

**Consolidation Inquiry
Bureau Director Check-in Meeting
September 17, 2014**

Meeting Participants: Fred Miller, Dean Marriott, Mike Abbaté, Andrew Scott.
OMF staff: Jane Braaten, Betsy Ames, Mark Grabow.

The group discussed each of the three areas identified as research areas for the Consolidation Inquiry: revenue collection, facilities maintenance and management, and PTE contracting. OMF staff presented spreadsheets created to track data in two of the three research areas: facilities and revenue. Fred Miller invited Andrew Scott to join, as the Mayor recently asked Andrew and Fred to come back with a proposal for a deep dive, which may dovetail with work being performed by this group. Mark Grabow was introduced as the Hatfield Fellow hired to conduct research on the Inquiry.

Facilities Maintenance and Management

OMF presented the spreadsheet template with example data provided about facilities management in three OMF operations – Facilities Services Division, Spectator Facilities, and the Portland'5. The spreadsheet breaks down facilities operations into major components. OMF is tracking facilities based on services provided in all areas of property management, project management, and operations and maintenance. The spreadsheet also captures FTE counts and other resources.

OMF vetted the facilities spreadsheet through their own staff first, populating fields for the provision of services by the Facilities division and by Spectator Facilities. The spreadsheet may be modified for additional fields as appropriate, as other bureaus start to complete the spreadsheet and suggest additional fields.

In the discussion it was pointed out that Parks Bureau operations may define major repairs and minor repairs differently from other bureaus, since maintaining parks and the condition of parks green space and facilities is part of core services and operations. Facilities personnel will answer calls for maintenance after a work order request has been submitted. Parks staff, however, conduct some repairs as maintenance as they complete their daily work. They submit a work order for things they can't fix on the spot. OMF will need to provide explanations of these key differences in major and minor maintenance when collecting and presenting Parks data.

The directors were interested in learning how these functions are performed across the City to see if bureaus could coordinate efforts to find efficiencies and/or improvements. For example, if Parks staff is painting over graffiti in a park near a fire station also with graffiti needing cover up, could the worker also do the fire station or does the fire station need some type of specialized service where that would not prove to be more efficient

The directors also discussed existing bureau partnerships for services. For example, BES pays PBOT for storm water systems maintenance. PBOT maintains catch basins and owns the work order system.

The directors discussed a framework for examining opportunities for consolidation:

- If one bureau has a substantial responsibility to perform a service, and another bureau(s) needs a small to medium amount of the same service, then this could be an opportunity for one bureau to perform the service for other bureaus. The issue that remains is how to prioritize the work so that the smaller amount of work is still performed well and in a timely manner.
- Specialized work may not be a good candidate for consolidation. For example, BES requires certain painting to be done with non-corrosive materials. If this is not standard for other painting, then the bureau may need to do that body of work separately.

Andrew Scott joined in on the discussion of service provision, noting that the case of PBOT handling maintenance work for BES seems indicative of past efforts to consolidate services and improve efficiencies. It was expressed that since the purpose of this current Inquiry is to determine whether there are potential areas for consolidation, it will be valuable to document efficiencies already occurring. The group noted that it is important to not only highlight our successes but also determine if there are more efficiencies in leaving certain systems at the status quo.

Next steps in facilities data research:

- Contact Kia Selley and Eileen Argentina in Parks Bureau to discuss Parks facilities and collect data.
- Contact Scott Turpen and Randy Tomsik in BES to discuss BES facilities and collect data.

Revenue Collection

OMF group presented a spreadsheet of revenue charges being received by the City. The spreadsheet captures how the City processes the receipt of revenue, including who issues the charge and what the means are for tracking revenue. It was discussed whether or not “revenue” included grants, donations, and development charges. The group determined that the list will eventually include those additional revenues as it is vetted out through the different bureaus.

The bureau directors present at the meeting approved of OMF’s proposed template for data collection. The group discussed ways in which the data will be collected. Focus of the conversation centered on ensuring that research is targeted and pertinent. It is essential that the purpose of the study, to determine opportunities for improvement of efficiency, remain central as data is collected.

Next steps in revenue collection research:

- Populate spreadsheet with other data from OMF – including charitable contributions, BTS, Revenue, BIBS
- Contact Jeff Shaffer in Parks to discuss revenue collection.
- Populate revenue collection spreadsheet with Parks Bureau data.
- Contact Jim Hagerman and Sediegh Khodaverdi in BES to discuss BES revenue collection.
- Populate revenue collection spreadsheet with BES data.

PTE Contracting

OMF group has begun researching PTE contracting. Facilities and revenue research has been the primary focus to date, and PTE contracting is being folded into research moving forward. The Audit Services Division is currently auditing procurement and has collected data from the Procurement Services Division. Directors encourage Procurement to share the draft audit and draft response with other bureaus so they can add comments or support the response.

We agreed that in addition to data we would ask bureau staff to identify:

- Opportunities for efficiencies or improvement by coordinating use with others;
- Success stories of efficiencies and improvements.

Next Steps:

1. OMF group to contact individuals in BES and Parks to begin data collection.
2. OMF group tracking opportunities and successes while conducting data collection.
3. OMF to communicate to Fire and PBOT to gather contact names for facilities management and revenue collection
4. Have Procurement share draft audit and response with bureaus on this committee.