

**Consolidation Inquiry
Notes and Next Steps
June 26, 2014**

Meeting participants: Mike Abbaté, Dean Marriott, Fred Miller, Leah Treat.
OMF staff: Betsy Ames, Jane Braaten, Celia Heron.

The group discussed each of the three areas that are subject to this inquiry and began identifying opportunities for improvement that we should explore. For each topic, OMF provided an introductory statement (included below) describing the issue, and opened with a series of questions:

1. What opportunities for improvements would be worthwhile to explore?
2. What information do you need?
3. Who should we talk to in order to better understand the problems and opportunities?

Revenue collection

There are (at least) ten bureaus that collect revenues for the City. As a result, customers may need to interact with multiple bureaus to pay the City, and there are multiple billing system platforms used by bureaus including manual systems (Excel), in-house, Lien Accounting System, Cayenta, SAP, and TRACS/ITAP. There are citywide financial and accounting policies and procedures that dictate key requirements, as well bureau-specific practices. Programs may be integrally tied to revenue collection activities, which may require program knowledge or necessitate dispersed collection points.

- Create a list of the systems that the City uses to collect revenue. Describe each system's capabilities and identify the timeframe for upgrades or replacement. Are there any shared services that we should pursue?
- Describe the services performed by the Parks Bureau customer service center on the first floor of the Portland Building. They are already collecting revenue for PBOT; PBOT is looking at expanding the services for PBOT at the center. Are there other customer service and revenue collection functions that could be performed there?
- The Water Bureau customer service center accepts payments on the first floor of the Portland Building as well. Are there other customer service and revenue collection functions that could be performed there?
- BDS collects revenue associated with permitting activities on behalf of numerous bureaus. There could be opportunities there, though some questions were raised about timing vis-à-vis ITAP implementation.
- Describe the services that the Treasurer can perform in accepting deposits. Are there bureaus that could have Treasury accept their deposits?
- Describe how bureaus resolve the collections of bad debt. Are there common procedures, policies or vended services?
- Identify monthly billing options. What is the implementation timeline for monthly billing of utilities? Are there other services that could be billed together? What are the concerns about having multiple services on the utility bill and can those be addressed?
- Parks collects revenues throughout the Parks' system – from grants and donations to user fees and parking revenues. Are there opportunities for shared services?
- Share system and customer service center information with all City bureaus. Are there any opportunities for shared services?

- Revenue, Water, Parks, and BDS are the logical starting points for the inquiry. Contacts at Parks: Shaun Rogers and Jeff Shaffer.

Facilities maintenance and management

There are seven property- and facility-owning bureaus in the City. Some bureaus own, manage and maintain their own buildings and facilities. OMF also owns, manages and maintains numerous buildings and facilities on behalf of City bureaus. For purposes of this inquiry, “facilities management and maintenance” is broadly defined to encompass maintenance, repair, improvements, and replacement of facilities and the systems and services integral to running those facilities, such as HVAC, work order systems, custodial and security services. Information that is essential to effective facilities management includes an inventory of real property, an assessment of the condition of facilities, maintenance reserve policies and practices, and information about the acquisition and disposition of City-owned property.

- Identify how property and building maintenance are performed throughout the City; identify what services are performed in-house and what services are contracted out. Are there common contracted services that could be bid as a single contract?
- Different types of facilities may have different needs associated with them. For example the Columbia Blvd. Wastewater Treatment campus has a number of specialty facilities and a designated BES facilities manager; the Storm water lab is managed by Facilities with Parks providing landscaping services. What are the categories of facilities and are there different opportunities for different types?
- Identify how bureaus grade the condition of their buildings and assets. Is there a common terminology or common database that could be used?
- What asset management platforms are we using – is there value in having a common system? What are the opportunities to integrate/interface with common systems, even if each bureau uses separate work order and dispatch systems?
- Consider factors when assessing efficiency and effectiveness: Saving money doesn’t help if we’re adding more process and more time; bureaus can’t always wait for a centralized service or coordinated contract to be put in place. Need flexibility to address needs. Need seamless process from customer complaint to work order to dispatch etc.
- Contacts: Property managers group coordinating on condition assessment, property database. Citywide Asset Managers Group (CAMG) looking at maintenance and funding; disaster planning.
- Identify the work currently being done by the Portland Property Management Committee. Do any of those efforts inform or dovetail with this consolidation inquiry? Are there lessons learned from those efforts that inform this inquiry?
- Identify the equipment, services, contracts and activities used by the different bureaus in their facilities management and maintenance; look for opportunities for shared services.
- Randy Tomsk (BES) manages the storm water treatment campus and would be a contact on specialized facilities management.
- Parks, BES and PBOT have many “green assets” – probably should be considered “out of scope.”

PTE contracting

Most contracting processes in the City are centralized, but PTE contracting is a notable exception. Bureaus manage PTE contracts in a semi-decentralized manner, which has advantages and disadvantages. The policy and central oversight provided by Procurement Services occurs toward the end of the process. The PTE process is time consuming for both the

operating and central bureaus. Errors and omissions in the PTE process and resulting materials create the risk of protests from vendors and delay.

- Identify areas where a number of bureaus are contracting for the same service. For example, the City has two dozen contracts for architectural and engineering services. Could these be bid as a single contract or a handful of contracts?
- Bureaus and Procurement can probably both point to a number of factors that contribute to problems with the PTE contracting process. Deserves a “deeper dive” to understand all perspectives.
- Identify the factors that contribute to problems with the contracting process. If it is staff proficiency on the bureau side, could we require staff to be certified/pre-approved to perform work on City contracts? Can Procurement manage the process to pre-approve staff? Could we require a review by Procurement Services prior to obtaining signatures? Or, could Procurement review requirements with bureau staff earlier in the process? For either, what would be the turnaround time?
- Describe the services that Procurement could perform in the contracting process. Small bureaus may have less capacity and less experience with PTE contracts as compared to larger bureaus who issue many. Is there capacity for Procurement to manage the process for small bureaus?
- Describe the types of PTE contracts the City uses, e.g. facilitation, design, engineering, technical writing. Are there some that are more suitable for combined solicitations?
- Review current guidance and forms, and obtain feedback. Are the manuals and forms up to date and easy to follow? Are there parts of the process that could be improved?

The group agreed that OMF staff will begin drafting a timeline and approach for information gathering and then schedule our next meeting in August.