



July 7, 2025 Transportation and Infrastructure 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

Monday, July 7, 2025 9:30 am

Session Status: Adjourned

Committee in Attendance:

Councilor Tiffany Koyama Lane
Councilor Angelita Morillo, Vice Chair
Councilor Mitch Green
Councilor Loretta Smith
Councilor Olivia Clark, Chair

Councilor Smith arrived at 9:37 a.m.

Councilor Clark presided.

Officers in attendance: Diego Barriga, Acting Council Clerk

Committee adjourned at 10:44 a.m.

Regular Agenda

1

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

Resolution number: 37712

Document number: 2025-265

Introduced by: Councilor Olivia Clark

Time requested: 30 minutes

Council action: Referred to City Council as amended

Motion to add a Resolved statement, "BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that City Council urges the Governor to call a special session, as soon as possible, to pass a comprehensive statewide transportation funding package, to avoid further reductions to PBOT's operations and maintenance budget, as well as those in other communities statewide." Moved by Green and seconded by Morillo. (Aye (5): Morillo, Green, Smith, Koyama Lane, Clark)

Motion to send Resolution, Document Number 2025-265, to the full Council with recommendation the ordinance be adopted: Moved by Morillo and seconded by Smith. (Aye (5): Morillo, Green, Smith, Koyama Lane, Clark)

2

[2025 Legislative Session recap](#) (Presentation)

Document number: 2025-266

Introduced by: Councilor Olivia Clark

Time requested: 30 minutes

Council action: Placed on File

Portland City Council, Transportation & Infrastructure Committee
July 7, 2025 - 9:30 a.m.
Speaker List

Name	Title	Document Number
Olivia Clark	Councilor, Committee Chair	
Diego Barriga	Council Clerk	
Angelita Morillo	Councilor, Vice Committee Chair	
Mitch Green	Councilor	
Kyle Lewis	(Testimony)	2025-265
Priya Dhanapal	DCA Public Works Service Area	2025-265 and
Millicent Williams	Director, Portland Bureau of Transportation	2025-265 and
Loretta Smith	Councilor	
Megan Beyer	Chief of Staff, Councilor Clark	2025-265
Tiffany Koyama Lane	Councilor	
Evyn Mitchell	State Relations Manager, Office of Government Relations	2025-266
Derek Bradley	State Lobbyist, City of Portland	2025-266
Shoshana Cohen	Chief of Staff, PBOT	2025-266

Portland City Council Committee Meeting Closed Caption File

July 7, 2025 – 9:30 a.m.

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

All right. Good morning. I call the meeting of the transportation and infrastructure committee to order. It is Monday, July 7th at 930 or 9:32 a.m. Welcome, everyone. Good to see you. Hope everybody had a great July 4th. And, diego, can you please call the roll?

Speaker: Good morning. Morillo here.

Speaker: Green present.

Speaker: Smith. Koyama lane.

Speaker: Clerk I here. Great. And diego can. Let's see. Christopher, can you please read the statement of conduct for us? Thank you.

Speaker: Welcome to the meeting of transportation and infrastructure to testify before this committee in person or virtually. You must sign up in advance in the committee agenda at. Ed.gov. Agenda. Slash transportation and infrastructure 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. Colleagues, today we have two items on our agenda. First, we're going to consider a resolution urging the public works service area and the budget and finance service area to develop a comprehensive strategy for alternative funding for transportation and infrastructure. And our second item will make it very clear why that is necessary. Second item is that we're going to recap on get a recap on the legislative session that just adjourned from our colleagues with the office of government relations, who I see in the audience. Thank you for coming today. So, diego, can you please read the first item.

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

Speaker: Thank you. I hope everybody has seen this and had an opportunity to digest it. It's actually built off of a budget note that we had that was left on the cutting room floor during the budget process. But our second item today will reveal exactly why this is even more important today to do today, I would like to ask if there's anyone here to testify on it. Should we take testimony first or should we have the presentation?

Speaker: It's at your discretion.

Speaker: Well, let's have testimony. Sure. If there's someone signed up.

Speaker: Yes. We have one individual, kyle lewis.

Speaker: Oh. Hi, kyle. Come on up. Welcome.

Speaker: Thank you. Hi, everyone. Thank you to councilor clark and to the rest of the committee for your time. My name is kyle lewis, and I live in district three. I'm a bridge inspector for odot, and I cover territory that roughly aligns with the Portland metro area. I also serve on the board of directors for the association of engineering employees of Oregon, which is the union that represents engineers, project managers and other professionals at odf, odot, and oprd. I'm here today on behalf of dozens of our members in Portland and dozens more across the state who are receiving notice today of their being laid off because the state legislature has gone home without investing in transportation. I support this resolution because I value living in a city that's modernized and expanding its transit network, that's taking big strides in accessibility, and we're actively correcting decades of car centric infrastructure. And I would hate to see the city lit up on any of that. In the absence of state funding. I think the city has an obligation to explore every possible way to mitigate the damage that will be done if its transportation network doesn't get the investment that it needs from the state. Now, but I also want to live somewhere where food and medicine flow reliably and efficiently in and out of the city, where emergency services can get where they need to go, when people need help, and where people on the outskirts without good access to public transit still have access to opportunities and services in the city. Those things right now are only possible with adequate statewide transportation funding, even if the city is able to find the alternative funding sources it needs, and the rest of the state's transportation infrastructure is left to crumble, Portlanders still lose our people at awp, and our hardworking friends and colleagues at sco, seiu 503, many of whom live and work in the city, show up every day to keep Portland connected to the rest of the state

and the country. And the state is in the process of cutting hundreds of us loose. The task at hand right now for our union is the same as it is for the city, and that we are preparing for the worst and doing everything in our power to minimize the harm done to our people if this isn't corrected. But it would be a mistake not to send our efforts on where the issue starts. And that is the legislature's failure to deliver basic funding for operations and maintenance that we all rely on. We still believe that the best and easiest solution for everyone is a special session and a transportation funding package for the entire state, and we ask that the committee consider referring this resolution to full council with an amendment that urges the state legislature to reconvene and fix this before it's too late. The damage is done. We recognize that the city cannot compel the state to act, but we are asking for help in telling them, as we've been telling them, that we desperately need them to. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you very much for that excellent testimony. We appreciate you taking the time to come here today. Thank you. Thank you so much. Why don't we call up? I think we have a couple of speakers. Do you see a dana paul? Are you here to speak on the resolution and director williams? Thank you.

Speaker: Good morning. Chair. Clerk. Morning, councilors. I'm priya dana paul, and I use she her pronouns. I'm the dca for public works. Thank you, chair clarke, for your leadership in bringing forward a resolution and for continuing to shine a light on one of the most urgent challenges facing our city. I want to clearly affirm our strong support from public works for this resolution, and for the direction it sets forward. We welcome the charge to develop a comprehensive and community informed strategy to address Portland's transportation funding crisis. The truth is, we have inherited a model that no longer matches the reality of how people move, how technology is evolving, or what our communities need, and continue to rely on

declining fossil fuel based revenue while a street deteriorate is not a sustainable path forward. This resolution calls for something better, something smarter. It is a call to reimagine a funding framework in a way that is equitable, resilient, and grounded in community values. And this invites us to reimagine not just how we fund a system, but why. And that includes working across bureaus and service areas and centering Portlanders, residents, businesses, neighborhood groups and frontline workers, and shaping solutions that work. And from my vantage point, this effort is more than just financial strategy. It's about public trust. When we invest consistently in the basics safe crossings, smooth streets, reliable maintenance, we build confidence in our institutions and unlock support for future investment. This strategy will also be a critical step in empowering a frontline transportation workforce who are doing everything they can with limited resources. They deserve a system that supports them just as much as the public depends on the system they maintain. So again, thank you, chair clark, for your vision and commitment. The public works service area stands ready to partner with our colleagues in budget and finance, with pbob in a lead technical role and with communities we serve, to develop and deliver a strategy that meets this moment and helps us build a more connected, equitable and sustainable Portland. Thank you.

Speaker: Good morning, chair clark and members of the transportation and infrastructure committee. My name is millicent williams, and I am the director of the Portland bureau of transportation. The proposal, as put forward by the transportation and infrastructure committee, directs the public works and budget and finance service areas to develop a sustainable funding strategy to support Portland's transportation infrastructure. The Portland bureau of transportation, under the umbrella of the public works service area, is expected to contribute to this effort by providing technical analysis and operational insight. As has been

mentioned, pbot is expected to serve as the primary technical contributor, including analysis of current funding conditions, development of potential alternatives, and coordination on stakeholder engagement related to transportation operations. Pbot would be expected to support this work by identifying existing staff and resources to contribute to the development of strategies and research possibilities. Pbot has for years surveyed the landscape of transportation funding, recognizing that our current model is dependent on fossil fuels generating generated revenue, parking fees, and gas taxes. Between 2019 and 2021, pbot, in partnership with the bureau of planning and sustainability, convened a community task force to explore this question and advise the city on next steps. In October of 2021, Portland city, the Portland City Council adopted the poem task force final report and passed a resolution directing staff to move to the next phase of this work. This included developing a suite of fees and investment proposals, designed in line with the task force's recommended principles. Since then, staff have been working internally to advance thinking around the near-term strategy, ideas identified by the task force and so much more. The direction given by this resolution and current City Council will allow for next phase of exploration, advancing a citywide funding conversation, creating opportunities for additional fact finding, peer city research, partner engagement and strategy implementation recommendations. And we thank you for your consideration.

Speaker: Thank you very much. Colleagues, do you have any questions or comments about the resolution? Councilor smith?

Speaker: Thank you, madam chair. Thank you for your leadership on this resolution. I fully support this resolution. Our committee in our communities deserve action and not excuses. When it comes to infrastructure and maintenance and as you know, being the author of the cip, the sidewalk improvement and

paving project, that's that's another example of things that we should have done long ago. But we didn't have the political courage or the funding to do that. So we're facing some tough choices, rising costs on struggling, on struggling families and letting our infrastructure fail on on both. Both accounts are unacceptable. And I think we must find some better solutions. And I think this resolution will allow us to do this. I like the resolution for its emphasis on a coordinated approach and an alternative funding source. This encourages us to have exchange of ideas and that lead to innovation. And so if we have bold ideas brought to the table, then we can take bold action as City Councilors. And so for me, I fully support this public works deserves our attention. And I think the time is right and the time is now. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor smith, councilor green, you have your hand up.

Speaker: Yes. Thank you, madam chair. First, I just want to say your leadership is prescient. I think the budget note was already a good one, but it set us up to have this resolution brought forward on a I guess it's a 4/5 agenda item, so we can immediately respond to the failures of our state legislature. So I really I really appreciate that. Thank you for kind of supporting this work and being willing to step up and meet the moment. And so mr. Lewis's testimony I found moving. So in that end, I've drafted an amendment that I wonder if you'd consider as a friendly amendment. I'll just read it out loud. I'm also in the sort of process of emailing this out to you guys, but it would it would tack on a final, be it further resolved clause that says be it further resolved, that City Council urges the Oregon state legislature to call a special session as soon as practicable to pass a comprehensive statewide transportation funding package to avoid further reduction to pbob's operation and maintenance budget, as well as those in other communities statewide.

Speaker: Perfect. I think we'll need to get the motion to move the resolution, and then we'll do your amendment. I think it's a great amendment. And thanks to mr.

Lewis for coming and offering that up today. Should we? Well, let's have councilor morillo speak first.

Speaker: Councilor green, I would amend your amendment to say as soon as possible instead of as soon as practical, but fully supportive of that. Yeah, this is really urgent. And it's absolutely wild that our state legislature had one job which was to pass the transportation package, and they failed to do that. I'm extremely frustrated by the level of misinformation that we saw going around about the different options, and how that dissuaded our colleagues at the state legislature from passing a policy that is absolutely critical for the infrastructure issues that we're facing. And yeah, thank you, mr. Lewis, for being here today and testifying. I'm sorry that you even have to consider that you and your colleagues may not have employment, and also that our infrastructure is going to crumble because our leaders fail to meet the moment. So I will be fully supportive of councilor green's amendment. And thank you, councilor clark, for bringing this forward.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor morillo. I think I'm getting an urgent message from someone, am i? Are you megan? Do you want to come to the witness stand and introduce yourself with whatever the urgent message is?

Speaker: Hi, I am megan beyer. I am councilor clark's chief of staff. I would just suggest an amendment to councilor greene's amendment that would suggest the governor call a special session, not the legislature.

Speaker: Perfect. Thank you so much. As someone who worked in the legislature for years knows, I appreciate that.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: All right. You're amending your amendment right now, and we'll ask you to read that in a moment. Can I get a motion from one of my colleagues.

Speaker: So moved.

Speaker: Can we.

Speaker: I guess I should read it out first. Sorry.

Speaker: Maybe. Here.

Speaker: Would you like to. Move it?

Speaker: I think.

Speaker: You're supposed to read this. Oh, I'm supposed to read this. Okay. Sorry.

Speaker: I'll read it. Okay. Is this chair? May I have a motion member?

Speaker: Oh, okay.

Speaker: Sorry, everybody. We need more coffee. Chair, I move, I move. The resolution urged the public works service area and budget and finance service area to develop a comprehensive strategy for alternative funding for transportation and infrastructure to be sent to full council, with a recommendation to be adopted.

Speaker: Is there a second?

Speaker: Second?

Speaker: The motion has been moved and by councilor morillo and seconded by. Was that councilor smith? I heard okay. Is there any further discussion of this resolution? Okay then will the clerk.

Speaker: I would like to.

Speaker: I'll make your.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: Okay. Do we do that.

Speaker: Now if you'll if you'll accept a friendly amendment. It is it now reads be it further resolved that City Council urges the governor to call a special session as soon as possible to pass a comprehensive statewide transportation funding package to avoid further reductions to pbob's operations and maintenance budget, as well as those in other communities statewide.

Speaker: Second, perfect.

Speaker: All right, so should we clerk, call the roll on the amendment and then the resolution.

Speaker: Morillo i.

Speaker: Green, I smith. I koyama lane I clark hi. With five eyes the amendment is approved.

Speaker: Great and without any further discussion of the resolution, can we call for the vote?

Speaker: Yes, yes.

Speaker: What are you.

Speaker: I.

Speaker: Green.

Speaker: Smith i.

Speaker: Koyama lane I clark. I with five eyes. The resolution is referred to full council as amended.

Speaker: Terrific. The motion carries and the resolution urging public works service area and budget and finance service area to develop a comprehensive strategy for alternative funding for transportation and infrastructure, will move to the full council with a recommendation to be adopted, and some of us might ask to have that expedited if possible. Thank you everyone, and thank you for to our witnesses, we really appreciate your being here and all your support and helping us craft this as well. I really appreciate it. And to mr. Lewis for taking the time out to come today and definitely teamwork. We really improved the resolution together, I appreciate that. So diego, will you please read the next item?

Speaker: Item two 2025 legislative session recap.

Speaker: Terrific. Thank you. So we've asked our colleagues from the office of government relations who were exhausted after another long busy legislative session, to provide us with a recap on the transportation and infrastructure related legislation that the city was tracking and advocating on in salem. Can you please join us at the dais? So we have evan mitchell, who's our state relations manager from the office of government relations, derek bradley, our state lobbyist, office of government relations. I see sam is not here. And, shoshanna, are you coming up as well? No. Okay, great. We have the full complement at the dais and dc. Do you want to kick this off?

Speaker: I'm going to pass it on to ogat to give us a preview first and then.

Speaker: Terrific. Thank you. And welcome.

Speaker: Hi. Hi, chair clark, members of the committee. My name is evan mitchell. I use she her pronouns. I'm the state relations manager for the office of government relations. And I'm filling in today for director chase, who is off with his daughter today. Although rightfully overshadowed by the failure of the transportation package, there were a few positive advancements in the infrastructure arena that at some point we would love to discuss with you all around infrastructure linked to housing and also our local levee system. Obviously, we know that the transportation package is the big, most important issue that we need to talk about for cities and counties. And we're glad to be here to talk to you about kind of what happened, what we think went wrong, and what comes next. I'll turn it over to my colleague derrick, who worked on this for over two years with the amazing pbot staff that provided so much information, so much education and support to us in salem. And then we'll pass it over to dci john paul and director williams to talk about some of the impacts that that are anticipated for pbot. And derrick and I will

stick around to answer any questions about the process, talk about what comes next and how what we're hearing in salem. So with that, take it away, derrick.

Speaker: Thanks, evan. Chair clark, vice chair, morillo members of the committee. For the record, my name is derrick bradley. He him state lobbyist for the city of Portland. And transportation is in my portfolio. I'm just going to sort of walk through broadly the process that got us to here over the past two plus years before allowing pbot to have opportunity to share sort of the impacts and happy to take questions, preparatory conversations about how this was going to happen over several years, started before the conclusion of the 2023 legislative session. There was discussions with the chair, the co-chairs of the transportation committee. Leadership was already beginning to have conversations. Jurisdictional partners were meeting to start talking about how we were going to be advocates for this. That moved into 2023. Interim work began at regional level to help find a path forward, to coordinate a set of priorities that jpac could adopt, which was something that occurred formally in early 2024. I believe through a lot of hard work and various communities across the region, that led into a slight pause as the short session occurred in 2024. Upon its completion, there was a lot of work at the state level to begin doing road shows for the transportation committee across the state. Inspired by that as a good idea, the city of Portland began coordinating a series of four tours for delegation members to attend in the summer of 2024, as we also began producing, I think a really incredible amount of educational and advocacy materials to share with delegation members and as well just other communities around the state that led to an ongoing and increasing number of conversations with legislators. As we got towards the end of 2024 about their hopes, their plans, the needs, and sort of educating everyone about the needs that not just the city of Portland, but every community across the state was experiencing with

transportation funding. That leads us to the beginning of the 2025 legislative session, where there was a prolonged amount of negotiations behind closed doors that I do think went on for the amount of time that frustrated some legislators. That eventually led to an unveiling of house bill 2025. In the second week of June and a flurry of hearings, amendments, a pivot at the last day to another proposal that had challenges that we can talk about, and ultimately a sine die adjournment without a transportation package being passed. And that is where we are today at the moment.

Speaker: Great. Thank you. Once again, I'm here for public works and thanks to our colleagues at ogr for giving the legislative update. I, together with director williams, i'll be sharing the impacts of the legislature's failure to pass the hb. Yes.

Speaker: Before you.

Speaker: Go further, I just want to check to see if anybody has questions for our ogr staff or any comments about the process.

Speaker: Yes.

Speaker: Excuse me. Councilor smith.

Speaker: Thank you, madam chair. Thank you for the invite. It is my understanding that the comprehensive bill was dropped like 20 days before signing day, right? Did you all have a heads up of what was in it prior to that?

Speaker: Chair? Clark councilor smith that's a great question. To an extent. There was a framework released either may in may that had a broad outline of what was going to be in the package. It didn't have a lot of numbers on it. It had some numbers. It laid out a potential increase in gas tax and the some of the fee increases it had some it had a it was lacking in the finite amount of revenue that would be generated. It was lacking a bit in which was a point of contention moving forward for a while. How much exactly dollar amounts. We're talking about the

adjustments to heavy vehicles were not shared for a while, so there was a framework that was a broad outline of what was to be expected, which even that I think some people had hoped to see earlier. But it was not. It was really not receiving the complete package with the full analysis until about it was about 20 days before signing day. That. Yeah.

Speaker: So what I'm trying to figure out is what were the if you had to identify the three things that legislators were concerned about in the reason why they didn't vote? Because I heard that no one voted for this last package that came out. Even the modified one, they weren't interested in bringing it out. And then a minority leader, drazan there was there was some sort of process that she didn't allow to go through. So I wasn't totally clear on exactly what happened and what the issues were that were preventing our legislature to go forward.

Speaker: Chair. Smith sorry. Chair. Clark councilor smith I will start try to start that. And then derek, please feel free to add. I think there were a handful of different things going on. One was the, you know, where the republicans were and what they were willing to provide was really unclear. I think there probably could have been a lot more done. Obviously, these conversations took place behind closed doors, but I think there could have been a lot more done to find out what they needed to get the votes to get it done. We also had members of our democratic caucuses that were out. You know, we lost a member of the senate Dems midway through session, and that created changes in the house. And then we had a house member who was out ill, which changed the dynamic around the supermajority, which was also a complicating factor. There were really messy politics between some of the committee members, which I think very much contributed to some of the downfall and the lack of education and ability to analyze a bill. Was definitely, I think, hurtful to the process. Chair drazan at the very end. Excuse me, minority leader drazan at

the very end did use a maneuver to block the 3402. The bill that they dropped at the last minute that would have just provided funding to odot. Whether or not they actually had the votes for that remains very unclear.

Speaker: So there weren't like issues around how much money was going to be for highways or how much money the 50, 30, 20 people. I'm trying to figure out the infrastructure, if there are things that we could have done or that we how we could have lobbied a little bit heavier for this. And in terms of that, we actually needed the 20%. That's that's what I'm trying to figure out. Did they just did not know the complexity or how much was actually needed. They didn't think that the numbers were right. That's what I'm trying to get a chair.

Speaker: Clark councilor smith. So aside from a few legislators, 50, 30, 20, the 50, 30, 50% of money going to the highway trust fund for go to the state, 30% to counties, 22 cities was not seriously being considered being altered, which was something that I think was a success from lots of lobbying before session from jurisdictions across the state. But to the question of what wasn't in the bill that people needed to see to vote, the I think part of the challenge was that that question's answer was wildly different among several groups within just the democratic caucus itself. And it was the lateness of the bill that I think didn't provide enough time for an internal caucus like working through where they are. So, for example, when the framework was first released, there were some that were already concerned about cost of living increases on one side, but there were some that were very concerned that there were not direct allocations for safety, and that transit increase was at a degree that was going to result in wide transit cuts. And so while some of those were folk noted that they had these concerns, it was hard for them to still then stake out exactly where it was without seeing a full analysis and package. And so, you know, I think there was a lot of lobbying done. I

don't think there was a lot of lobbying done, coordinated with jurisdictional partners across the state on the framework. And you heard from a lot of legislators within increasing amount of. I would say, irritation in their voice that they were not really interested in offering up their final position or be and eventually, honestly, even being lobbied on the package until there was a complete bill released. I think we I think a lot of the jurisdictional lobbyists across the state were successful in leveraging good relationships with legislators to get more time to talk and to really encourage them to understand the need. But ultimately, and I think with a fine, you know, which from a point I can understand why they they were not going to offer their form, their formal final positions until there was a bill that they could react to.

Speaker: Right. I think you're right. And thank you for the for the comments, because I know they did the really hard thing in the long session in 23. The chips bill was their big thing. They dropped it in the beginning. That was it. They did a road show in the summertime and did this big report, and they did it for eight weeks. I have never seen a bill, and I was really hoping that the transportation committee would have done something very similar to the chips bill, because they did like 8 or 9 weeks of straight talking about this at the beginning so that people could have a real understanding. So I was trying to figure out what if this was just the timing, or they just didn't like the bill. And then politics got in the way and trying to figure out if there's something that we could have done to help push this along a little quicker.

Speaker: If I may, on the what could we do more of? I do think that the you you raised an excellent example with the chips bill. There was also the amendment the changes to ballot measure 110. That same thing. Bill came out very early. Kind of worked through the process. Right. That was one of the big challenges that we saw this session, I don't think I think there's always more that we need to do to make sure that the governor and the legislature knows that they cannot leave us behind.

When hb 3402 dropped on the last day of session, I think it's fair to say we were heartbroken. It was disgusting to think that after all that work.

Speaker: The 11.2 billion package.

Speaker: Well, the final bill that would have only put a three cent gas tax increase towards odot, we were shocked. The league of Oregon cities was shocked. The association of Oregon counties was shocked like them leaving us behind in that manner to save, you know, 600 odot employees who deserve to be saved at the expense of all the local communities was, you know, I don't want to be overly emotional, but it was pretty appalling. And so I think that's that's where we have more opportunity to say, like, you can't leave us behind. Our communities are providing the infrastructure that connects to your roads. So if you leave us behind, there are consequences you need to understand.

Speaker: And that was speaker fahy's bill, the last one.

Speaker: It's very difficult to say who exactly that bill. The governor was in the building all day long, running back and forth trying to get votes for that bill. The bill sponsor was majority leader bowman. But my understanding is that fahey and the governor had had a significant role in it.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: Thank you. Thank you so much.

Speaker: Thank you. Councilor smith. You have to understand that there are a couple of us up here that spent a lot of time at the legislature and even worked on transportation packages, so we're kind of interested in the details. I have a question for you. And on that 50, 30, 20, I mean, that is the holy grail, right? That is the holy grail of transportation in this state. And some of us did make calls at the last minute, say, you cannot do this to us. You cannot violate that that relationship, the 50, 30, 20 without real consequences. I had a question for you. Excuse us, which is

where we dig a little bit deeper. Was it in May when you got a hint of what was coming, that you, in conjunction with pbot, developed an estimate of what the cuts would be, which we're going to talk about soon. But is that when you started to develop the impact on Portland.

Speaker: I would.

Speaker: Say, and Shoshana, if you want to add on to this in a minute, or Director Williams or anyone, I would say it was an ongoing process of what the impact would be that was even started. I would say about a year ago, we first started producing materials highlighting the amount of assets that the city manages, the ongoing growing depth of the deferred maintenance backlog, and educating people on that. I would say as we as at the first framework, it was when we did really start to do an analysis, but though it was still high level because we didn't have very specific about what kind of investment would this be, and it seemed pretty favorable if the original package as presented had passed, it would have been a really meaningful investment. Historic investment from the state and local government, operations and maintenance. And so then as different iterations occurred, we were offering numbers. And it was as there was some real friction a little later than May, I would say, as we got closer to the end of session about, okay, we need to really dial in. What is the level of potential damage if nothing is passed, or if something that only funds ODOT is passed, and if pbot has anything they'd like to add?

Speaker: Yeah, I think just adding to sorry. Shoshana Cohen, pbot chief of staff working with the office of government relations, really for a year and a half, I think, on the types of things that we would be funding. But then it was through both sort of simultaneously through seeing the numbers in the bill and through the budget process here, that we were sort of narrowing in on what the package as it was coming together, would be funding within our budget. And still, I mean, that's sort

of where we are right now, is working with you all on now that we have this gap exactly where we'll land.

Speaker: I'll share that. What differs in this package or proposed package, and the hb 2017 was that the projects sorry, the projects in there were there was a list of projects in hb 2017 for this round of funding. We were proposing that it would go toward maintenance and operations. And so I think I'm not trying to presuppose that anyone thought anything other than without having a thing to attach funding to that might have created a disconnect around what this funding would go toward. So an example in hb 2017, we funded the 42nd avenue bridge. And so that was a significant investment. You could see that immediately happening. That work is getting ready to start in terms of construction now. So I think that that is one factor that played into the decisions that people were making. As we were doing the roadshows, we were intentionally writing on the most damaged infrastructure so that we could say, this is what this means. When you say maintenance and operations, this is what this means. A special project doesn't solve this project problem. A named project doesn't solve the widespread spread problem, which all of our communities have. And so that I offer that as we were thinking about the budget and as we've had many conversations with this committee, our focus and our priority is on asset condition, asset maintenance and operations. And so we were trying to convey that message even as we were advocating for ourselves in this process about what was important and doing that in partnership with county partners, with city partners all across the state, we were all saying the same things. So I am curious to learn more about where there perhaps might have been some of those challenges that extended beyond the understanding of what the impacts of maintenance and operations funding would mean for us.

Speaker: I'm really glad to hear that where you took them, that you may have to take them there again.

Speaker: Well, we have plenty of options.

Speaker: Sometimes it takes, you know, several times for something to sink in. So yeah. Did you have something you wanted to add?

Speaker: I would just add that one element we haven't discussed yet is a related to odot and odot's relationship with the legislature and how it is perceived in the legislature. There was, some of you may recall, in January, February, an audit came out of odot that that really portrayed the agency negatively. And that was very difficult to overcome. During the session, a lot of us were trying to advocate for our needs and both try to defend and not defend odot at the same time. Obviously, we work incredibly closely with odot. We need them to function and function well and have the funding that they need. But there was a lot of angst about that particular issue within this legislature and the perception of providing resources to an organization that needed to be held accountable first. So that was another piece of the dynamic that I think we'll have to work through.

Speaker: As hanging, hanging over a little cloud, hanging over the whole process. Did you want to say something? No. Okay, colleagues. Counselor smith, did you want to say one more thing?

Speaker: And just so that we're not talking over people's heads, you're talking about the \$2 billion that they couldn't find. Find. And you're talking about the bridge that was going to require additional funding, a lot of additional funding, and we probably could have built a new bridge instead of repairing an old bridge. What was the name of that bridge? The.

Speaker: Albert abernathy.

Speaker: Oh, the abernathy. Abernathy. Abernathy.

Speaker: So, so that's what you're talking about when you say that the trust was lost, were those issues that you're talking about.

Speaker: Those are some of the big ticket issues in that audit. I think something that struck a nerve was the belief. Some may say it's unfounded, but I would say that some legislators certainly conveyed to me the belief that odot knew how bad the problem was for a while before this audit came out, and that that had not there had been no effort to educate legislators about this problem and that this audit had sort of landed like a lead balloon in front of them, while being while being asked to consider a major transportation package that would help fund odot, I think maybe even more certainly, some legislators told me that that perception was more problematic to them than what was actually in the audit, and to just add in a slight point, you know, even as I would hear that consistently from legislators, legislators that do not border the city of Portland would quickly also then say to me, but boy, I do know how important this is for pbob and how, you know, meaningful it is for the whole state, for the city of Portland, to have this investment in transportation, and that you guys aren't like, I'm not sitting here lumping you guys in with this. And I think generally Portland got a lot of positive praise from this. I think generally though, like local jurisdictions, transportation bureaus across the state are pretty well regarded. And people, even as they were mad at odot, it was this view and understanding of 50, 30, 20 impact the benefit of the cities and counties across the state and how important they are that honestly even kept the conversation alive during session.

Speaker: And while the sellwood bridge was a Multnomah County project, we did come in under budget and ahead of time. And so if you had examples to talk about, you know, how we do work here in the city of Portland, that can definitely be used

as an example of how we've used federal, state and local dollars. So thank you so much.

Speaker: I just want to pile on there that all those projects that trimet came in on budget, on time, right?

Speaker: I have to say.

Speaker: Well, let's thank you so much for that input. And please stay at the dais because there may be more questions, but let's let pbot go ahead. They've prepared a presentation for us about the potential impacts of the lack of a state package. So thank you. I'm sorry to interrupt you. Okay.

Speaker: No problem. Thank you. I think this was a good conversation to have and it was a right time to pause. So I want to start by saying that the failure of the state transportation package was more than a missed opportunity. It was a missed lifeline for aging infrastructure, for equitable access, for sustainable growth and for public trust. And Portland was counting on this funding to repair roads, support safe mobility and sustain critical staffing. And we are now left with no clear alternatives. As the infrastructure deteriorates, the cost for inaction compounds. And while ogre has walked through what happened during the session, director williams and I will speak to the impacts of how we are managing and what this means for the future of our bureau and our transportation system. If we reduce investment now, the cost will face later in dollars, in delays and in safety and in credibility will be exponentially higher. Next slide please, john. So state funding is essential to pbot's ability to maintain and operate Portland's transportation system. And state highway fund is a key source of flexible revenue, largely made up of gas tax. But like many cities, Portland is seeing the rising costs and falling revenue, meaning every year about buying power erodes what the needs are while the needs continue to grow. Next slide please. As we discussed earlier, the state

highway fund is distributed with about 50% going to odot, 30% to counties and 20% to cities. And while there are carve outs and exceptions, this general split is a long standing practice, and any loss of new revenue affects all levels of local government. Next slide please. For pbot, the state highway fund revenue represents over half of the bureau's general transportation revenue, or gtr, which funds core operations and maintenance. And pbot is not a general fund bureau. Gtr is what keeps the lights on, signals maintain, potholes filled and crews working. Without it, the bureau cannot sustain its current scaled back level of service. Next. Next slide please. Oh, am I supposed to pass it on to you? That's you okay. So with in this slide, every version of the house bill 2025 would have brought a significant new revenue to transportation across Oregon. So for Portland, that meant real, measurable help in tackling a massive deferred maintenance backlog. And this table shows our staff's estimate of what Portland would have received under the final amendment amended version of the bill. And these projections are based on preliminary state analysis and reflects Portland's longstanding revenue agreement with Multnomah County, where 80% of the combined allocation comes to Portland. Next slide please.

Speaker: And i'll take it from here. Thank you so much again. Millicent williams, director of the Portland bureau of transportation. The failure to pass the bill has some consequences that we will feel immediately and over the next few years, the most acute impact is, of course, on pbot's budget for fiscal year 2526, the loss of the budgeted \$11 million we were expecting from the transportation package means that immediate adjustments must be made. I'm pausing because, after hearing the testimony of mr. Lewis earlier and thinking about the staff who I was facing as I was walking in this morning, recognizing that we would be having this conversation. It is very difficult. We've been sharing with the team. We could not

give more information until all the things made it through. Our budget passed, we were celebrating that. We said we still need to wait to find out what's going to happen at the state level. And the message that I was that I needed to send last Monday was a different message than I would have liked. As we were preparing to go into the new fiscal year, it is incredibly challenging to have the conversations and to recognize that it's not just the maintenance and operations that goes away, but it's the people that do that work that will be impacted most. There are other impacts that affect Portland. The loss of funding to finish the rose quarter, which was another project that we might have mentioned in the last conversation. We will look at preventing service cuts to trimet as well. And then there's the challenge of increasing safety investments in urban corridors. The cuts to odot's budget will also directly and indirectly affect Portland. For example, the city was notified that odot will no longer provide irp funding, which supports the cleanup on odot right of way. We'll they'll be spending far less to do that work, and an odot contractor will be doing that work instead of the city of Portland taking care of that. Next slide, please. The potential impacts of an \$11 million budget shortfall. Well, this is a draft list of potential cuts. Pbot is, of course, working hard to minimize the impact impacts on all of our employees and on Portlanders. And this list is not final. This would mean, first of all, the loss of valued employees. As I just mentioned, along with their experience and knowledge, this is irreplaceable. Current projections indicate that we will lose up to 50 staff. This loss could also mean up to 300 street lights, something we've discussed a lot in this committee will not be repaired this year. The number will go up incrementally each year. We will also lack funding to purchase the equipment and replacement parts necessary to address damaged lights, and will begin to remove and cap them, increasing safety concerns and darkness in areas where light is needed. Reduced capacity to respond to requests

from the public for safety measures, such as the installation of stop signs and crosswalks. Or, to put it more plainly, 823 safe. The number that people call to get service requests in their communities would be significantly reduced. Delays to traffic signal upgrades on busy corridors. These upgrades are intended to improve safety for pedestrians, bikes, freight transit and automobiles, and assessments will be. We will begin assessments to determine which funded projects of all types can be delayed rescope or that should be canceled. Maintenance and capital improvement programs alike. We are not. If we are not successful in identifying ways to address the budget shortfall, the bureau will begin to issue layoff notices as soon as Monday, July 14th. Next slide please. Beyond the immediate impacts, the failure of the transportation package has serious ramifications for the future. The transportation revenue system is heavily dependent on the consumption of fossil fuels, as has been mentioned and as we know, which is problematic for both climate and for future funding stability. Hb 2025 would have established a road user fee program to begin the transition away from fossil fuel revenue, and it also indexed the gas tax to mitigate the erosion of buying power over time. Now those problems remain unaddressed. The second impact is that without the increased revenue, we could face a future in which we will not only be able, we will be unable to meet our goals, but we will face a steadily worsening backlog of maintenance needs. The more we neglect our maintenance, the more expensive our problems will get. Each dollar invested in preventative maintenance can save up to \$10 in future. Reconstruction failures cost more to fix and create risks to safety, livability, public health, and the environment. Next slide please. I want to underline that this is not a matter of tightening our belts and finding efficiencies. This is pbot's seventh year of reductions to gtr. And the belt is already very tight. You can see the evidence of this as you go out and look at our infrastructure. We need to address

the lack of sufficient stable, the lack of we need to address the lack of sufficient, stable revenue. Without that, we cannot make meaningful progress toward the city's transportation goals. Next slide, priya.

Speaker: Thank you, director williams. So at the state level, we'll continue to work with office of government relations to understand the next steps and prepare for future opportunities to secure sustainable, long term funding and the city level. The impact is immediate and unavoidable. The failure of hb 2025 has left the Portland bureau of transportation with a projected \$11 million gap. As we previously mentioned, a hole that was anticipated to be filled by this legislation. And this gap means difficult decisions are now on the table. As we mentioned, potential layoffs, service cuts and delays to critical safety and maintenance work. We've been in austerity for many years, and the consequences are increasingly visible in the condition of our streets, the responsiveness of our services, and the morale of our workforce. As we move forward, we will do everything we can to manage these impacts responsibly. But we cannot fill this gap alone. We need our state partners to recognize that continued inaction on transportation funding is not just unsustainable, it is actively harmful to Portlanders daily lives. Next slide please. So pbots entered this fiscal year with the unbalanced budget, which was already bare bones, and the anticipated funding would have helped us maintain our current already reduced level of service. More than that, it would have, it would have been a turning point. The projected allocations in our outyears would have allowed the city to begin addressing pbots's staggering maintenance backlog, which is currently about 5 to \$6 billion. So without those funds, we are left to make impossible choices. And the road ahead is harder now. But a responsibility has not changed. We owe it to the people of Portland to be honest about what's at stake and to work towards a stable, sustainable funding our city needs. And I'm really appreciative of

chair clark to bringing the resolution today, and also councilor green to make that really, really time appropriate amendment as well. We're looking to this committee and our council for a mayor for leadership and support as we navigate this critical moment, because the future of our bureau, the future of our transportation system, hangs in balance. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you, dana paul and melissa williams, thank you so much for your presentation. And our government affairs staff, all the hard work. I imagine it was quite an emotional letdown at the end of session, not just for pbot, but for you as well. You were there every day. I think we have our my colleagues. Have some more questions or comments for you, so please stay there. Councilor koyama lane.

Speaker: Thank you, chair clark. And thank you so much for all of you for being here. I'm wondering if any of you can outline some of the impacts on our community regarding traffic safety.

Speaker: Sure. I can take that question. So as I mentioned, the a23 safe line would be immediately impacted. That's both from a staffing perspective, but also the ability to go out and address the needs that have been outlined. So it would take us longer to get to the things that we know about because of a lack of ability to do that based on staffing and in some instances, the equipment necessary to do the work, the signals and street lights programs would be directly affected. We would also need to reevaluate what we were doing around pavement maintenance and crosswalks and crossings, and how we would be able to invest in those. It would have a direct effect on the livability of communities. We would not be able to do some of the things that people are expecting as it relates to that very basic maintenance on streets that we are focused on both crash corridors, high crash corridors, as well as some of the other arterials and collectors. Some of the safety work that we would propose is not going to be something that we could continue to

do. There are grant funds that we would have anticipated using some of this grant for as match, and that's when I mentioned needing to evaluate which projects we would do that many of our projects right now, as slated, are top line safety projects. So we would be making choices about which parts of town, which projects, which investments we would be able to make based on our ability to match the necessary funding that would have potentially come in the door. So it's hard to put a thumb on one particular thing. It's a little bit of everything.

Speaker: And I understand that this is on top of many years of cutting back.

Speaker: This is our seventh year of significant cuts to the bureau. Yes.

Speaker: Thank you. I'll make sure to share a lot of that with my constituents. And I know that's a priority for many of us up here.

Speaker: We will continue to do our level best. It breaks our hearts when we have to make those choices. There are no good choices at this point. As I mentioned, our belts are incredibly tight. Our stomachs are hit in our backs. If you're from the country and you're familiar with that term, like me, but it's incredibly challenging and the staff want to do a good job. They want to be able to deliver with excellence in everything that they're doing. They hate having to make those choices and having to use, in some instances, reused parts over and over and over again to address those things that are basic and fundamental for our city. And we want to be able to ensure that they're able to do the work with excellence. Some of that is both based on their skills and abilities, but of course, the equipment and the ability to do it. From the funding perspective, there's no asphalt to fill the hole with.

There's no concrete to patch the sidewalk with. There's no wiring to do the lighting with. So it's down to which bill are we paying today folks? And that's really difficult.

Speaker: Thank you. And thank you to you and your team for all your hard work. We see it.

Speaker: Councilor smith.

Speaker: Thank you, madam chair. Director williams, you noted in your comments that July 14th, if we didn't have some changes that you'd have to fire some people or layoff people, that those those were your words. How many people are you predicting that you would have to lay off?

Speaker: We are continuing to reevaluate the numbers, but right now, based on the projection that we were anticipating to receive, it's roughly 50 staff.

Speaker: Okay, 50 staff. So I'm going to ask you the question the other way, how much money in restricted funds and in general funds will you have to cut to meet your current operating budget to stay within it?

Speaker: \$11 million.

Speaker: So it is \$11 million. Okay. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor morillo.

Speaker: Thank you for this presentation. If I wasn't livid before, I'm even more livid now. I am curious if the 11 million cut that we've discussed accounts for the tnc fee increase. I know that that wouldn't cover everything. It was \$5 million I think. So even then we would have a big hole. But I'm just curious if that was factored into this.

Speaker: We are evaluating councilor morillo. We're evaluating what the impact of the tnc would be on our revenues, but also tnc, a portion of it was for other programs, you know, for the driver.

Speaker: The there were some safety benefits that we needed to backfill. So it was roughly 600,000. And there is a proposal on the table for driver resource center that could impact that roughly 10 million in revenues that we would be expecting. The I would like to note that the ten 10.7 million is actually only 5 million of that would be considered excess based on the increase from the mayor's proposed to

the council approved. So it's that additional \$0.65 that would help to make that 5 million. So the total tnc revenue that we're anticipating is ten. But the additional revenue would be 5 million. And that's what we'd be working with to potentially fill the \$11 million gap.

Speaker: Okay. Thank you. I appreciate that clarification.

Speaker: Any other questions or comments, counselor green?

Speaker: Thank you, madam chair. And again, thank you for the presentation today. It's very sobering, but we have to act with what we have, right? My counselor, koyama lane koyama lane, asked a question that got my brain moving on traffic cameras related to safety. I understand that there are some some behavioral changes that that we've seen on an evidentiary basis that, you know, when these are placed, people do slow down and they drive more safely. But the revenues associated with that, where do those revenues flow? They don't. Do they flow back to pbot?

Speaker: There's not a lot of revenue that comes from that program. Right now. We have 31 cameras. By the end of the fiscal year. We intend to have 40 cameras, and that will help to do what you said curb the behavior. The ticket generation, revenue generation, relative to the overall impacts of the city's budget or the bureau's budget is not significant enough for there to be a difference in the ways that we would work to fill gaps. The more significant revenue comes from as it relates to driver behavior and motorists comes from parking fees, of course, and from the gas tax, fixing our streets gas tax, as well as existing current former state gas tax. And. What am I forgetting? Gas tax and parking revenues. And we get a couple of dollars off of those citation revenues. But that is shared not just with the city. The state and the county receive funding from that. And our ticket revenue, while we anticipate it will go up some, that's not what we base our budget on.

Speaker: I appreciate that. Yeah.

Speaker: Just just adding again, just I think at this point at least, it primarily just pays for itself. It pays to expand the program. And yeah, we're just not getting.

Speaker: And I ask it I guess I'm I'm curious. So in the state of potentially with the absence of action from the governor to whip some folks into shape here. In the state of decreasing resources, do you anticipate cutting the rollout of those those? Okay. So that's going to stay the course.

Speaker: That will stay the course.

Speaker: All right. Because it is probably a pretty low cost way to change some behavior. So thank you.

Speaker: Just a follow on there. Is that governed by state law the division of those citation resources? Yes, it is governed by state law. And we're probably pretty far downstream.

Speaker: State and county.

Speaker: Yeah. Yeah we share with the county okay.

Speaker: Great. Thank you. Thank you for those questions. Any other comments or questions from my colleagues? Thank you all of you so much for being here and for all the hard work. And we're all feeling the same pain. Maybe not to the intense degree that you're feeling it right now. Post-session. And with the pending layoffs and cuts, we're with you in spirit anyway, and we'll do everything that we can to get the message across and let us know if there's more we can do. I think you've got members of this committee that are happy to pick up the phone or do do what's necessary, and we'll try to we'll see if we can't expedite this resolution. Given that, you know, we're all we're all hoping that the governor takes action in just the next couple of weeks so we can get it to the full council quickly. That would be great. But

thank you again, all of you. So much for being here again and less than happy circumstances. Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Colleagues.

Speaker: Our next meeting is on July the 21st. We're anticipating bringing back an issue that was going to come up today. That was the public utility board. They have some appointments that they had to delay, but that will come back to us and on the 21st, and then we're going to get an overview of the whole one water concept from public works. I know some of us are really anxious to hear about that, how that's going to work, that integration of bees and water and others. So with that, I will adjourn the meeting of the transportation and infrastructure committee.