



**CITY OF
PORTLAND, OREGON**

**OFFICIAL
MINUTES**

A REGULAR MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PORTLAND, OREGON WAS HELD THIS **8TH DAY OF JANUARY, 2004** AT 9:30 A.M.

THOSE PRESENT WERE: Mayor Katz, Presiding; Commissioners Francesconi, Leonard and Saltzman, 4.

Commissioner's Leonard and Saltzman arrived at 2:06 p.m.

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE: Karla Moore-Love, Clerk of the Council; Harry Auerbach, Senior Deputy City Attorney; and Officer Curtis Chinn, Sergeant at Arms.

Item No. 7 was pulled for discussion and on a Y-4 roll call, the balance of the Consent Agenda was adopted.

| DUE TO WEATHER CONDITIONS THE JANUARY 7TH MEETING WAS RESCHEDULED TO JANUARY 8, 2004 | | Disposition: |
|--|--|-----------------------|
| COMMUNICATIONS | | |
| 1 | Request of Charles E. Long to address Council regarding the New Year's holiday (Communication) | PLACED ON FILE |
| 2 | Request of Watchman to address Council regarding church (Communication) | PLACED ON FILE |
| 3 | Request of Todd Kurylowicz to address Council regarding the lack of morals in politics (Communication) | PLACED ON FILE |
| 4 | Request of Glenn Warren to address Council regarding free speech limited to 8 hours (Communication) | PLACED ON FILE |

January 8, 2005

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| TIME CERTAIN | | |
| 5 | TIME CERTAIN: 9:30 AM – Accept the report on Homeownership in the City of Portland for Program Years 2001-2002 and 2002-2003 (Report; introduced by Mayor Katz) | CONTINUED TO JANUARY 21, 2004 AT 9:30 AM TIME CERTAIN |
| CONSENT AGENDA – NO DISCUSSION | | |
| 6 | Statement of cash and investments November 20, 2003 through December 17, 2003 (Report; Treasurer) (Y-4) | PLACED ON FILE |
| Mayor Vera Katz | | |
| 7 | Authorize City's initiation of an unfair labor practice complaint against the Portland Police Association (Resolution) (Y-3; N-1, Leonard) | 36194 |
| *8 | Pay claim of Anna Marie Spindler (Ordinance) (Y-4) | 178125 |
| *9 | Amend contract with Shannon & Wilson, Inc. for completion of geotechnical engineering services for Fire Station 1 (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 34429) (Y-4) | 178126 |
| *10 | Create a new Nonrepresented classification of Hydroelectric Power Project Manager and establish a compensation rate for this classification (Ordinance) (Y-4) | 178127 |
| *11 | Approve annexation to the City of Portland of property in case number A-1-03, 6824 SE Clatsop St. (Ordinance) (Y-4) | 178128 |
| Commissioner Jim Francesconi | | |
| *12 | Authorize payment to Pioneer Courthouse Square, Inc. for security services management (Ordinance) (Y-4) | 178129 |
| *13 | Amend contract with Mayer/Reed for interpretive signage design work to extend contract and increase contract amount (Ordinance; amend Contract No. 34703) (Y-4) | 178130 |

January 8, 2005

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>*14 Authorize an agreement with Police Activities League to provide payment for operational support for youth programs (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p> | <p align="center">178131</p> |
| <p>*15 Apply to Oregon Department of Transportation for Special Transportation Grant funds in the amount of \$30,000 for development of a neighborhood specific map highlighting transit routes and stops, elderly and disabled residential facilities, medical facilities, grocery stores, community centers and libraries in the Interstate Corridor (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p> | <p align="center">178132</p> |
| <p>*16 Apply to Tri-Met for \$133,310 for FY 04/05 and \$134,725 for FY 05/06 to provide regional Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality funds for project management, technical and marketing expertise and services to the CarpoolMatchNW project (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p> | <p align="center">178133</p> |
| <p align="center">Commissioner Dan Saltzman</p> | |
| <p>17 Authorize a contract and provide payment for the construction of improvements at the Stephenson Pump Station site (Second Reading Agenda 1460) (Y-4)</p> | <p align="center">178134</p> |
| <p align="center">Commissioner Erik Sten</p> | |
| <p>*18 Authorize subrecipient agreement with Rebuilding Together with Christmas in April for \$31,181 to provide home repair services and provide for payment (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p> | <p align="center">178135</p> |
| <p align="center">REGULAR AGENDA</p> | |
| <p align="center">Mayor Vera Katz</p> | |
| <p>19 Authorize water revenue bonds to refund outstanding bonds and to finance new water system improvements; prohibit use of proceeds for Mt. Tabor open reservoir project or burial of reservoirs (Ordinance)</p> | <p align="center">PASSED TO SECOND READING JANUARY 14, 2004 AT 9:30 AM</p> |
| <p>20 Authorize bonds to refund outstanding Series 1995 water revenue bonds and Series 1993 general obligation water refunding bonds (Ordinance)</p> | <p align="center">PASSED TO SECOND READING JANUARY 14, 2004 AT 9:30 AM</p> |
| <p align="center">Commissioner Jim Francesconi</p> | |

January 8, 2005

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>21 Endorse the formation of a Bi-State Coordination Committee and its Charter to replace the Bi-State Transportation Committee and expand scope to include transportation, land use, economic development and environmental justice issues in the vicinity of the I-5 corridor in the Portland-Vancouver area (Resolution) (Y-4)</p> | <p align="center">36195</p> |
| <p>*22 Authorize funding agreement with Oregon Health and Science University for pre-construction and engineering services for the Marquam Hill Aerial Tram (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p> | <p align="center">178136</p> |
| <p>*23 Authorize agreement with Doppelmayr CTEC, Inc. for pre-construction services for the Marquam Hill Aerial Tram (Ordinance) Motion to reconsider: Moved by Mayor Katz and gavelled down after no objections. Motion to accept amendment to add a new paragraph “a” to the “Now Therefore” section; The Mayor and the Auditor are hereby authorized to execute a funding agreement with Doppelmayr CTEC Inc., in a form substantially similar to the form attached to the original of this Ordinance, and by reference made a part hereof. (Exhibit A): Moved by Commissioner Francesconi and gavelled down by Mayor Katz after no objections. (Y-4)</p> | <p align="center">178137 AS AMENDED</p> |
| <p align="center">Commissioner Dan Saltzman</p> | |
| <p>*24 Authorize the Chief Engineer of the Bureau of Water Works to apply for and accept water right permits and certificates for ground water development in the Bull Run (Ordinance) (Y-4)</p> | <p align="center">178138</p> |

At 3:28 p.m., Council adjourned.

GARY BLACKMER
Auditor of the City of Portland

By Karla Moore-Love
Clerk of the Council

For a discussion of agenda items, please consult the following Closed Caption Transcript.

January 8, 2005

WEDNESDAY, 2:00 PM, JANUARY 8, 2004

**DUE TO LACK OF AN AGENDA
THERE WAS NO MEETING**

January 8, 2005

Transcript of Portland City Council Meeting

(Note: no TV or closed captioning service due to storm. This transcript done from audio tape)

Key: ***** means unidentified speaker.

JANUARY 8, 2004

Katz: Everybody, Council will now come to order. Karla please call the roll. We'll sit and wait for the rest of the Council members. I know they are here. Let's take communications, item one.

Item 1.

(Charles E. Long not present)

Item 2.

(Watchman not present)

Item 3.

Todd Kurylowicz: My name is Todd Kurylowicz, veteran of armed forces four years '94-'98. I live in Portland and I'm a critic of policy set by the people that sit before me. Title 14 is what I could I guess get on the most that dictates behavior on public property. Such as sitting on sidewalks and engaging in human activities such as sleeping. Glad to see everyone is in good health after the snow hit. It was pretty intense. Actually I heard about the one homeless person who froze to death.

Anybody hear about that? I don't know what bridge he was underneath, but he died in the cold while other people were in houses keeping warm. I can't imagine stumbling on a dead body, frozen, covered with snow, but it's not incredibly pleasant to think of. And to think of people out there trying to survive in this and the fact that there is not enough shelter space and you can't have a blanket and can't keep warm. I just don't understand that. Well I can understand it as far as how the system works and how you can't keep the people too comfortable. They might keep their palms up. There's still no justifications, and I've asked for justifications in this communications period. And you've said it's for me to talk to you time, but as people who are running the city, I've given you time to respond in a public forum. If there is any moral justification it should be easy to point out. But homeless veterans are sitting on sidewalks being harassed by policed officers trying to get change to scrape by. And it's illegal. I don't understand it. How people can sit and enforce these laws. It's chilling, no pun intended with the weather. It troubles me. But I hope you all keep warm and safe and drive safe and spend some time to think about the people that are out there. They are people.

Item 4.

Glenn Warren: Good afternoon. My name is Glenn Warren and I am a resident of Portland, planet earth. It's very regrettable and disturbing to me that I have to even discuss this, but it needs to be done. Unfortunately we only have 3 minutes and I'm not that articulate. I'm very nervous, I don't like this format. I told you people on City Council this before. It's important that we sit and talk like human beings. I'm sure if any one of you or anyone in this room were asked, if someone was to change the constitution, amend it or restrict it, they would find this a deplorable action without some due public process. They would find this an act of treason. But unfortunately here in Portland Oregon this is what we have. We have slipped into an ordinance under the guise of a guideline so that there is no question by anybody. This is all done behind closed doors that we can only express our freedom of speech in a public place for 8 hours at a time. If we do not disburse we are subject to arrest. This is heinous. This is the message we are sending to the rest of the world, to people in Iraq about democracy. That it is a sham and it doesn't exist. That you just got bombed and our companies from America are going to rebuild it and charge you from your own resources.

January 8, 2005

And it's all for freedom and democracy. And people are protesting in Iraq and being shot for it. And here in America we're getting silenced. People didn't suffer their lives away through the generations here in America for equal rights for everybody to have it destroyed in a single stroke of a pen behind closed doors, quietly. This is not going to go unnoticed and I'm not going to stop talking about it. I know I'm not the only one. These little 3 minute sound bites that people are so used to because of the commercial world we live in is only temporary. Things are going to get very heated here in this country and people are going to be heard. Thank you.

Katz: Thank you. Consent Agenda items—item 7 will be pulled off the Consent Agenda. Any other items to be removed by either City Council members or anybody in the audience? Hearing none, roll call on Consent Agenda.

Francesconi: Aye. **Leonard:** Aye. **Saltzman:** Aye

Katz: Mayor votes Aye. Item 7.

Item 7.

Katz: You all are aware of this item. While we were experiencing this snow storm, Commissioner Leonard stopped by my office and asked if we could pull this off and I had agreed. I also agreed to something else which I will share later. Right now let me shift this to Commissioner Leonard

Leonard: I asked this item to be pulled off, not because I was unaware of it. I had discussions with the city attorney's office. The basis of this item is that it is an unfair labor practice that if passed would be filed by the city against the portland police association. So those police officers that are sergeants and police officers in the city would be the subject of an unfair labor practice by the city. That was explained to me by the city attorney's office to make the case that the police officers' union had improved its position in its final best offer to the arbitrator on items by reducing its request to their arbitrator in certain specific areas that they hadn't bargained with the city about prior to that. I think it was characterized as enhancing their position or improving it. I said at the time I would like to have the cases. I was given the cases, read them, talked to the police union about their response. They had quite a different response than you can imagine was presented to me and I'd like to have the entire council better understand this. For this reason, we characterize employees as being members of our family. However, when we take actions like this—actually filing an unfair labor practice that doesn't feel to me like we're treating them like family. I think it's long term divisive, causes morale problems that we all end up dealing with later, no matter who wins. For me these kinds of actions should be something that are done with everybody clearly understanding what the issues are. I would greatly appreciate, before the Council takes a position on this that we understand better for both sides what the issue is.

Lory Kraut, Deputy City Attorney: Do you have specific questions Commissioner Leonard?

Leonard: Yes I do. Why are you recommending we file an unfair labor practice?

Kraut: Ok. I would just like to offer to the Council, I'm not sure that open session is the best time for us to be talking about legal strategy.

Leonard: At some point you have to file a legal petition with the employment relations board and you have to have certain allegations in the petition. I haven't seen that. We're voting on authorizing you doing that. Once that's filed it is a public record. I'm not asking you so much to reveal a certain strategy as I am specifically what it is you are alleging they violated in pecva (? unintelligible) and the basis for the unfair labor practice. That's not a strategy, that's a charge.

Katz: You don't need to talk about the strategy, just what the content is.

Kraut: What the content of the complaint is. Basically there are 2 claims for relief. The first claim is that the union, the ppa, failed to bargain in good faith. And there are a number of components to that first claim for relief. The first count is that the city believes that we reached a tentative agreement with the union on one particular proposal—that is transfer of prisoners. The union has not recognized that tentative agreement. It is an unfair labor practice to go back on a

January 8, 2005

tentative agreement. So that's the first count in the first claim for relief. There is another count related to the transport of prisoners. The case law under the employment relations board says that you may not interject a new issue from the final offer to the last best offer. We're saying that the union has done that in their proposal for transport of prisoners. The third allegation is that the union has interjected a new issue with respect to health care proposal. I'm not sure if you want me to back up a little bit and explain case law, but there is a process that is required under the public employees collective bargaining act and in that process the parties file what is called the final offer. Subsequent to that right before the interest arbitration they file a last best offer. Case law says you may not interject a new issue, one that has not been subjected to the 'crucible of bargaining' in your last best offer. The allegation is that the PPA changed its proposal with respect to health care from its final offer to its last best offer without bargaining it. The fourth allegation relates to the ppa's proposal on wages. Again this goes from changing in a significant way from the final offer to the last best offer. And then there is an allegation that under the totality of the circumstances if the employment relations board looks at a number of other things that would not stand alone it would conclude that the ppa has failed to bargain in good faith. The second claim for relief is that the ppa is pursuing permissive subjects of bargaining to interest arbitration. The law says that only mandatory subjects must be decided by the interest arbitrator. And the city attorney's office believes that the ppa's last best offer is permissive in a number of respects. One is a provision regarding retirees in the ppa's last best offer. Retirees are not public employees within the meaning of the public employees collective bargaining act and therefore it's a permissive subject of bargaining. The other major example in the complaint is there is a proposal for pager pay in the ppa's proposal. In the hearing it became quite clear to the City that the proposal really is a penalty for management doing the things it's entitled to do under the law in terms of operating the police bureau and under the case law, a proposal that is in essence a penalty for the city exercising its management rights is a permissive subject of bargaining. So that's essentially the totality of the complaint.

Katz: Anna, did you want to add anything?

Anna Kanwit, Operations Manager, Bureau of Human Resources: I don't have anything to add concerning the specific allegations, but the case law is clear that if it's a significant improvement that is a violation if it has not been subjected to the bargaining process. As an example the one percent decrease in the ppa's wage offer from the final offer to the last best offer over the life of the contract is \$1.8 million over the cost of living. So that is significant. I of course expect if we file the complaint that the Portland Police Association would dispute it, just as we have disputed the allegations in the complaint they filed against the city. But it would be up to the employment relations board to determine the validity of those claims under the case law just as it is under the unfair labor practices they filed against the city.

Katz: Let me just say, Commissioner Leonard wanted to raise some of this issue. We have a time issue before us, right? The deadline for filing this complaint?

Kraut: We're not that close to it. The law provides 180 days from the date of the alleged violation to file.

Leonard: When is the 6 months up?

Kraut: Sometime in February.

Leonard: We had been told it had to be sometime today. It doesn't have to be today?

Kraut: No. It wouldn't be prudent to get too close to the deadline, but it's certainly not today. We have not cut it that close.

Katz: Did anybody tell us that it had to be today? From your shop?

Kraut: I don't believe so.

Kanwit: I don't think so.

January 8, 2005

Katz: I wanted to clarify, because the discussion with Commissioner Leonard was if it had to be today we would vote on it. If we had a little bit of time, it would depend on what the Council would do. The bottom line was that I made a commitment that we would give an opportunity for both sides to sit down one more time with a clear understanding that there is no additional resources available. One more time to see if we can get to some agreement so that we can act as a family, as Commissioner Leonard said.

Leonard: I would appreciate the opportunity since these would heard the elements of what the ulp would be to have a response.

Katz: We will do that, but I don't want—Will are you listening because you may be the one that's going to be here—I don't want a diatribe for an hour on those issues. You can argue that in front of the employment relations board. If you can just outline some of the issues if that's what you want. Maybe you don't want to do that.

Kraut: Before we turn it over I do want to just state that it's incumbent on both parties to put on their strongest case possible at the interest arbitration. Part of putting on a strong case is identifying the failings of the other side. That's incumbent on both parties. And the ppa certainly has filed unfair labor practices and identified what it perceived to be the weaknesses or failings in the City's case. The law does provide for that. It does not necessarily mean that is poor labor relations. There are rules both parties are required to play by. It's incumbent for parties to identify when they perceive the other side has not played by the rules.

Saltzman: Two questions. First of all, in the city's history, has there ever been a collective bargaining unit we have not had a successor agreement with for over 2 ½ years?

Kanwit: I don't think that we have done that since 1991 when I started with the city. I could be wrong, but I think we have generally reached agreements certainly within a year of the contract expiring.

Katz: I think that's accurate.

Saltzman: Secondly, as explained to me—and I really don't think it's incumbent upon us to get into discussions of what our strategy is for filing an unfair labor practice—I have no problem with anyone sitting down with the ppa anytime, but from what I've heard we should go ahead and vote to file this unfair labor practice. I don't think it's the penultimate melt down of the family. We've already had them filed against us. They've been filed against us by other bargaining units in the past. As far as I understand, it's all part of the dance of negotiation/arbitration. It's all part of a big dance, football game, whatever. You take various strategic maneuvers to protect your best interest. I'm no expert in this, but as explained to me by people whose opinions I do respect that this is a strategic move that we should take at this point. It doesn't mean people can't sit down and talk. I hope they will sit and talk and we reach an agreement. We should go forward today with the resolution before us. I don't see why we should delay further.

Katz: And it doesn't mean that we can't withdraw it at some time.

Francesconi: Just briefly, what's the nature of the union's unfair labor practices claims against the city?

Kraut: With all do respect, it's very hard to briefly say that. It was a 100 page complaint. That's the latest. There's been 3 unfair labor practice complaints filed.

Francesconi: OK, I took three main things alleged that we think they did wrong. How many allegations are they making against us?

Kanwit: In the one complaint I don't know the numbers. The other 2 complaints have to do with the "me too" clause, the one we first negotiated with DCTU, we litigated that before the labor relations board. The city prevailed on that complaint, although ppa has appealed that to the Court of appeals. The second ulp concerned the "me too" clause that was negotiated similarly with portland fire fighters association. That case has been heard, but not yet decided. The third is the one that

January 8, 2005

Lory was referring to, the 100 page complaint. It has a number of allegations.

Leonard: The first thing I want to say is, Lory, you're right. You're doing your job and I have no criticism of that. I appreciate the fact that you and Anna have a certain responsibility and you're doing what you need to do. I do think, however, that when the city council is asked to vote on something, we have a responsibility to look at it and ask questions. Particularly if it affects our relationship with our employees. And Commissioner Saltzman, you're right. This is the way negotiations occur in Portland. And I can say that with some experience. But if you keep doing the same things over and over, getting the same results which create animosity—and I can say within the city workforce there is some animosity towards management which we're a part of—it's time to look at what we're doing and ask questions. Employee groups file unfair labor practices against employers. I've had a number of them filed against me since I've been here. Often times the reaction from the city is, it happened to us, let's do it to the units. It's part of how we do business. In my opinion we have a dysfunctional relationship with employee groups because we accept that as part of how we relate to employees because we don't ask enough questions when we take actions like this. I think you have to break the cycle by doing something different. Since we don't have to pass this today, it actually gives me some reason to be hopeful that maybe we can withdraw it until we get to the timeline that will cause us to not be able to file it if we pass the 180 day and sit down and have discussions. Like we did with the teachers, I believe we can find a solution. I do not believe that where people come reasonably to a table that can't find a solution without having to fight with each other. And then one side wins and one side loses and the side that lost always waits to get even. That's the cycle of relationships in this city with our employees. It has been for 25 years that I know of. I'd like to do something to try to break it.

Saltzman: I can appreciate everything you said, but I also accept the strategic reasoning I was given when I was asked to support this filing of unfair labor practice from the city's financial bottom line point of view. Right now the differences between the two offers are of such financial magnitude that I support filing these unfair labor practices without going into further detail. Notwithstanding all the harmony we can hope to effect between our labor unions and the city employees, but there is strategic value. While I'm certainly willing to take this off and have further talks, I don't see any reason not to go ahead and take this action, protect our action and have those talks as well.

Kraut: These are separate proceedings. I would not advise council get close to the deadline. There are many uncertainties when it comes to what is the precise date to file. You can, as the Mayor suggested, you can always withdraw.

Katz: Ok, we're not going to have a discussion now between ourselves. We're going to open it up to the public, if anyone wants to testify. Then I'll take a motion.

Robert King, President Portland Police Association: I'm Robert King, president of portland police association. I'm glad to have an opportunity to speak to you today. We think that there are issues at hand that are much larger than this unfair labor practice. We think this is a critical time in our relationship between the police officers and you the Council. It's an opportunity for me to look each one of you in the eye and ask you for help. Over the last 2 years we've been bargaining this contract and we've watched you intervene to settle a potential school strike. We've watched you settle with the fire fighters where you gave them 2% on top of the cpi. You recently settled with command officers for 2% on top of cpi, and we listen to you as you tell us you won't make us that same offer. We've watched our wages decline to the point where we're no longer the highest paid agency in the state and we can no longer recruit experienced police officers as lateral transfers from other Oregon agencies. We've watched our job get more complicated and more difficult to perform. Officers go through their work everyday knowing they are under a microscope. We deal with the second highest violent crime rate of any city in this country. And yet the city spends 13%

January 8, 2005

less on its police than the average big city. It's been since 1984 that the ppa was in arbitration with the city. Our officers were paid 2% more than similar sized west coast cities. Today they are paid 17% less than these same cities. We find ourselves genuinely confused. And now, not unlike—we've worked with you in the past on a series of issues that required a collaborative approach. We worked with you to structure the ipr which we think has been working and is effective in a variety of positive ways. The parc report has identified several key issues that you believe are important to improve the credibility and integrity of the investigative process. The recent shooting, the Greyhound bus depot shooting, the officer involved was interviewed within 24 hours. All the officers who were witnesses were interviewed that night. Things like that happen between the ppa and the city because of our leadership. We tried to be patient during this process, we tried to understand your interests. We've modified our wage position, our health insurance position. We've done this to come closer to yours. We haven't seen you budge 1/10th of 1% on any issue. We've requested meeting after meeting to settle this contract and on several occasions Mayor, of course, I've come to you. We have made an effort to settle the contract and you've told us you're not interested in reaching an agreement. We'll finish this arbitration if we have to. We're comfortable with our position and think it's going well. We think the unfair labor practice is wrong and mostly I guess, Mayor Katz, I'm asking you to make a commitment publicly today to meet with us personally to settle this contract.

Katz: Your time is up. I have met with you. We have discussed it and I said at the beginning of this that I'm willing to sit down with the team one more time. But I've also said that there is no ability on the part of this council, especially if members of this council want to deal with some business related issues that will cost us an additional \$3 million, there is no additional resource. We need to be sure we clearly understand that we may get to a point where we ask you to be a little more flexible just like we had opportunities with some other unions you mentioned, so that we can add a little bit of resources on the table. It's got to be a give on both sides. I'm willing to do that.

Leonard: I'd like to hear the response to the seven issues that I heard laid out by the city attorney that were elements of the ulp. I don't know if you took notes on those?

Katz: I'm not sure this is terribly helpful right now.

Leonard: Excuse me, it's helpful to me. I'm being asked by the Mayor's office to vote on something and I want to know what I'm voting on. I want to hear the response.

Will Aitcheson, Attorney for Portland Police Association: Madam Mayor and Council, I am Will Aitcheson, attorney for the ppa. I did not take notes.

Leonard: I did. The first one was...went back on the tentative agreement with the ppa.

Aitcheson: With respect to the tentative agreement, on the subject of prisoner transport and rate of compensation, there is no tentative agreement. Tentative agreements at our table are initialed and signed by the chief spokesperson. There was none. Nothing signed or initialed. The only thing there is is correspondence in August 2003 that reflects the absence of a tentative agreement.

Leonard: How about the new issue on the transport of prisoners?

Aitcheson: I think that flows from the first issue. I didn't understand it.

Leonard: How about the new issue on health care proposal?

Aitcheson: The ppa's health care proposal changed substantially from the final offer to the last best offer. What the ppa did was to move from its old position which basically required you to maintain the old city-select plan. In its last best offer it accepted virtually all the changes to City core which are the 25% reduction.

Leonard: But did you bargain that prior to submitting the final best offer?

Aitcheson: There was no negotiation between the final offer and the last best offer.

Leonard: Isn't that the concern the city attorney's office is raising?

Aitcheson: Yes, but this is where I'm totally at sea. I think what the city attorney is raising is a

January 8, 2005

claim of regressive bargaining, which is taking a new position without bargaining with it. We have moved closer to the city's position. For example on wages we were at cpi plus 3%. We're now at cpi plus 2%. That's what the process is all about. To get the parties closer. So I'm lost.

Leonard: Since the arbitration have you sat down and talked with them about that proposal?

Aitcheson: Since the arbitration started, yes. We've had full negotiating team meetings with the city.

Leonard: And you just mentioned the wage proposal was a 1% drop.

Aitcheson: We came 1% closer to your position.

Leonard: And the bargain in good faith is just permissive subjects. Did you know what those were?

Aitcheson: Yes I do. There's three topics there. One category is the 7 issues we have in arbitration, the 2nd is the one in which we reached tentative agreements; the third is the category of all those things in the contract that neither side opened negotiations on. Neither side proposed like on the preamble and things like that, that have not been tentatively agreed to. They were thought by us to simply be included in the next contract. The city has identified 14 of those issues on which neither side made a proposal as being permissive for bargaining and is apparently going to file a complaint saying those should not continue into the new contract.

Leonard: And the last one I took a note on was page pay—the concern that somehow the proposal would effect management's ability to manage.

Aitcheson: Our proposal was simply if you put someone on "on call" status and require that they stay within radio range of a pager or respond immediately to a call for service, refrain from alcohol and you subject them to discipline if they do not meet those requirements, that they receive 1 hour of compensation for each 6 hours they are on on call status.

Leonard: You haven't done anything that somehow suggests that you're trying to manage...

Aitcheson: No, and those proposals are modeled after provisions in your contracts with DCTU and the firefighters and other labor organizations.

Leonard: Did you have anything to add, Robert?

Katz: Does anybody else want to testify? Roll call.

Francesconi: There's much that we agree upon. We need to continue to do more to improve labor relations, including with the police union. That's why I supported taking more money out of the healthcare reserve fund to try to help on that issue. I also personally intervened over the initial objections if not permanent objections of the city attorney's office to resolve the ulp within the department of transportation against afsme. I thought that was the right thing to do, given the fact that we're trying to move ahead. So I understand that. I also with Commissioner Leonard's leadership, and the mayor's leadership—we're doing our budget process differently to include labor at the front end before decisions are made. So there's more we need to do. The question in front of us is do we need to resolve, not file against the police union? I have to take note that they've filed ulps against us in the same case. Do we do that to improve labor relations against the advice of the Commissioner in charge? And the city attorney who is telling us we need to do this? In listening to Robert King, who I greatly respect—he has to represent his members. And his members have done a lot to help us on police shooting cases in a way that Robert talked about and other police discipline cases by increasing civilian oversight which is very difficult for police to accept. In listening to though, Robert, your testimony was all about the contract, not about the ulp. Which is something we do need to make attempts to resolve, but not the fundamental issue in front of us. I still can support this ulp without telling you at this point based on mayor, city attorney and staff there is reasonable grounds. Whether we prevail or not is another issue. And we can still have that fundamental conversation that you want to have. Aye.

Leonard: There are another of issues since I've been here which I forecast that in the future,

January 8, 2005

employee represented groups will not agree with me on and take legal action because of positions I've taken. I only do that when I think that I really have no choice, either given employee conduct or policies that I think are important to the citizens that in balance outweigh the interest of the employee groups. But I take that very seriously. I also take very seriously when I tell employees that I do think they are part of our family. And I try to treat the people that I have responsibility for that way. I don't sue members of my family. I could sue members of my family. There are people in my family that have violated my rights a number of times from my children to my parents. And I could sue them. And I could also look forward, as those of us who watched the Mary and Abe Lincoln series the last three nights on PBS, when Mary was committed by her son Robert, to probably never see my children again. Or whoever in my family that I sued. I think it is a sign of a problem when you're resolving your disputes this way. I'm not ameliorating employee groups that file ulps against us either. We need to get to the place where we can resolve our differences in a more civil manner, and we're not doing that. All people who work for the city should be honored by us. Nobody should be treated less than that. Especially the people that go to work and place themselves in particular special hazards to protect us should be honored. Where there is a benefit of the doubt, we should give them the benefit of the doubt. If there is no doubt, that's fine and we should do something different. As I understood when we came into this debate we had to file the ulp today, or the 180 days would expire. I've learned today that's not true. I'm especially disturbed that we would go ahead and pass this knowing there isn't a deadline in front of us to pass it. So for no other reason than that, I can't support filing this ulp. No.

Saltzman: I think the facts supporting our filing the unfair labor practice will not change. If we set this over a week or 2 weeks, the facts are not going to change. The question simply becomes do we take this strategic move of filing an unfair labor practice? From everything I've been told this is a wise move on our part. Indeed, if it hadn't 2 ½ years that we've been going at this trying to reach an agreement, and there haven't been somewhat crocodile tears, we've had a 100 page unfair labor practice filed against us by the portland police association. I can't imagine them taking too much emotional offense at our filing this motion for strategic values. As I said earlier, this is part of the dance that seems to be played. I don't understand the game well. It baffles me how Oregon labor law works, but it does have a process and it does have certain moves and steps that people take. This is one of those steps. This is a necessary step we should take. Aye.

Katz: I'm going to refrain from commenting on the testimony that Robert made before the council because I think Commissioner Francesconi is right, it doesn't deal with this issue. I don't want to belabor the points that were made at this time. I made a commitment that we will sit down again, but Robert knows what the ground rules are on that score. There isn't additional resources to be put on the table at this time. In fact, there are possibly less resources today than there were at the first time we talked about it. We have some choices and we'll be willing to sit down and lay them out, but when it comes to the unfair labor practice I will support it. My hope is that we can get to some agreement and we can withdraw it, but I think it protects the city and I will vote Aye.

Alright. Time Certain item 5.

Item 5.

Katz: We've been asked to delay this until -- (date has not been set). Ok we'll wait until the staff is ready to make the presentation. Any objections? Hearing none, so ordered. Let's continue it to next week. Alright, regular agenda. Let's do item 19 and 20.

Items 19 and 20.

Saltzman: Madame mayor, members of the council, we are here today with two ordinances that would do several things. I'll have Ken or Eric explain them in more detail, but basically it is seeking permission to go to the bond market for financing water bureau improvements not related to the Mt. Tabor reservoir replacement project, but other capital needs the water bureau has. The other

January 8, 2005

part will deal with saving rate payer money by repaying a line of credit and refinancing two bond series. Again to save rate payers' money. With that I'll turn it over to Ken and Eric.

Ken Rust, Chief Financial Officer and Director of Bureau of Financial Services: Ken Rust, chief financial officer and director of bureau of financial services. With me is Eric Johansen, debt manager for the city. There are two ordinances. Ordinance 19 ...under the city charter it will do 3 things. It will allow us to repay a line of credit in the amount of \$25 million that is owed to Wells Fargo Bank. It is a line of credit that is due March 1st of this year. We will also be able to refund some 1993 water revenue bonds in the amount of about \$16 million that will save ratepayers' money. We would like to execute that financing and achieve that savings for ratepayers. The third element is to fund ongoing capital projects of the water bureau. This may sound familiar to you. In October of last year the Council passed an ordinance that would have authorized in effect to do many of the same things. That authority was under the state uniform revenue bond act that the city had undertaken about a year prior to that. That action has since been contested in circuit court by a group that is concerned about some of the projects the water bureau is engaged in and has not allowed us to issue bonds. In fact we have promised the court that while that litigation is pending we will not issue bonds under that prior uniform revenue bond act authority. However, the bureau does have important capital needs that need to be taken care of. We do have a line of credit we need to repay. There are rate savings we would like to achieve for ratepayers by doing a refunding of bonds. So what we have proposed to do is that we will not spend any proceeds on the Mt. Tabor project or the burial of any existing reservoirs but we will fund construction and do it under the city's charter authority. This is our first reading, there will be a second reading and a 30 day referral period. Assuming no referral we will then move to get the bond issued as quickly as possible and to execute the financing to achieve the ratepayer savings and fund the water bureau construction program. The second ordinance is purely a refunding. It allows the city to take advantage of low interest rates and further increase savings for rate payers.

Katz: Let me just add that one of the lessons we learned during the last 2 ½ days is that our infrastructure needs some major attention. Especially some of our old pipes that have been broken, much do to the weather. If we can continue meeting those kind of obligations and continue our investment in what is a very important part of the city business then we need to pass this and other measures to make sure our investments are protected. Anybody else want to testify on this? Passes to second. Item 20, anybody want to testify on item 20? Passes to second.

Item 21.

Katz: Let me just say as we're getting staff up here, I am thrilled to pass this on to Commissioner Francesconi—he wants to give it back to me. As most of you know we spent probably over a year dealing with a lot of these issues and we knew that our large committee from the State of Oregon and the State of Washington couldn't continue meeting on some of these issues, so Commissioner Francesconi is very happy to take this on and that's why this item is on the agenda.

Francesconi: Each jurisdiction is passing this. It's the next phase of the Bi-State Committee that the Mayor sat on. Serena Cruz is representing the County and Rex Burkholter is taking the leadership role from Metro. There are a lot of others. I want to emphasize a couple of things and then I'm going to pass it to Laurel. The primary purpose is land use and transportation. Planning is our partner with PDOT on this and I appreciate the good staffing I've received on this. But there is also the components of economic development and environmental justice with the displacement of the old Minnesota freeway and what that did to the residents. So those are the primary components of this, but land use and transportation have taken the lead on it. It's also a very important freight corridor that needs major attention. The other thing I want to point out and this was important to all the jurisdictions, is that the committee holds no regulatory authority, but builds and sustains regional dialogue. Our region includes Vancouver and this is an approach to expand the region on

January 8, 2005

land use and transportation as well as economic strategies, but to take kind of baby steps in that regard. So it has no statutory authority, but it is helping build a relationship. Go ahead Laurel.

Laurel Wentworth, Office of Transportation: I couldn't have said it better for either the Mayor or Commissioner Francesconi and I will not add anything to that. Thank you very much, you hit everything on the head.

Katz: Anyone else want to testify? If not, roll call.

Francesconi: I've learned a lot. Especially about Vancouver and the Washington side and what their needs are and actually how they view us with decreasing distrust—increasing trust as we move forward and that's a healthy sign. Aye.

Leonard: Aye **Saltzman:** Aye

Katz: Commissioner Francesconi is absolutely right. That was a wonderful opportunity to build that trust between the two sides and for them also to realize how important additional transportation corridors, including light rail, and I want to underline light rail, is important to not only Oregon but also Washington. There was a little bit of paranoia which you will have to work through as this is enacted and one of that was the concern of those of us from the Oregon side that we made a strong commitment to land use and transportation and to housing and trying to maintain a tight urban growth boundary. The State of Washington until just recently did not make that same decision. And so the conversation about expansion of land for lower density housing versus tightening up the growth boundary on the other side of the river was really a large portion of that conversation. The question was raised as: It doesn't make much sense to put a lot of money in transportation if you're going to expand your urban growth boundary and then create the need for additional transportation dollars as you push further out into the boonies. I think even our friends of the other side of the river understood that and supported this and hope that that message gets translated over and over again. We'll be partners in financing the improvements on both Washington and the Oregon side, but we're going to be partners if both of us adhere to sound land use policies. Aye. OK, item 22.

Item 22 and 23.

Francesconi: This is Matt Brown from the Department of Transportation. He sent a very helpful memo to the Council on January 6th. There are just two points I want to make. And Vic Rhodes is here who is the staff to the PATI board. The purpose of this contract is to help us make sure the tram can do what it is supposed to do. That it has functional integrity, especially the upper end. And it's also to make sure we have a high quality product, but also it can help us in reducing costs. So there's been a lot of talk in the media and we do need a well-functioning tram that's well designed to meet the hopes and dreams of not only the neighborhood and the city, but also that's cheaper. And so the second point I want to make—and there's also cost savings that have been identified. The second point is we're not approving the tram by this vote. We are improving that if we proceed with the tram that it's going to be able to do its job, and it will help us set the cost. When we finally make a go or no go decision will be tentatively scheduled for March 17th-18th. At that point we'll receive a final design recommendation including a final budget and financing plan. This contract helps prepare for that so we have the information to create the structural design but also the costs. At that point we'll also come forward with who's paying what.

Matt Brown, Project Manager, Office of Transportation: There are two items before you today. One is an interim funding agreement with OHSU basically to pay for their share of the preconstruction design work that will be going on over the next several months with Doppelmayer CTEC. The second, of course, is the pre-construction design contract with Doppelmayer CTEC, the tram manufacturer, essentially completing our design team for the tram. Just to step back one second, in August we engaged the firm of Angelil/Graham/Pfenninger/Scholl as a result of the design competition to be the lead architect for the tram. Portland Aerial Transportation Inc is

January 8, 2005

essentially leading that team effort. At the same time we also approved a process that's right around when the development agreement was being finalized, we could finally get these pieces going. A process to go through an alternative selection process for a tram manufacturer. We went through the requirements of ORS 279 waive those purchasing requirements, advertised an rfp in August and selected as a result of that process Doppelmayer to be our tram manufacturer. That was done in early November. We got 2 proposals, as you recall there are only 2 tram manufacturers worldwide, so we got both of them to submit which is great. Doppelmayer is really head and shoulders, the leader in tram manufacturers around the world and is going to be excellent for this project. We've negotiated the contract that's in front of you today. As commissioner Francesconi suggested, this is really going to help us lend the level of specificity and technical expertise that we've been missing to date on our team and already we've been able to make a number of modifications in the design in direct response to the technical requirements of the tram. In some cases those have saved us money, in other cases they've begun to lend some additional work. For instance on the upper terminus for how that needs to be designed. The funding for the contract, 81% OHSU, 18% City. The OHSU piece is coming through the interim funding agreement that is before us today. So it's a \$487,000 contract. The City is responsible for about \$88,000 of that. Again, we won't make any decisions in terms of ordering tram equipment or anything like that until this design work is done and we've made our other final decisions on the tram. Right now we're doing a design piece of this to complete our design team.

Katz: Matt, let me ask you, we did the charette on the design at the OHSU site. You are taking into account the results of that design charette?

Brown: Right. Most of the results of that focus on the pedestrian bridge and the public space itself and not the tram. I think people were generally pleased with the direction the tram had been taking, but there were suggestions about the pedestrian bridge. And we're still working with the community who is interested in having a say in that as well as the design.

Katz: OK. I was specific about the design and how those 2 connected. I want to thank you for your willingness to really participate on the understanding of the environment at the bottom of the tram. That also will be taken into account as the discussion of the design of the tram continues.

Brown: Yes.

Saltzman: This money comes out of the \$15.5 million total that's been authorized by the three parties?

Brown: That's correct.

Saltzman: And you say this is for \$487,000?

Brown: That's correct.

Saltzman: OK, it doesn't say the amount any where in the ordinance.

Brown: I think it talks about sharing the cost. The numbers are in the contract.

Saltzman: I don't see it in the contract either. Given the considerable misunderstanding the design firm seems to have had about how much money was available for this project, I think it's pretty important we nail down for Doppelmayer CTEC that there is \$487,000, not \$4 million.

Brown: The number is on the first page of the contract, if you look at "consideration", the third bolded statement down "The City agrees to pay contractor a sum not to exceed \$487,500 for this work.

Saltzman: OK, my mistake.

Leonard: I do have a couple of questions. The only group that was able to get in to see me the last 2 days was a group representing this neighborhood, coincidentally. And they raised a number of issues as you can imagine, but a couple of them seem to be relevant to this discussion. One was concerns about the pedestrian bridge that had been –I don't know if the right term is "promised"—but I recall having

January 8, 2005

Francesconi: Promised is a good word.

Leonard: I'm very careful how I characterize these things, but that's how I remembered it. Understand that I came in after this decision was made. My recollection is there was a pedestrian bridge at the foot of Gibbs St. over to the site. They represented to me that they had been told, either by a contractor or somebody that that was no longer an appropriate site for the pedestrian bridge and it was going to be moved somewhere south.

Brown: The discussion, and this was somewhat related to the charette that Mayor Katz was talking about. There was a charette on December 12-13, somewhere in that time, the Bureau of Planning brought in a lot of design professionals engaged in South Waterfront to talk about how this all fits together. There has always been on the plans for South Waterfront the notion of about four different pedestrian connections in and out of the South Waterfront area. Not just one or the other. One of the suggestions that came out was look at moving the bridge to Gaines because early on in the district, it connects to the neighborhood park, you're able to utilize a new parking garage on the east side of Macadam and use that as part of the structure and elevator to get down to grade. There were a number of reasons to put forward for consideration. My approach on that has been, I want to bring that back to our citizen's advisory committee and talk to them about the trade offs on that and help us get to a final recommendation. We haven't made a decision on that at all at this point and we were supposed to have a CAC meeting on Monday that I cancelled due to the fear of weather. We'll be talking about that next Monday night with the community.

Leonard: I will tell you this I told them I would raise that issue. My recollection was a promise and one of the things that kind of mitigated some of the impact of the tram going down the middle of the street at least for me, and what I explained to them, was they would have access immediately at the end of their street to get over to this new project and the waterway. I would be very skeptical about moving that anywhere. Speaking for myself. I don't think I could get myself to slap those neighbors one more time.

Brown: I think eventually it will come back in the form of a recommendation from PDOT. We would have a hard time—the bridge is there for the neighborhood and if they told us that without equivocation the right place for it for the neighborhood is in a certain place, we would have a hard time ignoring that.

Leonard: But it was represented as –

Brown: I'm not sure how they got that message. It's always been clear to me that this needs further conversation with the neighborhood to get a sense for where—

Leonard: The reason they got that is—I recall seeing a map. I didn't just have it explained to me, I actually was looking at something that was shown to me that showed a pedestrian bridge over I-5.

Katz: Let me just add that there are a lot of other issues that were raised in the charette that need consideration. This is just one of them and it has to be looked as a whole in terms of the park and the development around that area. No final decision has been made. I would recommend Commissioner Leonard that you ask Planning or Matt to sit down with you and explain the charette at the bottom of the hill and see how it fits with the whole environment on the landing.

Leonard: I guess what I'm saying is I would be more comfortable if they explained the charette to those affected that think they were promised something. If it's ok with them, it's ok with me. I feel there is a perception that there has been a lack of public process. I want to make sure that at least things I understood were part of the deal remain part of the deal to the nth degree.

Brown: And I'll commit to doing that. It's not a problem at all. Again, we had Bureau of Planning scheduled to come in with our Citizens Advisory Committee to talk specifically about that. We'll do it next Monday instead, but that will happen.

Francesconi: On the perception about lack of public process is 100% accurate. There was no public process involved with the charette. But the charette was looking at some design issues.

January 8, 2005

There are some people in the neighborhood that may want the pedestrian bridge to actually connect to something which is going to be a park sooner than later because it's not clear if Zidell is actually going to move. And so it would connect to something. But there are other people in the neighborhood who feel that that's where it should be because of the reasons Commissioner Leonard said. Matt said it, maybe not clear enough. On behalf of PDOT as the Commissioner of Transportation, we're not moving that pedestrian bridge away from its current location unless there's strong sentiment. The current location is not down at the park, it's right where the tram is. We're not going to move it unless we get strong support in the neighborhood to move it. That's our position.

Leonard: That's all I'm asking. The other point is I don't care where it is as long as people feel like they've been including in deciding where it is. The other concern is about the community garden at Naito.

Brown: Actually what we've suggested in our early recommendations is that it be expanded and enhanced. We're moving in the opposite direction of their concerns, I believe. Long term as Naito is down graded, for instance, there will be extra right of way there that could expand that garden.

Leonard: OK, great, thank you.

Katz: Anybody else want to testify on those items? If not, roll call on 22.

Francesconi: We need a very good team to address both the structural issues presented especially the upper tram and this contract is going to help us do it, as is Sera, the architect. And then we want to still make it high quality and we have a terrific architect to do it. But we also want to make it cheaper and I'm very pleased that we've identified \$4-\$6 million in savings here from one estimated price. I appreciate all the work folks are doing. Aye.

Leonard: Aye

Saltzman: Well, my paranoia about having a number specified in the CTEC contract arises out of the concerns I have that the designer somehow seems to think that \$15.5 million was a political number. I don't believe it was. I sat here and asked the chairman of PATI several times whether \$15.5 million was the real number and was assured that. So I do resent the characterization by the designer and the media that somehow that was a political number and there's no way a tram can be built for \$15.5 million. Second to that is my resentment that I seem to be sensing that the movement afoot now by the PATI board members and others is to somehow say, well, if we come in at \$19 million we're still doing a tremendous job. Because now it's moved from \$15 to \$19, and if we come in at \$19 we should pat ourselves on the shoulders. I'm still holding out for \$15.5 million. That's the cost that was presented to us, the City Council, to PDC, to OHSU, to North Macadam Developers. We should be able to deliver a first class tram at that cost. I can't believe with all the talent involved on PATI and others that somehow they could blow it and not think of \$4-5 million in "soft costs" left out. The people involved in PATI are way way too experienced for that to happen. So that's my paranoia about us authorizing contracts and suddenly finding out, 'oh, those are just political numbers.' That's not acceptable. I don't believe it's a political number. I believe \$15.5 million is the number that all the parties signed off to. The designer should get on board too. Aye.

Katz: As I said, I want to thank PATI and Matt and everybody from the Planning Bureau and other design representatives from the community that were thinking about not only the tram, but where the tram lands. Where it begins, where it ends, because that becomes a public place and it can't land in a vacuum. It has to be a landing for the public to use. That was one of the discussions that focused around a park which made a lot of sense. Also the importance of the edges of the block and how they would be redeveloped. So my hope is that that conversation will continue and that all of that be finalized as soon as possible with the neighborhood and with the team that was working on it. Aye.

January 8, 2005

Item 23.

Katz: Roll call

Francesconi: Just to comment briefly on Commissioner Saltzman's comment. I think there is confusion over this point. But I think at \$15.5 the tram could be built, but it would be the ski lift variety and wouldn't meet the expectations of the neighborhood and others. I think that is the issue.

There is a question that we have to present back to the Council on March 17th which is the cost. The second question is who pays for it? It isn't going to be the public who pays all of this. That's for sure. That's the other part of the conversation we're going to have. And now I'm going to exercise just 20 seconds of personal privilege to thank another part of transportation—the maintenance bureau—that's out there plowing and sanding and doing a terrific job that no other city in Oregon is doing. I mean that—in keeping our arterials and connectors safe, the streets safe. I'm recognizing them. Also for the public safety vehicles, the buses and now today they are working on the secondary streets. We also appreciate the patience of the public who are also responding in a safe way. Finally, there has not been a lost time or serious accident of maintenance employees during any of this time. Thank you to all the public employees out there who are doing their work.

Katz: Let me use my privilege as Mayor to interrupt the roll call. Commissioner Eric Sten and his wife are now proud parents of a baby boy. Almost 7 lbs., so congratulations. [applause]

Leonard: Aye

Saltzman: As I said, when this was all sold to us, the tram and I don't mean 'sold' in the pejorative sense of the word, but \$15.5 million—nobody told me I was authorizing only a ski lift. So now suddenly after I've authorized \$15.5 million and us to pay for it, it's not the big gondolas and everything else we've seen in those great schematics, it's a ski lift. I don't buy it. Let's make this thing come in at \$15.5 million. It may not make the front page of Architectural Design, but it will be functional. It will get people from the top of the hill to the bottom. And do it in a cost effective manner. I'm still at \$15.5. Aye.

Moore: We have an amendment to this. We need to add a paragraph A to the "Now Therefore" section.

Auerbach: Move to reconsider it.

Katz: Any objections to reconsider? Hearing none, let's make a motion on the substitute.

Francesconi: I move we accept the substitute.

Katz: Roll Call

Francesconi: Aye.

Leonard: Commissioner Saltzman, I would just say that for just another \$100 you could have undercoat. [laughter] Aye.

Saltzman: Aye.

Katz: Mayor votes Aye.

Item 24.

Saltzman: Madam Mayor and members of the Council, this ordinance allows the Water Bureau's chief engineer to apply for and accept water right permits relating to development of groundwater in the Bull Run water shed. The water bureau for the past several years has explored the potential of groundwater resources in the Bull Run watershed itself through a series of well tests. The Bureau has identified there is a deep aquifer or groundwater pool that is capable of producing high quality groundwater—drinking water. So this project is part of the Bureau's strategy to increase the reliability of it's water supply by adding back up and supplemental wells at the top of the water system. The purpose of the proposed wells is as I said to benefit the Bull run system by increasing it's reliability with a third source in addition to our current groundwater field. When the City does submit the actual water rights acquisition package, it will be available for comment in its entirety. The Water Resources Department does provide a weekly public notification of pending water

January 8, 2005

rights. Water rights are determined by when you apply, so the sooner we apply the better. And that's what we will be doing with the passing of this ordinance.

Katz: Anybody want to testify? Roll call.

Francesconi: This sounds like a very good thing. As a back up source, this would be terrific. Aye.

Leonard: Aye.

Saltzman: Before I vote Aye, I also want to take my point of personal privilege and not only thank the Bureau of Maintenance but particularly want to thank Water Bureau employees as well as Bureau of Environmental Service employees who have labored long and hard over these past 4 or 5 days. Several main breaks and things like that which a bonding ordinance will help remedy those main breaks—but I want to thank them for all the hard work they've done too. Aye.

Katz: Mayor votes Aye. Before we stand adjourned, on behalf of the entire City Council I want to thank all of the City employees, and the State employees of ODOT and PDOT, Water Bureau, the Parks Bureau, Police, Fire, 911 for coming in on Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday for maintaining our City and for making it safer for everybody else. And I want to thank all the City employees that came today to support the services of our emergency essential City employees. I want to tell you we've had a very high number of city employees that have come in today and hopefully will come in tomorrow. Thank you everybody and thank the Council for their support as well and all the Bureau managers. We stand adjourned.

At 3:28 p.m., Council adjourned.