



City of Portland Charter Commission Agenda

Charter Commission Education Committee
February 2, 2022 at 6:00 PM

1. Call to Order

- a. Due to the existence of an "emergency or urgent issue", the Charter Commission Committees will conduct this meeting by remote methods/technology at the Zoom link provided below, in accordance with the requirements of 1 M.R.S. section 403 -B and the Charter Commission Remote Participation Policy.

You are invited to a Zoom webinar.

When: Feb 2, 2022 06:00 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Topic: Charter Commission Education Committee

Please click the link below to join the webinar:

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/85699028780?pwd=UGl6U0VLeDFHNVF4OTJNSldPeVVOZz09>

Passcode: 572466

Or One tap mobile :

US: +13126266799,,85699028780#,,, *572466# or
+16465588656,,85699028780#,,, *572466#

Or Telephone:

Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

US: +1 312 626 6799 or +1 646 558 8656 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 346 248 7799 or
+1 720 707 2699 or +1 253 215 8782

Webinar ID: 856 9902 8780

Passcode: 572466

International numbers available: <https://us06web.zoom.us/j/85699028780?pwd=UGl6U0VLeDFHNVF4OTJNSldPeVVOZz09>

2. Approval of the prior meeting minutes

- a. Approval of the draft January 24, 2022 meeting minutes

3. Brief on memo from Drummond, Woodsum.

- a.
- Emily Figdor, School Board Chair
 - Xavier Botana, Portland Public Schools Superintendent

4. Workshop on Joint Committee proposal
 - a. Draft Language for Collaboration between the City of Portland and the Portland School Department
5. Public Comment
6. New Business
7. Adjourn



City of Portland
Charter Commission Ad Hoc
Education Committee Meeting Minutes
January 24, 2022 at 6:00 PM

- I. CALL TO ORDER
- II. ATTENDANCE
 - A. PRESENT: EGLINTON, HOUSTON, CHANN.
- III. APPROVAL OF LAST MEETINGS MINUTES
 - A. EGLINTON moves to approve minutes. HOUSTON seconds. Roll Call: EGLINTON, yes. HOUSTON, yes. CHANN, yes.
- IV. DRAFT PROPOSAL FOR JOINT COMMITTEE ON BUDGET GUIDANCE
 - A. EGLINTON presents draft proposals introducing joint meeting on jointly crafted budget guidelines.
 - B. On proposal 2 on capital improvement plan, EGLINTON said that it depends on how governance structure changes.
 - C. HOUSTON asked about how governance committee proposal effects the proposals.
 - D. No language in proposal that gives school board power to approve own budget to go on ballot.
 - E. CHANN asked about whether mayor would be a part of the joint committee, whether the appointed members to the committee, and how people get selected.
 - F. Discussion on timeframe of school budget and how participatory budgeting fits in.
- V. PUBLIC COMMENT
 - A. School Board Chair Emily Figdor asked questions about proposal, wanted more accountability for joint committee.
 - B. Eamon Dundon, Greater Portland Chamber of Commerce spoke in favor of proposal, explained that having budget guidelines up front will help Council and School Board to work better
 - C. Karen Snyder, for clarity can we have flowchart with timing.
- VI. NEW BUSINESS
 - A. HOUSTON discusses next steps. EGLINTON mentioned we need to have Attorney Katsiaficas to go through, and to get feedback/markup from Board Chair and Superintendent.



- B. EGLINTON will send to Attorney Katsiaficas, School Board Chair Emily Figdor, and Superintendent Xavier Botana.
 - C. Next Meetings February 2.
- VII. ADJOURN
- A. EGLINTON moves to adjourn. CHANN seconds.
 - 1. ROLL CALL: HOUSTON, yes. EGLINTON, yes. CHANN, yes.

MEMORANDUM

TO:	Portland Public Schools School Board and Xavier Botana, Superintendent of Schools
FROM:	Agnieszka A. Dixon and E. William Stockmeyer Drummond Woodsum
DATE:	January 24, 2022
RE:	Proposals for Charter Provisions Regarding School Budget Approval Procedures and School Bonding Authority

At your request, we write in response to a memorandum prepared by Attorneys Jim Katsiaficas and Emily Arvizu to the Portland Charter Commission Education Committee, dated December 14, 2021 (which we refer to here as the “Perkins Thompson Memo”). In that memo, Attorneys Katsiaficas and Arvizu questioned (1) the scope of the City’s charter authority to assign the role of determining the total school budget to a municipal legislative body other than the City Council including, specifically, the School Board, and (2) the proper roles of the City Council and School Board in issuing school construction and renovation bonds. We respond to both of these issues in turn.

I. AUTHORITY TO REPLACE THE CITY COUNCIL WITH ANOTHER MUNICIPAL LEGISLATIVE BODY TO DETERMINE THE TOTAL SCHOOL BUDGET

As you know, in our memo dated August 11, 2021, we provided an overview of the law governing the powers and duties of the Charter Commission to address matters of school governance, policy, and management (the “August 2021 Memo”). You then asked us whether the Portland charter could be revised to task the School Board with determining the total amount of the school budget, and we responded that there appears to exist a strong legal basis to do so (the “November 2021 Memo”). Specifically, we stated in our November 2021 Memo that a charter provision that assigns the responsibility to determine the total school budget to a municipal legislative body other than the City Council while leaving the decision for final budget authority with the voters would likely be within the City’s charter authority.

In reviewing the Perkins Thompson Memo, it appears to agree with us on this point. Where our opinions seem to diverge is on the scope of the City’s home rule authority to identify *who* can serve as the municipal legislative body for this limited purpose.

In considering this question, we think it noteworthy that the Maine Law Court has not only held that the school statute did not implicitly preempt municipal charters from designating an entity responsible for preparing the school budget, but emphasized that the budget figures prepared by such an entity are “advisory” and that, perhaps, what mattered most was that “[r]esponsibility for the adoption of a final school budget . . . is vested in the voters, not the School Committee.” *School Committee of Town of York v. Town of York*, 626 A.2d 935, 940 (Me. 1993). Indeed, the Law Court unequivocally rejected the contention that interposing a budget committee between the school committee and the town meeting frustrated the legislative scheme set out in the school statute on grounds that it undercut state policy dividing school authority between the school board and the municipal legislative body. *Id.*

We think the *York* decision could lend credence to a variety of ways that the Portland charter could be revised to remove the City Council’s current role from the school budget approval process while respecting the plain language of Section 2307. We next discuss two of the various possible alternatives, and we respond to the objections to these two alternatives raised in the Perkins Thompson Memo.

- **Alternative #1: The voters determine the total school budget.**

The Perkins Thompson Memo states (correctly, we believe) that “the use of the phrase ‘or other [municipal] legislative body’ could be considered to allow Portland to amend its charter to transfer budget adoption authority from the City Council to a City-wide voter referendum.” (Perkins Thompson Memo at p. 4.) One alternative approach to the status quo, then, would be to have the charter direct the City Council to call a City-wide municipal school budget referendum for the purpose of determining the total school budget, followed by the statutory budget validation referendum (BVR). While the Perkins Thompson Memo objects to this approach, it does not appear to be on legal grounds but rather on the policy ground that holding two referendums (the first to set the total budget, and the second to ratify that budget) is a waste of effort. Yet there may well be sound policy reason for such a two-vote process.¹ Moreover, the Legislature established a two-vote process for nearly all school administrative units as a matter of state policy, and it also established a process by which voters can vote to discontinue the BVR should they find it to be an unnecessary duplication. In other words, the Portland voters could vote to eliminate the statutory BVR in short order, leaving a single referendum vote by charter to determine the total school budget.

- **Alternative #2: The School Board determines the total school budget, and the voters ultimately approve the budget.**

As we discussed in our November 2021 Memo, we can also envision a school budget approval process that removes the City Council from the budget process but does not require two referendums. Such a process stems from my suggestion during the Education Committee’s panel discussion that there appears to be no statutory prohibition on the School Board serving as the “municipal legislative body” for purposes of Section 2307. The Perkins Thompson memo objects to this alternative process primarily on grounds that Section 2307 was amended to “clearly delineate and balance the roles and power of the school board and the existing municipal legislative body having school budget approval authority.” (Perkins Thompson Memo at p. 4.)

This objection, however, contradicts the plain reading of Section 2307 and requires the inference that the phrase “or other municipal legislative body” confines charter municipalities to a single form of legislative body—the town meeting. Yet while it is true that in charter municipalities the council and the town meeting are the two traditional forms for the municipal legislative body, nothing about the language of Section 2307 indicates that other forms are excluded. Indeed, Sanford (as the Perkins Thompson Memo noted) and, arguably, York (as we’ve noted) have at one time or another established an “other municipal legislative body” that in each case was something quite different than a town meeting. Additionally, as we discuss in our November 2021 Memo, the definition of “municipal legislative body” in the municipal statute does not support such an inference. Finally, although a statute otherwise clear on its face might require a narrower interpretation in the face of a constitutional objection, the constitutional separation of powers doctrine does not generally apply to municipal bodies or school budget approval procedures. It strikes us that reading such an intent into the language or legislative history of Section 2307 goes too far when the constitutional ground does not exist. Rather, Section 2307 addresses the role of the

¹ For example, the initial referendum to determine the total budget could be an opportunity for the School Board to inform voters on the details of the budget through the presentation of the eleven cost centers and to get an early indicator of the voters’ proclivity; and the BVR would then serve to ratify the approved budget—which is, in fact, the role the BVR serves in school budget approval procedures for regional school units and school administrative districts throughout the state.

municipal legislative body, not its identity, and just as importantly, does so by affording greater deference to charters, not less.²

For these reasons, we think Section 2307 leaves room for the Portland charter to assign the School Board the advisory role of determining the total budget before it is finally adopted by the voters. We also think that such an approach would be consistent with the holding in *York*. And, while there are arguments favoring different legal views on this matter and a charter revision that assigns the role of determining the total school budget to a school board is not without legal risk, such a charter revision would be entitled to a presumption of validity by Maine courts under home rule principles the Court articulated in *York* and many other cases.

- **The school statute and case law leave ample room to explore alternatives to the current school budget approval process.**

Should the Charter Commission entertain the idea of removing the City Council from its current role in the school budget approval process, both the school statute and case law leave ample room to explore these or other alternatives. To that end (because more often than not it is helpful to read proposals rather than legal memos), we have enclosed examples of the two charter revisions discussed above. We also would be happy to discuss other possible school budget approval processes that we believe fall within the legal limits of municipal home rule authority and address the parity issues raised by the existing charter process.

II. BONDING AUTHORITY

There is clear agreement between us and Attorneys Katsiaficas and Arvizu that there is insufficient legal basis to reassign the authority to issue school construction and renovation bonds from the City Council to the School Board. Our suggestion in the November 2021 Memo, however, does not concern who issues such bonds; rather, we propose that, whenever such a bond exceeds a charter-established threshold so that it must be submitted to a referendum, the voters should have an opportunity to vote on the bonding amount and purpose proposed by the School Board, rather than the proposal of the City Council.

Accordingly, we suggest a charter revision that would have the City Council continue to issue such bonds and to call and oversee the referendum, but require the City Council to place the *School Board's* proposed question before the voters. To further clarify our intent, we have attached a suggested charter revision for your review and consideration.

We trust this memo is responsive to your request. We are available should you have further questions.

² Notably, Section 2307(1) and (2) are exceptions to the mandate that municipal schools must follow the same school budget procedures as regional school units: First, Section 2307(1) clarifies that, notwithstanding the statutory mandate, charter municipalities are not restricted to the town meeting for the first part of the school budget approval, but may use their own legislative body—namely, the “municipal council or other municipal legislative body established by the charter.” Second, Section 2307(2) clarifies that municipal charters may circumscribe the role of a municipal council or other municipal legislative body to determining the total amount of the school budget. Section 2307 indeed “delineates and balances” roles, but only by giving charter municipalities substantially more room than other school administrative units to apply the details of the two-step school budget approval process.

SUGGESTED CHARTER REVISIONS TO ARTICLE III, SECTION 5. SCHOOL BUDGET

EXAMPLE 1: The voters determine the total school budget at a school budget referendum.

Not later than three and one-half (3.5) months before the end of the fiscal year, the superintendent shall submit to the school board budget estimates of the various sums required for the support of public schools for the ensuing fiscal year and shall thereafter provide the school board with such information relating to such estimates as the school board shall require.

During the thirty (30) days following submission of the superintendent's proposed budget to the school board, the school board and the city council, or their designated subcommittees, shall meet jointly at least twice to review the proposed school budget, focusing on its underlying assumptions and supporting data and the ability of the city to raise the necessary funds for the support of such proposed budget. The superintendent and the city manager shall provide information regarding such proposed budget as reasonably requested by the school board and the city council, or their designated subcommittees.

The budget submitted by the superintendent to be reviewed jointly by the school board and the city council shall provide a complete financial plan of all school funds and activities for the ensuing fiscal year. In organizing the school budget for joint review, the superintendent shall utilize the most feasible combination of expenditure classification by fund, organization, unit, program, purpose or activity, and object. The budget shall begin with a clear general summary of its contents; shall show in detail all estimated income and all proposed expenditures, including debt service for the ensuing fiscal year; and shall be so arranged as to show comparative figures for actual and estimated income and expenditures of the current fiscal year and actual income and expenditures of the preceding fiscal year. The total of proposed expenditures shall not exceed the total of proposed income.

Not later than the last Monday in April of each fiscal year, the school board shall submit to the city council a budget of the various sums required for the support of the public schools for the ensuing fiscal year in the format provided above, ~~and shall thereafter provide the city council with such information relating to such budget as the city council shall require.~~ The city council shall call a school budget referendum for the purpose of determining the total amount of the school budget. The budget

presented to the school budget referendum shall be the amount proposed by the school board. The warrant calling the school budget referendum shall include voter information containing the amount of locally raised funds and the amounts for each cost center summary budget category proposed by the school board. The school budget approved at the school budget referendum shall thereafter be submitted to a budget validation referendum until such time that the voters discontinue use of the budget validation referendum process.

A budget hearing on such budget estimates shall be held by the school board at least seven (7) days prior to ~~final action by the city council~~the school budget referendum.

The city council in its appropriation resolve for the ensuing year shall, in addition to amounts appropriated for other general city purposes, appropriate one gross amount for the support of the public schools, which amount shall equal the greater of (i) the amount adopted by the voters at the school budget referendum and ratified at the budget validation referendum, as necessary, ~~not be less than~~or (ii) the sum required to be appropriated for such purposes by the general laws of the state. ~~Such gross amount shall not be less than the sum requested by the school board except by a vote of at least six (6) members of the city council.~~ Such appropriation shall be expended under the direction and control of the school board but no such appropriation shall be exceeded except by consent of the city council.

EXAMPLE 2: The School Board determines the total school budget, followed by a budget validation referendum or, if eliminated, by a school budget referendum.

Not later than three and one-half (3.5) months before the end of the fiscal year, the superintendent shall submit to the school board budget estimates of the various sums required for the support of public schools for the ensuing fiscal year and shall thereafter provide the school board with such information relating to such estimates as the school board shall require.

During the thirty (30) days following submission of the superintendent's proposed budget to the school board, the school board and the city council, or their designated subcommittees, shall meet jointly at least twice to review the proposed school budget, focusing on its underlying assumptions and supporting data and the ability of the city to raise the necessary funds for the support of such proposed budget. The superintendent and the city manager shall provide information regarding such proposed budget as reasonably requested by the school board and the city council, or their designated subcommittees.

The budget submitted by the superintendent to be reviewed jointly by the school board and the city council shall provide a complete financial plan of all school funds and activities for the ensuing fiscal year. In organizing the school budget for joint review, the superintendent shall utilize the most feasible combination of expenditure classification by fund, organization, unit, program, purpose or activity, and object. The budget shall begin with a clear general summary of its contents; shall show in detail all estimated income and all proposed expenditures, including debt service for the ensuing fiscal year; and shall be so arranged as to show comparative figures for actual and estimated income and expenditures of the current fiscal year and actual income and expenditures of the preceding fiscal year. The total of proposed expenditures shall not exceed the total of proposed income.

Not later than the last Monday in April of each fiscal year, the school board shall ~~submit to the city council~~prepare a budget of the various sums required for the support of the public schools for the ensuing fiscal year in the format provided above, ~~and shall thereafter provide the city council with such information relating to such budget as the city council shall require.~~

The school board shall hold a~~A~~ budget hearing on such budget estimates ~~shall be held at least seven (7) days prior to determining the total amount of the school budget final action by the city council.~~ The city council shall thereafter

submit the school budget determined by the school board to a budget validation referendum. If the voters discontinue use of the budget validation referendum process, the city council shall instead submit the school budget to a municipal school budget referendum. The warrant calling the budget validation referendum or the school budget referendum shall include voter information containing the amount of locally raised funds and the amounts for each cost center summary budget category proposed by the school board.

The city council in its appropriation resolve for the ensuing year shall, in addition to amounts appropriated for other general city purposes, appropriate one gross amount for the support of the public schools, which amount shall equal the greater of (i) the amount adopted by the voters at the school budget referendum and ratified at the budget validation referendum, as necessary, or (ii) ~~not be less than~~ the sum required to be appropriated for such purposes by the general laws of the state. ~~Such gross amount shall not be less than the sum requested by the school board except by a vote of at least six (6) members of the city council.~~ Such appropriation shall be expended under the direction and control of the school board but no such appropriation shall be exceeded except by consent of the city council.

SUGGESTED CHARTER REVISIONS TO ARTICLE VII, SECTION 11. BOND ISSUES

Section 11. Bond issues.

Money may be borrowed, within the limits fixed by the constitution and statutes of the state, now or hereafter applying to Portland, by the issue and sale of bonds or notes pledged on the credit of the city, or on the revenues or assets of the projects financed with the proceeds of such borrowings, the proceeds to be used for the acquisition of land, the construction, reconstruction, major alteration, extraordinary repairs, and equipment of buildings and other permanent public improvements, the purchase of departmental equipment, for economic development to the extent determined by the City Council to serve a valid public purpose, to create reserves to settle workers' compensation obligations, to fund, refund, pay or to create reserves for the payment of the city's unfunded pension fund liabilities and for the payment of refunding bonds, notes and other evidences of indebtedness previously issued, or for any other purpose permitted by state law.

No order providing for the issue of bonds shall be passed without public notice given by posting notice of the same in two (2) public places in the City of Portland and publishing such notice at least twice in a newspaper of general circulation in Portland at least two (2) weeks before final action of the city council. In addition, the city council may, in its discretion, provide that such notice shall be published on the city's website and in such other additional media as the city council determines are appropriate to notify the general public of the public hearing.

Any order authorizing the issue of bonds must be approved by vote of at least seven (7) members of the city council, except as set forth in Section 11.A.

Section 11.A. Bond issues for school bonds.

The city council shall submit school project bonds to voter referendum in accordance with this section. When the school board has voted to propose that the city issue bonds for school construction, renovation, or other capital purposes in an amount that requires the city council to submit an order or resolve to voter referendum by Section 16 this Charter, the school board shall submit to the city council (i) a description of the project concept and concept budget; (ii) the major components of the project

concept budget, including as applicable sums for real estate acquisition, design and other services, construction and site development, equipment, infrastructure, and project contingencies; and (iii) the proposed sources and amounts of funding for the project budget, including project debt. The city council shall order the issuance of bonds for the school project as proposed by the school board, subject to voter ratification of its bond order as provided in Section 16, in an amount sufficient to fund the debt portion of the project concept budget after deduction of issuance and other costs. The city council shall submit its order authorizing the issuance of debt for the project to voter referendum at the next regular city election occurring at least 120 days after the school board has submitted the project concept to the city council or at an earlier election. The city council shall use a separate referendum question to submit its bond order for each school project as proposed, except that if the school board has consolidated school projects into a single concept that it has approved, then the city council shall use a single referendum question to submit its bond order for that consolidated school project as proposed.

Draft Language for Charter Provisions Governing Budget Collaboration Between the City of Portland and Portland Public Schools

FROM: Peter Eglinton
TO: Portland Charter Commission Education Committee (Commissioners Houston, Chann, and Eglinton)
DATE: January 29, 2022
RE: Communications between City Staff and Elected Officials

The following proposals are intended to address recommendations raised in public comments to seek greater parity for the superintendent and school board in the discussions around and decisions affecting Portland Public Schools. Proposal 1 would shed light shift discussions that have frequently occurred among a small group of officials to a public process that benefits from the input of the full council, school board input, and residents. A joint committee, equally represented by members of the school board and city council, would engage in a process to prepare draft guidance for the full bodies of elected officials to consider, ensuring transparency and accountability. The guidance would set the context for budget guidance and allow both the school system and city to describe important priorities and constraints, including the flagging of unpredictable events that could affect the outcome (such as changes in state funding) and possible ways to address significant issues. The joint committee is similar to, although not based on, the model followed in Sanford. In summary, following are the goals of Proposal 1:

- Improves collaboration between the School Board and the City Council
- Provides more parity between the School Board and the City Council in developing budget guidance
- Increases transparency of budget guidance and gains earlier agreement on underlying, shared objectives
- Allows for flexibility along with longer-term goal-setting

Proposal 2 would explicitly include the superintendent in the capital improvement planning process on an equal footing. This proposal is similar to the process used in Auburn.

PROPOSAL 1

[Note: Changes in blue reflect edits made since the last proposal. Changes in red and blue reflect proposed edits to the existing Charter.]

Amend Article III (Board of Public Education) as follows:

Section 5. School budget.

Prior to the submission of a school budget, the school board and city council shall establish a Joint Committee on Budget Guidance, consisting of ~~with~~ four city councilors and four school board members, appointed by the Mayor and school board chair, respectively. The

purpose of the joint committee is to develop guidance for the city and school district on budget priorities and constraints, covering a two-year period and updated annually. The joint committee shall obtain public comment on the guidance prior to submitting the guidance as a proposed non-binding joint resolution to the city council and school board for their approval. Although the resolution is non-binding, the intent is to agree on budget guidance at a sufficient level of detail so that the city council can approve the school budget without amendment should the school board ~~budget~~ follow the guidance.

Not later than three and one-half (3.5) months before the end of the fiscal year, the superintendent shall submit to the school board budget estimates of the various sums required for the support of public schools for the ensuing fiscal year and shall thereafter provide the school board with such information relating to such estimates as the school board shall require.

~~During the thirty (30) days following submission of the superintendent's proposed budget to the school board, the school board and the city council, or their designated subcommittees, shall meet jointly at least twice to review the proposed school budget, focusing on its underlying assumptions and supporting data and the ability of the city to raise the necessary funds for the support of such proposed budget. The superintendent and the city manager shall provide information regarding such proposed budget as reasonably requested by the school board and the city council, or their designated subcommittees.~~

The budget submitted by the superintendent ~~to be reviewed jointly by the school board and the city council~~ shall provide a complete financial plan of all school funds and activities for the ensuing fiscal year. In organizing the school budget ~~for joint review~~, the superintendent shall utilize the most feasible combination of expenditure classification by fund, organization, unit, program,

purpose or activity, and object. The budget shall begin with a clear general summary of its contents; shall show in detail all estimated income and all proposed expenditures, including debt service for the ensuing fiscal year; and shall be so arranged as to show comparative figures for actual and estimated income and expenditures of the current fiscal year and actual income and expenditures of the preceding fiscal year. The total of proposed expenditures shall not exceed the total of proposed income.

Not later than the last Monday in April of each fiscal year, the school board shall submit to the city council a budget of the various sums required for the support of the public schools for the ensuing fiscal year in the format provided above, and shall thereafter provide the city council with such information relating to such budget as the city council shall require.

A budget hearing on such budget estimates shall be held prior to final action by the city council. The city council in its appropriation resolve for the ensuing year shall, in addition to amounts appropriated for other general city City of Portland Charter Code of Ordinances ~~Article III Rev. 12-6-12~~ purposes, appropriate one gross amount for the support of the public schools, which amount shall not be less than the sum required to be appropriated for such purposes by the general laws of the state. Such gross amount shall not be less than the sum requested by the school board except by a vote of at least six (6) members of the city council. Such appropriation shall be expended under the direction and control of the school board but no such appropriation shall be exceeded except by consent of the city council.

Note that additional amendments may be necessary under the city council's section of the Charter to further specify its role.

PROPOSAL 2

[Note: Changes in blue reflect edits made since the last proposal. Changes in red and blue reflect proposed edits to the existing Charter.]

At the appropriate location(s) in the Charter, specify that the city manager and superintendent must jointly prepare and submit to a joint meeting of the council and school board a multi-year capital improvement CIP before submission of the budget, and must publish a general summary of the CIP. The CIP must be revised and extended each year with regard to capital improvements pending or in process of construction or acquisition.

The Education Committee recognizes that changes in the city's governance structure may affect the roles of city officials in the CIP process. If no changes are made to the governance structure, the following amendments to the Charter appear to capture the intent of this proposal:

ARTICLE VI. ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS

...

Section 5. Appointment; qualifications; powers and duties of the city manager.

...

The city manager's powers and duties shall be as follows:

...

(i) To ~~jointly~~ prepare ~~with the Portland Public Schools superintendent~~ a five (5) year rolling capital improvement plan for annual presentation to ~~a joint meeting of~~ the city council ~~and school board~~, which plan includes the following:

1. A one (1) year plan of specific projects and their cost;
2. A two (2) through five (5) year plan of specific projects and general categories, and amounts of proposed spending and funding sources; and
3. A discussion of the basis for the plan and the factors which went into its development or amendments.

...