



[Home](#) / [Portland City Council](#)

City Council

City Council holds regular meetings at 9:30 a.m. on the first Wednesday and 6:00 p.m. on the third Wednesday of each month. If there is sufficient business, additional meetings are held the following Wednesday or Thursday at 2:00 p.m.

[July 16-17, 2025 Council Agenda \(Special and Regular Meeting\)](#)

5813

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

Wednesday, July 16, 2025 2:30 pm

Session Status: Adjourned

Council in Attendance: Council Vice President Tiffany Koyama Lane

Councilor Angelita Morillo

Councilor Steve Novick

Councilor Mitch Green

Councilor Eric Zimmerman

Councilor Candace Avalos

Councilor Jamie Dunphy

Councilor Loretta Smith

Councilor Sameer Kanal

Councilor Dan Ryan

Council President Elana Pirtle-Guiney

Special meeting scheduled by request of Councilors Zimmerman, Green, Koyama Lane, Dunphy, Morillo, Ryan, Novick, Smith, Avalos as required by City Code Subsection 3.02.010 D.

Council President Pirtle-Guiney presided.

Officers in attendance: Mike Porter, Deputy City Attorney; Rebecca Dobert, Acting Council Clerk

Councilor Smith arrived at 3:20 p.m.

Council recessed at 5:12 p.m.

Regular Agenda

1

[Refer to the voters a five-year local option tax levy for the November 4, 2025 election to maintain safe parks, nature, affordable recreation through 5-year levy](#) (Resolution)

Resolution number: 37710

Document number: 2025-281

Introduced by: Council President Elana Pirtle-Guiney; Councilor Steve Novick; Councilor Angelita Morillo

City department: Parks & Recreation

Time requested: 90 minutes

Council action: Adopted As Amended

Motion to amend the Resolution as shown in Green 1: Moved by Green and seconded by Dunphy. (Aye (11): Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Green, Zimmerman, Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Kanal, Ryan, Pirtle-Guiney; Absent (1): Clark)

Motion to amend the Resolution as shown in Ryan 1: Moved by Ryan and seconded by Green. (Aye (11): Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Green, Zimmerman, Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Kanal, Ryan, Pirtle-Guiney; Absent (1): Clark)

Motion to amend the Resolution as shown in Novick 1: Moved by Novick and seconded by Kanal. (Aye (11): Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Green, Zimmerman, Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Kanal, Ryan, Pirtle-Guiney; Absent (1): Clark)

Motion to amend the Resolution as shown in Kanal 1: Moved by Kanal and seconded by Dunphy. (Aye (6): Koyama Lane, Morillo, Green, Avalos, Dunphy, Kanal; Nay (5): Novick, Zimmerman, Smith, Ryan, Pirtle-Guiney; Absent (1): Clark). Motion failed to pass.

Motion to amend the Resolution as shown in Zimmerman 1: Moved by Zimmerman and seconded by Ryan. (Aye (5): Koyama Lane, Morillo, Green, Zimmerman, Smith; Nay (6): Novick, Avalos, Dunphy, Kanal, Ryan, Pirtle-Guiney; Absent (1): Clark). Motion failed to pass.

Aye (11): Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Green, Zimmerman, Avalos, Dunphy, Smith, Kanal, Ryan, Pirtle-Guiney
Absent (1): Clark

Session Status: Recessed

Council President Pirtle-Guiney presided.

Officers in attendance: Mike Porter, Deputy City Attorney; Keelan McClymont, Council Clerk

Items 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 were pulled from the consent agenda. The balance of the consent agenda was approved with a vote of aye (8): Koyama Lane, Novick, Green, Zimmerman, Avalos, Dunphy, Ryan, Pirtle-Guiney (Morillo, Clark, Smith and Kanal were absent).

Council recessed at 6:04 p.m. and reconvened at 6:18 p.m.

Councilor Kanal left at 6:04 p.m. and returned at 6:46 p.m.

Councilor Morillo left at 6:04 p.m. and returned at 7:13 p.m.

Councilor Kanal left at 6:50 p.m. and returned at 7:12 p.m.

Councilor Zimmerman left at 7:13 p.m.

Council recessed at 7:59 p.m.

Agenda Approval

2

Council action: Approved as amended

Motion to move Item 13 to the beginning of the regular agenda. Approved by unanimous consent.

Public Communications

3

[Public Comment](#) (Public Communication)

Document number: July 16, 2025 Public Communications

Time requested: 15 minutes

Council action: Placed on File

Committee Referral Report

4

[Committee referral list](#)

Time requested: 5 minutes

City Administrator Report

5

[July 2025 City Administrator Report](#) (Presentation)

Document number: 2025-282

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: City Administrator Michael Jordan

Time requested: 15 minutes

Council action: Placed on File

Consent Agenda

6

[Vacate a portion of SE Oak St between SE 37th Ave and SE Cesar E. Chavez Blvd subject to certain conditions and reservations \(VAC-10141\)](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 2025-247

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Transportation

Previous agenda item

Council action: Passed to second reading

Passed to second reading August 6, 2025 at 9:30 a.m.

7

[Declare property at an unnamed road off NE 33rd Dr as surplus and authorize the Bureau of Transportation to dispose of the property by sale to WPC Marine LLC](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 2025-250

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Transportation

Previous agenda item

Council action: Referred to Committee

Item was pulled from the consent agenda for discussion and referred to the Finance Committee.

8

[Vacate a portion of an unnamed road near the intersection of NE 33rd Dr and NE Marine Dr subject to certain conditions and reservations \(VAC-10133\)](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 2025-251

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Transportation

Previous agenda item

Council action: Referred to Committee

Item was pulled from the consent agenda for discussion and referred to the Finance Committee.

9

[Declare property located near the intersection of N Midway Ave and N Columbia Blvd as surplus property and authorize the Bureau of Transportation to dispose of the property for fair market value](#) (Ordinance)

Document number: 2025-252

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Transportation

Previous agenda item

Council action: Passed to second reading

Passed to second reading August 6, 2025 at 9:30 a.m.

10

[Appoint Cathy Keathley to the Home Forward Board of Commissioners for a term to expire July 15, 2029](#) (Resolution)

Resolution number: 37713

Document number: 2025-274

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Housing Bureau

Previous agenda item

Council action: Adopted

Item was pulled from the consent agenda for discussion.

Aye (9): Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Green, Avalos, Dunphy, Kanal, Ryan, Pirtle-Guiney

Absent (3): Clark, Zimmerman, Smith

11

[Appoint and reappoint members to the Portland Parks & Recreation Board](#) (Report)

Document number: 2025-235

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Parks & Recreation

Previous agenda item

Council action: Confirmed

Item was pulled from the consent agenda for discussion.

Motion to accept the report: Moved by Kanal and seconded by Novick.

Aye (9): Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Green, Avalos, Dunphy, Kanal, Ryan, Pirtle-Guiney

Absent (3): Clark, Zimmerman, Smith

12

[Appoint Alfonzo Moore as Commissioner of the Civil Service Board for a term to expire in June 2028](#) (Report)

Document number: 2025-253

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Human Resources

Previous agenda item

Council action: Referred to Mayor

Item was pulled from the consent agenda for discussion and referred back to Mayor Wilson's Office.

13

[Appoint Gabrielle Poccia to the Portland Committee on Community-Engaged Policing for term to expire June 26, 2027](#) (Report)

Document number: 2025-259

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: DOJ Settlement

Previous agenda item

Council action: Confirmed

Item was pulled from the consent agenda for discussion.

Motion to accept the report: Moved by Kanal and seconded by Novick.

Aye (9): Koyama Lane, Novick, Green, Zimmerman, Avalos, Dunphy, Kanal, Ryan, Pirtle-Guiney

Absent (3): Morillo, Clark, Smith

14

[Appoint members to the Planning Commission](#)(Report)

Document number: 2025-262

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Planning and Sustainability (BPS)

Previous agenda item

Council action: Confirmed

Item was pulled from the consent agenda for discussion.

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

Aye (9): Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Green, Avalos, Dunphy, Kanal, Ryan, Pirtle-Guiney

Absent (3): Clark, Zimmerman, Smith

15

[Appoint Matt Donahue to the Arts Access Fund Oversight Committee for term to expire December 31, 2028](#)
(Report)

Document number: 2025-269

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Arts & Culture

Previous agenda item

Council action: Confirmed

Item was pulled from the consent agenda for discussion.

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

Aye (9): Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Green, Avalos, Dunphy, Kanal, Ryan, Pirtle-Guiney

Absent (3): Clark, Zimmerman, Smith

Regular Agenda

16

[Amend System Development Charge Exemptions Code to add a temporary exemption for residential housing projects \(amend Code Section 17.14.070\)](#) (Ordinance)

Ordinance number: 192082

Document number: 2025-243

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

Time requested: 25 minutes

Second reading agenda item

Council action: Passed As Amended

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

Absent (2): Clark, Smith

17

[Urge the Mayor to make the City a signatory to the Swimmable Cities Charter](#) (Resolution)

Resolution number: 37711

Document number: 2025-219

Introduced by: Councilor Olivia Clark; Councilor Mitch Green

Time requested: 30 minutes

Previous agenda item

Council action: Adopted As Amended

Aye (9): Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Green, Avalos, Dunphy, Kanal, Ryan, Pirtle-Guiney

Absent (3): Clark, Zimmerman, Smith

18

[Urge the Public Works and Budget and Finance Service Areas to develop a comprehensive strategy for alternative funding for transportation and infrastructure](#) (Resolution)

Resolution number: 37712

Document number: 2025-265

Introduced by: Councilor Olivia Clark

Time requested: 40 minutes

Previous agenda item

Council action: Adopted As Amended

Aye (9): Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Green, Avalos, Dunphy, Kanal, Ryan, Pirtle-Guiney

Absent (3): Clark, Zimmerman, Smith

19

[Require City Administrator to develop Citywide Asset Management Strategy to establish priorities and practices to address asset management maturity and financial planning gaps](#) (Resolution)

Document number: 2025-194

Introduced by: Councilor Olivia Clark

Time requested: 30 minutes

Previous agenda item

Council action: Rescheduled

Session Status: Adjourned

Council in Attendance: Council Vice President Tiffany Koyama Lane

Councilor Angelita Morillo

Councilor Steve Novick

Councilor Mitch Green

Councilor Eric Zimmerman

Councilor Candace Avalos

Councilor Loretta Smith

Councilor Sameer Kanal

Councilor Dan Ryan

Council President Elana Pirtle-Guiney

Council President Pirtle-Guiney presided.

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

Councilor Ryan arrived at 2:02 p.m.

Council adjourned at 4:41p.m.

Time Certain

20

[*Amend Flood Hazard Areas Code to comply with Federal Emergency Management Agency National Flood Insurance Program Pre-Implementation Compliance Measures \(amend Code Chapter 24.50\)](#) (Emergency Ordinance)

Ordinance number: 192083

Document number: 2025-217

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Permitting & Development

Time certain: 2:00 pm

Time requested: 45 minutes

Previous agenda item

Council action: Passed As Amended

Motion to amend the Ordinance and Exhibit A as shown in Pirtle-Guiney 1: Moved by Pirtle-Guiney and seconded by Novick. (Aye (10): Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Green, Zimmerman, Avalos Smith, Kanal, Ryan, Pirtle-Guiney; Absent (2): Clark, Dunphy)

Motion to amend Directive A and add an emergency clause in order to meet FEMA's July 31, 2025, implementation deadline as shown in Pirtle-Guiney 2: Moved by Pirtle-Guiney and seconded by Ryan. (Aye (10): Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Green, Zimmerman, Avalos Smith, Kanal, Ryan, Pirtle-Guiney; Absent (2): Clark, Dunphy)

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

Absent (2): Clark, Dunphy

Regular Agenda

21

[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)

Ordinance number: 192084

Document number: 2025-197

Introduced by: Mayor Keith Wilson

City department: Planning and Sustainability (BPS)

Second reading agenda item

Council action: Passed

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

Absent (2): Clark, Dunphy

22

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

Document number: 2025-186

Introduced by: Council Vice President Tiffany Koyama Lane

Time requested: 1 hour

Previous agenda item

Council action: Passed to second reading as amended

Motion to amend Exhibit A as shown in Avalos 1: Moved by Avalos and seconded by Kanal. (Aye (6): Koyama Lane, Morillo, Green, Avalos, Kanal, Pirtle-Guiney; Nay (Novick, Zimmerman, Smith, Ryan); Absent (2): Clark, Dunphy). Motion failed to pass.

Motion to amend Exhibit A, to replace Subsection J.2 with "If the Mayor is unavailable either in person or virtually to cast the tiebreaking vote on final passage during the meeting, the result of the tied vote is deemed inconclusive. If the vote on final passage remains inconclusive at the end of the meeting, the matter will be automatically postponed and rescheduled to the next Council meeting for the sole purpose of the Mayor casting their vote. If the Mayor is not present, it would be considered a no vote as in J.3.": Moved by Koyama Lane and seconded by Novick. (Aye (7): Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Green, Avalos, Kanal, Ryan; Nay (3): Zimmerman, Smith, Pirtle-Guiney); Absent (2): Clark, Dunphy)

Motion to amend Exhibit A to restore "resolutions, reports" to Subsection J.1: Moved by Kanal and seconded by Koyama Lane. (Aye (6): Koyama Lane, Morillo, Novick, Green, Avalos, Kanal; Nay (4): Zimmerman, Smith, Ryan, Pirtle-Guiney; Absent (2): Clark, Dunphy). Motion failed to pass.

Passed to second reading as amended August 6, 2025 at 9:30 a.m.

[Reaffirm Council commitment to the Vision Zero Action Plan and convene a cross-bureau Vision Zero Task Force](#)
(Resolution)

Document number: 2025-204

Introduced Council Vice President Tiffany Koyama Lane; Councilor Angelita Morillo; Councilor Olivia Clark;
by: Councilor Mitch Green; Councilor Loretta Smith

Time requested: 45 minutes

Previous agenda item

Council action: Rescheduled

Portland City Council Special Meeting
Wednesday July 16, 2025 - 2:30 p.m.
Speaker List

Name	Title	Document Number
Elana Pirtle-Guiney	Council President	
Rebecca Dobert	Acting Council Clerk	
Tiffany Koyama Lane	Council Vice President	
Angelita Morillo	Councilor	
Steve Novick	Councilor	
Mitch Green	Councilor	
Eric Zimmerman	Councilor	
Candace Avalos	Councilor	
Jamie Dunphy	Councilor	
Loretta Smith	Councilor	
Sameer Kanal	Councilor	
Dan Ryan	Councilor	
Mike Porter	Deputy City Attorney	
Priya Dhanapal	Deputy City Administrator, Public Works	2025-281
Sonia Schmanski	Acting Director, Portland Parks & Recreation	2025-281
Jessica Green	(Testimony)	2025-281
Alyson Berman	(Testimony)	2025-281
Suenn Ho	(Testimony)	2025-281
Elizabeth Milner	(Testimony)	2025-281
KAREN CHIRRE	(Testimony)	2025-281
Jon Isaacs	(Testimony)	2025-281
Brian Owendoff	(Testimony)	2025-281
Mary Ruble	(Testimony)	2025-281
Rob Martineau	(Testimony)	2025-281
SANDEEP Divekar	(Testimony)	2025-281
Micah Meskel	(Testimony)	2025-281
Ryan Sotomayor	(Testimony)	2025-281
Leinaala Slaughter	(Testimony)	2025-281
Bob Weinstein	(Testimony)	2025-281
Ashley Murray	(Testimony)	2025-281
Jim Sjulín	(Testimony)	2025-281
Sarah Huggins	Sustainable Future Program Manager	2025-281

Portland City Council Meeting
Wednesday, July 16, 2025 - 6:00 p.m.
Speaker List

Name	Title	Document Number
Elana Pirtle-Guiney	Council President	
Keelan McClymont	Council Clerk	
Tiffany Koyama Lane	Council Vice President	
Angelita Morillo	Councilor	
Steve Novick	Councilor	
Mitch Green	Councilor	
Eric Zimmerman	Councilor	
Candace Avalos	Councilor	
Jamie Dunphy	Councilor	
Sameer Kanal	Councilor	
Dan Ryan	Councilor	
Mike Porter	Deputy City Attorney	
Andrea Haverkamp	(Public Communications)	3
Sarah Hobbs	(Public Communications)	3
Sharon Nasset	(Public Communications)	3
Jeff Kaady	(Public Communications)	3
Michael Jordan	City Administrator	2025-282
Loretta Smith	Councilor	
Keith Wilson	Mayor	2025-243
Kraig Cook	Policy Analyst, Council Operations	2025-219
Jacob Griffith	(Testimony)	2025-219
Claire Adamsick	Policy Analyst, Council Operations	2025-265
sharon nasset	(Testimony)	2025-265
Jordan Lewis	(Testimony)	2025-265
Willie Levenson	(Testimony)	2025-219
Morgan Spriggs	(Testimony)	2025-219

Portland City Council Meeting
Thursday, July 17, 2025 - 2:00 p.m.
Speaker List

Name	Title	Document Number
Elana Pirtle-Guiney	Council President	
Keelan McClymont	Council Clerk	
Tiffany Koyama Lane	Council Vice President	
Angelita Morillo	Councilor	
Steve Novick	Councilor	
Mitch Green	Councilor	
Eric Zimmerman	Councilor	
Candace Avalos	Councilor	
Loretta Smith	Councilor	
Sameer Kanal	Councilor	
Linly Rees	Chief Deputy City Attorney	
Claire Adamsick	Policy Analyst, Council Operations	2025-217
Tanya Hartnett	(Testimony)	2025-217
ChericeBock	(Testimony)	2025-217
MicahMeskel	(Testimony)	2025-217
MarnieGlickman	(Testimony)	2025-217
ChelseaStewart-Fusek	(Testimony)	2025-217
Patricia Diefenderfer	Chief Planner, Bureau of Planning & Sustainability	2025-217
Dan Ryan	Councilor	
Donnie Oliveira	Deputy City Administrator, Community and Economic Development	2025-217
Ashley Hernandez	Policy Analyst, Council Operations	2025-186
Robert Taylor	City Attorney	2025-186

Portland City Council Special Meeting Closed Caption File

July 16, 2025 – 2:30 p.m.

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

Speaker: Good afternoon. Colleagues. I am calling to order a special meeting of the Portland City Council. It is Wednesday, July 16th at 2:32 p.m. Rebecca, could you please call the roll.

Speaker: Koyama lane?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Morillo here.

Speaker: Novick here.

Speaker: Clerk green.

Speaker: Here.

Speaker: Zimmerman here.

Speaker: Avalos, here. Dunphy.

Speaker: Here.

Speaker: Smith.

Speaker: Canal here.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: Here.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney here. And could I have our attorney please go over the rules of order and decorum?

Speaker: Welcome to the Portland City Council. Testify before council in person or virtually. You must sign up in advance on the council agenda at w-w-w. Portland council agenda. Information on engaging with council can be found on the council clerk's webpage. Individual 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 address the matter being considered. When testifying, state your name for the record. Your address is not necessary. If you're a lobbyist, identify the organization you represent. Virtual testifiers should unmute themselves when the council clerk calls your name. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you very much. Keelan. Could you please read our first agenda item?

Speaker: Agenda item one refer to the voters a five year local option tax levy for the November 4th, 2025 election to maintain safe parks nature affordable recreation through five year levy.

Speaker: Thank you very much, colleagues. This agenda item came out of a work session, not out of a committee. So there is not a committee staff summary. This is a measure to refer a five year tax levy to the voters to maintain safe parks, natural spaces and affordable recreation opportunities in our city. The current levy expires next year and without this new levy, we'll see 50% cuts in our parks and recreation department. With the new levy, we will see levy rates increase to \$1.40, which will

allow us to maintain the investments that we worked hard to put in the budget this year. Generally, when something comes to council, we don't have a full presentation, but because at the last work session we talked about the levy conceptually, but not about the final details. And because this is a referral and so it is a little bit different from our normal agenda items, we are going to have a short presentation today. I am going to have us start though with comments from the carriers, like we usually do in our council meetings on other agenda items. After that, I will turn it over to donna paul and to sonia shymansky to give us a little bit of information about what ended up in the final levy that will be discussing today. Well then, as usual, take technical questions, move to public testimony, and then have the bulk of our debate. So that is our plan for today. We have, I believe, 2.5 hours scheduled. I don't know that we'll need the full amount of time, and I hope that by the end of our session today, we can refer a levy to voters with strong support from this council. So with that, this is an agenda item that is co-sponsored by councilors novick and morillo and myself and councilor novick. Would you like to kick off a bit of an introduction about the levy before us?

Speaker: Sure. I want to focus on what this levy does and something about what it does not do. As the council president said, we it was concluded that a \$1.37 is what it would take to combined with general fund resources, maintain the park system where it is now, which means after the add backs, that the council made many of them one time to the mayor's budget. So this is a levy which will enable us to continue providing services at that level and thus to some extent, making up for the fact that some of the resources we used were one time something that we've discussed is what do we do about capital maintenance, given that we have a hundreds of millions of dollars capital maintenance backlog? And what we're proposing is we acknowledge that and recognize that we need to do something

about it, although we're not going to be able to do a hell of a lot in this levy. So \$0.03 of the levy are set aside for capital maintenance projects. We anticipate those will be kind of small scale capital maintenance projects like fixing bathroom roofs. There's also a provision in the resolution that commits the council to following a policy which is adopted in 2015, I believe, but which is not been followed in recent years. The description in the resolution is somewhat technical. It's the second, whereas in page three, a somewhat simpler way of describing it is a policy that at least 50% of any excess ending general fund balance, and 50% of any one time general fund resources available in the annual budget development process is dedicated to major maintenance or replacement of existing assets. That's all infrastructure assets, not just that's not just parks. That could also be transportation. So this, again, is a signal that we take infrastructure maintenance seriously. And the language also recognizes that we will ask the council will probably ask the legislature to clarify that we can use systems development charges for maintenance. And it also recognizes that we will at some point need to think about a major maintenance bond. So with that, i'll turn it over to councilor morillo.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor novick. I appreciate you covering all the technical stuff so I can do the other fun stuff. This was a big decision for us with regards to how it's going to impact Portlanders, and I think that that all of these decisions have been weighing heavily on us. There is no question that Portlanders and people across the country right now are really struggling economically. So whenever we make decisions about what changes we're going to be making to the fees and things that they have to pay for to get the services that they want, that's something that we have all really heavily considered. And I also want to talk about the fact that this levy is going to bring a lot of benefits to Portlanders. People really need their

parks, they need recreation. They need third spaces to play, live and thrive. And we need to ensure that we are still using our social contract and collectively working together to ensure that working families do have those options available to them. So I want to assure Portlanders as well, who are listening to this, that we are going to have direct oversight over this as a council. We're going to make sure that these dollars are being spent responsibly by your city government, and that we're going to be delivering the services that you care about, the new form of government, our district system, our budget listening sessions all gave us an incredible amount of feedback about which programs and services you care about, and we are going to be watching this very closely to ensure that every dollar that we receive, as the public body is going to be going directly to the things that matter most to you. Our city is going to be responsible for this, and it's not just going to be private entities that are, you know, profiting off of private partnerships. It's something that is a public good that the city should be taking ownership of. In partnership with our community. We also there's no question that we need to look up sustainable funding models in the years to come. We can't continuously rely on a parks levy to bail us out, and so we will be working as a council to ensure that that's something that we have an alternative for moving forward. And with that, I will pass it back to the council president.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor, colleagues, parks are a fundamental piece of what makes Portland a great place to live. It is a fundamental piece of what attracts families to our city. It is a fundamental piece of what helps us build community. This levy is our opportunity to continue our investments in our open spaces, our recreation programs and our neighborhood parks. These are the places that connect our communities and provide our kids with natural areas close to home, and offer hundreds of hours of classes of programs, classes, and programs each

week. This is our chance to continue funding those programs, and it's also our chance to make sure that we are talking about the way we fund those programs and the way we want our parks system to operate. And what you see in the measure before you, as our colleagues have touched on, are increased accountability measures, increased clarity around what the levy should be used for, and the start of a vision for how we want our parks and recreation department to operate. As we move through the conversation today, I hope that we can talk about some of those pieces, because I think they are important portions of what we're doing today. Before we move into the presentation, though, I just want to very quickly thank the many people who helped bring this together. All of you have provided feedback over the course of a few months on what this measure should look like. We had stakeholders from the employees who work within our parks department to businesses across the city, to our advocates within friends of groups and the parks foundation and the parks alliance, and many other people all around the table talking about what a levy should look like in order to truly reflect the needs of our community, the ability of our community, and the type of park system that our community would like to support. So a big thank you to all of those groups, and to all of you, and to all of the Portlanders who have already testified in support or with concerns about the levy before us today. It's with all of that input that we were able to bring this proposal forward. With that, I'd like to turn it over to dca donna paul, who I believe is going to kick off a brief presentation to make sure that we all have a clear understanding of what the final proposal before us looks like. Go right ahead.

Speaker: Good afternoon, council president and councilors. I'm priya paul, the deputy city administrator for public works. I'd like to begin by saying thank you for all of the work that you all have been engaging in for the last several months, and

for some of you, for the last several years, to bring us to this moment as the dca of public works. I'm honored to now have parks and Portland parks and recreation as a part of the public works service area, and I have appreciated learning more every day about the work these teams bring do to care for Portland's treasured park system and the funding needed to deliver those services. Portlanders care deeply about their park system, and I've been inspired by how many people, whether during budget meetings or meetings about parks levy specifically, have showed up and submitted testimony to have their voices heard. And while I am new to this particular levy process, I'm not new to stewarding systems that serve people, nor to the deep responsibility of holding public trust. I've been following the conversations to date, and look forward to partnering with you on the work to come. And with that, I'd like to pass it on to sonia shymansky, the acting director of Portland parks and recreation.

Speaker: Thank you. Good afternoon. I'm sonia shymansky with Portland parks and recreation, and I'm going to be so brief that I'm managing my own slides. Rebecca said it's a heartbeat delay. Okay. Thank you for having us back. This hearing follows two council work sessions in June and a hearing of the climate resilience and land use committee last week. The time and care that you've taken in this conversation is felt and appreciated. For the next just few minutes, I'm going to do a quick recap of where we are and how we got here. And then I know you're eager to get to community testimony. Two national comparators to start. First, Portland parks and recreation is ranked number nine in the national trust for public land review of park systems and the 100 most populous united states cities. Using the. The metrics you see on the slide here. We've been in and out of this top ten for many years, and it is a point of pride for Portland. Secondly, we you have rightfully pointed out the challenges of recurring five year levies, particularly when they're

not sequenced as part of a long term financial plan. And we are not the only park system in the country that uses this type of funding to sustain operations. Zooming into Portland and looking forward, we have learned through polling and community surveys and anecdotally every day, what Portlanders value and prioritize most in their parks and recreation system. They want it to celebrate our natural environment, be safe and cared for, and be open to all. Based on those priorities and your guidance. The package before you today focuses on basic care and maintenance, environmental care, and resilience and affordability. It will fund daily cleanup and maintenance of our parks. Small but high impact fixes to park amenities, and our park ranger program to keep these shared spaces healthy, safe and welcoming. It will support tree planting and maintenance of trees and parks, keep our natural areas healthy and reduce risk from wildfires. So Portland's unique and special natural areas stay that way. And finally, it will keep the events, classes and programs that Portlanders use and value open and available to everyone. This includes free programming like summer free for all and free lunch and play ongoing now and class discounts, so the cost is not a barrier. These slides have a bit more information, but we're going to go quickly through them. And the purpose of these is to show you how we got to the rate that's before you today, because that was heavily informed by the budget process that you just concluded it was a difficult cycle for parks and recreation and required cuts well beyond those taken citywide. To close the deficit, the parks team advanced a large number of reduction packages to the city administrator. In developing his proposed budget, mayor wilson restored key programs you see up in the top left, including some schools, citywide sports, which is home to golden ball and the potential closure of a neighborhood community center. He did this through a combination of cuts elsewhere in the bureau and increased revenue. When that proposed budget came to you, you

made a number of additional changes which added really significant funding back into park care and maintenance. And you partially restored community center hours. You did this through a combination of one-time and ongoing funds. So the net of all that on the personnel side is reductions of about 20 positions within the central teams that support service delivery, a few reductions to park care work, and significant reductions in the urban forestry division, although about two thirds of those were added back on the pad side, so they're not lost to the city. The net of all of that on the financial side is that the rate needed to sustain current operations went down. We were talking about \$1.60 for a while. We are now talking about \$1.37, the levy package before you today sustains those current service levels and also includes, as you mentioned, small but meaningful investment for high impact capital repairs like fixes to pools, bathrooms and playgrounds. It also includes a new investment that i'll touch on in this next and final slide. I have here a summary of key city direction included in this referral action, either in the resolution, in comments elsewhere, or in the accompanying exhibits. Some of these things will be carried out by organizational leaders like us, others by you, directly. Through this action, Portlanders can expect, as was mentioned. Thank you both immediate and long term steps toward solutions for the deferred maintenance backlog at parks and citywide ongoing oversight with annual and regular reports cadence to be determined, including in conversation with you from the bureau, from a community oversight committee, and at least once from an independent auditor that speak to the financial and performance outcomes of the investments, you'll see no impact to the Portland children's levy, which will be reimbursed for the compression impact of this levy. And you'll see, I hope, and anticipate a much stronger connection and support of partners and volunteers who are part of delivering this system, with the

particular emphasis on revenue generating opportunities. So that's the end of this presentation.

Speaker: Thank you very much, sonia. Colleagues, before we move to.

Speaker: Public testimony and then our broader debate, are there any technical questions about what is included in this final proposal that sonia has laid out for us? Councilor Ryan?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Thank you, council president. I don't have a technical question. I have a clarification. We've been in dialog about this for the last couple of days, sonia. And in the whereas that's at the second, the second page. Yeah, it talks about the city of Portland recognizes strengthening partnerships with the private sector, philanthropic community volunteers and grassroots that area. I wanted to put a little bit of teeth into that with a friendly amendment that would add a sentence that we are talking about this morning and yesterday that would have some indicators that we'd actually measure. So if we're two years into it, we'd see it going from the 1% it's out now to hopefully a higher percent and include that for earned income too. Because if we go through this five year cycle and nothing really happens with this, whereas that actually indicates that we landed, that people will be mightily disappointed, including me. And so I want to make sure that we have that type of accountability. So when we do our annual updates or or whenever those are, we can actually look at that data. So my question is like in our conversation earlier, you're good with that friendly amendment, but you want me to specifically tell you what that is? I thought for some reason, we got off the phone that you were going to magically put that in there. And so I apologize for not tracking that.

Speaker: No, not at all. There is a resolution that came from your office. Thank you. That does put a somewhat finer point on what the work will look like, including a dedicated staff person. Focus on private and philanthropic dollars. It doesn't speak to particular metric. I would welcome that direction, either in the resolution or here in the legislative record, and I would consider it guidance either way.

Speaker: Okay, give me a minute or more than that to figure that out colleagues and I'll, I'll go ahead and bring that to you before we vote. But I wanted to at least indicate that to people who are going to testify. So they knew that that might be added into this just in case.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor.

Speaker: Does that make sense? Okay. Thanks.

Speaker: We do have we have some of we have your original language included in the proposal. It sounds like you have additions to that.

Speaker: Based on the meeting we had yesterday with some stakeholders and a dialog, a couple of conversations this morning, I think people would just like to make sure that it's so transparent that we're tracking it and that the voters do that. So again, we're not this isn't the 2020 levy. It's a different levy.

Speaker: And colleagues, I know there are a few others who have amendments that you plan on bringing forward as well. Without introducing those, why don't we open up the opportunity for people to just put on the record and, you know, a sentence or two what you have coming so that folks who are testifying know what that is. Councilor avalos, go right ahead.

Speaker: I don't have an amendment. I have a question. Okay. I on the be it further resolved that says that starts with be it further resolved that the \$0.03 for capital projects is intended to be distributed between the four council districts. That section. I guess I'm just trying to understand what is the intended process for this?

Is this a area that could benefit from using the city's building belonging framework? And how, I guess, like, I don't know, is this a decision the parks director is making? How are you going to determine the equity in the distribution to each district? It just seems really prescriptive. I obviously understand the intent and also the fact that it has a section here essentially saying, let's see, City Council members in each district will recommend which projects. I understand the intent. I'm worried about the application and it being equitable. So I'm curious if you can speak, you can speak to that. I'm assuming that would be to director szymanski.

Speaker: And acting director szymanski. I believe that the distribution of these funds would be part of the regular budgeting process. So council would have the ultimate decision making authority here. But if you can speak to how how the bureau might bring forward a recommendation, that would be great.

Speaker: We have dialed in the scope of the universe of projects that would be options for this investment with the scale of the \$0.03. So that kind of fixes the overall scale that we're talking about. And it is things like playgrounds and bathrooms and somewhat smaller scale neighborhood park amenities. So the first thing we would do is gather all of those. What happens between there and a final list that you approve in the budget is something I hope we can figure out together. It would involve a lot of dialog with you, and I would I would happily take your guidance about what that conversation looks like and how it's processed.

Speaker: You have a process.

Speaker: Right now for rating deferred maintenance needs. That includes a number of factors, including things around likelihood of failure and danger and equity. Is that correct?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: So could we assume that the proposals you brought forward would be run through that same lens that current projects are run through?

Speaker: Yeah, we could definitely do that.

Speaker: Councilor avalos, does that help answer your question?

Speaker: Not fully, but i'll follow up. Thanks.

Speaker: Okay. Councilor green.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. As we get into the substantive part of the discussion, I will be bringing forward and have filed an amendment to the body of the resolution, not the exhibits. I want to be careful not to upset a delicate balance there, but that changes one whereas clause. And they therefore be it resolved, a clause that really speaks to the question of kind of using a fiscal stewardship and responsibility lens, given that we're going to go in with a lower recommended levy that tries to extend what we get in terms of capital maintenance. And so the basic spirit of it is to clarify and, and sort of suggest that we continue to use system development charges that extend the useful life of restoration of existing capital assets. And, you know, recognizing that we do need to build new assets and parts of the city that are poor, it will hopefully reaffirm that it's okay for the city to do this, that we have done it in the past. And it's a really good way, I think, to use already existing funds. So that's what that's what that will be about as we get into it. And I hope that if you're following along in the public, it's on the website, it's councilor green. Thanks. Council green number one.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor, councilor zimmerman.

Speaker: Thank you for just in terms of your intent, madam president, to highlight where we might be offering in the second to last, be it resolved. It starts with be it resolved that the \$0.03 for capital projects. You know, I think that one of the things I've talked a long time about have been, you know, taking care of the basic

infrastructure in the parks and particularly in our district, in district four. I think it's been a challenge in our bathrooms. And so in that, be it resolved, I will be proposing an amendment in the middle of the paragraph after, along with annual estimates for available funds for each fiscal year period, the 3%. This is the amendment. The 3% for capital projects will be spent only on bathroom facilities, period. That's the extent of the amendment. And then it continues on with the City Council members in each district. Et cetera. Et cetera. So I just wanted to highlight that, and I appreciate you having these at least aired out so that if public comment has opinions, we can we can be forthright about it. Thank you. That's all.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor canal.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. Colleagues, I've emailed you the exact text of the amendment that I will be proposing, but to describe it briefly, it is an amendment to the body of the resolution, not the exhibits. It would ask parks to direct \$139,000. Sorry, \$139,169, which is 0.23 \$0.02, or just under a quarter of a cent from within the existing dollar 37 to a pilot project that would extend community center hours at one community center per district on Friday and Saturday nights in the summertime to 11 p.m. To promote access to free third spaces for all Portlanders, in particular young young people, and promote student achievement, community safety and youth development. It would be an extension of hours without programing, but I'm sure that the existing text around volunteerism and my personal pledge to donate to sets of dodgeballs to any community center in need would help with ensuring that there are activities for people to do. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you councilor. Councilor novick, do you have a proposed amendment?

Speaker: I have several possible proposed amendments. One thing is, and actually, the parks alliance brought this to my attention, there's a number of places in the resolution where there's reference to capital projects. They've recommended that we in each case clarify that means capital maintenance projects, which is the intention rather than just perhaps imply that we're talking about big, fat building new things. There's a variety of places where that appears. I also realize that the whereas at the top of page three, which I actually proposed, I kind of screwed it up. Whereas City Council recognized the parks and recreation system has an extensive backlog of major maintenance needs, and the 2025 parks levy will begin to address those needs. But only a small fraction of them. I concluded I made a mistake in saying major maintenance, because we're not talking about using the parks levy to do big fat things again. So I'm proposing changing major maintenance to capital maintenance there as well. And then there's a couple of other additions that the parks alliance suggested, which I thought were worth discussing. They wanted to add a whereas saying whereas paris shall, as part of the annual budget process described to council the approximate percentage of its operations and number of fte, which will be funded by levy resources, and then after the whereas that that I was referring to before which discusses it says the parks and rec system is extensive backlog of capital maintenance needs. Et cetera. Et cetera. And it says the council will continue to work with our community on a long range financial plan with a variety of components. They've suggested that we say that we will adopt this long range financial plan by the end of fiscal year 20 2728. So I just want to actually I just wanted to put that out there for discussion.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor. Councilor Ryan.

Speaker: Yes, thank you, council president, to bring some clarity to what I mentioned earlier, I would propose adding a whereas it's very basic, it would say this, whereas on or before December 31st, 2025, parks leadership and collaboration with stakeholders will submit ten key performance indicators for council's approval. These kpis will form the levy performance dashboard. And i'll make sure we email that to everyone by the testimonies going on. Thanks.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor colleagues, are there any other potential amendments or technical questions before we move to public testimony? Okay. Acting director shamansky donna paul, my suspicion is that we will ask you to come back up for our broader discussion after we hear from the public. So please don't go too far. But for now, before we move into that discussion, I'd like to have us hear from members of the community about their feedback on the levy proposal before us today. Rebecca, could you please call up our first panel?

Speaker: Jessica green, allison berman, suzanne ho.

Speaker: Welcome and thank you all for being here today. Go right ahead, jessica.

Speaker: Thank you. Council mayor I'm jessica green. I'm the executive director of the Portland parks foundation, a citywide parks nonprofit whose mission is to mobilize support for parks, natural areas and public spaces. I'm here today to affirm pbf's support and commitment to leading the levy campaign in partnership with the intertwined alliance. And you once referred. I also want to take this time to thank you, councilors, mayor wilson and all of your staff for the collaborative spirit in developing the levy over the course of the last several months. Six months ago, you were faced with the question of whether to refer \$1.60 to the may ballot, and you made the bold decision to hit pause and discuss what this levy should be and could be. The pause allowed the proposed levy in front of you to be informed and shaped by the public through polling and various forms of testimony, by

conversations with each other. Key stakeholders that council president mentioned earlier the business community, labor cbos and parks partners. And by a hard look at the parks budget during this year's budget cycle. This has been a really thoughtful process, no matter how rushed it's felt in the final weeks, days, hours, minutes. And I really want to thank each and every single one of you for carving out the time and being open minded, coming to the table curious and with creative ideas. As commissioner Ryan said during a meeting yesterday about this, everyone in this room has had to compromise on some level, and it really shows the partnership of the city. Ultimately, the levy maintains a parks and recreation system that we know and love and is essential for a thriving, livable Portland. In addition to the levy proposed today, the process really is also reignited a couple very important conversations the need to address the 600 million plus backlog and capital maintenance, and an opportunity to do more with partnerships in order to advance an equitable park system. The commitment towards some capital maintenance in this levy signals a shift towards prioritizing our capital maintenance needs in our parks, but as you all know, it's only just a start and we are committed to work with you and other parks leaders to develop a long term, long term strategy to address parks operational and capital needs. The levy also recognizes the power of partnerships. I recommend prioritizing investment also in existing partnerships, looking at how the city works with them. How can we streamline systems, remove obstacles, invest in a culture of creativity and collaboration. There are hundreds of partners looking to do more together and in true partnership, ppf and the intertwined alliance are ready to partner with you, City Council on this future levy. Thank you for your time now and in the past.

Speaker: Thank you. Go right ahead, ali.

Speaker: Thank you. And just echoing Jessica on the thoughtful process that has gone into this. My name is Ali Berman, and I'm the chair of the Portland Parks and Recreation Advisory Board, a tier one advisory board within the city. I'm representing the board today to strongly advise the City Council to refer a levy renewal at an increased rate for the November election that will allow community centers to remain open, stop programs from being substantially reduced, and ensure ongoing park maintenance as well as capital maintenance. This is vital for the health of our city, especially in light of the cuts Penner has already faced in this year's budget and projected further cuts in fiscal year 2027, as well as the proposed pause on SDC collection. Right now, City Councilors get to determine what kind of city they want Portland to be. The board believes that an extensive, vibrant and robust park system is essential for Portlanders, that parks are one of the main reasons why Portland is so special, and that parks are a material driver for both new residents and businesses. But a great park system requires both operational funding for programming and maintenance, and capital funding to preserve and expand systems. We're excited to build on the 2020 levy, which was very successful in fulfilling what was promised: delivering recreation programs, removing physical barriers to parks programs, prioritizing services for communities of color and households experiencing poverty, and planting and maintaining trees. The 2020 levy allowed the park system to be more robust and more equitable than before. The board asks council to refer a levy renewal to ensure the kind of park system that would be best for Portland and their constituents. The board also asked council to not underestimate the popular support for parks and parks programming. The support has been seen in polling and, more importantly, in the recent response to the budget. Thank you for your consideration and all of your work on behalf of parks. The board is committed to working alongside you, Portland Parks and

recreation staff and the broader community to ensure a vibrant, equitable and sustainable future for our park system.

Speaker: Thank you. Go right ahead.

Speaker: Good afternoon everyone. I am swen ho. Today I am speaking to you not as a board member of the Portland parks and rec advisory board, but as a Portland citizen asking you to refer the parks levy at a higher rate to care for and maintain our parks system. I want to share a beautiful evening experience with you at 6 p.m. This past Sunday, when the temperature finally dropped to 90 degrees at ventura park, myself and 700 other Portlanders cheered as the summer free for all concert began. Portland taiko filled the stage with their big japanese drums. The invigorating drum beat inspires so many little kids to dance and wave their colorful streamers. Such pure joy. Edit or share backyard. The magic of the two hours of applause filled performance did not just randomly pop up. It took Portland parks staff months of planning and coordinating volunteers, cleaning and maintaining the park ahead of a scorching hot day. Multiply this effort by all the other parks events this summer by the quick run to the restroom between laps, up and down the playground. Slide by the long hikes on your favorite trail, and by all the other year round, reliable, well loved outdoor indoor programing in community centers that are clean and cared for by park staff. None of this would exist at this scale or be functional without parks levy. With the parks levy, this work is done daily, oftentimes behind the scenes, so that we, as park users, can enjoy our beautiful parks and recreation spaces and programs. This park levy is an essential piece of Portland's next five years and beyond. It maintains the services and programs that are critical to community and the health of our city. I sincerely hope that you will decide on a levy amount that maximizes children and adults being inspired by our wonderful parks, programs and facilities for years to come. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

Speaker: Next. We have elizabeth. Peralta. Whoever you are. Elizabeth milner, karen turay, and john isaacs. Elizabeth is online. You can go ahead. Elizabeth.

Speaker: Hi there. Good afternoon. Councilors. My name is elizabeth milner, and I'm the development and engagement director with sellwood community house. Apologies if it's loud. It's we're full of summer camp today. Thank you so much for the opportunity to give testimony again regarding the parks levy. And thank you so much for the careful time, consideration and thoughtful thought you have obviously all put into this process. Now that you've settled on a dollar amount for the levy, Portland really needs to know what the specific vision is for how those dollars will be spent. What will this levy mean for people in their daily lives? The last council session, one of the slides presented measured the health of ppr by comparing the number of full time staff to other cities park bureaus. By that metric, Portland is in the middle of the pack compared to other comparable cities. But how well does that metric really measure what's happening in Portland? Minneapolis, where I lived for several years, employs just slightly more full time staff per capita than Portland, and yet operates 47 community centers, dozens of free summer park programs, and hundreds of free concerts, movies and community celebrations all over the city so that residents on any given day can find fun activities to do with their families. Portland, meanwhile, operates 22 free lunch and play programs from 10 a.m. To 2 p.m. And a smattering of concerts and movies that, for most of us, require advanced planning and transportation in order to enjoy. Portland has so much potential. We have new music venues going in the wnba, great local festivals, and Portland parks and recreation should be at the heart of a vision for a vibrant and engaging city that attracts and cares for its citizens, and we are just not quite seeing that yet. So it's heartening to see the new language on partnerships, but

please don't consider partnerships as an opportunity to outsource the work of Portland parks and recreation, but rather as an avenue for achieving a shared vision of Portland that we all have a stake in and then support them, work with them, collaborate with them, and pave the way for them to help achieve that shared vision for our city. As someone who engages with hundreds of families each year, organizes events and parks, and is a parent who has accessed or tried to access parks programming for the past 16 years, here are my suggestions for this levy. Please make our parks and recreation more fun and less complicated. We need activated parks in every district. Vibrant community centers, activated rivers and streets, and citywide sports, art, music and nature education. So same summer park staff in between playing with kids all day can clean bathrooms and remove trash just like they do at the shack in Sellwood Park, which the Sellwood community has activated this summer. Where PPR doesn't have the staff or capacity to program yet truly partner with and support the friends groups, neighborhood groups, business alliances, etc. To take on those programs and finally shake off the past. Just because we've done things one way doesn't mean we have to keep doing them that way. Current levels of service doesn't necessarily equate to optimal delivery of service. This is an incredible opportunity to start fresh with a bold vision for Portland parks and rec. For the 21st century that is more robust, not less than the one we enjoyed in the 1970s. Thank you for your time.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

Speaker: Karen is also online. Karen, you can go ahead.

Speaker: I believe you're muted.

Speaker: There you go. You're unmuted.

Speaker: Can you hear me now.

Speaker: We can we can hear you Karen.

Speaker: My name is karen turay resident of district three, business owner in district one and a member of stadium hood. And while I recognize the importance of parks and recreational facilities in our community, I believe that we as taxpayers have reached a breaking point with new taxes. I'm all taxed out. As a business owner, I already contribute significantly to the city's revenue through various taxes, permits and fees. And yet I see little return on this investment. The promise of improved parks and recreational services does not justify the additional financial burden on residents and business owners, especially when many of us are struggling to keep our heads above water due to the rising cost of living and doing business in Portland. In the four block radius of my store stadium superette within the stadium neighborhood, we have seen over 19 businesses close or move in the last few years, and just found out today that another will be moving in September. Most of those are due to taxes and safety. The proposed tax rate of the 1.4 per 1000 assessed value may seem small, but for many of us, it translates into an added monthly expense that we cannot afford. At a time when our local economy is still recovering, it is essential to prioritize the financial well-being of our residents and small businesses. Furthermore, while the city emphasizes the operational needs of our parks, I urge you to reconsider the allocation of existing resources instead of placing further financial strain on taxpayers, we need to ensure that the current funds are being utilized effectively before seeking more money from the community. I implore you to listen to the voices of residents and business owners who are concerned about the implications of this levy. Instead of proposing new taxes, let's focus on finding innovative solutions to manage and maintain our parks with the funds we already have. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

Speaker: Council president pirtle-guiney and councilors. For the record, my name is John Isaacs. I'm the executive vice president of public affairs for the Portland Metro Chamber. I prefer he/him pronouns, and I'm a resident of district three in southeast Portland. The chamber is the Portland region's chamber of commerce and Oregon's largest business association, representing about 2400 members, over 80% of which are small businesses. I'm here today to express our strong support for the parks levy resolution and explain why the chamber chose to endorse it, and because I cannot be here tonight, I want to also express the chamber's support for the directly related action you will take at 6:45 p.m. To formally have Portland join the International Swimmable Cities Alliance in 2023, Governor Kotek and the Central City Task Force called for a three-year moratorium on new or increased taxes. With our full support since 2022, taxes have advanced without our support and both were soundly defeated. This levy is the only significant tax increase we've allowed to advance without opposition during that moratorium. Here's why. Because Portland's parks are more than amenities. They are core economic assets. For decades, Portland's growth was built on livability, safety, strong public schools, quality transit and a reasonable cost of living. But over the last decade, that foundation has eroded and is now crumbling. We overregulated housing and small businesses, increased business taxes by 84% since 2019, and adopted the second highest marginal income tax rate in the nation, with little focus on results. Killed our housing production market at the very worst time, allowed core public safety services to degrade and let our core infrastructure decay. The result? Portland is losing over 1 billion a year in taxable income. Businesses are leaving, layoffs are growing, and private investment is drying up. Population growth will turn into negative territory by the decade's end, so without question, Portland will need to compete with other cities for people and growth. We will only do that successfully

by unleashing private sector growth, adopting a competitive tax burden, supercharging housing production of all types, and investing in our core competitive assets. This includes parks, and if they are core academic economic assets, then they must be maintained and maintained and in the services delivered in a manner worthy of the beloved treasures we say they are. This levy must be the beginning of that transformation. In 2019, the Portland parks and rec budget budget was \$5.6 billion. Just six years later, its budget is \$8.2 billion, and during this time services have declined. Deferred maintenance was ignored and trust eroded to do the due to promises broken. Still, we support this levy because parks remain essential to our competitiveness, livability and economic recovery. And we believe the longtime Portland spirit of collaboration and innovation can make change possible. I want to be clear, the support of the chamber and our partners is contingent on change. We expect accountability, fiscal discipline and adoption of national best practices, like an expansion of public private partnerships to drive increased economic and cultural vitality, develop development of more diverse revenue streams and performance based budgeting. Most other cities, including all of our peer markets, formally work with the private sector to manage and activate parks to attract investment talent and drive economic and cultural vitality. Portland must do the same next year when you have to consider more cuts to the parks general fund. The chamber and our partners will hold the city accountable to ensure levy.

Speaker: Thank you. John. I'm sorry. I'm sorry, john, but we've got to move on.

Speaker: From the general fund.

Speaker: As possible. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Brian and mary ruble. Rob martineau.

Speaker: Councilors, mayor brian orndorf live and work in district four. Parks matter. Since moving here 17 years ago, I've been a strong supporter of parks both through treasure and time. The treasure includes over 25 million parks, sdc fees generated through seven mixed use towers I've had the pleasure of working on. I've also spent significant time volunteering on the south park blocks, couch park, and the soon to open darcelle 15 park in the west end. The proposed increase of the park levies from \$0.80 to \$1.40 per thousand of assessed value is a sharp jump that warrants careful scrutiny, especially when the bureau still faces a \$600 million maintenance backlog. This proposal does not meaningfully address the backlog. Instead, it sustains the current operations operations that many residents believe have been poorly managed. The recent dismissal of the parks director, paired with an ongoing city review, raises serious questions. If the audit uncovers fiscal mismanagement, it would only deepen public concerns about how the tax dollars are being spent. It is essential that the parks audit be released before tax related measure is placed, before the voters. To withhold it until after the election would be a serious breach of transparency, and could reasonably be seen as an attempt to obscure facts that would inform voters decisions. With housing affordability at a breaking point year over year, increases in property taxes, often overlapping with duplicative services, places a growing burden on Portlanders. We are a generous community. We value public spaces, but many of us at our financial breaking point. Here are three things I ask you to consider one. A moratorium on new tax measures until audits are complete and publicly released. Two a requirement for clear performance metrics and cost controls tied to any future levy. Three a mandate that capital backlog plans be fully scoped, costed with a gmp if possible, and scheduled before seeking additional funding. Well run, fiscally responsible parks matter. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

Speaker: Good afternoon. I'm Mary Ruble, district four. I have been involved in Portland parks for over 25 years, having served as board chair of the parks advisory board, as well as the Portland parks foundation, and currently a Portland parks levy oversight committee member. I'm speaking as an individual, not as a representative of these groups. I encourage City Council to refer this parks levy to the November ballot. While I am no fan of additional taxes in Portland and agree with our previous speaker, I do support this levy at \$1.40 because I believe in our parks system and its importance to the city. As a member of the levy oversight committee, I believe I bring unique insights into the way that levy can be run, and I have three things that I would request from the council. One is that the appointments to the role after application by people interested in involvement with the levy be made by a select group of City Council and mayor's office representatives, with input from the bureau director and appropriate staff, as opposed to simply by the bureau itself. Secondly, I recommend involvement in levy committee meetings by appropriate members of the City Council and the mayor's office and their staff, and I would like to see an opportunity for levy committee members to provide input and advice on specific use of levy dollars, because this group has a lot of insight into how the dollars have been spent. The bureau has done a very good job of ensuring that the levy committee understands the use of the dollars, and we have certified that use as appropriate in the past. I believe that should be what we do going forward. But with additional input from the levy committee in the future, the parks levy needs to focus on daily maintenance, cleaning and care for our parks and natural areas, as well as additional tree canopy. We need to keep our parks usable and prevent further degradation. But it is also my belief that we need to focus on maintenance, and so I

encourage the City Council to also look to the future and to a bond for capital maintenance that will be that will make a difference. The 3% is helpful, but it will not make a meaningful difference in that. \$600 million back backlog. Thank you very much.

Speaker: Thank you for being here and sharing those ideas.

Speaker: Good afternoon. My name is Rob Martineau. I am the president of AFSCME local 189 and first vice president of the Northwest Oregon Labor Council. Both of these organizations I represent have been a partner and supportive of past levies and Portland Parks and Recreation. I hear the capital maintenance. I hear all of the things that need to happen. The city does a, I think as well a job as it can at times in asset management. Asset management is a critical piece of this, whether we call it, you know, capital maintenance or or however we're looking to ensure these parks remain. This is something that the city is not new asset management. What we haven't been able to do is fund that. We've been able to do it in our other infrastructure systems. But this is one that has not moved forward with a clear plan. I am supportive of this levy. I represent nearly 1100 people, city employees who live, work, play and worship in Portland. All of us are beneficiaries, beneficiaries of this park system. I think about when the people I know from out of the area come to visit, and it's hard to think of something I do or that they want to do, or how we spend time that doesn't involve our parks. I said, what do you want to do? And my brother said, I got to eat voodoo donuts. I don't know why I needed a bowl of cereal on my donut, but we ate that at Waterfront Park and he said, we got to go eat at a food cart. We took that and blankets and went up and spent time on Tabor, Washington Park, or Zoo, all of the things that are in our area. It's hard not to end up at a park. These are part of our identity. These are part of what we deserve to support. And I'm sure all of us have those same examples of where we

started to do one thing and ended up in our parks. This levy has got to be well defined, giving Portland parks and recreation clear direction and accountability. Our community should rally to support and pass this levy. As a member of organized labor, I expect to be a partner and I expect and look forward to that opportunity as we develop and lay out a vision and mechanisms for our parks, a vision that will ensure Portland's parks and services thrive to buoy and support our community as critical infrastructure. This levy is not going to fix everything. That's very, very clear. But this levy is a bridge to the future where we fund the park system we want and deserve. As Portlanders. We owe you our new form of government, an opportunity to raise up our parks rather than oversee their decline and loss. This levy and new council are the only next step for the public spaces and places we all deserve. Thank you.

Speaker: Sundeep, devika, mic check Ryan sotomayor.

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

Speaker: Let's see. Okay.

Speaker: My name is sandeep debacker. I live in district four downtown council green. Actually, I heard you say at some one of your meetings that not many people live in downtown. I beg to differ. There's a lot of section eight, low income housing, a lot of elderly people living in that downtown area, a lot of high density housing. I've been a resident there for about nine years now. One of the things I truly enjoy about Portland is the fact that we have the ability to use these public parks scattered all over the city. I studied urban design in graduate school, and parks are essential in high density urban environments because they function as backyards for people that don't have backyards. These parks were a godsend during the pandemic when people were cooped up. Which brings me to the matter under discussion today. The parks levy, the parks we have today are not usable, and not

for the reasons that I heard today. I walked through the south park blocks on my way here. There was a drug deal that went down in front of me. There's needles over there. There's a group called Portland people's outreach project that hands out needles and food at 4:30 p.m. In the south park blocks in front of the art museum. There's a preschool on the next block. The children have to worry about the needles and human excrement when they come out to play in that park. I was at couch couch park day before yesterday for a drawing class. Same thing. Needles, tents, homeless people and drug use. So it's very difficult for me and my neighbors, many of many and many of the neighbors are older and they like to go sit in the park, which they're afraid to do because there's an 80 bed shelter going in two blocks from where I live, three blocks from south park blocks. We went to the shelter. They said they have no plans to do anything except clean around the shelter. None of us were given notice about the shelter. We heard about it in the newspaper. And these. This is a no barrier shelter. These people have guns and knives. They've been stabbings and shootings in that area. This is five blocks from city hall. They will be let out at 7:00 in the morning. They will be in the parks. So why should we be paying \$1.40 more on everything that we're already paying, when we can't use the parks that we have? So I urge you as a City Council, to please do your jobs and make the city livable. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

Speaker: Micah. You can go ahead.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, council president and the rest of City Council. My name is micah meskell. I'm the urban conservation director at bird alliance of Oregon, a local nonprofit whose mission is to inspire all people to love and protect birds, wildlife and the natural environment upon which life depends. Building and

maintaining the regional system of parks, trails and natural areas has been at the core of our urban conservation efforts for decades. Our goal is to ensure that every person in the region has access to nature within walking distance of their home. To that end, bird alliance of Oregon has focused a significant portion of its efforts on ensuring that there's adequate funding for parks, trails, and natural areas and the maintenance of those. I'm representing the organization and our over 10,000 plus local members in urging you to refer the parks levy renewal to the ballot in November. An increased rate of \$1.40. This isn't enough, especially to meet the maintenance backlog that the system is hampered by, but it is better than the status quo rates and will allow for you all to take iterative steps towards reducing the backlog while working collaboratively with partners, including community organizations, towards securing a more sustainable funding path. Pathway for Portland parks via future bond measure or other strategies for alliance has helped shape and passed several bond measures and levies over the past 30 years and plan to play a role alongside rob and other community members who have offered today in helping make this one past the finish line. In November. As many city bureaus are, Portland parks and rec is struggling, especially in light of the cuts that ppr has already faced in this year's reduced budget, both on the maintenance side and on the urban forestry side. Projected further cuts in 27, 20, 26, 27 also loom, and the proposed pause of the sdc collection. With all of this in place, it is essential that right now you all as City Council, give them a lifeline to remain, providing services and protecting the resources that Portlanders cherish and rely on. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

Speaker: Ryan Ryan's. Online. You can unmute and begin.

Speaker: Good afternoon, president. Council president pirtle-guiney and City Council, it's very nice to see you really appreciate all the work that has gone into this. We really appreciate all of you who've opened your offices to us and have come to talk to workers out in the community, out in the parks. We look forward to further collaboration around the parks levy and also our working relationship with the Portland city laborers and recreation contract. I'm going to back up and explain that I'm Ryan sotomayor from laborers local 483. So we represent city of Portland workers in both the pcl contract, which covers Portland parks, maintenance workers, and then on the recreation side, the recreation contract folks in community centers, folks that are involved in summer programing like summer free for all lunch and play, and seasonal maintenance workers. And we represent folks from lifeguards up to millwrights. Everything that happens in the city of Portland is somehow touched by folks in the Portland city, labor's contract and the recreation contract. So we appreciate your work and not only collaborating with community partners, but also meeting with labor that is meaningful and we appreciate the engagement and the investment. We appreciate the energy that's being brought by the community. The Portland parks foundation, the Portland parks alliance, all the community groups that have brought energy and spoken to the important resources that Portland parks and recreation are, and also supportive of the workers of Portland parks and recreation. So we really appreciate that and look forward to the partnership moving forward. We fully support this levy going forward. We are in it to win it. 483 was the folks that were texting and phone calling in the 2020 parks levy. We used a panos texting infrastructure, but it was folks from the parks alliance and from the foundation and from 43 that brought this home. And we look forward to partnering with labor, partnering with all of you, and partnering with the community partnerships to make sure that the levy is passed

and that there is accountability on the other side. We really appreciate the look into the budget that the mayor has been doing and that City Council has been doing. We know that it's difficult work. We appreciate your leadership on that. We appreciate your looking forward to your leadership around all the struggles that we face around transportation and livability and all of the things. So we appreciate your leadership. We look forward to seeing you in person. Thank you for your important work, and thank you for your time and your consideration. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you very much. We appreciate it.

Speaker: Slaughter, bob weinstein, ashley murray.

Speaker: Hi, I'm lina slaughter. I did not think I was going to go right after Ryan Sotomayor. I am the union rep for liuna 43. I live in district two. I'm here to also state my support for the levy. We appreciate City Council, the mayor for working on this. I know it's been hard and you haven't been in your position for that long. I will say we I am very supportive of continuing programs, which I've been a fitness instructor from lead, and I worked at grant park during the summer doing fitness teaching, hula classes. And this levy will help our teens, our our youth who are employed for summer camps for these summer programs. And if the levy doesn't pass, I'm not sure if we could continue those programs. So thank you so much. I look forward to working with you in the future.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

Speaker: Am I next okay, council members and mayor, my name is bob weinstein. I speak today on behalf of the concerned citizens. We urge you to revise the proposed parks levy before referring it to the voters as written. The ballot title risks misleading the public and several key ways. First, the ballot title blurs the critical distinction between routine maintenance within operations and major capital maintenance. The language implies this levy will help address the city's staggering

\$600 million major maintenance backlog, but the actual portion going to major capital maintenance is minimal, and nowhere is that made clear. Why not specify the initial major capital maintenance allocation \$2 million so voters understand what they're truly being asked to approve. Second, the language maintains excessive discretion for parks leadership. This vagueness enables the same mismanagement and imbalanced spending between overall operations and major capital maintenance that created our current crisis. We do not need more blank checks. Third, the ballot title masks the true cost impact. Nowhere does the ballot language acknowledge that this is a 75% parks levy tax increase from \$0.80 to \$1.40 per \$1,000 in assessed value. Voters deserve transparency. This should be stated plainly on the ballot, the measure states. Also, it may increase taxes by more than 3% without explaining that 3% is the constitutional cap on assessed value growth. Making this sound routine when it's actually an override exception. Fourth, the timing is particularly concerning affordability, and Portland is facing death by a thousand cuts with recent huge utility hikes, large increases in parking, rideshare and other fees. And now a major tax increase in this levy. This comes as we await an audit of the parks bureau and following the recent departure of the parks director, we recommend two changes. First, significantly increase the share going to major capital maintenance. \$0.03 out of \$1.40 generates about \$2 billion, not enough to make a dent in a \$600 million backlog. Second, revise the ballot title to clearly state this is a 75% tax increase. We also request that parks and recreation audit be released prior to the election. The current proposal asks for trust for a bureau that has demonstrated poor fiscal stewardship without transparency and accountability measures. This levy will perpetuate the same problems that created our parks crisis. We urge you to be honest with voters. Voters can make informed choices only when they're given the full picture. Thank you very much.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

Speaker: Ashley is online. Ashley, you can unmute.

Speaker: Okay. Council members, my name is ashley murray, executive director of solid community house and district four resident. I want to say thank you for how much time, coordination and effort has gone into bringing this levy forward. It's been complex and a demanding process, and your dedication truly matters. That said, as we look toward November, I'm asking us to make a shift beyond spreadsheets. Over the last six months, I've had dozens of conversations with park and rec leaders, park foundation staff, campaign strategist volunteers, nonprofit partners, and many of you. In every single one of these conversations, I've asked the same simple question who's shaping the vision for Portland parks and recreation? Every single time. The answer is the same. It's a really good question. That's not an acceptable answer anymore. Portland does not currently have a public unifying vision for its park and recreation system. And this isn't just my observation. It's widespread. No one can clearly articulate where we're headed or what kind of future we're building together. We cannot move forward, not effectively, not meaningfully, without a shared vision and a visionary to lead it. We are not in a vacuum. Voters, partners and staff feel the same uncertainty. Where we going? What are we working towards? What is the future of Portland parks and recreation look like right now? We're asking Portlanders to support another tax increase without offering a compelling, inspiring vision and return. Maintaining current service levels is indeed necessary, but it is not inspiring. People are hungry for purpose. They're eager to be part of something bigger, and they deserve more than operational upkeep. They deserve leadership that shows where we are and being bold enough to lead towards something better. The 1.0 fte partnership included in this levy is a start, but without a shared vision, what does that position

building towards? Is it approving paperwork or is it creating strategic collaborative relationships rooted in values like equity, belonging and joy partners? Stepping in to meet the community needs should be seen as co builders coauthors, not just as applicants that require intention, investment and alignment. We need someone who doesn't just say, yes, your program is approved. We need someone who can say, this partnership reflects our values and meets a critical need. It brings our vision to life and we're doing it together. So I'd like to say it again Portland currently does not have a vision for its park and recreation system. That's a leadership gap, and we are asking clearly and urgently for council and parks leadership to make the creation of a shared, bold vision a top priority over these coming months. We cannot keep answering the most important question who is leading the vision of Portland park and recreation with? That's a good question. We must start saying, here's where we're going. Come with us. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

Speaker: Jim schulan.

Speaker: Thanks for accommodating. Appreciate it. I'm jim Keelan. I am representing the Portland parks alliance today. I'm also a volunteer with the 40 mile loop land trust. Thank you very much for this opportunity. As a resident of district three, I really appreciate it. I'm going to read a letter into the record from the Portland parks alliance. The Portland parks alliance is an informal alliance of volunteer based and professionally led, not for profit organizations that are allies and supporters of Portland parks and recreation and their programs. We are representative of 60 participating organizations who are concerned about the sustainability of pa's financial model and the long term sustainability of its assets. Our purpose is not to advocate for individual programs or assets. Rather, we exist to advocate for the entire system of parks, natural areas, trails, community and

cultural centers, and for programs that are desired by the community that ppr is uniquely able to provide. Ppr's documentation tells us that the amount of deferred capital maintenance total 600 million. You've heard that about five times today. This list includes everything from worn out playground equipment, restrooms with failing roofs, buckled pathways, sidewalks and sports courts, inefficient lighting, park lighting, poles that are subject to failure, and the failure of entire structures such as the Multnomah art center. Because of our concern about the deterioration of ppr's assets nearly a year ago, we came before City Council to question the process of simply renewing the parks levy of 2020 without also addressing the deterioration of ppr's assets. Since then, we have met and spoken to most of you about our concerns, the budgets. The city's budget office recommends an annual expenditure of 60 million just to maintain ppr's asset base, never mind addressing the \$600 million backlog. In recent history, the city has appropriated 5 million per year, \$0.03 specified by resolution 20 2025 281 will add about 2.1 million per year. You could say it's a start, and the ppr appreciates it as a good faith gesture. In a time of financial stress for the city. The ppr. Ppr also appreciates council's renewed attention to its own statement of intent, made in 2015 to address the city's capital maintenance backlog. Clearly, we have a long way to go, and we wish to continue working with you to find a sustainable funding model for Portland parks and recreation. Thank you very much. Thanks. Special thanks to councilor novick for bringing forward a discussion on the amendments that we proposed. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

Speaker: That concludes testimony.

Speaker: Okay, colleagues, that moves us into our discussion. And as we heard, we have a number of councilors who have amendments to propose to the resolution before us. When we take our vote today, we will be voting on the resolution as well

as the exhibits, which are the materials that will actually appear before voters. The resolution will guide us in our work as we implement this levy. Moving forward. So I would now entertain a discussion on the underlying materials or amendments to that resolution that folks have brought up previously. Councilor green.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president, and also thank you to everyone who came out today to testify and share your priorities, concerns. I think the amendment that I want to bring today is responsive to a theme that I have heard since taking this office, which is sort of voter and taxpayer trust. And my approach to this conversation is not necessarily from the standpoint of taxpayer fatigue. I think if you know me, you might think that that's not my position. I see bob smiling there. But but I also think from the standpoint of stewardship of our existing resources and how we use our money. And that's that's an area that I think I'd like this, I'd like this amendment to speak to. So if you have the amendment in front of you, I'll just read what it is. Well, before I do that, I just want I just want to motivate it. I think that we have a narrow interpretation of what is it, ors two, two, three, which begins on dot 297 and runs through. I think it's two, 316, which, which is the state law that governs our use of system development charges. And I'll direct you to the section on authorized expenditures of system development charges. Basically, we are allowed to spend sdcs only on things that are capacity increasing capital improvements. And they give us a number of definitions for what that means. And they say specifically, an increase in system capacity may be established if a capital improvement increases the level of performance or service provided by an existing facility or provides new facilities. And so, colleagues, I just want to say that if you're looking at a facility that is near failure and a roof is about to fail, or, you know, an hvac system is about to fail, or you've got a tennis courts that are so buckled that you cannot play tennis anymore, that is no longer routine maintenance. That is

something qualitatively different. And so I think from the standpoint of, you know, recognizing that, yes, we do need to build some new assets for part of the city that that has not had them or kind of I think the council president had articulated a vision for regional parks assets, you know, things like the north Portland aquatic center. Those are meaningful and reasonable new investments. I, I want the resolution to sort of put in writing that we recognize that we have some internal work to do inside the city to clarify our policies, to revisit our internal assumptions about what's in and what's out of classifications for system development charges. Because if we can use a good share of the existing pot of money for sdcs to tackle some of these very important capital maintenance programs that are not routine, that are of a nature that is going to threaten the viability of the capacity of the existing system, then I think it's a strong signal to voters that that this council is, is, is willing to take very seriously the fiscal stewardship lens. It doesn't go as far as I think some you know, it's not perfect. And I would love to refer a levy that was much higher. But I but I'm more interested in a levy passing than, than, than what I think is, is necessary for the, for the maintenance backlog. So colleagues I would move that that we adopt my amendment. That's let's see. Let me stop rambling. Get to the point here. All right. So there's a whereas clause that speaks to the backlog. And it says whereas City Council recognizes the parks and recreation system has an extensive backlog of major maintenance needs, and the 2025 parks levy will begin to address these needs, but will only be able to make only be able to address a small fraction of these needs. The council will continue to work with pr and community on a long range financial plan. We'll explore options for a major maintenance bond measure, and will direct the office of government relations to work in the legislature. And here's where my change is. I say strike authorize in the underlying resolution and replace it with clarify authority for because I believe we

already have the authority to use sdcs to invest in capacity preservation of our assets. And then I add a new clause that says and will pursue as appropriate, policy changes in the city of Portland that clarify and prioritize the use of system development charges for extension of useful life or restoration of existing capital assets. So that's the whereas piece and then it's just mirrored later on in a second to last, be it further resolved where I add a clause on that that says and where appropriate, system development charge use will continue to include major maintenance projects, which the major maintenance piece may change and adjust pursuant to councilor novick's previous comments that extend the useful life or restores the capacity value of existing parks, capital, assets, and colleagues. Before I yield, I just would like to mention that I previously contemplated putting language that said prioritize sdcs for existing kind of preservation, and I want to recognize that that might run afoul of some of our equity commitments and some of our you know, I don't want to put prioritize in there. I just want to say, let's just continue to use this practice and codify it a little bit. So that's what I'd like to add colleagues and would love to, to hear a second.

Speaker: Second, second.

Speaker: Colleagues, we have a motion and a second, I believe. Councilor dunphy, was that you? First? I think four of us might have said it at the same time on the table. And clearly a fair amount of support here. Is there any discussion? Seeing none. Councilor novick. Councilor novick. Go right ahead.

Speaker: I just want to raise i, I'm a little worried about confusion because I think that there's a general impression that you can't use sdcs for maintenance, even if in fact we have used them to some, some extent. And we're talking about going to the legislature, but we're also saying we're going to continue to use them. So I just.

Want to know, councilor green, how do you think that we should manage any confusion that arises from this? Adding this to the conversation.

Speaker: I think it's a great question. I think part of why, I mean, I think we tackle that by updating our codes and our policies that specify how we how we use them. And we need to, as we consider councilor clark's asset management lens going forward, we need to incorporate maybe some of the kpi discussion that councilor Ryan wants, wants to contemplate. We need to we need to provide a qualitative distinction on what we mean between capacity preserving and increasing, and how this fits into capital improvement plan lens. And so it may be the case that the legislature doesn't need to do anything. But I still think we got ourselves into this mess because the language in ors two, two, three would benefit from some. Just like maybe an example of how of how an investment might be capital improvement by just fixing up an existing thing.

Speaker: And this is always a hard question to ask without also asking for privileged information. But have you run this by the city attorney's office?

Speaker: Yeah, my staff has had conversations with the city attorney. I forget the gentleman's last name, but he does not support this interpretation. And you know, I'm not I'm not convinced I can read the law here. And I do have a background in, in cost accounting. And I think it's fairly straightforward to say, look, you can capitalize a project, you can capitalize a review if it threatens the viability of existing assets. So the resolution just asks us to do some internal work on our policy work. So there's still an opportunity for us to discuss what that policy change in relation with the city attorney and have a broader discussion. So I am comfortable with that. That tension with the city attorney's office, I recognize others may not be.

Speaker: But I think that a little feel. Probably okay with pursue as appropriate policy changes in the city of Portland that clarify. And you said you're moving the

word prioritize, which is what I had the use of sdc's for extensive use of life. So maybe as appropriate is like enough of a savings word that I'm not as worried about it. But then the where you say. In the subsequent amendment we're appropriate systems development charge use will continue to include major maintenance projects that extend the useful life for restores the capacity value. I know you're saying that or there are examples that we have done that, but I think that I just feel more comfortable saying include rather than continue to include.

Speaker: May I offer a potential. Compromise here that I think gets to your concern. Maybe if we strike major maintenance project, which I already don't think belongs there, what if we just replace that with capacity improvement projects? Because those are the ones that can go into our capital improvement plan, and those are the ones that are already in our 2016 sdc plan that are otherwise non routine maintenance.

Speaker: So we're let's see. Actually I'm not sure I'm looking at the same thing. What I've got looking at now is says where appropriate sdc use will continue to include major maintenance projects that extend the useful life or restore the capacity value of existing. So how would it read?

Speaker: I would say instead of include major maintenance projects, it would say include capacity improving projects that extend the useful life that's very closely connected to the 223 language in ors. And it's also how it is described in our own sdc capital improvement plan. Okay. Is that okay?

Speaker: Yes. Thank you.

Speaker: Do we have that? Are we following that friendly amendment. Can i.

Speaker: Say that one more time.

Speaker: Yeah. So in a green amendment number one, what I'm what I'm getting from councilor novick is to replace in the penultimate, be it further resolved in the

last clause, replace major maintenance projects with capacity improvement projects.

Speaker: Councilor dunphy is the seconder. Are you okay with that change? Okay, rebecca, do you have that or do you need us to send it in writing? Okay. You have it. Great. Okay, colleagues, we have a slightly tweaked amendment before us now. Councilor Ryan, go right ahead.

Speaker: Yes to the amendment. And I want to say thank you to councilor green. I had a two year experience where I was pursuing, and all I heard was no. So the legal said no. And then it was never a legislative priority. And so I think we need to do this action to get to the bottom of this. And I think the language changes that you and councilor novick ironed out were were superb. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor colleagues, is there any other discussion to the amendment? And i'll note this is our first council meeting since the break. And I did say that after the break, I was going to hold us to the policy in robert's rules of order to not speak at length with our votes. So if folks have comments on this vote, now is the time to make those. Okay. Seeing no one else in the queue. Rebecca, can you please call the roll. Koyama lane i.

Speaker: Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick I green.

Speaker: Hi zimmerman. I avalos.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Dunphy i.

Speaker: Smith. Hi.

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: I Ryan. Hi pirtle-guiney. I 11 eyes. The amendment is approved.

Speaker: Thank you very much colleagues. Are there other is there other discussion to the now amended resolution or are there any other amendments to bring forward. Councilor Ryan.

Speaker: Thank you. Council president. As mentioned earlier, here's the language for the amendment. My chief of staff did send that to everybody over the last half hour or hour. It reads as follows. Whereas on or before December 31st, 2025, pner leadership, in collaboration with state stakeholders, will submit ten key performance indicators kpi for City Council's approval. These kpis will form the park's levee performance dashboard.

Speaker: Colleagues, is there a second?

Speaker: Second?

Speaker: Any discussion?

Speaker: Councilor kanal I just had a question.

Speaker: Can you speak to the choice of the date December 31st?

Speaker: I didn't want to rush it and have it be pursued. Obviously today that would not work. I thought it was necessary that we include many of the stakeholders that we've been all talking to the last couple of weeks, and I do think that the arts and economy committee, which is the rec side, I think, would like to provide a space for that to take place. And I did December 31st because in a quick conversation with the current director, it seemed like it was fair. I'm sure it will come prior to that. That's why we use language that need to land before that. So what do you think?

Speaker: Just to clarify. So then the intent is that that they would start working on it before the election. Right. Absolutely. Just making sure I wanted to understand that we're not asking for like a month and three weeks.

Speaker: I just didn't want the experience that that we had with the last levee, where there was so much confusion. And what what was the intent, how did it make the world better? And I think that that wasn't fair at times, but we didn't have anything clear and visible that that was transparent to the public, that what success looked like. So with this one, since we want to improve operations and improve in addition to the ones I mentioned, that's why we have up to ten, and we want them to be digestible so that they're easier for people to understand. It's not going to be an insider's indicator. It's one that the public could definitely understand.

Speaker: Thanks. And you answered my second question, which is sort of in passing, which is would this include indicators about recreation? So I am good and I'm comfortable supporting this.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor, councilor Ryan, I have a question. I'm wondering about the statement that there would be ten kpis. I'm wondering if you have specific kpis in mind or why you chose the number ten. I'm just concerned that if we get feedback back that we need an additional, or that we don't need that money, are we holding ourselves to something where we then are trying to split things and we don't actually have the performance measurements that we want? We have the ones that we need to make sure it's exactly ten.

Speaker: How did i.

Speaker: With ten? So I came up with ten because in my life experience in doing work like this continuous improvement work, the ten is a good number. Many times organizations will list hundreds and that doesn't really track as well. And people also get lost in it and you lose the accountability. So I thought we should lift the key ones that we keep hearing over and over again from partners. And all of you will be

included in that dialog. And so is giving us some discipline to make it so it's manageable.

Speaker: I hope we don't feel hemmed in by that number later. Councilor green, are you in the queue?

Speaker: Yeah, I just wanted to say that the reason why I seconded this, councilor Ryan and I, when we sat down to chart out what our committee would look like and what it would focus on, KPIs was at the forefront. And kind of a data driven approach was at the forefront of how we manage our portfolio. And recreation is a big part of that portfolio. You want the KPIs to be driven by a need, and we have this opportunity. We have a new levy, we have some new leadership in the parks bureau. We're hearing calls for increased accountability and transparency. And so I think this is just a great way to slot that in. So I just wanted to articulate why I think it's a good idea to add this in.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor Novick.

Speaker: Councilor Ryan, since you and I are of a certain age and share cultural references, are you sure you wouldn't want to go to 11?

Speaker: I'm. I'm open to a number of change on that. And it was so I am open to the number.

Speaker: Would you accept a friendly amendment to.

Speaker: I'm really I'm trying to discipline us. I won't use the word hem. And so hem is in. But I do think it's important that we are disciplined. I'm fine with a friendly amendment of 11. And I also when we listen to testimony colleagues, it was really clear that people want that vision. In my experience, what you measure matters and what you put out visually does provide that transparency, and it further provides an opportunity to track that vision. Are you getting the results from what you're putting out there? So we've been operating on a lot of vision

at times or maybe ideas, and it's really important that we have an operations plan that has strategic clarity. And so when you can measure it and everyone can see it and they're all seeing the same thing, that dashboard is visible to the entire community. They know where we are and they know where we want to go.

Speaker: Councilor morillo. And I'm just want to pause. Actually, I'm not sure if there was an actual proposal for an amendment to 11 or if that was just a joke. So I'm moving on to councilor. Morillo.

Speaker: I couldn't tell either.

Speaker: I didn't understand the reference, so sorry. It's true. I feel like I had the same question as council president pirtle-guiney around the number of ten key performance indicators, and I know that you answered it, but I'm not quite sure I understood specifically what we're looking for. So could we specify that or maybe just remove the ten so we're not bound by it? If we if there aren't ten or.

Speaker: The friendly amendment that you're offering is to just not have a number. And that I hear that or.

Speaker: To hear specifics from you about what it would.

Speaker: Where it's we have to work that out. I didn't want to tell you what the ten were today. I think that it's really clear what some of them are from based on dialog of late, but I'd rather take a pause. And all of us come together with parks leadership and the stakeholders to identify what they are. If we did that today, this meeting would last really long.

Speaker: So what if it just says we will submit key performance indicators without the ten?

Speaker: I can I can accept that friendly amendment because we're going to do them. So yeah.

Speaker: Then I propose the friendly amendment.

Speaker: All right I accept.

Speaker: Do you accept that.

Speaker: I accept as the second.

Speaker: Okay. So this would say in collaboration with stakeholders will submit key performance indicators for City Council approval. Okay. Councilor novick, are you back in the queue?

Speaker: Yes. Well, just for my own amendments not to discuss this one.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Okay. Is there any other discussion on the amendment before us? Okay. And this is now a slightly amended form of the amendment to say will submit key performance indicators without a number there. And councilor Ryan, before we vote on this, could you let our clerk's team know where in the resolution you would like this whereas clause to be located.

Speaker: We placed it on page two and now it's the third from the bottom. So it's after the one that talks about the annual reports.

Speaker: Okay. So in between whereas ppr will produce annual reports on how levy funds are being spent. And whereas the community member oversight committee will review. Yeah okay. Rebecca do you see that.

Speaker: It was in the email. It was mailed out about an hour ago.

Speaker: Perfect okay. Thank you. Rebecca, can you please call the roll?

Speaker: Koyama lane. I morillo. I novick. I green. I.

Speaker: Zimmerman. I.

Speaker: Avalos. I dunphy. I.

Speaker: Smith i.

Speaker: Parnell i. Ryan hi.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: 11 eyes. The amendment is approved Ryan one.

Speaker: Councilor novick.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. There's a whole bunch of really tiny things here, and I'm going to mix in the slightly more substantive proposals from the parks alliance with the simple word changes. If anybody wants me to divide those up, then I'd be happy to do that. So the first word change is whereas the proposed 140 levy would include 137 for park and recreation options and zero three for now. It says capital projects add the words maintenance capital maintenance projects. Then two hours is below the oh three rate for capital projects. Again, make it capital maintenance projects. Then. Let's see. This is a more substantive addition to the. Whereas after the whereas that says p and r will produce annual reports about how levy funds are being spent, including performance metrics, etc. Addition would be whereas p and r shall, as part of the annual budget process, describe to council the approximate percentage of its operations and number of fte, which will be funded by levy resources and. And then below the current. Whereas that says whereas City Council recognizes the parks and rec system has an extensive backlog of major maintenance needs. Oh, first of all, I'm proposing change major maintenance needs in that paragraph to capital maintenance needs. Extensive backlog of capital maintenance needs, but then follow that paragraph with the language suggested by the parks alliance, whereas City Council will adopt this long range financial plan by the end of fiscal year 20 2728. And then let's see. There's a whereas which reads whereas if approved, the 2025 parks levy would raise an estimated 2,000,000 in the first year to support capital projects. Again, add the word maintenance capital maintenance projects in the now. Therefore, be it resolved, also change the oh three of the rate will be for capital projects to capital maintenance projects and then a subsequent. Be it resolved that the .03 for capital projects is intended to be

distributed between the four council districts, again at the word maintenance between capital and projects, and then in the same further resolved instead of capital, project decisions from levy funds will be included capital maintenance projects and then, along with other capital maintenance projects. So that would be the extent of these numerous but small amendments.

Speaker: Councilor I believe what you're doing is adding capital to any time where we talk about maintenance projects.

Speaker: Actually maintenance, where.

Speaker: We talk.

Speaker: Maintenance, where we talk about capital, I apologize, adding language about long range financial plan development and adding language about reporting on the percentage of the budget, the parks budget funded by the levy.

Speaker: Right.

Speaker: Are those the three categories?

Speaker: Right and in one place, replacing the word major with the word capital perfect.

Speaker: Is there a second.

Speaker: Second second?

Speaker: Okay. I believe councilor canal beat you to it. Councilor Ryan, is there any discussion on this amendment? Okay, colleagues seeing none. Rebecca, could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Koyama lane.

Speaker: Hi, morillo. Hi, novick. Hi, green.

Speaker: I zimmerman.

Speaker: Hi.

Speaker: Avalos.

Speaker: Hi, dunphy. Hi, smith.

Speaker: Hi.

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: Hi, Ryan. Hi, pirtle-guiney. Hi.

Speaker: And the amendment is approved with 11 ayes.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor canal.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I'm going to take the opportunity to formally propose the amendment that I handed out and have emailed in as canal one. This would create a new whereas clause that I have placed between the. Whereas on community and art centers and then free and discount options for recreational programing above and then below the sorry, those would be the ones above it, and then it would be directly above the strengthening partnerships ones about midway through page two. Whereas a new levy would allow for \$139,169 per year, \$0.00232 of the 1.37 for parks and recreation operations to be dedicated to the extension of hours at four community centers, one in each council district on Fridays and Saturdays from memorial day to September 30th each year to 11 p.m, to promote access to free third spaces for all Portlanders, in particular young people, and promote student achievement, community safety and youth development. And just to speak briefly to it, we have talked about baltimore a lot. I think it's also worth noting two other examples of situations where the extension of community centers has hours on the evenings where. Young people, in particular don't necessarily have something else to do that they can afford, or something else to do that they can afford. That's in their home area. And so baltimore extended their hours in the summertime on Fridays and Saturdays to 11 p.m. Dallas has also done something quite similar. We're clearly willing to learn from their example. It's they call it the summer of safety program. And the other example I would cite is

that this was a part of the conversation. I want to note the conversation, not the programming around some of the initiatives we've done in the past. Here in Portland, a couple of years ago, we recognized that gun violence goes up in the summertime, and we worked on a safer summer intervention program. Programs like that would be supported by having the ability to send young people to a place where they don't have to pay. And so that's fundamentally what this is about. We did have it scored. We're we're talking about an \$84 million levy. And this is \$139,000. And I just want to close with that piece of information. I actually I'll also note that the testimony we got from. Sorry, I have forgotten the name miss murray at sellwood community house talking about asking Portlanders to support an increased tax without getting anything new. This would be something new that would be visible in your community. And I think that's a really important thing to deliver to voters is that for a very small amount of money, you'd be able to see a space open that young people can go to. So that is why I would be proposing this amendment. And I would ask for a second.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilors. Councilor morillo, are you in the queue to discuss this amendment?

Speaker: I am, thank you, council president. I am definitely in favor of this in terms of the substance of it and what it could do. I have some concerns about this amendment and councilor zimmerman's amendment with regards to earmarking funds for specific things, because I think that given all of the federal funding issues that are coming down the pike and just everything else going on, that I would like to give parks maximum flexibility in how they're able to allocate those funds. So I guess I wanted to hear your response and analysis of that because I am I

completely agree with your analysis on what that could do for public safety and for youth in our communities, but just have some concerns.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: I hear you. I think that there are massive concerns around, I think, roughly \$100 million a year that we're talking about in the context of grants. I don't. So the two things I would say is one, I don't think \$139,000 is going to make a huge difference either way on that particular concern, but it is one of the best bang for your buck type of programs we could possibly do. In terms I was, I was aware that it would be a low six digit number. I said that in the committee last Thursday when I floated this for the first time, I did not know it was going to be this low. So that's, you know, a pleasant surprise. And I also think that at a time when we're under significant threat, that from an authoritarian federal government, that one of its tactics is to divide us, combining this with the idea of volunteerism as a way to help bring communities together in an intergenerational way, often in terms of who's volunteering to provide programs for teenagers and young adults, is actually a way of pushing back against the broader concerns there. But that's not the original intent, but it is sort of a additional benefit.

Speaker: Councilor avalos.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor canal I and thank you, councilor morillo, for asking that question because I was sitting with that tension. But I think where I'm landing is one the impact is very, you know, small. And I think that the impact in dollars and in percentage of the levy is translates to a huge impact to east Portland, where this will greatly affect our ability to create more third spaces. I think, you know, this is our opportunity in this levy, as we're doing in lots of other ways, to signal intent and program. And so I see this as just another one, even though, you know, it has a

monetary amount. I mean, just like we're adding the \$0.03 for capital maintenance. So I hear you councilor morillo, because I agree in general, that I want us to be careful to not be overly prescriptive. This feels like enough of a like, I can I can get down with this. And I think the impact is good and it's also us totally agree with this assessment of us adding something visible that people will be able to feel. So I plan to support it, but I'm grateful for the discussion that happened just before me because I was sitting with that tension, but definitely landing on supporting it.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor. Councilor koyama lane.

Speaker: Thank you for this work, for your work on this. Councilor. I am absolutely interested in the extension of hours at community centers. I would love to see this. I am wondering also if the levy is the right place to do this type of earmarking. And I'm also thinking about how this is very specific and how I know voters appreciate having some specific examples of what they can expect. And so I actually can see this possibly being helpful as a campaign will hopefully be ran around this. And then I also have another follow up question. I'm wondering about this language. A new levy would allow. And then going on for that money to be dedicated. I was wondering if allow is the right word or it seems a little like squishier. I was wondering if there's another word like the word direct, or can I hear your thinking around that?

Speaker: Thank you. So i'll first say yeah, the part about specificity I think is and this is a strange conversation because we're talking about how to build something that can be more politically viable. Right. That's just a strange concept to this entire thing. But I do think that having specificity will help with that. In terms of the levy, I think next year's budget will take effect on July 1st. There's a lot of time between the end of the school year and July 1st, where you start to see spikes in gun violence happen. And so we started when I was at the community safety division.

We started the safer summer program significantly earlier than that when we could, and sometimes we couldn't because of funding and how it was funded. So I am thinking about that in terms of this opportunity. So and I think the two things together is the answer to your timing question? On the third question, I think that's a really good one about the use of the word allow. And I think this also relates to councilor murillo's question of it's signaling council intent. But I don't think the resolution itself can direct it. And we were advised by, you know, not to amend the exhibits on the dais on the day of and through no fault of their own. I want to be clear. I'm not blaming them. It just took a little time to get the exact scoring figured out. And so it kind of it made sense to frame it this way as a direction. And i'll also just take the opportunity to note, you know, we are expecting that for three of the districts. We're going to have the conversation about which community center, you know, with the councilors. And I apologize to my colleagues in district one, you only have one community center. For now. That's a challenge for a later prog, a later problem to solve. But for the other three districts, I would hope that we're able to have input into that process. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. All of that is helpful and I am excited to support this.

Speaker: Councilor I had told you when you first brought this concept up that it was something that I was excited to support in the budget next year, because I do think that it is a really important thing for us to do, and we've had a lot of conversations about programed less time, but more programing or more time, even if it means less programing. And I'm really supportive of this concept. I'm struggling because we costed this levy in order to be able to assure Portlanders that we would maintain all of the investments that we bought back during the budget process. And I worry that if we start to say and also this and also this, it becomes harder and harder to keep that promise. And I don't want to set ourselves up to not

be able to keep the promises that we make during this levy. I know it's only a small amount of money. I am going to take the next minute or two as others talk to think about my vote. But I'm leaning voting no because I worry about being able to keep that promise that we will maintain what we have, that Portlanders won't see cuts. But I did just want to state on the record that if I vote no on this, that does not mean that I wouldn't support it in the budget process. I do think it's a really important thing for us to do.

Speaker: Thanks. And I'll just clarify the based in part on our conversations. It this does not include programming includes enough staff to keep the space open, but open gyms for gyms that have basketballs, gyms that at least one of which will have dodgeball soon. You know, those sorts of things will allow for that. And I think if there is a need for additional programming, there is the concept of volunteerism that we've talked about in a lot of places and obviously the friends of groups and things like that. To the other point about costing it out, that's that's where the costing is based. Just to just to clarify that.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor novick.

Speaker: Yeah, I share the concern about this being really prescriptive. I also worry that I think that the overall message here is that we've got a levy that, in the words of bon jovi, holds on to what we've got. And I think that polling actually shows that the maintenance message is strong. And I'm a little worried if we say all this is about is holding on to what we've got, plus a little bit for capital maintenance plus this one other thing, it kind of implies that we've thought that we think that only this one other thing is important enough to be worth adding, and maybe there's a reasonable case for that. But I can sort of see people saying, well, wait a minute, if you're going to add things, why don't you add this thing or that thing or the other

thing? So I'm just worried about having a bit of I don't feel strongly about this, but I think I'm a no, because I think it's sort of a muddled there's sort of a muddled message.

Speaker: So i'll.

Speaker: Just quickly state, because you brought up the bon jovi thing. The last reference was a reference to spinal tap. This is spinal tap. Just to clarify, for those who didn't know. Yeah, the I guess this is a kind of a response to both questions. I, I don't apologize for saying public safety is special and deserves prioritization. I do think it's appropriate to ask why this and not that. And I also think it's an incredibly fair response to say, because public safety and I for me, that is a priority that we often view very narrowly. But I think this council has come to the realization that maybe other councils did not, that that recreation and community centers are a part of our public safety system. And so it is special. I do think it's an exception, and I don't mind. I'm not apologizing for that.

Speaker: Councilor Ryan.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: To the amendment.

Speaker: Yeah. Great conversation on this amendment. I have agreed with a couple of the comments here. First of all, I'm struggling on my vote on this one because I see the impact, but I also have experience where when there's carve outs, how rough that is to land it. And I know that we already put in a couple that were negotiated over the last few weeks. The point three for capital maintenance or in the other one is the one fte for partnerships. And I I'm concerned if we keep adding these and it's so hard to get to 140. And so this would would something would have to probably give. And so I'm probably just out of principle would would want to hear from parks leadership and have more time to see how they would be able to

roll this out. I agree that I want this and I would support it in the budget process, putting it into another earmark. Carve out whatever you want to call it for this specific item. It gives me some. Hesitation.

Speaker: Thanks. I just wanted to quickly state this is kind of to both councilor novick and councilor Ryan councilor novick. In the previous amendment, you noted that as appropriate, alleviated your concern. And I would I would say that the use of the phrase here of would allow should serve that same purpose. And I think this relates to the conversations that, that my staff had through with cbo and with parks about, you know, we did staff. The main concern we heard is we don't want necessarily one person to always be there alone. And so talking about the staffing level, we did adjust and get it rescored based on that, to have the ability to have a second staffer there so that the first person isn't staying alone the whole night, you know, so that we did adjust based off of those sorts of pieces of feedback. And I just wanted to make sure that was clear. I don't know if that alleviates the concern, but I think it's additional context.

Speaker: Okay. I'm going to try to keep moving this along because we have a half an hour left today and at least one more amendment. Councilor dunphy.

Speaker: Thank you to.

Speaker: The amendment. I just want to note, and i'll be a bit of a broken record, because I have said this multiple times on here, but I started my career working in a middle school in east Portland in the david douglas school district. I have watched three of my students die of violence. I have watched six of my students shot and live. I have seen one of my students doing a long term sentence because she was involved in the violent beating death of her classmate. Third places for students in east Portland especially, is unparalleled for our resources, for public safety. And the reality is, my 13 year old daughter will not benefit from this because we live in

parkrose and the only available community center is the east Portland community center, which is adjacent to floyd light middle school. Those are my kids. Those are actually now the kids of my kids when I was there, because it's been 15, almost 20 years since I left. I think that this may be a special carve out. I hear my colleagues concerns about calling out one special thing versus another, but for my students in district one, for my young people, this is the difference between life and death. And it's not hyperbole. Kids who do not have a place to go find a place to go, and if they don't have something positive to do, they will find something to do and it will lead to increased. It is directly tied to increased gun violence, directly tied to car theft, directly tied to retail theft, and directly tied to interpersonal violence. I think that this is an enormously responsible use of our time, to modestly increase the amount of hours that some of our kids can benefit, even if it saves one child's life. So thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor, councilor green.

Speaker: Yeah, I just I just want to say that I think public safety begins with strong and safe and healthy communities and parks. Parks are a cornerstone of that for me. I think for all the other reasons that have been articulated, i, I think this is such a small amount of money that has the potential to save us a lot of public safety expenditure on the back end that this is, is, frankly, in a time where we do have budget challenges. I think just a really cost efficient move. I also, you know, I hear the I do hear the structural concerns about like, okay, what are we cobbling together here? And are we creating confusion. But I do think voters are looking at looking at us to, to be increasingly creative in how we stretch the value of every resolution, every measure, everything that we refer and ask them to pay for. And if we can say, all right, this has a very, very small impact on the rest of the program

delivery, but has a huge impact on public safety and whole communities, I think is really something we should support. Colleagues. So I intend to vote yes.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor avalos.

Speaker: Yeah, I agree with councilor greene. And I just want to note there's been a lot of negotiating and carve outs that happened before it came to this table. So I think that this is another one that is actually people forward, which is why I'm going to support it. And I think you all should too. Thanks.

Speaker: Thank you councilor. Any other discussion to the amendment? Okay. Seeing none. Rebecca, could you please call the roll.

Speaker: Koyama lane? I morillo.

Speaker: Sorry, I know we were supposed to have all our discussion. I'll be very brief, I think. In general.

Speaker: A sentence brief.

Speaker: Yes, a sentence brief. In general, I think that we should be able to indicate legislative intent when we are on the dais and have that be a part of the public record. But since this is such a small impact to the budget, with such a big impact for the community, I will be voting yes. But generally I'm quite tired of us being stuck in one position because we have specifically allocated funds when we need maximum flexibility, but i.

Speaker: Novick nay.

Speaker: Green a.

Speaker: Zimmerman no. Avalos.

Speaker: I. Dunphy i.

Speaker: Smith no.

Speaker: No i.

Speaker: Ryan no. Pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: And the amendment fails with six I and five nay. Passes with six I and five nay.

Speaker: We need seven to pass. Can we get the final vote count? Rebecca?

Speaker: Yes. Sorry. The amendment fails with six I and five nay votes.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Councilor zimmerman.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. As I indicated earlier, I would like to just add the sentence in the second to last resolved clause. The sentence reads the \$0.03 for capital projects will be spent only on restroom facilities. So the reason I have shared before and being the representative for the downtown area in particular, but actually across our district, this is one of those areas where I actually think specificity in levies is important. And in particular on this topic. The reason I'm presenting this as an amendment is because I think we have seen over the last few years, we've seen where restroom facilities in our in our parks have been downgraded, if you will, in terms of their prioritization. Instead, we saw the parks put in porta potties and things like that. And I think it's important that we be specific that this is also part of it. And I appreciate the rest of the other capital maintenance and councilor novick points about about the right sizes. I think those are all really important signals and, and pieces to send. And the additional 50% open to other items. But I do think it's important for us in this time to consider calling out the park restrooms, because for whatever reason, I don't think that park restrooms are held in high regard in the cultural decision making of the last levy, or in the last several years of parks. And so in this case, i, I think it's important I would never shy away from specificity. I think that the health of a levy would be that this would all be more specific. And I'm willing to be flexible on this entire levy. But in

this in this case, i, I think for this one, I would like this 3% to be clear and that be resolved so that we meet our intent here. Thank you. I would appreciate any seconds.

Speaker: Thank you counselor. Is there a second?

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Okay. Seconded by councilor Ryan, councilor dunphy to the amendment.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Councilor zimmerman, you know, there are I think I'm ultimately going to be a no on this. I appreciate where you're going. And I have seen firsthand how, for example, when the bathroom at ventura park was chained shut for a year, it led to less use by families and more use by bad behavior. But I also see situations like lewitt view park in my neighborhood, where the rubber on the surface of the playground began crumbling. Within a year, the pipes that were used to irrigate the plants got run over by a lawnmower and never got replaced. And the splash pad has been out of commission for the last four years. So there are some, you know, especially in my district, there are reasons beyond simply restrooms, that people are no longer able to use a lot of these public spaces. And i. Would be hesitant to only specify that, especially because there are there are bathrooms in east Portland or parks in east Portland that simply don't even have bathrooms. So.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor. Councilor novick.

Speaker: I wanted to second councilor dunphy's reference to playgrounds. The current language of the levy says that a new levy would include 0.03 of the rate for capital projects to maintain our park system, such as repair of bathrooms and playgrounds. So it does call out bathrooms. And as a 62 year old man, I yield to no one my appreciation of the importance of bathrooms. But I would not want to exclude playgrounds.

Speaker: Thank you councilor. Councilor. I also am concerned with just calling out restrooms playground stand out to me. There are also a number of facilities in my district that could support the type of partnerships that we are asking for parks to do more of. If only the facilities were more usable. Things like cottages. I know in sellwood park we've heard about the shack that need roof repairs and other upgrades to be able to be usable for the type of partnerships that we're talking about that actually come in at about the same cost range as the bathroom projects that I'd like to be able to have on the list. If folks are interested in moving this forward and the votes are not there without changes, I would suggest that I would be happy to say prioritizing bathrooms, but not excluding other projects to give us some ability to look at what the needs are in our districts. However, if the votes are are there without that, or are not there at all, i, I don't need to move that forward. But I am concerned with the current language as proposed. Councilor avalos.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor dunphy, agree with your points. I don't see how at a moment where we are scraping by, we're already sacrificing so much by choosing this 140 number, we're already carving out \$0.03 for capital, and that's not even close to being enough. And our playgrounds are deteriorating. I don't see how we could put this kind of restriction on ourselves to make it only go to bathrooms, especially when east Portland barely has them. So I'm going to be voting no.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor, councilor koyama lane.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. Glad you're with us. Councilor zimmermann, I have a question for you. I kind of wish I could just ask you this. Not on the dais. I'm. I'm genuinely wondering and a little confused. And I'm wondering if you can speak to your hope for specificity here and why that's appropriate and how that is similar or different from what councilor kanal just brought up. I am

genuinely curious. And it might be that those two are quite different, but can you speak to that a little bit? Help me understand?

Speaker: Well, those are your words. I didn't speak to councilor canales issue about specificity, and I agreed with his specificity, and I disagreed with those of you who thought that specificity was bad. I voted no for a different reason. It has. Unrelated.

Speaker: Thank you for clarifying. That's helpful.

Speaker: Councilor. Anything additional?

Speaker: Nope. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor green.

Speaker: Yeah, I was I'm councilor council president. I, I appreciate you brought in that potential amendment that you can make because that's something that I was going to suggest that could move me. But but I think yeah, I think that I think that councilor novick has pointed to the language that in the ballot that, that that does identify the bathrooms. I bathrooms are a huge problem in our district. I know that I also think that we have an opportunity with the amendment that we passed from councilor Ryan with the kpis to say, look, we're we're in the five year levy period. How are we spending our money? Are we prioritizing the right things? And yes, bathrooms need to be opened up. We shouldn't be using porta potties, but i, I don't know if I'm there yet on this. So if there's further discussion, I might be able to be moved. Or if you want to have a response to me, please, please, please go for it.

Speaker: Councilor zimmermann, go ahead.

Speaker: I appreciate I appreciate that so much. You know, I think that this levy should have specificity. I think there's so much about this levy that is being taken on faith. And I have great concern, I think being able to signal a couple of areas where we have seen time and time again, the decision making within the bureau has not

prioritized something. And so that's all I'm really trying to trying to solve for here is because I think that it can be very easy to get a bureau to talk about repairing a playground, but for whatever reason, that decision making has not ever prioritized restrooms in our community. And so i, I don't disagree with a lot. That's being said. I certainly wish this levy was more transparent in terms of what was being included in it. And I thought that this one little ounce of that might be palatable. And I just want to highlight a little bit of a difference when we talk about some of the parks that are in west Portland, we're usually when you stand in one position of that park, you know, you can see almost the rest of the entire park except for except for, of course, the, the forest park. And that's a little bit different than when you stand in some of the parks across our cities who who occupy larger blocks and larger areas. And the reason I bring that up is sometimes the behavior that happens in and around our parks is the kind of thing that you can't get away from when you're in a urban area park in the downtown area, that you will just choose to leave that park. And sometimes and a lot of times in our district, that is what I've noticed is it's toileting and it is, you know, it's the porta potty getting dumped over. Right? It's the it's the it's that kind of stuff that's you can't just go to the other side of the park when that park is only one square block and think that you're away from it. So I am, I am hearing folks I would still support and hope for some support on this. I know it's a tiny amount, but I am. I'm pretty worried about the future of this levy and where we're going with it, and I think some specificity could help with that. So thanks for the questions. And I and I recognize it's not everybody's cup of tea, but I appreciate consideration.

Speaker: Councilor morillo.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. Thank you, councilor zimmerman, for bringing this forward. I, I think I share the same concerns that some of my

colleagues have already brought up and just the fact that restrooms were already referenced, but I did just want to say put it on the record right now, that whenever you want to work on opening more restrooms and repairing our restrooms in the city together, I'd be happy to work on that with you. I do think it's a really critical issue, and I think that in the coming years, frankly, we're going to be experiencing more housing and homelessness issues because of everything happening economically at the federal level and locally. And this is going to be a really critical resource for people who are on our streets. And just for anyone who wants to use our parks. So I hope that this is signaling some legislative intent to move this forward, and that maybe in the next budget cycle, we add some specific budget notes as well to direct the parks bureau to have a specific focus on this.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor koyama lane.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. This is a helpful discussion and thank you for clarifying. Councilor zimmerman. That does refresh my memory. And I remember you saying you appreciate specificity. I would be interested if any colleagues are interested in sharing. If you voted no on that last amendment, specifically around concerns around specificity, but are considering voting yes on this one, I'd be interested. If you're comfortable hearing a bit of your thinking there. I, I said in my last vote, I'm interested in specificity and so I and I want to make I make my voting decisions based on what I think makes the most sense and what's going to be best for Portlanders. And so I am also interested in this a bit. I am wondering, councilor zimmerman, if you might be interested, if you might be open to a friendly amendment that council president and I were just whispering about over here about it saying bathrooms, playgrounds and other small structures. Or if the parks bureau has a more a better word besides small structures, insert that.

Would you be open to that? Councilor zimmerman adding in playgrounds and other small structures.

Speaker: Thanks. So and i'll just remind folks, we have a maintenance budget in the parks bureau outside of this, \$0.03 in this levy. And so nothing would stop them from doing those projects that you're referencing. Councilor. And so I appreciate the nod, I think, to get to get there. The reason I actually value including the term restroom in this one solely is because I don't think that those the prioritization for restrooms actually exists within the thought process within the bureau structure as it currently is. So that was actually part of the reason why I think calling it out individually was important, because the other aspects of park maintenance, excuse me, the other park maintenance funds seem to already be trying to keep up with some of the other areas. I'm noticing what I think is inequity in terms of how they apply those maintenance dollars. And this is a signal to one of those areas that I think has been on the lowest end of the decision making. So it's not that i, i, you know, I think some of the framing here has been like for some reason, this is against against playgrounds or something of that nature. And that's certainly not the case. I obviously was supportive of the regular budget and continue to be I'm just talking about this in this one. So I wouldn't I wouldn't quite be there for that friendly amendment. But I do appreciate the nod.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you so much.

Speaker: Councilor smith.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I just wanted to say that I agree with you, councilor zimmerman. I think that bathrooms should be pointed out and I will be supporting this amendment.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor Ryan.

Speaker: Yes, thank you, madam president. I did second this because I wanted to have this conversation. I was equally challenged with the last one by councilor kanal. All of us have heard from countless constituents, especially parents who tell me their frustrations with bathrooms being closed. And so clearly this is an operational issue that this council must stay on top of from for oversight reasons. But because I voted no on the last one, there's some similar themes on this, and that's where i'll land to stay consistent. Thanks.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor.

Speaker: Is there any other discussion to the amendment? Okay. Seeing none. Rebecca, can you please call the roll.

Speaker: Koyama lane i.

Speaker: Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick no.

Speaker: Green.

Speaker: Hi.

Speaker: Zimmerman. I avalos.

Speaker: No, no.

Speaker: Dunphy.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Smith.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Ryan.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: The amendment fails with five I and six nay votes.

Speaker: Colleagues.

Speaker: Those were all of the amendments that I had noted. Folks said they were bringing. If there are any other amendments though, please feel free to put yourself in the queue. And in addition, because we are trying to not give our speeches with our votes now, if there is anybody who would like to speak to the now amended resolution and attachments as a whole, this would be the time to get in the queue to make those comments. Councilor dunphy.

Speaker: Thank you. Yeah. First, colleagues, thank you for this conversation. I think that the debate back and forth has been great to add some some value and to continue to work with you all. Thank you to everybody who's been involved in this so far. I'm eager to support the renewal of the Portland parks levy, and I'm really thankful to everybody who has and all the work that's gone into the compromise proposal before us. You know, as I said, just a little bit ago, and I've mentioned repeatedly in my in my brief time on City Council, I've insisted that we treat parks as a vital public safety infrastructure, especially in east Portland, where far too many residents lack access to safe, accessible places to play, gather and connect. I believe strongly in investing in these spaces, not just to maintain what we have, but to grow and transform what our parks can be. But let's be clear what we have heard from every part of our community. This cannot just be business as usual. We're asking Portlanders to dig deeper into their pockets. If we are asking Portlanders to dig deeper into their pockets, especially in my community in district one, we must demand more in return, holding ourselves and parks and recreation to the highest standard of fiscal stewardship, accountability, equity, and imagination. Our parks should be more than vibrant or more than beautiful natural spaces. They should be

alive and vibrant with youth programming and cultural celebrations and music and food and community events that bring neighbors together and activates these public spaces year round. And where the bureau can't do that on their own, then we must be bold enough to pursue partnerships with community organizations that can, like the Sellwood Community House and others that have shown us what is possible if when our public assets are community powered. So I support this levy and I'm let's also use this moment as a call to action, a challenge to ourselves and to the bureau to raise the bar, to build a Portland where our parks reflect the vibrant, diverse, thriving communities that they are meant to serve. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor, councilor canal.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: I actually have a couple questions for the parks leadership. I separated this out so I could propose my amendment. And it's related to some specific testimony that we had here, both Mr. Oldendorf and Mr. Weinstein referenced an audit that they said had not been released publicly. Could you speak to that?

Speaker: Yeah. I don't I don't quite know what that is. I know there are a couple of audits underway with the city's audit services division. None ready for release. I think one is maybe scheduled for fall and one's a little earlier in the sequence, but those are released publicly and contemporaneously by the auditor.

Speaker: Right. And then there's when you say in the fall before the election.

Speaker: Up to the auditor, I, I kind of think so, but I don't know.

Speaker: Okay. And then last year, there was a conversation when I was on the parks board about that not by the auditor, but an independent look into the levy, specifically the current levy, and that that had, as far as I'm aware, been publicly released. I've seen it.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: And I was on it as a volunteer. So I assume if I could see it, anyone can see it.

Speaker: Correct.

Speaker: But yeah, I'm seeing nods over there for the record so that that's helpful to know. And I'm just for the record, it was a clean audit like it was it was a very positive audit. Thanks. Second, is there any current strategic planning process underway at parks or for that matter, in the public works service area.

Speaker: Or in the city? Yes, in the parks bureau. I might ask sarah to come up briefly. I think the healthy parks healthy Portland framework is really the strategic conversation about directional priorities for the bureau. And within that, how to get there. Could you give us 30s on that?

Speaker: Thank you. Certainly. Thank you so much, sarah huggins with Portland parks and recreation, for the record. So the bureau has a strategic planning framework. It's called healthy parks, healthy Portland. It includes both a mission vision values equity and anti-racism commitment. It also includes a performance framework. We call it actions and results that looks at performance over time and how those link up to six identified outcomes that are also in that strategic planning framework. It has other elements as well, but that is sort of the guiding principle for the bureau.

Speaker: Thanks.

Speaker: So, colleagues, I just wanted to note, I think my I'm a supporter of that. It's a 2020 document and I think we need to also evolve over time. I think that there's been some valid criticism of parks that that's insufficiently focused on recreation, to the point that we often just say Portland parks and it's Portland parks and recreation. Right. But I think that's worth noting here, and I hope that there will be a strategic planning process that can inform the next levy through this process. I

think that's a fair thing for voters to ask because, as miss murray mentioned, and I think mister schulan as well, that there is a lack of cohesive understood by the public vision in that shorter, more concise way. When I met with mr. Schultz's group, I referenced my vision statement for parks, which is that parks are the thing that move your life in Portland from merely surviving to thriving, regardless of your income level. That's helpful context for our purpose. It's not specific enough. And so I want to note that and say that we do need to get there at some point. And then i'll just mention mr. Weinstein. Also, weinstein also mentioned the risk of conveying something to voters. That's not what they'd be voting for on major maintenance. And I think councilor novak's amendments resolved that for me. I also mentioned this exact concern in the work session and the committee last Thursday. I checked all the exhibits. I think we have resolved that issue. And so I wanted to just note that finally, I agree with councilor dunphy that we should treat parks as part of the public safety infrastructure of the city. Unfortunately, that didn't happen today and we had an opportunity to do that. I've been told in the in the Portland building and told for years next, next budget cycle, next fall bump, next spring bump. We'll get you the money. That never happened under the previous mayor. So we'll see if the next if the current mayor puts up a budget proposal that includes extended community center hours, I hope he does. I believe that he is interested in this work. And having said that, even if he does, we won't have it in June, which is when schools are out but before the budget takes over. Having said all of that, this is at the upper end of what I said was a good amount. I said \$1.30 to \$1.40 was my range when we had the work session. I think they've threaded the needle on where. The people and when I say they, I mean the people who did the negotiations over the last few weeks threaded the needle in terms of resolving both the needs of the operational side and contributing a small amount to the capital side. I committed

then not only to donating dodgeballs, but to knocking doors for this levy, and I intend to keep that and I will support this.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor, councilor avalos.

Speaker: Thank you. I just wanted to put my thoughts on the record about this.

Ultimately, I do plan on voting I because I believe that this resolution is better than failing to address our budget shortfalls. But I'm definitely disappointed that we didn't have a bigger investment in parks that that wasn't really on the table. It seemed like there was a lot of discussion about, you know, what would be palatable with different groups. And I just feel that we miss the mark and that within the 140 range, we could have gone higher. I think there was a number at like 147 that would have gotten us a lot more. And I felt, you know, politically we could handle those \$0.07 as well as it's just what we need. East Portland's parks and recreation facilities, they're crumbling, as we have said over and over again. And we have so few of them as to begin with. So I'm just hoping that we really talk about how we stop this cycle of under investment and deferred maintenance. That just continues to lead to all of these even worse problems down the road. I hope we're prepared to have a discussion about how we make some progressive taxes instead of regressive taxes. Of course, it's not easy to add more taxes and fees to people who are struggling, and yet the folks that often fight us on some of those fees are the folks that don't let us do the progressive taxation that we need from the people who are leaving, not giving us the infrastructure dollars that we need as a city to build and thrive. So I'm ready to have that conversation to start figuring out how we do some other taxation measures that ask those that have the most to pay their share. So that's where I'm landing. I will be voting yes, but I wanted to continue to

raise our concerns about how we really invest in our infrastructure that we need.
Thanks.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor, councilor green.

Speaker: Yeah, when we had our work session, I had indicated my directional preference for the my upper and lower bounds for the levy and a buck 40 was my lower bound. And here we are would prefer a higher number for all the reasons that councilor avalos has already articulated. But I didn't want to let the perfect be the enemy of the good. I do believe that we have a council that is invested in hearing constituents and advancing that forward into accountability and transparency, and you have my commitment on that part of what got me here. And part of why I think we have a real opportunity is the willingness for this body to consider an amendment to more clearly specify how we might use system development charges to really leverage our, our backlog. And I think that's I think that's a win today. I do think as we contemplate the future, you know, future levy's future, future funding packages that we do, we always got to remember that you got to noticeably improve people's lives to keep them in the game. And this is a game of political economy. At the end of the day, we are losing people out of our county that we are primarily losing people in the middle of the income distribution, who who really want prized assets to raise a family. And the, you know, parks are a big part of that. So this got us partway there. We've recommitted, but we have more work to do. Yeah. Thanks.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor, councilor smith.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I think that my district one councilors have have identified that taxation without representation is real key here. And I think the fact that we have probably one of the most vulnerable districts, the average income in district one is \$60,000. And I know we know that from groceries to gas, every

dollar counts. And this council has attached to itself many, many additional taxes this year all the way down to the parking. I felt that this past weekend, being downtown, \$3.50. And that's a huge, huge amount of money. If you're asking folks who have very little to do more with less, but the importance of this particular levy is being thoughtful and transparent about, you know, what is important, what is critical. It's not about expanding or, you know, increasing and improving shiny objects, but preserving what Portlanders love and Portlanders. They love our parks, our trails, safe and clean community spaces. Without this funding, Portland risks the decline of some of our greatest assets. Parks are not luxuries, but they are on the front line infrastructure for public health, climate resiliency and social connection. And I believe delaying investment today could cost them far more investment tomorrow. This levy protects access for children, seniors and all Portlanders while preserving skilled jobs and critical sanitation of our public spaces. Our parks are economic engines that help protect the value of the properties in the communities that they sit within. And so I've listened to all of you, and I've listened to Portlanders, and I believe we would not ask for this increase if it was not necessary, critical, important parks are the lifeblood to our communities, and this levy was designed to be targeted and subject to accountable stewardship by our partners at Portland parks and rec. And I just believe that this is something that the community wants, and we have to deliver. So I will be supporting the levy. And thank you, madam president.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor, colleagues, as a parent, a coach, a summer free for all fan. I have used parks a lot and I see the uses a lot, and I see the need in our parks a lot, especially around bathrooms. Parks are part of what hold our community together. They keep people safe, they keep people healthy. They're places that we can connect. Our communities provide our kids with natural areas

close to home, regardless of income level or the amount of free time parents have, and that offer hundreds of hours of classes and programs each week. This continued funding will ensure that our parks summer programs can continue, and it will begin to address some of the long term maintenance needs that are piling up right now. This measure gives us new accountability tools, things that we have asked for and that we have heard community members ask for because our parks must be everything they are and more. And for too many neighborhoods, our parks start to feel like they are less and less. This measure will start to make a difference in that accountability. Tonight, I am excited to refer a ballot measure that I hope we can all get behind, and that I think Portlanders can get excited about. One that balances the needs of our parks with our community's financial capacity. I will do everything I can to make sure that this is a win for our city. I hope that you all join me in that and Portlanders, I hope that you will join us in continuing to invest in our city and our kids, and in our future colleagues, thank you for being a part of this robust debate today. Councilor Koyama Lane.

Speaker: Thank you. I really see this moment right now as an invitation to our entire community to join together in making sure our parks are able to exist and operate, both now and in the future. I support this levy at \$1.40 rate as a smart investment, even at the same time as I acknowledge that it will not address every need for our beloved park system, how exactly these funds will be used equitably to benefit all of our communities is a really important issue that we will need to address and explain really clearly to the public. For example, I'll be looking to see how these funds might impact the years long backlog of removing the more than 20,000 barriers to our parks facilities that were identified in the 20. In 2014, as part of the city's ADA transition plan. And I want the community to know that I commit, along with my colleagues, to holding all of us accountable to the stated intent of the

use of the levy funds, and I look forward to a successful result. And finally, I want to share that with the newest park reopening in district three, berrydale park. I look forward to enjoying a newly renovated and updated park that ensures a park that's safe and accessible for all, and I want to invite everyone to join in the celebration on Friday, August 8th from 3 to 5 p.m.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor. Councilor Ryan, you may be closing us up today.

Speaker: Oh, thank.

Speaker: You, thank you, council president. First, I want to thank the many stakeholders who have been very active in this, putting this on the ballot. We've had a lot of tension to get to this point. I wasn't sure how we were going to land this on this date and no one got everything they wanted. Special nod to the many conversations I've had with you, council president and you, councilor novick. In between some of those creative meetings that we that we were all participating in. I'm supportive of this parks levy. And although I initially had a hard time going above the 120 rate, knowing that we intend to address maintenance needs at a higher rate, move my thinking, as did the willingness to join other big cities in the top ten of parks around the nation to attract more revenue from philanthropic sector and more earned revenue connected to our rec programs. And I'm thrilled with the crisp performance measures that we will bring forward. I hope that all funding measures, in fact, become more crystal clear when we go to voters so they can track what success looks like and become, and that voters and taxpayers deserve this accountability. I support obligating some of the levy funds to tackling a backlog of parts parks deferred maintenance. However, we know that the need is far greater than what is the reasonable levy is able to fund, and we need a plan for funding maintenance for the long term. This entire council is committed to that. I've been a vocal advocate for long term planning to push legislation changes in the

state to utilize sdc funding for maintenance of capital assets. Thank you, councilor green, for your amendment. It's clear that parks needs to undergo a cultural change and a transformation, including some structural changes, funding, stabilization, plan for the long term and prioritizing core services the public expects. I'm looking forward to starting this work immediately and so that we can regroup after the levy focus. I will always be a champion for parks outreach and partnership development work, which really fell off the last few years. They had a robust donor development partnership team prior to the last levy, and I want to revive that, which is why it's important to me that this position was included in this levy and that we will have dedicated more to this work. I hope to bring forward a proposal in the fall bump to find a second position to do that type of work so they can achieve more funding stability for parks operations. I'm so thankful that the north Portland aquatic center will stay in this levy to keep the promises the city has made previously to north Portlanders, and I'm also thrilled to see the old town skate park is also included. These are promises that were made dating back well prior to I joined the council in 2020, and we are now equipped to deliver all that would have been ideal to resist, reset the culture change in parks and do some organizational shifting before we consider this levy. Timing didn't allow for that. I fully expect that after today, we will start working on what our parks can look like in the future.

Speaker: Thank you councilor colleagues. Seeing no other discussion or debate, rebecca, can you please call the roll? And i'll note this is on passage of the final package of resolution, as amended, and attachments as submitted.

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

Speaker: Zimmerman i.

Speaker: Avalos i.

Speaker: Dunphy I smith.

Speaker: I connell. I Ryan. I pirtle-guiney. I and the resolution is adopted with 11 I votes and adopted as amended.

Speaker: Thank you colleagues. This was the only order of business on our agenda. Today I am going to adjourn our special meeting, and we will be back here at 6:00 for our regular council meeting.

Portland City Council Meeting Closed Caption File

July 16, 2025 – 6:00 p.m.

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

Speaker: I am calling tonight's Portland City Council meeting to order. It is Wednesday. There we go. July 16th at 6:01 p.m. Keelan, could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Good evening clay, online here morillo. Here novick. Here. Mark green here. Zimmerman here. Avalos here. Dunphy. Here. Smith. Canal here. Ryan. Here. Pirtle-guiney here.

Speaker: Could you please read us the rules of order and decorum? Council president. Thank you.

Speaker: Welcome to the Portland City Council. To testify before council in person or virtually. You must sign up in advance on the council agenda at w-w-w. Agenda. Information on engaging with council can be found on the council clerk's webpage. 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's preserve officer preserves the 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 convene virtually. Your testimony

should address the matter being considered. When testifying, state your name for the record. Your address is not necessary. If you are a lobbyist, identify the organization you represent. Virtual testifiers should unmute themselves when the council clerk calls your name. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you colleagues. The first item on our agenda is agenda approval. I have a couple of updates before we approve the agenda. Agenda items seven and eight have been requested to be referred back to committee by the service area for some technical changes to the language, so I'm removing those from the agenda to send them back to committee. Agenda item 12 has been pulled.

Speaker: From the City Council.

Speaker: I'm sorry, but we are in the middle of a meeting right now. We will have time for the public to respond.

Speaker: Respond.

Speaker: We will have time for the public to give comments later. I'm sorry, but we need to move forward with our meeting and I'm asking you to sit back down. We have time for folks to give comments later. I'm sorry, but I need you to sit down so we can continue with our meeting.

Speaker: You do not give us an answer.

Speaker: As we read in the rules of decorum, we need you to sit down. Otherwise we will need to take a recess. Colleagues, I'm going to recess us for two minutes so that we can regain decorum. Councilor, zimmerman and avalos, are you still there with us?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Fantastic. That gives us quorum. I am reconvening tonight's City Council meeting. Colleagues, we are on approving the agenda, and I was running through items that have been pulled, including items seven, eight and 12. The mayor has

requested that item 12 be removed back to his office. Item 17 has been requested to be moved to a future meeting by councilor clark, and item 23 has been requested to be moved to a future meeting by councilor koyama lane. Agenda items ten, 11, 13, 14 and 15 have been pulled off the consent agenda and will be moved to the top of the regular agenda. Colleagues, are there any other requests for amendments to the agenda? Councilor zimmerman?

Speaker: I would request that anything that got pulled off of the consent agenda be placed at the end or after the remaining regular agenda. Thank you.

Speaker: I believe we have one person here for an appointment, and I am not sure which appointment that is. Councilor zimmerman, would you be okay if we add item 13 to the top of the agenda and move ten, 11, 14, and 15 to the end of the agenda?

Speaker: I think we have a consent agenda for a reason. I think we should use it. This practice of continuing to pull consent is not helpful.

Speaker: Understood. Councilor greene, do you have any amendments to the agenda?

Speaker: No. I just wanted to make a clarification. I heard you right. Did councilor clark requested item 17 be pulled from the agenda?

Speaker: Item 1919.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: 19.

Speaker: Item 19.

Speaker: Though no item 18 is still on the agenda. She, in fact, specifically requested that we continue with that one, despite the fact that she's not here. Okay. Agenda 17 is still on the agenda. Okay, colleagues. I have had a request to

move the items from that are pulled from consent to the end of the agenda. I will note that there are some people who were told they would be at the beginning of the agenda. I have offered that we keep item 13 at the beginning, since that individual, we've been told is here tonight and move items ten, 11, 14 and 15 to the end of the agenda. Do I have unanimous consent for that proposal? Councilor zimmerman, I see your hand raised.

Speaker: That's an old hand.

Speaker: Okay. Any objections? Okay. We have agenda approval. Colleagues, the next item on the agenda is public comment. Keelan, could you please call up the members of the public who are here to share some information with us today?

Speaker: First up, we have andrea haverkamp.

Speaker: Thank you for joining us tonight.

Speaker: Hi. Thank you. Good evening, Portland City Council. My name is andrea haverkamp. I'm a resident of the kerns neighborhood in the central east side. I'm here today as a member of the advocacy group strong towns pdx. We advocate for a pattern of development that is financially strong and resilient for roads and streets that are safe and productive, and that the best change is bottom up, low cost with high impact. Lots of groups also stand for safe streets, public transit, zoning, and housing, but we're unique that we lead from the financial reason that all of these are important. Portland just elected a crew of advocates and changemakers to City Council. There's a lot of change makers and advocates out here doing the work to. We are okay with things being messy and perfect. That's actually a core tenet of the strong towns approach. What we're not okay with, though, is inaction. Things moving backwards or waiting 5 or 10 years for change. So here's a few things Portland is doing right. We need to keep nudging it to keep going. The pbob public street plaza program. This is tremendously low cost and

generates invaluable human connection space for artists and neighbors, and supports our ecosystem of local small businesses. This low cost, innovative program emerged after the pandemic of 2020. However, it was dangled for potential cuts. The plaza on 13th is having three blocks removed and things feel waffling. The new plaza on hawthorne is amazing, but it's only seasonal and temporary. Let's make it permanent and let's keep going. So every one of our over 90 neighborhoods has public street access, street dining too. In my neighborhood, street dining is abundant, fun, and thriving. What could be a couple boring parking spots become a lively new korean food dining place, moon polka or elegant italian food at montelupo. My favorite mexican restaurant. Guerrero used to have a big, vibrant, cherished street dining structure for years until after restrictive, ever changing regulations, fees and an order from pbob, it was removed. Now it's just a parking space. Street dining should be free to permit, and it should be really easy for businesses to make one. There could be pre-approved plans from pbob so you know exactly what. Two by fours to buy and just go and build it so that we have that space. These are core human needs to be outdoors and to have fun. These are really low cost too. Here's another couple low cost, high impact ways we can keep Portland fun and affordable for everyone. We need to simplify zoning with all the business overlays and zoning codes that we have. There's over 900 different possible zoning combinations for small local developers and startups. That's insurmountable and therefore only large out of state big groups that have the ability to navigate and build here. We need bottom up, not overly prescribed from the top down. With my last few seconds, let us help. Strong towns members across the nation are painting their own crosswalks rather than waiting years for crosswalks to happen. Advocates in the bay are building benches where there's no benches at bus stops. Let's get code ordinances and programs going so that we

bottom up and build the city. There's 600,000 Portlanders. Let us help paint and repair our own city. We also do a lot of math. We got graphs, charts, numbers, gis data. Let's find a time to gather and talk. We have ideas. Happy pride. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you so much for being here today.

Speaker: Next up we have sarah hobbs. Sarah is joining us online.

Speaker: Welcome, sarah. Thank you for being a part of our meeting.

Speaker: Sarah you're muted. Go ahead and unmute.

Speaker: For the record my name is sarah hobbs. I'm a volunteer field advocate with the Oregon state chapter of the American foundation for suicide prevention. I'm sorry, I'm nervous at the way had just added to my nervousness, so please bear with me here.

Speaker: Take your time.

Speaker: So I started in suicide prevention in 2013 as a member of friends of the bridge in. Commissioner novick. You were our champion on that project and I'm forever grateful for you. I now come before you as our new city commission, asking a ask of you. And that is again for the third year that you declare September international or excuse me, suicide prevention month for the city of Portland. September is national suicide prevention month. My organization's motto is be the voice by. Making September to declare on behalf of the city as suicide prevention month, you amplify my voice that I can go and see. See my city commissioners are taking this seriously. They have declared it for the city and you all can help. Sorry and nerves amplify my voice. One of our national priorities. And we are an organization that works just in a collaborative effort. We believe you don't need to invent the wheel. This weekend is one of our organization's busiest weekends because suicide prevention within the lgbtq plus youth community especially, sadly, with what we're seeing now with transgender youth, we work very, very closely in

partnership with both the trevor project and glisan. So this weekend will be a busy weekend for us. And then the first weekend in October when we have our big annual letter as well, will also be another big weekend. I see that I'm close to being out of time. I appreciate your consideration. Help me to help the city. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you very much, miss hobbs. And i'll note that proclamations are done through the mayor's office now. But the mayor is here with us tonight and heard your testimony.

Speaker: Next up, we have sharon nasset. Welcome, sharon.

Speaker: Thank you for being here.

Speaker: Oh, I guess this one's in the center. Mayor, council members. For the record, I'm sharon nasset. I'm with the economic transportation alliance. Last week or so, I spent quite a bit of information having to do with transportation to your office. And then earlier today, I sent a package and I sent a request of City Council, and I left the pile of the quest pages at home when we handed those out. So I don't have any of my notes. I'll start with these are two awards. This is a board. Mike abboud is the mayor of saint john's. If anybody doesn't know that and this is a reward from 26 and this is word from 2011 having to do with transportation. I've worked a lot in transportation for over 20, 25 years. So this little package is telling you that we were in the columbia river crossing. They did not follow the nepa process, and they removed us without studying and have made false and inaccurate statements. They are doing a supplemental environmental impact statement called the bridge replacement. Right now in the federal register. It's called crc two, and it is all built on it. And supplement is meant to be opened up. When you find out more information and other things need to be studied. When you look at this last two pages and you see the devastation that would happen with over 600 pieces of property fully or partially removed, 9 to 11 years of construction

on i-5, what they would do to jansen beach or hayden island, as we call it. As an elected official, you would say, oh my gosh, isn't there anything else we could do? Anything else before this, especially since we know it will not give us any more time. The corridor is full on both ends and it's not what anybody wants. Well, there is, and they removed those alternatives, have made false statements, have stolen our maps, put false statements on them, and we have been saying that for a long time. It. Oh, this is supposed to be. Are you seeing this map?

Speaker: We do see the map. Yes.

Speaker: Oh. Anyways, I beg your pardon. So anyways, there is no reason not to open up the supplement. In 25 years they have not been able to go forward. What they're going forward with is not going to work. We have our own funding ideas. It will not include tolling. The majority of the land is bare and vacant. It will have a tunnel through through north Portland, so we will not have a second freeway. These awards and hundreds of people have come to our meetings have said it. Every time you go, any place you hear third bridge, why isn't it being studied? We're not talking about construction. We're talking about studying. They removed us. And you see the video that I sent you or the port commissioner came out and said, I don't think this should be studied right now, and took it off, and they went forward with that. And letters from the signatory agencies over and over said they had violated it. But without a sponsor's counsel, as you know, there was no sponsors counsel because they disband after being bullied, receiving disinformation and all of the data from the sponsors council had to be null and void, which is why it's called the project staff recommendation. Because there was no sorry.

Speaker: There was no beep. But I'm noticing that we're a bit over time now. Thank you for being here though.

Speaker: So what I'm asking for is that you immediately require to the sponsoring agencies that that they have to open the cis to include the projects that they removed that came forward from the community.

Speaker: Yeah, we have the information here from you and appreciate.

Speaker: Oh, that's a minus. I beg your pardon? I thought I had I didn't see the minus sign, thank you kindly.

Speaker: It usually beeps and it didn't tonight.

Speaker: Oh, hey. Well thank you.

Speaker: Next up next up we have joshua trotter. Joshua trotter. All right jeff katie.

Speaker: Welcome jeff. Thank you for being here.

Speaker: My name is jeff. Katie and I live on southeast 12th avenue in a condominium I recently bought which is in district three. I have three transportation related items one, the union pacific trains that block southeast 11th and 12th division. Two how scary it is to ride max and busses around Portland. Three the dangerous speeds on southeast 11th and 12th between hawthorne and division. The union pacific trains are constantly blocking our neighborhood off to the south and southeast. 11th and 12th division. They can block our neighborhood off for an hour for the bottom line of union pacific railroad to load and unload trains. Our neighborhood is extremely inconvenienced every day. What I really think about are the worst case scenarios of those streets being blocked. The response time for emergency responders into our neighborhood from the south gets impacted. There are a lot of situations where just one minute delay is the difference between life and death. I visited fire station 23, which is just south of the tracks, and they confirmed that response time is affected regularly by those trains being stopped. Southeast 11th and 12th division has to be the worst railroad crossing in the city. Now that man just died under a max train trying to beat the

union pacific, because he knew that it can stop for up to an hour, you know, and I'm guilty of it myself when riding my bike. It's human nature. Also, due to these long wait times, the streets become full of angry drivers. People lose their minds and it becomes a road rage zone on 11th in division. The long term goal should be to either take the train under, under or cars, bikes and pedestrians over there. But I think union pacific railroad should be held accountable to keep our streets open. The only way is for the City Council to make it painful for their wallet to block our neighborhood. How about \$100,000 per minute fine for being stopped? Yes. Please make them pay for the construction project. I need to write trimet daily, and I would like to talk about how scary it is to ride max and stain it puts on the image of our city. I'm confident people arriving for the first time from the airport are stunned and scared that so many addicts high out of their mind are riding it. Some wheel their whole house and bring large bags of cans along with them. This shouldn't be allowed. Others bring vicious dogs onto the trains. Dogs shouldn't be allowed on trimet either. As I've heard, bites have been happening. I believe it as I've been barked and viciously growled at on it. As a side note, I personally believe that forcing a dog into homelessness should be considered animal cruelty. I'm a dog person and they need a loving home, proper dog food, and veterinary care. The only time I feel safe on max is when the security is on board. I would like to challenge every council member to go ride max to and from work every day alone with no security. Maybe if you required all city and trimet employees to ride trimet to work, things would improve. I mean, don't you all want safe and clean public transportation in our city? I recently witnessed a major a major violent altercation on the two bus at the omni stop between a high addict and another rider. At least make sure people pay before getting on max or busses. Wouldn't that be a novel concept? It shouldn't be a warm place to hang out for hours on a cold and rainy day

for free. I trimet bus driver told me he wasn't allowed to enforce fares. Why do you think the max ridership is so far down? It's unsafe, unsanitary, and downright scary. It's the same reason the whole downtown has been abandoned and that big pink building is empty. Lastly, the cars on southeast 11th and 12th between hawthorne and division are going way too fast. I see serial traffic enforcement on my street. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you very much for being here and for squeezing so much into those three minutes. Hearing from you.

Speaker: That completes communications.

Speaker: Thank you. Keelan colleagues. The next item on the agenda is the committee referral report. I will try to do this quickly. I referred to accepting the 2024 Portland police bureau annual report to community and public safety appointments to the home forward board, to how homelessness and housing appointments to the arts access fund oversight committee to arts and economy. Urging the public works and budget and finance areas to develop a comprehensive strategy for alternative funding for transportation and infrastructure to the transportation and infrastructure committee. Appointments to the planning commission, to the climate resilience and land use committee. Appointments to the Portland committee on community engaged policing to the community and public safety committee. Appointments to the civil service board. To the governance committee. Declaration of property at north midway and north columbia as surplus to the finance committee. Declaration of property at northeast 33rd to the finance committee. Vacation of property at northeast 33rd and marine drive to the finance committee. Vacation of property at southeast oak and 37th to the transportation committee. The 82nd avenue project. Property rights to transportation and infrastructure. Approving findings to approve alternate contracting measure for the

bridge project to transportation and infrastructure appointments to the Portland utility board, to transportation and infrastructure. Declaration of property as surplus and approval of a property swap from pbot to odot to transportation and infrastructure and appointment of members to pcef to climate resilience and land use. Since our last meeting, the next item on our agenda is the city administrators report. Mr. Jordan, would you like to give us an overview of anything you have in there?

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I will keep it very brief. Just a couple of things. One, early in the report under service area highlights, we note that we'd like to use this report in the coming months to regularly report to council regarding all the budget notes that we have and report progress. We used to do that just at fall and spring bumps with what we used to call those. So now I think we will be able to give you a more real time update on budget notes. That won't preclude us from having contacts with you on specific notes for other reasons. Some of them are pretty complex, and we need to have some interaction on getting those done, but we'll do some regular updates there. I wanted to thank whoever mailed emailed us from a gmail address that let us know that our our risk report didn't have enough column width to accommodate the numbers. So it was reissued. And I appreciate somebody giving bringing us to that. And then lastly, we are very close to being able to bring council. This is coming attractions a report on contracting. We're developing a prototype report that we'd like to bring you in in the coming months that will report on all contracts, not just the ones of a certain size. So look forward to that. And with that, I'd be happy to try and answer any questions. Madam president.

Speaker: I believe councilor avalos has a question.

Speaker: Oh, okay.

Speaker: And for folks in the room, i'll just note there are only six of us at the dais. But we do have two colleagues who are online. So we are still we do still have a quorum. Go ahead, councilor avalos.

Speaker: Thank you. I was wondering, city administrator jordan, if you could give an update on the hiring process for the city administrator?

Speaker: Thank you for the question. I believe there has a packet of information that is coming to council. If you don't already have it. Regarding the work that we did last year in developing a successful candidate profile, it has a lot of information in there about the focus groups and the survey work that was done last year in preparation for getting ready to go out. We have a consultant on board, a headhunter that will be we will give you, I would say within the next week, you will have a draft process of how we will go through the review for the city administrator position and the engagement of council and stakeholders in that. In that review process, I am hopeful to be on the street, if you will, with that recruitment by the end of the month or early August. Hopeful also to close that around labor day. September will be quote unquote review month, where we will go through a process of reviewing candidates multiple layers for all candidates. I like to call it hell week. They are very strenuous. But but I know that this is the first hiring process for a city administrator. And it's going to be a very important issue for everyone in the community and certainly for council and the mayor. And then looking hopefully through that process to make an offer to a candidate sometime in October. And my hope is that somebody in the chair by thanksgiving, that may be a little optimistic, but that's that's our schedule and that's our hope. Does that help councilor avalos?

Speaker: Yes it does. Sorry. Yes. Sorry y'all. It does help. I also was wondering if you could give us more updates in the future about the process to involve the community in that search. I would love to be a part of that. I think the council

should be a part of, especially promoting to our constituents opportunities for people to weigh in on that search. So I just wanted to flag that. I would love to hear more, and I'd like to participate more in that discussion.

Speaker: Absolutely. Thank you. Councilor.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor and colleagues, I'll note that there is a survey that went out to all of us to as a first take at our opinions on this, that I believe is due by the end of the week. Colleagues, are there any more questions for Mr. Jordan? Okay. The next item on our agenda is the consent agenda. And I believe we have two items left on the consent agenda. Is that correct? Keelan.

Speaker: That's correct.

Speaker: Okay. And I'll note that we have a new type of agenda item that is on consent. We get a lot of agenda items around property, dispose of a piece of property, declare a piece of property, surplus things that could take a lot of time, that get vetted in committee, that get vetted by the councilors who represent the district that the property is in. And I am starting to put those on consent. If you have thoughts about this as we move forward, please let me know after this meeting. But my intention is to put agenda items like that on consent moving forward, knowing that if there's a specific agenda item somebody has concerns with that can be pulled off. I'll note that I am not adding eminent domain items to the consent agenda, because I know that those can sometimes have additional complications. But those other property related items I'll be putting on consent moving forward, unless I hear from anybody after tonight that they have concerns with that. Keelan could you please move us forward with consent?

Speaker: Yes. Koyama Lane I Morillo. Novick i.

Speaker: Green a.

Speaker: Zimmerman. Avalos I dunphy i. Canal Ryan. I pirtle-guiney I with 7 or 8 yes votes. The consent agenda is approved.

Speaker: Okay, colleagues, we moved one item from that was pulled from consent to the top of the agenda agenda item 13. So we are going to jump to agenda item 13 now. And. I don't have a full script because it's on consent, because this was on consent. We don't have plans for a report of the committee staff. Summary. You do have that committee staff summary posted online, though I believe this came out of public safety and councilor novick. I'm not sure if you or councilor kanal had the gavel this day, but you are here and he is not. So would you like to give us an overview?

Speaker: I think I actually did have the gavel. We had two candidates come before us for the community on the committee on community engaged policing, and we moved forward. The nomination of gabrielle poccia, who has a background as a policy analyst, a performance auditor and a community clinic administrator, definitely has a background in mental health, and we're very impressed with her. There was another candidate, dion salazar, who did not move forward because we had five people and it was a 2 to 1 vote with one vote against him. So that means that we are going to be one short, I think, on the pccep board.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor kanal did you have anything to add to that overview?

Speaker: Yeah, just that it was presented as one document and then divided and voted on separately. But I agree with councilor novick's comments that we're very impressed with with the candidate who is before us today in the committee, and we're excited to have the have the vote to formally confirm her.

Speaker: Great colleagues.

Speaker: Any comments or questions?

Speaker: I have a question.

Speaker: Councilor Ryan.

Speaker: Yeah, I'm just co-chairs. When there's a vote, it's 2 to 1. What's the protocol when you look at that? Again, since there were two people that were absent?

Speaker: Well, I mean, the rule is in order for something to move forward, you have to have a majority. Actually, I don't know if that means I don't know if there's a provision for bringing somebody back.

Speaker: I think we could we could theoretically vote to move, to rescind the vote, I believe, would be the official motion to, to reopen it in committee, that that would be a possibility. I'll note that the councilor who voted no, there were two councilors absent. So I don't know how they would have voted, but the councilor voted no, not present now to talk about that side of it. But it is theoretically possible that at a later date we could bring it that other nomination back up. I also know from, and I believe the staff could answer if we needed to confirm it, but that they're doing interviews because there was, I believe, one additional vacancy beyond it. So there'd be two vacancies to fill. Now that they're doing interviews for potential candidates to fill, we expect that in a few months. We'll probably get that next. Round of nominations.

Speaker: Got it.

Speaker: Colleagues, are there any additional questions about this appointment? Okay. Keelan, could you please call the roll.

Speaker: Council president for this? I think we may need a motion to accept the report.

Speaker: So moved.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: There we go. I apologize because it came off of consent. I was moving a little too quickly there. I realized that I didn't actually have you read the title either, which we should probably do.

Speaker: Sounds great. Thanks a point, gabrielle, to the Portland committee on community-engaged policing for term to expire June 26th, 2027.

Speaker: Okay, let's move forward with the vote.

Speaker: Koyama lane i.

Speaker: Novick i.

Speaker: Green i.

Speaker: Zimmerman. I.

Speaker: Avalos. I dunphy i.

Speaker: Canal i.

Speaker: Ryan i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: With nine yes votes. The appointment is confirmed.

Speaker: Thank you. Keelan. Could you please read our next agenda item, which I believe is agenda item 16? Is that right?

Speaker: That's correct. Item 16 amend system development charge exemptions code to add a temporary exemption for residential housing projects.

Speaker: Thank you. And I believe we do have a. Oh, no. This is a second reading isn't it? Okay colleagues, this is a second reading on this item. This was the. Sdc measure that we heard at our last meeting. Are there any comments or is there any discussion? Councilor avalos, agenda item 16. Councilor avalos go right ahead.

Speaker: All right. Thank you. Yes. I have a couple of thoughts that I wanted to just share. I do plan to vote yes on this sdc waiver, but because at the last meeting I had to leave early before I could hear the end result of my amendment. I just wanted to

talk about that real quick and say, first, I'm disappointed that it didn't pass because I'm worried that I and I don't believe we have strong guardrails to protect the city from losing more infrastructure than we can afford to lose. Especially concerned now that, you know, there's just so many dollars for infrastructure that are at threat, whether it's federal, whether it's the state's lack of passing a transportation bill, just worried about, you know, how much infrastructure funding we're we can afford to lose. I totally understand and understood the oppositional argument that it could have added an uncertainty that would have made it hard for developers. I think we could have had an honest discussion about how to accomplish both outcomes thoughtfully. But the other things that I heard were around folks not feeling worried about potential additional money lost other than the 63 million proposed because they believe that, you know, exceeding the goal simply means that we will have more housing. But if we don't have that same energy to ensure that the housing that we build is actually affordable to the people who need it, then we're simply deepening our housing crisis while adding more money into the pockets of wealthy developers at the cost of this vital, life saving infrastructure. And I have to speak up about that, especially as a councilor for east Portland. I've also heard people say, you know, that they don't believe that sdc should be the way that we fund infrastructure. I agree, but I remain interested in hearing ideas that people have about how we do that infrastructure. If we don't have that, I think both can be true, that it's not the best tool, and that it's one of the few tools that we have to build infrastructure that will just continue to be under grave threat during this trump administration. Should we lobby the state to adjust this way that we spend for sccs? Absolutely. But should we forego millions in sdc just on principle because it does doesn't fund everything that we want or need it to do? No, I think the sdc is an important lever that we can pull, and absolutely we need to continue to work on

other strategies to increase housing production and drive down housing costs. But one thing is for sure, I promise that trickle down urbanism is not going to save us. Abundance is not going to save us. We need actual housing for all wages, stages and ages. And that takes intentionality, not growth, just for growth's sake. So I just felt that I had to put those thoughts on the record. At the end of the day, I will be voting i. But I remain concerned about how we will continue to fund infrastructure that our entire city seeds our entire city needs, but especially my district. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor, councilor Ryan.

Speaker: Yes, thank you, council president. Thank you, mayor wilson. And thank you, dca, oliveira and your team for bringing this innovative legislation forward. I just want you to know, my staff attended a tour of a district two multifamily property being built now in. The developer did confirm that they have multiple projects, that this waiver will allow them to break ground on much sooner than they ever would have. This is a type of incentive we need to let the housing industry know we are ready to partner with them to reach our housing goals. I'm really excited about.

Speaker: I thank you, councilor, councilor green.

Speaker: Thank you. I just want to briefly note that, I mean, I've been a big champion of this approach for a long time, I think. I think it's exactly the right signal we need to be sending. I just want to express my full support behind the other kind of code and zoning reforms that I know that that are that dca olivera is working on with his team. Because you got to make hay while the sun shines. While we do this to have the maximum effect. And I had made the argument, I think, to councilor avalos concerns that I'm comfortable with this because we will grow our tax base with this. And I and I think I'm I'm looking forward to that alternative finance

conversation. I tipped out a little bit of my idea ideas at the pedestrian advisory committee last night. So this is beginning of a discussion. But I'm so excited to support this and I really hope I hope we do some more stuff like this.

Speaker: Thank you councilor colleagues, I do support sdcs, and I do think that they are a really important tool, and I don't take lightly the fact that we're forgoing tens of millions of dollars of revenue for public infrastructure at a time when we have so many infrastructure needs. But I also know that right now, with the tools in our toolbox, this is the single most impactful thing that we can do this year to support housing development. And right now, kickstarting our housing pipeline, getting folks back to work, getting more housing open so that we can start to address the affordability crisis in our city and the growing numbers of folks who are homeless in our community needs to be a top priority. This may actually be significant enough. This single piece of legislation to move the needle on housing in our community, to get eyes back on Portland, to get permits coming in the door, to get housing here for our community members. That's why I am supportive of the measure. Despite the funding we will forgo. It's why I am grateful to the mayor and the governor for bringing this forward to us, to champion. It's why I emphatically support what's before us today. I hope that our community sees this as a commitment to building more housing, that the development community sees this as a call to get back to work, and that this is the start of real solutions for our housing crisis. Councilor dunphy.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. Colleagues, I'm also looking forward to supporting this. I'm under no delusions that this policy will will lower rents citywide. I don't believe that we will ever build our way to a place of affordability at this point. I don't believe that that's how development works. That said, I'm really worried about our workforce. I'm really worried about our qualified builders who are out

there right now struggling to make a living to pay their rents. And if we don't get cranes in the sky, if we don't get shovels in the dirt and we don't start getting things built, then they will move. They will move on to new communities, they will find work. And if we don't demonstrate to the development community some form of carrot, then they simply will invest in other communities. They will buy up foreclosed homes rather than purchasing or building new ones. I don't believe that this will make things cheaper. I don't think that's the intention, and we need to have a bigger conversation about how to get things cheaper and how to get better wages into our communities so that people can afford the rents we have here. But this is the right step right now. I'm looking forward to the broader conversation about the future of sdcs. I agree with everything that councilor green has been saying about this, and he has some credibility that I don't have since he's a doctor. But this is the right policy right now for Portland, and we will come back and take a look at it after we get those 5000 units built very quickly. So thank you, mayor, for leading on this. Thank you, council, and thank you, community, for trusting us to try and do something good in the right direction.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor, colleagues, is there any other discussion?
Councilor koyama lane.

Speaker: Thank you. I'd like to say thank you to the mayor.

Speaker: And dca oliveira for bringing this idea forward. I am supportive of creative, innovative ideas and to address our most challenging issues. I will say at the front that I plan to support this today. I also believe there's no one action that will fix our housing challenges. We need many tools in the toolbox. This is one of them. Homelessness and the lack of affordable housing is so important and is fundamentally connected to economic injustice. And so I'm always very sensitive to any action that could exacerbate economic inequity, even if it's

addressing short term needs. I would say waiving sdc's is in that short term solution category. I will say that I appreciate there's a clear end date to the testing of this idea. And I also want to name there are possibly some potential long term impacts that may not be sustainable. And in my 16 years as teaching, I've seen firsthand the impacts on students and their families who have to move frequently because they lack access to safe, stable housing. And I am wondering how this could work in also in conflict with what we were just talking in our previous discussion about parks, the parks levy, and how much we care about parks. By waiving these fees, we do have to be clear that parks will get less. I also want to make sure that every development project started as a result of this is held accountable to sharing in the responsibility of supporting all the things that we all up here really love in our city the infrastructure, the parks. So I will look forward to hopefully some regular reporting to council. And this being a conversation and also to the community that can show us that this short term action is being effective. And as a nod to kind of the more long term outlook, I look forward to the council deliberation of councilor avalos unified housing strategy. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor, councilors. Is there any other discussion before we move on to a vote? Okay. Keelan, could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Koyama lane.

Speaker: Hi.

Speaker: Novick.

Speaker: Hi.

Speaker: Greene. I zimmerman.

Speaker: Very proud of the finance committee for sending this forward to the council. I vote aye.

Speaker: Avalos. Hi, dunphy.

Speaker: Portland is open for business. I.

Speaker: Ryan i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: With eight yes votes. The ordinance is passed.

Speaker: Thank you. And mayor you brought this forward. Do you have anything you want to add before we move on?

Speaker: Thank you. Council president. First of all, thank you to the governor for stepping up. Council president, councilor avalos, councilor dunphy for joining the multifamily task force. This a big, bold move that is really designed to bring housing fast to the market. But also it's a jobs act where our city is in need of that boom loop. This is for plumbers and framers and painters and delivery drivers to get people working right now with good family wage jobs to keep families, we have to bring new families to our city to create income tax going north, property taxes going north, business license, taxes, everything that we've talked to our communities while we were campaigning about the renaissance, we see and I I'm grateful to work with each and every one of you. And thank you for giving us this shot in the arm and getting Portland moving. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, mr. Mayor. Keelan, could you please read our next agenda item.

Speaker: Item 17 urge the mayor to make the city a signatory to the swimmable cities charter.

Speaker: Thank you. And I believe we have a committee staff summary.

Speaker: Madam president and councilors, for the record, my name is craig cook, council policy analyst, and I serve as staff to the arts and economy committee. The resolution before you document number 2025 219 was considered in the arts and economy committee on June 3rd, where it was referred to council, as amended,

with a recommendation to be adopted. It declares council support for joining the international urban swimming movement, and urges the mayor to make the city a signatory to the swimmable city's charter. The committee adopted an amendment prior to moving the item to full council. The amendment is summarized in the staff summary. The full impact statement on this item includes information on potential community impacts and community involvement. There was no verbal testimony prior to committee action. One person submitted written testimony prior to committee action, of which general themes included the importance of integrating urban public spaces with waterways for residents and visitors to enjoy benefits to the economy, environment and health of better connections between the city and the willamette river. This concludes the committee staff summary. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. And councilor green. I believe you both have our presiding officer additions and also carrier comments tonight. Is that the case?

Speaker: It certainly is. Right ahead, briefly, just as as the presiding officer of the committee, I just recall it being a very fun. People were excited. We have a hot summer, we have a beautiful river, and people were proud of the work they did. So that was an easy one for me, and I'm glad that we can use the arts and economy committee for that type of, that type of, of joyful activity. So that's all i'll add to this. I think, you know, if you'll if you'll indulge me, i'll go right into the, the motivation here.

Speaker: Go right ahead.

Speaker: Thank you. So councilor clark clark brought this forward. But she can't be here tonight. So I've I'm just going to kind of provide some remarks that are motivated on her behalf. So I'm honored to introduce this resolution as a co-sponsor. And on behalf of councilor clark, who cannot be here today, many of us advocated for parks and programs to preserve swimming pools and swimming

lessons during the budget season, and just today referred levy to the ballot to repair and restore our parks. The swimmable cities resolution, which passed out of our committee, elevates Portland's commitment to joining the swimmable cities charter, an international alliance that prioritizes safe and swimmable waterways, a fundamental part of our communities for people and wildlife. And the willamette river is our biggest park, right? I want to recognize our community members and organizations like the human access project, black swimming initiative, willamette riverkeepers, columbia river inter-tribal fish commission, and lower columbia estuary partnership for your grassroots work and advocacy to prioritize people and the environment you guys have. I grew up in this city, and I remember when you couldn't swim in there. I used to get infections in my feet when I tried anyway, because I'm stubborn. You guys all made this a swimmable river. And so I'm happy. I'm happy to, to, to do this. And so let's, let's also acknowledge the environmental services for, for czech rec their willamette river water quality testing program. Nowhere to swim when it's safe especially on hot days like today. So colleagues I would I would love if we would urge the mayor. We obviously cannot compel the mayor, but this should be an easy sell for you, mayor.

Speaker: Colleagues, are there any technical questions of either councilor green or. Craig before we move to public comment? Councilor avalos, do you have a technical question?

Speaker: No, i'll come back after public comment.

Speaker: Okay. Keelan do we have anybody signed up for public comment?

Speaker: We have two people signed up, willie levinson and morgan spriggs. Let me see if. Willie levinson, morgan spriggs oh, hi. You signed up for this item? Okay. All right, I think. Yeah. Go ahead and come on up. Will you please introduce yourself?

Speaker: Hi.

Speaker: Members of the council and our mayor. My name is Jacob Griffith, a citizen in district four. And I'm here personally and to represent the Sunrise Movement in Portland. One of our biggest issues today is climate change and pollution. In recent history, city projects like the Big Pipe project have acknowledged the problem to keep sewage out of the river. Regrettably, and pretty bare minimum thing to have accomplished. As you all might and should know, we are experiencing the sixth mass extinction event. What the city has not done well is properly addressing how terrible of a habitat the Willamette River is. Ultimately, pollutants like mercury harm both humans and the ecosystem, so joining the Swimmable Cities Charter would be a worthwhile step towards bettering Portland and its third places. Climate change is an unarguably disastrous and real problem that is largely, largely fronted by the poorest Americans. The fish and majority of Portlanders don't put copper and mercury into our river. River pollution is the peak symbol of capitalism's disregard for our ecosystems. So let's keep whittling away at the pollution in our rivers by urgently. By urging Mayor Keith Wilson to become a signatory of the Swimmable City's Charter. Why should we let up when it comes to stopping climate change and stopping its environmental impact and social impact, especially when those polluting do not? I yield my time.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

Speaker: And that completes testimony for this item.

Speaker: Okay, colleagues, I suspect that at least one of those individuals would like to testify and maybe joining us a little bit later. So we may, although I think we should move forward with this, we may want to give them some time when they get here. Councilor Avalos, go right ahead.

Speaker: Yes. Hi. Thank you so much to councilor clark for bringing this forward. I think that, you know, safe, swimmable, natural waterways are obviously part of thriving communities and just our environmental bounty. I'm really looking forward to checking out the willamette river now that it is swimmable. Swimmable. So that's great. I'm going to vote. Aye. I just wanted to take an opportunity to emphasize that making our city a swimmable city should also mean that we're expanding water safety and skills education courses. Right now, Portland parks and rec only offers swim lessons at a single location east of the 205. We know that's not enough, and research shows that, you know, black and latino parents are parents, and children are much less likely to know how to swim and have access to swim lessons. And those gaps just grow even further when you take into account family income. So this is a public safety concern that I want to bring up, because every year when we experience a heat wave like the one we're in this week, we tragically see drowning deaths in our community. So I just want to raise that and hope that this resolution and this directive to our mayor can bring attention to this overlooked issue. As we continue to expand our city, let's make sure that we're building in the right infrastructure to protect our kids and families from drowning. Drowning unnecessarily. So thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor. Councilor Ryan.

Speaker: I'm sorry I missed the meeting that day. I think I was at a lovely emergency dental appointment, but I have to tell you that this is exciting. Every time willie levinson and the river huggers come to council, they always get everyone uplifted. I will say that I actually, the docs went in in 1986, just south of the hawthorne bridge, the ones we use for the dragon boat races, and I used to go swimming with my friends down there, and my mother was still alive at that time

and she didn't like it. But here I am many years later. And so please, people, swim in the water already. All right. Thanks.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor, colleagues, any other discussion? Okay. Oh, councilor koyama lane.

Speaker: I just want to say, I think it's one thing to think about something as an idea and go, yeah, I want someone studies. And it's another thing to have that hands on experience when we're dragon boat racing or when with my third graders, I worked with the tribes and also worked with osu to raise salmon in my class and then bring the kids down there, and they get to release the salmon into the river. Being able to have that access is so it just takes things to another level and helps folks really feel that connection and own that part of nature as something that they want to take care of, they love and want to take care of. And I also appreciate just happened to yesterday with human access project. Got to swim in the willamette river every Tuesday. They're doing these splashdowns and I was excited to go. But like there was something about showing up and seeing all these people just enjoying Portland and being so excited and just reminding me, reminding me how much I love our city and access to the river is a big part of that. So I'm excited to vote for this.

Speaker: Thank you councilor. Perhaps if the mayor chooses to take us up on this suggestion, we should all go to one of those together. Colleagues, is there any other discussion? Councilor kanal we are in discussion on agenda item 17, the resolution to urge the mayor to sign the swimmable cities charter. Go right ahead.

Speaker: Yeah, i.

Speaker: Just wanted to say this before the vote. I definitely support this. And I think one of the things that we don't always do a good job of at the city is join the coalition, the international coalitions that can advance the things we all believe in.

And so this is a good first step to changing that under a new form of government. I look forward to getting involved in this on the international side, because there's so many different partnerships we could be involved in, and cities are at the forefront of a lot of this. In my work at the United Nations and the international system, it's been an a thing that I've observed for a long time, and I'm excited to get Portland started on getting back into those networks. Thanks.

Speaker: Thank you councilor. Councilor Morillo, we are in discussion on agenda item 17, urging the mayor to sign this city's charter. Would you like to jump in the queue or should we keep moving?

Speaker: I got nothing, okay.

Speaker: Seeing no additional discussion. Keelan, could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Koyama lane i.

Speaker: Maria.

Speaker: Novick i.

Speaker: Green.

Speaker: Hi, Zimmerman.

Speaker: I believe he may have had to drop off.

Speaker: Avalos i.

Speaker: Dunphy i.

Speaker: Canal i.

Speaker: Ryan hi Pirtle-Guiney. I with nine yes votes, the resolution is adopted.

Speaker: Thank you.

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

Speaker: Item 18 urge the public works and budget and finance service areas to develop a comprehensive strategy for alternative funding for transportation and infrastructure.

Speaker: Thank you and colleagues. We have a committee staff summary from Claire Adamski. Claire, go right ahead.

Speaker: Madam president and councilors for the record. Claire Adamson, council policy analyst and staff to the transportation and infrastructure committee. The resolution before you document 2025 265 was heard in the transportation and infrastructure committee on July 7th, where it was referred to council with a recommendation to be adopted. The resolution urges the public works and budget and finance service areas to work collaboratively in developing a comprehensive strategy for identifying and evaluating alternative sources of transportation funding, and emphasizes the importance of inclusive community engagement throughout the process and requests a detailed report be submitted to appropriate committees by December 1st, 2025. The report should outline potential funding scenarios, summarize stakeholder input, and address key considerations for implementation. Additionally, the resolution urges the governor to convene a special legislative session to pass a statewide transportation funding package aimed at preventing further cuts to both local and statewide transportation budgets. The committee adopted an amendment prior to moving the item to full council. The effects of the amendment on the original resolution are summarized in the full committee staff summary posted online. The full impact statement on this item includes information on financial and budgetary impacts and community impacts, and community involvement regarding public testimony in the committee, one person provided verbal testimony and one person submitted written testimony on the resolution prior to committee action. General themes included impacts of the legislative session, outcome on transportation funding, and the resulting need for the city to identify and pursue alternative funding sources. A request for a special legislative session to consider and enact a comprehensive statewide

transportation funding package, and prioritizing the maintenance and preservation of existing transportation and infrastructure systems. That concludes the committee. Staff summary.

Speaker: Thank you very much. Councilor morillo. I believe you have our carrier and the both the committee and the carrier report. Since councilor clark is absent today, is that correct?

Speaker: That's correct. Thank you.

Speaker: Go right ahead.

Speaker: Well, claire did such a fabulous job on the summary. I don't have much more to add. I will say this was brought by chair clark. So I'm just doing this in her place as vice chair of the transportation infrastructure committee. I think we all know that Portland's transportation system is facing a critical funding crisis, and that this funding decline has been compounding for year after year, and it has created a lot of budget cuts within the transportation bureau that are now impacting our infrastructure, our staff, and just the general functionality of the bureau. Our system has been funded through a lot of unsustainable sources that are heavily reliant on fossil fuel generated revenue and parking fees. And with the rise in fuel efficient and zero emission vehicles, our traditional funding sources no longer keep up with the needs. Our dire situation was further exacerbated by the failure of the Oregon legislature to pass a statewide transportation package in 2025, which was quite literally their only job this legislative session. And that will require further cuts to the Portland bureau of transportation. Portlanders deserve a stable transportation system that supports them and provides critical maintenance and safety measures for our infrastructure, and without that additional funding, we are going to continue to lose ground. This will mean weight restricted bridges, streets riddled with potholes, snow covered roads uncleared in

winter and an increasing number of failing street lights and signals. This resolution is a call to reimagine how we fund the system, and asking the public works and budget and finance services areas to work in coordination to develop a comprehensive and sustainable funding strategy. A key step in this plan includes a broad community engagement to explore funding alternatives, and this is crucial to ensure that we can build a more connected and equitable transportation system. Public works and budget and finance will be tasked with presenting a detailed report by December 1st, 2025, and this report will outline funding scenarios, stakeholder input and implementation recommendations. The other key piece to this resolution is adding our collective voice to urge governor kotek to call a special session to pass a comprehensive statewide transportation funding package. This resolution passed out of the transportation and infrastructure committee with unanimous support. And I urge all of you to support this resolution to get this essential work started. Thank you so much.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Colleagues, are there any technical questions before we move to public testimony? Councilor novick.

Speaker: Not technical.

Speaker: Okay, okay. Keelan, I believe we have some folks signed up to testify. Thank you. Claire.

Speaker: We have three people signed up for this item. Sharon nasset, ernie munch, and jordan lewis.

Speaker: Welcome back.

Speaker: Thank you, mayor and council. Thank you for having this. At the same night. I would like to just three or 4 or 5 funding ideas that we are not doing right now. And I've thought about them a lot. So I'm going to go over and briefly, but if you got questions asked, first thing is you've probably noticed on your electric bill

that they know how to tax you, how to take the money, where to send it, how to do it. Well, in 2005, I was at jpac and they were talking about smart meters, were capable of telling you exactly how much energy was used and exactly by what equipment in your house, and they could easily tax people and wanted to put it on your bill in 2005, at which point elected officials in our area and federal wide said, well, we want to hold off knowing, get mile tax, get into their pocket further. That's almost 20 years ago. They get rebates, they're harder on our roads and they're riding free tax. Oregon was the first to do a gas tax, and now we need to be the first to an electric tax. Everything's in place and they're able to do it. Also every every place that has electric of 220 is an incomplete charging station. All they need is a receptacle to be a charging station. Asking the electric companies to put out a bond and put those on private property, they will make the money back. We would immediately have it all over, not have to spend any of our own money on that infrastructure, and be able to require people to not use electric fueled items in areas where you don't want it. They can also form a way where you can connect to it, charge it yourself, and be able to use anybody's electrical service. This has already been done for 20 some years. We need to be doing it. It came in in the 1980s. That's a funding source we don't have. The other thing is, is we have a deposit on pop bottles, a non deposit refund on that was done to solve suburban litter and vandalism for individual bottles of beer and pop, because they're all over the roads. Great idea. But we didn't do it for bottles of wine. We didn't do it for other things. And hard liquor. Think about a liquor store. Think of \$0.10 on every one of those, but not refunded back. Nobody's going to whine when they spend 12 or \$15 on tequila and spend \$0.20 more on a tax and have it nonrefundable. So if you did that on all bottles of wine and you did it all liquor bottles, you would have a funding source for forever. And anybody that didn't want to pay that tax just didn't

have to buy into that. And. It's high. It's a new bill. The next thing is, is bonding infrastructure. We have several ports in our area, port of saint helens I know that's not in their area. Is deepwater port doing infrastructure bonds with other things is something that we should be looking at. And once we move all this freight and everything off of our city streets and on to the third bridge freeway corridor, think how much it's not going to be ruining your streets. Thank you very much and have a lovely evening.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

Speaker: Hello. I don't I don't even know why I signed up for this. I just think it's really important to pass the funding plan. I really want that. And when you go to the state and ask them to pass new transportation package, substantial stiff improvement funding for great streets statewide transportation improvement fund, stiff. I'm I'm pretty tired. I don't much else to say it. Just please pass it. That's what I'm here for.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

Speaker: Ernie munch. That completes testimony.

Speaker: Thank you. Keelan colleagues, is there any discussion to the resolution? Councilor novick, are you getting back in the queue?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Go right ahead.

Speaker: So I have a concern that it seems to me that we're sort of asking bureaucrats to do a political evaluation. We're asking the staff to identify viable options for funding, and it's going to be up to the council to decide what we think is politically viable, what we'd be willing to support, what we would think that the voters were sending something to, the voters would tolerate. Staff can obviously like look at various funding mechanisms and say, using these mechanisms, here's

what we would need in order to generate the revenue to do x. But I really think that it needs to be a collaborative process between us and the service areas. And I'd like to before voting for this, I would like to see some language changes to reflect that, rather than making it sound like it's just up to the executive to figure out what's politically viable for us. And let me see if I can get my computer unslept it says now, be it resolved, the council urges the public works service area, in collaboration with the budget and finance service area, to develop a comprehensive strategy to identify and evaluate viable alternative funding sources. What I feel comfortable with, I realize it's quite a departure, would be the council resolves to work with the public works service area. Et cetera, et cetera. And then be it further resolved that the relevant committee and the service areas shall prepare and submit a comprehensive report to the council no later than December 2025.

Speaker: Councilor was that an ask for a change?

Speaker: That actually, it's something that I would suggest to the carriers that they consider ask if they would consider those friendly amendments or unfriendly amendments.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: I believe this came from councilor clark, who's not here tonight. So we'll need to make a decision on whether we want to amend this without her or not.

Speaker: I can remember with councilor clark was the only carrier.

Speaker: I believe. So why don't we move on to additional discussion, and we'll give you some time to think about whether you want to move that or not, okay. Councilor green.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. You know, I got in the queue to talk about other things, but I'm just going to I just want to address that. I think I would be happy to support an amendment tonight. I was in the committee. I, I amended the

original one that called on the governor to call the special session. I don't I don't read viable in the same way. Maybe you do. I think my, my understanding of this is like, here's a good example. The gas tax, if we want to replace reliance on the gas tax, which is a diminishing source, a forward looking strategy would not consider that a viable source. So that's how I'm interpreting that. But I don't I'm not opposed to your thing. And in fact it's actually it's actually closer to the spirit on how I envision this government to work a little bit. These committees should be partners when we go do big policy changes, because there are politics in it. And I said this, you know, I've said this elsewhere that our job is to provide political leadership for good bureaucratic work. Right. And so I don't know if you want to draft it or if any of us wants to draft it, but as we do this discussion, if that gets you along, I'm fully in support of that. The things I wanted to say, though, when I went in the queue was just that if we pass this and I hope we will, I think I would like to take up the question of bonding in conjunction with what this revenue produces, because we do have capacity to bond against a defined revenue source, and that that is how we accelerate our investment in infrastructure. In my view, that's not something we want to define in, in, in dry ink tonight. But that's I'm just teasing the conversation here and sharing a little bit on how I think about this and how I will think about it. As a member of the tni committee, a member of the finance committee, and it just connects a little bit to the sdc discussion. So let's draft it. I support it.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. I trust that the two of you are working on that right now. Okay. Councilor kanal go right ahead.

Speaker: Thank you. I'm open to the conversation as well. When that feverishly paced working session is concluded, I yeah, I'm very supportive of this broadly. I think that doesn't mean it couldn't be improved through that. But I am very supportive of this broadly. And I think it's important that we say in no uncertain

terms to the state to get their stuff together because, as councilor morillo put it, they they had one job and this was a really big deal for us. And I think, you know, we had our budget is reliant upon as part of the budget is for pbob is reliant upon this. But but also there's some conversations that need to happen at the state about their priorities. And I think that that a special session might actually have the silver lining of being able to allow for some of the conversations around transit and around public streets to be accelerated when there's a singular focus, instead of the 50 other topics that are being discussed at once. And I hope that that happens because, you know, an approach that prioritizes freeway expansion exclusively, isn't it? Thanks.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Colleagues, I'm going to very slowly ask if anybody else has any discussion while our our colleagues, councilors, novick and green work on some amendment language. Councilor Ryan, you're going to save us.

Speaker: Thank you. Yeah. Thank you. And the risk of filibustering, I just want to say, with the current state of our roads and everything that we're looking at and experiencing right now, it's pretty much a no brainer. And I'm just really grateful that the committee led by councilor clark in this circumstance acted so quickly. It's too bad she's not here tonight. There's a lot of councilor clark work coming forward, so I just wanted to honor her good work, and I look forward to voting yes on this, but it's going to be even more exciting to vote yes when you two tell us what you landed on. I'll stop.

Speaker: Councilor green.

Speaker: Thanks. Madam president, I would like to introduce an amendment coauthored with councilor novick that reads. So it takes the. Now therefore, be it resolved. That council, it adds, commits to work with strikes, urges the public works service area. And I'm going to email this comma through relevant council

committees, comma, because there may be more than one committee in collaboration. So the rest of it stands so that the only addition is that we're saying that council commits to work with these service areas through our committees and the budget and finance, and then it extends that on the be it further resolved that says that and the insertion is be it further resolves that the relevant council committees and the service areas and then the rest of it continues. So it just sort of completes the circle on saying we're going to work with these service areas and the parts of the of the city administration that that would benefit from that partnership.

Speaker: Can you email that?

Speaker: Oh, I'm going to email it. Yeah.

Speaker: Can you make sure that you send that to Keelan as well, please.

Speaker: Seems funny to have the committees then report to the appropriate committees. So could we make.

Speaker: That.

Speaker: While our colleagues are looking at that? Councilor kanal are you in the queue?

Speaker: Just a question. So the where it says committees, it is clarifying that to council committees.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Okay. That's great. Thanks.

Speaker: And I'm sending this out now.

Speaker: Colleagues, while that's being sent, I will note that I heard from councilor clark's team that while they can't speak for her and she is not in reception and able to watch the meeting, they do believe that this aligns with the intent of the measure as she brought it forward.

Speaker: Trying to find our distro. Don't say it out loud, please.

Speaker: Are we getting that out to everyone? Councilor? Okay, colleagues, are there any other comments or questions? Actually, we are now in discussion on an amendment. So is there any are there any comments or questions to the amendment before us?

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: We're going to pause for about a minute and a half for everybody to look at that as it comes in. And for the public watching, I apologize that we can't get it up online quite as quickly, but hopefully councilor green, having read it a couple of times, allows you to follow along. I think we're okay. It's not hugely substantive. Okay. Colleagues, is there any other discussion to the amendment seeing none Keelan could you please call the roll on the amendment before us, which includes council committees in the work with the public works service area in both the first and the last, therefore, clause or the first in the second, I believe, I'm sorry, the first and the second, therefore. Clauses.

Speaker: Koyama lane for the amendment i.

Speaker: Maria i.

Speaker: Novick i.

Speaker: Green.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: I zimmerman as councilor zimmerman gone for the meeting. Do you know.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Believe so. He said he couldn't stay the whole time.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you.

Speaker: Unless i.

Speaker: Dunphy i.

Speaker: I Ryan. I pirtle-guiney. I with nine yes votes. The amendment is approved.

Speaker: Very good colleagues.

Speaker: Is there any other discussion to the now amended resolution? Okay.

Seeing none Keelan, could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Koyama lane i. Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick i.

Speaker: Green i.

Speaker: Avalos.

Speaker: Hi, dunphy.

Speaker: I canal.

Speaker: Thanks councilor clark for your work on this.

Speaker: I Ryan. I pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: With nine yes votes. The resolution is adopted as amended.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: I'm looking to see if our guests are here yet. Who? We had said we would let testify, but I don't see them in the room. So why don't we move on to the next agenda item? Keelan.

Speaker: Item 19.

Speaker: Believe agenda item 19 was pulled.

Speaker: Oh, okay.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: I think we're back to our consent agenda items. Is that right?

Speaker: Okay. Yeah. Did you want me to read the title for 19 or just move on to the.

Speaker: We took it off the agenda in agenda approval.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: All right. Okay. So next up. Item ten appoint kathy keithley to the home forward board of commissioners for a term to expire July 15th, 2029.

Speaker: Thank you. And I believe this came out of the homelessness and housing committee. Councilor avalos, is there anything that you'd like to share with us?

Speaker: Councilor dunphy actually presided.

Speaker: Councilor dunphy, go right ahead.

Speaker: Absolutely.

Speaker: So, colleagues, as you may know, kathy keithley is a serves currently as a gresham City Councilor. She's being appointed to the city of gresham spot on the home forward board. For those of you who don't know, home forward is our housing authority. The city of Portland has the authority to appoint the. We heard from councilor keith keith lee at our city, at our housing and homelessness committee meeting, and unanimously supported her candidacy. So looking forward to supporting her again.

Speaker: Thank you. Colleagues. Are there any questions or comments about cathy keighley's appointment? Okay. Seeing none Keelan could you please call the roll?

Speaker: For this item? Sorry, just. Yes. Great. Thanks. Koyama lane I morillo. I novick i.

Speaker: Green i.

Speaker: Avalos i.

Speaker: Dunphy i.

Speaker: I Ryan. I pirtle-guiney. I with nine yes votes. The resolution is adopted.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: And could you read our next agenda item please.

Speaker: Item 11 appoint and reappoint members to the Portland parks and recreation board.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: And I need my mic on councilor, novick and morillo. I believe this came from your committee and I'm not sure who presided that day.

Speaker: I think that I did okay.

Speaker: Councilor novick take it away.

Speaker: We consider the nominations of six people to the Portland parks and rec board from a variety of backgrounds and industries. The goal was to have board members that represented a variety of ages and professional experience. This group achieves those goals and more with folks representing architecture, farming, horticulture and just good old regular volunteering. The committee recommended this group unanimously, and we hope that the full council will seat them.

Speaker: Thank you. Colleagues, is there any discussion on agenda item 11? Councilor kanal.

Speaker: Thank you. I'm in the unusual position of appointing or voting on appointment of my own replacement on the parks board, because my partial seat is here. I wanted to mention, just for this, that one of the conversations we've had around the bureau, and we referenced it earlier in the parks levy conversation, was the need to prioritize recreation as highly as parks. And I just wanted to take the opportunity to commend michelle and everyone involved in the recruitment for actually working on that, because this is a conversation we've had in the past, and we often are in the position of lovingly, gently criticizing when the bureaucracy isn't doing everything the exact same way. And I want to make sure we're also recognizing when they when they do. I was really impressed with the candidates and their backgrounds on the whole, and there are a few particular members that

you'll read the bios of here who talked about ensuring that not only recreation is prioritized, but another key priority for me, which is ensuring that we are not merely creating equity in our programs, but actually seeing those metrics realized in who's actually utilizing parks and recreations programing or just visiting the parks. And that was another item that came up in this conversation in committee. So thank you so much for that. To the parks.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor.

Speaker: Colleagues, any other discussion on the appointments to the parks board? Okay. Seeing none Keelan, could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Yes. And council president for this item I believe it is a report. So we'll want to.

Speaker: So moved.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: There we go.

Speaker: Moved by canal. Seconded by novick.

Speaker: Great. Thank you. Koyama lane I maria.

Speaker: Very grateful to everyone serving.

Speaker: I novick.

Speaker: Likewise a green.

Speaker: Thanks for your service i.

Speaker: Councilor did you not hear me? I said I yeah, can you hear me?

Speaker: Thank you dunphy. I know. I Ryan pirtle-guiney. I with nine yes votes. The appointment is confirmed.

Speaker: Colleagues when we were on agenda item 17, urging the mayor to make the city a signatory to the swimmable cities charter, the folks who are signed up to testify weren't here. We had reordered the agenda some, and they thought that

that agenda item would come later in the meeting and had had a conflict earlier. And I had noted at the time that I'd like for us to make space when they did arrive, to allow them to testify on that resolution, even though we had already concluded our work and voted there. I see that mr. Levinson just entered the room, and I would ask that we pause now to make space to move back to agenda item 17 briefly before we move on with our appointments. Keelan would you mind calling up the folks who are signed up to testify on that agenda item?

Speaker: Sure. We have willie levinson and morgan spriggs.

Speaker: Welcome.

Speaker: Mr. Levinson, and I apologize for the timing shake up there.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

Speaker: My name is willie levinson. I am the ringleader of human access project. One word with a capital r. That's my legal iris title. And it's unusual to be referred to as mr. Levinson. Makes me feel a little uncomfortable. I do prefer willie due to migo or bro, or as my preferred pronouns. It's really exciting to be here. It's been a journey. It's great to see michael jordan here. When he was director of biz, we did a lot of work together. You know, 100 years ago. Last July, Portland closed the willamette for swimming in 1924 due to pollution. It took us 100 years later to start bringing the culture back after we completed the big pipe in 2011. So there's all this talk about paris, france, and the massive achievement that they had where they didn't give up on their river and made an investment to create a swimmable city. It's lifted all ships and it's a very exciting thing. I just came from duckworth dock, where there was 500 plus people hanging out on the dock. My new favorite thing is greeting people with hug after they get out of the river and feeling the temperature of their skin, which is super cool. The willamette is a natural cooling center, so

moving ahead. Human access project got a \$250,000 capital grant from metro. It's going to require some very interesting negotiations of who owns that property, which I will really need some help from city hall on Portland metro chamber. It sounds like we'll be able to potentially put in some additional money to help support that. And when we are in a time of a short budget and we're looking to bring hope and future to Portland, I think it's more important than ever to look for the high roi items, particularly. I know a lot of you people on council receive calls from the public of people about how they want to change things, and they bring no solutions or money to the table. Well, we've been doing this for 15 years, and hopefully everyone has seen of the miracles that we've been able to do, but ultimately, it's the power of the river. I mean, I can't really take any responsibility for the work that we've done other than creating positive platforms for people to experience the willamette river and people responding. It's great to have be able to have the nice thing. I saw the video, dan, when we were able to jump in at cathedral park last summer, we removed 150 tons of concrete from that beach and fundraised to replace the dock. Commissioner green and commissioner clark, thank you so much for championing this. And council president pirtle-guiney, many thanks for figuring out how to get us on the schedule. But it's just, you know, super exciting. You know, when we started our work 15 years ago, 99% of Portland thought this idea was totally nuts. Now, I think probably only 90% does. But that is massive change. We're getting somewhere and ultimately a livable city to me is one that you can ride your bike to in the summertime. Take a dip in the river. It is our liquids public space that brings out the best in people. So many thanks y'all. And this is just kind of the platform for everything we have moving ahead. A lot of everything that's exciting and imaginative, that's happening in Portland right now

seems to be touching the river, and it's great to just be right in the mix and have all of you guys as partners.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

Speaker: We have morgan spriggs online.

Speaker: Good evening, council, and thank you again for passing. My name is morgan spriggs and I'm the co-founder of the black swimming initiative. And just wanted to share just some thoughts. Kind of moved the prepared statement away. It's it is electrifying to see the bipoc community when they first enact first interact with the rivers. So on the 26th of this month, we're going to be doing yet another set of lessons in the willamette. We've also been very successful over the last couple of years of doing lessons out, out at swan island, on lindbergh beach, and we've also have done lessons on brighton beach. What this resolution really communicates to the community is, is that the water is open. It's available to all. When you go into Portland state, if you happen to get an opportunity to go take a look at the archives there, where they've preserved many of the legacy black newspapers that don't exist anymore, but they were able to do that. It's striking to see at the turn of the last century, african Americans swimming in the waters out at cannon beach in through there, when it was available to us to be able to swim. And now that we have this public declaration that this is something that the city wants to continue to do, we have people that are willing to take that leap, to walk into the water, get their feet into the mud, get their feel the, the, the flow of the river on them. I think this is exciting to changing the changing the relationship of a historic community that's been removed from aquatic opportunities towards it. So again, I think, you know, on behalf of the bsi and our families, thank you so much for passing this resolution. And again, thank you for this opportunity to speak to you tonight.

Speaker: Thank you very much. And thank you for your flexibility, both of you, at the timing this evening. We appreciate hearing from you. And I know it's a little anticlimactic that we don't have an action right afterwards, but we thought it was important to make sure to have your voices as part of the conversation.

Speaker: Yes. Many thanks, and I would like to add that I am testifying in a wet swimsuit, so I don't know if that's happened in city hall before, but I'm proudly here in a wet swimsuit.

Speaker: We are so glad to have accomplished that first tonight.

Speaker: That's awesome.

Speaker: Okay. Thanks, y'all.

Speaker: Thank you. Colleagues. With that, I think we are returning to appointments that had been pulled from the consent agenda. Keelan would you mind reading the next agenda item for us?

Speaker: Item 14 appoint members to the planning commission.

Speaker: Okay. And I believe this came out of climate resilience and land use. Councilor novick. You're smiling as though you were presiding at that meeting.

Speaker: It did indeed. And again, the committee saw this great slate of potential appointees, including a youth member. Lucas pollock represents the group represents a diversity of backgrounds, experiences, and geographic representation, with the committee, passed them on to the full council unanimously, and we hope that the full council will take a recommendation and appoint this incredible group of people to a filter.

Speaker: Thank you very much, colleagues. Are there any questions about these appointees? Any discussion? Okay. Then I will just add a thank you to the folks who stepped up to be appointed today. And Keelan, could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Yeah. And for this item also.

Speaker: Is this a report? This is a report.

Speaker: I would take a motion.

Speaker: So moved second.

Speaker: Okay I think we're going to go with novick Ryan there.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Koyama lane thank you for your service I vote aye maria.

Speaker: I novick.

Speaker: Thank you for stepping up. Hi.

Speaker: Green.

Speaker: Hi, avalos.

Speaker: Hi.

Speaker: Dunphy.

Speaker: Hi. Hi, Ryan.

Speaker: I pirtle-guiney. I with nine yes votes, the appointments are confirmed.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Can you read our next agenda item, please?

Speaker: Item 15, appoint matt donahue to the arts access fund oversight committee for term to expire December 31st, 2028.

Speaker: Thank you. And councilor green councilor Ryan, were one of you presiding over this meeting?

Speaker: I was I was.

Speaker: Okay, councilor. Ryan, please.

Speaker: Yeah, we were fortunate to have someone with so much experience that wants to be a part of this committee. Some of you might know matt, because he was on the tax oversight board that comes to this council once a year and just very passionate about the arts. In fact, I saw him at the Portland, the metropolitan youth

symphony concert like the week before. So he's just really active out in the community and he's ready to serve. And we all know he has great expertise as a volunteer. And so I'm delighted to bring him forward.

Speaker: Thank you so much, colleagues. Are there any questions or comments about this appointee councilor kanal.

Speaker: Just wanted to ask, has there been a. Have we seen this committee actually really take up the conversation around the tax itself and its mechanism, not merely reviewing expenditures, tracking progress, assessing outcomes, but the conversation about how we collect it and those sorts of maybe chronologically, earlier in the process, conversations.

Speaker: That came up. I recall in the committee, I do recall charity montez saying that was something that is that they need to bring back to the actual arts office, but it's not something that's put into the role, clarity of the people on this commission. So the answer is no. They haven't taken that up. Their job is to ensure that the dollars get to the school districts as as specified by the legislation.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: I'm so I would suggest that you would reach out to the arts office and have some more dialog about that.

Speaker: Yeah. I guess. There are few places where I see a good thing, which this is, that has nonetheless a large disconnect between the broader public and the bureaucracy, at least the way it's portrayed as is. I get complaints about the arts tax much more than I would imagine for a \$35 tax, and I think it's largely mechanism based, but it's not exclusively that. So I'm always curious about committees. It is an oversight committee, but I it's in the name. Right. So we're clear on what it does. But as a vehicle or as a conduit to broader community engagement around potential changes to the structure. And I know there's an appetite to at least

explore that from everybody. I don't think anyone's sitting here being dogmatic about it, and I don't mean to imply that, but I am curious about not from the perspective of mr. Donahue, but from the perspective of the broader committee as an institution, whether or not that is a place for that type of conversation, or if it could be, or rather, a conduit to broader community conversations around the tax itself, as opposed to exclusively the arts office. Does that make sense? I'm not sure if I'm explaining that question correctly.

Speaker: I think you're in your legislative role right now, and I think it's something that we would take up in dialog at the committee. But to put it on this specific committee with this specific charge goes beyond their charter. So your systemic questions are, of course, valid. And if you're saying that you councilor kanal want to look into that deeply, then I think that that that's what you're trying to do right now. But I think doing it in the confines of this person on this committee is, is not what you're trying to do, but it's happening right now in this conversation.

Speaker: My question is less about I think it's I think it's appropriate when we do this to ask what is the role of a committee broadly in the context of its area of work? That's what I'm asking. Not it's not about.

Speaker: Councilor dunphy, were you the one that actually had this dialog with the with the candidate?

Speaker: Absolutely.

Speaker: And yeah.

Speaker: I am I'm, I similarly hear a lot of complaints about the arts tax and I'm actively working on exploring proposals for what a replacement would look like. And at this hearing, I actually asked about that. I asked about whether or not the arts oversight committee would be a resource in order to help us be a thought partner about that, because I do think that more than anybody else in the

community, they are currently positioned to understand how the program is working and how it isn't. They are not proactively looking for those options, but I will be personally going to them and asking for input on that. One area that this committee really does especially need to do, and they have done a lot better in the last few years, is holding the seven different school districts accountable.

Historically, people think, oh, it's Portland public schools because it's a Portland arts tax. But we know that there are six additional school districts that receive funding, five of which are in my district. And the way that David Douglas presents arts is very different than how Parkrose is very different than how Centennial does and way different than how Portland public schools are. And so also River View. And what's the other one? Rand Reynolds thank you. They are all yeah, right. Thank you. And so my urging to them specifically was to look at cross the districts and make sure that even the small districts are being equal in how they're administering these things, that the kids are getting the right amount of education, and that when we set terms for these school districts to receive these dollars, that those terms are being met, because we know that in past years they have not been certain school districts have not been meeting their matching funds. Certain school districts have been using these funds to supplement. And so that is really what I was particularly excited about, about this candidate, Matt Donahue, because of his experience at the TCC, on making sure that the letter of the law is being followed, and I think they will be great partners on what comes next for the arts tax.

Speaker: Thank you. That satisfies my concerns.

Speaker: Thank you. I'm glad we were able to bring in the other part of the discussion there. Councilor Dunphy, is that what your hand was raised for? Okay, colleagues, are there any other questions about this nominee for appointment? Okay. Keelan, could you please call the roll? Wait, it's a report. Could we get.

Speaker: I move second?

Speaker: Okay. We're going. Ryan koyama lane on that one.

Speaker: Great. Thank you. Koyama lane. Hi, maria.

Speaker: Hi, novick.

Speaker: Hi.

Speaker: Green.

Speaker: Hi, avalos.

Speaker: Hi, dunphy. I know.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: With nine yes votes. The appointments are confirmed.

Speaker: Thank you. And colleagues. I know we jumped around on that agenda a fair amount because of the things that were pulled and then placed at different times, but I do believe that was the last item on our agenda. Fantastic. I'll note that it is not even 8:00. Good work. We do have a meeting tomorrow. We had thought that this meeting was going to run a little bit later, so we moved a few things on the agenda to tomorrow afternoon. So please, I know that some folks have conflicts, but we are just at the number we need for that meeting, so please let me know if you have any conflicts I don't know about or that you haven't filed. Councilor kanal are you in the queue for a point of order?

Speaker: I am.

Speaker: I colleagues. I would ask for unanimous consent to be allowed to change my vote on an item that is already closed, which is item 16, amending system development charges from an to a yes vote. I was not present for that. I was running back in, and I know that after the fact we're allowed to do that. If no

colleague objects, I would like it to be on the record how I voted on that, so that my constituents know where I stood on it.

Speaker: And colleagues, without objection, we can actually allow this through unanimous consent. Are you making a request for the same agenda item? Okay. Is there are there any objections? Okay. Go ahead then. Keelan, could you please take councilor kanal and councilor morillo votes?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Morillo I canal.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: That's ten yes votes. And the ordinance is passed as amended.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Ten zero on that one. Mr. Jordan, maybe you want to update the mayor that he got a few more votes. Thank you colleagues. With that, I will close our meeting and see you all tomorrow.

Portland City Council Meeting Closed Caption File

July 17, 2025 – 2:00 p.m.

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

Speaker: Afternoon, before I call us into order. Counselor avalos, are you online with us? And counselor smith and zimmerman?

Speaker: Yes. I'm online. This is loretta.

Speaker: Okay, great. And we have six in the room. So for folks who are watching online or in the room, we do have colleagues joining us today remotely. So we have a quorum. I will call us into order for today's the recessed portion of the City Council meeting. It is 2:02 p.m. On Thursday, July 17th, Keelan. Could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Good afternoon. Koyama lane here. Morillo. Here. Novick here. Clark green.

Speaker: Here.

Speaker: Zimmerman. Here. Avalos. Here. Dunphy. Smith here. O'connell. Here. Ryan. Pirtle-guiney here.

Speaker: And linly, could you please read our rules of order and decorum?

Speaker: Thank you. Council president, welcome to Portland City Council. To testify before council in person or virtually, you must sign up in advance on the council agenda at. Agenda. Information on engaging with council can be found on the council clerk's web page. Individuals may testify for three minutes unless the presiding officer states otherwise. Your microphone will be muted when your time

is over. The presiding officer preserves order disruptive conduct, such as shouting, refusing to conclude your testimony when your time is up, or interrupting others testimony or council deliberations will not be allowed. If you cause a disruption, a warning will be given. Further disruption will result in ejection from the meeting. Anyone who fails to leave once ejected is subject to arrest for trespass. Additional. Additionally, council may take a short recess and reconvene virtually. Your testimony today should address the matter being considered. When testifying, please state your name for the record. Your address is not necessary. If you are a lobbyist, identify the organization you represent. And finally, virtual testifiers should unmute themselves when the council clerk's calls their name. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Linly colleagues. We originally had four items on the agenda, but item 23 was pulled from the agenda. We will see that at a future council meeting. It was not pulled back to committee just off of today's agenda. So we have three items we will be discussing today. One, we will hopefully we'll talk about this in a minute. Be adding an emergency clause to and passing one is a second reading, the other is a first reading and will just be a discussion. Keelan could you please read our first agenda item for us?

Speaker: Item 20 amend flood hazard areas code to comply with federal emergency management agency national flood insurance program pre implementation compliance measures.

Speaker: Thank you. And claire, you have a committee staff summary for us right? Correct. Fantastic. Thank you.

Speaker: Madam president and councilors for the record, claire adamson, council policy analyst and staff to the climate resilience and land use committee. The ordinance before you document 2025 217 was heard in the climate resilience and land use committee on may 29th and again on June 12th, when it was referred to

council with the recommendation to pass the ordinance. Amends Portland city code title 24.150 flood hazard areas to bring the city as a participant in the national flood insurance program into compliance with fema requirements regarding development in specified areas within the city's 100 year floodplain. The code amendments incorporate the national flood insurance program, pre implementation compliance measures, model code, and other requirements which consider the impacts of development to fish habitat and require mitigation efforts that meet a no net loss standard per direction from fema. The city must adopt the implementation compliance measures in order to remain in the national flood insurance program. While fema's long term compliance measures are finalized. The committee adopted an amendment prior to moving the item to full council. The effects of the amendment on the original ordinance are summarized in the committee staff summary posted online. The full impact statement on this item includes information on economic development and real estate impacts, as well as community impacts and community involvement. At the two committee meetings, eight people provided verbal testimony. Eight people provided verbal testimony during the first committee meeting on may 29th, and three people provided verbal testimony on the proposed amendments discussed at the June 12th meeting. 14 people submitted written testimony on the item prior to committee action. General themes of the testimony the committee heard or in writing included the need for continuous riparian habitat for migrating fish, and the need for riparian setbacks to protect salmon and other endangered species. The role of floodplains and riparian habitat areas as a buffer between river and forest lands. The variance between the biological opinion issued in 2016 by the national marine fisheries service and fema's proposed model code regarding mitigation, urging the city to review development projects with the lens on habitat restoration in order to maintain

compliance with the endangered species act and the goals of the city's north reach plan. Concern regarding tribal consultation and consideration of tribal fishing rights. Navigating environmental protection and mitigation alongside industrial uses and industrial jobs in the north reach of the willamette river, limiting development in the riparian buffer zone to water dependent and other similar uses. And finally, concern regarding properties with certain land use decisions that would not be subject to new regulations. That concludes the committee. Staff summary. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you very much, claire. And councilors novick and morillo. I believe you each presided over one of these meetings. Is that correct?

Speaker: I believe that's right.

Speaker: Okay. Do either or both of you have anything to add to the committee staff summary. I don't.

Speaker: I don't really either. I think it was pretty thorough.

Speaker: Okay. Perfect. And this came from the administration. So we don't have a carrier summary colleagues, are there technical questions for claire before we move into hearing from the members of the public? Okay. Seeing no one else in the queue, I will flag that. I do have two amendments that I will be proposing when we get to discussion. One of the amendments adds an emergency clause to the ordinance. This has to go into effect by the end of this month, or else we may have Portlanders who are not able to purchase flood insurance at the same rates that they normally would be able to. So I've requested that we add an emergency clause. The other is more substantive, though I would say not terribly substantive, and does two things. It adds to the ordinance language that recognizes that this is a temporary measure, and that we plan to adopt long term compliance regulations that comply with federally mandated deadlines. Once we have more information

from the federal government about what those deadlines are, there had been some discussion about a sunset clause, because we know that there will be different federal mandates in the future, rather than sunsetting and risking having a gap period if those come at a different time than what we're expecting. This language tries to get at the intent of a sunset, while giving us the flexibility that we may need based on where the feds are headed. The other piece of that second amendment returns us to some of the original language before the changes that were made by this ordinance, by removing language that says does not include indirect uses, such as from the part of the definitions that discusses functionally dependent uses, it does keep the original language that says that functionally dependent use does not include long term, long term storage or related manufacturing facilities. Those amendments are posted online, and when we get to the discussion, I'm happy to explain them in more detail. Does anybody else have amendments they plan to propose or technical questions for claire? Okay. Seeing none. Claire, thank you very much. And Keelan, could you call up the first panel of folks for public testimony?

Speaker: First? First up, we have heather king, tanya hartnett, sherry spark, and micah meskill.

Speaker: I'm not sure if we have heather with us. So tanya and cherise, if you'd like to go ahead.

Speaker: That's great. I'll go first. All right. Thank you. Good afternoon. Council president pirtle-guiney and council members. My name is tanya hartnett, executive director of the working waterfront coalition. And I'm here today to speak in strong support of Portland's harbor businesses, an economic engine that sustains our city and shapes its future. The Portland harbor directs support, directly, supports over 30,000 living wage jobs, many that don't require a four year degree. These are

careers with on the job training, union representation, and real upward mobility, especially for people historically left out of Portland's prosperity. More than half of all middle wage jobs for those without a bachelor's degree are in industrial sectors like those along the harbor. This is where we make real progress on income inequality. These jobs offer stability, dignity and generational opportunity. Harbor businesses are also deeply committed to equity. For example, radius recyclings Portland's workforce is 47% people of color. Vigor's team outpaces regional averages for women and bipoc representation. Other companies hire apprentices from nontraditional backgrounds, including people impacted by the justice system, and train them for careers in clean energy and infrastructure. And these companies don't just employ people, they build and move the materials that make modern life possible. At the harbor, steel is recycled, ships are repaired, and marine vessels, bridges and wears are constructed. Companies also produce and transport cement, asphalt, grain, lumber, semiconductors, insulation, renewable fuels, and advanced components. These are the foundational goods behind our roads, data centers, housing and green energy infrastructure. Beyond Portland, the harbor's impact is statewide. These businesses generate over 1.8 billion in personal income and support 250 plus local suppliers. Nearly 90% of Oregon exports, mostly small and mid-sized, rely on these inputs and this infrastructure to access global markets. A strong harbor means a strong Oregon. These companies are also leading the way on sustainability, recycling metals, switching to renewable fuels, cutting emissions and managing storm water. Environmental responsibility isn't an afterthought, it's how they do business. But this ecosystem is under pressure. Industrial land is shrinking, permitting is inconsistent, and rising taxes and regulations, like those being discussed today, are making it harder to retain and attract employers. And too often, the public narrative overlooks their progress and underestimates their

role in a just green economy. If we went to Portland, that is equitable, affordable and economically resilient, we must support the harbor businesses building that future literally and figuratively. We ask the council to ensure the ordinance being considered today remains temporary, and that the continued the important collaborative work of building the Portland we all want, where businesses and the hardworking people who sustain them can thrive.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

Speaker: Good afternoon, councilors. Thank you for the opportunity to give a comment today. My name is sherry spock, and I'm the climate policy director at 350 pdx, which organizes thousands of Portlanders who care about climate justice. So I am speaking today in support of the amendment to the flood hazard area code that was suggested by the climate resilience and land use committee. I appreciate the work that the committee and the city staff did to make sure that this would bring us into compliance so that we are able to protect the endangered species in our rivers, protect our river health, which contributes to climate health, mitigates the impact on climate change, and therefore is really positive for all Portlanders to be able to have a healthy and safe place to live. So I would encourage you all to support this amendment and to pass it. I recognize that it's really important to do this right away so that we can retain our flood insurance. The folks living in the floodplain have a higher incidence of vulnerability, being vulnerable from vulnerable populations than the rest of the city of Portland. So this is really important to make sure that we maintain that flood insurance. And we recognize that this is a temporary measure, and we hope to come back and make these measures even stronger, to make sure that we're protecting our population around climate change. We've all seen the recent floods that have been happening this month around the country, notably in texas and north carolina. Lots of flooding all along the eastern seaboard. And in

chicago, these incidents of floods are going to become worse and more frequent because of climate change, unless we do more to mitigate those impacts. The way that we do that is through maintaining our river health and making sure that we have areas like the setbacks and the vegetation areas along the edges of our waterfronts, the riparian zones, to make sure that the flood waters have a place to go, that they aren't endangering Portlanders. And this type of protection is not really fully, fully maximized in this particular plan that we're working on here. So we need to come back and make a more comprehensive plan that will address all of the issues to ensure that Portlanders remain safe. So we encourage you to pass this today and to recognize that we have more issues to work on. We need to address climate impacts and do that through river health, while also maintaining the opportunity for people to make a living and to live safely. All along our beautiful rivers in Portland. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

Speaker: Micah is joining us online.

Speaker: Council president and the rest of council, thank you for the opportunity to testify. My name is mike maskell. I'm in the urban conservation director for alliance of Oregon, representing the organization today. As an organization, we have been engaged in advocating for the city to improve its implementation of fema's national flood insurance program for nearly two decades now, as it has a substantial impact on the city's natural resources and the wildlife that depend on it. Along the willamette river, columbia slough and johnson creek. The process that led to these measures in front of you today was started back in 2009 when my predecessor, the late bob salinger, helped lead a lawsuit against fema, asserting that fema's management of the national flood insurance program was violating the endangered species act's protections for federally listed salmon. We were

ultimately successful in that lawsuit and the pre implementation compliance measures. Pick'ems in front of you today is the first step in coming into compliance. As you've heard, the plan in front of you today is interim attempts to come into compliance and should be improved upon to meet more squarely the findings from the biological opinion and in the later iteration of this. But we support the current the current proposal to serve as that interim, even though it is an interim plan, it is very important that it does not have a sunset clause considering the risk, the current, the risk that this current federal administration poses and rolling back previous rulings or bedrock environmental protections such as the endangered species act. The protections put in place today are important for salmon, for people and our economy. It protects important habitat for endangered salmon and other wildlife along our rivers and our sloughs and our streams. It will protect, or it will lead to expanded floodplain habitat that will soak up flood waters, reduce flood risks for people and our economy, our structures. It incentivizes movement of development outside the floodplain, thus increasing the safety of the people who live and work in those hazard zones. And it moves the city importantly into compliance with fema's flood insurance program, which ensures residents along the willamette, columbia, slough and johnson creek can secure insurance for their homes. Of the three pathway options that fema offered with their biological opinion, we would have preferred the no new development in the floodplain option, as it takes us in the direction of best safeguarding people, property and environment. But we understand the direction today that the city has taken to find balance in this interim plan. We want to thank councilor morillo and her office in crafting some earlier amendments that we think strengthens the plan, and we really caution against any weakening of the current proposal. And with that, thank you.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

Speaker: Heather king. Okay, next up we have sarah taylor, marty glickman and chelsea stewart.

Speaker: I'm not sure if we have heather. So go right ahead, marni.

Speaker: Sure. Good afternoon, councilors and I my name is marty glickman. I testified today as a volunteer for willamette riverkeeper on behalf of heather king. She is the co-executive director and lower willamette riverkeeper for willamette riverkeeper. She cannot be here today because right now, she is being sworn in as a director on the urban flood safety and water quality district board. Heather's testimony is in support of agenda item 2025 to 17, as passed by the climate resilience and land use committee. Willamette riverkeeper does not support further amendments that would weaken the code, risk losing flood insurance, and degrade floodplains. The city should use federal language to codify existing city practice to prevent confusion and ensure federal requirements are being met, any attempts to change the federal language would lead to further confusion, and a lack of clarity on what exactly is required under federal law, as these amendments are needed to ensure Portland residents and businesses can qualify for the national flood insurance program. Muddying the waters with different language could risk eligibility in this program. If there is confusion about what is required, the city should not add a sunset provision into the amendments. These amendments are temporary until permanent ones can be put in place, and adding a sunset provision with a firm deadline puts the city at great risk. If the city has not passed permanent amendments by the time of sunset clause would be invoked, the city would lose eligibility in the national flood insurance program and put the city at risk of endangered species act violations, which could lead to expensive lawsuits. Adding a sunset clause would be irresponsible and impractical, and could cause great harm

to the city, its residents and businesses, finally, making non-substantive changes would just slow this process and go against city staff recommendations. The city has already worked on these amendments for many months, and making further non-substantive changes would just slow the process and risk not meeting the July 31st deadline. Please support the amendments as passed by the climate resilience and land use committee without any further changes. Thank you so much for your time.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Chelsea is joining us online.

Speaker: Hello, council. My name is chelsea stewart with the center for biological diversity endangered species program. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. I'd like to first uplift the testimony. We've already heard about how important it is that Portland city does as much as humanly possible to prepare our communities for the flooding disasters that are most certainly in our future. We've witnessed four 1 in 1000 year floods in this country in the span of less than a week. And given Portland's geography and the fact that the majority of our floodplain has been destroyed already, it's not a matter of if a similarly disastrous flood will occur here soon. But when and as the council considers amendments that could potentially weaken the floodplain protections afforded by this code, I'd like to remind council that title 24, as written right now, already represents a significant compromise, if you will, for a few reasons. The biggest reason is that the biological opinion called for a prohibition on most types of development in the riparian buffer zone, and permitted only water dependent uses. Habitat restoration activities activities that result in a beneficial gain for species or habitat, and activities that will not degrade or limit natural floodplain functions in any way. We recognize that fema's model ordinance did not require the city to limit development in the buffer

zone in this way, due to their own definition definition of beneficial gain, but that is part of why the center for biological diversity, as well as the northwest environmental defense center, willamette river keeper, and the conservation angler, are currently engaged in ongoing litigation against fema. Second, the grandfathering permitted by the city for existing permits for which the start of construction has not begun, is far more expansive than what the biological opinion called for, and we'd prefer to see a much narrower grandfathering clause, especially considering that these measures were supposed to be in place back in 2018. And third, we think the city should at least at least make clear in the code that developers should not only conduct mitigation, should only conduct mitigation activities off site if it's spatially infeasible to conduct those activities on site. I also direct the counsel to the comments submitted by the center and the northwest environmental defense center for further information on these shortcomings. That said, we understand that the council must pass these amendments for Portland residents to continue to receive affordable flood insurance. And that's an effort we support. We urge you, however, not to further weaken the protections afforded by title 24 and to instead revisit the code in the future to strengthen it. If that cannot be done here today, thank you for your time and for taking floodplain protection seriously. For the sake of our communities, businesses, worker safety and wildlife.

Speaker: Thank you very much.

Speaker: Checking to see if sarah taylor has joined us. Okay. That completes testimony.

Speaker: Thank you. Keelan. Colleagues. That moves us into amendments and discussion. If anybody would like to get in the queue for amendments or discussion, please do so. Otherwise I will propose my amendments and I'd like to start with the. The first amendment. If you pull up the amendments, they're listed

together. And package one does two things. This would add an additional clause number 27 to the ordinance as it is listed. I'm pulling this up right now as I'm talking. I apologize to the ordinance as it's listed online, which would say the city acknowledges that the proposed amendments represent temporary measures and that the council anticipates adopting long term compliance regulations as required to comply with federally mandated deadlines. As we heard in testimony, we have some stakeholders who expressed worry that if we put a sunset clause on, we might have issues with the federal government if they don't act in the time that we expect, we could end up with a gap. We don't want to do that. I'm my office, and I believe many of your offices have also heard from stakeholders who wanted to make sure that we reiterated that there would need to be more permanent rulemaking at another point. And this language was designed to acknowledge that need for more permanent rules, while also permanent regulations, while also ensuring that we didn't inadvertently leave a gap period, and that this language could be in place until that additional language is developed. The second change here is that there's a portion of the current code language, which was amended in the proposal from our bureau, which is now being partially amended back to the original language. Under what I've brought forward, it's under the functionally dependent use portion. And this is of the exhibit. It is section a. And if you look at that section there was language added to include the term structures and facilities such as bridge piers and later the term and similar uses. Those changes are retained. There was also a change to add language does not include indirect uses such as that new language is removed and it's returned to the original language to say it does not include long term storage and related manufacturing facilities, and that was because concerns were raised that indirect uses, since we haven't had the time to fully define that, could capture things. It was not intended to, but we did still

want to make sure that we included the language around this functionally dependent use definition, not including things like long term storage and related manufacturing facilities that are in fact not dependent on being river adjacent. What this does, in effect, is return us to or maintain us at, I guess I should say maintain us at current city policy. What I have heard from our bureau staff and attorneys is that there is not actually a functional difference between the language does not include indirect uses such as and the does not include language, but that it addresses concerns around that definition changing in the future. So I would move the amendment package one that contains those two changes.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor councilor morillo. Are you in the queue for discussion on this amendment?

Speaker: Yes. I just wanted to address some of the testimony that we received, and I was hoping that staff would come up to address some of those questions, particularly patricia, on the package. One amendment to confirm the functionality dependent use.

Speaker: I think that makes a lot of sense. Patricia, do you mind joining us up here?

Speaker: Thank you. So I was just hoping if you could confirm for us the impact of the functionality functionally dependent use amendment, just from your own perspective, I think that there's some misunderstandings about what some of the amendments do. And personally, I'm fine with what has been presented thus far.

Speaker: Good afternoon. Councilors. Patricia diefenderfer, for the record, excuse me, I'm getting over a cold. So the what's proposed as the minor changes to this definition, I think it's maybe helpful to explain the definition is just referring to as council president noted, uses that are dependent on being by the river and those

that are not. And you can have a site where the primary use is dependent on the river, but there can be proposals for smaller projects within that site that the specific development in question is not necessarily river dependent. We've been giving the example of like a small storage building or a small accessory building on a, on a site that's otherwise a use that is river dependent. So that particular example, that small building is not river dependent and therefore would be subject to the regulations that are being proposed here. So the only difference that that small change in language makes is it just doesn't specify what specifically what uses are indirect uses, although there's long standing practice that staff who implement these regulations in the Portland permitting and development bureau, there's long standing practice around how they implement these regulations. So functionally, it will not change how these regulations are implemented.

Speaker: Thank you so much, patricia I appreciate that. So just to confirm this is not going to change. This isn't this change is not going to weaken the language.

Speaker: It will not change the way the rules are implemented.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you so much. That's all I needed to hear. Appreciate you.

Speaker: Anything else councilor? Okay, colleagues, is there any other discussion to the amendment? Okay. Seeing none. Keelan, could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Koyama lane i.

Speaker: Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick I green. Hi, zimmerman. Hi, avalos.

Speaker: Hi, smith.

Speaker: Hi.

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: Hi, Ryan. I pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: Hi. With ten yes votes, the motion is approved.

Speaker: Thank you. Colleagues, unless anybody else wants to jump in first, I can bring forward my other amendment. Okay. Seeing no one else jump in in that same package listed online or in that same document online. There is amendment package two, which simply adds an emergency clause to the ordinance because we need to meet a fema deadline of July 31st and it is July 17th and measures ordinances, take two hearings before council if they're not emergency ordinances and then 30 days to implement, I am asking that we add an emergency ordinance so that we can stay in compliance with the fema deadline of July 31st. The reason for the emergency ordinance is simply to accommodate that deadline. Second, thank you. That was councilor Ryan for a second. Colleagues, is there any discussion on this amendment? Councilor kanal.

Speaker: Yeah, I'm going to end up supporting this for the reasons you gave. Madam president, I think it's worth noting that if and when we do have this item come back, one of the things that caused us to get to this place is that we were given less notice by staff than would have been ideal to ensure that we could have gotten this considered in time. So I would love to get to a place when the next time we are discussing something like this. It's not an emergency because this is an emergency, not in the sense of a flood is an emergency. This is an emergency in the sense that we don't have enough time to prevent putting Portlanders at risk. It's still suitable for the clause, but I think it's worth noting that and working towards the sort of preventable emergency being prevented in the future. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you councilor. And I continue to try to back up the amount of back up from when folks want things past the time when they submit them, so that we can get better and better at that. Councilor smith.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. Just so that I'm clear on this, was there a deadline that was running out is the reason why we're doing this now, or do we have to update this every so many years?

Speaker: Patricia, do you mind coming back up and filling in some of the details here for us? Councilor we have staff joining us at the table. To answer your question more thoroughly than I can.

Speaker: Sure.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you.

Speaker: Again for the record, patricia diefenderfer, this is a deadline that was imposed as a result of these interim regulations. The city being informed of the need to update to be compliant with these interim regulations. So July 31st, 2025 is the deadline for that. This is not a there's not a periodic deadline that we have to every so often we adopt these things. This is in response to the current situation of having these these interim requirements being required by the federal government.

Speaker: And so patricia, when did we get those deadlines? When did we get the notice that we need to update this?

Speaker: Sure. We can give you a timeline. So July of last year was when the city received a letter from fema saying that by December of this of last year, the city had to notify fema of its approach. The approach, as you've noted, I think you've seen in the materials that there were three different approaches. So it was by December that the city had to let the federal government know which approach we were going to take. And then from that time. So from December until now, the city has been working on the regulations in the city, the bureau, the permitting bureau, published a draft of those regulations in March of this year. And they were they were up for public comment for about three or so weeks. And then we began the

legislative process to bring them to council. So it was a very expedited timeline, really, for this kind of project.

Speaker: Excellent, excellent. I was trying to figure out the nexus between why this was an emergency and was this a normal timeline every four years or something like that? But I appreciate your explanation and thank you so much.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Colleagues, is there any other discussion to the amendment? Okay. Seeing none Keelan could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Koyama lane i.

Speaker: Maria.

Speaker: Hi, novick.

Speaker: I mean.

Speaker: Hi, zimmerman.

Speaker: Hi.

Speaker: Avalos.

Speaker: Hi, smith.

Speaker: Hi.

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: Hi, Ryan.

Speaker: I pirtle-guiney. I with ten yes votes. The amendment is approved.

Speaker: Thank you. Colleagues.

Speaker: We now have the amended ordinance before us as an emergency ordinance. Is there any discussion to the ordinance? Councilor. No. And, colleagues, i'll remind you that we are working on doing our comments during discussion and not with our votes. Councilor green, go right ahead.

Speaker: Yeah. I just want to say that I'm going to support this today because because of the timeline requirements that we have and it's unfair to homeowners to sort of hold them hostage when it comes to insurance products. As we kind of work through. Perfecting our approach to this. Right. And. We have an obligation to both be a good steward of our watersheds while also, you know, being good fiscal stewards. So I'm going to support it for that reason. I also that's the reason I supported your amendment, is because I think I did not support a sunset clause, but the sort of suggestion that this is temporary because we are committing to do more work on this got me to that place. So I appreciate all the work that counsel my fellow colleagues have have done on this to get us to this point, as well as the advocates and stakeholders in this process. So that's that's why I'm going to support this ultimately.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor Ryan.

Speaker: Yes, thank you, madam president. Actually, I want to acknowledge you for your leadership. I was a no in the committee. I thought that we did need to have more dialog. And I think that we bought ourselves some diplomatic time here, and we're making this land in a way that I think keeps us all at the table. We all know that our working waterfront is a part of Portland's history and needs to be a part of our story going forward. Those are some of our best jobs we have in this city, and I think that to councilor green's comments, we are giving ourselves still guidelines and commitments. And so it's not running away from this, but it's in we're doing our work to bring everyone to the table, the stakeholders, so we can keep working this out. So I thank everyone for your time. There's been quite a few meetings on this topic and I just want to call that out. So thank you so much for your leadership and I will be supporting this. Thanks.

Speaker: Thank you councilor. Councilor avalos.

Speaker: Yeah I wanted to say thank you to staff and advocates again for their extensive work on all of this, and in particular, councilor morillo, you really did a lot of work ahead of bringing it to the committee to ensure that we were navigating all of the legal and technical complexities of the fema compliance and the protections and local implementation. As I said during the committee, this package doesn't resolve every concern that's been raised, especially around long term habitat protection and development limitations. But it is a necessary and time sensitive step that we need to do to keep Portland eligible for the flood insurance and disaster relief. I think that the city has been really proactive in working to comply with the buy off, and we can't really rely on congressional intervention for further delays in this implementation. I do appreciate that it's an interim measure, and I'm encouraged by the city's commitment to reengage after fema's nepa process is complete in 2026. But i'll definitely be watching very closely to ensure that our long term plan meaningfully strengthens habitat protections and is centering the community in particular and environmental resilience. So thanks all for your hard work. I'm excited to be voting I for this.

Speaker: Thank you councilor. Colleagues, I am in the queue simply because I wanted to acknowledge the work that our colleague, councilor morillo, did on this. When this first came to committee, there were a number of amendments proposed, some of them a bit at the last minute, and councilor morillo was presiding over that meeting and was able to take the time to hear from everybody, but also give councilors the time to consider all of those amendments by making sure to delay to another meeting, and then really working to put those together in a cohesive package. And I appreciate all the time that you put into that. Thank you. Councilor novick.

Speaker: I just wanted to say that I appreciate councilor rios work, the council president's work, the work of all the advocates. And a special thanks to patricia diefenderfer for all her work and patiently answering all of our questions over the last couple of months.

Speaker: Councilor zimmermann.

Speaker: Thanks. Similarly, I did appreciate the one on one brief that I got with the staff from a couple of the departments being able to go through the, you know, sometimes the deep dive or trying to understand where, you know, just as the amendment earlier, what words have impact and what words signal intent. And i, i, I don't think we always are able to navigate, no pun intended, navigate these waters. So as adeptly as well as as this team did. And I just I'm appreciative of them. And they were able to belay some of my concerns that had come up. So appreciation there. And thank you for bringing those amendments as well, madam president. Thanks all.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor, councilor canal.

Speaker: Yeah, thank you, madam president. Thank you to all the same folks here. Councilor morillo, council president, staff, I appreciate the time the environmental environmental advocates took with my team and i, as well as with working waterfront coalition. There's some things in here that I think are imperfect, and I think those who are in the room on the navigation of the finding compromise did a very good job there. I personally don't have a problem with sunset clauses, for example. I think they are often an appropriate use. If they're not necessary here based on the compromise, then so be it. I'm not advocating it here, but I think there are some things that could probably have been better, and I look forward to revisiting those starting with the same three groups I just mentioned of our staff, industry and the environmental advocates. Over the course of time. I wanted to

Speak mostly to say that with time, consensus is possible, and when we rush things, we often don't have the ability to get there. And so I hope that this process can build that in, and not just with these three groups, but the tribes and a whole lot of other folks that are involved as well. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor.

Speaker: Councilors, are there any other comments or questions to the amended emergency ordinance? Okay. And I will just note that I got a lot of thank you there. But that really is shared with my team and Emily on my staff, who does policy work, who has been in communication with both city staff and the advocates over the last couple of weeks to help make this happen. Keelan could you please call the roll.

Speaker: Koyama lane i.

Speaker: Maria well, I got to add a shout out to Susie Doister, my policy advisor as well, I vote i.

Speaker: Novick i.

Speaker: Green.

Speaker: Zimmerman.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Avalos i.

Speaker: Dunphy oh sorry. Smith. Hi Canal. I Zion. I Pirtle-Guiney. I with ten yes votes. The ordinance is passed as amended.

Speaker: Thank you colleagues. Keelan. Could you please.

Speaker: Read our next agenda item.

Speaker: Item 21 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.

Speaker: Thank you. And colleagues. This is a second reading. Is there any further discussion before we move to a vote? Okay. Seeing none Keelan o councilor green.

Speaker: Yeah, I just want to say on the record that, you know, when we considered this, I thought, I think the staff did a really good job at walking the committee through what it means to grant this kind of a franchise agreement to comcast and how that interacts with. The cable. Mhc. But I also want to note that this does not preclude the city of Portland from pursuing a municipal broadband system in the future. So I know that's that's something that my colleagues value as well. And I want to I just want to throw that out there.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor councilor kanal.

Speaker: Yeah, I think it's possible dc olivera stepped out of the room, but the question I was going to ask is exactly that about whether or not there was oh, there you are. Sorry. And just to get that on the record, if I have just this one question in the comment, does anything in this document limit the city's ability to explore municipal internet in any way?

Speaker: Thank you for the question. Councilor daniel oliveras. For the record, no.

Speaker: Great. Thank you. That is my has been my only hesitation and I appreciate this. I think it's important that we talk about places where the public sector can be a part of solutions to some of the issues that that Portlanders face. Reliability, as has usually been a good thing here. But affordability and access is always a concern. And so I think that as we're talking about potential long term plans, publicly owned broadband is something that I would like to explore. And it's with a ten year franchise agreement, a hesitation I had. And I appreciate councilor green as well as dcca answering the question. So I will end up voting yes on this.

Speaker: Colleagues, is there any other discussion before we move to a vote? Okay. Thank you both. Keelan could you please call the roll.

Speaker: Koyama lane I morillo. I novick. I green. I. Zimmerman i. Avalos I smith.

Speaker: Councilor smith.

Speaker: I thank you sorry.

Speaker: I was on mute.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Canal i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: The ordinance passes with ten yes votes.

Speaker: Thank you colleagues Keelan. Could you please read our last agenda item. Item 22 amend council organization and procedure code to include council rule on tiebreaking.

Speaker: Thank you and colleagues. This is a first reading of an ordinance. So we won't be taking a vote today. But it is our time for discussion and any changes. We have a committee staff summary from ashley hernandez. Go right ahead, ashley.

Speaker: Madam president, councilors. For the record, my name is ashley hernandez. I serve as a staffer for the governance committee. The ordinance document 2020 5-1686 was considered at the governance committee on may 5th, where it was referred and referred as amended to full council with the recommendation that it passed the ordinance. Amend city code 3.02.030, providing guidelines for the mayor's tiebreaking vote. The American cast a tie breaking vote in the council. In the council is evenly split on on a non emergency ordinance or procedural matter, and if the mayor cannot vote, the motion fails for tie determination advances, absences and vacancies are counted as a no vote. The committee adopted amendments by moving the item to full committee to full council. The amendments are on the original are on the original resolution draft. Summarizing the in the committee staff summary, one person testified during the

committee meeting on may 5th, and three people submitted written testimony. Prior committee action. The testimony focused on in defining what constitutes a thai language, consistency between coding and charter, impact on absences on the vote. On the vote count significantly influences the passage of legislation. This concludes the staff summary. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you very much. Ashley. Vice president, koyama lane. You were both the presiding officer and the carrier here. Would you like to provide any additional context or information about the background?

Speaker: Sure. Thank you, madam president. So, colleagues, this came to governance on may 5th. We discussed this ordinance that was drafted in consultation with city attorney robert taylor, to address the issue of council tie breaking when, the when and how the mayor steps in to break a tie. And as we all know, this has come up several times in our meetings with conflicting interpretations, interpretations of the language in charter and code. So this was brought forward with the intention of not changing, but rather clarifying the process. And that is what we hope to be accomplished with what we bring to you today. Today is time for us to discuss this. As you can see from the strikethrough underlying version of exhibit a attached that documents the governance committee's adopted amendments. That the language was really pared down by the committee in hopes of getting to a place of clarity. I really look forward to hearing what you all think and love. I'm excited to hear all the different interpretations.

Speaker: Thank you councilor. Are there any technical questions or proposed amendments that we should put on the record before we make a call for public testimony? Councilor avalos.

Speaker: Yes, I have a proposed amendment. It has been posted, so it's on the website for folks to follow along. So i'll say what the amendment is and then i'll explain it. So under j three a essentially I'm adding in here in determining if a tie exists. So changing the language if a vote is a tie making it tie exists. And then essentially it only had one section under a. So I'm adding b which says council must vote 6 to 6 in at least two subsequent rounds. Subsequent rounds would not require a motion to reconsider. So the logic for this is, first and foremost, voters were very clear when they passed charter reform that they were fed up with the old system. And my amendment is about making sure that the legislative responsibilities stay within the City Council. There are going to be ties. That's just simple math with a 12 member council. And as I have shared in the past, i'll just give a little bit of background to say that, you know, when the decision to have 12 members was come up, it was the fact that it was an even number really wasn't as important to us as it was to achieve proportional ranked choice voting and multi member representation. So I could go on another tangent about that. Happy to share the history with other folks about that. But I think it's important to say, because I know that there's been folks that felt that, you know, we put ourselves in this hard bind. And sure, it's tricky when you have a 12 or an even numbered body, but there were things that were more important. On that note, then we decided to add a mayor tie breaking to make up for the fact that one we had a tie council, and two that the mayor did not have a veto. All that being said, I believe that policy differences should be resolved between councilors. I don't think that we should be relying on the mayor to settle debates. So what my amendment is doing is just ensuring that we have the opportunity as a council to debate our differences and be able to essentially have three chances to resolve that. I know that there have been times so far that, you know, it ends up in a tie, and I know I look around the

room and people are like, well, you know, if I would have had an opportunity to keep talking it out, maybe I could have gotten to another place. I just think this is an opportunity for us to ensure that the legislative decisions stay within our body, and that a mayor tie is an absolute last resort. So that's my amendment. I guess I need a second for that. And then. Yeah.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilors. Councilor green is your do you have a technical question or an amendment?

Speaker: It's a technical, logical question for councilor avalos amendment. It can also wait until after testimony.

Speaker: But let me pause and see if we have testimony.

Speaker: No one signed up.

Speaker: Okay. Perfect. Then let's move straight into our discussion. Ashley, I think we're okay. Thank you so much. Go right ahead, councilor green.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. Thank you for introducing this. Councilor avalos. I just want to make sure I understand the kind of conditional logic that's in this amendment. So section j is about clarifying the conditions in which it's appropriate for the mayor to make a tie breaking vote. And your what you're doing here is you're amending section three, which is really trying to get a defining when the tie exists, when the condition of the tie exists, and that we're not counting absences and abstentions or those are no votes. But what you're basically saying is your you're saying we're going to give ourselves at least two rounds before we do that final math on what those what those tie condition votes could be. But then I guess my question is on the third round, are we then saying if we're still stuck, the mayor casts the deciding vote? Can you clarify that?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Yeah. So it would, you know, anything that would follow after that third round would just continue in whatever the code says that we would do in a tie. So this is just adding a provision to give us the opportunity to debate it before it gets to that point. So I'm not anything left in the rest of the code is as as is.

Speaker: Okay, I think I understand that. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor kanal. Oh, I'm sorry, councilor smith.

Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, madam president. I think that this amendment again, it's administrative overreach. It is changing the process of charter review. It is not doing what the charter review put forward. And I think that. Not only this amendment and others and the entire amendment, it is it is out of order. And it's something that we really need to take a look at, because I believe that we're going to get sued for not following the charter and trying to put something in code to replace charter if we want to make these kinds of changes. These are the kind of changes that we should make during charter review. And that happens every ten years. So I think that this is a moot point. I think we should have had more conversation from other legal counsel. I appreciate our legal counsel, but I just disagree with his interpretation. And so now we're trying to interpret and modify his interpretation of what our charter says in all of it is totally wrong. It it doesn't pass the smell test. And so we're taking the job, we're doing the job of the charter review by trying to put something in code and adding amendments like this amendment, which is totally out of order. And if and I'm glad for the first time, I this is the first time that I've heard a reason why the plain one sentence was put in was because vetoes were taking out of the out of the mayor's hands. And this was, this was a way to give some, some people on the charter review some, some kind of comfort that the mayor will have some sort of power. And it didn't identify any of these things. And if we wanted that, that's where we should have put it. I'm just

afraid that we're going to somebody's going to take us to court, and we're going to spend more money out of the risk fund. And we're, we're we're taking away the power of the charter review committee. If we put this in order. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor, councilor canal.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. Thank you to councilor avalos for putting this forward. I have three broad concerns with the document. This is an attempt to resolve one of them, which is the whether or not on the very first time we cast a ballot or cast a vote, I should say as councilors, that should it result in a six, six or I guess six, five, six, four, six, three, etcetera. Whether or not we immediately are going and talking to the mayor or whether or not we have the opportunity to discuss it, and I think it is appropriate to do so. I seconded, for the purposes of discussion, I have a couple wording questions as well, and I would like to ask about it. So subsequent rounds to me implies that we're talking about three total rounds and that on the fourth or sorry, on the on the third round, we would be asking the mayor for a tiebreak before concluding that third round. Is that correct, councilor avalos?

Speaker: I'm processing your question. So you're saying by the third round, if it is still a tie, then yes, we would ask the mayor to intervene. Yes.

Speaker: Okay. And that subsequent.

Speaker: So real quick and then like, just like councilor green was asking me, it would just follow the rest of the code.

Speaker: Got it. There is no. So there I have two, two questions here. One is I don't believe there is any code that that would answer the my next question, which is would we have the opportunity to debate again between the first and second or second and third rounds? And i, I believe that we should have that opportunity to do so, because the only chance we've had to do this was the council president vote,

which tied, I believe we're on the ninth round or something like that, ninth or 10th. Before there was a definitive outcome. And I think that the conversations we had between those were in fact helpful. So I would like to see that. And I don't believe that exists anywhere else in code. So I think it would need to exist here.

Speaker: Could i.

Speaker: Could we get.

Speaker: A legal opinion on the interpretation of this? I think that might help answer the question that you're getting at. Councilor kanal.

Speaker: Thanks. And then the only while city attorney, taylor or representative would come.

Speaker: Up or robert, I don't know which of you would like to address this.

Speaker: While you're coming up. I'll ask the other question, too, which is sort of rhetorical, but might be helpful, I think, in the amendment in the committee removed the idea of having I think it was four total votes at that point, up to three additional times. This would have it be three total times. I'm not sure what that optimal number is for me. I think it's two would be sufficient to total, but I don't know if there's any legal implication that. So I figured I'd float it before you answered.

Speaker: I think, mr. Taylor, that's two questions. The first is, if we were to pass this amendment as presented by councilor avalos, would you interpret this as either allowing or requiring either one additional debate between voting rounds? And then also, do you have any thoughts on the correct number, the optimal number of rounds of voting, is that correct, councilor.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Thank you. For the record, robert taylor, city attorney. I, I don't have any real opinion on the correct number of rounds, whether it's just you do one round

and if it's six six, the American break a tie. If you do a try it again or try it a third or fourth time, the main issue that that that we have identified with having subsequent rounds of voting is normally if the first vote fails, you would have to have a motion to reconsider, go through that procedure. There's consequences if a motion to reconsider fails. If that happens, the item is procedurally extinguished. So that's why you'll see in councilor avalos amendment this concept that subsequent rounds would not require the motion to reconsider. So that would allow you to just proceed to another round of voting on this question of whether you would be allowed to engage in debate or prohibited from engaging in debate in that second round. If I was asked to interpret this language, I would say that once you are engaged in the second round, it is just back before the body, as if there had been a successful motion to reconsider. It's just right back before you. You can engage in debate, you can amend it, you can refer it back to committee. All of those things are available to you. That's my interpretation of the words. If you want to make that clearer, you could certainly add language to this to make that clear.

Speaker: Thank you. I think that resolves that that concern and I appreciate it. I it could be clearer, but I think having your interpretation on the record is sufficient for my concern. The only thing I would suggest then is I would say up to instead of at least. And I would ask councilor avalos if we could consider that friendly.

Speaker: Absolutely.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Thank you. And while my preference is still if I was picking how I would write it, I would probably just say, let's do it one more time. So a total of two instead of a total of up to three. But i, I think it's important that we have this option and the exact number is less relevant to me, so I will leave it there.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Mr. Taylor, you're up here and I have the next question. And conveniently, it's a question for the attorneys. And perhaps if we're going to further debate between voting rounds, that shows the difference. But I guess I'm wondering about the necessity of this, given that anybody can change their vote at any time. And i, I don't know if from a legal perspective, there is a difference in terms of how we operate between specifically saying you're going to have another round of votes as opposed to just the allowance within robert's rules and the rules that we operate under, that if something should fail, somebody could choose to change their vote in order to take care of the work amongst councilors.

Speaker: Great question. So the under robert's rules, anybody can change their vote at any time before the vote is announced. Once the vote has been announced under robert's rules, it would require unanimous consent to change your vote. So. I, I can imagine a scenario where it would be tricky to get unanimous consent to change a vote if you're tied 6 to 6, the result has been announced, and then somebody wants to change. You're now relying on all of your other colleagues to agree. We you know, if there is an objection, I think there would be a way to suspend that rule in robert's to allow someone to change their vote afterwards. But even that suspension of the rules would require nine votes. So you just have to think about a situation where you are in a difficult policy debate. You're tied 6 to 6. The vote has been announced whether you can achieve unanimous consent or nine votes to allow someone to change their vote.

Speaker: Thank you. That's helpful. Colleagues, I'm considering what I want to do here. And one of the things that was weighing on me was whether this was really necessary or not. I am compelled by the idea that there would be an option for debate. And I understand the difficulty in overcoming the barriers to change a vote. I do wish that it was just one additional round as opposed to multiple additional

rounds. I think you take the time to go back to debate and you see if anything changes or not, and then you move forward. And the balance of making sure that we're doing good work and trying to come to consensus, but also making sure we have time for whatever the next work is, strikes me as appropriate. At one additional round, i'll continue to listen to the rest of your comments and think about where I want to go here, councilor avalos.

Speaker: Yeah, to that last point that robert taylor spoke to, that's exactly it. Like, yes, there are technically ways within robert's rules that you could reconsider and all of that. My point here is to bake in an opportunity for discussion that isn't dependent on having quick robert's rules reactions and savvy. And I think ultimately the goal here is, again, to ensure that we as a legislative body can retain our authority. And we're not, you know, running quickly after every decision to have the mayor weigh in. I'll just say to, you know, code things that go in charter always require accompanying code. So this is not out of the ordinary. We do it for literally everything else. And the whole point of charter is to give you the foundation. And it's our job as leaders to define that. And, and, you know, with the help of our lawyers and the code to add clarity. And that's essentially what I'm trying to do here. Ultimately, as I've stated previously, and I think the rest of the way that the resolution is written, like, you know, I went and spoke to the governance committee, I had a lot of thoughts and ideas about how we could write the language to ensure that, again, we are preserving the council's ability to an authority to make decisions. I think the way that the other parts of this resolution landed are satisfying to me in in doing that, this is just the last piece that I feel should be baked in to again assure that we can retain our authority. So that's my logic for it. Thanks.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor, councilor green. Oh, I'm sorry colleagues, I wasn't looking at the list of folks who have already spoken, and we have a lot more people signed up. I should have gone to them before councilors avalos and green spoke again. Councilor green, do you mind if I move on to our colleagues and come back to you? Thank you, councilor zimmermann.

Speaker: Thank you. I was wondering, I have a question. Was, was this aspect of and I'm speaking purely to the amendment right now, was this included or discussed at all when it came up at governance? And I'd be curious if. Well, I'll just did it. Did it was it proposed or did this come up specifically at governance? And then clearly it didn't make it through governance, but did it even come up?

Speaker: Vice president koyama lane, would you like to speak to that?

Speaker: Yes. Thanks for the question, councilor zimmermann. If you look at exhibit a, the one with the strikethrough underlining that version, you'll see that there's a whole whole section in number two that was voted 4 to 1. I was the only one that voted not to cross all of that out. So that was really taken from attorney taylor's recommendation of his his interpretation of is that correct? Mr. Taylor? His interpretation of what we should be doing, and that is what council president, that's what we have been using thus far, is his interpretation. Where it landed. I'm not sure if this is clear for everyone. It is if we have a 66 vote and we look right over there, which is happening right now in a council meeting, and mr. Mayor is not here, the vote fails. It's done. We don't come back to it. So I think the question is are you okay with that or would you like a chance to try talking it out and voting again, or would we like to have it in code that this is bumped to another meeting that he can come to. So quite a lot was struck from this. And if someone else on governance, I have a couple colleagues up here want to talk about some of their thought process. That would be great.

Speaker: I want to interrupt a little bit, councilor. I am taking I'm taking your answer just to the specificity of councilor avalos specific amendment. It doesn't look like the at least two times before we go into the. Doesn't look like that was part of the discussion at governance that that's my that was my first question. I want to make sure I'm not.

Speaker: That I mean.

Speaker: That's not true because I did bring I gave like a whole document with a whole bunch of information. It had this in it. So I definitely brought it to governance a couple times.

Speaker: And did.

Speaker: Did it receive a vote?

Speaker: It wasn't a votable thing. It was like a just a concept that I brought to them and asked them to take it up as the governance committee, since I'm not on it. And then they didn't take this thing up on they didn't take this thing up, which is why I'm bringing it here as an amendment.

Speaker: Councilor zimmermann, can I respond? The it was in the ordinance that mr. Taylor drafted. Part of that was it says here the council may vote again on passed final passage up to three additional times. So in that sense we did discuss it. It was part of the original ordinance. Does that clarify?

Speaker: That's really helpful. Both both of you, I appreciate it. I think this is a great conversation. Councilor canal asked some other questions that I would have, and my interpretation was that of course we would have debate after after each time. And so that's where if this was to pass, that's how I would interpret it. I, i. To the amendment specifically, I am cautious about giving this council another reason to go quote unquote, another round. I don't know that we have been particularly quiet on anything. And so this idea that more debate has to happen is not

compelling for me yet, that I think the power of a tie breaking vote is important. And this seems like it is an additional procedure to delay in order to just continue to talk about a thing. And so i, I don't love, love this because I do think if something does get reconsidered, of course it gets continued debate. So on the amendment, I am not going to support it. I appreciate very clear rules, and I think that this is a less clear rule. So I appreciate the debate. And also thank you for the history. Just kind of how the documents changed. Councilor koyama lane. And i'll leave, i'll, i'll leave my comments there for at least to the amendment. Before we go on to the rest of the document. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor Ryan.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Thank you, council president. This meeting may 5th seems like it was even longer. It seems like it was like four months ago at least. And so just know that we're those of us on the committee are trying to remember. I want to also acknowledge that I was kind of a pest to the council president wanting to bring this earlier, and I think because it was so fresh at the time, we actually took a lot of different opinions on this. Councilor smith's point of view is one that I'm really close to. I think that when I talk to voters, many had reservations about not having the veto since most democratic governance institutions have that checks and balance. And the one thing that got them there was the mayor's ability to break ties. So I think when I when I came on board, I assumed for everything that there was a tie, the mayor would break that tie. I have been listening to my colleagues and appreciating the dialog we've had about this. I thought we came to a really good compromise with where we landed with this legislation. We think that with ordinances especially, and also with the land use, that those are issues that are in code that oftentimes have some urgency to them. And we also know that it is

legislators opportunity to connect with the third floor of the mayor's office. When those votes are coming up, I think it will be very easy to accommodate the mayor being at our meetings. I don't think Portlanders wanted the mayor to be isolated from the big issues facing our city. And I actually think we got to a really good place. I, I moved from thinking it was going to be for all amendments, for resolutions, reports, anything and it it we got it very clean and the or the. I'll just tell you the many conversations on this with resolutions. It was like why would the mayor weigh in on something we're advising the mayor and enterprise to do? And so that's our job to do the follow up and do the oversight. But it made it really clear that we should just stay focused on these two. So I'm, I'm I understand the spirit behind the amendment because we discussed it at length. But I will be voting no on that. And I am supportive of this, I think very clear package that I think voters have been asking for. Thanks.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor, councilor novick.

Speaker: Okay, this is going to sound rather frivolous, but I kind of like the idea of a system where we have to keep on our toes, and we were watching to see if it's a66 vote. And do we have to? Well, maybe we could ask the clerk to pause for 30s before announcing the results of a66 vote to give people a chance to change their vote if they want to. I kind of like the idea of having to, the mayor having to know in advance whether he should show up because it might be a66 vote. I confess that my views might be influenced by the fact that, as a baseball fan, I hate the designated hitter, and I love the strategy that we used to have and the idea of the double switch and all of those things. So I kind of like having a system where we all have to, you know, be on our, you know, be on our toes and react appropriately. So I think it would oppose the would oppose the amendment.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor, councilor green.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. So there's two things I want to weigh in on at this point, based upon the way the conversation has evolved. The first was I just wanted to make the point that I think that the charter itself grants the City Council both the power. And I would also argue the obligation to make code change updates as is necessary to clarify our rules of procedure. So I don't I don't agree with the point of view that this is an overstep of what the intent of the charter is, because it's written into the charter that indeed City Council will adopt its rules of procedure to include how how we do this tie breaking. So I just that to me is crystal clear and I'm not worried about a legal challenge there. But then, you know, some interesting questions have been raised about like the need. And I'm glad the council president raised this on whether or not this provision is necessary. And one of the reasons why I think it is, is because that we do have and this is partly driven by Oregon public meetings law. We do have some information asymmetry. And so if we're going through, and especially if we're in a world where there's 12 of us, we need to limit how much we speak. And I recognize this is my second time in the turn. So there's a little bit of irony here. But in order to go back and forth and have us come to a position of resolution where we do have an even number of people having a built in relief for us to resolve the final vote, and then think about the implications of the vote and think about the fact that the vote did not conclude. And resolve gives us the ability to change, gives us the ability to persuade each other further. So I think this is actually pretty elegant solution to that, that problem. Otherwise. I mean, while I appreciate the baseball analogy here, and I think it's useful to stay on our toes, I think we don't all think in the same way, and we don't all process information in the same way, but we're all very smart and we're all duly elected individuals who are supposed to be bringing forward the values of our constituents and passed serious policy. So I think if we have a good institutional

mechanism to say we have a relief, we have an opportunity to resolve this at our level, not without without bringing the mayor into, I think, considerations that really are not final in that regard or not appropriate. This to me seems like something I can definitely support.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor koyama lane.

Speaker: Okay, so we have I it's helpful for me to separate separate out if we should have multiple times to vote again and if so, how many? I will say I don't feel super strongly. I could be fine with one, two, three or if there there aren't enough people to agree to do it again. I do think if there's a pause, people can change their vote. I do kind of. I like the idea of there being a chance to do it once. So there's some sort of an invitation for us to pause, reflect, maybe talk a bit and reconsider. But I'm not willing to fight for that really hard. What I do care a bit more about, and I am interested in my colleagues. I think councilor novick kind of likes the excitement that it would bring of looking over in the mayor's not here and maybe having to call him. I yeah, or whoever that mayor is at some point. The big chunk that we cut out about what if the mayor is not there is if the vote on final passage remains inconclusive at the end of the meeting, the matter will be automatically postponed and rescheduled to the next council meeting. When the mayor is able to attend in person or virtually at the rescheduled meeting, the matter will come to council in the same form and posture as it appeared at council immediately before the roll call vote that resulted in the tie. The rescheduled matter before council is subject to procedural motions, including, without limitation, those listed, blah blah blah. Okay, I do not think mayor keith wilson, of course would do this, but what if there is a mayor at some point that hides? Are we going to let them do that? If they don't want to vote on something, then they this is an out. They don't have to. So I think that's the question my gut is now make them vote. Make them make the

choice. I that's the one that I feel a little bit more passionate about and that I would be interested in amending to try to get that piece back in if there is interest from others.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor, councilor morillo.

Speaker: Thank you. I like this amendment. I will say I after hearing everything, I think that it needs to be just one additional round. I don't really see what three additional rounds does for us, because I think it's going to become a pattern of us just going through additional rounds as an, as a check mark that we've gone through them, and only the final round is actually going to matter. So I think that it should just be one additional round. We have quite a lot of meetings. There's quite a lot of debate, and we are struggling to get through our agendas at times. So i, I would feel a little hard pressed to do three rounds of this. I am interested in if the mayor is the tiebreaker. As you know, charter has said that he's going to be if something doesn't pass or is tied and he is unavailable, because I don't think it's realistic that the mayor will be able to attend every single council meeting for the entire duration of the meeting, that at the next council meeting, he is prepared to attend and to break the tie. Because I agree, I think that there are something that I find very frustrating in our legislature and other elected bodies is that people get to evade their votes or not be there for the vote or find ways to get around that. And I think that people, the public deserves to have that transparency around where their elected officials stand, including the mayor. So I would be interested in an amendment bringing that information. But on this particular amendment, I think I would be okay with just one round. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor navigating folks who are in the queue for a second time right now. Councilor canal.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president, to respond to both council vice president and councilor morillo i, I do have concerns about the lack of text that relates to the mayor potentially being absent. I think that's outside the scope of this amendment. So I'm going to talk about that after this. For me. I know it was in the same paragraph previously, so I understand why it was brought up. But for me, I think there's I have three concerns. One is the scope of what just for reference, what the scope of what the mayor can break a tie on, what happens if he's not present or future mayor is not present, and how many rounds, if any. Those are sort of my three concerns, so i'll talk about the other two in a minute here when we're out of the amendment. But I would like to request the I'm going to float an amendment and ask if it would be friendly here, and I'm going to read it out to replace the text that's in b, which currently says council must vote 6 to 6 in up to two subsequent rounds. Subsequent rounds would not require a motion to reconsider. That's where we're at now to council must vote 6 to 6 in two rounds. It does not require a motion to reconsider, to move to the second round, and I'd ask if that would be considered friendly. I am the second or the motion, so I do assent to that. Of course.

Speaker: Councilor avalos.

Speaker: Yes, yes.

Speaker: Can we have a point of order about the intent of that language and what it means before we understand that?

Speaker: Absolutely, certainly.

Speaker: So. So right now, the original proposed amendment was at least two subsequent rounds, which means it would take three or more votes to where we'd get to the mayor breaking a tie. We changed that to up to two, meaning that if a second vote resolved the issue, we wouldn't need a third, but it could go up to

three. This would change it to two. An initial vote, and then if that were to be six votes in favor, then we would effectively go back into discussing it. As our attorney just mentioned, it would be as if it was reconsidered, but without requiring that motion would be debating it. And then if we took a second vote and it should remain six votes in favor at that stage, it would be considered a tie, and the mayor could break the tie in that second round of voting.

Speaker: Councilor zimmerman, does that clarify for you?

Speaker: So two is the number, but did you also get rid of the word subsequent for a reason?

Speaker: I think subsequent implies relative to the first. And we're talking about two rounds. It just I think second was a clearer word personally, but.

Speaker: Just just clarifying. You are a master of the procedures. So learn to cross check everything.

Speaker: Thanks.

Speaker: Point of privilege.

Speaker: I just wanted to note I'm having some issues with my zoom, and that it keeps lowering my hand when I don't want it to. I'm trying to change the setting, but I noticed that I was in the queue and then it lowered my hand, so I put my hand back up. I'm trying to fix that, but just fyi.

Speaker: And councilor, I didn't hear definitively. Is this a friendly amendment, or is this a proposal that you're rejecting?

Speaker: Friendly.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Okay. So colleagues, we now have a slightly changed version before us, which would say council must vote 6 to 6 in two rounds. Hold on. I wrote this down in two rounds. It does not require a motion to reconsider to move to the second

round. So that is now the motion on the table that folks are speaking to. Councilor smith, I don't believe you've spoken a second time. Go right ahead.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I just want to go back to this policy amendment. For me. It is too complicated and it puts into a lengthy process. The charter also gives the mayor. I want to remind everyone he has been given the mandate to drop resolutions and ordinances in the charter. He is already involved in our policy making. We have been pushing forward his agenda this past seven months. The mayor has approved more policies and appropriations, more than any single councilor. He has also proposed and appropriated more dollars in the 2526 budget than all of us put together. We did not do a wholesale change of his budget. So to suggest and to even say we don't need him in this process, he is so knee deep in this process and putting forward his agenda. We don't have a stamp on this council yet, but this mayor does. If you look at all the resolutions and the ordinances that have passed, you need to go look at that. So all of this is way too complicated and too lengthy. And i'll just say again, I will not be supporting it.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor zimmerman.

Speaker: Thanks. I, i, I guess I would encourage us that, you know, if something fails, nothing precludes a team or a sponsor from taking it back behind closed doors or back in their committee and working some things to then find a more palatable solution. And this idea that once something ties, that it's dead forever, I think is, you know, for a long time, government has brought things back once it gets workable. And once a sponsor thinks that there's a second chance at it. So I am not I'm not very sympathetic to this idea that we've got to govern to the lowest common denominator for slowness or for like, let's just have a longer discussion until we can finally get there. I think there is some importance about when something hits the dais. You have that period of debate, and then there has to be

some finality to that. And that finality doesn't mean that something can't come back. But in that moment, it's time you move on. And so I really value that. That's why I think a tiebreaking vote is important to have. I you know, I think that this, this charter has made this situation quite confusing. Right. And I think councilor koyama lane brings up a very important point about compelling a mayor to be present to vote or not, because and I appreciate that, councilor, because I do think we need to be crafting this system, not to work for the 13 of us, but to work for the hundreds that come after us, that that people's practices and dodging and things of those natures are real, right? Those are real. But I don't think that this amendment does that. I think this amendment just delays something for the sake of more conversation. And I think the better way to bring something back and be more palatable is okay. You know, you had something die on the on the dais. It didn't quite get passed. Now let's go work it and then bring it back. And I think that's a more deliberate way instead of a in the moment way. And so i, i, I just hope we'll think about that a little bit. And like councilor kanal, I have some comments about the overall piece, but i'll hold those for now. I think this amendment I'm prepared to vote.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor, before we move on, I just want to give a warm welcome to our guests who filed in here with us. They are from sokcho korea and are here with eddie morales from gresham. Sokcho is a sister city of gresham, our neighbor, just to the east. I know we have your mayor, council president, and council member as well as many other community leaders. We appreciate you being here to visit today and making the jaunt over from gresham to see our fine city of Portland as well. Thank you for joining us.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, colleagues, for that brief pause. Councilor novick, I believe you have not spoken a second time.

Speaker: Yes. And although I know this is not directly addressed to the amendment, I think that it affects the overall context. I just wanted to say that despite my desire for excitement, I'm compelled by vice president lane's proposal that there should be some procedure that forces the mayor to vote. So if we're going to bring that forward, I would support that.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor Ryan.

Speaker: I want to get a second time because I think it's important to remember, like when we're sponsoring, when I'm sponsoring legislation and I know it's going to be a tight vote, I would definitely. And I'm not saying I'm counting them, but you can tell by the dialogs you're having. I know we're all trying to dance around that rule that was passed by the Oregon legislature that said, we still have dialog with one another. And so we have a sense of if it's going to be tight. We also have a sense, therefore, that we want to make sure the mayor would be there. We also have the leverage to pull something back to our offices before the final vote is taken. And so you can that happens all the time. To councilor zimmermann's point. I feel like we're enabling what we get paid to think, we get paid to make decisions. And when I come to this meeting and I see what's on the agenda, I have to be prepared to vote up or down. And when I'm sponsoring the legislation, it's a deeper dive, and I'm doing the best I can to get a sense of what that is. And it's on me to work with the mayor's office, which I think is important to land that. So i, I'm concerned that we're going if we keep adding more to this, we're going to make it more confusing for Portlanders who are trying to track our work. And also it puts us more in alignment with most of the other democracy democratic organizations around the

country. And I think that's important as well. So anyway, I'm right now still in favor of the legislation that we brought forward without amendments. Thanks.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor, colleagues, I said earlier that I was still weighing this amendment. And one thing that stands out to me about our process and our rules, that's different from some other places, is the limitations that we have on vote counting. And that means that sometimes we bring things forward, not knowing if we have the support or not. In fact, generally always we bring things forward not fully knowing if we have the support or not. And for that reason, with the change to one one round of reconsideration, if you will, I am compelled to support this, because I think there may be times where we bring something forward thinking the support is there. We learn at the vote that it's not there, and to give ourselves one opportunity to say, does a little bit more debate at the dais allow us to get to a majority, allow us to get closer to something that more of us can agree on, where more Portlanders concerns, needs, values are represented is compelling to me. I don't think I could have supported it with multiple additional rounds, but i. I am supportive with this change to one round because of the way that our public meetings laws interact with our ability to do our work and to know exactly what will happen on the dais.

Speaker: That's a clarification question.

Speaker: Absolutely.

Speaker: So thanks for being up here, attorney. If you're the sponsor of the legislation and the vote hasn't been called yet, even after hearing all the votes, you could still pull it back to your office before the vote is announced. Is that correct? No it isn't. Okay, so you'd have to pull it before. Okay. And I get that it's not the usual, but it was five, five people. It's 12. So I get there's more legwork that's involved. There's more hustle. But I still think it's on me to have that gut sense. If I

need to pull this back to my office to get more support and more importantly, to improve the legislation, that's the point. And we've seen good examples that we just had a good example of that earlier in this meeting. So I just don't know why we're adding more votes. Personally, I just so I like one extra vote better than two. So thank you to the two colleagues that have proposed that. So i'll stop there. Thanks.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor. Councilor morillo.

Speaker: I just wanted to clarify, to ask a clarifying question about this. So if this passes with the one additional round and then the policy fails anyway, does that mean that it can't go back to committee for reconsideration at a later point? If the chair is okay with it?

Speaker: I think we should direct this question to the attorneys, mr. Taylor, because the second vote is not technically a reconsideration. It's something different from that. If that second vote failed, would we have the opportunity to reconsider and send back to committee, or would after the second vote, the mayor automatically vote if he were here? And if the mayor weren't here, would we then have additional opportunity to send back to committee?

Speaker: There's a lot there. I would say that the first vote is tied 6 to 6. You would then proceed to the second round of voting without the need of a motion to reconsider if that second vote results in a tie and the mayor is not there to break the tie, then the vote would fail. That failed vote would be subject to a motion to reconsider, according to the normal rules that apply to a motion to reconsider. So that second vote could be reconsidered if council wants to. Once it's reconsidered, you could refer it to a committee. The other option, of course, is just after that first round of voting. Once it's back before you again to debate again, you could refer it to committee. At that point if, let's say, at the at the end of all of that, the second vote is tied six six. The mayor is not there to break a tie. It fails. There's no motion

to reconsider. That item would be procedurally extinguished. But somebody could always introduce a new item that's similar and that could go through the normal process. So there's the just because an item is procedurally extinguished at council doesn't mean the idea is extinguished forever.

Speaker: Thank you counselor, does that answer your question?

Speaker: That does. And thank you robert. So much appreciation for you answering all of our questions on the fly.

Speaker: Okay. I councilor avalos, did you have an additional comment?

Speaker: Yes. Hold on. Let me get my brain together. Well, I think one thing that's important is as it relates to the like, well, you go and workshop it behind the scenes, yada yada conversation we're having. I think the goal here too, is to have. The discussion, the rehashing, I guess, in public. So that's another big part of this for me, especially given the points everyone's making right about our limitations on being able to collaborate ahead of time. I think that just gives us this opportunity in public to do so. Yeah, I had other points, but I can't. My brain hurts. I'll leave it at that.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor colleagues, seeing no one else in the queue. That's a legacy hand, right? Oh, yeah. Okay. Just checking. Keelan, could you please call the roll on the amendment, which, just to clarify, now reads council must vote 6 to 6 in two rounds. It does not require a motion to reconsider to move to the second round.

Speaker: Koyama lane i.

Speaker: Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick. No green. I zimmerman.

Speaker: No. Avalos i.

Speaker: Smith. No.

Speaker: Canal I Ryan.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney i.

Speaker: The amendment fails with six yes votes and four no votes.

Speaker: Thank you. Keelan. Colleagues. We are now back to the original ordinance. Is there any other discussion on the ordinance? Councilor koyama lane.

Speaker: Yes, with some encouragement from some of my colleagues, I moved to consider. Is that right?

Speaker: Are you moving to propose an amendment?

Speaker: I moved to.

Speaker: Proposing an.

Speaker: Amendment proposing an amendment to add the language back into two from. If the vote on final passage remains inconclusive all the way to the end there, from the strike through version, it is the language that outlines. How we invite how we have the mayor come back and break a tie and makes it so no mayor can hide and not vote.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: So crossing out, eliminating those first two sentences, and starting at. If the vote on final passage remains inconclusive all the way to the end, does that make sense?

Speaker: So we are going back to. The original language. We're not making the other changes. We're not taking out vote fails. And number three, but we're going back to the language that was removed from the original two in your proposal. Okay. Which has been seconded by councilor novick councilor zimmerman.

Speaker: Thanks. Well, councilor koyama lane, I appreciate the effort. This is not the method in which I would support this. I, I think that it needs to be much more

clear a single sentence. I. So when I signal my support in my comments on the last amendment, I certainly was not signaling that I thought number two needed to all be brought back. In fact, my comments on the overall when we got to the overall ordinance today, I was going to appreciate that the committee had actually struck paragraph number two and made it a single sentence with a period at the end. To be quite clear, I think these have to be clear, and I think we can I think we can achieve the mayoral question more clearly than what's being proposed. So I am not going to support this today as it's currently put. And I would appreciate after this, passing it and having a more in-depth conversation, because I do think there are very important. I would like some opinions, frankly, from community and thoughts about compelling another elected and how what mechanisms we have to make sure that, you know, dodging a vote doesn't happen. I don't feel like I've got enough to even if we rewrote it here in the moment, to be able to do that responsibly. And so thank you for the effort, but I will not be supporting this. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Council president, director spohn, I appreciate that. And if this doesn't pass, I would be interested in looking to see if there's something brief, more brief that you would feel comfortable with. And no worries. I was signaling that councilor novick suggested that he would support, so I wasn't expecting. But I would always appreciate your support.

Speaker: Councilor kanal.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. Thank you, madam vice president, for introducing this. I think I am similar in assessment to councilor zimmerman in that I also think the problem assessment here is correct, and I'm not sure about the particular solution. I think it might be workshop able. I this is one of the three problems that I identified with this document, and I just want to quickly read a couple portions here of charter section two 401, which begins, the mayor has the

following responsibilities. And I want to emphasize responsibilities. Advance the city's core values of racism, equity, transparency, collaboration, communication and fiscal responsibility. That, to me does not imply an option. I think we would all interpret that to mean that the mayor must do these things. Second, advance the city's efforts to mitigate the human made climate crisis and prioritize environmental justice initiatives. Exercise a careful supervision over the general affairs of the city. These are, abcde says, introduce such matters as the mayor deems necessary. It has that that clause in there to say the mayor could, if he chooses, as the mayor deems necessary. And then we get to e! Again. Mayor has the following responsibilities e is vote on matters before the council in case of a tie when the mayor casts the deciding vote. So for whatever we determine, the scope of this is and whatever we determine constitutes a tie in that scenario, the mayor has the responsibility to do it. I agree with the council vice president that I'm not particularly concerned about this. In the context of mayor keith wilson. I am concerned, as councilor zimmerman pointed out, that we are trying to do something for the future. And so I do want to find a way to solve this. I understand that the mayor may be absent, so I do I do see a tension there, the same way that any of us might be absent. Right? We also have a responsibility, but nobody's interpreting that to mean you can't use the restroom. If you might miss a vote or you can't have a crisis or something in your personal life, and you might need to be absent. So I do think that we have to resolve this, and it will be a requirement for me to feel that this code change would be in line with the charter, that this be resolved for me to vote on the underlying ordinance. In terms of the particulars of this text, I also would like something shorter. I don't really know what it is. I think the governance committees. Solution was clear, but I think fails to recognize that the mayor at some point does need to be able to be reached and brought into the

conversation. If that requires a will, we'll revisit. We'll consider it unresolved until the next meeting of the council. That's an option. And it would require, I think, one sentence to say that I don't have the text yet, so I just wanted to flag that. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor, councilor morillo.

Speaker: Yeah, I think that this can be done in one sentence. I would also encourage my colleagues that if they like an idea, but they don't like how it's written to propose a written version that would make you happy. I think that would be good collaborative spirit. I would say that we could add one sentence, and I'm sure legal will check me on this. That just says the mayor is required to attend the following council meeting, where the policy will be reintroduced to full council to cast the tie breaking vote. Can it be that simple or is that.

Speaker: Mr. Taylor? I want to let you respond. I also know we need to just flag for folks where we are in the language, because I think not everybody caught where we were headed. If you look in the materials that are posted, there are a few. I'm pulling up the exact piece here. There are a few different. Amendment versions listed, and if you click on the strikethrough underline version, this shows the changes from in committee. If you look down to paragraph two, there is a significant amount of text crossed out in red. And the amendment before us is to add that text back in. So I just want to note that. Mr. Taylor, the question before us was whether the sentence could be added, that the mayor must attend the next meeting. And I don't know what we do there. If the mayor is on an extended vacation in the hospital, has some conflict, and isn't able to attend, but I'd be curious to hear the response and linly did you have a comment before?

Speaker: Robert answers that. I just want to make sure I'm clarifying that with the strikethrough. The proposed amendment removes the language that's currently in

blue that says vote fails and then adds the red back in in number two, because otherwise.

Speaker: It keeps the clarity. The vote fails, but then adds back in the vote. Starting from where okay, where the vote on final passage and we would say fails as opposed to is inconclusive.

Speaker: So it removes result of the tied vote is deemed inconclusive.

Speaker: I believe so councilor koyama lane. Is that correct?

Speaker: Can you repeat that?

Speaker: Are you returning to the original language without vote fails, or are you keeping the clarity of the vote fails and then picking back up at where the vote on final passage instead of is inconclusive? It would say fails. The council may vote again.

Speaker: I'm picking back up right here if the vote on final passage.

Speaker: Okay, so we're actually skipping linly two sentences. So if the mayor is unavailable either in person or virtually, to cast the tie breaking vote on final passage during the meeting, the vote fails. Skip two sentences. If the vote on final passage, we're going to say fails at the end of the meeting, the matter will be automatically postponed and rescheduled to the next council meeting. When the mayor is able to attend in person or virtually at the rescheduled meeting, and then continuing on to the end of the paragraph. Is that correct?

Speaker: Yes. I would also be open to just simply saying the vote fails. The mayor shall cast the deciding vote at the next council meeting. They attend or they're present at.

Speaker: Okay. Councilor morillo.

Speaker: I think it does need to be that simple. I think the only other concern is like in it, in the event of an emergency, like if there's a family crisis, if he's in the

hospital, whoever is in that position. But yeah, other than that, I don't think it should be further complicated.

Speaker: May I add something to the conversation? I, I think I think it may be confusing if we say, on the one hand, if the mayor is not available to cast the tie breaking vote, the vote fails, which is conclusive. And then, on the other hand, to talk about what happens if there's an inconclusive vote. So my effort to restate this in a way that gets us to the one sentence principle would be keep the language in j2 and say the result of the vote. Is deemed inconclusive. So say the result of the tied vote is deemed inconclusive. Period. If the vote on final passage remains inconclusive at the end of the meeting, the matter will be automatically postponed and rescheduled to the next council meeting. When the mayor is able to attend in person or virtually. Period. So, so that idea that if it's tied at the end of the meeting, it's inconclusive, it will automatically get rescheduled to the next meeting where the mayor is available.

Speaker: I like that. Okay. Who seconded this originally?

Speaker: Councilor think I did. I like that too. Okay, I second that too.

Speaker: Councilor morillo did you have anything additional?

Speaker: Cannot be reread.

Speaker: Mr. Taylor, can you reread that, please?

Speaker: Yes. So the full text of j2 would say if the mayor is unavailable either in person or virtually, to cast the tie breaking vote on final passage during the meeting, the result of the tied vote is deemed inconclusive. Period. If the vote on final passage remains inconclusive at the end of the meeting, the matter will be automatically postponed and rescheduled to the next council meeting. When the mayor is able to attend in person or virtually. Period.

Speaker: Councilor.

Speaker: Novick legacy have.

Speaker: Okay colleagues, I have some major concerns with this. I understand that folks are concerned about a mayor dodging a vote. I am concerned about a mayor delaying action, and given that we don't have the ability to compel the mayor to attend our meetings, I fear that we are setting up a situation where we have a piece of legislation that is sitting, waiting for a mayor who may choose to just not come to a meeting for an extended period of time. If something fails, we know what's happened. We can start over. We can continue the work. If something is sent back to committee, we can work amongst ourselves to get to a better place. But if we're truly doing this because we are worried about a mayor dodging a vote, I think we are actually setting up a situation where a mayor can hold something in limbo, which is far worse in my mind than dodging a vote, allowing something to fail, and then giving council the opportunity to start over and do our work. For that reason, I will not be supportive of efforts to delay the opportunity for the mayor to weigh in. Councilor zimmerman.

Speaker: Thank you. I have some I have some similar thoughts, actually. Council president, I think this this language, while I appreciate its clarity. So that part I am I am good with the clarity on that. But by using the word when he is able to, I agree that we're establishing a way in which the dodging or the delaying, whatever the correct word would be. So I find it very strange that we have a city attorney on the dais, and we're all trying to write very legal language in the moment, and my timbers are not shivered. I am not going to just vote on this. I set it very clear. I would like to work out a legal opinion about the compelling of another elected official to reach the end that we've identified as a need. And so this is the right direction. But I don't think that this amendment should go forward. I think we should pass the original document as is as an incremental. And if this can get

further review later, I think that's a more appropriate manner in which to do it. So we understand all of the unintended consequences, which I think this council should be very aware of. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor. Councilor canal.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president, with two caveats. I think I agree with everything that councilor zimmerman just said. My concern remains around the same place of when the mayor is available. I think it would probably be better if we were to do something like this. We would say it happens at the next meeting. If the mayor is not available, it's considered a no vote, just like anyone else's, which we're doing in, I think it's three a absences will be considered, you know, a no vote. So I think that's the appropriate way to do it for, you know, this is only for non-emergency ordinances. So there isn't as big of a time consideration. If we were to do it, I'd prefer to just see it with the next meeting, not the next meeting. When the mayor is available. The two notes I would add is I'm probably going to end up being a no vote on the underlying ordinance. I don't think we should adopt something that is problematic if we believe that, and I currently do, and then revisit it, I think we should just not do it. I want to resolve this issue. This is the one of the three of that I'm looking to get resolved. And then I'd like to see some sort of assessment or maybe like a those like wildfire indicators for when someone's timbers are shivered going forward. The level to which that is true.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor green.

Speaker: I see that there are hands up from councilors novick and koyama lane, so i'll hold my conclusive thoughts until they've spoken again. I suspect there's probably further discussion, but I just want to say, whatever we do here, we got to make sure we're not creating opportunities to dodge. So whatever the final rule is,

if I can support it, I think we need to call it the randy johnson rule, because you cannot dodge a pitch from randy johnson. Or you could in that 1990s.

Speaker: Thank you for that appropriate era of baseball reference. Given the new folks entering the hall of fame this week. Yes, very tall diamondbacks. And mariners, both councilor koyama lane.

Speaker: Thank you for the discussion, everyone. I just want to clarify, this is an ordinance, so it's just a first reading. I do believe that this is part of the work that we're supposed to be talking about this and changing it in real time. We have our city attorney here also. My vice chair, vice chair Ryan and I have talked about we've been waiting a while for this to come, and we talked about it in governance. I don't believe that we haven't put a lot of thought into it. And I actually appreciate all this conversation because my mind has shifted about some of these things. I appreciate a lot of the comments. I think it is stronger because of these comments, and I am happy with changing the last line to the matter will be automatically postponed and rescheduled to the next council meeting. And we can make amendments in our next council meeting. It will also mean that then we can't pass it without emergency ordinance. And this clarity that we've been wanting for a while will then be pushed out longer. So it's just a choice.

Speaker: Councilor koyama lane was that just floating something or are you asking to change the amendment?

Speaker: I'm asking to change the amendment. Is that okay with you, councilor novick?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: So I'm going to try to read this and make sure that we have it right. If the mayor is unavailable, either in person or virtually, to cast the tie breaking vote on final passage during the meeting, the result of the tied vote is deemed inconclusive.

If the vote on final passage remains inconclusive at the end of the meeting, the matter will be automatically postponed and rescheduled to the next council meeting.

Speaker: That is correct. I believe that that addresses some of your concern.

Speaker: I believe it creates an inconclusiveness that I'm still not comfortable with, but I can speak to that later. If I haven't used my two turns, I'll have to check and see on my notes. Councilor novick.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: I was going to let's see. Councilor koyama lane do we think that we could. I kind of like the way that councilor kanal phrased it. Councilor kanal can you remember what you said about, you know, the next meeting? If the mayor is not there, his vote will be considered a no vote like anybody else's.

Speaker: Yeah, yeah.

Speaker: Go ahead councilor. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: What I said is that. If. If the mayor is not so, it happens at the next meeting. Full period. If the mayor is not available or not present, I guess would probably be the better word. His he will be considered. It would be considered a no vote, as in three a, which I believe it. Below it says that absences count as as no vote. So I think instead of we could either reference it or just copy and paste that particular section which explicitly says absences will his absence will be counted as the mayor's absence will be counted as a no vote.

Speaker: Councilor koyama lane is that acceptable to you?

Speaker: That is acceptable to me.

Speaker: Madam president. Do you think that might address some of your concerns? Because it would not allow the mayor to postpone anything by more than one council meeting.

Speaker: Give me 30s to think about it. The original language left me concerned because there was an inconclusiveness if the mayor wasn't there a second time. And this does address the inconclusiveness give me 30s as I try to also capture this, to send to our clerk and attorneys so that they're looking at the same thing. Councilor Ryan.

Speaker: Thank you, council president. I'm actually mulling over what councilor kanal just said. So I look forward to whatever this update is. When we were in that committee meeting, as you recall, i, I right. I'm the I'm guilty as the one that did a lot of the red lining because I wanted some certainty where it seemed very uncertain. And that's what I keep hearing from people in Portland. And I'm open to the dialog we're currently having, of course, about the mayor. But we're also in this scenario planning that's really complicated and body politic. That has a lot of uncertainty at the moment. So I just don't know what planet we live on where a mayor would be a mayor very long if they dodged these kind of votes. And but you say that in 2025 with what's going on in our country right now and you're like, you know, so I get that we're trying to nail this. I do, but it's not adding any clarity or certainty for me to change my opinion at this moment. And I still don't think you would survive in Portland, Oregon as mayor if you dodged votes all the time. So I just don't see that scenario playing out in my lifetime. But.

Speaker: Councilor morillo.

Speaker: I'm not that paranoid about things. So no.

Speaker: I am. I, you know, as someone who's lobbied at the state legislature on bills and watched a lot of state legislators just walk out so that they could kill bills

and never address them. They hold on to their seats for a long, long time. And it's quite painful and terrible for all of us involved. So unfortunately, I think it is a very real possibility that we have to address. And I am definitely interested in the language that was proposed in the this final round of discussion.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor. Councilor koyama lane.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. The only thing I want to add is that I do believe it will be fairly rare that this happens. And I want to point out that we're about six months in, and we actually haven't had a situation where it was non emergency ordinance that the mayor needed to tiebreak. So I do think it won't come up often. And so when it if and when it does, I do want to make sure that we're ready to work with the mayor to see when there's when make sure they're at the next meeting. And yeah, but want to point out that this hopefully won't be happening all of all the time and hasn't come up yet.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor colleagues, is there any additional discussion? Councilor.

Speaker: Thanks. I just want to make sure that I'm following exactly the new language. So could I just have that repeated one more time?

Speaker: Yes. And it looks like councilor koyama lane. You and I sent slightly different things, so I want to make sure we clear up the discrepancy. If the mayor is unavailable, either in person or virtually, to cast the tie breaking vote on final passage during the meeting, the result of the tied vote is deemed inconclusive. If the vote on final passage remains inconclusive at the end of the meeting, the matter will be automatically postponed and rescheduled to the next council meeting. If the mayor is. And I said again, not present, you just said not present.

Speaker: We can add in again.

Speaker: It would be considered a no vote as in j three and I'm going to recommend that we add a there that's oh it's three. You're right. There is no b as in j three.

Speaker: Yeah that's great councilor avalos I can message that to you if that's helpful.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Okay. Colleagues is everybody clear on the language before we move to a vote? Okay. Mr. Taylor.

Speaker: Just in aid of interpreting this in the future. It's tied six six. Mayor is not there. Gets automatically rescheduled to the next meeting. Mayor is not there again. Do you still have the opportunity to debate, amend? Discuss, or are you just receiving that item as six six? Mayor is not there automatically. He's a no vote. You don't have a second bite at the apple at that meeting.

Speaker: I would suggest that in the language we don't clarify whether we have another vote or not before it goes to the mayor. And if we have different people present and absent on council, that may create things where we turn to you, mr. Taylor, and ask you how to interpret it. And those aren't clarified right now in this language.

Speaker: So this.

Speaker: Hate to throw a monkey wrench here, but you brought this up.

Speaker: And this would be your opportunity to choose what you would like to do. So if when it comes when it gets automatically rescheduled to the next meeting, do you want to have an opportunity to debate again and vote?

Speaker: I well, the vice president's question was can you always move to debate? But because this is something outside of what is within robert's rules, I believe it's probably something where we would need to clarify what our rules are, because

there's not guidance for a situation like this. Council councilor koyama lane you've brought this forward, do you want to, before we move to a vote, clarify what happens before the mayor votes, whether there's debate whether council takes an additional vote, and what happens if you have different councilors present at that later meeting than you did at the first meeting or not?

Speaker: I'm interested in what councilor novick might also say. As the seconder, I am inclined to stick with keeping it shorter and clearer, and I think we could kind of keep going and playing out all all of these different scenarios. At the end of the day, I think we can also turn to the presiding officer to have them make the decision, talk to the attorney. That's their councilor novick.

Speaker: I my personal preference would be to clarify just by saying that she'll be referred to the next meeting, or whatever the language is, for the sole purpose of having the mayor cast the deciding vote. And then if the mayor is not there, then that's considered a no vote. So there would be no further debate discussion. It would just be if the mayor is there, the mayor votes or the mayor is not there. The mayor is a no vote boom.

Speaker: I appreciate how clear that is.

Speaker: So.

Speaker: That's so close. Now with council.

Speaker: Members so close. But I'm hearing not quite close enough.

Speaker: With this.

Speaker: So i, I'm going to jump in here just to ask a clarifying question to the attorney on this, which is if that language were added, it comes back to that next meeting for the sole purpose of the mayor casting a tie breaking vote. Do we have a legal problem if the councilors present are different, or does that first vote hold over even if those councilors are not present?

Speaker: I think if you adopt the language that councilor novick suggested, then I would then if you if you're tied at the first meeting, six six gets carried over to the next meeting for the sole purpose of the mayor casting the tie breaking vote, then I don't think you have a problem with different attendance at that second meeting. The sole purpose is for the mayor to come in and say yes or no on that item. There would be no additional debate or testimony. That's his only job is to come in and say yes or no. If he's not there, he's a no. And I appreciate that clarification. That's very helpful.

Speaker: The sole purpose. Okay. Councilor smith.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. And so with this new language, if a if a mayor doesn't want to come, he's not compelled to come. And if he doesn't have to come or be compelled to come, why why are we even doing this?

Speaker: I believe councilor koyama lane would like to respond to that.

Speaker: I think that's a great question, councilor smith. And I think this brings me back to councilor Ryan's position of at that point, if a mayor truly is dodging that, it will be very clear and obvious.

Speaker: Well, it'll still be a no vote, and it may be something that people need him to, to weigh in on. And so I think all of this we're doing this is much to do about nothing. It's very complicated. And then it's very simple. I think we just need to squash it and move on to the original vote to see where we're at, because we're solving for a problem that we don't even have yet, because we haven't passed the original intent of the ordinance that's on the table.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor, and i'll just clarify that, because this is a non emergency ordinance, we actually won't vote on the underlying ordinance today. We will have the vote at a second reading, presumably at the next meeting. But I do hear your intent. Councilor kanal.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. The only thing I wanted to add here is that in the event that the second meeting, I think to resolve the concern you brought up in the event that in the second meeting, the vote would be less favorable than it's kind of a moot point anyway, because it would fail in the event that it's more favorable, there could be a reconsideration. In the event that it failed, then members would still have the ability to reconsider the vote. After the mayor broke the tie. Right.

Speaker: The sole purpose would be for the mayor to vote. Right?

Speaker: But after the sorry, after the vote would be taken, that the document would have a yes or no would either pass or fail. At that point, someone could reconsider using the existing motions.

Speaker: I see what you're saying. So the mayor comes in and votes no. The item fails. Then at that, at that juncture, the motion to reconsider could be made. Now, of course, then the challenge you're going to have is you have to have voted on the prevailing side, right, to move for reconsideration. So you would have had to have voted no. And you don't have the same opportunity to change your to change your vote necessarily.

Speaker: Right? So my point is that I think the existing rules provide a solution to the concern that was raised without any need for a change to either those existing rules or this text is my underlying point there. Thanks.

Speaker: Councilor green.

Speaker: Yeah, I just want to say I'm comfortable with the sole purpose language. I also just want to float that they're still here in case where it's possible we can contemplate a mayor that still refuses to come or can't be present. And so there's still sort of the next available council meeting always rolls forward. And I think if we're in that position, colleagues, I would be prepared to introduce a resolution

that censured the mayor, because that's a that's an abrogation of the duty, the charter, if the mayor just doesn't come ever to take to avoid this, this, this vote, i, I again not keith wilson I can't contemplate a member of mayor doing that. But that's a very clear denial of the charge of the office, because the office, the charter says the mayor, has a duty to cast a tie breaking vote. I would also expect if I was in a position where I just never showed up for a vote, I would expect my colleagues to do the same. Or I don't know if censure is the right word, but but some sort of formal resolution to say, shame on you, councilor greene. And then we always still have the opportunity as a body if we're like, oh no, we're stuck with a mayor who won't show up, we can't go back and reconsider or we can't go back to change our votes. Then we can always suspend the rules to settle a question that way. So I just kind of think the edge case is an interesting thought experiment. I do think this one for the sole purpose of casting the thing is enough for me, because it's simple. It does reconcile an issue of like one nonattendance because he's got a family emergency. But but in the in the event of the larger crisis that we've contemplating, I think we have a political obligation in the tools to deal with that. So that's all i'll say there.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor, colleagues, is there any more discussion to the amendment? Does anybody need the amendment? Read again.

Speaker: Oh yeah.

Speaker: If the mayor is unavailable, either in person or virtually, to cast the tie breaking vote on final passage during the meeting, the result of the tied vote is deemed inconclusive. If the vote on final passage remains inconclusive at the end of the meeting, the matter will be automatically postponed and rescheduled to the next council meeting for the sole purpose of the mayor casting their vote. If the

mayor is not present, it would be considered a no vote as in j three. Councilor novick.

Speaker: I was just wondering, did any of us formally move that?

Speaker: I believe that you accepted that friendly amendment that councilor koyama lane had put forward, but let's confirm that you both are still on board here.

Speaker: Yes, yes. Thank you.

Speaker: Okay, Keelan, could you please call the roll?

Speaker: Koyama lane?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Maria,

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Novick i.

Speaker: Green. Zimmerman.

Speaker: No. Avalos I smith. No.

Speaker: Canal i.

Speaker: Ryan i.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney no.

Speaker: I thought you were. Knee amendment is approved with seven yes votes and three no votes.

Speaker: I didn't think I was being tricky. I thought I was clear, but.

Speaker: Wow.

Speaker: Colleagues, we are back to the now amended resolution. Are there further comments or amendments on the resolution?

Speaker: Councilor kanal thank you, madam president. So I want to discuss the third concern I have, which is the this was an amendment that was made during the

governance committee meeting, and I'm going to propose an versus it. And it's the removal in part one of the words resolutions comma reports. There's a comma at the front end of that to again we the charter section says the mayor has the following responsibilities. Vote on matters before the council in case of a tie. When the mayor casts the deciding vote, there are three core parts. There matters before the council in case of a tie, when the mayor casts the deciding vote in case of a tie means emergency ordinances are outside the scope of this, 8 to 4 isn't a tie. When the mayor casts the deciding vote means a 55 vote doesn't involve a mayoral tiebreaker because he wouldn't be the seventh and deciding vote. But matters before the council has been explained to us as different from matters of the council. And that's why the council president vote are internal rules are separate, and I agree with the attorneys on that. But there are items that are not internal in focus, but which are excluded here to resolution reports and resolutions outside of the scope of internal council policy, which the existing text already rules out and doesn't need to be reiterated. Here. I'm talking about reports. Reports that appoint people or are submitted pursuant to some previous piece of legislation or requirement upon the city. I'm also talking about resolutions like the social housing report and street response resolution, which are policy direction, not talking about those internal matters. And I want to be clear, this isn't what I would write if I was writing the charter. This is what I think the charter says. I think the charter gives Portlanders enough information to interpret this as saying the mayor breaks these sorts of ties. I agree with councilor smith on many of the conceptual parts of her argument, most notably that the charter is the charter, and that's it. My reading of it is if it's not about internal council stuff and it's not an emergency ordinance, the mayor breaks a tie. And it's also not amendments, which, if I was writing it as someone who's put up six different amendments that have failed six six, I would

obviously love if amendments had a had the mayor on the record either way, but that's that's outside the scope here. My point is, I think this is one of those things where it is really about the question of, are we changing what the charter says? And this to me is a really important part of why I would support it or not for the underlying document. So I'll stop here and I'm happy to engage in a debate. I move to restore the words, resolutions and reports to section one, and I'd ask for a second.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Councilor smith, are you in the queue to discuss this motion?

Speaker: Exactly.

Speaker: Right ahead.

Speaker: Could Keelan put up what the charter says? I think my staff gave her something so that people who are online and who are in the council room, they can see exactly what it is. But sometimes you see it better when you when you read it.

Speaker: Councilor smith, are you seeing that now? Great.

Speaker: I don't see it because I'm on a I'm on an iphone. But let's see here.

Speaker: We have it up for us. And on the tvs within the council chambers.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Perfect. I'm going to go back to this again. My. My concern is that we're trying to solve for problems that we don't have. And I'm going to read this charter section 2-401e states the mayor has the responsibility to vote on matters before the council in case of a tie. When the mayor cast the deciding vote. Now, what is the definition of matters? No one has given a definition of matters, and he has the responsibility. But is that a mandate? So we can we can really get technical with this if we want to. And we can we can second guess what the charter members intended to do. But I think it was very clear that there was a lot of pushback on

giving the mayor veto power and instead giving him the ability to be able to put resolutions and policies on our agenda, and to being able to cast the last vote. It is not specific enough, and I don't think any number of amendments that we add to this original amendment is going to make sense to me. And people have called my office about this. It's not going to change it. Y'all can try to put lipstick on any number of animals and try to make it different, and it's going to be the same. You are not following, you are not following the charter. And so we've spent virtually almost an hour or so on trying to wordsmith for something that we're not even going to take a vote on until the next council meeting. And so this is this is the part that the public can't follow and don't understand. So that's why I asked Keelan to put it up so that they can actually see it. You did read it exactly that way, councilor kanal, but I wanted to make sure that people could see what we're talking about. And it is very simple. We're trying to make something out of nothing, and we're going to go to court on this at some time soon because we're breaking the charter. So again, I will not be supporting any of these amendments to the original amendment because I don't think we need to because we already have direction. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor, is there any other discussion to the proposed amendment? Councilor canal.

Speaker: Thank you, madam president. I'm happy to defer if councilor koyama lane. Okay. So i'll be honest, I don't know if we'd get sued for this or if anyone would sue would have standing I maybe and that's that's worthwhile as a reason. I don't need that reason personally for this. I think this is one of those really deep underlying values for me, because I'm in an awkward position to say, if I was writing the charter myself, I'd probably do something a little different than this, but I'm supporting this other way of doing it. And the reason for that is that's the job. And

I'm here because an election put me here. An election. Put the ballot measure here, put this charter in place. And if that ballot measure is changeable other than by someone other than the broader electorate that approved it, then someone other than the broader electorate can say that the election of a councilor or a mayor or a president can be unrecognized. It makes the election of officials less legitimate. If we undermine ballot measures from and metro to preschool for all the county to police accountability piece and, yes, charter reform at the city. And so obviously we have we're talking about the year we're in and the context we're in. We have a president who still thinks it's okay to declare that the 2020 presidential election shouldn't have mattered. So given all of that, I don't know how I can support the underlying document. If it's restricting something that I think is fairly straightforward in what it says. And I think we've gotten the interpretation. I would sort of adapt what councilor smith has said. My matters before the council has been, I think, defined to some degree by our attorneys in the earlier meetings. And I think January about it being things that we vote on that are not about our internal processes. I'm some I'm not a lawyer. I'm not don't hold that in a legal sense. But I'm summarizing for ease of understanding and a resolution and a report is that unless of course, it relates to those internal matters. And we've had some that don't from the. Social housing resolution to the mlk resolution, to the, the, the Portland street response resolution. And we've also had reports that don't. So for me, the only way to ensure that this underlying document complies with that charter text, that that was on screen is to ensure that it reflects what a plain text reading of that text would lead you to, which is that reports and resolutions other than the ones that are already excluded by other texts in that paragraph, which are the internal matters of the council, have to be within the scope of a mayoral tiebreak.

Speaker: You councilor councilor koyama lane.

Speaker: Thank you for your points, councilor smith. I really appreciate them and appreciate what you're bringing to this conversation. I, I believe that what you asked about the matters and defining that, I think that's what we're doing right now. And just to clarify, the interpretation from our city attorney is that it would include non-emergency ordinances, resolutions, reports and quasi judicial matters. But through a lot of debate and talk in committee, resolutions and reports were taken out. And I genuinely am interested, because when I have heard you talk about this, I would assume that you would actually support having resolutions and reports in there, because I hear you oftentimes saying, and I want you to be able to speak for yourself, that that the mayor should be breaking those ties. And so i, I am I'm kind of curious why you wouldn't support adding those back in. I don't feel extremely passionate about it. I would be fine to put that back in. I think I agreed, was convinced by my colleagues in the governance committee to take them out and have it just be the ordinances and quasi judicial matters, but something that kind of does change me a little bit is I think about the budget which the mayor brings before us. That is something that is definitely from the executive side. He would break the tie on that. So if he if he was, if he had to break ties on reports and resolutions, i, I think that would be fine and would also hope that this wouldn't be coming up all of the time.

Speaker: Councilor green, go right ahead.

Speaker: Yeah. I think just my view is that anything council, City Council has to vote or take action on at this dais in public is a matter before council. And if we are choosing a council president or if we're choosing our own rules of procedure, that's a matter of council because it's of our own creation. So. I support the broader plain reading interpretation of this.

Speaker: Councilor smith.

Speaker: Thank you. I wanted to go back and answer the vice president's question. I don't support any of it. So there's no way that I can justify it. And you do know that you can disagree with our city attorney's interpretation. That's not a bad thing. I genuinely agree with his with his. Advice. But for this, I have a different interpretation. And I think something like this should be decided by a judge, not by us. Because the way I'm looking at it, I'm looking at the plain language councilor green. And matters are matters are matters, whether it be a, a parking ticket. A report, an ordinance, a resolution, a budget, a matter is a matter. And just because our attorney's office said this is what he deems the definition of a matter is, that does not make it so. And I really wish the charter commission would have dealt with this and figured out a way to deal with this. And, you know. Things change. And so as far as I'm concerned, we're we're going down a rabbit hole and we're digging deeper and we're getting layers upon layers about this very simple one sentence that doesn't require all this. We have so many more important things that we need to be talking about. When this was settled with charter review, and for us to have to come back and do this again and try to repair what the charter review left open ended of sorts. But I'm taking it for what it says. There were there were no clauses, there were no extra stuff. It's very simple. It's just matters. So us it's really funny listening to the arguments because we're trying to solve for something that was not complete. And I bet you if you line up 20 attorneys, they're all going to have a different messaging or interpretation. And that's why I said, I think we're going to be taking a court. Because the average constituent who looks at this, they're going to see matters. You have a very keen eye for law and case study and that that we don't even have. The city attorney, robert taylor. But the average person, they're just looking at this on what they read in a matter is a matter is a matter as long as it is on our agenda, it is a matter. So we're we're spending a lot of time. And I

appreciate you trying to fix this vice president, but I just think that it's it doesn't change for me. Everything relating to the underlying ordinance, I'm not going to vote for it or vote for any of the amendments because I don't think we have to. We already have direction. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor, because two of our colleagues who are in governance aren't here. I just wanted to take a moment to speak a little bit to why this change was made. I don't know if either of them would be compelled by the discussion and change their position if they were here today, and perhaps they would be. So I don't want to speak for them, but I want to bring up some of the things that were part of that discussion. There was a conversation about reports and resolutions coming out because of what they generally are. Resolutions are often the place where we give direction to the administration on things we'd like to see done. And there was a discussion around whether or not it was appropriate to allow the mayor to weigh in on if we wanted to give direction to the mayor and the city administrator and the bureaus on reports. Those are generally things we are receiving from the administration. And there was a conversation around the appropriateness of allowing the mayor the opportunity to break a tie on whether or not we should accept something that the mayor would likely inevitably want to accept, since it came from the administration. If half of council felt strongly that the report was in the wrong direction, and we should in fact not accept it without changes. And so those were very intentionally removed because of what they represent, how they come to us or what they do and how they interact with our relationship with the mayor, the bureaus and the administrative branch broadly. I just wanted to make sure to point that out and have that as part of the discussion here today as well. Colleagues, is there any other discussion to the amendment? Councilor green? Okay, seeing none Keelan could you please call the roll.

Speaker: Koyama lane.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Morillo i.

Speaker: Novick i.

Speaker: Green.

Speaker: I zimmerman.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Avalos. Councilor. Avalos.

Speaker: Hey, I'm sorry, I'm not feeling well. What are we voting on right now?

Speaker: Councilor avalos, this is the proposed amendment to add reports and resolutions and resolutions back into the items that the mayor would cast a deciding vote on in the case of a tie.

Speaker: I. Smith.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: No. I Ryan.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Pirtle-guiney.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: The amendment fails with six yes votes and four no votes.

Speaker: Colleagues, is there any other discussion to the amended ordinance or additional amendments to propose councilor kanal?

Speaker: Just a question, madam president, and maybe it's for the attorneys on this document. When we come to a vote on it, would this be considered a matter of the council or a matter before the council? Would the mayor, under our current interpretation.

Speaker: Be.

Speaker: A tie on this? I, I agree with what was just stated that the mayor should not be breaking the tie on this. I just wanted to make sure that that we were all clear on that. I think having early clarity may be helpful.

Speaker: Mr. Taylor, is this of or before council?

Speaker: I guess. What I would say is this is a rule that of procedure that council is adopting under it's separate and distinct charter authority to do so. And as we have previously advised, on matters of the council's rules of procedure, the mayor does not break the tie.

Speaker: Thank you for that clarification. Colleagues. Is there any other discussion or proposals of amendments? Okay. Seeing none, we will move this ordinance to second reading at our next meeting. I will note that if things are amended upon second reading, they cannot be voted on for five days unless they have an emergency clause. So if further amendments are proposed when this comes back for second reading, we would either need to hold it over to the next meeting after that for a vote, or add an emergency clause and receive nine votes in order to pass it. That is the last item on our agenda today. So with that, I will close today's meeting. Thank you all and have a good afternoon.