

Council Work Session – April 1st

Prosper Portland | Civic Life | Government Relations | Special Appropriations | Community Technology

The following questions were asked during the bureau’s budget work session on April 1st, 2019. Responses are included in the attached packet. Not every bureau who presented during this session had follow-up questions.

Civic Life

1. Please provide an update on the Neighborhood Coalitions’ funding plan (Commissioner Fritz).

a) What is the status of this plan?

See below.

b) Does the plan include a one-time reduction?

In the presentation to Council on January 16, 2019, the following bulleted items were proposed as next steps ([document attached, pages 6-7](#)) and are listed here for convenience. Updates are presented in italics.

The coalition directors and bureau staff met on January 8 and March 21, 2019 to continue the discussion on the FY 2019-20 budget and planning for FY 2020-21 and beyond. We have a “retreat-type” meeting scheduled for end of April to continue discussing these items.

- Presenting a budget request for district coalitions that is 99% of the current allocation level.
 - * *Submitted in the FY 2019-20 proposed*
- Developing and funding toward agreed-upon outcomes that reflect district coalitions’ unique contribution to the bureau’s long-term goals.
 - * *Part of the discussions in March and on the agenda for April*
 - * *Being discussed in April and in successive meetings this year:*
- Identifying and implementing the next steps within a **multi-year process** for:
 - o Increased efficiencies within existing district coalition budgets.
 - o Developing shared goals, strategic collaborative efforts and shared resources resulting in equitable outcomes within and across district coalition boundaries. The complexity of this conversation is reflected in the areas we identified for further exploration, including:
 - What are existing shared, core functions of district coalitions where we can share capacity and possibly staffing?
 - What are neighbor-level resources we can develop in common to share and redirect existing staff capacity?
 - How will we leverage the unique ability of coalitions to work at the district level and to partner with other organizations and networks on policy, systems change and citywide issues? Could district coalitions function as hubs within a wider civic engagement infrastructure within and across districts and geographies?
 - What are other models of collaboration or different structures to consider? How can we better work with and consider other geographies that do not neatly match district borders—such as school districts, “centers and corridors,” police precincts, fire

management areas, and others—in order to better serve community members in the ways that they experience their daily lives?

- Developing a deeper analysis of our collective and coordinated ability to serve populations that are displaced from and/or migrate to one part of the city to another.
- Developing a plan to address the differences between city- and community-staffed offices. Civic Life has already adopted an objective to explore the question of how, when and under what conditions city-staffed district coalitions will eventually be returned to community structures.

** A more efficient supervisory model for the city-staff offices is in the proposed FY 2019-20 budget. The position description includes the responsibility of the new supervisor to manage this process.*

c) Does this plan include the previously identified \$130K funding gap?

There is no \$130K funding gap. See email correspondence and supporting documents from January 16, 2019.

d) How is COLA for Neighborhood Coalition staff included in this plan? What is the plan to address equity across the Neighborhood Coalition funding?

As presented to Council on Jan 16, 2019 ([see page 6 of the document attached](#)):

“Civic Life and district coalitions agree that the critical step in developing a methodology to equitably distribute existing resources is to ask, “What are the equitable outcomes we envision for all Portlanders?” Then we can ask, “What will it take (bureau-, community- and city-wide) to achieve this, and what is the contribution or value that district coalitions can uniquely deliver?” And then we ask, “How do we invest existing and future resources toward that end?”

Civic Life and district coalitions also agreed that this will be a process that will require us to work both separately and together in articulating equitable outcomes and aligning with the bureau’s and city’s equity policies and goals. We acknowledge that this is the beginning of an iterative and longer-term conversation that is long overdue. This is a substantive re-framing of the “funding equity” conversation from previous conversations of distributing resources on a per person basis with emphasis on the disparity between East Portland and other districts.”

In the discussions at our January and March meetings, **Civic Life and the coalitions continue to agree that we must substantively reframe the conversation and the COLA question being asked should flow from this larger discussion.** The April retreat allows us to dive more deeply into this area of work. Civic Life is not asking coalitions for the same or more work for a lesser amount of grant funds; rather, we are re-defining together what the outcomes will be for a longer-term (aligned with bureau long-term goals) and then taking the first/next steps in FY 2019-20. (For additional context, we are having the same conversation with the Diversity and Civic Leadership program partners, who also took a 1% cut from FY 2018-19 levels in FY 2019-20.)

This includes offering more flexibility to coalitions to invest the resources as they see fit toward agreed-upon outcomes, which can include eliminating duties that they no longer feel are impactful. In addition, the bureau has already reduced the reporting requirement of metrics from previous years that were time-consuming for staff to collect and report upon and yet were irrelevant for the coalitions, bureau, CBO or city uses. We are identifying other items that can be eliminated and thus freeing financial and human resources for more important priorities. Increased flexibility for

coalitions to invest their dollars as they see fit, renewed agreement on outcomes, and honest acknowledgement that coalitions cannot depend on a single source of funding for nearly 100% of their budget are the big-picture conversations we are having.

Further, additional equity considerations that we will be tackling in this and subsequent years include:

- **The reality that these have been no-bid contracts for more than 40 years, and that is not an acceptable contracting practice in any field.** Again, this is why we are having discussions about the outcomes we seek to achieve first, as this should be the primary consideration from which the funding, technical and other details follow.
- **The reality that the compounding effects of the bureau’s early investments in the district coalitions over 44 years has benefitted this program over others.** A 3% increase in the neighborhood services program budget (3% of \$3,031,198=\$90,936) eclipses a 3% increase in other program budgets (3% of the immigrant/refugee program budget \$211,698=\$6,351 and 3% of the youth program budget \$151,654=\$4,550). This is a **structural inequity** in our bureau and we cannot keep assuming each program is automatically entitled to a 3% increase without examining if those investments are aligned with the strategic and racial equity goals of the bureau and city, and against the backdrop of a demographically diverse community. This is especially important as the programs serving communities of color, youth, people with disabilities and others are more recent additions to the bureau and are not as generously or adequately funded. Yet, these are the populations that are the emerging majority and often the least-well served and underinvested in by government.

The bureau cannot perpetuate siloed programs, thinking or investments, and we are taking every opportunity to ask how our individual program efforts contribute to shared bureau goals (established one year ago). Lastly, this funding example is one that other community partners have clearly identified as needing attention from the bureau. Again, as presented to Council in January, this will be an iterative, multi-year process and we are having these conversations first with the coalitions themselves.

Office of Government Relations

1. Please provide a summary, explanation of differences, and any additional relevant information for the following programs: Tribal Relations, International Relations, and Regional Relations programs. (Commissioner Fritz)

Below is a description of the personnel costs for the Tribal, International, and Regional Relations programs. The salaries for the Deputy Director/Regional Liaison, International Relations Director, and Tribal Relations Director at the time of the requested budget submission were as follows:

Working title	Classification	Salary at time of budget submission	Approximate benefits	Total personnel compensation
Deputy Director/Regional Liaison	Deputy Director I	\$125,890	\$55,965	\$181,855
International Relations Director	Comm. Staff Rep.	\$75,629	\$33,481	\$109,110

Tribal Relations Director	Comm. Staff Rep.	\$82,971	\$52,487	\$135,458
---------------------------	------------------	----------	----------	-----------

The Regional Relations Program is a “split” position and is classified as a Deputy Director I position, with responsibilities for developing a nascent and targeted regional relations program, in addition to Deputy Director duties. The position presently manages three FTE, and over the summer will see a shifting of additional management responsibilities. This timing is due to hiring an internal candidate who is presently completing other job duties with the Oregon Legislature. In addition to management and budget duties, the position is also responsible for high-level outreach to surrounding regional governments to advance the City’s strategic position and will work with client offices and bureaus on multijurisdictional projects.

Both the International Relations Director and Tribal Relations Director are classified as Commissioner Staff Representative (CSR) positions. They originated in the Mayor’s office and were transferred into the Office of Government Relations in 2014 and 2017, respectively. The International Relations Director manages the City’s work with Portland’s nine sister cities on one friendship city, including direct engagement with foreign governments and the local leadership of non-profit sister and friendship city associations.

The International Relations Director helps to build strategic opportunities for international partnerships and exchanges that advance City policy goals, as well as ensuring adherence with appropriate protocols while welcoming over 70 delegations to the City of Portland every year and supporting outbound missions.

The Tribal Relations Director works to promote culturally grounded, long-term, positive relationships and decision-making processes through engagement with Tribal governments and the urban American Indian/Alaska Native community. The Tribal Relations Director is responsible for three large areas of work:

- (1) developing and deepening government-to-government relationships with sovereign Tribal governments;
- (2) educating and providing technical assistant and support to City of Portland employees around Tribal work (treaty responsibilities, engagement and inclusion, and other tribal-related work); and
- (3) engaging with, and responding to, the urban Indian community.