

Portland City Council Agenda Written Testimony  
Document Number 2025-137

	Name or Organization	Position	Comments	Attachment	Created
1	Anonymous		Recent changes were proposed to the Title 11 fee scheduals to ensure there were no penalties for doing work without a permit. Please ensure this fee scheduals also has no penalties for doing work without a permit.  I also see there is a few for administrative review and appeals. Please ensure these fees are reduced to zero. It is inappropriate to have a fee stopping a community member from identifying a City error.	No	04/06/25 1:04 PM
2	Anonymous	Support with changes	We must increase cost recovery from permitting. I don't think these fee increases are enough. Better yet, the city should exercise more discretion before waiving enforcement fines. That's a big issue in and of itself. Our city lets deadbeat property owners get away with code violations for years, then waives fines. So the cost of all that enforcement, etc., is basically paid by us all instead of the property owner. Also we must start doing rental inspections and charge landlords a fee to have all rental properties inspected. The city needs dedicated rental inspectors.	No	05/05/25 5:16 PM
3	Irvington Community Association - Land Use Committee	Oppose	The Planning and Development Department has announced a 5% increase in permit fees beginning this July. The Irvington Community Association (ICA) is deeply concerned about the impact this will have on homeowners seeking Historic Resource reviews for small projects — particularly "Type 1" reviews, which cover straightforward improvements like window replacements.  These reviews were originally created to make historic compliance quick and affordable. For many years, the fee held steady at \$250. That changed recently: first to nearly \$900, and now with this latest increase to a minimum of \$1,332. For many homeowners, the cost of the permit may exceed the cost of the actual work. Which means they might not do necessary repairs, or they'll do them without following city processes.  The harm goes beyond affordability. As fees become more onerous, homeowners may be discouraged from participating in the permitting process at all. That can lead to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More unpermitted and potentially unsafe work</li> <li>• Alterations that violate historic preservation rules</li> <li>• Lost city revenue from discouraged applicants</li> <li>• Increased enforcement burden on a Design and Historic Resources Team already operating with half its previous staff</li> </ul> In short, this fee hike undermines its own goals. Instead of supporting preservation and city revenue, it risks doing the opposite — pushing people away from compliance and creating more code enforcement work, less permitting work — and affording the city less resources to handle any of it.  The ICA strongly urges the City to freeze permit fees for small-project Historic Resource reviews at current levels. This is the best way to promote safe, legal, and preservation-aligned improvements — while ensuring the City can provide adequate oversight in accordance with both local and federal preservation policies.	No	05/05/25 6:41 PM

Name or Organization	Position	Comments	Attachment	Created
4 Bret Born- Rec Rehab Consulting DBA: Ascend Dispensary	Oppose	Implementing a 2% increase in cannabis licensure fees in Portland is an unfair burden on cannabis operators already struggling in a saturated market. With existing financial pressures and razor thin margins, this additional cost could exacerbate the challenges faced by cannabis businesses. As you know Portland is the only municipality that has a cannabis license fee and there is no added value. Unlike the State license fee which provides licensees with an inventory management software as well as a multitude of educational opportunities. The City of Portland licensure fees have zero added value. More importantly, the city's reliance on state decisions creates additional uncertainty and delays, making it even more difficult for businesses to complete the City of Portland 's licensure process on time let alone plan and operate effectively. Take for instance the lawsuit I have against the State for Ballot Measure 119, because of back door politics and nepotism the State of Oregon created a red pill which in turn created a huge back log with cannabis licensure renewals. As you all know the City of Portland's cannabis licensure process is dependent on the State. If you have not cleared the State, you don't move through the city. Is there a plan in place to deal with the potentially inappropriate assessments due to the State timeline or the lack thereof? The fees may seem small to you, but I want you to consider that those increases could be applied to a new security camera to replace the damaged one from the last robbery. Or a more secure lock system for your vault room. Possibly an exterior siren to help decrease response time by about 4 hours. Instead of increasing fees, we urge the city to look at the amount of tax revenue that is generated by our industry and support the cannabis industry by providing relief and fostering a stable regulatory environment. As the longest standing CPOT member I have written policy recommendations for a fee reduction program that were approved by council only to have you increase the fees? Does this make any sense? Tip your hats to one of your top revenue generators and do the right thing and take the 2% off your budget proposal.	No	05/05/25 8:22 PM
5 Satchel and Cultivated Industries	Oppose	As a cannabis business owner trying to operate in the City of Portland, I vehemently oppose any further increases to the license and/or application fees charged to cannabis businesses. This opposition is based on a number of factors. First, very few cannabis businesses are profitable (estimated to be about 28% of businesses - leaving 72% already not breaking even). Second, the Oregon cannabis market is already suffering as a result of shrinking total revenues and increasing over-production, costs and fees. Third, cannabis businesses are already required to pay the City of Portland more in application and license fees than to the state's principal regulator, the OLCC. The City of Portland also charges higher fees and sales taxes than any other city in the state (no other city in Oregon charges anywhere near the fees or taxes charged by Portland). Fourth, the cannabis industry pays sales taxes at the retail level but is not able to avail itself of tax deductions as a result of IRC 280(e). Other businesses, such as alcohol businesses, are charged lower application and license fees and pay no sales tax, yet are able to deduct the nominal fees they are assessed. Cannabis businesses are unable to survive such a regressive application and license fee structure. I implore the City to consider the disproportionate impact any additional fee increases will have on the cannabis industry businesses. Please, please, please do not raise the application or license fees for cannabis businesses.	No	05/08/25 3:24 PM