

## PORTLAND TRANSITION TEAM – final public comment report of the transition

*Date range March 1st-March 31st, 2025*

From March 1<sup>st</sup> through March 31<sup>st</sup> the Portland Transition Team received a total of 20 public comments through our online comment form, via email and verbal public comment. 0 out of the 20 comments were submitted on behalf community-based organization(s). To date, we've received **2,824** public comments during the transition of Portland's city government.

**Raw public comments received during March 1<sup>st</sup> through March 31<sup>st</sup>. Attachments are included at the end of the report. Replies from city staff are not included in the raw public comments. The \*\*\* indicates the commenter reply to a city employee's response.**

Raw Public Comments
Good morning,  I would hope with the recent charges against Arlene Kimura she would be removed. She committed theft and fraud and is still featured on your website and a commissioner?
We were very impressed with your presentation to City Council on 3.19.25 and, following the extended conversation with Council members, we came away with a far clearer understanding of the inspired path you have been on for 2 years and with a better appreciation of some of the challenges the Council faces. We met many of the Councilors before the election and were convinced their motivation to effect change was strong and their commitments to community inclusion in the new government aligned with our priorities. Because we are community advocates for safety related to Zenith Energy and the CEI Hub, our presence at City meetings began quickly, which has been interesting but also frustrating. Watching the Council in action, talking with them, and meeting with them confirms they are what is needed for Portland. They have provided hope for the first time in years. We want to do all that we can to support them and would welcome the opportunity to discuss this with you, Fred and Jose, at an online meeting, if that would be possible. We are grateful to you and look forward to hearing from you. Thank you.
Portland is going down the toilet and you folks will never come to grips with the reality that your progressive liberalism and far left craziness is the reason for failure.....Liberalism creates an inherent blindness that will never accept the reality that Liberalism NEVER works. And as long as you folks remain in your bubble, you will continue declining until your self destruction will be so obvious it cannot be denied. Meanwhile your downtown is dying, property values are in the tank and people are

leaving your state entirely and your tax base won't support the present much longer, much less future fantasies. Changing the entire government is simply rearranging the deck chairs on the Titanic. Can a leopard change it's spots? No, and neither will Portland. Your done, its not possible to know the exact moment reality will strike, but its not that far off.... Perhaps when you folks finally reach the end, there might arise some measure of intelligence, but I wouldn't bet my life on it.

This entire new form of government so far seems way more expensive and less effective unbelievable

I vehemently oppose this agenda item as it is monetarily reckless for these district councilors to spend city budget funds already noted as deficient for programs such as parks and rec, fire, public safety, development services etc. in order to add another office space???? I think they need to work within the framework already established including the budget. The optics of this agenda speaks loudly to these councilors' priorities. them not the constituents they are supposed to be representing. Adding another office space isn't going to guarantee better work productivity. Be creative and work with what you were originally given. No more funding for office space!

In a time of dire budget constraints, this lease is an inappropriate use of taxpayer dollars that we need for police, fire, road maintenance, and community centers. Councilors in District 3 can complete necessary duties in their homes, in neighborhood coffee shops, from city hall, etc. During a time of sacrifice for everyone in the city, this minor inconvenience for councilors is necessary to save every dollar possible for essential services in the community. These district offices are NOT essential.

Let's focus on the community's expressed needs before this!

Don't close community centers and lease new workspace for the council. Our communities need these spaces more than ever.

We tax payers already payed for a remodel for so called representatives = money, the 1st thing you did was hire assistants before you even had a work load = more money. You want people downtown then get to work downtown!!!! With the huge budget deficit & closing community centers yet pay for more space is a slap in the face to those you claim to represent. Do better.....Myself & everyone I know wants responsible change not waste!!! Each of you need to be on local news & explain why you believe wasting even more money is the best decision & why!!!

Why can't city councilors be located at our community centers or other public buildings?

This is an unnecessary expense that should not even be considered at a time when other city services and center are being cut.

Budget priority for police, fire and parks. No new investments unless it produces net cost savings.

We should not be leasing secondary office spaces for councilors other than District 1, which has a lack of community spaces and businesses that are fit to use for constituent meetings. Having meetings at businesses in each district will help boost the local economy and garner goodwill towards neighbors. It's a really bad look to be at risk of losing 3 community center that benefit many more people than a district office space.

The city is facing a substantial budget crisis, while much of the Portland Building sits empty. Why would you propose spending money to rent additional office space?

We should not be spending money in the face of a historic budget crisis for unnecessary offices. We don't live in some massive urban sprawl city like Denver or Dallas, it takes twenty minutes to get from downtown to any point in the city at any point of day.

This is preposterous and self serving. You are in a year where we are discussing taking away free meals and after school programs for children, and you want to spend money on THIS?

It is outrageous and shameful that this is even on the table at a time when we face such a huge budget shortfall, the results of which will do real harm to our fellow Portlanders. If this is the caliber of leadership the city of Portland has, then all I can say is that you are fundamentally not serious people. We're in a crisis, and you, our elected officials, are unashamed to convey this kind of clown show optics. Vote this down and show us that you understand how wildly inappropriate this measure is.

Good evening, council Pirtle-Guiney and city council. I'm a district two resident and I'm a board chair of participatory budgeting Oregon. Our mission is to support more just and participatory public budgeting for all Oregonians. So I wanted to follow up on GTAC important presentation to make sure that you understood what participatory budgeting is and isn't. Now, it didn't make the top of the list in this presentation, but in the committee, it was mentioned, and it's on page 28 of the report recommendation to

explore participatory budgeting. And it's a topic that's important because it's been a topic of confusion for the past city councils. And I've submitted a packet with a diagram and actually some polling data on city of Portland voters. But quickly, I think it's useful to describe participatory budgeting in the context or in relationship to the budgeting process you're currently in. As you know, when you adopt a budget in June, you won't be deciding how every public dollar is ultimately spent. Rather, you'll be mostly allocating funds within broad categories or to bureaus that hopefully reflect your priorities and the public's you are effectively. In a sense, you're effectively delegating a portion of your budgeting power within parameters, mostly to bureaus, but also sometimes to nonprofits and businesses to advance the city's work. Now, while most Bureaus and departments and NILS do that most of the time, as you know, Portland has struggled with adequate transparency and accountability over how public funds are spent on the public's behalf. This is a problem that has, in many ways, increased and made a lot more Portlanders distrustful of their government. So instead of delegating budgeting power to bureaus and NGOs to make the many budget decisions, you can't make, ppb basically delegates some of that budgeting power directly to the residents of the city, who are allowed to decide within parameters how a portion of the budget is invested on their behalf. So pb is a process that commits to radical transparency and accountability over a portion of the budget by a clear set of rules that outline the process and how people can get involved. The pb process allows residents to collaborate with each other and with city staff to develop feasible projects or short term programs that then are subject to a vote of all residents citywide or in your city council districts. So. And this is so, so then, and this is crucial, the city implements the winning projects and evaluates the process and does it again the next year. And this is really critical because it is by doing that that you convince more and more residents to get involved in this process over time. It's a proof of concept that the city serious. And this is how city pb in places like New York has grown to hundreds of thousands of residents deciding how to spend tens of millions of dollars annually. That's my time. But thanks for hopefully, a continuing conversation about finally bringing participatory budgeting to Portland.

Hello. I'm a resident of district three, a business owner in district four and a member of stadium. And I'm here today to address the pressing financial implications of our current administrator slash councilor form of government, a structure that GTAC was instrumental in setting up. While the intention behind this governance model may have been to enhance effectiveness, we must critically examine the significant cost and inefficiencies that have arisen. As it stands, our city is responsible for paying 12 city councilors and mayor, a city manager, six deputy city managers, and at least 2 to 3 administrative staff for each of these positions. This substantial payroll, on top of maintaining offices at city hall places an immense burden on our budget. Currently, we

also face a proposal for district three councilors to lease an office space at a staggering cost of \$36,000, plus additional property management fees. This raises serious concerns about our fiscal responsibility and resource allocation. Given our budget constraints, it is perplexing that we would incur such substantial expenses when a city owned building located at 4745 east burnside street offers ample space and parking. Utilizing this existing resource would not only save taxpayers' dollars, but also streamline operations by consolidating our administrative functions. Furthermore, we must consider the importance of public accessibility with this additional lease space. Be accessible to the public for constituents to engage with their city councilors. It is vital that the locations where councilors operate facilitate communication and interaction with the community they serve. If we can provide a space that is both cost effective and accessible, we would be better serving our constituents, leasing additional office space for the councilors while we have a suitable facility available exemplifies the inefficiency inherent in our current governance structure. The financial burden of leasing, combined with the duplication of roles and responsibilities, only exacerbates our budget challenges and diverts resources away from essential services that our community needs. While we cannot change the framework of our government at this time, I urge this council to reconsider the leasing proposal and explore the use of city owned building at 4745 east burnside. By doing so, we can demonstrate a commitment to fiscal responsibility and the prudent use of taxpayer funds. It's imperative that we prioritize effective governance and accountability in our administrative practices. Let us work together to ensure that our city operates efficiently, responsibly, and maximize the resources we have at our disposal. Thank you.

Well, on my very last day of GTAC. They've taken away my email. But nevertheless, here I am and as part of our GTAC discussions at the very end, some of us will be cursed to come to governance committee meetings until we're done. Right. So anyway, on this topic, I just want to say, I think what you've got here is fine. It's great. The one thing that you might want to consider is and let me there's some written testimony to make it clearer is to make it clear to appointees what their responsibilities are and whether they're invited or not, and who invites them. And how does that occur? Seems a little vague in your draft. One way, I think to simplify it just really quickly is to is to make it is to generalize it that in a committee hearing, if you're an appointee, you may show up, and if you do, you'll be afforded an opportunity to speak, period. And if you would like to show up at the full council meeting, the council may want you to speak. And in neither spot is it necessary for you to show up to, to be appointed and leave it at that? And then if there's a problem with an appointment, then it should be on the sponsor of the appointment or the appointee to show up and make themselves heard and make their case. If there's not a problem, then most of these are just going to coast right by and you don't get you don't need to wrap yourself up in process as to who does the invitations when those

invitations go out, how that how those lands on the chair's desk, you don't have to worry about it. So just something to think about. And but other you know; this is otherwise it's great. I'm glad to see progress.

I appreciate the long engagement and hard work that's gone into this. It's an impressive process. I support what they're doing here. And as full disclosure, I've applied for the commission. We'll see what happens after I'm done talking here. But I have some concerns about the draft language, and that's just a curse of mine. And I just wanted to curse you all with it to just to be share in the love. The main thing, I think, is you've got later on your agenda today is the alignment with advisory bodies. I think that's a really important process. And this body probably needs to be in alignment with the alignment, and that's just something to consider. And what I think that looks like now is maybe a whereas clause in the, in the ordinance that you're, that you're drafting. I have some written testimony that I encourage you to read. I will say that the members and terms provisions are not what I would have drafted the membership, i think, in the language of the ordinance is a range between 10 and 20 members. I think you have to set a number. And so that it's really 20 members with some number of vacancies to be filled. Similarly with the terms you have the mayor appointing terms up to four years. But I kind of think there are four year terms that you may stagger initially if you want, but if you're going to do that, go ahead and put that in the code. If the youth positions are not four years, go ahead and put that in the code just for clarity's sake on the powers and duties. If you look at the way it's drafted, it says the I think the commission may do the following. If you read that narrowly, it's like that's all they can do those things there. I think you want to leave it open to be more than that. And so other duties consistent with the purpose or other duties as directed from the sustainability office, something else to go there. So it's not just restricted to the to the enumerated powers and duties in the, in the legislation. I think the procedures and meetings provisions are probably specifically subject to the alignment. And so again, you'd want to keep that open to the alignment where you end up. And then finally, on the staffing provision, I'm not sure that needs to be in code. I think that's, you know, the city administrator, the executive branch can staff this commission as he or she. Desires. I'm hoping that a big active commission might need more staff and do lots of things. And I don't think you want to restrict it in code. So those are those are the drafting suggestions that I have. And I'm happy to work with you all to do that. I don't want to hold up progress as an applicant, but I you're setting a precedent here, and I'm hoping it's a good precedent. And thanks for letting me go on for more than three minutes. I'm sure that was more than three minutes.