

## PORTLAND TRANSITION TEAM PUBLIC COMMENT REPORT

*Date range August 1<sup>st</sup> – August 31<sup>st</sup> 2023*

From August 1<sup>st</sup> through August 31<sup>st</sup>, the Portland Transition Team received a total of **39** public comments through our online comment form, via email and verbal public comment. **6** out of the **39** comments was submitted on behalf community-based organization(s). To date, we've received **1,739** public comments during the transition of Portland's city government.

**Raw public comments received during August 1<sup>st</sup> through August 31<sup>st</sup>. Attachments are included at the end of the report.**

### Raw Public Comments

When will district maps for city council be approved?

Dear \_\_,

I hope you are doing well! My name is \_\_\_\_\_, and I'm a 12th grader in high school in Portland, Oregon. I am interested in mapping and using mapping technology to improve lives. This summer, I decided to create a podcast series called "Cartographie," which will focus on the history of mapping and the importance of those tools in the modern day. I also want to highlight current events around the world where people could benefit from improved mapping resources. My goal with this podcast is to get people engaged with this topic even if they don't have a scientific or technical background. In my previous episodes, I had the opportunity to interview Professor \_\_\_\_ of the London School of Hygiene (he created the John Snow Society!) as well as Dr. \_\_\_\_ of Hyderabad, India, about disease mapping and the impact of urbanization on flooding, respectively.

In my fifth of five episodes, I plan to discuss the intersection between maps and law, as well as gerrymandering. I was reading about how Portland is drafting a new district plan, which determines the election boundaries for the four city councilors, and learned that you were managing the project. I would be really excited to interview you, or anybody else on the project interested in being interviewed, about the process of drafting new plans and your current work. As someone who's lived in Portland throughout my life, I would be very interested in learning more about these issues and being able to talk about them to my podcast's audience!

Please let me know if you would be interested. I am hoping to get the first few episodes of my podcast out in the next few weeks, so the sooner the better! I expect that these

interviews will only take about 20-30 minutes each, and I will share the podcast episode with you in advance.

Thank you so much for your consideration and for helping me get this project started. I look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Please add to the new system of city government a new system of hiring & evaluating police to exclude white supremacists, racists, & sociopaths.

Do you know if any citizen groups that have formed interested in sponsoring ballot initiatives to tweak the charter reform?

What are the current updates, when will the IDC cast their votes on which map will determine the four respective districts?

Hello, members of the District Commission,

SUMMARY: Please choose the Maple plan!

To create four new districts with similar-sized populations, each map of the proposed sets of boundaries shows a different chunk of the Eastside being added to the low-population Westside.

However, the goal of grouping similar, interconnected neighborhoods goes far beyond the goal of numerical balance.

The Maple map groups SE and SW areas in the least disruptive manner:

- these two sections of the central city include "the city's most densely populated and urbanized neighborhoods," according to the website;
- the proposed district is linked by five bridges across a short span of river (the other proposals include only one bridge on long stretches of river).

Thank you for considering my comments.

I would love it if you can forward this invitation to the IDC.

Please join the Coalition of Communities of Color and community partners for a Portland Districting Community Conversation on Monday, August 14 from 6 - 7:30 pm.

We would appreciate it if Commissioners can attend this event to hear directly from community members about their thoughts and opinions about what the final district map should look like.

Folks can register here to receive the Zoom link. Spanish interpretation will be available.

Thank you so much,

Hi - Thanks for the fast posting of the slide deck presentation used at last night's Chapter 3.02 listening session. The last line in the chart on page 9 begins with the word "relieve" as follows: Relieve committees of legislation (for full council consideration).

Can you explain what that means? Perhaps there is a better word choice than relieve?

Thanks for your help with this clarifying question

Hello-

Can we view previous online? I am usually not available to join at the live meeting time.

Meeting video for August 2nd? Would it be possible to get this video uploaded since it's been a week since this mtg occurred? Thanks,

Hi,

I have a question about the GIS files for the eventual adopted City of Portland districts. I know that the proposed maps are available for exploration online, that's great!

I wanted to see if, once a map is chosen, or before, the shapefile/s will be available on the website for downloading. (Or if they are already somewhere and I'm just not looking in the right place.)

Will the shapefile be available for download once a map is adopted? In the legislature's 2021 process, it was on their redistricting website at the GIS Downloads link.

Thank you!

Meeting slides missing for August 9th. Could someone look into this? The meeting agenda appears to be uploaded twice (see attached screenshot.)

Thanks,

Note: PDF of following text attached in case formatting is lost in transmission. Portland, OR 97239

August 12, 2023

Government Transition Advisory Committee and Transition Team

Following are comments on the August 8th Community Information Session on City Council Organization and Procedures (Code section 3.02). However, during my retrieval of the meeting materials I discovered GTAC's special Aug 10th meeting. While I was unable to view that meeting (not posted) I did review the posted documents and offer some comments on that meeting as well.

My understanding is that Council operations (Code section 3.02) is being worked in two phases. Comments follow for each phase:

1. Phase I: The proposed changes to 3.02, going to Council Sept 20, to set the initial framework for Council operations on Jan 2, 2025.
2. Phase II: Recommendations for the Council to consider after Jan 2, 2025 – targeted for sometime in 2024. This included comments in support of GTAC's position (questions) outlined in their Aug 10th draft memo to Council.

Dear Commissioners,

On August 10, \_\_\_ of Oregon Public Broadcasting declared that your work is finished and you've narrowed the map of choice down to Alder. As there are still a few days before the commission can take its first vote on the maps, I would like to make a case for the Maple map based on data that was released at your August 2nd and August 9th meetings.

By mandate of the voters who approved the charter amendment, the commission needs to choose a map based on certain criteria. Based on those criteria, the Maple map is the obvious choice. Unfortunately, during the public hearings, new criteria, which were not approved by voters, have been presented to justify the Alder map.

1) How renters vote is NOT a criterion that the voters approved:

We have heard that renters in the inner eastside neighborhoods shouldn't be consolidated into a west side district because in their words, "the votes of progressive east-side renters would be diluted by the wealthy, conservative voters on the west side of the river". In reality, data distributed at the August 9 meeting showed that renter-occupied units--in both maps--are about the same for the western district. The Alder map has 53.9% and the Maple map has 58.9%. In addition, feedback that commissioners received from public hearings showed that fewer than 3% of the respondents noted that this specific issue was a concern to them. If the real issue is keeping a progressive block of voters together in the same district, which might be considered gerrymandering, then whether these voters are renters is irrelevant if both maps have close to equal number of renters.

2) Socioeconomic status is NOT a criterion that the voters approved:

Even if this was a criterion, the data doesn't justify putting Sellwood and Eastmoreland with the west side of the river with the rationale that these neighborhoods have the same socioeconomic status as the west side. In reality, the west side is not a wealthy enclave that would bury the votes of the inner east side as some have claimed in commission meetings and public hearings. According to data distributed at the August 9th meeting, the median income for residents of the western district is between \$88,863 (Alder map) and \$84,286 (Maple map). Poverty levels in both maps are also similar. In the Alder map 19.7% of the population are less than 2x the poverty level. In the Maple map, it is 20.6%.

3) "Asset packing" is NOT a criterion that the voters approved:

The term "asset packing" has been frequently stated a reason to oppose the Maple map. Even if it was a criterion, it is irrelevant because an "asset-packed" district including the central city would only get three out of twelve votes on the new council.

4) Transportation links ARE a criterion, but it is being ignored by Alder map supporters: Sellwood and Eastmoreland do not have the transportation links to the west side that are available to the inner eastside neighborhoods of Buckman, Kern and Hosford-Abernethy. The Sellwood bridge is their only connection to the west side and it's not considered a neighborhood corridor by the 2035 Comp plan. This bridge has one bus route, which only operates during commuter times, and it only serves Sellwood, not Eastmoreland. On the other hand, the central city is well connected with five bridges which have eight bus routes directly serving the inner east-side neighborhoods.

5) Keeping communities of interest together IS a criterion, but it is being ignored by Alder map supporters:

Eastmoreland does not have a commercial area of its own and the Woodstock commercial center is where its residents primarily do their shopping, eating and recreating. The Alder map arbitrarily carves the gathering place of Eastmoreland into a different district rather than keeping our community of interest together.

Based on the data your commission has received since the public hearings, the Maple map is the better option because it combines the well-connected city center into the same district, whereas the Alder map just destroys SE neighborhoods. Please base your decision on data, not opinions and subjective assumptions. Please vote for the Maple map.

Dear Independent District Commissioners,

While I have not been able to physically attend the last two meetings due to work constraints, I have been closely following your discussions. I want to write to thank you for voting to eliminate the Cedar and Map maps, which in our view did not promote equity and were divisive.

We supported the ALDER Map because we firmly believe it is the best option of the 3 Drafts. If there are to be only 4 districts, and if the Westside is to remain whole, then the ALDER Map best supports the goals of the district creation process socio-economically and demographically.

But what I wanted to say in particular to the Commission, was that we as a mostly working class, diverse neighborhood felt heard....something that is not always the case. And thank you for that.

I know your work has not been easy, and the timeline, terribly short.

I hope you are able to avoid going to City Council for a final decision as I have heard, and often, that is not the preferred option. :))

Thank you all for your service and commitment to a fair and thorough process.

Dear \_\_\_\_\_,

Here is the link to the LWVPDX webpage about our information (and yours) regarding Charter Reform implementation: <https://lwvpdx.org/city-charter-reform/> . I mentioned sharing this link with you, when you spoke at last week's LWV meetings about the Districting Commission (\_\_\_\_) and the GTAG/Transition Team (\_\_\_\_).

Starting at the Jade Night Market next Saturday, August 19, we will be handing out cards with a QR code leading to this page. Please let us know if you see something on this web page that should be corrected.

Thank you for checking it and for all the information you have shared with the Portland League.

Hi \_\_\_\_\_,

Thank you for all of your work on the first round of Code 3.02 updates! I've read the materials, joined the listening session, and watched the GTAC discussion of the code changes. I appreciate the questions you posed, have contemplated and sought input from partners, and wanted to offer comment.

- Who should be able to submit items to the council agenda?
  - o Definitely Option A (any councilor may submit, then item is referred to council or committee for consideration; Mayor has equal ability as a councilor)
  - o Also, if a Committee advances something to the full council, they can assign a "carrier" for that item, which might be the person who brought it forward to begin with. If there isn't an obvious carrier, than it should default to the committee chair or vice chair to carry the matter, on behalf of the committee
- If items are filed timely, should the Council President be able to determine if an item is heard on the current agenda or on a future agenda?
  - o Yes, that's a primary role for the Council President to be able to time items so they have their best showing and the proponents/opponents of any item can be well-prepared
  - o The Council President's burden is to be aware and factoring in all the many components coming forward from the Mayor's office, committees, and urgent actions. Bureaus and committees may not be cognizant of the many moving parts and deadlines when they refer forward their items (nor should that be their role, but someone has to bottom line the triaging)
- Should council have the authority to withdraw items from a committee (for consideration by the whole council)?

- o Yes, there should absolutely be a mechanism to withdraw items from committee that aren't receiving votes; after they've had a chance to be adjudicated in committee
- o The question is what vote threshold can trigger that withdrawal, whether that's 7 votes simple majority or 8 votes. The Oregon House rules reflect that an affirmative 31/60 majority votes could pull a measure from the committee to the floor
- o If the code were to be more silent on the issue then it could default to needing a "rules suspension" (2/3 votes) to go out of proper order and bring forward a measure.

On recommended items to discuss as additional code changes are made:

- City Intergovernmental Relations office -- whose direction do they take when there is clearer executive-legislative branches. Very important office since the city has much stake in business before the state, county, federal, and metro levels
- Conduct Committee -- who regulates the behavior of elected officials? It'll have to come from members of council themselves
- Ways to enhance collaboration - what are the places where leadership might be shared among a committee composed of someone from each district?

Additionally, what I've found most compelling about why to make the code change now is the notion of setting the council up for success and following recommendations that you've received along the way. At the listening session I think you mentioned that an organization of city administrators or city managers recommended ensuring that some of the questions are answered in advance of the new council meeting. When I hear that the transition team is following best practices as laid out by experts, that is very heartening and goes a long way toward answering the question of why something is being worked on. Thanks for uplifting that!

Thanks again,  
--

Originally supported commission Went to advisory committee last night \_\_\_ attempted to undercut commission & got a motion that would sabotage the GTAP committee and September presentation for council. \_\_\_ is not on the committee & is an alternate. Babs is a lifelong Portland resident for 75 years & has followed the meetings on zoom for months.

Dear Commissioners,

I have read \_\_\_\_\_'s letter that she forwarded to all of you on Aug. 13. It raises cogent arguments regarding why the Maple Map is the best of the three that have been contemplated and far better than the Alder Map that so many commissioners seem to be leaning toward.

My letter is written to support \_\_\_\_\_ letter and to raise several additional issues:

1. \_\_\_\_\_ notes that voters did NOT approve a criterion that considers how renters vote.

2. I want to add, further, that voters did NOT approve any criterion that “progressive east side neighborhood renters” should be given preference compared to other voters throughout the city. On May 3 meeting minutes, “Some in the group raised concerns about renters in the central city area losing voting power if combined with wealthier, whiter areas.” During numerous commission meetings Commissioner \_\_\_\_ stressed that renters on the east side are different than renters on the west side as a reason not to combine them. Such sentiments were repeated frequently during the public hearings. On June 5, \_\_\_\_ of the Buckman neighborhood stated that “liberal strong votes of Buckman will be watered down if they are put on the west side of the river with the conservative wealth and power of the west side.”

Regardless, as requested by voters, the districts should be drawn as nearly as possible to ensure that all votes are equal. This is the reason behind requiring districts be of equal population. It is my hope that the commissioners have not decided among themselves that “progressive voters” (in an already progressive city) should be given preferential treatment.

3. Transportation links ARE a criterion approved by voters, according to \_\_\_\_.

Let me just add to her comments. She notes that the Central City shares FIVE bridges and eight bus lines that join east side and west side and Eastmoreland/Sellwood have one bridge to the westside that is NOT considered a neighborhood corridor and one bus line that only runs during commuter rushes. In fact, Eastmoreland itself will have NO bus line at all soon, as Tri-Met will cease all bus service through the neighborhood on Aug. 27.

4. Keeping communities of interest together IS a criterion, as explained by \_\_\_\_\_, who explains that Eastmorelanders frequent the Woodstock commercial center.

But I wish to add that Eastmoreland also shares pollution concerns with other eastside neighborhoods because it is located adjacent to the Brooklyn Intermodal Railyard and Precision Castparts. Neighborhoods on the west side do not share any of these concerns. In fact, Eastmoreland and the Sellwood-Moreland Improvement District (SMILE) won cash awards from the railyard, as well as promises to reduce pollution from the yard’s operations. These same pollution concerns are shared by all eastside neighborhoods that abut the rail facility and industrial activities at Precision Castparts; the latter has also paid penalties to neighborhood residents who are upwind of fumes it creates.

5. I agree with \_\_\_\_ that socioeconomic status is NOT a criterion approved by voters; neither is “asset packing.” This latter term should be irrelevant to the Commissioners’ discussion.

I conclude by seeking assurances that the IDC will consider those criteria voters



approved and abstain from riding hobby horses or biases that are not among the voter-approved criteria. The IDC has no need to further politicize the process with which it is charged and to promote any neighborhoods or residents over other neighborhoods or residents. Portland is soon to embark on a radically different form of government. We MUST ensure that this new government accords with the wishes voters expressed.

IDC Commissioners have been given considerable power and should use it wisely and fairly.

Sincerely,

Your link to the voting area maps does not appear to go anywhere...

Hi can you offer some explanation as to why you moved Sellwood and Reed College/East Moreland area into the SW/NW Portland Boundary? That seems a bit peculiar...

I really appreciated this update. Thank you!

A note of appreciation for your commitment to public service and working to forge a more responsive and inclusive city government.

Cheers!

I cannot find what I'm looking for

The link to DistictR from the independent redistricting commission pages leads to an indecipherable website that needs a page of explanation that isn't there to begin exploring the draft IRC map.

As a long-term resident of Eastmoreland and a former president of the Eastmoreland Neighborhood Ass'n I am complaining about the efforts of the District Commission to lump our portion of the east side of Portland with communities west of the Willamette River. The river has formed a natural boundary, encouraging us to form alliances with adjacent east side neighborhoods, particularly Sellwood. Your decision to ignore that union is harmful both to our neighborhood and to the neighborhoods you want to link us with on the west side. We are two different cultures.

You apparently have given no weight to complaints previously made, since the district boundaries remain as before. Your work would make #3 the City's second largest district, all on the west side except for Sellwood and Eastmoreland. It should be obvious that modest adjustments would provide a remedy. From your own maps it is evident that the deep east county district (#1) has about 5,000 fewer residents than your proposed merger of Sellwood and Eastmoreland with the west side. An adjustment seems obvious. Give #1 a small piece of adjacent portions of #3 and put all of the remainder of southeast (Sellwood and Eastmoreland) back together. This is not rocket science.

I recognize that there will always be unhappy people when district zones are created. However, Sellwood and Eastmoreland are two of the most progressive and self-cohesive parts of the City. Your existing plan is likely to damage or even destroy that.

Inadequate—people’s input wasn’t really incorporated.

I hope that you will read this letter and understand its comprehensive picture of what I and the majority of Portlanders agree make up the critical crisis that has destroyed our City and County! The operative word here is “has”! We have seen unconscionable things in every corner, and every neighborhood of our once, but no more, internationally lauded home.

As a part time LYft driver, who works all hours of the day and night on a continuous basis, and as someone who has participated in the PIT count the past two years, and who has personally spoken with at least 100 homeless individuals on the streets and in the bushes, I see nothing but movement of the problems from one place to another. I see crime and human degradation at every juncture. I the graffiti problem unabated, and currently growing at ever increasing rates.

We have hotels and Class A office buildings going bankrupt at a dizzying pace, and the tragedy of their unsustainable vacancy rates is hidden behind their attractive exteriors.

We elected each and every one of you to solve these problems, but we see little in the way of leadership or creativity in staunching our bleeding wounds! You have issued a plethora of hollow Emergency Declarations, and failed to use their powers to make real change.

I have long ago come to the conclusion that with the support of well intentioned, but ill educated and informed voters, you have transformed a law abiding community into a place that has elevated the Acceptance of Unacceptable Behavior into an art form.

Stop the madness now! Use better judgment and listen to more rational , and non personally invested , groups and individuals who are feeding at the public trough. These amazingly ineffective people and organizations feed you erroneous information and have produced little in the way of results, and have only gotten fatter and less effective as a result.

You can do better, you must do better, or we will continue to suffer the fate of cities such as Flint Michigan, Gary Indiana, Detroit Michigan, Memphis Tennessee, and surprisingly, Atlanta Georgia which has successfully hidden the fact that 52% of its citizens are economically stressed.

Sincerely,

We're receiving postal solicitations from City of Portland Transition, and we'd like to stop. This is physical mail, not email. You can see the mail in the attached picture.

Would you please remove the following address from your mailing database and limit sharing of this information?

Resident

Hello – As a busy student interested in government, I really appreciated the recording of the listening session on the council operations code and the chance to send in some suggestions on the 20th.

Because the current draft council operations code just addresses replacing a Council President and VP if either of them resign or leave the council, I appreciated the listening session question about giving the new council the authority to choose new council leaders and not wait around for a resignation or departure. As I see it, the answer is in the charter's "or oftener at its option" language that reads to me as meaning that the initial Pres. and VP selection made at a council's first meeting of a calendar year can be changed before the first council session at the beginning of the next year.

What I am concerned about is that those council leadership votes can occur with just a majority of those present. I assume there was some reason for that charter provision but using the "7 yes" votes required for enacting ordinances would be a better process in my opinion. But I understand that "7 yes" votes to replace a Pres. and/or VP isn't an option.

However, I wonder if the council leadership replacement process allowed with the "or oftener at its option" could be implemented with a code requirement that a removal vote requirement of at least "7 yes votes". The subsequent replacement vote would need to be based on a majority of those present and can't get around that vote threshold because that is in charter.

What I'd like to see is a remove and then replace process. The remove step would be implemented by code requirement for a "7 yes" votes to remove either a Pres. or VP. This would address the possibility of a small number of councilors tossing out one or both council leaders with less than "7 yes votes" in a meeting that just meets the quorum requirement. I suppose public pressure and agenda item approval via "7 yes" votes would help prevent that possibility.

But since hope doesn't seem like good public policy, I suggest a two step remove and then replace approach. Step 1 would be to remove one or both council leaders via a code requirement for "7 yes votes". This creates a vacancy or vacancies that would be followed by step 2. Step 2 would be to replace council leaders via the majority votes present required in the charter. I understand that this might be a stretch of what is

allowed under the charter, but please check out this two-step approach with your lawyers.

I also listened to the council operations code discussion at the last meeting of that Government Transition Advisory Committee. I really liked the idea of using that Portlanders will be electing three councilors from four districts to set up a council committee composed of one councilor from each district to get some citywide thinking going in the council's work. What would be really great is if that kind of committee had a role in leading the council. But the idea floated of having the councilors on that kind of committee be tied to vote counts is terrible. Instead, let the three councilors from each district take a vote. And if they come up with a three way tie, then the full council can break that tie on a "7 yes votes" basis.

Thanks for the chance to make these suggestions.

Dear \_\_\_\_\_!

I'm emailing you to request computer mapping shapefiles for the new Portland City Council districts. (I looked but did not see link for this on Commission website.)

Thank you in advance for your professional assistance. - cheers,

Hi \_\_\_\_\_:

On behalf of the Metro/Oregon Public Housing Location Maps team at Portland State University I request the overlay coordinates for the final city council districts map. We would like to add it to our maps. Now that your committee has made its final decision we will permanently incorporate that map into the Metro/Oregon Public Housing Location Maps. Commissioner \_\_\_ has instructed \_\_\_\_\_ to add the URL pointer and identifying image of the Metro/Oregon Public Housing Location Maps to the Office of Community & Civic Life website.

Please send the overlay coordinates to \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_. Thank you for your cooperation and the good work done by the map committee.

Request for New Council Districts Map Overlay Coordinates

Good afternoon,

This is \_\_\_\_\_, digital reporter for KOIN 6 News. It's my understanding that the Portland's Independent District Commission unanimously approved the final district map/system at last night's meeting. However, I am unable to find any agenda packets, recordings or other information online specifically related to last night's meeting.

Are you able to provide any documents from this meeting? With the map finalized, has the commission completed its duties or does it have more work to do?

Also, is this district map established immediately or is it something that will only be acknowledged once the official district elections are held? (Should Portlanders officially consider themselves residents of their specific districts?)

Thanks,

I hope your week is going well 😊. I'm reaching out because, as you may be aware the City of Portland, "We Are Better Together" is host our first Say Hey event and we would like to share information on the Charter Commission and the City's Transition processes with the audience at our resource table at the event. I'm curious to know if you can provide us resources to share as well as 1 volunteer to help us educate the audience on this? Hope to hear from you soon. Thank you!

The district map that is posted on this page should be interactive, so a user could enlarge areas, to actually identify boundaries. As it is, it is quite useless...

Is there a newsletter for the TAC? If so, could you please signup my email address to receive it?

I was unable to get my input on Portland districts to the commission last month. I know this is probably to late but I would still like to give my input on this.

First of all, I think that dividing up the city into four districts according to population is the wrong approach. I think it would be better to divide up the city into 12 approximately equal size voting districts. That way the people in each district would be voting for one of their own in their district. The way it is now, is that each district could vote for three council members that were from the same general area where the population is the greatest and the outlying areas where the population is less may not have any representation, for instance, district 4 may have a greater population in the central city and so voters may elect all three council members from the central city and the NW and SW parts of the city may not have any council members. How is that fair? If the city were divided into 12 equal (land area) each council member would would represent that area. That would be much more fair and representative of the whole city. As this has already been decided I will have to just go along with their decision on this initial set up of the districts but I see a lot of problems with this way of setting up the districts.

First of all, populations of an area in the city can change over time, and they will. How will that effect each district, and the city council? By dividing up the city into twelve (equal in land area) districts, if populations of the district change they will still have one council member to do their bidding in the government. That is important for areas in the city that are more sparsely populated. It would still give these areas equal representation in the city government. I see my input on this late but I think the city may decide to change this at a later time say in a couple of years due to negative input from the public on the current system. That is my hope.

I've lived in my house @ \_\_\_ for 43 years. I have traveled, shopped, educated my kids at Grant, go to church& recreate in Rose City Park, Hollywood area, Providence Hospital. Rarely do I do anything past NE 82nd or south or Burnside.

Very disappointed that my City Council District representative will be SE Portland. SE Portland has some real needs that have been ignored and does need representative. But any council person elected will be addressing those needs not thoses of NE PDX.

Hi there,  
I am wondering how quorum will work in the new system of government. Can you please let me know how the new Council members will be limited if at all with their individual or group gatherings? Will 6 Commissioners getting together constitute a quorum? I am primarily interested in how the Commissioners will be able to interact outside of Chambers but also interested in Chamber quorum, etc.  
Thank you!

Michael Veale  
841 S Gaines St, Suite 2200  
Portland, OR 97239

August 12, 2023

Government Transition Advisory Committee and Transition Team

Following are comments on the August 8<sup>th</sup> Community Information Session on City Council Organization and Procedures (Code section 3.02). However, during my retrieval of the meeting materials I discovered GTAC's special Aug 10<sup>th</sup> meeting. While I was unable to view that meeting (not posted) I did review the posted documents and offer some comments on that meeting as well.

My understanding is that Council operations (Code section 3.02) is being worked in two phases.

Comments follow for each phase:

1. Phase I: The proposed changes to 3.02, going to Council Sept 20, to set the initial framework for Council operations on Jan 2, 2025.
2. Phase II: Recommendations for the Council to consider after Jan 2, 2025 – targeted for sometime in 2024. This included comments in support of GTAC's position (questions) outlined in their Aug 10<sup>th</sup> draft memo to Council.

**Phase I Code 3.02 Changes**

Code Section	Comments
--------------	----------

3.02.010	<p><b>Council Meetings</b></p> <p>While two meetings to conduct formal business (resolutions, ordinances, etc) seems reasonable in most cases, there was no mention of “Work Sessions” of the full Council. Such sessions, along with committee meetings, appear to be the most applicable mechanisms for Council to focus on “legislation and policy development”</p>
3.02.010.D	<p><b>Council Meetings – Special Meetings</b></p> <p>Other than the City Auditor, the Mayor is the only city-wide elected official and should be afforded the ability to place items on the agenda. Charter sections 2-401 (Mayor) and 2-406 (City Administrator) enumerate many areas where the Mayor should have that flexibility.</p>
3.02.020.A	<p><b>Council Agenda – Notice</b></p> <p>A 24 hour minimum submission window, for other than emergency measures, provides little time for the public to comment and council/staff to consider such comments. Such a window does not demonstrate transparency.</p>
3.02.020.B	<p><b>Council Agenda – Item Submission</b></p>
3.02.002.B.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For practical purposes the City Administrator should be able to submit items.</li> <li>• What process/criteria would the President use to assess which items should be reviewed by the full Council, referred to a particular committee as well as when? Seems subjective.</li> <li>• The proposal is the full Council reviews and may amend the President’s recommendations? Is this practical? What is the process for each step, what are the windows, etc?</li> </ul>
3.02.002.B.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All associated documents, including the presentation (e.g., PowerPoints) material should be posted as well. In many cases this is not the case. Only about 10-20% 80% of the time when I request the presentation from the item contact do I receive it before the Council Meeting or Work Session.</li> <li>• The timing implies that agenda items and content are known and available (generally) a full week before a meeting. How do section A and B.2 relate? B.2’s timing, assuming the Auditor’s publication of agenda with all content on the prior Friday’s provides reasonable time for stakeholder comment.</li> </ul>
3.02.002.B.3 3.02.002.B.4	<p>What constitutes “complete”? Is that more than all required sign offs (e.g., City Attorney, dependent bureaus, etc.) and documents submitted? Does the President need to be part of the process? What is the value gained vs loss of time not spent on furthering effective and harmonized work of Council. I don’t know how the process works today, but it would seem the Auditor has process discipline to perform this function.</p>

3.02.050	<p><b>Council Committees</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This section is written as if Committees are purely <u>transactional</u>; addressing only specific tasks, etc. referred by the full Council – rather than on-going “legislation and policy development” within specific assigned sphere.</li> <li>• While the new Council will need to “get its feet wet” understanding how best committees can support their role, the Transition Team/GTAC should stake out a proposed structure, roles and processes based on best practices. See comments provided later.</li> </ul>
----------	--

**Phase II Code 3.02 Changes and GTAC’s Aug 10<sup>th</sup> Concerns**

The Transition Team on slide 20 of the Aug 8 presentation stated:

**2024 – Phase II recommendations – Requesting GTAC assistance throughout in identifying and clarifying recommendations**

In my June 12, 2023 email I offered some thought on a number of key topics that should to be considered for an effective and successful implementation of the new Charter. Key is outlining a viable **Council/Executive (City Administrator) Interoperating Model** that can guide/drive understanding of:

Intersection of ...	... through outlining:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council and its Committees</li> <li>• Mayor/City Administrator and Government Structure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roles, responsibilities</li> <li>• Processes</li> <li>• Staff alignment/support</li> </ul>

One of the key reasons offered last month by some Commissioners proposing possible Charter amendments was the increasing costs of the new Charter’s implementation. While one-time costs (e.g., facilities changes) will be what they will be, run-rate costs will be significantly impacted by the chosen Interoperating Model; particularly how well Executive/City Administrator staff is leveraged to support the Council in perform its roles. For example:

1. How policies, programs, etc. are developed, reviewed, etc. from request/inception through approval. Where are the supporting resources housed? How specific work threads are coordinated, etc.
2. How the city’s bureau structure, City Administrator’s deputy alignment and relationship with Council committees, etc. are optimized.

I share the concerns raised on Aug 10<sup>th</sup> by GTAC (e.g., “GTAC was not envisioned to deliberate on city organization work”) given my belief that phase II recommendations, will in part, require consideration of the most effective alignment of government structure and Council committees and how the city’s business will progress through both branches of government. Please refer to detailed narrative on Council/Executive (City Administrator) Interoperating Model in my June 12<sup>th</sup> email (provided below). The



transition will be better off if the Transition Team/GTAC explore the questions in point 3 for the various kinds of anticipated work. This will ensure completeness. GTAC's participation in helping craft that **interaction model** will help ensure completeness and fidelity with the Charter Commission's and voters expectations.

This would also provide much needed context to address another objective expressed by Transition staff during the Aug 8<sup>th</sup> GTAC meeting; specifically: ensure "anyone running for council will understand how the Council will function." Personally, I do not believe Code section 3.02 , as it stands, provides the necessary context.

Timing of phase II ideally would be:

1. Early enough to inform run-rate budgeting for transition – today there is a lack of needed context. Resolving phase II before mid 2024 seems necessary.
2. Support early socialization with the public as well as with the elected Council; ideally during the interim between election day and Jan 2, 2025. With the new Council starting midway through the budget process, it would be helpful to operationalize an initial model that can be tweaked along the way.

#### **Stakeholder Comments to Mayor/City Administrator**

A question was asked during the Aug 8<sup>th</sup> session regarding how Councilors relay feedback to the Mayor and City Administrator. A few thoughts:

1. City should consider developing a "Public Agenda" website where all matters going before Council and its committees and boards/commissions provide an ability for stakeholders to submit comments which would go to their item lead as well as their/other Councilors, Mayor, City Administrator, bureaus, etc. for awareness. Can provide more detail.
2. As a policy, project, program, etc. works its way through Council and its committees, with Mayor/Administrator staff supporting/participating, Councilor and stakeholder input would be captured by applicable staff.

Regards,

Michael Veale

From June 12, 2023 memo to GTAC/Transition Team (p4)

## **Council / Executive (City Administrator) Interoperating Model**

1. GTAC Commissioner Bill Farver's questions/comments at GTAC's June 6<sup>th</sup> meeting were "spot on" and critical to envisioning the high functioning government expected by the voters. Sections 2-401 and 2-206 of the revised Charter (Mayoral duties and City Administrator) enumerate a number of roles (responsibilities). But the charter lacks similar specificity for the Council; essentially providing one sentence definitions of "legislative authority" and "executive and administrative authority." Charter Commission Progress Report #5 provided additional narrative of the Commission's intent for "*City Councilors focused on setting policy and constituent services.*" See **Appendix A** for side by side comparison.
2. Critical to envisioning the high functioning government expected by the voters will require much more than the structure/alignment of the bureaus and offices. How the Legislative and Executive will function within each and across both to define budgets, policy, projects, programs, etc. need to be defined as well as allocation of resources.
3. In particular, clarity of the roles and processes for **policy** and **budget** development is critical – they are not defined in the charter. For the transition to be successful a thoughtful model on how both branches (Council and **Executive**) will collaborate on both need to be defined. For example (partial list):
  - a. Who can spawn a policy, implementation, etc. discussion; How?
  - b. Who analyzes needs, gathers input, postulates of options/plans and assessment them; How?
  - c. Who assesses the performance of the City (e.g., bureaus, projects, programs, etc); How?
  - d. Who sets schedules, priorities, coordinates above activities; How?
  - e. What are the desired timeframes and thresholds for elevating issues.

All of this and more needs to be envisioned ahead of Jan 2, 2025 so that everyone understands processes, swin lanes, etc. It won't be perfect day 1, but hopefully the new Mayor and Council can agree to the draft and tweak it over time as experience and needs dictate.
4. Understanding what a proposed interaction model may be will have significant input into the what will be the run-rate costs the new structure as it will drive what kind of resources need to reside where (possibly duplicate). **[Discussed elsewhere]**.
5. Transition team should consider which Code changes will be required/when to effectuate such a model.

Link to June 12, 2023 memo:

[https://drive.google.com/file/d/17B-jSJOc-YMUy4Gj2DD0QNrQgfO8Tiq2/view?usp=share\\_link](https://drive.google.com/file/d/17B-jSJOc-YMUy4Gj2DD0QNrQgfO8Tiq2/view?usp=share_link)

# PORTLAND DISTRICTING COMMUNITY CONVERSATION

Register at [bit.ly/pdx-districting](https://bit.ly/pdx-districting) 

Join us virtually on Monday, August 14 from 6 - 7:30 pm to learn about Portland's current districting process and share your thoughts about the possible districts maps.

