



June 24, 2025 Community and Public Safety Committee Agenda

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

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

Questions may be directed to councilclerk@portlandoregon.gov

Tuesday, June 24, 2025 2:30 pm

Session Status: Adjourned

Committee in Attendance:

Councilor Sameer Kanal, Co-Chair

Councilor Angelita Morillo

Councilor Steve Novick, Co-Chair

Councilor Novick presided.

Officers in attendance: Rebecca Dobert, Acting Council Clerk

Committee adjourned at 4:29 p.m.

Regular Agenda

1

[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

Time requested: 25 minutes

Council action: Referred to City Council as amended

Motion to refer the report to the full Council with a do pass recommendation and to divide the appointees: Moved by Kanal and seconded by Morillo. Vote not called.

Motion to refer the appointment of Deian Salazar to the full Council with the recommendation the report be confirmed: Moved by Kanal and seconded by Novick. (Aye (2): Kanal, Novick; Nay (1) Morillo; Absent (2) Zimmerman, Smith). Motion failed to pass.

Motion to refer the appointment of Gabrielle Poccia to the full Council with the recommendation the report be confirmed: Moved by Morillo and seconded by Kanal. (Aye (3): Kanal, Morillo, Novick; Absent (2) Zimmerman, Smith)

2

[Informational presentation on fireworks ban and enforcement](#) (Presentation)

Document number: 2025-260

Introduced by: Councilor Sameer Kanal; Councilor Steve Novick

Time requested: 40 minutes

Council action: Placed on File

3

[Informational presentation on sanctuary city status](#) (Presentation)

Document number: 2025-261

Introduced by: Councilor Sameer Kanal; Councilor Steve Novick

Time requested: 50 minutes

Council action: Placed on File

Portland City Council, Community and Public Safety Committee

June 24, 2025 - 2:30 p.m.

Speaker List

	Name	Title	Document Number
1	Steve Novick	Councilor, Committee Chair	
2	Rebecca Dobert	Acting Council Clerk	
3	Sameer Kanal	Councilor, Committee Co-Chair	
4	Angelita Morillo	Councilor	
5	Christopher Herr	Council Policy Analyst	
6	Dori Grabinski	PCCEP Program Manager	2025-259
7	Deian Salazar	PPCCEP Nominee	2025-259
8	Gabrielle Poccia	PCCEP Nominee	2025-259
9	Joe Rowe	(Testimony)	2025-259
10	Jonathan Betlinski	MD George Saslow Professor of Psychiatry Division Head for Public	2025-260
11	Debbie Caselton	City Veteran's Empowerment Team	2025-260
12	Dr. Steve Kochis	Chief Medical Officer and Interim CEO, Oregon Humane Society	2025-260
13	Steve Mawdsley	Interim Director of BOEC	2025-260
14	Kari Schimel	Fire Marshal	2025-260
15	Bob Day	Police Chief	2025-260, 2025-
16	Heidi Brown	Chief Deputy City Attorney	2025-261
17	Robert Taylor	City Attorney	2025-261

Portland City Council Committee Meeting Closed Caption File

June 24, 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: So. Oh, sorry. Good afternoon. I call the meeting of the community and public safety committee to order. It is Tuesday, June 24th at 2:30 p.m. Rebecca, will you please call the roll?

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: Here, maria.

Speaker: Here.

Speaker: Zimmerman. Smith. Novick.

Speaker: Here. Christopher, you please read the statement of conduct.

Speaker: Welcome to the meeting of the community and public safety committee. To testify before this committee in person or virtually. You must sign up in advance in the committee agenda at w-w-w. Gov. Agenda. Community and public safety committee. Or by calling 311. Information on engaging with the committee can be found at this link. Registration for virtual testimony closes one hour prior to the meeting. In person, testifiers must sign up before the agenda item is heard. If public testimony will be taken on an item. Individuals may testify for three minutes unless the chair states otherwise. Your microphone will be muted when your time is over. The chair preserves order disruptive conduct such as shouting, refusing to conclude your testimony when your time is up, or interrupting others testimony or committee 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, the committee may take a short recess and reconvene virtually. Your testimony should address the matter being considered. When testifying, state your name for the record. If you are a lobbyist, identify the organization you represent. Virtual testifier should unmute themselves when the clerk calls your name. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Christopher. Today, the committee will consider the appointments of gabriella. I hope I'm pronouncing that right. And diane salazar to the Portland committee on community-engaged policing, often referred to as pccep. We will receive an informational presentation on Portland's fireworks ban and enforcement thereof, and receive an informational presentation on Portland status as a sanctuary city, taking a look into the relevant state laws, city code, and the Portland police bureau directive. I want to thank everyone in the audience for being here today and to those tuning in online, we appreciate your time and engagement. We do have a full agenda ahead of us. But before we dive in, I want to take a moment to speak about public testimony. As you may have noticed, we do not have public testimony for two agenda items today. That's in keeping with standard committee practice. Testimony is typically reserved for when a committee hears a resolution or ordinance, or holds a public hearing. Today's meeting is focused on providing brief, foundational presentations on the city's fireworks ban and Portland's and Oregon's sanctuary laws. Our aim is to ensure that committee members and the public alike have a clear understanding of the legal frameworks, local policies and current practices before we move into any future discussions or actions on the sanctuary city policy and ice in general. This will not be the only discussion this committee has on this issue. We intend to have more opportunities in the future for public testimony, and to make sure the public's voice continues to

be heard. We absolutely value community voices. Your input is vital and we look forward to creating space for those conversations soon. Please keep reaching out to your elected officials, ourselves included. Keep showing up and continue to show support for our most vulnerable community members. We need to keep hearing the community's voice in this issue. Rebecca, could you please read the first item?

Speaker: Item one appoint gabrielle pacha and dean salazar to the Portland committee on community-engaged policing for terms to expire June 26th, 2027.

Speaker: May proceed.

Speaker: Good afternoon. Councilors. My name is dori grabinski, and I'm the program manager for the Portland committee on community-engaged policing, or pccep. We're here today to present two candidates selected by mayor wilson to join the committee. So i'll begin with a very brief overview of pccep origins and scope, as well as the process used to select these candidates. I know we have a very packed day. So for your reference, this is about four minutes long. After that, we'll hear directly from the candidates and answer any of your questions. And next slide. All right so in 2012, the city of Portland reached a settlement agreement with the department of justice over the Portland police bureau's unconstitutional use of force against individuals with actual or perceived mental illness. This agreement came about after years of community organizing, following a string of officer involved deaths of people in crisis. As one of the settlement remedies, pccep was created to ensure community voices a part of shaping public safety and policing in Portland, and an acknowledgment that their absence contributed to the conditions of unconstitutional policing. Having a community board be a part of compliance is unique in the national landscape of settlement agreements, and came about because of the organizing that led to the doj investigation. So I start with this history to emphasize that pccep stands in a long continuum of community work

towards police justice in Portland, and reflects a powerful commitment by the city to uphold the changes it pledged to make. And in present day, pccep is working with the mayor's office to codify the program and ensure it remains a lasting remedy. Next slide. So here we have some text pulled from the pccep plan, a settlement agreement amendment outlining the purpose of the committee. There's a heavy emphasis on cultivating trust, building relationships and sharing information. Equally, there is emphasis on accountability to those community driven efforts, such as recommendations and participation in public forums. And next slide again pulled from the pccep plan. Here is a list of the committee's powers and duties. The main enforcement mechanism in terms of powers comes through pccep recommendations. Pccep is authorized to issue formal recommendations to the mayor, chief of police and police commissioner. They are required, not police commissioner, sorry. They are required to issue a formal written response within 60 days, which is unique among city advisory bodies. Additionally, you will see other duties here related to convening power. Pccep conducts its work in public meetings and hosts large scale public forums and town halls. The committee is successful convening a diverse array of presenters both within the city and outside of it. The committee considers itself a clearinghouse of information when it comes to complex public safety topics. And next slide so you can see some of those topics and steps. Work on them here, including recommendations around body worn camera policy and public education around different components of the first responder system. And next slide pccep is a committee of 13 members who serve two year appointments. We have reserved seats for youth and give special consideration to those with lived experience of mental illness or addiction. And next slide. So for this recruitment we utilized a rolling application system, received about 40 applications after doing conflict screenings and reviewing materials, staff

and the mayor's office conducted two rounds of interviews, and mayor wilson then selected two candidates for consideration. Next slide. And those candidates are with me here today. And at this time, I will pass it to the candidates to introduce themselves, beginning with dean.

Speaker: Thank you. Dory. So City Council, yes, I am dean salazar. I currently serve on the Portland children's levy committee, advisory council and a host of other roles. My background and work has been focused on applied equity through the past several years, and my family background is actually quite intertwined with policing. Since my great grandparents were undocumented farmworkers who came to salt lake city, utah, in the 30s who later received citizenship, as well as my family having consistent issues with the police for decades, with me being the only member of my family to actually have to have never been arrested for anything major or minor. So that really informs my perspective as someone who understands intergenerational trauma, as well as having a diverse amount of experience with the law enforcement system. In addition to that, I am very aware of the issues that Portland has had regarding police enforcement against people on the disproportionate impact with people with mental illnesses. I myself have autism and adhd, which, you know, disability, mental illness, how the police really perceive that or stuff like that is sort of interchangeable. And so I bring a diverse amount of experience working on stuff such as the governor foster advisory commission, regularly advocate for foster youth, who are also disproportionately likely to receive, you know, to be on the receiving end of law enforcement and other stuff. And so I feel very qualified to be able to represent a wide variety of communities, to really push for fair and accountable policing so that we can ensure that we live up to the ideals of impartial justice. Thank you, thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. My name is gabby poccia. I came into policy in 2010. My father was killed by napa police department during a mental health crisis, and part of our settlement was that body cameras would be worn and that there would be crisis intervention training. Since then, in my education, I have a master's degree in public policy that focused on police accountability, police oversight, police reform, and also the response to homelessness in san francisco and the state during covid. I think that I'm very excited to be part of pccep. I think really just generally I won't get too much into like my professional career, but I think one of my strengths is just community engagement. I want to know what the community thinks. I want to know what underrepresented, and I want to know what the community thinks. And I want to bring that to the decision makers so it can be implemented in policy. And I think this is a great position to do that. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you very much. Councilors. Any questions for the nominees?

Speaker: I just had a question about process. Yeah. Are we voting these through separately or together?

Speaker: Oh let's see. The plan is to vote them together. But we can always separate them if we want to.

Speaker: Let's separate them.

Speaker: What?

Speaker: Let's separate them.

Speaker: Okay. Then. Let's councilor kanal.

Speaker: Yeah, thanks. I have three questions. Two for the prospective appointees and one for staff. Thank you all for being here. It's great to have you here. And it's exciting to get a chance to talk about pccep and learn more. I'll start with the appointees. And these are for both of you. So I was previously staff support for pccep. And one of the things I've seen is that pccep members are often more

successful when they are collaborative with each other in terms of division of labor, some people aren't always good at research on what the current policy is, but they may be good at talking to pb or looking at what the community activists are saying on something, or looking at other jurisdictions and saying, hey, I'm not the research person, but I am the person who can do this. So I trust your research and ask you to trust the thing that I'm good at. In our sort of specialization, however that works between the 13 of you, is that something that you each feel comfortable doing with your colleagues if appointed?

Speaker: Yeah, I feel very comfortable in both roles, both doing research and working collaboratively. I'm looking forward to seeing where I'm most needed on the committee.

Speaker: Yes, I feel comfortable doing that. That's how I functioned as a team player in various various roles and functions, so I foresee no problem with that.

Speaker: Great. And then the other question I had for you both is one of the traps. I think that that often gets fallen into by advisory groups is viewing themselves as the community, as opposed to representatives of the community and, frankly, conduits to the community. And I think the way that that dori laid that out in the presentation is uniquely successful for pccep. And I'm kind of hoping it stays that way. So can you commit to not viewing the 13 members alone as the community, but to being a conduit to people like yourselves that you represent, but also people that you just know bring people in?

Speaker: Yes, 100%. I that's something that I myself always try to keep in mind. So I think that that in particular will remain strength for the, for committee as long as I am on there.

Speaker: Absolutely. That's part of the main reasons why I wanted to be part of the committee.

Speaker: Thanks. And then I have two questions for the staff. First one, you don't have to answer now, but I'd love to know if after the budget adoption, if you have what you need to run the committee in the way that would comply with the four paragraphs of the settlement agreement that specifically referenced the pcep plan everything else, and feel free to say you need to get back to me on it. But yeah.

Speaker: As councilor canal is aware, we have been requesting support for community engagement for many years and this budget cycle we were finally successful in in meeting that that compliance measure as, as mandated by the settlement agreement and that support for this, this body. So we were very happy to see that come through and yeah. Yeah. So at the moment we feel well resourced to do this work.

Speaker: Thanks. And then if someone wanted to learn more about pcep who may be here for another purpose, you have a meeting tomorrow. Do you want to give a pitch for it or for yes.

Speaker: So yes, thank you for asking that. So we pcep works on a broad range of issues related to of community concern related to policing and public safety. We meet most Wednesday nights via zoom, sometimes hybrid at 6 p.m. The best way I would just recommend googling pcep Portland and that will come up. But we are. We have a city web page and we have social media. Tomorrow night we will be reviewing a recommendation related to the Portland police bureau's directive on exculpatory evidence, which has significant impacts on how the justice system works for people who are accused of crimes. So yeah, that's happening tomorrow night at 6 p.m. Via zoom.

Speaker: Thanks. And i'll just note I see other pcep members here co-chair as well. So thank you all for being here. I think the technical process is that we need a motion to refer the report, and then potentially a motion to or request to divide

that motion. So I will make the motion to refer the report to the full council with a due pass recommendation. And then obviously we can have more discussion.

Speaker: The report is for, for both I think I thought because the way it was presented to me is we're just voting on the.

Speaker: My understanding is technically you move it together and then somebody would request to divide it, but I'm not sure. Can you speak to that?

Speaker: You could vote on each one individually. Yeah.

Speaker: So that I'm going to make the motion together and ask if a councilor, if a colleague would like to divide it. That's of course, okay.

Speaker: I request to divide it.

Speaker: Very well.

Speaker: And i'll go in the order that it says on the. So I missed the first, mr. Salazar second.

Speaker: So do we have a motion to move the appointment of mr. Salazar to the committee on community engaged policing to be sent to the full council with the recommendation the appointment be confirmed? Yes.

Speaker: If.

Speaker: You want to go that way. So. Sure. Do you have a second? Okay, i'll second it. Can the clerk please call the roll?

Speaker: Yes. So this is a motion to move salazar?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: The full council with recommendation.

Speaker: I should ask, do we have any discussion? Okay, then call the call the roll.

Speaker: Canal.

Speaker: Thank you to the staff for putting together a list of folks that have not only the specific needs that are enumerated in the pccp plan and the and the

settlement agreement in terms of what we need, but also help balance the existing members as well. I vote yea.

Speaker: Morillo.

Speaker: I appreciate all the work that people put into getting this committee together. Unfortunately, I have met Dion outside of these spaces, and I have known and seen him to perpetuate misinformation for political gain and ignore the voices of people with lived experience. And given that pattern, I don't think that he would be a good person to have on this committee, given the delicate nature of the work that is ahead. So I vote no.

Speaker: Apologies. Chair. There is someone signed up for public testimony.

Speaker: Oh. I'm sorry. I'm so sorry. I we should have done that first. Can the can the testifier come up or is it or is are they here virtually.

Speaker: We have one person signed up. The testifier is Joe Rao.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Joe Rao.

Speaker: And Joe Rao approach.

Speaker: Might be in one of the overflow.

Speaker: Looks like they are not here.

Speaker: Councilor Kanak observes that Mr. Rao might be in an overflow room, but we don't really.

Speaker: Have been told. We got people in both Pettygrove and Lovejoy right now.

Speaker: So let's give them a moment. Give them here Joe Rao, for testimony. You can come to main chambers if you're in the overflow room.

Speaker: Do you want to call the second person in the. Oh, okay.

Speaker: There was only one.

Speaker: Oh.

Speaker: Joe rao is on his way.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Alice. Can you swap joe?

Speaker: Thank you. Go ahead.

Speaker: Hello, my name is joe rao. I'm a resident of north Portland district two, and I'm here to address the new commission for police accountability. And also. I'm concerned about the bias clause that still remains allowing anybody to kick anybody off of this for an allegation of bias. I was abused by the police when I arrived in Portland in 2004. I submitted all my testimony online as pdfs and pictures. And this city is extremely unaccountable to the police department, as evidenced by the millions of dollars in police overtime, 21 million just for the most recent report and for the hundreds of millions for payouts. When police abuse people like me who are protesting. I was just shot in the legs, standing where the ice staff told me to, as far away from the ice building as possible. And while I was being shot by ice cops illegally with my constitutional right to stand on a sidewalk, Portland police were nearby protecting them by hanging out day after day in the parking lots behind the ice building.

Speaker: So could you limit your testimony to the nominees before us?

Speaker: Yes, I'm encouraging them. And you, in my written testimony, to write a city resolution affirming the rights of people to protest. We still do not have that right. Exercisable in Portland, as evidenced by my injuries to my leg and the pdfs of my court case, which went through the Oregon court of appeals, where I won in 2006 after two years of a legal battle against police abuse. So I encourage the commission. Congratulations to all of you for being on there. I didn't even apply

because I'm too busy in my life with my child. So thank you. And I close my testimony.

Speaker: Thank you. And nobody else is signed up.

Speaker: That concludes testimony.

Speaker: Okay, since I jumped the gun and called for a vote before we heard testimony, I think they probably technically we should have a revote on the nomination of mr. Salazar. So, rebecca, you think that's correct? Okay, so I ask for a motion.

Speaker: So moved.

Speaker: Okay. And I offer a second. Rebecca, can you call the roll?

Speaker: Canal?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Morillo.

Speaker: No.

Speaker: Novick.

Speaker: Yes. Can I ask for a motion to move the appointment of gabrielle pecchia.

Speaker: So moved.

Speaker: Second.

Speaker: Any discussion? Rebecca, can you call the roll canal.

Speaker: So this doesn't officially appoint you? We're still going to have to do it in in a full council meeting. But I appreciate both of your willingness to serve on this committee, and I vote i.

Speaker: Morillo I just want to thank you so much for sharing your experience, and I think that it's going to be really valuable for this committee. So I vote yea, thank you.

Speaker: Novick.

Speaker: I want to thank all 40 people who applied to the staff for going through the applications and to both of you here today, really appreciate your willingness to serve. I. The motion carries the appointment of gabrielle pecchia and diane salazar to the committee on community engaged policing, will move to full council with the recommendation that the appointments be confirmed. Thank you very much.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Rebecca, can you please read the next item?

Speaker: Item item two informational presentation on fireworks ban and enforcement.

Speaker: Thank you. This is an issue of some personal significance to me. I and my dog spend 12 incredibly miserable hours a year due to people violating the fireworks ban. My dog's reaction to fireworks is to try to tear a hole in the wall in order to somehow escape it, so I have to literally hold on to him for six hours on the 4th of July and six hours on new year's eve, because people in my neighborhood start setting off fireworks at about 730 and don't stop until about 1:30 a.m. I know that fireworks have similar impact on many pets around the city. Fireworks are also a trigger for ptsd for many individuals who have had to deal with explosions in unfortunate circumstances. Today we're going to hear some information on the impact of fireworks on pets and people from three up to three folks. Doctor stephen cox, I'm sorry, your name and the Oregon humane society chief medical officer and interim ceo, doctor jonathan bilinski of Oregon health and science university, and debbie castleton of the city veterans empowerment team to talk about the impact on people. So I'd ask them to begin their begin their testimony in that order, doctor cox.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Doctor koch is here. Hum. Let's see. Well, let's see, we're trying to wait to see if we can find doctor cox. Can we hear from doctor berlinski?

Speaker: Certainly. Co-chairs canal and novick. Councilor morillo. Thank you for the opportunity to speak before the community and public safety committee today. For the record, my name is doctor jonathan bilinsky. I'm a psychiatrist and among other roles, I get to be the george saslow professor of psychiatry at ohsu. And I live right here in Portland, Oregon as well. I'm here today to raise awareness about an important issue, that of navigating independence day, when one has post-traumatic stress disorder or ptsd. We have a long tradition in this country of celebrating independence day with fireworks and however fun that may be, it can also present challenges for those living with post-traumatic stress disorder. For those not familiar, ptsd is a condition that commonly includes intense distress at reminders of one's past traumas. Efforts to avoid those reminders, hypervigilance, and an exaggerated startle response, among other symptoms. As the national center for ptsd reminds us, fireworks are loud with bright flashes of light creating smoke and burning smells. There are often crowds gathered to watch displays, and loud music may be typical. Any of these sounds, sights, or smells may serve as trauma reminders for veterans. Fireworks make you memories of combat or explosions for others. Fireworks may be reminders of intense fires or gun violence, rather than the short term fix of simply avoiding fireworks. Here are some of the things the national center for ptsd says you can do to take care of yourself. If fireworks scare or otherwise bother you. As often as you need to. Remind yourself that however similar fireworks might be to a past event, they are not a current threat to you. Learn as much as you can about an event before you go, so you can know whether fireworks will be involved and the timing of them. Talk with someone close to you about your concerns and invite them along. Consider bringing earplugs or

headphones to lessen the noise. And most importantly, if you find that fireworks or other trauma reminders are very distressing and hard to manage, remember, treatment can help for the rest of us celebrating independence day, here are some of the tips the national center for ptsd offers for how to support those who live with ptsd. Consider the meaning and value of using fireworks versus other alternatives like sparklers or light shows, and consider centering activities around themes other than loud fireworks. Avoid setting off fireworks at unexpected times. Instead, notify guests ahead of time if fireworks will be a part of your celebration and set a specific time, or at least announce the start of fireworks so guests can plan for their own needs. And finally, show compassion. You can choose the celebration you want, and at the same time, you can respect the decisions of others that they need to make for self-care. In summary, whether or not fireworks are expected, they can cause distress for those who have experienced combat or have gone through a fire, explosion, or gun violence for independence day this year, I ask all of us to infuse our national pride with thoughtfulness for anyone, and especially veterans living with ptsd. Thank you for your time and attention. I'm happy to take questions.

Speaker: And I'm going to take as long.

Speaker: As you. Thank you. Any questions?

Speaker: Debbie is online.

Speaker: Oh that's right. Sorry. Hi, debbie. Go ahead. Hi.

Speaker: Thank you. My name is debbie castleton, and I'm here to speak on behalf of veterans, especially those living with the invisible wounds of war. But I'm mostly here as the daughter of a veteran who struggled deeply with the impact of fireworks in her neighborhoods. My father was a vietnam war veteran. He served two tours in the marines and came home with three purple hearts and a bronze star. He was proud of his service, but he carried a lot of pain with him. Like many

combat veterans, he lived with post-traumatic stress. Every year around the 4th of July, our family prepared for the worst. The loud, unexpected explosions of fireworks would send him into a panic. He would duck, flinch, and sometimes disappear into a closet or crawl space to feel safe. He couldn't sleep. Sometimes he would lash out, not knowing where he was. He he couldn't tell if he was still in a war zone or back home. As a small child, I didn't understand what was happening. I just knew that the fireworks made my dad act in ways that were scary and very unpredictable. I was frightened and confused. I didn't feel safe either, and these memories have stayed with me. And we're not alone. The us department of veteran affairs estimates that about 11 to 20% of veterans who served in iraq and afghanistan experience ptsd each year, and for vietnam veterans, that number is closer to 30% over their lifetimes. These are people who live in our communities. People like my dad. When we set off fireworks in neighborhoods without warning or regulation, we are forcing veterans to relive trauma they've spent years trying to heal from with what some see as a celebration feels like combat to others. And because these fireworks often happen unpredictably for days or even weeks, the stress isn't just on one holiday. It stresses stretches across the summer. This isn't about taking away celebration. It's about being thoughtful. Professional fireworks shows that are scheduled and brief or light based alternatives that don't rely on explosions are ways we can include everyone in honoring our country's history. My father passed away years ago from complications from his service and his time in the marines, but I believe he'd be proud to know I'm here today speaking up for him and for those for all of those who still feel the effects of war every time they hear a boom in the sky or in your neighborhood, please consider how we can protect and support our veterans, especially the ones who continue to carry the cost of service long after the battle ends. And I'd like to also note that the effects it

has on my rescue dog have to sedate for weeks, and the sedation doesn't work and makes him sick, and he's just terrified and hides in a closet. And it brings back that post, that PTSD from my childhood as well. Witnessing my dad not to compare my dad to a dog, but you know, I think that you understand what I'm saying. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you so much. I think we have doctor coaches here now. I apologize for mangling your name.

Speaker: That's okay. It's close enough.

Speaker: Doctor Steve, thank you for having me speak today. I'm the chief medical officer and the interim CEO from the Oregon Humane Society. I've been a veterinarian practicing in the Portland metro area for almost 25 years. I've been a practicing vet for almost 30 years. This is as our previous witness alluded to, this is a very stressful time of year for the veterinary community, but not just for veterinarians, but for the pets and the people that we serve. There are tens of thousands of pets in this community, and pet owners probably or possibly more, that this has a huge impact on. In my veterinary experience, I can't tell you how many times, especially for the number of years that I served as an emergency veterinarian in this community, the number of pets that are coming in injured either due to harm that they've caused themselves out of stress or anxiety and fear in the home, or in the process of trying to get away from the sound, the noise, the vibration and the stress of the fireworks. And it's not just the day of. Especially when this holiday occurs over a weekend, it's usually the entire weekend. The days leading up and the days after. For shelters, which is what I'm also representing here today. A lot of the shelters in the area are already overwhelmed trying to deal with pets that we are trying to find homes for. That is magnified when we have pets that are trying to escape from a home where they are terrified, especially if their parents or their owners are not home. There's an uptick in strays that are brought into

municipal shelters and humane societies like ourselves. The return rate for pets that end up in a shelter is less than 30% for dogs, and less than 5% for cats that they get reunited, especially if they don't have id or microchip that is even less. Shelters are already a lot of them are at capacity. In Oregon, humane society is trying to help as much as we can in the community, but this puts an unnecessary strain on our animal welfare community from a public safety perspective. Think about a terrified dog running through the neighborhood trying to get away, and there's really no escape for them. From the sound, the noise, the light, all of it is terrifying for them. Increased risk of being hit by a car or causing an accident in someone trying to avoid hitting a cat or a dog that's running from this fear. And it's there's an unpredictability to this. So for some pets, this means that they're in a sedated state for days or weeks around the 4th of July, because you just never know when somebody is going to have that barbecue or that party for pets that have other clinical diseases that would prevent them from being appropriately sedated. This adds a whole nother level of complication, and the sedation doesn't eliminate the fear. It's just keeping them sedate. They're still feeling stressed. They're still feeling fear, and they're still very anxious. All we're trying to do is to keep them from causing harm to themselves or anyone around them. I would encourage anyone to consider or give it a second thought before buying that. Very colorful, somewhat pretty package for fireworks and consider something an alternative. Something that's going to be less harmful to the environment, for the people, for the pets, and for the community.

Speaker: Thank you very much. Councilor morillo.

Speaker: Thank you. Are we moving to discussion now?

Speaker: I thought that maybe we'd have questions for any of the testifiers.

Speaker: I don't have questions. I guess I just want to name something while we're having this presentation. First of all, thank you all so much for coming here today and for the information that you've provided. And I want to acknowledge that while we're having this conversation about how this impacts pets and how this impacts veterans, there's also a bunch of people here who have been protesting for a while. And as someone who protested a lot in 2020, I remember the direct impacts psychologically, physically of protesting and the flash bangs and the rubber bullets and the tear gas and everything else, and how that triggers your PTSD, too. So I want to acknowledge that while we're having that conversation, we're sitting in a room full of people who might be experiencing those things as well right now. I also had a general maybe counsel operations question. I've been told that our overflow rooms for testimony for maybe or I guess there's no testimony for the next item. But our overflow rooms are full and people are waiting outside to get into the building. Is it possible to open any rooms in the Portland building to get more people access, to be able to watch the.

Speaker: Please limit your applause to jazz hands or blues hands or other non noisy communication. Thank you very much.

Speaker: The Portland building overflow has been requested to be set up and staff are in process right now.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. We're now going to I mean, fireworks are illegal in the city of Portland, but compliance is, to put it mildly, spotty. We're now going to hear from the fire marshal from PBB and from BOEC on how the fireworks ban works, what we can do and can't do in terms of enforcement, what we are able to do in terms of public education. So please proceed.

Speaker: Yes. Good afternoon. I'm Steve Mawdsley, interim director of the bureau of emergency communications. Our bureau is often the starting place for many public safety responses, and we wanted to introduce this section by briefly talking about the impacts of fireworks. July 4th is one of our busiest, busier days of the year, where our hourly call count nearly doubles, especially after 9 p.m. Due to increased reports about fireworks. These extra calls hinder our ability to quickly answer emergency calls, because so many of those calls come in within a few hours, instead of being spread out across 12 or 24 hour periods, like some other events we experienced throughout the year. Last week, our 911 call volume averaged between 1700 and 1800 calls per day. Since 2020, we received an average of 2300. Call 911 calls on July 4th. This increased call volume and the hundreds of calls to the non-emergency line regarding fireworks and other things, makes it hard to keep up and ensure the community receives the service they deserve on that day. As you know, our team has made a lot of progress towards reducing 911 wait time and we're currently averaging 24 seconds this year. We want everyone to know 911 is for emergencies when there is a threat to life or property. If the complaint is only about noisy or illegal fireworks, those are not emergencies. We need the community's help to keep 911 available for people who need us. With the firework ban in place, we wanted to provide you with context surrounding some impacts to 911, and now we'll hand off to the fire marshal.

Speaker: Thank you. Good afternoon. Councilors, I'm Carrie Schimmel, fire marshal. The purpose of the fireworks ban is because of our drought conditions. And elevated summer temperatures cause imminent risk of fires starting within the city and throughout the region. Use of fireworks causes an increased demand for emergency services. Like we just heard. Fireworks are associated with a heightened risk of death, injury and property damage. And again, what we've already heard

there is a known negative impact on veterans and pets. Next slide. We are demonstrating the increase in our call volume. So this is a compact slide here or chart. It's over the last six years the first eight days of July. So July 1st through July 8th of the last six years. And it shows the increase of our call volume. So you'll see on the fourth and the fifth, it's our call volume increases quite a bit for fireworks related incidents. The next slide we just focused on July of 2024. So again, this is the first eight days of July of last year. And it just shows the fire related calls compared to all the other calls that Portland fire and rescue is responding to. So again, you'll see on the fourth, fifth and actually all the way through the eighth, that increase in calls, but especially for fires on the fourth and fifth. And a lot of questions come up about our authority and fireworks accountability. So title 31 is the gives us as Portland fire and rescue authority to cite per firework for firework possession or use. The city of Portland initially banned the sales and use of fireworks from June 30th to July 14th and 2021. That was under emergency ordinance under mayor Wheeler at the time. That prepared us to get the work together and do a complete fireworks ban that was adopted by City Council in March of 2022. We up staff our investigations unit. During this time, we also upped staff, or what we call our brush units that are able to respond to the forested areas. But with our investigators, our Portland fire investigations unit investigates all fires that have a connection to fireworks. So if your firework use is found as a cause, you will be held responsible. Fireworks use that causes injury or extensive damage can result in heavy fines and or jail time. So some of the challenges that come up every year in our questioned, there's definitely a safety concern. We have a hard time getting our inspectors and other employees to step up because of that concern. And so we do partner with ppb. In the past, that does become a challenge because of the staffing and the capacity of who we have available on a holiday and work in those, you know,

usually from 8 to 2 in the morning. And again, this would be a volunteer basis. We don't there's not mandatory for staffing. And this is very specific to patrolling the city for fireworks. And also the budget constraints. This is in the past it's been over time. We spend a lot of time on our campaign and outreach. And then once the citation is issued, citizens have the option of administrative appeals. And that just also takes quite some time to put together that board to review those citations. And usually that results in a reduction in citation and or complete waive. Inconsistent, inconsistent regulations with regional partners. You see this with we have a complete ban here in Portland. It makes it a little more difficult with our neighboring jurisdictions that have different regulations. So we do try to partner with our surrounding jurisdictions as much as possible to be as consistent as we can, but those are usually the challenges that we face every year. And i'll pass it on to chief de.

Speaker: Thank you, council. Bob de, chief of police, city of Portland. Just want to thank the public testimony. It was just a good reminder, really compelling reference. And ppb is continuing to educate and will be doing so over the course of next week. What we can legally enforce. I intend to incorporate some of the testimony we heard today as a reminder for our members of the significance of it, and officers will be directed that when they encounter violations, fireworks, to be able to seize those and issue citations if necessary. Typically, the ability to seize them is adequate. That will obviously be within the course of their regular duties, but we will be making an intentional effort over the next week to educate our members, to explain to them the expectation for the holiday, and as well as sharing some of the information we've learned from the public testimony today. Steve.

Speaker: Thank you. So as mentioned earlier, and as we wrap up, it's vital to keep 911 free for emergencies. So concerned about system wide impacts from fireworks

from the 4th of July and the days surrounding public safety. Service area is working with 311 on a website for community members to report fireworks and looking forward to launch in the coming days. The draft intake screen is what you see on your monitors right now, so we're excited about it and we expect it to make a difference. As noisy, illegal fireworks calls are directed away from 911, doing so will free up emergency lines and collected information will help responders identify hotspot areas where fireworks are being used, which could inform future public education efforts. For this to work, though, we need the community's support when it's ready. We encourage all community members to use the fireworks reporting link visible on the screen there, and we'll go ahead and message that out, and that will help keep us nine, keep 911 lines free for emergencies. Councilors. That's the end of our presentation.

Speaker: Thank you. Any questions, fellow councilors? I've got a couple. What is the fine for using fireworks in the city of Portland?

Speaker: In our fee schedule is up to a thousand thousand dollars.

Speaker: Up to. What's that? How much?

Speaker: A thousand.

Speaker: A thousand. Up to a thousand. Last year. Last 4th of July. Was anybody actually assessed \$1,000 fine?

Speaker: Not by Portland fire.

Speaker: How about by Portland police?

Speaker: Not that I'm aware of. No.

Speaker: I have to say that. How how often did you cease fireworks?

Speaker: I don't have those numbers in front of me. We have done different efforts over the years, but I don't have that. I can certainly ask and see if we seized any last year or not.

Speaker: I have to say. I mean, I understand that doing wide scale enforcement would be difficult, but it is done in other cities. I met with the deputy fire chief from dallas a couple of weeks ago, and she said that they send out drones on 4th of July, and when they find violations, they assess people for violations. And I think that to have a situation where people know that there is no enforcement whatsoever is problematic. Even if you could find five people a year and let people know that that's happening, then that might have some sort of effect. I'd like to think I just don't like the idea of a law for which there's no enforcement whatsoever. I do hope, I mean, I think that public education can be useful. I know that there are some people out there who don't realize when they set off fireworks, that they are guilty of animal abuse and of abusive behavior towards people who are triggered by explosions. So public education is important. But I would like to see some effort at some level of enforcement, even understanding that you can't, you know, cite thousands of people a year. Do you think that might be possible?

Speaker: Yes, ppb definitely be communicating that to the members that are working on that during that time frame.

Speaker: Thank you. And could you make sure that, you know, keep track of the citations. And so we can let people know that it actually does happen?

Speaker: Yes. We'll keep track of any of those seizures that happen. And then i'll also get you the numbers for 24 if they exist or where they're at.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you very much. I realize this is difficult. I really appreciate your work and take to heart that, you know, the idea that we should not be calling 911, despite the fact that I personally think that it's an emergency, that my dog and I are terrorized for 12 hours a year. But I know that's not something to call 911 about. Oh, councilor kanal.

Speaker: Yeah. Thank you chair novick. Thank you to councilor morillo for pointing out that it's not just veterans and pets, but many people can have ptsd. Obviously people who experience gun violence, protesters, first responders, and more. Thanks to our presenters, doctor cox, doctor bilinski, debbie castleton. Also, thank you to debbie for your work on deep and the other the ergs as well. I appreciate this coming out because they're coming up because this is a life safety risk as it relates to fire. I want to thank fire marshal schimmel, chief and interim director, for being here. Congrats on the new role. Interim director mawdsley. And also, thank you for bringing up the impacts on other callers who might be calling about something else that gets delayed. And also on 911 staff, our first first responders. I do think this this brings to light two other things that maybe not directly in the scope of this conversation, but are related. One is the importance of resolving our non-emergency structure so that there's ideally a single place. I mean, you may have heard the conversation around 311 has, and the non-emergency line is one thing. I think the best example of why 311 is easy is actually the beginning of this meeting where we read that ridiculously long url for the website for this committee, or just call 311, and really, no one's going to remember it spelling that all out. So I do want to talk about that in the 24 seven aspect of eventually getting to 24 seven for 311, so that we can have a place for those to go that isn't burdening the 911 center and the staff there, because there are other staff at three, one, one. The other thing is I would strongly oppose the use of drones as it relates to the fireworks enforcement, but I do want to agree narrowly with the part about human first responder activity on that and just cosign that part of it. So thank you.

Speaker: Councilor morillo.

Speaker: Yeah, strongly oppose expanding the surveillance state to police fireworks. I think that's a bad idea. I also just feel I don't want to yuck anyone's yum.

But we have literally all of our overflow rooms are full. People are spilling out outside of our City Council halls. The Portland building is full. I think that people want to hear about the immigration issues, which are extremely prescient at this time.

Speaker: Well, the presentations are concluded, and thank you very, very much for being here. Both the both staff and outside testifiers and look forward to working with you on this issue on the 4th of July and in the future. Rebecca, could you please read the next item?

Speaker: Item three informational presentation on sanctuary city status.

Speaker: I'd like to introduce this item.

Speaker: Thank you. Chair novick. So we know that Portland's sanctuary city status and immigrations and customs enforcement actions are top of mind for many people in this room. Many people in the overflow rooms in the city and around the country. We believe that a starting point for this conversation is clearly understanding our sanctuary laws, policies and directives, including an understanding of where these may need to be clarified or frankly, strengthened. And so putting this item on the agenda was a way to start that conversation as as councilor novick put it, this will not be the last conversation is merely the first on this topic, as we have. As many of you know, we this committee doesn't have enough time to a few meetings and they're often too short. As a result, we were unable to have public testimony on this. That's something that we're not supportive of as a general practice, but it is something that we had to do today. It was either that or wait till July to have this conversation start at all, which we thought was a worse option. So having this get started and then trying to work with colleagues to schedule some type of listening session for around July 7th, leading into our committee meeting on July 8th. We also have committee meetings on July 15th and

22nd. That's really where this is going to be, something that that continues on. As I mentioned, it's not the first or sorry, not the last conversation. We know many of you are here to make your voices heard on this issue. We're glad you're here. We need you. We need people everywhere to keep speaking out on this issue, and to keep telling your elected officials what you want, what you expect. We also I also wanted to note that there's a conversation going around around the permit for the facility on mcadam. There is a conversation to be had there. If you haven't read the recent Portland mercury article, I think it lays out a lot of the various arguments, so I won't rehash them here. The permit issue is not entirely within this committee's jurisdiction, so it's not part of today's conversation explicitly. It could be a topic for the climate and land use committee or transportation and infrastructure to explore next. It's just how we're structured. And lastly, we know the one hour that we have for this is probably going to be insufficient, but we want to make sure that this is starting now because as I mentioned, we don't have another committee meeting for two weeks. And we wanted to make sure this conversation began before, whatever the events of the next two weeks are. Lastly, i'll just ask that the degree to which we are able to have this conversation progress is related to the degree to which this conversation can go smoothly. So i'll ask that you allow us for us to ensure that we're able to get this information out to the public, including those who are here in person, in this room or outside, but also to express your your views in a way that allows us to proceed and have this conversation another time. We are as much having the federal imposition occur to us in city government, and we're trying to find the best way to respond to it. So I appreciate everyone being here. I appreciate councilor novick working to help get this on the agenda and letting me give a comment up front, and I'm looking forward to hearing and asking some questions as well for our presenters. I'll let you. Do you want to introduce?

Speaker: Yes. I think that our first speaker is chief deputy city attorney heidi brown to talk both about the state law and the city policy. Thank you, heidi.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilors. Good afternoon. My name is heidi brown, chief deputy city attorney, and I'm going to go over briefly our Oregon state law related to sanctuary and then our city policy. And then I thought it might be helpful if you just if I just give you a brief update on the two lawsuits that the city is a party to related to our sanctuary status. So this first slide, I just wanted folks to know that that the state of Oregon has been a sanctuary state since 1987. So quite a long time now. That law, the current law, prohibits any government entity in Oregon, an Oregon government entity, from using equipment, money or personnel to detect or arrest people in order to enforce federal immigration laws. So the state law and then there's a couple of exceptions where law enforcement may arrest a person who's charged with a criminal violation of federal immigration laws and has a warrant for the crime issued by a federal judge. So, just to be very clear, it's not an administrative warrant, which some people know about would be a warrant issued by an agency. Rather, it needs to be issued by a federal judge. And then law enforcement may exchange information with federal immigration authorities to request criminal investigation information. So it's the limitation on that. If we can go to the next slide, please. Thank you. And then there's a handful of different sanctuary laws. But these are the two that I think are relevant to our discussion today. And this is the other one which is the prohibition for public bodies related to immigration enforcement. And so public entities such as the city of Portland cannot deny services, benefits, privileges or opportunities based on somebody's immigration status. We also do not inquire into or collect information about a person's immigration status, except in limited circumstances where it's required regarding a state or local law violation, and there may be some eligibility for a

benefit a person is seeking. There are certain visas that people can obtain when they're working with law enforcement on something, and they're an undocumented immigrant. And so they may they may seek that benefit and provide information related to that. Or if it's submitted to a court related to a court proceeding. And then, just to be clear, public bodies can't provide information about a person in custody to a federal immigration authority for civil immigration enforcement purposes, again, unless it's required by a subpoena. Sorry, unless it's required by a subpoena or it's or it's information that's readily available to the public and it's already out there. So those that's a very brief overview of state law. In 2017, after the first trump administration, the city adopted its sanctuary policy. If we can go to the next slide, please. Thank you so much. So that was in a city resolution where the city acknowledged us as a welcoming city to all people. And I will note that the that the start of the resolution and the resolve that occurred in there talks about welcoming everybody, immigrants but people based not. We welcome folks national origin, race, color, gender, sexual identity. There's protected class statuses we recognize and welcome. And so under this but in in in relation to our sanctuary city status, we had resolved to continue to prohibit in a manner consistent with state and federal law, which we are required to follow. This use of city funds, personnel and equipment to enforce federal immigration law. So we prohibited that. And then council also directed the police bureau to ensure that their directive, which chief dave will discuss, provides that ppb personnel do not cooperate with ice except as expressly provided by federal law. That's, I think, really the summary of our sanctuary city policy. And then I did want to tell you, though, about our two lawsuits that we're involved in right now. The first one we joined was with san francisco that was filed in February, and that was a challenge to the executive orders put out by trump. The trump administration, where they were limiting. They

were ordering all federal agencies to refuse to provide federal funding to any sanctuary city. Sanctuary jurisdiction is the term they use. So not just cities, but all jurisdictions that consider themselves sanctuary and that they were. And if they were refusing to enforce civil immigration laws and cooperate and help with ICE, that there were a number of conditions put into that particular executive order from the Trump administration. And we were able, along with San Francisco and other jurisdictions, to get a preliminary injunction prohibiting the enforcement of those executive orders against Portland. And that remains in effect with Judge Orrick down in San Francisco. And there was a recent discussion about whether some of the orders that had come out, excuse me, some of the enforcement efforts come out by the agencies within the federal government related to grants, of which the city received several and the judge held that his preliminary injunction did cover those agencies as well, and that they were prohibited from not providing funds to the city based on our sanctuary status. The second lawsuit that we joined is up in King County in Washington, and that was specific to grants from the Department of Transportation and Human and Health Services, excuse me, Health and Human Services. And again, we have a preliminary injunction ordering the federal government to proceed and provide federal grants that we would be entitled to and not to refuse to provide them based on our sanctuary status. So we are currently, as I noted, engaged in those two lawsuits to ensure that our sanctuary status is respected and recognized and that we are not penalized as a city based on federal grants, as we're seeing happen nationwide. And then if you have questions, I'm happy to answer them. But that's like big picture where we stand as a sanctuary city.

Speaker: Any questions? I have one. You talked about our having to do things that federal law requires. Have there have you seen instances where there's a debate about whether federal what federal law requires?

Speaker: I, I well, I've certainly seen the federal government debate about what they are or are not required to do, or what we are or are not required to do. There's their belief that we are required to help them enforce civil immigration laws and to detain people on administrative warrants as as opposed to judicial warrants. So things of that nature, I think we disagree with the federal government on. And so far we've prevailed in our court proceedings on those. Other than that, i, i, I don't you know, those are the things that are highlighted right now because we are in litigation about them. And as I've noted, we've been successful. I think several jurisdictions have been successful in their lawsuits to date.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor kanal.

Speaker: Thank you for being here, heidi. And I think you've been working on sanctuary city policy for, I think, eight plus years here. So thank you for that as well. Could you clarify what cooperate means in the context of it's on our screen. It's not up there, but the resolution 37277.

Speaker: You as shall not cooperate. Yeah. So well it would be the kinds of things I was just talking about. So holding somebody on an administrative detainer. So a warrant issued by an agency rather than a by a federal judge. Going out and arresting and taking people into custody based on a federal civil immigration. Matter. So those are the kinds of things that the resolution was focusing on. On on the cooperation with ice.

Speaker: And it's not overly limiting in the sense that I know the chief, for example, talks to federal law enforcement on a regular basis, and the act of communicating is not a concern there. Right?

Speaker: Right. I mean, there's several things that the federal government does. There's criminal law violations that pbb would coordinate with them, human trafficking violations and things of that nature that they would work with them on, and that this did not prohibit. But but as it relates to civil enforcement of federal immigration laws, that was really what we were focusing on or what the council was focusing on in adopting this resolution.

Speaker: Yeah. Thank you for clarifying. I'm just asking because I think it's not always clear to everyone what is allowed and what's not. And also sanctuary may be gives an impression that isn't necessarily always accurate, that just word and what we think of when we hear it. So I want to make sure everyone's on the same page. Thanks.

Speaker: And of course pbb would always enforce state laws. So if there's state law violations then just just like any other community member, you know, they would respond to calls of especially serious criminal law violations.

Speaker: Councilor morillo.

Speaker: Thank you, chair novick. And thank you for being here to answer our questions. I think there's two outstanding questions that I have and that the community has. And also, I've been told by attorneys that these things have to be answered in a case by case basis because the law is complicated, and I think we frustrate attorneys when we ask broad questions. So I'm trying not to do that to you, but I think overall, a question that I've seen come from community is can you sort of outline knowing that there are nuances in varied situations of when our police interact with ice and how so that the community can have some clarity around what counts as cooperation under the law and what our police are legally required to continue to do. And, well, maybe i'll let you answer that question first. But my second big question, so you can start thinking about it, is there is a moral

debate happening right now about revoking the permit for the ice detention or the ice facility, but there's also a legal question about what does it actually take to revoke a permit, because we can't just do it because it feels morally good sometimes. There are legal requirements for that. And I'm curious if you could outline that for all of us as well.

Speaker: I can I will discuss pbb interacting with ice and how and then also let the chief talk about to the ways in which they would interact with them, because I think it's he would be able to better answer ways that they would interact, because I think I can answer better what what where they won't interact with them, which would be if there was a call, for example, for pbb to come and arrest somebody because there's a warrant issued by the agency by ice to hold somebody based on a federal civil immigration hold. So they would not do that. They would not keep somebody, hold them in their holding facility at pbb. Of course, the city doesn't own the jails or holding facilities, but those are the county. But but they also will not hold somebody solely based on that federal immigration detainer. That is not a criminal matter. And again, a warrant issued by a federal judge. So it's more around the things that they will not do if there are if and then just to get into a couple of things they might do, for example, if, if there were, if there were an ice van and somebody were to ram into it intentionally and cause, you know, and bash on the windows and try to injure people, that would be something that pbb would be called to, and I assume they would call for help and that pbb would intervene because that would be a state criminal law violation. And or, you know, setting fire to a building that would be something that they would they would respond to and, and, and, and would be working with the victim of that crime just like any other, any other crime victim. On your second question about the permit for the ice facility, I would love to wait and defer that to our land use attorneys because it is complicated. But but you

are right. It has there there is an existing permit and I think they can better answer our land use attorneys can best answer what are the parameters around that and what are the legal parameters that we have to work within as a city when we're dealing with a permit? Sorry.

Speaker: No, that is okay. You can't answer all the questions, but you answer many of them all the time. So thank you. Heidi. Are we able to bring a land use attorney down here before the end of this? And I'd love to hear from chief day as well. If you have anything else to add, I want to make sure you have a chance to speak.

Speaker: Chief day.

Speaker: I'll check into that. Councilor.

Speaker: Yeah. I'm not a land use attorney, that's for sure. Bob day, chief of police a couple things. One, I want to just highlight our directive, and then i'll speak to a couple of things heidi mentioned. And the blue areas that are in bold. There are no bureau member shall interrogate, detain, arrest, initiate investigation or take other official police action against an individual solely on the basis of either of these aspects of their identity. And then the other section there that we've highlighted, the bureau will follow the direction of the state statutory law and city ordinances by not enforcing or assisting in the enforcement of federal immigration laws, as that is a federal function. So a lot of that language mimics what was already been covered by heidi intentionally. So we have been messaging consistently over the last several months the importance of this and really understanding our lane and our role and responsibility to Portlanders. In regards to a couple of things that have been mentioned. You know, we talk about cooperation or working with our federal partners there as to be expected, a lot of different groups associated with this from a law enforcement perspective. So you have the Portland police bureau, I would say the vast majority of our conversation are with what's called the federal protective

service. They are not in the what would be considered the apprehension aspect of the work of homeland security or the federal government. Now, they do provide law enforcement services. They provide the security for the ice facility. They provide security for other federal buildings. But they're they're not under the title they're not ice agents, they're federal protective service. And that's where we spend a great deal of our time. Our other organizations would be department of homeland security. There's also the border patrol. There's also ice agents themselves. So, you know, I see our role as really understanding and staying specific to state, state law, state statutes, city ordinances and directive. And when we do have contact and we do have relationship, I've certainly talked with people in all of those areas over the last month just to keep lines of communication open. But when it comes to the activity that we are directly involved in, it's strictly centered around criminal behavior as it relates, you know, primarily as heidi already mentioned and gave examples to state statutes that would be applicable anywhere and that we don't have a role or even been have not even been asked in any kind of way to support the immigration enforcement aspect of it.

Speaker: Councilor morillo.

Speaker: Thank you. I appreciate those answers. I think I was also curious about the closure of some pathways around the ice building that have happened recently. I wasn't sure if pbb was in charge of that. It's my understanding that there were walkways that the general public uses, and I was curious if you could answer some of that. I think some of these things, there's just a lot of questions that come from the public when it happens that way, because it can seem like cooperation. If that's not the intended impact. Yeah, i'll stop there.

Speaker: I fully understand that community concern. We've tried to be very transparent in that several of those pieces of land around the facility have variety of

ownership. So, for example, we've been working with Oregon department of transportation, which has some responsibility down there, and they have been posting and requiring people to have notification of trespass, some of it's private property. And then of course, some of it's city of Portland property. I'm not aware of any, any property. That city of Portland has closed. We have been regularly enforcing our consistent policy around camping and structures and setups, and we've been using Portland solutions and going through the traditional posting. I'm not aware of a particular, you know, area that we have denied access to other than regularly, you know, posting areas where there might be camping or something like that. I can definitely check on that. But that's not something that direction that I've given at this point. Areas that are closed is my point, might be related to other agencies, and I'd have to look and look into that.

Speaker: Gotcha. Okay. So it sounds like yeah, I think there were a few of our staff that were down there and they did witness the closures themselves. It was a public right of way. And I believe someone was charged with trespassing for going on that public right of way. So I would be curious to know which agency shut that public right of way down and why that person was arrested for using it. Thank you. If we can follow up on that.

Speaker: Yeah. So just quickly, maybe offline a name would be helpful just so I can, you know, Portland police has arrested a total of 25 people in the last two weeks related to criminal charges down there. I don't have information specific to any arrests that the feds have made. So, you know, I'd love to look into that for you. And maybe, like I said, offline we can get a name or time or something like that, a little more specific, and we can try and run that to ground.

Speaker: Okay. I will get more information for you and we'll follow up offline, because I think that would be good for all of us to have some clarity on that. And I

know that this isn't your jurisdiction. I'm going to make a general comment mostly directed at mayor wilson, but I think that there I think that there are valid concerns from the community about some of the mutual aid tents being removed in the vicinity, and I just wanted to state how I actually think it's quite dangerous. I understand the concern about encampments being set up around the ice building and the potential escalations that could happen there, but the reality is that I saw, you know, footage and video photos of someone who had their eye shot with a rubber bullet and it was bleeding down their entire arm. And I don't actually know what happened to their eye or if they're okay. And so the everyone who's protested before knows that we need medic tents, and you need medics, and you need people who are there who can help immediately. Because if there's not people there to help you, sometimes things can go awry. So I have concerns about us using city resources to clear out medic tents and other mutual aid things that are there to really just keep protesters safe while they engage in their first amendment rights.

Speaker: First of all, I'd ask people to keep their commentary quiet, if you could. I have a question about whether we're able to. Look at what other cities with sanctuary policies are doing and what issues they're encountering as to what might be viewed as cooperation and what is not, because I would imagine that there are other cities that have basically the same states that have basically the same rule. You don't cooperate with ice. So are we looking at what's going on in other places so we can identify issues that might we might see here and get ahead of them?

Speaker: Yes. Councilor. So a week ago, we convened a call with the Oregon association chiefs of police. We had about, I think, somewhere between 35 to maybe 40, 45 chiefs on that call for about a half an hour. And we talked about, you know, this is applies statewide and talked about different jurisdictions and responses. And I would say on that particular call, we were all very much aligned in

our role and our understanding about not supporting an immigration enforcement. And there's a lot of people paying attention to Portland and how Portland police is showing up, and how Portland police is navigating this with the understanding that should we see increased enforcement, as we witnessed just recently in Newberg, you know, the likelihood of there being efforts made in other communities outside of the city, this is a statewide concern. So we are problem solving that and having those discussions and trying to learn from one another. But Portland has the most experience in that just by the nature of the facility being here. I've also had conversations with chiefs and sheriffs in the city of Los Angeles and other places trying to, you know, learn and the information that's coming back to me consistently from other sanctuary city chiefs and sheriffs is and particularly chiefs. I've talked to one sheriff, but particularly chiefs that I speak with because sheriffs have a little bit different role in communities is, you know, really a commitment to not being seen as participating immigration enforcement. And I understand this term cooperation that we've touched on a couple times, and I understand how that can be seen as confusing to both members of the public as well as even our police officers. And when are we crossing that line? And for me, it's it really does center around the role that we're trying to accomplish. And if there is immigration component to that, then that's absolutely out of bounds for us, where it does become more nuanced and they're struggling with this. As example, the example Heidi used in Los Angeles in talking to the chief down there, you know, ICE will show up. They will begin to take enforcement action. They will then be challenged by the community for that action. And then the police are called and respond to step in. And what they're finding is then the federal government will step away and sort of leave the problem of the mess. So they just the, I should say, the unsettledness of that community in local law enforcement. And so one of the things that we're doing

a lot of here, from the police standpoint, is we're doing a ton of outreach with our community, trying to really make sure that they know that we understand our lane and that we are working with them. We're informing them. We're providing them with information. As we become aware of it. We're providing that with we're providing that information with our community partners so they know what's happening. And we're, you know, I'm personally taking those phone calls or getting on zoom meetings with them and trying to make sure that they really can know what we know in terms of that information, share. And unfortunately, you know, as much as we pride ourselves on our relationships, our federal partners are not required to share their actions with us even ahead of time. And as I mentioned earlier to councilor morillo, for example, I do not know, you know, the names or the people who've been arrested, or what the charges are or the actions that they're taking down there. So there is that gap that we're still trying to close through these lines of communication when available.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor kanal.

Speaker: Yeah, thank you, chief, for being here. And I appreciate you clarifying the distinction, both of you actually, between communication and collaboration. I think that's an important thing. I think that a lot of the topics that we have come through this committee, there's an expectation created in community that isn't necessarily. Known to us or necessarily accurate to what the document actually says. Sorry. Thanks. I also wanted to take the chance to commend you for the statement that you made in the letter in January about ice and sanctuary status, and for pointing out a bunch of different things in there. You mentioned sanctuary status helps ensure that communities who might not be as likely to share information with investigators feel safer doing so, knowing that there isn't going to be collaboration on enforcement, and then also on your acknowledgment that there are

communities at all that feel less distrustful of police. And the comments on the burn justice assistance grant at the lawsuit filing, because that's part of where the money would get pulled from that we're suing to prevent that which and that money is used for a lot of really important projects, such as body worn cameras, such as some of the crime and violence prevention funding for office of violence prevention. Ceasefire to. So I have three questions. I think about the broad text. And you may need to get back to me on the first one. I acknowledge that there's broad text in resolution 37277 which says that we shall not cooperate, the ppb shall not cooperate with ice. And it's the request specifically to put that into directive eight 10.10, which is the actual standard for police conduct that officers are trained on and held accountable to. And my interest is not the accountable in the sense of like complaints and professional standards. That's not. But my point is, that's what we're expecting. The standard to be held to, right, is that the directives are generally how police are are. Evaluated.

Speaker: Can I can I clarify that point right there? I just want to make sure I'm getting this right, taking some of the language from three seven, 277 and putting that directly into 810 is what you're referring to.

Speaker: Well, so what it says is that.

Speaker: Cooperate with ice and it doesn't say that specific here. That's that's what I heard. Right. Yeah. Okay.

Speaker: So in the resolution it says that that council direct and this is the 2017 council directs the ppb to ensure that directive eight 10.10 provides that ppb, that the ppb personnel shall not cooperate with ice except as expressly required by federal law. So I think my question here is that that directive is a little bit more granular, right? It lists out specific things in a lot of detail. And you mentioned also that even officers are at times confused. So would you be able to either now or

later, get back to us with the level of clarity that we could provide or what council could do to assist in that? Because I think the gap between those two things creates some expectation that that may be unmet in community. Even if an officer is complying with the strict directive. Does that make sense?

Speaker: I understand, and i, I mean, I think let me repeat back to you what I think I hear you saying and then, you know, can work on that. So the language I noticed in in three, seven, two, seven, seven says, you know, not cooperate with ice. And the directive talks about immigration enforcement. It says to the extent that the mission of dhs has communicated is the enforcement of immigration laws. So the directive states, dhs, it doesn't say specifically iso, dhs, referring to department of homeland security, which is the umbrella over numerous agencies that we already talked about. So it's you're you're suggesting that we actually use the term ice within the directive, just to be more explicit in terms of that organization and its role, etc,

Speaker: Everything but that last sentence. Yes. The last sentence. Yes. And I think it doesn't provide a caveat in the resolution for non-enforcement non-immigration activity that ice does the. So I believe the resolution as I read it says we don't collaborate with ice, not we don't collaborate with ice when they're.

Speaker: Doing okay. I see where you're going. Yeah.

Speaker: So that that's the gap that I wanted to mention that first section. The second question I had. We know that one of the things that we have seen that I think is, is perhaps the exemplar of the type of criminal activity that you have mentioned and that pb will intervene on at ice, is setting fires at the ice building. And this is one of the many things. But one of the reasons I think that this comes up more is because fires spread, right? It's not going to be something that exclusively affects protesters or federal agents at that building, but it could affect someone

who lives a block away in an apartment building. And so that that makes sense to me. And I want to be clear before I ask this question, that I'm not saying that pb should not intervene on fires. Quite the opposite if someone's doing that. But we've also seen that some of isis activities could affect nearby buildings, such as the use of chemical munitions, which can have serious negative effects on health, including reproductive health, to those who ingest it or just are, you know, affected by it. And so given that we know that pb is getting involved, if a protester starts tries to start a fire, let's say, are there any situations, even hypothetical ones, in which pb would be getting involved to prevent ice doing anything?

Speaker: Well, that would have to be, you know, behavior that we openly recognize as unlawful. And i'll defer to the city attorney on that in terms of, you know what, we would have to be able to have a legal basis for doing so. So that would be my standard.

Speaker: No, that that's correct. So if pb were observing or there was evidence that federal law enforcement committed a crime, then just like anybody, anyone else, they would be subject to arrest based on that crime. But when they are enforcing their law, the enforcing their federal civil immigration laws by detainers, you know, they they. The law, the federal law allows them to do that. And even though even even under our sanctuary state law and our sanctuary city policy, both of them reference that except as required otherwise by federal law, in the state law and then in our city policy, except as required by federal and state law, because we are required to comply with both both of those laws, the state with federal law, and then the city with state and federal law. So to the extent they're committing a crime, then yes, pb could intervene and arrest somebody based on just like anybody else who commits a crime. But I would note there are certain things that, for example, in Oregon are not allowed. There's limited circumstances where tear gas is used. As

we know, there were a lot of laws that were passed during or after 2020. That really changed in a good way. The landscape for in Oregon and a lot of changes in pb policy that came, for example, pb doesn't even, to my knowledge, doesn't even have any rubber bullet distraction devices. So as councilor morillo was talking about earlier, somebody, you know, with gotten hit in the head and blood seeping down their face from a rubber bullet. That's not something that pb uses in protest situation at all. And so I would just know there's different laws for the federal government than there are under state law and under city policy, even identification state law requires police officers to identify themselves as soon as they reasonably can. The federal law doesn't have the same requirements. So we have ice agents going around and not necessarily identifying themselves. And we don't know necessarily who's who's taking that action, which puts Portland police in a very challenging situation.

Speaker: Yeah. So I recognize you led off with a comment on the immigration enforcement. Heidi and I want to talk about that in the context of the identification. That's really important. And I'm not sure if you're familiar with the conversation in la around requirements, around identification and whether or not people are required to respect the authority of someone who hasn't proven that they are, in fact, law enforcement. But but also my original question was about in the context of response to protest. And so in the use of we've seen there's videos everywhere of the green gas. Right. And anywhere in social media, we're aware of at least some of what it is in terms of chemical breakdown. We know the deleterious effects to health. I'm happy to bring in physicians for social responsibility, or one of those types of groups to talk about that. And so I guess maybe this is not a question for you to answer now, but a question for later is to what degree are we able to give

the legal authority to prevent the poisoning of our neighbors and our neighborhoods?

Speaker: And I think, I think councilor is a great question, you know, whether or not there's a criminal law violation is one question, but whether or not there's, you know, a civil remedy for the excessive use, potentially arguably the excessive use of cs gas, and particularly with the deleterious effects it can have upon people, depending upon the usage, etcetera. And so that might be something we want to consider or community members might want to consider. You know, bringing bringing a civil case, requesting some kind of preliminary injunction. I mean, during during the 2020 protests, there were temporary restraining orders and preliminary injunctions issued that people are required to comply with. I don't know how well the trump administration is complying with our current preliminary injunctions, but we are working on enforcement with those. And so I think that's one that's certainly an avenue that the city could look at and individuals could look at as well, who are being impacted by it.

Speaker: And then I'd also think that we should talk about with for our stormwater and sewer aspects of it, that, you know, we're going to end up with a water supply that's being affected. And I think that's that's worth looking into as well. I think it's outside the scope of the conversation, and I hesitate to say outside the scope of your expertise, because every time I ask for an attorney on anything, it's always you, heidi. But but I think maybe a conversation for another time around that I have more questions. I'm going to pause here and councilor other folks a chance.

Speaker: I just want to add if can I add something? Yeah. You know, we have been working closely with the district attorney's office and the city attorney's office regularly. So if there is a law violation that, you know, the district attorney also can weigh in on that and, you know, provide legal advice as to what our standing is. I

know that I do get asked regularly about, you know, whether or not, you know, the Portland police are going to step in or interfere with the role of the federal law enforcement. And, you know, as long as as I said, there's is not a criminal nexus if it's their policies, their procedures and what they're following and it's not, there isn't a criminal nexus to it, then we're not going to do that. But if we see the behavior that, you know, is of, you know, leads to probable cause or that happens, then we would have to take appropriate action, and we would not only rely upon our knowledge and expertise, but also that of the district attorney's office to advise us. And they've been with us on a regular basis in all of these events we've been monitoring.

Speaker: Yeah. And I recognize that you can't enforce a law that doesn't exist. Yeah. So I what I'm what I'm suggesting is that it may be worthwhile to pursue making explicit legal prohibitions on the use of gas, not just legal prohibitions on pb use of gas, as we have done, because it's not just obviously, and as we have the conversation about pb stockpiles and use and all that sort of stuff in other contexts, but in this context that that's, I think, where I'm leaning. And I wanted to be clear about that.

Speaker: And just to add one more thing, that that there is a federal criminal law on interfering or hindering ice immigration enforcement actions. So, so pb has to walk the line of enforcing our laws, but also not not they are prohibited from interfering with or or hindering isis immigration efforts. So just so people understand to the limits that, you know, all of us are under and facing potential federal criminal charges would be if we are interfering with or hindering. Isis efforts.

Speaker: So that that begs the question, is response to protest part of their immigration work?

Speaker: Well?

Speaker: No. I mean, I think that response to crimes and I think that's what the chief is talking about when, when if there's criminal action happening by anyone, then that's what they would be able to come in and take a stance on. And I just, I just wanted to, to, to make clear that there are, there are when, when there when ice is engaging in their civil enforcement action pb is limited on on the way that they can they can step in. Now. They would not help enforce it. They won't help them perform that work either. And because that's prohibited by state law, it's prohibited by city policy and prohibited by pb policy.

Speaker: Heidi, I just wanted to ask, have you been able to summon a land use attorney to address the permit issue?

Speaker: My understanding is that my boss here, who I think you all probably call more than i, is here. Thank you so much, robert.

Speaker: Thanks for joining us, mr. Taylor.

Speaker: Thank you, mr. Chair. The question was the city's authority to revoke or rescind the conditional use permit that was granted. So in 2011, City Council approved a conditional use review for the site. Those conditional that conditional use review approved the facility subject to certain conditions. Those conditions include that the facility will operate in conformance with an approved safety plan, and that an an approved ice custody release plan that the transportation demand strategies identified in the plan will be implemented, and that no razor wire or barbed wire barbed wire will be used on the perimeter fence. That was approved by the City Council in 2011. Nobody appealed that decision and it became final. Neither Oregon law nor Portland zoning codes code allows the city to unilaterally withdraw, rescind, or cancel that prior decision. There is a process under the zoning code to reconsider land use approvals, but it would require that one or more of the

conditions that were approved have not been implemented, or those conditions have been violated. It would require that the use be substantially different or increased substantially from what was approved previously. In the absence of those necessary requirements. The decision cannot be rescinded.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor morillo.

Speaker: I'm going to put my hand down for now. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor kanal.

Speaker: Thank you. And thank you, robert, for being here. I could probably go down this line of questioning quite a bit. I wanted to first go back to the questions, and I these are questions that I've gotten chief day about the response to. And it relates to my last follow up to heidi as well, about about the response to people who are attempting to. Let's say, inhibit or slow down the work that ice does in the in the immigration enforcement space. So their their activity is, is in the protest space. But they're, it's a, it's a effectively a conflict or an attempt to slow or do that. So and I'm I'm this is my categorization but of questions I'm hearing. So when police are present at, at the facility on macadam, what kind of resources are ppb using. I mean is this the rapid response team? I'm guessing it's overtime. If so, I'm imagining there's supplies being used. Would it be fair to say some sort of cost is incurred by ppb in this scenario?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Okay. I want to pretend for a moment that pb was not present and ice was or and it might be, and I appreciate that distinction was reacting to protest protesters doing unlawful activity, let's say graffitiing the building. In that scenario, they'd probably have to go out and use some of their resources, time, money, overtime, etc. To intervene and possibly detain a protester. I think they've already been doing that, as you mentioned earlier. Is that correct?

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Okay. So can we reasonably say therefore then pb getting involved in responding to graffiti is taking on a cost that ice would otherwise be taking on if pb was not present?

Speaker: I think there's a there's a valid argument to be made there. My position is that our responsibility to all of the population in the south waterfront is to, you know, serve and also to have a preventative effect on making sure that situations don't escalate and the criminal activity that's happening down there, I believe Portland police bureau members are very well equipped and more moderate and well trained in their approach for intervening and taking action, if need be. So we have seen over the course of the last several days a decrease of interaction by the Portland police. Portland police has not made an arrest in, I believe, the last five days. And you know, we're continue to monitor and be available, but we are looking at ways to, you know, decrease our footprint and allow for more of the other efforts being done on the part of pf. And we have seen an increase in that behavior. Once again, I do not know what the charges are, but the scenario you use, whether it be criminal mischief or trespass or others, we have seen them come out and take action. So it would be my preference that they be able to manage the building themselves and be able to handle that. I also would hope that they would be able to do that in a manner that doesn't escalate the situation. I think that with, you know, Portlanders, once again, the approach that we have taken and we've demonstrated that with the rest, we've made our, you know, more thoughtful, more well planned and lesser use of force than what we're seeing from our federal partners. But ideally would be to have them provide the security for their building. That would be the preference, yes.

Speaker: Would it be possible for us to follow up and for you to let us know what it would take for us to help you get from here to there to a place where they're providing the primary security on that facility.

Speaker: And I will say, I'm having those conversations in real time. I had them on Sunday, and I'm pushing all of us to get to that direction and hopeful that, you know, as a community as a whole, we'll be able to, you know, do that and the need for us or will be seen less on our part. I'm down there. Excuse me. In the police bureau is down there intentionally because I feel like we have a role and responsibility to that particular part of the community, as well as the city of Portland as a whole. But I understand also that that's taxing resources or other parts of the city are suffering. And so I am constantly evaluating that prioritization and looking aggressively, even this week for ways to manage those resources. So yes, I'd be happy to share with you and keep you updated about how we get from here to there. That's that is the goal.

Speaker: Yeah. And I think maybe an example might be helpful. There's a there's a judo studio in saint john's that's had its windows smashed and had fecal matter spray, you know, spread on the windows several times. And this is maybe it's a different precinct. I understand that, and it's saint john's, which we know gets less service by the city in a lot of ways. And so I think when I get constituent communications about police being willing to respond to 1120 windows, but not necessarily to window in saint john's, there's a there's a problem there. And I think that is not just an optical one, it is an optical one too. So I just wanted to kind of put that into relief through what I'm hearing.

Speaker: It's absolutely I mean, that is a very valid point. I don't dismiss that at all. And the efforts, as I said, in south waterfront, particularly the facility, have been very intentional by the police bureau, and they center around the fact that it's a,

you know, highly volatile, contentious situation has the risk, I believe, of causing greater harm to the city as a whole. So I don't see it as just the facility. I see it as my responsibility as the bureau director to think about public safety holistically. But I'm very empathetic and understanding that, you know, ideally, it would be if we could dedicate the resources to the coffee shop in saint john's or to the businesses that are often highlighted and suffering. And that's one of the concerns that I have, is because by prioritizing this work, we know that calls for service will take longer to get to. We know that investigations will be put on hold. And, you know, I'm very transparent about that. And it weighs on me as we try to find this balance, but know that the intention, the intentionality around it is more is less for me about the facility and more about the holistic approach for the city.

Speaker: Councilor morillo.

Speaker: I appreciate councilor canal line of questioning, and I guess I just want to bring a little nuance to this discussion as well, because it's my understanding also that, for one thing, I appreciate not wanting to put city funding or resources towards enforcing protests outside of ice, and I have concerns that, frankly, the federal government will act in more unethical ways towards protesters than local police who have some involvement. And I say that as someone who has also been beaten with batons by our local police, so that that is a nuanced concern that I have. The other concern that I have is that the federal government has made it clear that if a local laws don't appear to be enforced, that they will happily send the national guard or other escalations of the federal government into repress protests. So I just want to say that to our audience members that there is a very delicate tightrope that we are walking. And I want to make sure that when we're having these discussions that we are talking about the very real consequences of

every single decision that is being made at this time, and how delicate and strategic we have to approach everything.

Speaker: Anything further.

Speaker: I'll come back to the questions with Robert. You gave some information on the permit, and I think there was an assessment, if I recall correctly, it was in 2011 around whether or not there was a safety risk posed by this facility. And obviously some of this facilities work is completely outside the context of all the things we're talking about in a protest sense. Its predecessor in in northwest Portland is where my parents went when they first came to, to the United States into Portland. So I'm very familiar with the sort of normal, mundane work of appointments and things like that, and want to make sure those are protected to for those who are trying to make their appointments. But but in the context of that safety assessment at the time, and this is I'm reading this in news reporting. So please correct me if that's not 100% accurate, that the evaluation led to an assessment that the risk of protests specifically and their effect on surrounding neighborhoods was not enough to warrant reconsideration of the permit at the time. Is that something that assessment is that within the scope of something that can be reevaluated at this time?

Speaker: I think you have accurately described the finding at the time. I don't know that that single finding could be reexamined. I think you would have to look at it through the lens of whether there's been a significant change in the use or an increase in the intensity of the activity. That is a question that we could look into further. This is probably not the appropriate venue to be providing legal advice on that topic.

Speaker: Fair enough. I will ask this rhetorically and not to you. Then I think I would love to know the degree to which ice engaging in activity that leads to

community response, that leads to the counter protesting activity we see there from them constitutes a change to what was anticipated at the time that permit was granted. And that's not to say that I'm leaning towards whatever. I think it's fair to say we should have the authority to do so, and we should be evaluating this from the perspective of is it a good idea or not? That's that's where I'm leaning at this moment. But I don't know if that's true. So that's the that's the rhetorical question.

Speaker: And I don't know that what you're saying is true either. So just to.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Just to set the expectation for people in the audience that are listening. Yes. It's important not to speculate. And I'd be happy to give the advice at the appropriate time.

Speaker: That's fair. I appreciate that clarification.

Speaker: Councilor morillo.

Speaker: Yeah, I appreciate those clarifications as well. Thank you. I think we should get legal advice privately. So I appreciate you, robert, since I was the person who brought up questions about the permit, and I think that it seems like we might be ready to close out here fairly soon. I also just wanted to highlight that since this is public information at this point, and lots of people have been talking about it, that City Councilors, myself included, have been speaking with immigration attorneys about what the impacts are of the closure of the macadam building on the very people that we're trying to protect. And I am speaking about this from a place of lived experience. I'm a paraguayan immigrant. My family moved to the united states when I was four years old. It was just me, my mom, my sister, and we moved to the us because we had to. And that's a long story that I'm not going to get into right now. But we came right after nine over 11, so it took a long time for us to get our citizenship. People were very wary of immigrants at that time, and so I

didn't end up getting my citizenship until I was 17 years old. After moving to the country when I was four. And we've been working with immigration attorneys who have done this work for decades, who have done this work, some for longer than I've been alive. And I think it's really important to highlight their expertise and experience right now, because what they have been telling us is that with the closure of the macadam building, there have been times where their clients have been taken by ice and that they have not been able to find them. Normally. The 12 hour holding window at macadam is a very critical and pivotal time to protect their clients because if ice takes them, you have a very brief amount of time to get to your client, give them the legal advice and maybe get them out of that space. And right now, that window of time has been lost because either these immigration attorneys don't know where their clients are, they're being taken to other federal buildings, or they are being taken to the tacoma detention center, which is actually a detention center. And it has been known for, you know, human rights violations. It's not a safe place to be. And once someone is in a detention center, it is much, much harder to get them out. And so as we are making decisions both legally and procedurally about these permits, we also have to weigh the very difficult and delicate consequences that are happening to people in real time. And I understand the urgency that the community is feeling. I feel it too personally for myself as well, I'm afraid, for myself and for my neighbors, and I want to ensure that when we are acting, we are acting from a place of strategy and not urgency, because the we are dealing with a federal government that we have never dealt with before. And this is every single choice that we make is very delicate and critical. So I just want to name that. This is not a simple question, and we need to do right materially by the people that we were sent here to protect. And as the only immigrant on City Council, I do feel a responsibility to immigrants in a different way than maybe everybody else

does at this time. So since I asked that question, I just wanted to name those things that we've heard from immigration attorneys and people who've been doing this work for decades. And I know that's not exactly the happy story that everyone wants to hear. Of course, we all want simple and easy solutions to these things, but they are unfortunately very complicated.

Speaker: Councilor kanal.

Speaker: Thank you, chair novick. Yeah, I think just as we're getting close to the end of this time here, i'll just reiterate, we're going to continue this conversation for me. I think i'll just daylight perhaps some of the values that I bring to this conversation. And. You know, protecting the first amendment is where I'm always going to start. I want everyone to know here you have the right to assemble and to make your voice heard. And i'll do everything in my power to protect your right to do that, and to honor the labor that you put in to try and protect your your neighbors, ensuring that we're in compliance with our sanctuary city laws and policies, which, you know, I think is about also addressing that perception gap, where sometimes the requirements are actually being complied with. But the requirements and the expectations we've created through resolutions don't necessarily align. And I know that that's something that we have commitment across the administration from as well, ensuring the health and safety of Portlanders, including protection from dangerous chemicals and chemical munitions being used by our federal government against our own people and in our city. Following the lead of those most harmed and those most affected. And I think that's a really important thing that that councilor morillo said better than I could, but making sure that in our rush to action, we do not fail to listen to those who are the most directly impacted or the most at risk. And finally, and this is also something that that you mentioned, councilor morillo being strategic and trying to

deliver for the people. I think in our roles there are things that we could do that might be things that are requested, and it wouldn't be performative if anyone else did it. But in our roles it might be. And so I want to be clear that the goal here for me is to deliver an actual change of policy. And I think the degree to which we can do that is obviously limited by being city officials and not federal ones. But I do think that that those are sort of five ideas that I bring to this. I intend to continue this conversation and just remind everyone. Sometimes you don't see us talking about it doesn't mean we're not working on it. So I'll leave it at that. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor, we are reaching the end of our time. I just wanted to follow up on the point that if ice agents are breaking the law, as heidi said, they are subject to our authority and are not immune from law enforcement. So I think that's important for people to hear. I'll be interested to see if we see examples in other cities around the country where ice agents are breaking the law and have been held accountable. Thank you very much to all of our speakers, and thanks very much to the audience, which was largely silent in its commentary. Really appreciate that. Appreciate the jazz hands and the blues hands. I want to acknowledge.

Speaker: The poetic and you know it.

Speaker: Can you please can you please be quiet? We're about to close.

Speaker: 80% of the people who leave that facility still do not have a lawyer. So this whole we can't do anything because it's not a perfect solution.

Speaker: Can you please be quiet?

Speaker: I have been quiet enough in my life, sir, I will not.

Speaker: I want.

Speaker: To thank you very much for that. But you guys are talking a lot. A lot of things of how you're just going to go around.

Speaker: Okay? I'm going to have to ask to have you removed. If you don't quiet.

Speaker: That's fine. You can have me removed. I'll go. Okay. I'm going to stay here and be disruptive because that is the job, sir.

Speaker: Okay. Can I ask security to ask whoever's speaking to be removed?

Speaker: People in the head. And you're worried about.

Speaker: They are absolutely there.

Speaker: Okay. Are we gonna have to? We have to close. We have to clear the room.

Speaker: They are absolutely hurting protesters at this point. I have seen many they are seeking to do. They have shot me. I've seen them shoot kids. I've seen them shoot people in the eyes.

Speaker: They shot me in the back of the head.

Speaker: And that's because the community is with us. Revoke the permit or face recall, all of you.

Speaker: I just wanted to correct something I said earlier on the pcep recommendations. I was thinking that the fact that mr. Salazar got a majority of those present meant that he would be sent to the full council with the recommendation. In fact, a majority of the committee is necessary. So mr. Salazar will be dropped from the ranks of those of the nominees submitted to the full council. It will just be miss portia. And with that, our next committee meeting is on July 8th, and I bring this meeting of the community and public safety committee to a close.