of the summer works program and look forward to finding other opportunities to support its expansion with you. I just don't think that I am comfortable using these dollars for that and then potentially not having the funds available when we've made promises to kids.

Speaker: And I believe there's \$2 million available.

Speaker: Counselor avalos, you're next in the queue.

Speaker: Yeah, I guess I have a question because I have an amendment that was for the opioid settlement dollars. It was for 1.5 million for health. But then I was informed that there was only 200,000 left in it because 990 whatever was for bybee lakes. But I'm hearing that there was a new calculation and that there is a million in there. I'm looking to you, ruth. Are you confirming what I'm saying? Yes. So that's news that I just got and puts me in a, you know, so, so I can't support this because I want to I have an amendment to move to put those dollars towards for health. You know, it's for our district. Right. Opening up 62 recovery beds. So yeah. That's that's it.

Speaker: Counselors. I don't see anyone else in the queue to speak to this amendment. Keelan, could you please call the roll on the modified version of smith one?

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Ryan, no. Koyama lane.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Maria.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Novick.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Green.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Zimmerman.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Avalos.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Dunphy.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Smith.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: The amendment fails with one yes vote and ten no votes.

Speaker: Thank you counselor. I believe that that is the end of folks in the queue with economic development budget amendments. I would like us to move now to the transportation section, but I have promised councilor morillo that I would come back to her first.

Speaker: Okay. So I would like to motion to move the amendment topic area to parks. Next, I get a second.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Counselors, we are in discussion on the motion on the table. Councilor kanal are you in the queue for this purpose?

Speaker: Motion to yes. Yeah.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: I support this. I think we're we've been hearing a lot. There were I don't know how many people up there waiting on us to vote on the amendment on the mac. And there's a lot of things in the broader parks conversation that we need to talk about. So I support this. Thanks, counselor.

Speaker: Smith, are you in the queue for this purpose? Councilor. Morillo.

Speaker: We should do it.

Speaker: Next in the queue. Counselors, it is 1015. I was informed during our break and I believe all of your offices were informed also that we have a hard stop at midnight because of some staff timing. I know there are some looks about that. I'm frustrated by it as well. That is the reality we are living in right now. We do need to pass the fee bill with the tnc fee. I know some of you would like to talk about raising that. I would like you to have that opportunity. Most things we are talking about tonight can move to the 11th, but if we want to pass a change to this fee bill, I'd like us to do that while we have a fee bill in front of us that we can amend, which is why I'm asking for us to move to transportation next. It is 1015, and I'm concerned that if we go to parks next, we won't have time to come back and do transportation and close out the things we need to do before the end of our night. Councilor novick are you in the queue to speak to this motion?

Speaker: Yes, madam president, I share your concern. I think we need to get through what we legally need to get through first. However, if we have any time afterwards, I do think that we should get to the amendments to take money from

police and give it to parks, because that's the main event. That's what the fans paid to see.

Speaker: Councilor zimmerman.

Speaker: I am not even going to try and predict what each next section is anymore. But I do agree with with you that first off, we emphasize this approved budget far more than most governments, and it's inappropriate. And the big the big thing to get through is the 11th. And so I agree, we've got to get through the things that require us tonight the sec setting the size of the funds because the fee structure is part of that. I think it's important all of the amendments and all the points that councilor, morillo and others have brought up are important and can be argued and debated on the 11th just as much. But if we don't get if we change the fee structure, I think we would be in violation then, because we're not setting our revenues. That is very concerning to me, and that is the only reason I would like to stay here.

Speaker: Thank you. Seeing no one else in the queue for debate, Keelan could you call the roll on the motion before us? Which is to.

Speaker: I mean, I have a response. I was back in the queue.

Speaker: Okay. Councilor morillo, you're back in the queue.

Speaker: It will take me one minute to get the votes. I need to move 2 million from police into parks. So I think we can get that done. And you know what? It's not taking. It's not a cut. It's actually an increase. As councilor sameer kanal has so called it.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: The parks debate is much broader than that and.

Speaker: I understand. But the parks is what people came here to discuss and to talk about. And it's a resource the community needs. And we have been going in circles for a lot of these things.

Speaker: Maybe steve can just say the mac isn't.

Speaker: On the list of councilors.

Speaker: I'd like to bring us back into order. Councilor clark is in the queue.

Speaker: I'm just asking, what are we voting on? I'm sorry. I was out of the room.

Speaker: I councilor morillo asked if we could if she could make a motion to have us move in a different order than I had previously informed everybody we would move in. I said that I would entertain that motion. Keelan we have a motion on the table to talk about parks next, instead of transportation, could you please. Oh, councilor avalos, are you in the queue for discussion?

Speaker: I just jumped in really quick just to ask, is it just what is the thing that you're saying? It's just one thing. And transportation that has to happen today. So we could come into parks and then come right back and do that one thing.

Speaker: Or the fee bill is open with the tnc fee, which I know is part of the proposals that are on the table on transportation. I would like us to take up any proposals folks would like to discuss tonight on transportation so that if any of them involve an increase in fees, we can do that while we have a fee bill before us. Keelan would you please call the roll.

Speaker: Canal on the motion to reorder? I'll point out that there's only three hours scheduled on June 11th. Right now.

Speaker: It's more I vote yea. Ryan.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Koyama lane.

Speaker: Yes. Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Clark.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Green i.

Speaker: Zimmerman I'm not even sure that we can tell the presiding officer how to run this, so no.

Speaker: I dunphy.

Speaker: I smith.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: The motion fails with seven. No. No one I'm sorry.

Speaker: Six.

Speaker: Six six. Six. Motion fails with split vote. Thanks.

Speaker: Thanks. Keelan. Councilors. We are moving to the transportation section of our amendments, and I would entertain anybody who has transportation amendments that they would like to move forward. I see councilor kanal in the queue. Is that for transportation?

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Okay. Councilor avalos, are you in the queue for transportation?

Councilor novick, are you in the queue for transportation?

Speaker: I am at a clarification. I'm in the queue for amending the tnc fees, but I don't know if we can do that under transportation budget. Or do we have to go back to doing the fee resolutions?

Speaker: Ruth, do we do? I think we do both.

Speaker: You have to do it in both. Yeah.

Speaker: So i.

Speaker: Believe in budget.

Speaker: We will do it in budget. And if we do pass anything that amends it, as soon as we are done with the transportation section, we will move back into our council meeting to address the fee bill.

Speaker: Just a point of order.

Speaker: Point of order. Councilor zimmerman.

Speaker: I'd like to remind everybody that the mayor's budget was proposed with \$1.30, which is a 65% increase to the uber and lyft fees. That is not the fee schedule that came to the finance committee and that we sent to you all that we heard earlier 12.5 hours ago. So I just want to make that clear that we will have to if we do nothing right now except approve it, we still have to go back and amend that fee schedule. I know some of you have some increases you'd like to, but we're already out of balance. And that was a scrivener's error. Nothing intentional.

Speaker: Thank you councilor. Councilor, we talked to councilor novick councilor clark, are you in the queue to bring a transportation amendment forward?

Speaker: Yes, but it's a budget note regarding future revenue hold.

Speaker: If it's a budget note, we will do those. It may be on the 11th councilor. Smith, are you in the queue to bring forward a transportation budget amendment?

Speaker: Yes. Thank you. So I have smith three. It's funding for the sidewalk improvement and paving program. And this we put a request in to go to the finance committee to issue a series of \$250 million limited revenue bonds each year for the next two years. But to authorize a \$200 million budget authority. And the reason why I'm bringing this now is because I know that it took it was 11 one vote in support of the resolution. But if we don't set aside the money now in this budget to

impact 2526, then we'll be will be out of order. And that's why I'm bringing it early. We have to do an ordinance to change some things, but we also have to put some money into a contingency fund so that we can account for the amount of money that it's going to cost to put cip forward. So I'd like to put a. Put up a, a what do you call it, a. Do I have to put something forward if the amendment is there. But I want to do an authorization motion.

Speaker: Your motioning the amendment.

Speaker: Yeah. I want to put a motion forward to do a 200,000 authorization. But we only want to do \$100 million, \$50 million for this fiscal year, \$50 million for the next fiscal year. And that's going to cost about \$8 million. I don't know if. Is jonas still here? 200 million.

Speaker: Exactly which.

Speaker: Amendment this is smith three.

Speaker: The councilors. We have smith three before us, which is a \$200 million authorization to take out \$100 million in bonding. Is that correct?

Speaker: To take out 100 million in bonding, but doing a 200 million authorization so that we can come back in a couple of years? The idea is that if we take out too much money and we're not finished, we have to do some wrangling.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor zimmerman. Councilors discussion to smith three councilor canal. Is that your purpose in the queue, councilor clark.

Speaker: I would like to ask councilor smith, why are we reducing the housing bureau general fund by 8 million?

Speaker: So that's where we were going to originally take the money from. And I had a conversation with the mayor, and we're not going to take it from there, because we're going to have a bigger conversation about housing on Friday. And so

I think that that is where the conversation needs to come from. But I also want to change where the money comes from. And just to give you a couple of figures, I want to take it from the transportation operation fund. And put on just a second in our. In our research, we saw that debt service dropped off by \$7 million this year for 2526. Well, in 2627, there's going to be approximately about 35 million that drops off in debt service. And that being said, there will be enough general fund money to put in 20 year bonds for the 2627. But if we take the money out of the transportation operating fund, we could get that funded and started July 1st.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor green. I believe you're next in the queue for discussion.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. Councilor smith, respectfully, I don't think this is the way to do this authorization. I've been working with jonas to come up with a funding plan for the issuance of this debt. You need to do that because you have an external bond committee that rates the quality of the debt and the overall portfolio of assets. I think we have to we have to do it right. And this doesn't feel right to me. I don't think the debt service is 8 million. I think it's closer to 5 million. I would urge I would urge you to pull this back and.

Speaker: We can pull this back. But understanding we're still going to have to find we're still going to have to find the money out of this fiscal year. And if we don't set it aside or identify where it's going to come from, we're going to be in the same situation a month from now, two months from now.

Speaker: I understand that. But then we if we pass an ordinance before this council to authorize that debt.

Speaker: No, it's not an ordinance. This is just to put the money aside when we pass the ordinance.

Speaker: Let me finish. Thank you. I don't want to put this money aside before we pass the ordinance and we pass the ordinance, we will do a budget amendment to this to then to then next fiscal year to move money around. If this council if this body thinks that's the right thing to do. But I think this is premature, we have to figure out what the cost of this debt is. I know that we passed a resolution last month, but I don't feel comfortable setting aside \$8 million from this fiscal year from any source.

Speaker: Not this fiscal year.

Speaker: I'm sorry.

Speaker: For 26.

Speaker: For the budget we are considering from any source, for any fund before we have voted on an ordinance.

Speaker: The ordinance will identify the money. You won't have to do anything after the ordinance.

Speaker: Councilor we have to vote on an ordinance to authorize the debt, and during that period we will have two readings on it. We will have some analysis. I've asked the chief financial officer to help us out with that. We will identify that. Will we make our budget offset that time? I'm not prepared to support this part of cip at this moment. I don't think it works in the best interest of our program. That's all i'll say.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor. Councilor zimmermann.

Speaker: Thanks. I appreciate that councilor smith has been willing to look for a way to leverage our debt payments to achieve what we passed. I think it was 12 zero. The resolution for those two districts to get sidewalks. And while the ordinance and I'm going to give it all the time that I can this summer at the finance committee to develop the proper ordinance, I don't think of this too dissimilar from

the ada debt that we just recently authorized. And so the way I read this, and way I understand councilor smith's adaptations in the last week or so, is that this is a signal of money that is already sitting in the transportation contingency fund. And if at a future time, we were to create the ordinance to create the debt, that we could use that. So I look at this as the second signal of what the previous resolution was, was about cip. This says if we can get it together and pass a funding mechanism, that we have a payment, a payment mechanism as well. I, I wanted to go even further. I think that, you know, pcef does \$20 million worth of sidewalks right now for safe routes to school. I think it is very connected, but she's identified transportation. I think there have been some other ideas ideas out there. And that's why I'm going to support it, because I don't see it deferring anything currently in our plan. I don't see it creating a larger gap tonight because it's already a contingency ready to be paid if the ordinance mechanism is created this summer. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor. Councilor smith I'm in the queue for a point of clarification. You talked about authorizing 100 million. I'm looking at something authorizing 200 million to go out for a bond for 100 million. I'm looking at something that talks about a series of \$50 million bonds each year for four years, which I think would be 50 million this year. I just want to make sure that we're capturing your amendment correctly. For our staff who are making this all legal for us.

Speaker: So it would legally be 50 million. The 200 million would cover four years. But we're only asking for the 100 million so we can do for next fiscal year in the following. I didn't get a chance to talk to councilor green because he he wasn't he didn't have the information that I had. And I'm sorry about that. Councilor ruth had given me the amount of money that had dropped off. So you didn't have that

information, and I apologize for that. So I knew that there was money sitting there. I just want the conversation and I want to be able to ride the wave and, and I'll be honest with you, a couple things happened that that really made me jump the gun on this. We're going to be asked for a lot of different things. I saw the Keller go up. I saw the Portland Trail Blazers. Blazers go up for sale. We're going to be asked for a lot of money and possible bond authority. I do not want to get caught in the middle of all of that stuff. And then east Portland is stuck again without sidewalks. District four on the west side is stuck again without sidewalks. So that's why I'm bringing it forward, because I knew that there was an opportunity to have it paid for, and if we could do it now and then, we'd still have to go back and do the ordinance to make it legal. But this is just putting the money aside into a fund that we already have. So.

Speaker: Councilor. Clark.

Speaker: Thank you, madam chair. Okay, councilor Smith, I'm confused when I'm when I'm looking at has a three bullets on it. The third bullet is the Portland housing bureau. Did you take.

Speaker: I took I took that off and said we're going to do the transportation operations fund. As I said before, I talked to the mayor and he said a bigger conversation is going to be had about housing and homelessness on Friday. So I took that back.

Speaker: So I don't know what the downside is of actually approving this. Can you help me out with that? I don't I don't understand the downside.

Speaker: There wouldn't be a downside. But it's just it's just style. It's not it's style. It's not substance. Substance is here we have different styles on how we want to do things. I like to get things done early, quick so that we can set it up okay, but it still does not prevent us from I mean, we actually still have to do an ordinance, but

we're just setting the money aside so that we have it there and that we know that this money is going to be set aside for cip.

Speaker: Okay. Councilor green was saying he doesn't think it has to be 8 million.

Speaker: Well, at 7.5%. And you do 100 million. That's darn near close to.

Speaker: I can.

Speaker: Okay. Can he speak to this?

Speaker: Can we if we're going to throw around numbers, if we're going to throw around numbers, I want us to defer to the numbers that our budget team puts forward. So do we have a clear answer on what the debt payment would be for issuing \$50 million?

Speaker: 100 million?

Speaker: Well.

Speaker: I'm sorry, councilor, I'm still not seeing the 100 million in here, but let's go with 100 million.

Speaker: Go ahead.

Speaker: Okay. Sorry, I didn't know if there was a question. So.

Speaker: Sorry I dropped the question.

Speaker: Yeah, apologies. So, my understanding, just to level set the resolution authorized, looking into issuing up to \$200 million for the cip program. We are working on doing the due diligence so we can come forward. As councilor green mentioned, with a legally viable ordinance to authorize that financing. Often those financing ordinances also include, well, they will include authorization of the payment source, which could be a budget amendment at that moment or could be budget resources identified ahead of time. I will also flag that under the current projection, which I want to be clear, we're meeting with pbot. Tomorrow to begin that due diligence and really nail down the drafting of the ordinance. But under the

current expectation of issuing bonds during fiscal 2526, there would not be a first payment until fiscal 2627, at which point the projected payment would be just over \$8 million.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor koyama lane, are you in the queue to speak to this amendment? You can stay in the queue if you're there for another purpose.

Speaker: I think.

Speaker: It's time to call the question. I call the question.

Speaker: Councilors. Is there a second? Second councilors, do we have unanimous consent to move to a vote on this issue? I'm not seeing anybody shaking their head. No. Keelan, can you please read the roll?

Speaker: Canal I look forward to doing a supplemental budget ordinance alongside the future ordinance, but for now, no.

Speaker: No koyama lane. No. Morillo.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Novick.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Clark.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Sorry. It was that. Yes. Okay. Thank you.

Speaker: Green. I appreciate your fight, but I'm a no. Yes.

Speaker: Avalos.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Dunphy.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Smith.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: Councilor. I look forward to working on this in the budget or in the in the bill that I know you'll bring forward to us the ordinance that I know you'll bring forward to us later. But for today, I'm a no. I have too many questions about what's in here.

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

Speaker: Second, all, I believe you councilor kanal.

Speaker: I believe you said you were not in the queue for this for transportation. Is that correct? Novick are you in the queue for transportation?

Speaker: I am in the queue for transportation, but I'm in the queue to move to raise the tnc fees and I want to know if we can do that at as a standalone thing outside the budget amendments discussion.

Speaker: Well.

Speaker: If we're doing it as an amendment to the budget, then you would do it right here in this budget amendment discussion. I don't see a novick transportation amendment. So are you making a new amendment from the floor?

Speaker: Okay. I'm confused. I thought that we were. So at some point we'll go back to just do fees. Is that right?

Speaker: If it is, if you're moving, if there are a few people who have amendments that would affect the tnc, and if you are moving to raise the tnc to have more money in the transportation budget or to back general funds out of the transportation budget, then we would entertain that motion. Now, I'm just noting that we don't have an amendment from you. So it would be an amendment from the floor unless you are moving somebody else's amendment.

Speaker: It would be an amendment from the from the floor.

Speaker: Okay. Go right ahead.

Speaker: I would like to propose an amendment that I've been working on with councilor morillo, green and dunphy to amend the tnc fee per ride and exhibit f, and increase the rate from the listed \$0.65 to \$2 per ride. The mayor's proposed budget includes an increase to \$1.30 per ride. I believe we believe that an increase to \$2 is fair. The total increase would raise an additional \$10 million, 5 million of which is already included in the mayor's budget. The revenue is currently restricted to the tnc use for the tnc regulatory program, so we'll be bringing additional ordinance next week to allow the funds to move more freely. As gdr, we know that the transportation bureau is starved for money. I just to give a preview, I think some folks will be tempted to rely on this to reduce the amount of general fund going to transportation. I don't think that that's a good idea. I think we should use every dollar we can to address our failing streets. I think that it's ten years ago. I was one of the deciding votes to let the rideshare companies operate in the city. I actually now believe that that was a mistake. At the time, some environmentalists thought that that would reduce the use of cars because we encourage people to take transit and then use the rideshare companies for the last mile instead, it just resulted in more cars in the streets and more carbon emissions. And I think as long as they're out there, which I regret doing, then we should use it to raise the money for transportation. One specific thing I have in mind is I'm worried that the proposed suspension of sdcs will cost \$6 million, that pbob is counting for counting on to for the federal match for the 82nd avenue bus rapid transit. I think that it's that we could probably rely on increased tnc fees to make up for the \$6 million that they would lose, which could destroy the project. And I think that'd be kind of fitting to have money from the rideshare companies help ensure transit project. I'm also planning to continue examining the relationship between pbob and the rideshare companies generally, but for now, my proposal is to raise the fees to \$2, and I will

note that the city attorney has told me that since the mayor's. Well, since normally since this is a proposal in the second reading, it would require another meeting to pass it. Unless we add an emergency ordinance. So I would ask for consent that regardless of how people vote on the amendment, whatever amount we wind up with, that they vote to be one of the nine people to have it be an emergency ordinance. I also just wanted to ask council to zimmerman, based on what you just said about the scrivener's error, is it true that we're going to need to make this an emergency ordinance no matter what, no matter what figure we wind up with? Yes. Okay. So one way or another, it's going to have to be an emergency ordinance. Thank you.

Speaker: And for folks who didn't catch it, this is listed in your packets as morillo two. For anybody who's watching this is I believe, in the revenue generating section but is related to transportation as well. So we are taking it up here morillo two. Councilor kanal are you in the queue to speak to this amendment?

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Councilor. Morillo.

Speaker: Oh no, I was just trying to say that it was morillo two and it's been brought. Yeah.

Speaker: Councilor zimmerman, are you in the queue to speak to this amendment? Go right ahead.

Speaker: Thanks. Madam president. And i, I do think that the councilors who are proposing this have been thoughtful. I think that I have a firm disagreement on it. I looked at my uber receipts. I know that the uber receipt says city of Portland fee \$0.65. City of Portland. Accessibility fee \$0.11. I know that this sounds great that we're taxing some big company, but it goes directly to the users, to the riders. I am reminded when I worked in the mayor's office upstairs and the vice president of

Portland state university called me because we had started a new school year, and it was coming out of the pandemic, and he had students who had signed up for in-person class and within the first 30 days, had disenrolled from in-person to go back to virtual because of the situation on trimet, getting to class because it was a little too expensive for them to live in the central city. So they were taking trimet. I also remember a later conversation with that same person, who then said a number of students were taking uber and lyft in and they didn't prefer it. But because of the situation on trimet, which is, as some people on this dais have said, our largest homeless shelter, where dangerous behavior happens every single day, where trimet has had to hire over 200 safety specialists in order to make the trains and the busses barely palatable. I think it is rich that we are going to then tell those people. Those kids are one example, but there's thousands. There were 8 million rides by uber and lyft last year in Portland. That's \$8,000,002 charges that we're about to do. And I don't want to raise taxes on individual Portlanders, particularly when the other alternatives are pretty crappy right now. And I think we're also going to decrease the footprint that police and public safety have in this city in the same action tonight. And so to do that and take away the tools that people have, I hope we don't I know it's going to pass, but I just don't think raising taxes on individuals right now, in a time I don't think that we have to I don't think we're in a budget crisis. I think we're in a crisis. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor, councilors, I was remiss in not actually confirming that that introduction was councilor novick motion. And then taking a second.

Speaker: It was my motion.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Councilor morillo, are you back in the queue?

Speaker: Yeah. As the only person here who's dependent on transit because I don't have a car, I don't have a license. And my mom only knew how to drive a motorcycle, so we never learned how to drive. I don't know why. It's always the men that are, like, six feet tall that are terrified of being on the bus. It's really not a big deal. I ride the bus all the time and I'm five foot two and 130 pounds soaking wet, so I think we will all survive it. People love the bus. I see people fall in love on the bus, and the reality is that we need this funding for our budget. We don't have any funding to play with right now, as we've all discussed, and we are running that credit card up, so I suggest we pass this quickly.

Speaker: Councilor dunphy.

Speaker: I just wanted to express my support for this. Also, while this is a dramatic increase from where we are now, it is worth noting that comparable cities are far in excess of this. As I understand it, the city of Seattle is \$4 a ride and the city of new york is seven. I even think that I understand it that the port of Portland has their separate. If you get a pickup at the airport, if you get dropped off at the airport, it's the city of Portland. If you get picked up at the airport, they have their own and I believe it's a \$2 fee as it is right now. So I think we have a lot of room to be able to make flexibility in this, and it is still worth noting that the overall cost for an entrance to being an uber driver or a lyft driver is less than that of being a taxi driver. And the investment in there, we need to provide some level of market stability there. Because I was in city hall when the vote to implement tax happened as well, and it's time to have a bigger look at that, that arrangement. And I think this is a really good first start.

Speaker: Councilor I'm in the queue. Just to note that I did ask if it was possible to find out how many riders. Had accounts that were from Portland, meaning people

who live here and take this as part of their regular transportation, versus people who are visiting our city. And that's not data that the city has access to. I just wanted to share with folks that we don't have any way of knowing that. Councilor kanal I'm sorry, I thought you were not in the queue for this, but it looked like you were raising your hand there.

Speaker: I saw nobody else in the queue, so i'll just let it go.

Speaker: Councilor dunphy is back in the queue.

Speaker: Yeah. I'm sorry. I had one more thing to say that we have also heard directly from the uber drivers union and radio cab staff, and they are in support of this and also are interested in that, that broader conversation.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor councilor kanal. Were you in the queue or not in the queue? Okay. Councilor, councilor morillo, you've spoken to this twice.

Speaker: I just had a quick question. So are we moving the morillo amendment forward? My amendment or the verbal one? They're the same. Really? I don't.

Speaker: Believe that councilor novick has moved morillo to. And you seconded it.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Let's vote. I've tracked this.

Speaker: Let's vote.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Keelan, could you please call the roll canal.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: I Ryan.

Speaker: I know it's going to pass. I really think it deserves more dialog. And I would have liked to have had more time to look into that. So I'm usually a no on floor amendments.

Speaker: No. Koyama lane.

Speaker: Yes. Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick i.

Speaker: Clark.

Speaker: As much as I want more money for transportation, I'm very concerned about this. I'm going to vote no.

Speaker: Green.

Speaker: We got to get more people taking transit. And this is one step of the way. I vote i.

Speaker: Zimmerman.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: I dunphy. I smith no. Pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: I.

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

Speaker: Councilors. Are there any other transportation amendments that folks would like to move this evening? Councilor dunphy?

Speaker: Yes, ma'am. Thank you. I would like to move for the purposes of discussion. At the very least. Dunphy eight. But I would like to amend the text of dunphy eight as pre-filed. Dunphy eight is a motion to decrease the Portland bureau of transportation general fund dollars following a tnc fee. After the tnc fee passes, I move to. Dedicate to fully to use these new revenues to fully fund the vision zero based off of the. Reflecting this off of the koyama lane amendment regarding fully funding vision zero, they are receiving a \$677,664 reduction. I would like to earmark 677,000 \$664,000 to the vision zero programing, and a \$2 million. Decrease of interfund cash transfers within bureau of transportation to reduce general fund support by 2 million councilor.

Speaker: I just want to make sure that I'm understanding this. You are taking general fund is within the within pbot you are redirecting \$677,664 of general fund within pbot to the vision zero program, which had been previously reduced by netbackup and then backing up, backing out the balance of 2.5 million -677,000. So just under 2 million in general fund back out of pbot and to general fund discretionary sitting within our usable budgets.

Speaker: That was so much better than what I said at 11:00 at night. Yes, I am attempting to offset our general fund by using these dollars instead.

Speaker: Is there a second.

Speaker: Second?

Speaker: Keelan haley. Ruth, did you catch that? This is okay. So we are looking at dunphy eight, which was backing out 2.5 million of general fund from pbot. What councilor dunphy just did is reduced that by 677,664. This is the vision zero programing that was previously funded with cannabis tax reductions. We're buying that back up with general fund within pbot, the balance of the 2.5 million that is in dunphy, eight is being backed out of pbot and is available general fund discretionary dollars.

Speaker: It's combining.

Speaker: Got it can I jeremy's going to come up I think I'm not sure how the confusion resulted, but there's only about \$2 million of general \$2.3 million of general fund in pbot. So there's a \$200,000 discrepancy that would need to come from transportation, general transportation revenue.

Speaker: Pbot councilor dunphy.

Speaker: Are you intending to back out additional funds, or are you intending to back out all general fund dollars beyond the 677,664, whatever that balance happens to be?

Speaker: That is my intention is to back out the general funds in there, minus the full funding for vision zero.

Speaker: Can I try something here, please? I believe that councilor dunphy is proposing a floor amendment which would redirect \$677,664 of general fund within pbob to the vision zero programing line, and would back out the balance of the general fund within pbob to general fund discretionary, leaving no general fund within pbob except for that general fund, which has been redirected to vision zero programing. And whatever that number that balance is, is what you all tell us it is it appears that it's somewhere around between 1.5 and 2 million.

Speaker: Yes, about 1.6.

Speaker: 1.6 in.

Speaker: That area. There we go. Is there a second for this amendment? Okay. Councilor dunphy, are you or councilor kanal are you in the queue to discuss this?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: I'm going to move to limit debate to one round per person on this item.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Councilor smith, are you in the queue on this amendment?

Speaker: Yes, madam president, could donna powell come up to the dais? Good evening. Good morning, I guess.

Speaker: Good morning.

Speaker: I'm trying to get something clear. So how much in outreach dollars did vision zero lose? I thought it was 274,000.

Speaker: With the cannabis. For the.

Speaker: Record, this is.

Speaker: Nepal and.

Speaker: Public works for the fiscal. We are having a reduction of \$277,000 for the cannabis. Tax reduction. The \$400,000. Additional was.

Speaker: A.

Speaker: One time.

Speaker: Funding that was.

Speaker: Taken away from.

Speaker: The previous year.

Speaker: So that was a okay.

Speaker: So we're going back a year. Yes, two years actually. But for this year it was 277,000. Yes okay. That's what I needed to clear up because i, I think what they do is very important. And vision zero at this time. I mean people are. Crossing the street and they're being killed. We need to do something different, but we can't afford to take this 277 out. I'm not sure about all the other moving parts on this amendment, this floor amendment. I'm not I'm not with that, but I'm with bringing the cannabis money back. And I just wanted to make sure that I was correct because these numbers, they didn't. The numbers didn't number, I guess didn't work. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor novick.

Speaker: I support restoring the vision zero money opposed backing up the general fund. But I also just wanted to raise a question. I realized that after having said that, we need to make the tnc increase an emergency. I don't know if I specifically stated that, although I asked about it to begin with. So I wanted to ask the city attorney, do we need to take further action to make that ordinance an emergency? When the council.

Speaker: Moves back into.

Speaker: Their regular council.

Speaker: Meeting and takes up. Item 14, they will move to amend it. To change the fee to \$2.

Speaker: They will also move.

Speaker: To amend to.

Speaker: Add.

Speaker: An emergency clause.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Councilor clark.

Speaker: Thank you, madam chair. Like councilor novick, I support filling in from the cannabis tax reduction. But what? I'm having a hard time. It's late. Why are we doing what we're doing with the general fund, though? I mean, we need that general fund in pbot. So why? Why aren't we why aren't we just doing the cannabis amount?

Speaker: May I respond.

Speaker: Please go ahead, councilor.

Speaker: Thank you. As I said when I was introducing it, for the purposes of discussion, there are certainly vital needs within the general to use general fund within pbot. There are also vital needs in every corner. And also we are all voting on a thousand other things. And so I wanted to, for the purposes of this body, making the right decision.

Speaker: Well, I'm strongly.

Speaker: In support of vision zero and our whole committee has made it a priority. But I don't want to take additional general fund away from pbot. I'm fine with replacing the \$677,000, but not the rest of the general fund.

Speaker: Would you like to split it into two? Is that.

Speaker: I believe I'm looking to Robert, but I believe one could move to divide the amendment. Is that appropriate or would we?

Speaker: If an amendment has multiple.

Speaker: Parts, any member.

Speaker: May ask to divide the question.

Speaker: The maker.

Speaker: Of the.

Speaker: Motion can.

Speaker: Then decide. Which part of it is voted on first.

Speaker: So, Councilor Dunphy, I'm asking you to divide this.

Speaker: Absolutely. I'm happy to divide it. And I'd like to take the vision zero part first.

Speaker: Okay, so, Councilors, we are in debate on redirecting general fund within PBOT to vision zero programming in an amount of \$677,664. Councilor Koyama Lane, you are next in the queue.

Speaker: You all know how I feel about this. I feel very passionate. No one should die or be incapacitated from just going about their day, from moving through their neighborhood. We need to show Portlanders that we're serious about this. These are our streets. We have a responsibility to make them safe for everyone. We need to make vision zero whole. We need to make sure that we continue doing this work and we keep uplifting it. I know that our constituents matter to all of us, and this is very important. I urge you to support this and vote for it. I can say more, but it's late. I don't think I need to. Councilors. I call the vote.

Speaker: I don't see anybody else in the queue. Can we take Councilor Ryan's quick question? Can you?

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Well, since pbob folks are up here, what won't be done with the. If we direct this to vision zero, like, how many sidewalks won't be built, etc?

Speaker: Yeah. Jeremy pan with pbob again.

Speaker: So the.

Speaker: Funding right now, the general fund.

Speaker: The 2.3 million, 1 million is for derelict.

Speaker: Rv removal.

Speaker: So that funding will go away if we if we move all the funding the full 2.3. So we either redirecting the 677 division zero and then returning the rest to the general fund. It's a million and derelict rv. It's about a half.

Speaker: A million in.

Speaker: Paving gravel streets.

Speaker: Can I pause you for one minute? We've divided this. So what we have before us for a vote right now is just the 677,664 going division zero.

Speaker: So we would have to decide out of these programs which of those would.

Speaker: Lose.

Speaker: That funding would lose. Yes.

Speaker: And then the remaining.

Speaker: Funding is street cleaning Sunday parkways.

Speaker: Information, though I thought we just increased the fee. So I thought the point of this was we increased the fee to pay for these programs. So I don't see why it would be taking from other things. When we're adding revenue.

Speaker: There are some limitations to what those tnc fees can be used for. Are there items that are currently general fund funded that the tnc fees could offset?

Speaker: The tnc.

Speaker: Fees are going into general transportation revenues. I know they sound a lot like general fund revenues, but they're they're separate. The general transportation revenues can be spent on these particular programs as well. They could also be spent on vision zero work if you wanted to keep the general fund for these programs.

Speaker: Okay. Councilors, it looks like a number of other people just got in the queue. And I'm hoping that we are moving toward a vote on this. Councilor Ryan, are you in the queue on this councilor green, are you in the queue on this councilor green?

Speaker: I just want to flag that. I think I heard councilor novick say earlier that he was going to introduce an ordinance next week to relax the use restrictions on tnc fees.

Speaker: Councilor zimmermann.

Speaker: I think we've worked really hard to combat the issue of people dumping their rvs in our community. I think the mayor was smart to increase the fee, to tow them and destroy them, and end the fact that most of them are just drug dens right now. I am not willing to give up those sacred general fund dollars for something that is about the livability and safety in this community, which is the number one thing that we've heard in the majority of our polls. So i, I hate that these two things are being pitted together, and I and I'm frustrated by that. But hearing what it will be given up with the few bucks that are in general fund and transportation, I'm not sure I'm there.

Speaker: I just want to clarify. Did we also hear that general transportation revenues, which we've just increased, could be used for many of those programs that you listed?

Speaker: That's correct.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: So let me let me clarify. So general transportation dollars for maintenance stuff is now going to be used to. For the rv destruction program that the mayor has funded.

Speaker: We can use those. And we. Currently we currently use those as well for part of the program costs.

Speaker: And what was the reason then that general fund was used to? Because I was under the impression that that's why general fund had to be put into that bureau.

Speaker: Historically, the general fund has pitched in for derelict rvs just as to reduce the impact on transportation. So transportation puts in funding for the program. The general fund is also putting in \$1 million of one time in this particular year for the program.

Speaker: I, i, I appreciate that thank you for helping me clarify. I think this falls in this category of, you know, getting rid of the program to tow rvs or whatever it is. I wish we could be more specific about what an impact would have if we're going to pull out this stuff in the quite literally, the 11th hour. And so it's hard to make it's hard to make decisions like that when it's just a everything kind of goes down. Everything kind of goes down is exactly what I've talked about from the very beginning, which is let's do some stuff well and let's stop doing some other stuff really poorly. And I think millicent came up because she probably has something very powerful to say.

Speaker: Director williams, would you like to give us some sense of what might happen if we were to take this action? Then we will move on to the last two people in the queue, go to a vote and get to finalizing our actions for this meeting.

Speaker: Yes, and I will.

Speaker: Try to do.

Speaker: So very quickly.

Speaker: For the record.

Speaker: Millicent Williams, director of the Portland.

Speaker: Bureau of.

Speaker: Transportation.

Speaker: I just wanted.

Speaker: To share that.

Speaker: The earlier.

Speaker: Conversation that.

Speaker: We were having.

Speaker: About the increase in. Tnc fees would generate roughly \$5 million.

Speaker: Of which. The sorry, I'm.

Speaker: Trying.

Speaker: To talk as quickly. As I.

Speaker: Can as well.

Speaker: The proposed.

Speaker: Increase to \$2 in.

Speaker: The tnc fee would would.

Speaker: Result in an additional \$5 million. In what would be considered general transportation revenue. That would go to the bureau specifically.

Speaker: And could. Be used for.

Speaker: Vision zero and.

Speaker: Other activities that are.

Speaker: Related specifically to the.

Speaker: Transportation bureau.

Speaker: If we.

Speaker: Were to.

Speaker: Address the issue. In terms of reducing general fund. As the councilor has recommended, which is an option, of course, yes, it.

Speaker: Would have.

Speaker: An immediate and direct impact on some of those very limited.

Speaker: Ways that we are.

Speaker: Using general.

Speaker: Fund within.

Speaker: The bureau.

Speaker: And most of those things are for livability. We do not use general fund within the bureau. For things like planning. It is maintenance and operations, the very basic things that we do.

Speaker: So that would be the.

Speaker: Impact that we.

Speaker: Would feel. But of course.

Speaker: That is.

Speaker: What we.

Speaker: Are instructed to do or directed to do. We will make the adjustments.

Speaker: But we would have to make cuts.

Speaker: In other places.

Speaker: Councilor novick.

Speaker: I just wanted to know. I mean, I'm excited about the vision zero money, but it seems to me maybe that the simplest thing to do is to not mess with the general fund amount. And now that we have an extra \$5 million, come back on June

11th and figure out how to spend it on vision zero and a few other things too. Does that make sense? Director Williams.

Speaker: Yes it does.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Other option councilor Koyama Lane.

Speaker: I want to remind everyone that last year, 58 people were killed in traffic crashes in all of our districts. I don't love that. Right now, vision zero is being pitted against livability. I did wait to bring this amendment forward until we voted to increase the TNC fees, which we did. It's going to result in 5 million extra, we know that. I think this is an important amendment to show our constituents that we care about making our streets safe.

Speaker: Councilors, I see that people keep getting in the queue, and I just want to remind us that I need to move us very quickly into wrapping up this meeting, because we have a number of votes we have to take. Still, councilor Smith, did you have a you did limit debate? You're right. We've heard from councilor Smith, I believe and I believe we've heard from councilor Morillo on this. Okay.

Speaker: That's what.

Speaker: I was.

Speaker: Going for. Councilors, I believe we are going to move to a vote. Keelan, could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Canal?

Speaker: Just clarifying. We're voting on the vision zero part of the amended Dunphy.

Speaker: Yes, the vision zero portion.

Speaker: Thank you. For the sake of moving this along, I won't do a long speech, but thank you so much to councilor koyama lane for your leadership on this. And I vote aye.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: Yeah. Pedestrian safety. I actually think this could be a big mistake, because I'm hearing that we'll have to pull money from the general fund to do some of the maintenance work that's necessary. And so I'm going to vote no.

Speaker: Koyama lane. I morillo.

Speaker: We increase, we increase tnc fees so that we could do transformative things like this. And being able to walk safely in your neighborhood is a livability issue.

Speaker: I novick.

Speaker: I am totally prepared to vote on June 11th to allocate 677,000 of the 5 million that we're raising to vision zero. I just tired, confused. I don't want to back out of the general fund, and I think it's just easier to leave the general fund there and take this up in a couple of weeks.

Speaker: We need to.

Speaker: Vote no.

Speaker: This is a very, very high priority for the transportation infrastructure committee. We voted on it. We had a celebration, a lot of testimony. So I'm voting yes.

Speaker: Green.

Speaker: Ditto. Yes.

Speaker: Zimmerman.

Speaker: No. I.

Speaker: Dunphy. I smith.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

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

Speaker: Councilor dunphy, in order to get through the things we need to do to close out this meeting, I'm asking if you would withdraw your motion, knowing that we can come the other half of your motion, knowing that we can come back to it on the.

Speaker: Absolutely.

Speaker: Yeah. Withdrawn.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Do we not have till midnight? I'm confused.

Speaker: We have until midnight. But we need to move back into the fee bill. Take that vote, move back into the budget bill. Take that vote. Move into prosper. Take that vote. And I am and we literally have to be closing our meeting before the clock strikes midnight. So I'm going to move us to the feeble now, councilors, I'm going to recess our meeting, our budget committee meeting, and open back up a council meeting. Councilors. I believe we have item 14 left open in our council agenda from this morning. This is the revised transportation and fee schedule. We have debated this bill. I believe we need an amendment to this bill. Would anybody like to make an amendment to the fee schedule in agenda item 14? I'm sorry. Keelan do you need to call the roll as we switch meetings, or are we okay? We're all here.

Speaker: You are. You're fine. You can.

Speaker: Call.

Speaker: The roll if you want to verify.

Speaker: A quorum, but a quorum is present.

Speaker: Quorum is present. Great. Thank you. So, councilors, I would entertain an amendment to agenda item 14, which we left open to the fee schedule, which is in exhibit I am trying to grab which one f I'm being told from my right. Thank you. The fee schedule in exhibit f, where it says tnc fee per ride \$0.65. And in the fiscal year 2526 column to increase that to \$2. Would anybody care to make that motion?

Speaker: So moved.

Speaker: I heard a so moved from councilor canal councilor novick. Would you like to second second. Okay. Councilors, is there any debate on this motion? Councilor kanal is that why you are in the queue? Councilor green? Is that why you are in the queue seeing no debate? Keelan could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Hi, Ryan.

Speaker: Koyama lane this is to amend the fee schedule.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Maria.

Speaker: I'm sorry, I'm delirious. I.

Speaker: Novick i.

Speaker: Clark, I green. I zimmerman.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Avalos I dunphy. Yes.

Speaker: Smith.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney I councilor.

Speaker: Oh, sorry.

Speaker: The amendment is approved with nine yes votes.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilors. I would entertain a motion to attach an emergency clause to agenda item 14. Somebody might tell me where we put this emergency clause on here. I believe it would be in the ordinance language.

Speaker: The emergency clause would be added as section two to the ordinance. The emergency.

Speaker: We should spell.

Speaker: Out the reason for.

Speaker: The emergency leave.

Speaker: The emergency is in order to pass this in time to have a balanced budget. You tell me legally what emergency we.

Speaker: Move.

Speaker: We're good.

Speaker: Zimmerman. Do we have a second?

Speaker: Second?

Speaker: Robert, are you okay with the legality of that emergency clause?

Speaker: Yes. I believe the need to pass the budget on.

Speaker: A timeline.

Speaker: So that we can.

Speaker: Send this.

Speaker: To the task as an emergency.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Thank you. And I believe that was moved by Zimmerman and seconded by Novick. Any discussion? Seeing none. Keelan, could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Aye.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: Hi.

Speaker: Koyama lane i.

Speaker: Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick i.

Speaker: Clark, I green. I zimmerman.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Avalos i.

Speaker: Dunphy I smith. I pirtle-guiney. I the amendment is approved with 11 yes votes and one no vote.

Speaker: Councilors. We are back to the underlying ordinance. Is there any discussion on the underlying ordinance seeing no discussion in the queue? I will note that this is the amended agenda item 14. With the new fee schedule and an emergency clause attached to it. Keelan, could you please call the roll. Canal constitutes an emergency ordinance, I vote aye.

Speaker: I know. Koyama lane yes. Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick I clark.

Speaker: I green.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Zimmerman no.

Speaker: Avalos i. Dunphy i. Smith i. Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: Emergency ordinance is passed as amended with ten yes votes and two no votes.

Speaker: Thank you. Keelan I believe that was the last agenda item open in our meeting. Is that correct? Correct. Okay, councilors, I am going to close.

Speaker: Oh, no. The whole meeting?

Speaker: No, the council meeting. Closing the council meeting.

Speaker: I'm just checking.

Speaker: I'm just checking.

Speaker: I'm awake. Everyone had a panic attack there. We are only closing the council meeting. We are going to reopen the budget committee meeting. How's that? Do we feel a little better now? We're reopening the budget committee meeting. Councilors. I told my staff we could do all of this closeout work in a half an hour. And they told me they thought we'd need an hour at least. And I think I am going to be right on this one. If you all keep going at this speed, and if I can find my paperwork. So, ruth, could you please update us on where we stand as it relates to balance?

Speaker: Yes. Sorry, i. Believe you are still to the good on general fund discretionary by. \$309,914. So I think you need to put that into contingency.

Speaker: I'm sorry, 309,914. And then on. On overhead.

Speaker: It's. 689,426.

Speaker: And we need to do anything with that overhead to go into balance.

Speaker: Sorry.

Speaker: Hold on. I'm getting a message.

Speaker: The reason I'm asking this is that we need to send a balanced budget. So what we can do, because we're only partway through our work today, is add money that is in the positive, out of balance to contingency, knowing that we intend to pull that back out of contingency for our work when we come back on the 11th, should we need it. But that will allow us to send a balanced budget to ten to the tsk. In order to do that, we need to know what our current balance is.

Speaker: Madam president, I would move to move all remaining positive balance into contingency.

Speaker: I'm sorry, councilor kanal, I did not realize you were in the queue for this moment.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: I would like to make sure that we are still going to parks before that. So I will make the motion that councilor morillo made earlier to reorder to get into the parks section of this. And i.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Other than the votes on prosper and on the budget. What other closeout items do we need to do tonight that we need to make sure we have time for?

Speaker: You have.

Speaker: To vote.

Speaker: You have to vote to approve tax levies.

Speaker: Okay. So we need about 20 minutes probably for all of that closeout work.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Councilors. That gives us because I would like some buffer just in case. About 15 minutes of flex time right now. We are not going to get through all of the parks amendments. I would suggest that we close here. So that we can get through things on time. And I will give you all my word that my intention is, as long as I'm not overridden by your colleagues. To start with, parks, when we pick this back up on the 11th.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: No, I think we can hustle through this and we can get to the parks amendment that the entire community is waiting for.

Speaker: I don't think there's just one that the entire community is waiting for. I think there are.

Speaker: That's an increase which is more exciting.

Speaker: Councilors.

Speaker: I believe that. We need to keep moving here.

Speaker: So thank you.

Speaker: Ruth, what is our what is our out of balance right now?

Speaker: Yeah. I think you need to put \$999,340 into contingency.

Speaker: 999,340.

Speaker: So moved.

Speaker: I made a motion. Point of. Order I there is a motion already on the floor to reorder the agenda and go.

Speaker: So I was actually asking for a motion when you said you were in the queue and councilor zimmerman had said so moved. And that is something we regularly do outside of the queue.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: We have a second to move. \$999,340. Into contingency. We can then allocate those back in the adopted budget actions on the 11th, so that we can send a balanced budget to cc. Is there any discussion on the motion? The motion Keelan was made by zimmerman and seconded by councilor novick. Is there anyone in the queue for discussion? Councilor kanal. Are you in the queue for discussion? Councilor zimmerman you took yourself out of the queue. Okay. Keelan could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Ryan i.

Speaker: Koyama lane i.

Speaker: Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick i.

Speaker: Clark. I green. I zimmerman.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: I smith. I pirtle-guiney. I the amendment is approved with 11 yes votes and one no vote.

Speaker: Thank you. So we have. Switching here. Director levine. I am not finding the script for the next portion that we need to do here.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Can you help me out? I apologize.

Speaker: You need to vote on the tax levies. So. Sorry, i. Think. I have the script. Sorry. I think you need to vote to update the change memo, which is attachment b and c.

Speaker: Rate.

Speaker: To reflect the amendments that have been approved tonight.

Speaker: So, councilors, I would entertain a motion to update amendments b and c to reflect the amendments that were adopted this evening.

Speaker: So moved.

Speaker: Moved by canal. Seconded by green. Is there any discussion? Okay. Seeing none canal. Is that what you. Okay. Keelan, can you please call the roll?

Speaker: Canal i.

Speaker: Ryan,

Speaker: I. Koyama lane i. Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick i.

Speaker: Mark.

Speaker: I green hi zimmerman.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Carlos i.

Speaker: Dunphy i.

Speaker: Smith i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i. Motion carries with 12 yes votes.

Speaker: Okay councilors we need to vote to approve the amended budget. So I would entertain a motion to approve the budget as amended. I will note that we know that we have much more work to do on this, but it is in a state where it is balanced and we can send it to. Tsk.

Speaker: So moved. Thank you. I'd like to speak to it.

Speaker: Wait. What do.

Speaker: We need to approve? The amended budget? There's an asterisk here because we know that we are going to further amend it later. But in order to send it to. Tsk.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: So you're trying to close.

Speaker: This out?

Speaker: You're trying to close it out.

Speaker: Closes it for tonight.

Speaker: We are at 1123. We have the right to be here till midnight. We have one balanced amendment. 2 million from police to 2 million to parks maintenance, which still has not been filled, by the way. So we don't have to close this meeting right now at all.

Speaker: Councilors, do we have a motion?

Speaker: I made the motion and I'd like to speak.

Speaker: To it.

Speaker: Councilor. So we have a motion from canal and a second from zimmerman. Councilor kanal. Please speak to your motion.

Speaker: I withdraw the motion and yield to councilor avalos.

Speaker: I still motion it then.

Speaker: I already had the floor and i.

Speaker: Yield it.

Speaker: He had the floor and yielded councilor zimmerman. Councilor avalos.

Speaker: I would like to make a motion to move. Avalos.

Speaker: One second.

Speaker: Okay. We have a motion and a second to move. Avalos one.

Speaker: Councilor.

Speaker: Speak to your amendment.

Speaker: All right. Thank you. I know we are at the end here, but this feels like an important vote. This is the increase to the police increases credit to councilor kanal that terminology. Number one, this is not about reducing police effectiveness. It is about a balanced approach to public safety that includes well maintained parks where families feel safe gathering, a park with working facilities, proper lighting and regular maintenance is a safe park and that makes a safe community. This funding preserves the safety infrastructure that our neighborhoods depend on, especially district one, which is being disproportionately hurt by the maintenance cuts. I was really disheartened to see that two parks that we haven't even cut the ribbon to open are getting cut all their maintenance before they even open. When a park bathroom is closed due to plumbing issues or or playground, residents lose access to the public spaces they deserve. Right now, Portland police has 90 vacant positions while successfully reducing crime rates, and this amendment redirects the one time funds that they were increased by above their base budget that would

likely remain unspent due to ongoing recruitment challenges. I'm going to leave it at that. I think it's pretty self-explanatory.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: And I guess. Do I need a second?

Speaker: You do need a second.

Speaker: Have a second. Oh, I guess hold on. One more thing. The last thing I'll say is I would like to thank councilor morillo. We are teaming up on this. So avalos one and morillo one are one. And I also want to give a shout out to councilor novick, who also had been proposing similar ideas to this to be able to fund our maintenance needs. So. And now I'm done. Thank you.

Speaker: I'm going to ask everybody to limit themselves to one time in the queue. We need to move quickly. This has been proposed and seconded. Councilor novick, are you in the queue on this amendment?

Speaker: Yes. First of all, a question for the budget director. I had a confusing conversation about the police. \$2 million. That's a swap with something in the \$2 million. That's a pure one time increase. And I just want to make sure that this is 2 million. That's the pure one time increase.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Yeah. There is a one time increase of 2 million.

Speaker: Okay. And I just wanted to say that I personally would rather we be increasing the police budget. I think that we could use a dedicated burglary unit, but I can't accept having all most of the cuts fall on parks maintenance and increasing the police budget. When we were slashing parks, maintenance did not sit well with me. I also want to say, however, note an interesting conversation I had with the Portland chamber yesterday where they said, interestingly, that they'd been misquoted. They're not unalterably opposed to an increased parks levy, but

they sort of suggested that their support for a levy might be conditioned on the discussions about the police budget. So I told them, that's very interesting. Let's have some discussions over the next couple of weeks.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilors. I am in the queue. I agree with much of what councilor novick said. I don't want to be pitting these things against each other. Unfortunately, it cuts budget, makes tough decisions. There are a lot of proposals that have been brought forward for funding parks maintenance. I would like to find a way to fund parks maintenance. I am not interested in cutting police budgets to fund parks maintenance. Until we have looked at other options to see whether those other options have legs, have support or not. Therefore, I will be a no on this amendment tonight. Councilor morillo you're in the queue.

Speaker: So what I'm hearing from councilor novick is that apparently the Portland metro chamber gets to run this town and tell everybody under vague threat what we can or cannot do with our budget. This is not a cut to police. There will not be a single officer laid off. This was a \$2 million increase to the police budget, which no other bureau received at this time. They have 91 fully funded vacant positions. You have been one of the leaders on this discussion. I would hope that one measly call with a metro chamber wouldn't shiver your timbers so much.

Speaker: That.

Speaker: You couldn't vote with us. I really hope that we can just.

Speaker: Get this done.

Speaker: Come on, novick, come on. Come on.

Speaker: Councilor Ryan.

Speaker: Yeah. Thank you, madam president. Earlier today, we heard from chief bob day on this on the topic of cuts to police. And I'm. I would like to see mike

myers. Are you still on the in the queue? Yes, yes. Do you see myers? Can you please tell us what impact this will have on police operations and services?

Speaker: So.

Speaker: The chief may or may not be in the audience, but I would like to redirect to him. But ultimately, you know, I'm not in favor of reducing funding from one public safety bureau. To fund another. The mayor's proposed budget does an excellent job in balancing the need to maintain core services, with the need to create sustainability around new initiatives that are showing results like cease fire. So I think we have an opportunity to talk about this. I do think there will be an impact. I'd like to turn it over to the budget team. If they have any other comments about the impacts on the reduction for the police budget. If there's someone there present that can talk about that from the police bureau.

Speaker: If elizabeth coming.

Speaker: Oh, no.

Speaker: I was just going to say chief jay is going to come on. So I will let.

Speaker: Him take it away.

Speaker: Chief, thank you for joining us. Are you do you were you here for the question?

Speaker: Yes I was. Okay. Can you hear me?

Speaker: All right, we can.

Speaker: Go ahead, chief.

Speaker: All right.

Speaker: Guys.

Speaker: Chief, you're cutting in and out now.

Speaker: Yeah. Thank you. Yeah, I apologize. I left a little bit early and been having the conversation. I had to leave a little bit early times over the last several weeks.

Clearly, some of the councilors did not either respect or trust the responsibility given to me in my role as chief of police. This is significant effort that we've been making over the last 20 months, I think demonstrates a high level of accountability and respect for the wish of Portlanders across the board. As we partner with numerous folks inside and outside of law enforcement and across the community to help restore public safety as it is individual and unique to each person and each district. I understand that, chief.

Speaker: Chief, we are very short on time, and I believe the question before us is what the impact on the ground would be of a reduction like this on the force, and I'm hoping that you can answer that question. For us.

Speaker: It is the it is the answer that I have been sharing that there will be a reduction in services, how those services will show up. I don't know yet because I don't know how much money and what the impact is going to be at the end of the budget cycle, but I can tell you that it will be a reduction of services. The mayor up this \$2 million to help us support with recruitment and hiring, and so that will be impacted. And also the ongoing support for some of the specific crime reduction plan that we're doing so that those will will be decreased. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Chief Ryan, did you have additional comments?

Speaker: Well, I'm just I want to hear from my district one councilors. Also. How will you explain this to your. Constituents?

Speaker: Councilor the district, one can get in the queue to respond to this.

Speaker: I'm curious how they're going to explain this to their constituents, who overwhelmingly. I'm like all of my constituents I talk to in storefronts who will be very, very disappointed if we take this action at this time.

Speaker: Councilor zimmerman.

Speaker: Thanks. I have never seen a City Council or county commission in my life be so giddy to cut public safety. This is this is not a laughing matter. It's 1130 at night and I know that folks want to have fun, but this is serious stuff. This is a city who was rocked five years ago. This is a city who has difficulty retaining officers. This is a city who has built back over the last five years. This is a city who has renewed its investment in the Portland police because we know after their response, job, the next most important job that I've asked the chief to do is increase retention and increase recruitment to fill these vacancies. Right now is not the reason. It is not the time to cut public safety. It is not the time to cut police officers. Yes, there are vacancies, but there are multiple other offers out here to backfill the parks. We are choosing to keep \$100 million in contingency in the pcef fund when pcef is already funding so much of parks, they can take on a little bit more so that they can fill that vacancy or excuse me, that backlog of maintenance. We are pitting parks against police, and those are the two things that Portlanders want right now. They don't have to be pitted together. This is a move. This council is ready to cut it. Councilor Ryan is correct.

Speaker: Please don't impugn your colleague's.

Speaker: Motives and impugn any motives. What I'm saying is that this council has been giddy to cut police all day long to get to this vote at the 1135 point. This is not necessary. We can backfill parks with many other amendments that have been proposed. I hope you will consider those instead.

Speaker: Councilor clark.

Speaker: Thank you, madam chair. This is not amusing to me. There's been a lot of hyperbole that I don't appreciate. I think we are. Absolutely. If you vote for this, we are absolutely sending the wrong signal to the public and to the rest of the country that watches us. We're turning the corner right now, and this is going backwards. I

want to restore the transit police. I want to restore traffic enforcement. I want to restore or build a burglary unit.

Speaker: And this is.

Speaker: What people want. So I don't find it amusing. It's very difficult for me. I don't want to send the wrong signal. And I want people to feel safe. I'll leave it at that.

Speaker: Councilor koyama lane.

Speaker: I want people to feel safe too. That resonates. I would like director long to come up and paint the picture for us of what the cuts look like, as briefly as possible for our constituents.

Speaker: Director long, please do this in two minutes or less. We are stretching thin the time that our staff can be here to support us. I'm sorry.

Speaker: Thank you. Council.

Speaker: For the.

Speaker: Record.

Speaker: Adena long, director.

Speaker: Of Portland parks.

Speaker: And recreation.

Speaker: Proposed budget cuts to.

Speaker: For fiscal.

Speaker: Year 2526.

Speaker: Will significantly reduce. The staff.

Speaker: Needed to. Maintain parks, natural areas.

Speaker: Trails, community gardens.

Speaker: And community.

Speaker: Center and.

Speaker: Other recreational.

Speaker: Facilities.

Speaker: Without adequate personnel.

Speaker: We face declines.

Speaker: In basic services like.

Speaker: Litter removal.

Speaker: Restroom cleaning. Play equipment, lighting, fencing.

Speaker: Amenity repairs.

Speaker: Fire risk, mowing.

Speaker: And ada. Barrier removal.

Speaker: This will directly.

Speaker: Impact public.

Speaker: Safety.

Speaker: Cleanliness, accessibility. And our.

Speaker: Ability to.

Speaker: Manage.

Speaker: The.

Speaker: Maintenance workload.

Speaker: Cutting staff now means. Higher costs.

Speaker: Later, as.

Speaker: Deferred maintenance leads.

Speaker: To broken equipment. Asset failure, deteriorating.

Speaker: Trails.

Speaker: Unsafe structures.

Speaker: And emergency repairs. These reductions will also.

Speaker: Slow our response to storm damage, vandalism.

Speaker: And safety hazards while deepening.

Speaker: Inequities in park access across all of our communities. Protecting maintenance.

Speaker: Personnel is. A direct investment.

Speaker: In public.

Speaker: Health, safety.

Speaker: And the long term.

Speaker: Stewardship of our parks. I could go on about external materials and services. Which is a. Part of the maintenance reductions. This would cause our maintenance teams.

Speaker: To be.

Speaker: Severely limited, and our land.

Speaker: Service and.

Speaker: Professional repair.

Speaker: And maintenance services, and those are tradespeople. The ability. To perform essential upkeep across.

Speaker: Our.

Speaker: Parks. Facilities and natural areas. This funding supports critical. Tasks like restroom.

Speaker: Cleaning, graffiti.

Speaker: Removal.

Speaker: Roof repairs. And the. Maintenance of dog parks, playgrounds, trails, lighting and more. Without it, even basic repairs.

Speaker: And upkeep. Will stall, leading to faster.

Speaker: Deterioration of public assets.

Speaker: Increased safety risks.

Speaker: And higher long term costs.

Speaker: These reductions will.

Speaker: Directly impact park quality. Community use, and our.

Speaker: Ability to.

Speaker: Protect public investments.

Speaker: Sustaining this funding.

Speaker: Is vital for Portland's parks to.

Speaker: Remain clean.

Speaker: Safe and. Functional for all. Happy to take any other questions?

Speaker: Thank you. Director. Councilor canal I don't believe you've spoken yet.

Speaker: I have not yet. Madam president, I have a quick question just on the subject of where this money would go, and I think my understanding is for councilor novick, my understanding is that your support is contingent on this going to parks maintenance. Is that accurate? Yes. Thank you. So what I'm just going to speak to the parks maintenance side, as I've been seeing here. We've we've talked about picnic tables and benches that have rotted. We've talked about graffiti. We've talked about grass and weeds. We talked about a fire hazard, which is a very obvious public safety need in the community. We've talked about reducing restroom cleanings and turf maintenance and facility repairs, repairs and also taking out the trash. These are the things that that really affect people who go to parks. I'll note that in all the information that I've received, both anecdotally and in terms of surveys, not only the entire city, but district two in particular cares a great deal about their parks. We have separate issues to deal with at parks, with the recreation funding. That's really important with the park ranger funding, which is really important to. I've often said that a when most people are describing the ideal response to a low acuity public safety issue, they're talking about park rangers, but

they're also talking about the conditions that allow people to thrive. And, you know, we had a meeting with the with the parks alliance, and they asked what the mission of Portland parks were. And I said, the best way I can explain it is it's the gap between surviving in this city and thriving in this city is where the parks bureau fits in. It's the thing that makes life a little bit better and more than just the baseline. So, you know, working on that has really, really been influential as I've dug into that, preparing for this budget. The other thing that I'd like to point out, I didn't study math. I know there's some phds up here, but 316 and 316 appear to me to be the same number and not higher or lower than each other. And so characterizing something that went from 316 to 318 and then would go back to 316 as a cut, is disingenuous. Okay. Incredibly disingenuous. And we deserve as Portlanders, everybody out here deserves that. We don't mislead them about what the numbers here are. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor smith. I don't believe you've spoken to this yet.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. You know, maya angelou said, when people show you who they are, believe them. I've been fighting for cip ever since I got here so we can have safe streets, safe sidewalks, and I didn't once think about taking away money from the police to pay for my sidewalks, because people in district one. They believe that police don't come quick enough. They believe that we should have twice the number of police that we have. And so having this conversation around parks, police, sidewalks, safety, you know, vision zero, all those kinds of things, we can have that conversation, but we can't start to defund the police in little ways and keep picking off of it. Keep picking off of it. Everybody knows it takes 18 to 20 months to hire someone. And it is my understanding that we have about 2000 applicants in the queue right now for police officers. If we start

picking off of the budgets, we're going to have a real problem, and I'm not ready to do that right now. Thank you, madam president.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor, councilors. Everybody else in the queue, I believe, has already spoken to this measure. Councilor avalos, you introduced this. I had asked that we speak once to this so that we can be done by midnight, out of respect for our staff. So I'm going to ask that we move to a vote at this time.

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: We're voting.

Speaker: Thank you. Yeah.

Speaker: Can we please just vote? We've all had a chance to.

Speaker: Speak now. What's up y'all?

Speaker: We need to be done in 16 minutes. If we have a budget to vote.

Speaker: On.

Speaker: I'll do one sentence. If this was a cut, then this would be a different conversation. But again, going up and then saying no, let's not go up is not a cut. I vote I Ryan.

Speaker: I was elected in September of 2020. It was a really difficult vote. And the political realities were, you know, you better go ahead and cut the police, defund the police. That was a slogan. I felt like I got it right, even though I took a lot of heat for it. And we stopped the bleeding. We stopped the cuts. We've been slowly building back over the last four years. You've seen the culture respond. You're seeing more and more people on the streets saying, thank you. We're starting to finally get responses. When I went around to every small business storefront that you approved earlier, the grants, they all said, do not cut the police. This council will make a big, big mistake that you will regret if we go ahead and put this through, residents and businesses will continue to leave. The tax base will continue to erode.

There will be a decrease in public services because this is connected to our economic development. That's where we get our revenue. Councilor decline in public satisfaction. So I really hope that this council blocks this shortsighted amendment, and we get to fund parks maintenance through the levy that we're going to talk about later. And I deserved every second of what I just use my time for.

Speaker: No koyama lane.

Speaker: This is not a cut, I vote i.

Speaker: Morillo police have had 91 fully funded vacant positions for the past five years, so even if it takes a few months to hire, they should have already done that by now. They are unable to hire for other reasons. I also want to point out that morillo amendment seven talks about the police special revenue fund, which currently holds around \$6 million in asset forfeiture fees that the police can use to fill some of their budget. We have confirmed that with city attorneys. So when they say that there is no money, there is money for them. And this increase does not have to go to police, it could go to parks. And people are asking for these park services. So with that I vote.

Speaker: I novick.

Speaker: If the mayor had proposed cutting the police budget by \$6 million and adding 2 million in general fund to the parks budget, I'd be voting to restore some police funding tonight I vote i.

Speaker: Clark.

Speaker: This is absolutely a false choice. I vote no.

Speaker: Green. I zimmerman.

Speaker: We chose to cut parks maintenance at the expense or excuse me to keep tree code regulators who we've heard about. That same recommendation came

from the same director who proposed in her preliminary budget to cut sports. Mayor, you got played. They knew that this was going to happen. You got played I vote no.

Speaker: In general, I would really appreciate not being districts blamed. I know my district. I knock on those doors. They want to be safe. I want them to be safe. My entire agenda is about safety. I just don't believe that a police budget that has over 300 million, when we're in a dire budget needs to have an increase. So I vote to increase by 2 million. I vote i.

Speaker: Dunphy.

Speaker: I've asked repeatedly what these funds are designated to be used for. I have heard broadly around call time, but I've not been able to understand what that means because everybody agrees that the academy is full. It takes 18 months to get an officer hired, and we have a 91 vacancy or 80 plus vacancies. And I don't know, one has been able to explain to me how these \$2 million will actually be used this year, I vote i.

Speaker: Smith no. Pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: I was prepared to reconsider this after considering other options. No.

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

Speaker: Councilors, we need to approve this budget. The votes are here to approve this budget. And then we need to approve the proper budget. So I would entertain an amendment to approve the budget, to be able to send it to tsk.

Speaker: Madam chair.

Speaker: With the addition.

Speaker: Of that amendment.

Speaker: We need to reconsider.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: I would.

Speaker: I. Believe it would be in order for.

Speaker: A motion to.

Speaker: Approve the adjustments in attachments b, c, and d of the of the memo.
That would.

Speaker: Just again.

Speaker: Yeah, just do we.

Speaker: Need to repeat that work because we were interrupted last time.
Fantastic. Councilors. We now have 11 minutes. I hope that no one speaks as they explain their votes. I would point out that that is against robert's rules, though I generally do not enforce that. I would entertain a motion to amend the attachments, the exhibits necessary to reflect the changes in our budget.

Speaker: So moved.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: I see no discussion. Keelan can you please call the roll?

Speaker: Council?

Speaker: I Ryan. So this is on the entire package. Based on all the amendments that were passed tonight.

Speaker: We are not yet voting on the budget. We are voting to update the attachments to reflect the new changes to the budget.

Speaker: So this is a technical.

Speaker: This is a technical vote.

Speaker: After what we just experienced. I had to have that explained to.

Speaker: Me, understood.

Speaker: That was devastating.

Speaker: I koyama lane I morillo. I novick.

Speaker: I, i.

Speaker: Green.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Zimmerman no.

Speaker: Avalos i.

Speaker: Dunphy. I smith. No pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: I'm changing my vote. No.

Speaker: Elana I voted I what are we at.

Speaker: Elana amendment or no. The motion carries with nine yes votes and three no votes.

Speaker: Thank you councilors. I would now entertain a motion to pass our budget.

Speaker: So moved.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Moved by avalos, seconded by councilor novick seeing no discussion in the queue. Keelan, can you please call the roll?

Speaker: No.

Speaker: This is on the whole thing.

Speaker: This is on the budget as it currently stands to send to tsk. Knowing that we will reopen it on the 11th.

Speaker: I will have more to say when we get to the full thing then and I will for the interest of time, vote.

Speaker: I thank you Ryan.

Speaker: Yeah, based on the cuts to police, I vote no.

Speaker: Koyama lane i.

Speaker: Morillo negotiating with your fellow councilors is part of the job i.

Speaker: Novick I clerk.

Speaker: No green. I zimmerman. No avalos. I dunphy. I smith. No pirtle-guiney. I motion carries with eight yes votes and four no votes.

Speaker: Thank you. Do we have.

Speaker: Anything else we need to do in this meeting before I close it and move us back into our prosper Portland?

Speaker: You have to read the paragraph about the tax levies and vote on that.

Speaker: We voted on the tax levies. Do we need to do it again?

Speaker: I do not believe you've done that yet.

Speaker: Okay. So, colleagues, the city shall levy its full permanent rate of \$4 and 57 and 7/10 cent per thousand dollars of assessed value, and \$32,589,672 for the payment of voter approved general obligation, bond, principal and interest. Is this the right paragraph? Ruth, you look like this is the wrong paragraph.

Speaker: It's the right paragraph, the wrong number. I don't know why. 33,570,654 of voter approved.

Speaker: I have different numbers. So I'm going to let you read the numbers.

Speaker: Okay. Keep going.

Speaker: And 243. 251,613,821 for the obligations for fire and police disability and retirement fund. \$0.80 per thousand of assessed value for the parks local option levy. We doing okay there? 40 and 40.2 \$0.06 per thousand of assessed value for the children's levy. We're doing okay. Furthermore, the city shall levy the amounts listed in attachment e for urban renewal collections. I would entertain a motion to approve the tax levy.

Speaker: So moved.

Speaker: Point of.

Speaker: Order, councilor.

Speaker: I thought we had \$100 million variance.

Speaker: This is just to approve tax levies. You have to vote to approve tax levies in order to levy taxes.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Moved by councilor kanal. Do we have a second?

Speaker: Second?

Speaker: Thank you, councilor dunphy. Seeing no discussion in the queue. Keelan, can you please call the roll? We are voting to levy taxes.

Speaker: Councilors canal.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: I. Koyama lane i. Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick i.

Speaker: Mark i.

Speaker: Green. I zimmerman. Hi avalos. I dunphy I smith. I pirtle-guiney. I motion carries with 12 yes votes okay.

Speaker: Director levine, my script says that you discuss next steps. But we are at 1154. So I'm going to propose we skip that for now. Thank you. Is there any reason I cannot close our budget committee hearing?

Speaker: Go ahead.

Speaker: Okay. I have the go ahead from our budget director and our attorneys counselors. I'm going to close our meeting as the budget committee of the Portland City Council. We are moving back into the still open meeting of the prosper budget committee. Councilors, we have an amended prosper budget. I am not sure that we need to make any other special changes here. I believe we have adopted the amendments that we need to. So I would entertain a motion to approve the

prosper budget and send it to tcc as well. Moved by councilor morillo, seconded by councilor canal seeing no discussion in the queue. Keelan can you please call the roll?

Speaker: No thank you i.

Speaker: Ryan i.

Speaker: Koyama lane. I morillo. I novick.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Mark no.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Zimmerman i. Avalos i. Dunphy i.

Speaker: Smith i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: Motion carries with ten yes votes and two no votes.

Speaker: Councilors I will close. Yes. Anything else we need to do for prosper seeing nothing else from our budget director. Seeing nothing else from our attorney. I am looking to shabri anything else you need from us for your budget? I will close the budget here. The meeting of the budget committee for prosper Portland councilors. We have closed out all of our meetings. We have done our work for tonight. We will follow up with next steps on the budget sometime later this week. Thank you all for your diligence, time, patience and work together throughout the day.