

ONI BAC BUDGET WORKGROUP
Summary Notes
Dec. 3, 2007

ATTENDEES

Workgroup: Ann Balzell (PCDAC), Richard Bixby (EPNO), Sylvia Bogert (SWNI), Kate Bucko (Native American Youth and Family Center), Betsy Coddington (Resolutions NW), Anne Dufay co-chair (NWNW), Vicki Hersen (Elders In Action), Cece Hughley Noel (SEUL), Patty Lee (Ashcreek NA/SWNI), Paul Leistner (Mt. Tabor NA/Community Connect), Linda Nettekoven (HAND/SEUL), Linda Nguyen (IRCO), Dora Reyna (Latino Network and DCL Academy), Doretta Schrock co-chair (Kenton NA/NPNS), Mary Ann Schwab (Sunnyside NA/Community Connect), Mark Sieber (NWNW), Alison Stoll (CNN), Frank Walsh (Madison South/CNN), Marcus Mundy (Urban League), Midge Purcell (Urban League), Don MacGillivray and Pat Osborn (League of Women Voters).

ONI: Amalia Alarcon de Morris (Director), Amy Archer (Operations), John Dutt (Information & Referral), Michael Kersting (Finance), Stephanie Reynolds and Kelly Ball (Crime Prevention), Brian Hoop (Neighborhood Resource Center).

Guests: Sanj Balajee (Community Connect), Colin McCormack (Community Connect/Mayor's Office), Bob Tomlinson (OMF).

Facilitators: Joe Hertzberg & Carol Turner.

Interpreter: George Flores

Welcome:

The two desired outcomes for the meeting were to:

- Increase understanding of the various budget packages
- Preliminary prioritization for discussion packages

Colin summarized that the Mayor has informed staff that there appears to be \$26 million of new one-time dollars and \$8 million in ongoing dedicated funding for 2008-09 budget year. Ongoing funds would require an act of Council to change and one-time funds would require an act of Council to continue. Of the ongoing funds \$4-5 m. are already committed. It is anticipated that there will be about \$3 million that might be available for all City Bureau requests. In addition, the City is hearing from financial analysts that it is important to prepare for a future recession that could involve cuts. Several major programs are in strict competition with each other. The Mayor stated that Bureaus should stick to things that work, have high community support and are defensible- asking "How is this item going to get us to our ultimate goal?" Amalia added that with 26

Bureaus, it is critical that ONI is selective about what is put forward as ongoing requests.

Carol noted that it is important as the budget proposals are presented to keep in mind the criteria that BAC created about what would constitute a “good ONI budget.”

Review of proposed budget packages:

BAC committee members with ONI and CC staff reviewed quickly for clarity each of the 19 budget packages (A-S) which are listed below. These come from sub-committee review and other CC strategy proposals and ONI proposals. Please contact Amy Archer for more details on those proposals.

#	Title	Proposed Cost
A	Permanent DC staff funding	Low \$473,750, Med \$737,500, High \$1,949,967
B	Annual Community Wide Assembly	\$59,500
C	Communications Training	\$19,500
D	PortlandOnline portal expansion (OMF)	\$20,000 OMF I/A
E	Civics University Program	\$240,500
F	Civic Issues Forum - Citywide dialogues	\$120,000
G	DCLOP/DCL Academy funding permanent/expanded,	Low \$288,000, High \$590,000
H	Support BAC in Year 1 management & planning	\$96,000
I	Permanent funding for Effective Engagement Solutions	\$96,000
J	Small Grants Expansion	Low \$50,000, High \$100,000
K	Community Engagement Initiatives Expansion	\$15,000
L	Accessibility Fund Permanent	\$30,000
M	Permanent funding for Public Involvement Standards Commission	\$96,000
N	Support strategies to preserve schools as centers of community	N/A
O	Crime Prevention/Coalition Language Training proposal	\$24,000
P	Portland Disability Advisory Committee proposal	Low \$39,888, High \$78,000
Q	ONI Administration backfill for I&R transfer (BOEC 311 proposal)	Low \$120,000, High \$172,000
R	I&R Services database online	\$12,000
S	Elders In Action Police Contact Office	\$10,000

Questions/comments raised about some of the proposals are noted below.

- A. Is this strategy dealing with equity/parity salary with Coalition staff?
Answer was no.

Question about FTE for this at ONI. Some subcommittee members did not recall any position as part of the package.

C. Consider linking this with other community efforts.

The dollar amount seems too low.

Could it be incorporated into another training package?

D. Who populates the content? Answer – this has been discussed and OMF made a commitment to allow volunteers to access and post content.

This is not part of the ONI budget but the opportunity costs.

F It would be helpful to give an information book in advance of the forum.

There is a link to the Community Assembly concept (package B) and building partnerships.

G. The DCL advisory committee only discussed/recommended the high range of this package. It was staff that added the option of the low range.

Issue raised regarding interaction between the various programs and whether there is any plan for structural evaluation. Response was that it was included as part of the Community Connect strategy document distributed last meeting and that the plan was to evaluate within the next 12-18 months.

Be careful about creating a whole parallel structure.

H. Is this in addition to the \$95,000 in package A? Answer was yes.

I. Doretta shared that she felt this position can be the key to success of other projects and packages.

J. The package document listed \$250,000 and \$300,000 but there is already \$200,000 in permanent funding. The proposed increase is actually \$50,000 or \$100,000.

The grant management/technical assistance/capacity building is in package A.

K. The DCL Advisory committee proposed \$20,00 for each coalition so the “high” package would be a \$95,000 increase.

L. Question asked about what is meant by “licensed” child care provider. Response that they are certified by the state of Oregon.

The DCL Advisory Committee recommended the package be increased to \$60,000.

M. Request for clarification of the \$56,000 in the document. Response: that was included based on a belief that the current funding covered part of next fiscal year but it may not.

N. This is policy issue to include as support for Community Connect strategies but there are no funds required so it may not be part of an ONI budget package.

Is there any money required for staff time? Response: Not for ONI. Sten's office included in the current fiscal year Fall BuMP funds for a community organizer to network with school issues.

O. How much of training is on staff time and how much is personal? Response: Class is tailored to needs of the students/programs so there is not as much homework but it does require practice. Stephanie suggested this may be accomplished during brown bag lunches and any overtime would be minimized.

P. Why is there just .5 FTE, this seems low? Response: There is currently .5 FTE in ONI so this would have a total equivalent of 1.0 FTE. Ann indicated that there would still be fundraising required for the work but they would continue to do that.

Q. Why is there a high/low to this package? Response: we are still working out the details of what we need but once that is determined it will be just one amount.

Comment: Don't underestimate this package.

R. Why not wait until after 311?

Comment: This could be added in to package Q as part of the transfer.

S. Police Bureau is funding \$40,000 and the proposal is for ONI to fund \$10,000.

Reflections on Packages: (Comments and Questions)

- The CC strategies are foundational in launching the 5 year plan in areas of capacity building, leadership, bridging across communities and increasing government access. (CHN)

- What does #H propose a neighborhood coordinator and how is it different that #A? (AD)
- Going to Coalitions would allow communication to City Hall.
- Is #A entirely for performance measures?
- Packages won't allow synergies in terms of FTE? How do they fit, how do we do them? Look at globally (e.g. how do strategies w/ partnerships support each other?) (MS)
- How much moves to centralized versus grassroots? (Here are some options).
- Hard to rank without further conversation (SR)
- Is #A (low) really that low? (MK)
 - (\$550 K vs. \$350 vs. \$95 and \$105 K.) Do they have to go together or can then be broken down?
 - The 550 K is needed for implementation of future CC recommendations (CHN).
 - \$350 K is a start.
 - Important to focus on concepts, not dollar amounts. (AAM)
 - 3 ideas were distinct; one idea is for 3rd option-belongs to grants.
- We need more \$ so neighbors can stay connected- keep numbers high.
- Could we get the number of employees in the ONI office? Can Brian get out more to the Coalitions? (PL)

Preliminary Prioritization:

Joe stated that the purpose of this exercise is to get an initial sense of where there is consensus or differences re: the budget packages. This info. then would be ready for the Dec. 10 meeting and would be used as a discussion tool. BAC members agreed to list 5 as high, 5 as medium and 5 as low, with Strategies D, N, Q and R not being ranked because they do not have direct budget impact on this decision package.

Next Meeting: Dec. 10, 2007 5:30-8:30 pm, Lovejoy Room, City Hall.