

Portland City Charter Review

Dr. Melanie Billings-Yun
Portland Charter Review Commissioner
August 2022

Desired Outcomes for Charter Reform

- Participatory and growing democracy
- Reflective representation
- Government that is:
 - ❖ **Accountable** (93% of voters surveyed)*
 - ❖ Transparent (90%)
 - ❖ Effective (89%)
 - ❖ Responsive (86%)
 - ❖ Represents all areas of the city (84%)
 - ❖ Equitable (74%)

*FM3 research survey of 558 Portlanders, conducted 2/27-3/15/2020

Current Governmental Structure

Adopted in 1913; Portland population 200,000

- Four City Councilors + Mayor double as bureau commissioners
- All elected at large in winner-take-all primary/general election
- Problems with current system
 - Bureaucratic siloization, infighting, and inefficiency
 - Lack of bureau expertise—rapid turnover
 - Inability to address multifaceted, long-term issues
 - Too few representatives for 650,000 people
 - No local representation, knowledge, or accountability
 - Primaries get minimal and skewed voter turnout
 - Advantage to wealthy or powerfully-backed candidates

Proposed Form of Government

Mayor-Council system with clear separation of powers, enhanced representation, and professional management

- Mayor—Chief executive
 - Proposes and carries out policy; proposes budget; tie-breaking vote
 - Oversees running of city; nominates city administrator, police chief
- City Council—Legislative body
 - Develops and legislates policy; **represents district electorate**
 - Amends and approves budget; confirms city administrator
- City Administrator—Manages operations
 - Appoints and oversees bureau directors
 - Reports to mayor

Enhanced Representation

12-Member City Council

- Effectively represents diverse city of 650,000
- Accountable and responsive to local electorate vs. to bureaus

Four geographically compact districts

- Drawn by independent citizen commission by Sep 2023
- Equal in population; retains communities of common interest
- Equitably and transparently represented by 3 councilors each
- Able to interact with constituents, focus on multiplicity of issues

Single election with ranked choice voting

- Results fairly reflect voice of entire community
- Gives voters more choice; increased participation in election

Differences from Past Attempts

- 13% say our government is on the right track (vs. 55% in 2007)
- Learned from 3-1 failure in 2007 (2002, 1966, 1958)
 - Dealt only with ending commission form of government, not increasing electoral representation (top demand)
 - Too much power to mayor
 - Support by business, but failed to capture unions, civil society, hearts and minds of electorate
- Replaces current system, focus on equitable, local representation
- Strong checks and balances
- Extensive research on comparable cities' experiences
- Meeting with public, bureaus, unions, and civil society

Engagements	Number
Survey responses	4,022
People receiving monthly updates	1,310
Community listening sessions	26
Participants at listening sessions	580
Public comments received	1,600
Hours of verbal public comment	15 hours
Public meetings	81
Charter review briefings & presentation	111
Policy discussion with community organizations	34
Media articles, interviews, or inquiries	109

Polling Results

- 77% support complete overhaul or major governmental change ⁽³⁾
- 75% believe district representation is fairer and more accountable ⁽³⁾
- 73% support enlarged city council with multi-member districts ⁽²⁾
- 72% support ranked-choice voting ^{(1) (2)}
- 68% support city manager ⁽²⁾
- Support grows with single measure ⁽¹⁾
 - Mayor-council form: 51%
 - Plus ranked-choice voting: 56%
 - Plus rcv and bigger district-based council: 59%

Polls of likely voters conducted March 2022 by 1) FM3, 2) GBAO and 3) Lake Research Partners