

**City of Portland
Consolidation Inquiry**

Report to Steering Committee

**Evaluating Opportunities for Efficiency Improvement in
Facilities Management, Revenue Collection, and PTE
Contracting**

May 29, 2015

Introduction

In early 2014, the Mayor’s Office commissioned a review of the structure and responsibilities for the City’s Office of Management and Finance. Three recommendations from that report were to consolidate facilities management, consolidate revenue collection and coordinate professional services contracting. The CAO invited four other bureau directors – from Environmental Services, Fire, Parks and Transportation – to guide a research effort to look for opportunities to make these service areas more efficient and/or more effective. The research began in the summer of 2014 and will wrap up in early 2015.

Committee Membership

Members appointed to the Consolidation Inquiry Steering Committee include:

Bureau Represented	Name	Title
BES	Jim Hagerman	Interim Director, Bureau of Environmental Services
Fire Bureau	Erin Janssens	Fire Chief, Portland Fire & Rescue
OMF	Fred Miller	Chief Administrative Officer, Office of Management and Finance
PBOT	Leah Treat	Director, Portland Bureau of Transportation
PP&R	Mike Abbaté	Director, Portland Parks and Recreation

Guiding Principles

The Committee reviewed the scope of the Inquiry and identified Citywide opportunities in the three areas identified in the OMF Moss Adams assessment (Appendix G). In supporting the Steering Committee, the Work Group was charged with meeting the following guiding principles:

- The expected benefits of a proposal must outweigh the expected costs and disadvantages of such implementation.
- Consolidation may be achieved through an integration of existing technologies or business processes and does not necessarily require moving functions and services out of one bureau and into another. Additionally, do not assume that any functions that do move would necessarily move into OMF.
- Proposals that examine changes in business practices or moving a function from one bureau to another must consider the capacity of the organization to adapt to any increased workload.
- Proposals to move functions or services from one organization to another will need to consider change management strategies to address various levels of acceptance and resistance from the respective organizations.

Composition of Work Group

- Business Operations Team: Jane Braaten, Aaron Beck, Elyse Rosenberg, and Hatfield Fellow Mark Grabow
- Policy Team: Betsy Ames and Celia Heron

Analysis

Facilities Management Key Observations and Opportunities

I. Facilities and Property Management

1. The approach for Facilities and Property Management varies widely in the City with some property owning bureaus doing it all themselves (Parks) to some contracting with the Office of Management and Finance – Facilities Division (OMF – Facilities) for most (Parking Garages, BES, Water). Bureaus do not always recognize their own staff costs to managing services when evaluating the cost of their services versus those of an interagency (IA) provider. There is a need for cross-bureau coordination on issues and increased transparency and understanding of IA billings between bureaus.
 - a. Opportunity: Establish monthly or quarterly meetings among facilities and property managers across bureaus to discuss current projects and potential synergy of efforts.
 - b. Opportunity: Develop a common methodology for tracking costs and building conditions.

- c. Opportunity: Draft education/training materials for bureaus to better understand IA billings.

II. Contracting

- 2. At the present time, cross-bureau usage of on-call services contracts is prohibited without prior written approval from the bureau that owns the contract and the Chief Procurement Officer. The owner bureau is able to control the amount of resources they will authorize for use by another bureau. Additionally, there is already a cap of sorts in place within SAP, the City's enterprise financial system. The four infrastructure bureaus are able to lock down their contracts by identifying their "plant" thereby assuring that no other bureau will be able to use their contractual resources. Conversely, if they wish to share a contract with another bureau, they can develop a separate line item and input the cost ceiling for the requesting bureau. By design, SAP allows bureau access to all contracts not locked down by plant. Therefore, other than the infrastructure bureaus, the remaining bureaus within the City do not have the ability to lock down or restrict the use of their contracts. The City may also specifically identify within the solicitations and contracts which bureaus are authorized to use the resulting contract or they can be written as a Citywide agreement. Procurement Services is limited in what it can do to control usage of or cap an open contract within SAP.
 - a. Opportunity: Develop a process to post and share Citywide facilities-related on-call contracts for services as needed by all City bureaus. For example, plumbing, painting, carpentry, etc.
 - b. Opportunity: Consider establishing additional "plants" for the remaining bureaus within the City or find other means by which bureaus are able to share on-call contracts without reducing the project budget of the bureau that established the contract.
- 3. Bureaus spend lots of time managing janitorial contracts.
 - a. Opportunity: Review current janitorial contract specifications and compare with industry best practices.
 - b. Opportunity: Evaluate and implement a more efficient contract management system for janitorial services.

III. Sharing Programs or Systems

- 4. Facilities programs have a significant number of employees eligible to retire in the next three years.
 - a. Opportunity: Create a Citywide Facilities Maintenance Technician (FMT) apprenticeship program which will develop a pool of qualified FMT's to be shared across bureaus.

- b. Opportunity: Create a common staff resource pool for sharing staff who experience lulls in productivity due to extraneous circumstances like seasonal changes.
- 5. Some bureau work order request processes are handled reactively, with a single request required for a single service. There is potential to handle work order requests more proactively by coupling multiple requests into a single trip. A shared common work order system would allow each facilities management provider to assess work order priorities and schedule in the most expeditious manner. The City owns the SAP Flexible Real Estate and Plant Maintenance modules. Facilities is currently working with Enterprise Business Solutions (EBS) on reviewing/developing these modules as the Facilities' business solution for property management, project management, maintenance and operations. EBS is also working with OMF and property-owning bureaus on the potential broader implementation of the Flexible Real Estate module for real property inventories and management. There are opportunities for consolidating information systems. Some bureaus are in need of upgrading work order systems. Others rely primarily on email for initiating service requests.
 - a. Opportunity: Evaluate potential to share inventory functions, especially for facilities departments lacking an inventory system.
 - b. Opportunity: Look for opportunities for efficiencies through consolidation when upgrading work order systems/facilities management information systems.
 - c. Opportunity: Evaluate current service delivery method and look for opportunities to consolidate work order requests.
 - d. Opportunity: Develop common work order system or develop linkages between work order systems and SAP (e.g. Parks' Micro-Main work order system) to allow for sharing of real-time information. Information that could be accessed across shared systems/platforms could include preventative (planned) maintenance modules, asset management, and demand work orders for interested Facilities and Property Management providers. Functionality should include staff time and work order cost tracking reporting, real-time reporting to requesters, and status reporting.
- 6. Some bureaus lack inventory systems or centralized equipment/parts storage facilities. Researching facilities operations within bureaus could help determine the best approach for parts and supply delivery within the City.
 - a. Opportunity: Evaluate the potential to create a centralized equipment/parts storage facility to be shared by multiple bureaus.
 - b. Opportunity: Evaluate the potential to develop on-call commodities contracts and "just in time" supply delivery contracts.
- 7. Multiple bureaus have meeting room and venue reservations, event scheduling planning and billing duties. There is no centralized process or system for this work. Many bureaus have dispatch functions, but lack a formal dispatch system, relying on email and phone conversations to assign work. OMF – Facilities is

currently working with EBS on using SAP to replace their current work order system in place.

- a. Opportunity: Parks Bureau has a venue reservation and billing system. Investigate centralized meeting room, events, scheduling; or use of same systems.
 - b. Opportunity: Explore a shared or coordinated dispatching system amongst the bureaus
8. Service issues with vendors are common among bureaus, and many bureaus have similar concerns with technologies used across the City. For instance, some bureaus do not find the I-Net badging system user friendly and would like to replace it. Other bureaus find the vendors used for janitorial services to be lagging in response time and inadequate in service delivery.
- a. Opportunity: Establish monthly or quarterly meetings among facilities managers across bureaus to discuss current projects and potential synergy of efforts (same opportunity mentioned above in “Facilities and Property Management”, 1a).

Revenue Collection Key Observations and Opportunities

I. Expanding Payment Options

1. Bureaus have a need to offer their customers opportunities to access alternative payment modes using today’s technology. Numerous bureaus listed a desire to offer online payments, pay-by-phone options, payment apps for mobile phones, and other alternative payment modes. For instance, Portland Parks and Recreation Bureau (PP&R) reported working on a “pay-by-phone smart phone app” for Washington Park parking fees.
 - a. Opportunity: Continue to work with the City Treasurer and the Bureau of Technology Services in identifying alternative payment solutions for bureaus to access at a Citywide level, and identify what technology offerings are currently being pursued at the bureau level that could have broader applicability.
 - b. Opportunity: Continue to support the migration from the City’s legacy payment gateway to the competitively identified hosted payment solution.
 - c. Opportunity: City Treasurer and the Bureau of Technology Services to continue to provide guidance to bureaus about the legal, contractual, and information security framework that governs the City’s menu of available payment solutions.
2. Bureaus receive a number of City payments via paper check, while similar payments are being received via ACH and/or payment cards. For instance, traffic citation revenues for red light cameras and photo radar are still received by the City through mail-in checks from Multnomah County Circuit Courts and the State of Oregon after a third party processes the citation fees. Switching to electronic payments not only reduces City’s bank fees and risk associated with cash handling, but payments are deposited into the City’s bank account sooner, better

leveraging our cash position. The City Treasurer recently converted all State of Oregon check payments received by the City into ACH.

- a. Opportunity: The City Treasurer and bureaus will continue to evaluate specific bureau revenues that are still being received by paper check, and determine if there is potential for payer to switch to ACH or payment card.

II. Transactional Opportunities

3. There is a potential opportunity for bureaus to use a shared enterprise system for room/facility reservations rather than an Excel spreadsheet or direct email to the person in charge of room reservations. Some bureaus have already created intra-bureau partnerships to meet this need. For instance, the Water Bureau is using PP&R's staff and ActiveNet software for reservations at the Water Bureau's Dodge Park. Also, the Bureau of Internal Business Services' (BIBS) Facilities Division is currently exploring alternative room reservation software and may be a potential partner in expanding use of ActiveNet to other bureaus.
 - a. Opportunity: Work with PP&R staff to expand availability of ActiveNet to other bureaus, and explore the possibility of joint partnerships with PP&R to provide staff support for the system.
4. Records requests are a revenue charge area that many bureaus manage. However, there is no best practice or standard process for handling these one-off charges. Several bureaus discussed their records requests process as a transaction that is handled by one-off side systems. For instance, OMF indicated that requests for records are initiated via phone or email correspondence, and an official Public Records Request form must then be submitted. Staff typically receives checks but can potentially receive cash, and SAP is used for journal entry after funds have been sent to Treasury. A challenge with the current procedure is that the records requestor must submit a portion of the total payment as a deposit on the work to be done in retrieving the records. However, the bureau does not know the full costs until after the work has been performed. The City Attorney is managing a Citywide project for public records requests. The City Treasurer has been designated as the lead OMF financial representative on the payment process.
 - a. Opportunity: Continue to support the work of the City Attorney, City Treasurer, and bureau staff in developing a consistent process for handling revenue coming into bureaus for public records requests. Create parameters around the type of payments allowed. Develop and communicate a best practice for the deposit, payment and refund process.
5. Bureaus reported handling point of sale (POS) transactions in multiple ways. Several bureaus listed various POS transactions that are managed through use of Excel spreadsheets and SAP journal entries. There could be potential to shift several bureaus' POS transactions into an enterprise system currently being utilized by other bureaus.
 - a. Opportunity: Work with bureaus to determine if an enterprise system could meet the needs of transaction tracking and processing, such as SAP's

Public Sector Collections and Disbursements, ActiveNet or the Information Technology Advancement Project (ITAP).

6. Bureaus discussed using side systems for activities such as code enforcement violation fees, sidewalk permitting fees, and hydrant permits that have certain similarities to other permitting activities currently managed through TRACS. There may be potential to move some of these “permitting-like” fee revenues into ITAP.
 - a. Opportunity: Evaluate the potential to move additional fees and charges currently not included in TRACS into ITAP to be managed through that system.
7. Certain revenue charges are handled through side systems like Excel, with SAP involved only for journal entries. For instance, the Regional Water Providers Consortium dues are managed using Excel and then manually entered into SAP for journal entry.
 - a. Opportunity: Work with bureaus and the Accounting Division to determine if the SAP-AR module is an appropriate platform for managing these types of revenues.
8. The City owns the Public Sector Collection and Disbursement module of SAP. The Enterprise Business Solution (EBS) team is working with the Office for Community Technology in the Bureau of Revenue and Financial Services (BRFS) to transfer utility license fees and franchise fees from Excel to PSCD. The configuration will be done to accommodate other uses.
 - a. Opportunity: Support EBS in working with other bureaus to demonstrate PSCD functionality, and consider whether PSCD has potential for expanded use for other revenue types.
9. The City owns the SAP Flexible Real Estate module. Bureaus handling transactions for long term leases of property and/or charges for cell tower placements on their properties presented potential opportunities to utilize the City-owned SAP Flexible Real Estate module. EBS is currently working with OMF and property-owning bureaus on the potential implementation of the module, which could provide an enterprise approach for handling these types of transactions as part of property management.
 - a. Opportunity: Consider options for managing leases and cell tower rentals as part of the implementation of Flexible Real Estate. The Flexible Real Estate module has the ability to manage leases and interface with SAP Accounts Receivable module to efficiently bill for leases and rentals.
10. The BRFS – Revenue Division collects taxes using a number of separate systems. Staff from the Revenue Division have expressed a need to replace the various separate tax administration systems with a commercial off the shelf (COTS) system.
 - a. Opportunity: Create a pathway for BRFS-Revenue to work with other bureaus in the development of the COTS requirements as BRFS-Revenue scopes a tax collection system, and evaluate the potential to use existing City systems, including SAP, to fill this need.
11. The City has made a significant investment in SAP and in other systems and processes for managing revenue collection activities. Whenever possible,

bureaus should first consider using existing systems and processes and developing solutions that meet multiple bureau needs.

- a. Opportunity: Consider development of a new Citywide policy that brings together the various policy directives regarding consolidation of technology systems, SAP as the City's enterprise system, and processes and practices for review and coordination across bureaus of Citywide programs and activities. The Chief Administrative Officer, Chief Financial Officer, and/or Chief Technology Officer should provide guidance to bureaus that have identified new revenue collection needs.

III. Collections and Delinquent Contracts

12. A potential opportunity lies in evaluating the collections agency contracts used by bureaus to collect delinquent funds. Bureaus listed revenue charges that are sent to a collection agency after a certain length of delinquency had passed on the charge. Procurement executed a contract for collection services while the Consolidation Inquiry research was underway. Several bureaus share this contract. Other bureaus may use the contract by contacting BRFS – Accounting Division.

- a. Opportunity: Identify those bureaus that manage an individual collections agency contract, and communicate that a Citywide contract has recently been established for this service. Inform bureaus how to utilize this shared collections agency contract.

13. A potential opportunity lies in creating a collaborative process to aid in identifying and validating delinquent accounts. At times, staff must spend time pursuing delinquent accounts for revenue collection. It would benefit bureaus if a shared generalist position were created to aid in the validation of delinquent accounts, versus expending staff time and resources pursuing accounts that may no longer be valid.

- a. Opportunity: Work with BRFS – Revenue Division and Accounting Division to explore the delinquent account validation process, and determine if there is potential to create a central process of account validation.

PTE Contracting Key Observations and Opportunities

I. On - Call Contracts

1. On-Call service contracts can be used for repetitive, albeit routine needs and are designed to quickly and efficiently hire consultants to perform these routine services by issuing individual Task Orders as needs are identified. Any project over \$100,000 requires separate competitive bidding. The Bureau of Revenue and Financial Services' Procurement Services Division (Procurement Services) is looking into expanding its current Citywide on-call service contracts. There are only three Citywide contracts at this time; they are for industrial hygiene services (i.e. asbestos abatement). There are no other Citywide on-call service contracts at this time. The push back to on-call service contracts is that it locks a single

vendor or vendors into a contract for an extended period of time and other vendors cannot compete for that work for that period of time (usually 3 years). Small firms find it difficult to compete for on-call service contracts because of the upfront liability insurance requirement and the immediate call on their resources required under these contracts. Larger firms can usually manage the liability insurance up to City requirements as part of their normal business operations and have more depth in resources in responding to the City's requests. Procurement Services is considering several contracts for Citywide use. City Code requires that bureaus utilize Citywide contracts before establishing others.

- a. Opportunity: Work to establish Citywide on-call service contracts for comparable services required by numerous bureaus. These contracts should include minorities, women and emerging small business (MWESB) subcontractors rather than allowing the prime vendors to self-perform all the work.
2. At the present time, cross-bureau usage of on-call services contracts is prohibited without prior written approval from the bureau that owns the contract and the Chief Procurement Officer. The owner bureau is able to control the amount of resources they will authorize for use by another bureau. Additionally, there is already a cap of sorts in place within SAP, the City's enterprise financial system. The four infrastructure bureaus are able to lock down their contracts by identifying their "plant" thereby assuring that no other bureau will be able to use their contractual resources. Conversely, if they wish to share a contract with another bureau, they can develop a separate line item and input the cost ceiling for the requesting bureau. By design, SAP allows bureau access to all contracts not locked down by plant. Therefore, other than the infrastructure bureaus, the remaining bureaus within the City do not have the ability to lock down or restrict the use of their contracts. The City may also specifically identify within the solicitations and contracts which bureaus are authorized to use the resulting contract or they can be written as a Citywide agreement. Procurement Services is limited in what it can do to control usage of or cap an open contract within SAP.
 - a. Opportunity: Consider establishing additional "plants" for the remaining bureaus within the City or find other means by which bureaus are able to share on-call contracts without reducing the project budget of the bureau that established the contract.

II. Contract Management Knowledge among City Staff

3. Project managers sometimes lack the degree of skill required to properly manage the initial solicitation phase of the contracting process. Bureaus that do not often write contracts usually encounter the most problems. Procurement Services is attempting to roll out a pilot program reaching out to smaller bureaus who do not often contract out, establishing a relationship with them for assistance in future contract development processes. The present pilot program is being conducted in conjunction with OMF – Business Operations on behalf of the Council offices. Services ranging from solicitation, evaluation, award,

contract negotiation and contract development through receiving and payment are provided.

- a. Opportunity: Evaluate the proposed pilot program and resources required to roll it out, and communicate results to City bureaus.
4. Contract development trainings include coverage on the solicitation and evaluation process. Classes help establish working relationships among Procurement Services staff and project managers (PM's), and they reduce errors. It is not uncommon for larger bureaus to have problems with contracting process at some point (happens roughly 2-3 times a year), and it has a major impact on the development of the contract.
 - a. Opportunity: Convene a meeting of bureau contract management staff to gather feedback on the content for training courses and any other suggestions.
 - b. Opportunity: Consider reinstating the requirement that project managers attend Contract Development 201 & 202 training courses offered by Procurement Services (half-day trainings), and ask bureau directors to hold the supervisors of the project managers accountable for completion of the trainings. Consider opportunities for "just in time" training for project managers as needed.
 - c. Opportunity: Work with the City Attorney to determine if it is possible to develop a mechanism to share evaluations on contractors who have completed projects for the City previously, to be used during the request for proposal (RFP) process.
5. The City does not require that RFP's be reviewed by Procurement Services at the initial stages of contract development if the project is under \$100,000. Procurement Services hopes to educate and aid the part of the process where they have the most expertise. This is important because when errors occur, the process must be redone, often creating tension and dissatisfaction with the bidding vendors.
 - a. Opportunity: Research and document which bureaus experience consistent challenges with the RFP process and identify strategies for helping them improve through additional targeted trainings, requirements for early review, etc.
6. City requirements around minimum liability insurance thresholds can be a hindrance to the contracting process. Smaller contractors in the City are unable to compete for certain contracts that they would otherwise be eligible for because of these minimum liability requirements. Often times, bureau directors waive the liability insurance requirement because it is unreasonable or simply unavailable at the level required by the City.
 - a. Opportunity: Work with the Chief Procurement Officer and the City Attorney to revise current City policy around liability insurance on certain contract types.
7. Bureaus find themselves modifying or revising standard templates for professional, technical, expert services (PTE) contracts because the current standard PTE contract templates do not meet the needs of the contractors and/or the bureaus. Procurement Services is currently drafting new solicitation

and contract documents and will be discussing changes with representatives of bureaus at the next Bureau Liaison meeting.

- a. Opportunity: Work with the Chief Procurement Officer and the City Attorney to revise standard templates for PTE contracts to address changes commonly requested by contractors (and approved by the City).

Research Methodology

Facilities Research Methodology

Bureaus that own and manage property were selected for the facilities portion of the Inquiry. Those bureaus are: Office of Management and Finance – Bureau of Internal Business Services (OMF-BIBS); Bureau of Environmental Services (BES); Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT); Portland Fire and Rescue; Portland Parks and Recreation (PP&R); and the Water Bureau.

Contacts at each bureau were established either through contacting the bureau director or the operations manager and determining the best point of contact. Research meetings were held with bureau staff with the most oversight of facilities maintenance and management for their operations.

An Excel spreadsheet was created to indicate the way in which participating bureaus performed their facilities maintenance and management. Targeted areas of research included types of services provided in the areas of: a) property management, b) project management, and c) operations & maintenance. The spreadsheet also captured each bureau's available resources in performing facilities maintenance and management (Appendix H).

The Work Group then analyzed both the verbal and written responses from each meeting, identifying areas of opportunity. These potential opportunities were shared with the Steering Committee for feedback. For a complete listing of notes and participants, please see Appendix I.

Revenue Research Methodology

Bureaus that collect the largest sums of external revenues (over \$10,000,000 annually) were targeted for the revenue collection portion of the Inquiry. Other bureaus participated either by self-selecting, or because there was a specific area of research for follow-up, as identified by the Steering Committee at the outset. The following bureaus participated in the Inquiry: Bureau of Development Services (BDS); Bureau of Environmental Services (BES); Bureau of Revenue and Financial Services (BRFS) – Revenue Division; Bureau of Transportation (PBOT); Fire and Rescue; Parks and Recreation (PP&R); Office of Management and Finance – Business Operations; Portland Police Bureau; and Water Bureau.

The Work Group created a questionnaire for bureaus to complete, which indicated types of revenues collected from external sources (intra-bureau revenues were not the focus). In addition, the Steering Committee identified specific aspects of multiple bureaus in which more targeted research was required. One-on-one meetings were held with these bureaus to discuss bureau-specific aspects of the Inquiry. The Work Group then analyzed both the questionnaire responses and the information gathered from the one-on-one meetings, identifying opportunities. These potential opportunities were shared with the Steering Committee for feedback.

To view the questionnaire template used in conducting revenue collection research, please see Appendix J. For the completed questionnaire responses, please see Appendix K. For a detailed listing of participants and notes from the one-on-one meetings, please see Appendix L.

PTE Research Methodology

Because of the nature of the research involving Professional, Technical Expertise (PTE) contracting, research focused on the City's central Procurement Services division of the Bureau of Revenue and Financial Services (BRFS). Two research meetings were held between the Work Group and Procurement Services staff to discuss the current method of contracting out for on-call services and to identify potential opportunities in Procurement. These potential opportunities were shared with the Steering Committee for feedback. For a detailed listing of notes and participants, please see Appendix M.

Committee Findings

The Work Group compiled the observations and opportunities into a matrix for further evaluation. Through a series of meetings, the Work Group reviewed and assigned each opportunity an owner and a level of effort required to implement. The level of effort was estimated based on the following factors:

Low

- Does not impact many activities
- Low cost
- Limited barriers
- Quick to implement
- Few stakeholders involved
- Limited resources required

High

- Impacts many other activities
- High cost
- Multiple barriers
- Lengthy to implement
- Weak or conflicting stakeholder support
- Significant resources required

The Steering Committee was given the matrix and asked to prioritize each opportunity by rating them in terms of whether or not to pursue further, using the following rating guidelines: 3 = Definitely Pursue; 2 = Maybe; 1 = Not at this time.

The Work Group consolidated each individual response from the Steering Committee members into a single document and listed each opportunity's total and cumulative ratings. The matrix was sorted with the highest cumulative ratings listed at the top.

The Steering Committee met to discuss the opportunities and identify which opportunities to pursue further at this time. Due to the number of opportunities with a high cumulative rating, the Committee decided to pursue those opportunities with a cumulative score higher than 2.4. The following is a description of the opportunities with a cumulative rating higher than 2.4:

Facilities Management and Collaboration

- Establish and evaluate the value of monthly/quarterly meetings among facilities and property managers discuss current projects and potential synergy of efforts. *(Opportunity F.1.A & F.8.A)*
- Draft education/training materials for bureaus to better understand IA billings. *(Opportunity F.1.C)*
- Create a Citywide Facilities Maintenance Technician (FMT) apprenticeship program which will develop a pool of qualified FMT's to be shared across bureaus. *(Opportunity F.4.A)*
- Communicate to other bureaus that they could use the Parks meeting room and events scheduling system. *(Opportunity F.7.A)*
- Consider options for managing leases and cell tower rentals as part of the implementation of Flexible Real Estate. The Flexible Real Estate module has the ability to manage leases and interface with SAP Accounts Receivable module to efficiently bill for leases and rentals. *(Opportunity R.9.A)*

Revenue and Tracking

- Identify further alternative technology payment solutions for bureaus to access at a Citywide level, and identify what technology offerings are currently being pursued at the bureau level that could have broader applicability. *(Opportunity R.1.A)*
- Support the migration from the City's legacy payment gateway to the competitively identified hosted payment solution. *(Opportunity R.1.B)*
- Provide guidance to bureaus about the legal, contractual, and information security framework that governs the City's menu of available payment solutions. *(Opportunity R.1.C)*
- Evaluate specific bureau revenues still being received by paper check, and determine if there is potential for payer to switch to ACH or payment card. *(Opportunity R.2.A)*
- Develop a consistent process for handling revenue coming into bureaus for public records requests; create parameters around types of payments allowed; develop and communicate a best practice for the deposit, payment and refund process. *(Opportunity R.4.A)*
- Communicate with bureaus and demonstrate PSCD functionality, and consider whether PSCD has potential for expanded use for other revenue types. *(Opportunity R.8.A)*

Contracts and Contracting

- Develop a process to post and share Citywide facilities-related on-call contracts for services as needed by all City bureaus. For example, plumbing, painting, carpentry, etc. *(Opportunity F.2.A)*
- Revise current City policy around liability insurance on certain contract types. *(Opportunity P.6.A)*
- Revise standard templates for PTE contracts to address changes commonly requested by contractors (and approved by the City). *(Opportunity R.7.A)*
- Consider establishing additional "plants" for the remaining bureaus within the City or find other means by which bureaus are able to share on-call contracts without reducing the project budget of the bureau that established the contract. *(Opportunity F.2.B & P.2.A)*
- Evaluate potential to develop on-call commodities contracts and "just in time" supply delivery contracts. *(Opportunity F.6.B)*
- Identify those bureaus that manage an individual collections agency contract, and communicate that a Citywide contract has recently been established for this service. Inform bureaus how to utilize this shared collections agency contract. *(Opportunity R.12.A)*
- Convene a meeting of bureau contract management staff to gather feedback on the content for training courses and any other suggestions. *(Opportunity P.4.A)*
- Consider reinstating the requirement that project managers attend Contract Development 201 & 202 training and ask bureau directors to hold the supervisors of the project managers accountable for completion of the trainings. Consider opportunities for "just in time" training for project managers as needed. *(Opportunity P.4.B)*

For a copy of the complete Opportunity Matrix sorted by rating, please see Appendix N. For a copy of the complete Opportunity Matrix sorted by category, please see Appendix O.

Committee Process

For a listing of all documents involved in the Consolidation Inquiry, please visit the OMF website at the following link: <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/cao/index.cfm?&c=66339>

Please see Appendix A – [Committee Meeting Notes, June "Kick Off"](#)

Please see Appendix B – [Committee Meeting Notes, June 26, 2014](#)

Please see Appendix C – [Committee Meeting Notes, September 17, 2014](#)

Please see Appendix D – [Committee Meeting Notes, December 17, 2014](#)

Please see Appendix E – [Committee Meeting Notes, February 18, 2015](#)

Please see Appendix F – [Committee Meeting Notes, May 13, 2015](#)

Other Appendices

Please see Appendix G for [Moss Adams Executive Summary](#)

Please see Appendix H for [Facilities Management Excel Spreadsheet of Services](#)

Please see Appendix I for [Facilities Management Meeting Notes](#)

Please see Appendix J for [Revenue Collection Questionnaire Template](#)

Please see Appendix K for [Revenue Collection Completed Questionnaires](#)

Please see Appendix L for [Revenue Collection Meeting Notes](#)

Please see Appendix M for [PTE Contracting Meeting Notes](#)

Please see Appendix N for [Opportunity Matrix by Rating](#)

Please see Appendix O for [Opportunity Matrix by Category](#)

Please see Appendix P for [Moss Adams Full Report](#)