

Public Technology and Innovation: Re-Envisioning the City of Portland's Organizational Structure

Final Report



**For
City of Portland**

**Prepared by: Ron Pettit, Lisa Yeo, Manoj Garg
June 2018**



Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Final Recommendations	3
Budget Impact.....	4
OCT Staff Considerations	5
CoP OCT Transition Next Steps	6



Introduction

In 2017, Portland City Council issued a Budget Note to the City Budget Office ordering a review of the location and structure of the Office for Community Technology (OCT). Specific Budget Note text follows:

The Office for Community Technology (OCT) is currently a division of the Bureau of Revenue and Financial Services. Council directs the City Budget Office to engage an external consultant that will evaluate options and make recommendations to Council on the optimal location and structure for OCT within the City's organizational framework.

The City of Portland expanded the scope of the City Council Budget note, and named the project, “**Public Technology and Innovation: Re-Envisioning the City of Portland’s Organizational Structure**”. Specific project text follows:

The City of Portland strives to be a national leader in its engagement with the public around technology issues, facilitating intelligent growth, equitable access, and innovation via public investments and commercial collaborations.

As an outgrowth of the Council-mandated review of the OCT, the City is interested in exploring its approach to public technology more broadly. Facilitation of this broader visioning exercise is a core component of the desired consultant engagement. For the purposes of this consultant engagement, the City has attempted to define this collection of technology issues, service areas, and policy areas as “External Public Technology.” This is admittedly an incomplete definition, but we intend to gain greater clarity as an outcome of this facilitated consultant engagement.

VIE authored a report on its Findings and Recommendations in April 2018. This Final Report provides the final recommendations, cost, and staff considerations and requirements, including a proposed organization chart.

Final Recommendations

This assessment addressed four key questions (1) Should OCT move? (2) If so, where to? (3) What is the budget impact? (4) When would it move? A fifth topic included here is Smart Cities.

Should OCT Move?

- The Community Technology function should move
- The Franchise/Utility Agreement function should move
- The Revenue Collection and Audit function should remain in the Revenue Division

If So, Where To?

- OCT should move to a new bureau or office, reporting to the Mayor

What is the Budget Impact?



- There are one-time and on-going expenses to implement the OCT move
- There is significant budget difference depending on whether OCT moves into city-owned space versus commercial space
- The budget impact will be addressed in the November 2018 Budget Bump
- See budget details in the *Budget Impact* section below.

When should it move?

- Organizationally – as soon as possible
- Physically – to be determined
- Financially – with the November Budget Bump

What about Smart Cities?

- Smart Cities should remain in BPS
- Merging Smart Cities with OCT should be considered in the future

Other Recommendations

- The new OCT must develop strong working relationships with BTS, PBOT, and BPS
- The new OCT must develop strong working relationships with regional partners at Multnomah County, Metro, and Trimet
- Consider retaining the well-recognized name Community Technology

Budget Impact

Following are **initial preliminary estimates** for personnel costs and physical relocation costs provided by City of Portland facilities and budget personnel.

Ongoing Costs

- Director level position
 - **\$145,000 - \$175,000 (salary and benefits)**
- Additional program coordinator
 - **\$130,000 (salary and benefits)**
 - Note: funds were approved for a single year in FY 2018-19 budget for this position in the Revenue Division, and this position will move with OCT. This would be an incremental cost in FY 2019-20 and beyond.

One-Time Costs

These are low confidence estimates that are subject to change.

- Hard costs of relocating OCT
 - **\$350,000 in one-time costs if in City-owned space**



- \$105,950 rent
- \$425,000 capital cost (incl. Tenant Improvements, IT, Move, Proj Mgmt, Furniture)
- **\$555,000 in one-time costs if in leased space**
 - \$130,000 rent
 - \$245,000 capital cost (incl. Tenant Improvements, IT, Move, Proj Mgmt, Furniture)
- **Note:** The leased space option may well be necessary if OCT moves in the near term, especially if space cannot be identified in the 1900 Building. The City's other main office building is currently being reconstructed and tenants are all in leased space. This office space does not come back online until 2020.
- Ongoing relative rent increase if in leased space of **\$24,050**

OCT Staff Considerations

Revenue Division

1. OCT Manager (Vacant)
2. CT Program Manager (Julie Omelchuck)
3. Franchise Program Manager (Jennifer Li)
4. Program Coordinator (Rebecca Gibbons)
5. Program Coordinator (Scott Ellertson)
6. Program Coordinator (Melvin Riddick)
7. Management Assistant (Lexi Meek)
8. Assistant Program Specialist (Tyler Dice)
9. New Position in FY2018-19 Budget
10. (NEW)

Move to new OCT Location

1. OCT Deputy Director
2. CT Program Manager
3. Franchise Program Manager
4. Program Coordinator
5. Program Coordinator
6. Program Coordinator
7. Management Assistant
8. Assistant Program Specialist
9. Program Coordinator
10. OCT Director

Remain in Revenue

1. OCT Revenue Collection (Josh Eddings)
2. OCT Revenue Auditing (Seth Kabala)



CoP OCT Transition Next Steps

The CoP OCT Transition next steps include:

- Identify interim leader during OCT transition
- Clarify and refine new Community Technology organization
 - Organizational structure within new CT Office
 - Mission
 - Governance structure
 - Relationship to Smart Cities program
 - Is it an Office or a Bureau?
 - Name of new organization (e.g. OCT)
- Establish new CT relationships critical to OCT's mission with:
 - City – Mayor/Commissioners, City Attorney, OMF, BPS, BTS, PBOT and others
 - Regional partners: Multnomah County, Metro, Trimet, and others
 - Private industry communications and utility providers
 - Citizen engagement and community organizations
- Determine ongoing roles of MHCRC, CUB, TOC, and TAO
- Define a Community Technology oversight committee or Citizen Advisory group
- Establish roles, responsibilities, skills and abilities needed in OCT to accomplish mission
 - Define key qualities/skills/expertise required for OCT leadership positions
 - Assess/revise position descriptions of roles of other OCT positions
 - Recruit/Interview for the new Director and Deputy Director of OCT at strategic/partnership levels
- Identify priorities/key deliverables needed from OCT in next year
- Determine if any BTS, PBOT, BPS Community Technology resources move to the new OCT
- Determine budget requirements for Fall Bump
- Determine when OCT staff will move physically and to which office location
 - Work with CoP Facilities to plan and implement move

Key resources to help define and implement the OCT transition include:

- OCT – Julie Omelchuck, Jennifer Li, and Rebecca Gibbons
- City Attorney – Ben Walters, Maja Haiam, David Olsen
- OMF – Thomas Lannom, Jeff Baer
- BPS – Susan Anderson, Joe Zehnder
- PBOT – Christine Leon
- SCSC – Kevin Martin (BPS), Anne Hill (PBOT), Liz Mitchell (BTS)
- Citizen Engagement and Oversight – MHCRC, CUB, TOC, TAO
- Recommended by Commissioner Fritz:
 - Public Involvement Advisory Council (PIAC)
 - Former Office of Equity and Human Rights Director - Dante James
 - Former Office of Neighborhood Involvement Director - Amalia Alarcon de Morris



- Significant franchise business partners – PGE, Multnomah County
- Mayor’s Office –Kyle Chisek, Elisabeth Perez
- Offices of Commissioner Eudaly, Commissioner Fish, Commissioner Fritz, and Commissioner Saltzman
- CoP Facilities team

**Public Technology and Innovation:
Re-Envisioning the City of Portland's
Organizational Structure**

Report on Findings and Recommendations



**For
City of Portland**

**Prepared by: Ron Pettit, Lisa Yeo, Manoj Garg
April 2018**



Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Executive Summary.....	4
Recommendations Summary.....	6
Key Findings	7
Top Dozen Key Findings	7
Question # 1 – Should OCT move and if so, how much of it moves?	8
Question # 2 – Where should OCT move to?.....	11
Question #3 – What is the Budget impact to FY 18/19?.....	20
Question #4 – When should it move?.....	22
Next Steps	23
Appendix A – Interview List	24
Appendix B – OCT Mission, Accomplishments, and History	26



Introduction

Portland is the largest city in the state of Oregon and is a major port city and business center, located at the joining of the Columbia and Willamette rivers. The seven-county Portland metropolitan area is home to roughly 2.4M people, with nearly 640,000 citizens living within city limits. The City of Portland manages annual revenues of approximately \$4B, with approximately \$600M received into the General Fund. Portland's Commission form of government and participation in the Metro regional government is unique among US cities its size.

Portland has long been considered a national leader in successful metropolitan planning to improve livability and sustainability for its citizens. Portland has been recognized for managing its Urban Growth Boundary, for integrating sustainability into urban planning, and for innovative cable franchise agreements that provide affordable broadband Internet access to schools, libraries, and other non-profit agencies, as well as funding to promote digital access and inclusion for underserved citizens.

The cable franchise accomplishments began with the creation of a multi-jurisdictional governance group, the Mt. Hood Cable Regulatory Commission (MHCRC), and associated Office of Cable Communications and Franchise Management (OCCFM). The OCCFM, now titled the Office for Community Technology, is the subject of this assessment project.

In 2017, Portland City Council issued a Budget Note to the City Budget Office ordering a review of the location and structure of the Office for Community Technology (OCT). Specific Budget Note text follows:

The Office for Community Technology (OCT) is currently a division of the Bureau of Revenue and Financial Services. Council directs the City Budget Office to engage an external consultant that will evaluate options and make recommendations to Council on the optimal location and structure for OCT within the City's organizational framework.

The City of Portland expanded the scope of the City Council Budget note, and named the project, "**Public Technology and Innovation: Re-Envisioning the City of Portland's Organizational Structure**". Specific project text follows:

The City of Portland strives to be a national leader in its engagement with the public around technology issues, facilitating intelligent growth, equitable access, and innovation via public investments and commercial collaborations.

As an outgrowth of the Council-mandated review of the OCT, the City is interested in exploring its approach to public technology more broadly. Facilitation of this broader visioning exercise is a core component of the desired consultant engagement. For the purposes of this consultant engagement, the City has attempted to define this collection of technology issues, service areas, and policy areas as "External Public Technology." This is admittedly an incomplete definition, but we intend to gain greater clarity as an outcome of this facilitated consultant engagement.

The objective of this report is to present the assessment's initial set of findings and recommendations, and to describe next steps of this assessment.



Executive Summary

This document is a report of key findings and recommendations. Some recommendations are firm, while others are subject to fine tuning as additional research is done. VIE interviewed over 40 individuals from more than 15 organizations, including representatives from City bureaus, from other government and non-profit organizations, from the private sector, as well as elected officials and individual citizens. This report addresses four key questions – (1) Should OCT move? (2) If so, where to? (3) What is the budget impact? (4) When would it move?

An important finding is that everyone, including OCT leadership, agreed on two primary recommendations.

- (1) The revenue collection and audit function of OCT should remain in Revenue.
- (2) The technology function of OCT should be moved out of Revenue.

The technology function of OCT consists of engaging public and private partners in (1) developing regional public communications technology policy, (2) infrastructure planning to deliver services equitably to all Portland citizens, and (3) building collaborative relationships. Hereafter this set of functions is referred to as “**community technology**”. A key finding in this report is the community technology function is critical to the future growth and prosperity of the City of Portland, its communities and to every Portland citizen.

Another function of OCT is the negotiation of franchise and utility agreements. VIE’s assessment concludes that the community technology function and franchise/utility negotiations cannot be separated, because the latter depends upon leverage established by engaging private industry in community technology planning. VIE’s assessment also concludes that cable franchise management cannot be separated from utility license management. It does not make sense to silo the management of technologies when technologies are converging. The City needs a single clearinghouse for working with private industry wanting to use public property (rights-of-way, buildings, poles, and more) regardless of the type of media being installed to transmit communications signals. In fact, several key interviewees felt it was more important that community technology and franchise/utility negotiation functions stay together than where they move to.

Therefore, VIE’s recommendations are (1) that OCT revenue collection and audit functions remain in the Revenue Division, and (2) that the community technology and franchise/utility negotiation functions move out together. VIE considered many locations, including a division within BPS, a division within BTS, an office or bureau within OMF, becoming a part of the Mayor’s staff, a separate office or bureau reporting to the Mayor or to another Commissioner.

VIE’s recommendation is to move the OCT community technology and franchise/utility negotiation functions into one of two locations - a new Office/Bureau assigned to the Mayor’s Office or a new division within BPS.



Key reasons for recommending a new office/bureau assigned to the Mayor's Office include:

- Elevates the importance of Community Technology (CT) planning and implementation to one of the Mayor's top priorities
- Provides the visibility, influence and authority important to attracting private industry partnership and in establishing innovative franchise agreements to accomplish shared objectives
- Creates a separate entity that can stand on its own, critical to the 10-year planning horizon needed for CT services and for policy stability critical to reducing risk of litigation
- Creates an organization separate from the Mayor's office for handling citizen complaints and controversial regulatory issues involved in Community Technology as well as overseeing programs funded through Community Technology that may create political backlash
- Restores the organizational structure in place when OCT achieved national recognition for community technology and digital equity innovation and leadership

Key reasons for recommending a new division within BPS include:

- BPS is nationally recognized for bringing together urban planning and sustainability and provides an opportunity for Portland to be innovative in creating a model for Community Technology
- BPS has demonstrated success in assuming responsibility for planning and implementation of a large-scale service area where innovation is crucial (garbage collection and recycling)
- BPS provides resources and synergies that OCT can leverage to focus on its mission immediately, including an existing bureau governance structure, BPS' active relationships with all internal and external groups needing to be engaged in Community Technology, BPS' mapping, data crunching and web services, BPS' leadership of Smart Cities initiatives, as well as the ability to work closely aligned with other innovative thinkers in urban planning.
- BPS has consistently reported to the Mayor, obtains mayoral support and influence where needed while maintaining integrity of (1) the need for mayoral priorities to shift quickly and (2) the need for an ongoing operational program to evolve in a stable and consistent manner
- There is strong synergy between OCT and SCSC, which resides in BPS, and Smart Cities receives significant support from existing BPS GIS and IT staff.

The third and fourth questions are related and involve budget impact and when the OCT should move.

VIE's recommendations and conclusions include:

- Regardless of where OCT moves to, the FY 18-19 budget impact is similar. There is not a significant budget impact to creating a new office/bureau verses merging OCT into existing staff.
- OCT should move as soon as possible, preferably by the start of the new fiscal year, July 1st 2018. The OCT needs to resume regional leadership, reengage partners, update the plan and act on it. In the absence of OCT leadership, other IRNE/I-Net partners have begun to move forward in different directions.

The next sections provide a succinct list of the Recommendations followed by Key Findings and rationale supporting those recommendations.



Recommendations Summary

Recommendations are characterized as firm recommendations or as preliminary recommendations subject to fine tuning with additional research.

Question 1 – Should OCT move?

- Yes, the OCT needs to move (Firm)
- The community technology and franchise/utility negotiation functions move together (Firm)
- The revenue collection and audit function of OCT remain in Revenue (Firm)
- All current OCT positions, except for one staff person dedicated to revenue collection and one dedicated to revenue audits, move with the OCT to its new location (Firm)

Question 2 – Where to?

- Move OCT to a new Office reporting to the Mayor's office or to BPS (Firm)
 - Create a new Division within BPS at same level as its Planning and Sustainability divisions called Community Technology (Preliminary)
 - Rename BPS to Bureau of Planning, Sustainability, and Community Technology (BPSCT), (Preliminary)
 - Create a new Office/Bureau called the Office for Community Technology (OCT), assigned to the Mayor's office (Preliminary)
 - If OCT moves to BPS, merge it with Smart Cities (Firm)
 - If OCT moves to a new Office reporting to the Mayor, consider moving Smart Cities to it one year following the creation of the new OCT office (Firm)
- Create an appropriate Citizen Advisory group for the new community technology (Preliminary)

Question 3 – What is the Budget Impact?

- The budget implications are similar regardless of whether Community Technology is moved to BPS, a new Office assigned to the Mayor, as well as any other options considered in Question 2.
- Create two new positions in FY 18-19 budget:
 - A leadership position either as BPS Division director or Office/Bureau director (Firm)
 - Additional Program Coordinator within OCT (Firm)
- Reevaluate the proposed 30% budget cut to the Open Signal program (Preliminary)
- There is one-time budget impact to implement the OCT physical move
- The current OCT manager position should be re-allocated to the OCT Deputy Director position

Question 4 – When would it move?

- Make these organizational changes as soon as possible and no later than July 1, 2018 (Firm)
- Inform Multnomah County CIO of the OCT changes as soon as possible (Firm)
- Make public the planned changes to help alleviate confusion or chaos resulting from the several independent initiatives that have begun (Firm)



Key Findings

Top Dozen Key Findings

1. All interviewees, including OCT leadership, agreed on two primary points
 - o The revenue collection and audit function of OCT should remain in Revenue
 - o The community technology function of OCT should be moved out of Revenue
2. The function performed by the Office for Community Technology (OCT) is critical to the future growth and prosperity of the City of Portland, its communities and to every Portland citizen.
3. The OCT mission is the right mission, but the Community Technology portion of the mission has not been carried out well under Revenue.
4. There is strong synergy between Community Technology and Smart Cities
5. Regional public communications policy and planning has languished without OCT leadership focus on Community Technology. Many interviewees expressed concern that collaborative regional planning has not been done to prepare for renegotiation of the Comcast franchise (in 2021) to ensure continuation of I-Net on which over 300 public organizations currently rely.
6. Due to the perceived lack of OCT leadership, independent planning efforts have been initiated in Multnomah County, Commissioner Eudaly's Office, and BTS (See Question 4 Findings). For example, Multnomah County has begun developing I-Net backup strategies to ensure continuation of broadband Internet access for its schools, libraries and County buildings.
7. There is strong support from many interviewees including OCT staff for moving OCT to BPS or to a separate office reporting to the Mayor.
8. BPS has built a technology team with 8 staff with titles such as GIS Analyst, Web Developer, Web Designer, Database Admin, Graphics Designer, and Smart Cities Coordinators.
9. Past OCT leadership did not have strong relationships with BTS. It is essential that CT engage BTS, PBOT and others with assets and expertise relevant to Community Technology.
10. There has been a convergence of communications technologies, such that the same services (e.g. voice, video, data, broadcast/streaming TV) are now provided over various underlying technologies. Providers are attempting to classify their services as "Information Services", instead of cable or telecom which are regulated, to avoid franchise fees and local control over content. OCT's role in advocating for the public in franchise/utility agreements is even more important.
11. Many involved in urban planning and development consider broadband network infrastructure a key asset/resource upon which other capabilities can be provided – like roads, power grids, greenways, public transit – that should be included in the collaborative urban planning efforts led and coordinated by BPS.
12. The Mayor's Office is an advocate for the City's return to a Community Technology leadership position, and the Mayor's Office has a strong desire to lead Community Technology.



Question # 1 – Should OCT move and if so, how much of it moves?

Summary

- Yes, the OCT needs to move (Firm)
- The community technology and franchise/utility negotiation functions move together (Firm)
- The revenue collection and audit function of OCT remains in Revenue (Firm)
- All current OCT positions, except for one staff person dedicated to revenue collection and one dedicated to revenue audits, move with the OCT to its new location (Firm)

Findings

- Understanding an organization’s mission is critical to determining the most effective location for OCT within City structure. When workload exceeds demand, organizations focus on their primary mission and other work is deferred.
- The OCT mission is crucial not only to the future growth and prosperity of the City of Portland, but also to its communities and to every Portland citizen. (See Appendix B for OCT Mission and Accomplishments)
- The OCT mission is the right mission. This assessment did not find a group better suited than the OCT to perform this mission.
- Since moving to Revenue, OCT performance of mission improved in one area (revenue collection and audits) and declined in others (community technology and negotiating cable/utility agreements).
- Since OCT moved to Revenue in 2012:
 - Audits to ensure franchise compliance and fee payment increased from a handful per year to over 30 per year
 - A higher emphasis has been placed on helping manage franchises, collecting revenue and ensuring compliance
 - Most franchise and license tracking has been moved from a spreadsheet to a module of the City’s finance system, SAP
 - Business relationships between OCT and other OMF divisions are improved. There is better cross-division engagement and communication between OCT, Revenue and BTS
 - OCT staff performing franchise renegotiation and revenue collection and audit feel well supported by leadership in Revenue
 - OCT staff focused on the goals of expanding community access to broadband communications and improving Digital Inclusion and Digital Equity feel misunderstood and less supported
 - MHCRC representatives feel they have not received the contracted level of staffing from OCT since the office moved to Revenue



- There has been a significant loss of Subject Matter Experts (SME), and leadership with expertise critical to OCT's mission
- Some OCT staff view their primary role as negotiating franchise/utility agreements to protect the revenue stream
- The City's regional public communications policy and planning has languished since OCT moved to Revenue in 2012
 - Only two of ten initiatives within the 2011 Broadband Strategic Plan have been implemented: Digital Inclusion Network (DIN) and Digital Equity Action Plan (DEAP)
 - OCT did not provide leadership to update the Broadband Strategic Plan in 2014 as expected. The 2011 Plan involved more than 50 representatives from public and private sectors as well as citizens.
 - Many interviewees expressed concern that collaborative regional planning has not been done to prepare for renegotiation of the Comcast franchise (in 2021) to ensure continuation of I-Net on which more than 300 public organizations currently rely
 - The Multnomah County CIO described an I-Net planning effort initiated by the former OCT manager. CTC Energy & Technology (national communications consulting group) interviewed I-Net partners in 2016 to identify next-connect locations, compiled maps of dark and lit fiber, and was expected to issue a report in February 2017. The County did not receive the report and has not been able to determine its status.
 - It was understood at the start of this assessment that MHCRC and CUB had lobbied for OCT change, and that Commissioner Fritz supported their feelings writing the Budget Note. A key finding of this assessment has been that just about every organization interviewed has supported and encouraged the move of Community Technology and the negotiation of Franchise/Utility agreements out of Revenue.
 - Due to the perceived lack of OCT leadership, several independent efforts have started to fill that perceived gap, such as:
 - Multnomah County, the largest I-Net user, has begun developing I-Net backup strategies to ensure continuation of broadband Internet access for its schools, libraries and County buildings. Other I-Net franchise partners including a few new partners (major health organizations) have joined this effort. County leadership supports this effort but prefers the City resume leadership and regional coordination, enabling use of existing infrastructure versus rebuilding.
 - Other initiatives are described later in this report in the section for Question 4

Recommendations and Rationale

- Should OCT move? In our assessment, this is a clear "yes." The OCT has not been able to fulfill the mission of facilitating regional public communications policy leadership and attracting additional private investment since it was moved to Revenue.
 - The upcoming Comcast 2021 franchise renewal is of critical importance to the City of Portland, and the City is not prepared for these negotiations.



- Due to the perceived lack of OCT leadership, several independent and potentially competing initiatives have begun in attempts to ensure I-Net continuation, to expand community-wide broadband access, and to address digital inclusion and digital equity.
- The OCT needs to resume leadership of public communications policy and planning because broadband network access is “critical for advancement of consumer welfare, civic participation, public safety and homeland security, community development, health care delivery, energy independence and efficiency, education, worker training, private sector investment, entrepreneurial activity, job creation, and economic growth, and other national purposes” (US National Broadband Plan, FCC, 2010).
- The revenue collection and audit functions should remain in the Revenue Division.
- There has been a convergence of communications technologies, such that the same services (e.g. voice, video, data, broadcast/streaming TV) are now provided over various underlying technologies. Four companies, Comcast, Verizon, AT&T, and CenturyLink, have become monopolies and are attempting to classify their services as “Information Services”, instead of cable or telecom which are regulated, to avoid franchise fees and local control over content. OCT’s role in advocating for public interest with franchise/utility agreements is even more important.
 - All external partners interviewed (Multnomah County, MHCRC, Citizen Utility Board, Technology Oversight Committee, and Technology Association of Oregon) and many others agree that the OCT technology and franchise/utility negotiation functions should move together. Successful franchise/utility negotiation depends upon leverage established while engaging private industry in public-private policy development.
 - This assessment also concludes that cable franchise management cannot be separated from utility license management. It does not make sense to silo the management of technologies when technologies are converging. The City needs a single clearinghouse for working with private industry wanting to use public property – including rights-of-way, buildings, poles, and more. For example, Verizon and AT&T are both ready to start deploying 5G technology, which requires access to Portland’s poles and buildings. There is so much opportunity to mine in franchise agreements with these providers.
- Move all current positions, except for one staff person dedicated to revenue collection and one dedicated to revenue audits, with the OCT to its new location. Most people interviewed felt that OCT revenue collection had been handled by less than a single FTE prior to reporting to Revenue.
- Assess and clarify the role and responsibilities of each OCT position (see “Next Steps”) to ensure that all critical functions of the Community Technology program are performed. Several people have been hired into OCT positions since the move to Revenue. The mission of OCT shifted from leading collaborative strategic planning and implementation of regional and community broadband internet access to fiduciary responsibility focused on revenue collection and audit functions. Position descriptions may have shifted with the change in OCT mission focus.



Question # 2 – Where should OCT move to?

Summary

- Move OCT to a new Office reporting to the Mayor’s office or to BPS (Firm)
 - Create a new Division within BPS at same level as its Planning and Sustainability divisions called Community Technology (Preliminary)
 - Rename BPS to Bureau of Planning, Sustainability, and Community Technology (BPSCT), (Preliminary)
 - Create a new Office/Bureau called the Office for Community Technology (OCT), assigned to the Mayor’s office (Preliminary)
 - If OCT moves to BPS, merge it with Smart Cities (Firm)
 - If OCT moves to a new Office reporting to the Mayor, consider moving Smart Cities to it one year following the creation of the new OCT office (Firm)
- Create an appropriate Citizen Advisory group for the new community technology (Preliminary)

Findings

Potential OCT location and organizational options include:

- Office or Bureau within OMF, reporting directly to the CAO
- A division within BTS
- A division within BPS
- Merged into Mayor’s Office staff
- Office or Bureau reporting to the Mayor’s office
- Standalone Office assigned to a Commissioner, as it was previously
- Office of Innovation with a Chief Innovation Officer

Our findings include:

- The decision to move OCT from Revenue is a simple, more obvious decision, whereas the decision on where to place OCT is more complex with many nuances to consider. However, clear recommendations have been determined.
- OCT must move OUT and UP
 - OCT was organizationally demoted twice, once when moved into Bureau of Revenue and second when moved to Division of Revenue within OMF
 - OCT must have direct link to Mayor or Commissioner with authority to oversee innovative initiatives to ensure citizen engagement and support.
 - OCT needs to be organizationally elevated in importance to be better enabled to carry out its mission. It needs more clout, more power, more respect, more authority to carry out mission.
- It is important to understand mission and to ensure mission alignment in determining location



- It is important to determine who at the City should advocate for the public with private industry wanting to use public property to build their for-profit business
- It is important to determine who will ensure that all of Portland's citizens benefit including those traditionally underserved
- The decision on where to place OCT is of long-term critical importance to the City and its citizens
 - Community Technology and affordable municipal broadband are important to the future success of the City. It is important to the attractiveness of the City to businesses and residents.
 - In the 1800's if a town was on the railroad, it was advantaged. A town not on the railroad was disadvantaged. Similarly, in the 1900's, cities on the highway had advantages enabling growth and services. Similar comparisons can be made about an Energy Grid. In today's world, if a business or citizen is on the electronic highway, they are advantaged, while those not on the electronic highway are disadvantaged. It is important to be on the technology grid.
 - Utilities provide cost effective service to each business and citizen. It is a logical extension to consider Community Technology another utility.
 - Strategic planning is required providing such services to the whole City.
 - Community Technology and innovation should be a small organization with deep knowledge and positioned organizationally with high authority. It should be responsible for governance, policy, partnerships, and decision making.
 - Cable, telecom, information services, utilities, wireless, broadband, are all converging technologies. Leadership and coordination by a single organization is crucial to provide effective management.
- The Community Technology group needs a much stronger relationship with BTS than OCT has had in the past. BTS can provide extensive technical expertise in planning and design as well as in establishing effective strategies for partnering with private technology providers. Community Technology infrastructure is a logical extension of the City's infrastructure managed by BTS.
- The City is well-positioned to resume effective Community Technology leadership.
 - The Mayor's Office is an advocate for the City's return to a Community Technology leadership position, and the Mayor's Office has a strong desire to lead Community Technology.
 - The City has strong newer leadership in several organizations ready to lead the City's Community Technology endeavors.
- The OCT leadership position is a complex role requiring a unique skillset to be effective

A key purpose of a future assessment is to develop recommendations at the next level of detail. Current findings that will be further discussed in the next phase include:

- Several recommendations were made for one specific individual in the City to lead the new Community Technology organization



- There was ample input on whether to merge (or not) Smart Cities with OCT. There is strong synergy between the two.
- There are lots of different fiber activities within the City that need to be coordinated by one organization with elevated management
- There are extreme feelings regarding MHCRC. There are some who feel strongly that it is a cable organization who has outlived its usefulness. There are others who feel it has an extremely important future role to the City working with community technology that spans jurisdictions and whose mission should not be tied to the underlying physical infrastructure (i.e. cable) that delivers several communications services; but instead its mission should be associated with the communications services.
- The new Community Technology group needs to have citizen engagement and citizen advisory input. Further discussion of the potential roles of MHCRC, CUB, TOC, and TAO regarding Community Technology will be conducted.

Recommendations & Rationale

Several *rationales* need to be explained.

- What was the evaluation criteria?
- Why Office/Bureau reporting to Mayor's Office
- Why BPS?
- Why not the other options?
- Why the name Community Technology?
- Why not a Chief Innovation Officer?
- What about Smart Cities

Evaluation Criteria

The following criteria were used in the evaluation of where to recommend locating OCT

- Leadership
- Mission alignment
- Internal relationships across Bureaus
- Externally facing and regional relationships including citizen engagement
- Reporting structure and resulting authority
- Ability to *Hit the Ground Running*, i.e. to focus immediately on OCT mission
- Cost

Why or Why Not Office/Bureau Reporting to Mayor's Office

- As an office or bureau in the Mayor's Office portfolio, OCT will receive direct engagement from the executive on key decisions about technology deployment in the community. The elevation



of OCT will allow for the Mayor's Office to leverage its positional authority to ensure broader enterprise collaboration across the City, in a way that it has not happened in the past.

- OCT has the opportunity to be at the “tip of the spear” as a driver of the administration’s vision for shared prosperity and the City of Portland stated equity goals. As OCT prepares to lead future franchise negotiations, it will be better aligned with the City Attorney, Prosper Portland, OMF, BPS, and other bureaus within the Mayor’s portfolio. This will strengthen the City’s approach to future negotiations and partnership engagements with prospective private, non-profit, academic sector partners.
- The City of Portland should create a separate Office for Community Technology (CT) assigned to the Mayor’s office if it wants to elevate CT to one of the Mayor’s top priority programs, lending influence and authority while retaining flexibility and autonomy as the program evolves. As a separate office/bureau, the program can retain strong connections with other council members as well and can be reassigned to another Commissioner as CT program needs and city priorities shift in the future. An office/bureau also establishes appropriate separation between controversial aspects of the program and political leadership and provides the stability and policy consistency needed by a program that will span many mayoral administrations.
- The current Mayor’s office is a strong advocate for the advancement of Community Technology, and has a strong desire to see the City return to a Community Technology leadership position
- Private industry partners are already approaching the Mayor’s office seeking to discuss future business plans and potential joint ventures.
- Creating a separate office/bureau establishes a program structure that can benefit from Mayoral support, providing consistency needed while spanning multiple mayoral administrations. Community Technology requires a 3-5 year planning horizon with stable leadership and policy consistency (based on the rapidly evolving and dynamic technology arena)
- Establishing the OCT as a separate office/bureau shields the Mayor from direct connection to controversial issues surrounding Community Technology – for example citizen concerns about location of electronic equipment for wireless networks near their children, decisions made by the MHCRC, another political body staffed by the OCT, programming choices by Open Signal community media that receives funding directly from the OCT.
- One of the key services provided by OCT’s planning and franchise implementation has been affordable broadband across the metropolitan region, including the City’s IRNE backbone and the I-NET network used by over 300 government and education partners. Broadband is quickly becoming an essential service, like access to roads and electricity, and is currently not regulated. A separate office can engage in regulatory leadership as needed without concern for direct political impact on the Mayor.
- The most vocal proponents for widespread and affordable broadband access, whether wired or wireless, is the current “millennial” generation. For many of them, this is their first interaction with government. They represent significant potential for moving Community Technology forward, as well as significant risk given their lack of experience with political processes. An



office/bureau separate from the Mayor's staff may be more effective in dealing with this new-to-government constituency.

- OCT was nationally recognized for its Community Technology efforts including the Broadband Strategic Plan and its franchise agreements when it was a separate Office.

Why or Why Not BPS?

- The City of Portland should move OCT to BPS if it wants to leverage BPS' significant resources and synergies to grow and support the Community Technology program. OCT and BPS missions align, and staff currently work closely together. BPS provides a culture of innovation, existing external and internal relationships with the same partners needed by Community Technology, strong data analysis, mapping and web services relied upon by OCT, and synergies with the Smart Cities team also led and supported by BPS resources. BPS garners support from the Mayor's Office and other Commissioners as needed.
- BPS' core mission is strategic and innovative planning
 - City planning – the 20 to 30 years view – has historically never included technology planning. However, municipalities and planning organizations such as the American Planning Association (APA) are starting to figure out that technology planning is a key part of urban planning. The APA national conference in 2018 has a *Technology and Big Data* track with sessions such as *Transforming Communities into Smart Cities* and *Broadband Planning: Smart Cities and Superclusters*
 - BPS engages in other forms of technology in Sustainability (e.g. Solar Power)
 - Many involved in urban planning and development consider broadband network infrastructure a key asset/resource upon which other capabilities can be provided – like roads, power grids, greenways, public transit – that should be included in the collaborative urban planning efforts led and coordinated by BPS
 - BPS has demonstrated success in both planning and implementation of a city service undergoing significant innovation, assuming responsibility for garbage collection and recycling from BDS and implementing innovative new waste management services via franchises.
- There will be a transition in the BPS Director position in 2018.
- BPS has existing relationships with other Bureaus, other government agencies, private industry and with external partners, including regional planning groups, and citizens
 - Community Technology requires regional planning and coordination with the County, Metro, and other jurisdictions
 - Community Technology needs to work cross functionally with BTS, PBOT and others, and the Smart Cities Steering Committee is currently doing so with BPS leadership



- BPS is facilitating Smart Cities initiatives which are related to and dependent upon broadband infrastructure planning facilitated by Community Technology
- Reporting to BPS provides strong leadership and access to the Mayor & Commissioners needed by Community Technology
 - BPS has long reported to the Mayor's office and has a broad perspective and view
 - BPS has had strong long-term leadership.
 - Reporting to BPS, the Community Technology program can focus immediately on its mission (rather than having to establish governance and relationships as a separate Bureau or Office)
- BPS is recognized nationally for innovation in both its Planning and Sustainability efforts
 - Community Technology is a new and evolving service area – there may be no perfect models for managing this service in other cities today – Portland may need to innovate in creating an effective organizational model for Community Technology
 - BPS is unique in bringing together urban planning and sustainability and creates an environment for Portland to be innovative in a new Community Technology model

Why or Why Not Mayor's Office Staff

- The City of Portland should make OCT part of the Mayor's staff in order to prove the highest level of access and influence in attracting private industry partnerships and generating new revenue via the Community Technology program. This option would provide direct interaction with the Mayor and/or his senior management team as is the case for the Office of Youth Violence Prevention. OCT's role in supporting the administration's vision to create true shared prosperity through a more equitable community would be enhanced by a strengthened partnership between bureau stakeholders and external partners that have a direct reporting structure or relationship with the office (e.g. City Attorney, Prosper Portland, BPS, OMF, PBA, Business for a Better Portland, etc.).
- The Mayor's Office is open to moving OCT to the Mayor's Office staff, so that OCT will receive strong support in the Mayor's Office. It may also allow for certain efficiencies to be realized in the coming years as the work on machine learning, green tech, Smart Cities/Intelligent Communities, expands in the City over time. The Mayor's Office is an advocate for the City's return to a Community Technology leadership position.
- The Mayor's Office wants to move OCT to the Mayor's Office staff, so OCT will receive strong support in the Mayor's Office. The Mayor's Office is an advocate for the City's return to a Community Technology leadership position.
- If the Mayor's Office has a strong desire to lead Community Technology, VIE recommends it be done from a CT Office reporting to the Mayor than via Mayoral Staff. The former appears to have more advantages and less concerns. Community Technology was extremely successful



when it was an Office reporting to a Commissioner. It could recoup those same successes as an Office reporting to the Mayor.

- There are several political risks and concerns to be considered with merging OCT into the Mayor's staff, including
 - This option comes with significant risks – that OCT staff who represent the remaining institutional knowledge critical to the program's success may not make the transition, and that the Mayor will own, directly, the political and regulatory controversies that the program will likely create.
 - OCT positions will need to be reclassified to become part of the Mayor's staff. Mayoral staff are At-Will employees and tend to have lower-paying job classifications than employees in Bureaus and Offices.
 - Many OCT staff may not be willing to make the transition to become Mayoral Staff. Most OCT staff members would likely seek alternative positions in other Bureaus or Offices, resulting in a loss of OCT knowledge/experience
 - Reclassifying and potentially recruiting to fill many OCT positions will take time and energy away from the need to focus immediately on OCT mission.
 - It is more difficult for staff of programs requiring long-term strategy and planning (like Community Technology) to report to an elected official, where priorities and strategies can change every few years. Programs can continue from one administration to the next but require additional effort and time to align with every new elected leader.
 - The Mayor changes every eight years, and in recent past every four. Mayoral priorities can shift with a new Mayor. Due to the evolving regulatory environment and potential controversy created by innovating in franchise agreements, there is a greater risk of litigation if there has not been stability in policy.
 - Direct responsibility for Community Technology, Open Signal community media choices, MHCRC decisions, and controversial aspects of proposed public-private partnerships could "cost" the Mayor.
 - Four OCT staff spend part of their time working for/with MHCRC under an agreement where MHCRC pays for staff support. It appears unwise to fund Mayoral Staff with external funds from an organization that also funds community technology in other local jurisdictions.
 - It will be more difficult and costlier to move OCT from Mayoral staff to a separate bureau in the future if/when CT becomes an essential community infrastructure service like transportation, water, sewer.
 - CT is unlike Youth Violence Prevention program or the Children's Levy program

Why or Why Not OMF

- OMF coordinates City-wide services, has relationships and position of authority with all other Bureaus



- OMF's core mission includes fiduciary responsibility, risk management, service, leading city-wide initiatives
- OMF has internal city operations focus - CT mission extends beyond city boundaries
- OMF management does not advocate for the Community Technology mission
- Need to build the external relationships needed by the CT program (external public partners, private industry, regional planning groups, citizen engagement)

Why or Why Not BTS

- BTS has the technical expertise needed to plan, design and build the Community Technology infrastructure as well as existing relationships with private industry providers.
- BTS does planning and innovative thinking in providing technology services to City bureaus.
- BTS core mission is building, operating, maintaining and enhancing technology services for internal City use. In times of emergency or when workload exceeds resources, BTS' top priority must be "keep the lights on" for existing City services.
- BTS' external focus (e.g. I-Net) serves public facilities such as schools and libraries, but not the community at large and not beyond City boundaries as needed by Community Technology
- BTS has a large scope and a very large workload with internal technology projects

Why or Why Not Another's Commissioner's Office

- The OCT has been exceptionally effective (nationally recognized) in the past with support of specific commissioners assigned who are passionate about mission
- This model requires an exceptionally-skilled individually as OCT leader who can develop relationships at all levels internally and externally, can create vision, can lead via influence rather than authority, can manage planning and implementation to accomplish mission, and can do so without the support of reporting to another full-time City manager
- Reporting to a single Commissioner requires the OCT leader to also seek support for initiatives from other Commissioners. A single Commissioner does not have City-wide responsibility

Why the name Community Technology?

- The Office for Community Technology is a name that has worked and is recognized by many internal and external organizations
- Reusing the Community Technology name will be clear to external organizations familiar with the Community Technology name



- The name *Innovation* was considered but all organizations should be innovative, and several City organizations suggested not using the phrase
- The name Information and Communications Technology (ICT) was considered, but it sounds too much like OCT and would be confusing in that the “C” represents *Community* in one and *Communications* in the other

Why not a Chief Innovation Officer?

- The City should have a higher priority on hiring a Chief Data Office than creating an Office of Innovation with a Chief Innovation Officer
- Creating an Innovation Office and hiring a Chief Innovation Officer would:
 - Create significant delays in restarting the City’s Community Technology leadership, when there is a strong need to hit the ground running
 - Require mission clarification
 - Be very expensive
- The Chief Innovation Officer model at other cities may not be relevant in Portland. There is no one model that appears to be working extremely well for any city. In some cities the Chief Innovation Officer has little staff and is no more than marketing for innovation.

What about Smart Cities?

- The Smart Cities core team in BPS is the Smart City’s Manager plus two Smart Cities Coordinators, but the Smart City’s Manager also manages other BPS functions
- BPS has built a technology team with 8 staff with titles such as GIS Analyst, Web Developer, Web Designer, Database Admin, and Graphics Designer.
- Pulling Smart Cities out of BPS at this time weakens the program, because it leverages many BPS resources that are integral to other BPS functions
 - BPS has provided the funding for Smart Cities and filled funding gaps for the program beyond the funds provided
 - BPS has the work relationships with other bureaus and citizens – the process infrastructure and relationships exist to utilize for smart cities initiatives also
- Recommendation for Smart Cities is:
 - If OCT moves to BPS, merge it with Smart Cities
 - If OCT moves to a new Office reporting to the Mayor,
 - Leave Smart Cities in BPS to continue leverages BPS resources and synergies
 - Plan a second phase move/consolidation assessment with OCT after one year following the creation of the new OCT office
 - Have an internal agreement for OCT to utilize BPS data and mapping services



Question #3 – What is the Budget impact to FY 18/19?

Summary

- The budget implications are similar regardless of whether Community Technology is moved to BPS, a new Office assigned to the Mayor, as well as any other option considered in Question 2.
- Ongoing budget costs
 - Create two new positions in FY 18-19 budget: (Firm)
 - A leadership position either as BPS Division director or Office/Bureau director
 - Additional Program Coordinator within OCT
 - Reevaluate the proposed 30% budget cut to the Open Signal program (Preliminary)
 - The current OCT manager position should be re-allocated to the OCT Deputy Director position
- One-time budget costs
 - Budget impact to implement the OCT physical move which includes physical space, furniture, and equipment
 - There is a significant difference in incremental cost for office depending on City-owned or privately leased space
 - Budget impact to merge/move OCT staff to new location (e.g. Mayor's Office, BPS)

Findings

- Prior to moving to Revenue, OCT staffing level and budget had been sufficient to accomplish mission. The OCT has been a small, nimble group since its inception. They had been recognized for success in building public-private partnerships to extend affordable cable and broadband Internet access to schools, libraries, and other non-profit organizations as well as to traditionally underserved communities and citizens. They negotiated franchise agreements recognized as some of the best for municipalities in the US.
- Looking forward, the OCT is expected to be a similarly small and nimble group, able to shift directions quickly as is needed to innovate in a technology-driven industry.
- When moved to Revenue in 2012, the OCT Director position was eliminated.
- OCT franchise/utility negotiation workload continues to exceed OCT staffing level, resulting in renewals and extensions of some legal agreements versus new negotiations benefitting the City and its businesses and citizens.
- The Open Signal (OCT Community Media) program is proposed to take a 30% budget cut (the Revenue Division's total share of proposed reduction packages) in FY 18-19, since it is the only General Fund program within Revenue. Open Signal has been successful in leveraging City funding to attract private investment to provide media equipment and technology training to underserved citizens.
- In 2011, when OCT was a separate office reporting to a Commissioner, the OCT Director had a substantial salary. At least as much should be budgeted for the head of OCT regardless of its placement.



Recommendations and Rationale

- When OCT was a stand-alone Office, reporting to Commissioners Fritz and Saltzman, OCT leadership consisted of a Director and Deputy Director. Upon the move of OCT to Bureau of Revenue, two positions were eliminated, the Director and a Senior Financial Analyst. The Deputy Director became the OCT manager and the focus of the position shifted to revenue management versus Community Technology. Both positions need to be restored within OCT and are addressed below. The budget impact is similar whether OCT is moved to a new Office assigned to the Mayor or BPS (both need two managers)
- Recreate the Director position. The Director needs to be able to create a vision for Community Technology, be well-connected and build relationships, be a strong negotiator and communicator and needs to be able to manage the transition (to rebuild as a separate office)
- The current OCT Manager position needs to be redefined to return the focus to Community Technology. The Deputy Director needs expertise in managing people, budget, program management, and regulatory knowledge with the ability to define and implement Community Technology goals
- Add an additional Program Coordinator position to the Community Technology staff to address the franchise/utility renegotiation backlog and ongoing workload. It is understood that an additional FTE has already been requested for OCT in the current budget process. That request could be repurposed to meet this need.
- Reevaluate the proposed 30% cut to the Open Signal FY 18-19 budget as the magnitude of the proposed cut appears to have resulted based solely on reporting relationship to Revenue.



Question #4 – When should it move?

Summary

- Make these organizational changes as soon as possible and no later than July 1, 2018 (Firm)
- Inform Multnomah County CIO of the OCT changes as soon as possible (Firm)
- Make public the planned changes to help alleviate confusion or chaos resulting from the several independent initiatives that have begun (Firm)

Findings

- All interviewees who feel that the OCT should move have also said that the change needs to happen as soon as possible, i.e. no later than start of the new fiscal year, July 1, 2018.
- Regional public communications policy and planning has languished without OCT leadership focus on Community Technology. The 2011 Broadband Strategic Plan was not fully implemented nor updated as expected. Many interviewees expressed concern that collaborative regional planning has not been done to prepare for renegotiation of the Comcast franchise (in 2021) to ensure continuation of I-Net on which more than 300 public organizations currently rely.
- Several independent initiatives have started to fill the perceived lack of OCT leadership:
 - Multnomah County, the largest I-Net user, has begun developing I-Net backup strategies to ensure continuation of broadband Internet access for its schools, libraries and County buildings. Other I-Net franchise partners including a few new partners (major health organizations) have joined this effort. County leadership supports this effort but prefers the City resume leadership and regional coordination, enabling use of existing infrastructure versus rebuilding it.
 - A citizen group involving members of the Digital Inclusion Network with representatives from the African-American community and small business have approached Commissioner Eudaly about a \$500M bond to provide “last mile” connectivity in lieu of private industry providers, following a Colorado Springs model.
 - The City’s Bureau of Technology Services has begun planning for I-Net replacement and expansion to sites needed by the City. This effort has not engaged other I-Net partners, nor is it expected to address I-Net needs beyond City boundaries.
 - Comcast representatives have approached various organizations within the City seeking the path that benefits them most.
- Since 2012, there has been a significant loss of subject matter experts from OCT, as well as lack of leadership with expertise critical to OCT’s mission.

Recommendations and Rationale

- Move the OCT no later than July 1, 2018. Delaying this move jeopardizes the ability of the City to resume leadership of regional communications planning critical to the successful renegotiation of the Comcast franchise in 2021 and subsequent franchise/utility negotiations that will follow the precedent it sets.



Next Steps

This Report focused on the following 4 questions:

1. Should OCT move?
2. If so, where to?
3. What is the Budget Impact?
4. When should it move?

The City's next steps include:

- Make a final decision on the new location for Community Technology
- Communicate that decision internally and with external partners
- Determine organizational structure of OCT within BPS (the new BPSCT) or the new CT Office/Bureau
- Determine new Community Technology
 - Mission
 - Governance structure
 - Relationship to Smart Cities program
- New CT relationships critical to mission
 - City – Mayor/Commissioners, City Attorney, OMF, BPS, BTS, PBOT and others
 - I-Net partners (current and new) – Multnomah County and others
 - Private industry communications and utility providers
 - Citizen engagement
 - Ongoing roles of MHCRC, CUB, TOC, TAO
 - Definition of Community Technology oversight committee
- Role, responsibilities, skills and abilities needed in OCT to accomplish mission
 - Define key qualities/skills/expertise required for OCT leadership positions
 - Review/revise key roles of other OCT positions as needed
- Identify priorities/key deliverables needed from OCT in next year

Key resources to help implement the next steps include:

- OCT – Ann Goldenberg, Julie Omelchuck, Jennifer Li, and Rebecca Gibbons
- City Attorney – Ben Walters, Maja Haiam, David Olsen
- OMF – Thomas Lannom, Jeff Baer
- BPS – Susan Anderson, Joe Zehnder
- PBOT – Christine Leon, Anne Hill
- SCSC – Kevin Martin (BPS), Anne Hill (PBOT), Liz Mitchell (BTS)
- Citizen Engagement and Oversight – MHCRC, CUB, TOC, TAO
- Recommended by Commissioner Fritz:
 - Public Involvement Advisory Council (PIAC)
 - Former Office of Equity and Human Rights Director - Dante James
 - Former Office of Neighborhood Involvement Director - Amalia Alarcon de Morris
- Significant franchise business partners – PGE, Multnomah County
- Mayor's Office – Maurice Henderson, Kyle Chisek
- Offices of Commissioner Fritz, Commissioner Saltzman, Commissioner Eudaly



Appendix A – Interview List

Interviews

Bureau of Planning & Sustainability (BPS)
Bureau of Revenue and Financial Services (BRFS)
Bureau of Technology Services (BTS)

Bureau of Technology Services (BTS)

Citizens' Utility Board (CUB)

Commissioner Amanda Fritz' Office

Commissioner Dan Saltzman's Office

Mayor Ted Wheeler's Office

Mayor Ted Wheeler's Office

Mt. Hood Cable Regulatory Commission (MHCRC)

Multnomah County

Office for Community Technology (OCT)

Office of Management and Finance (OMF)

Open Signal

Private Citizen

Smart Cities Steering Committee (SCSC)

Smart Cities Steering Committee (SCSC)

Participants

Susan Anderson, BPS Director
Thomas Lannom, BRFS Director
Jeff Baer, CTO
Beth Fox, Manager Communications
Dan Bauer, Deputy Director
Dave Berg, Manager Network & Telecom
Jeff Baer, CTO
Liz Mitchell, Technology Business Consultant
Ralph Smith, Financial Analyst
Rob Durkin, Network Technical Analyst
Janice Thompson, Member
Sam Passtrick, Member
Commissioner Amanda Fritz
Tim Crail, Chief of Staff
Brendan Finn, Chief of Staff
Kyle Chisek, Chief of Staff
Maurice Henderson, Chief of Staff
Leif Hansen, Member
Sue Dicile, Member
Bob Leek, CIO
Ann Goldenberg, OCT Manager
Julie Omelchuck, Cable Program Manager
Jennifer Li, Franchise Program Manager
Josh Eddings, Franchise Program Specialist
Lexi Meek, Cable Management Assistant
Melvin Riddick, Franchise Program Coordinator
Rebecca Gibbons, DEAP Program Coordinator
Scott Ellertson, Cable Program Coordinator
Tyler Dice, Assistant Program Specialist
Jennifer Cooperman, CFO
Bea Bedard, Community Media Advocacy Director
Jenelle Neill, Director of Production Services
Justen Harn, Executive Director
Natalie Sept, Gov't and Public Affairs Specialist
Rebecca Burrell, Director of Strategy & Development
Mary Beth Henry, former OCT Director
Kevin Martin, SCSC Lead (BPS)
Christine Kendrick (PBOT)
Elisabeth Perez (Mayor's Office)
Julie Omelchuck (OCT)



Technology Association of Oregon (TAO)
Technology Oversight Committee (TOC)

Kevin Martin, SCSC Lead (BPS)
Liz Mitchell (BTS)
Skip Newberry, TAO President & CEO
Wilf Pinfold, Member



Appendix B – OCT Mission, Accomplishments, and History

OCT Mission & Vision from City of Portland Website

<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/revenue/57435>

Mission

The Office for Community Technology builds community capacity and champions investments and public policy in a rapidly changing communications technology, utility and broadband landscape to keep our local communities economically and culturally healthy.

Vision

The Portland metro region has a shared vision and strong partnerships for communications technology and broadband infrastructure in tune with the unique and diverse needs of all our communities.

The public interest is considered and embedded in communications technology, utility and broadband government policies.

The benefits of communications technology are available to all as part of an equitable, sustainable and economically healthy community.

The City of Portland and its citizens are fairly compensated for private use of the public rights-of-way.

The City of Portland leverages its Utility License authority to maximize revenue

OCT Role and Responsibilities

- OCT brings together regional public, non-profit, private industry organizations & citizens and facilitates collaborative planning and development of community broadband connectivity to all constituents in the region (public and private, organizations and individual households).
- OCT leads and facilitates local public communications policy development (within the changing framework of national and state communications regulatory landscape) to define opportunities for public-private partnerships to implement broadband access for all Portland constituents.
- OCT negotiates the legal agreements with private utility companies wanting to use public property (transportation rights-of-way, public towers, buildings and equipment) to construct wired and wireless infrastructure to offer services to residential and business customers. OCT seeks legal agreements providing a win-win result, with private industry able to utilize public property to reach customer markets, while OCT ensures that broadband network access is offered to ALL communities and citizens in Portland.
- OCT collects franchise and utility license revenue.



- OCT provides staff support for the MHCRC to advocate for the public interest in negotiating with private communications providers and to work to increase digital inclusion and digital equity for under-served Portland citizens through education and community grant programs.

OCT Accomplishments

- OCT has facilitated regional communications policy development and planning resulting in expanded access to affordable broadband Internet across the multi-jurisdictional Portland metropolitan region. Communities and individuals with broadband Internet access have an economic, social and political advantage over those who do not.
- OCT has negotiated franchise/utility contracts that currently represent the 3rd largest revenue source to the City's General Fund, totaling more than \$80M/year. The OCT protects public rights-of-way, seeking legal agreements enabling private industry to utilize public property to reach customer markets while ensuring that services are offered to all Portland communities.
- In collaboration with the MHCRC (Mount Hood Cable Regulatory Commission), OCT has led efforts to bridge the "digital divide" through proactive partnership agreements with private industry designed to increase digital literacy and access to technology for under-served populations in Portland.
- OCT led collaborative development of the 2011 Broadband Strategic Plan (BSP) in response to the federal National Broadband Plan 2010. The BSP was recognized nationally for its quality. The OCT engaged private industry partners and representatives from public agencies, professional associations, consumer-protection groups and citizen volunteers.
- Portland's OCT, and previous Office of Cable Communications and Franchise Management, became nationally recognized for innovative franchise agreements with cable companies. The existing Comcast agreement is nationally recognized as one of the best for a municipality.

History

- **The Cable Communications Act of 1984**, required cable companies using public property to build their for-profit services to obtain a franchise agreement from the local government entity. In exchange for use of the public right-of-way, the franchise agreement specifies up to a 5% fee on cable revenues and certain public benefit obligations.
- **In 1993, the Mount Hood Cable Regulatory Commission (MHCRC)** was created by Multnomah County and the Cities of Portland, Gresham, Troutdale, Wood Village, and Fairview via Intergovernmental Agreements (IGAs) to negotiate and collectively manage franchise agreements across those jurisdictions. At the same time, the **Office of Cable Communications and Franchise Management (OCCFM)** was created in the City of Portland to staff the MHCRC.
- **The Telecommunications Act of 1996 was intended** "to accelerate private sector deployment of advanced information technologies and services *to all Americans*" by deregulating the communications industry. It created different regulatory provisions for providers of "telecom services" (using telephone networks), "cable services" (using cable networks) and "information services" (using broadband Internet), exempting the latter from local government regulation.



- **In 2011, the OCCFM changed its name to Office for Community Technology (OCT) with the following mission:** *“The OCT builds community capacity and champions investments and public policy in a rapidly changing communications technology, utility and broadband landscape to keep our local communities economically and culturally healthy.”*
- **In 2012, the OCT was moved from a standalone office to a division within the Bureau of Revenue.** Previously, the OCT had reported to either Commissioner Saltzman or Commissioner Fritz. The OCT Director position was eliminated. The focus of OCT’s mission shifted from creating innovative public-private partnerships to extend broadband internet access to all Portland communities to improving fiduciary management of franchise revenues.
- **In 2015, the Bureau of Revenue and Finance Services (BRFS) was created** within the Office of Management and Finance, bringing together Revenue, Procurement, Accounting, Debt Management, Grants Management and Treasury to enable management of end-to-end financial processes. The unexpected impact to OCT however, was to move it (from, originally, an Office reporting to a Commissioner) to a small workgroup within a Division (Revenue) within a Bureau (BRFS) reporting to an Office (OMF) reporting to the Mayor.