

Welcome and Introductions

In attendance: Abdi Mohammed, Adam Lyons, Arainnia Brown, Benjamin Nguyen, Christina Wienholz, Jeanette Ward Horton, Jose Gomez, Katherine Couch, Manijeh Mehrnoosh, Nyla McCarthy, and Roberto de Anda

Civic Life Staff: Suk Rhee - Bureau Director, Michelle Rodríguez - Business Operations, Mary Hartshorn - Executive Assistant, Víctor Salinas - EPCO, Kenya Williams - Livability, Dianne Riley - CNIC, Meg Juarez – Crime Prevention

City Staff: Kea Cannon - City Budget Office

Interpreters: AlmaLuna

Public Comment

None at this time

Committee Members' Reflections on Current Services, Metrics and Investment Level

1% cut – how is it distributed?

Cut will be taken collectively by repurposing program dollars.

Will unfilled positions save money and carry over to the following year? Need to know if it is necessary to fill those positions. Do we need those positions? Would like to know more before making decisions

We budget annually and can only plan for the next year. Any unspent money from general fund will go back to the general fund. Vacancies make us ask questions how to make changes and make things better about where we need to go.

Need more history on programs and performance metrics. Metrics are not well supported.

Over time we will be able to have discussions of where we should strategically place our budget. Build capacity to make an impact long term.

Equity is important and Disability program is underfunded. Would like to see more resources to promote leadership and provide support.

Would like to know more to make informed opinions. Might not need to go so deep since programs compiled documents and have historical knowledge.

Would have liked to get into the budget a lot sooner. Would like to do trainings online, if possible.

Requirements and trainings are new from the City of Portland. We are hoping to make content available online (HR 2.02, equity, and City government) next year.

Present and Discuss Proposed Initial Changes

Adapt to Impact: FY 19/20 is the first year that these four areas will be working together in this way. Previously, each one-person program operated independently, despite shared functions. This change represents the bureau's commitment to reject siloed thinking and fragmented, under-capacitated delivery of services. Bringing together four efforts in a unified program requires changes to program identities, staff relationships and capacity, supervision, budgeting, performance evaluation and communications. These have been enthusiastically embraced by the staff and supervisors in these areas.

Program development began in FY 18-19 (actively between October 2018 and June 2019). In FY 19/20, a new position will be created to supervise this program, representing 5.0 FTE in total. The supervisor position will be re-purposed from an existing position in the Immigrant and Refugee program. The integration of immigrant and refugee perspectives within Adapt to Impact will be developed in FY 19/20 and implemented in FY 20/21.

Constructing Civic Dialogue: The Constructing Civic Dialogues program came from funding formerly dedicated entirely to neighbor-to-neighbor mediation services and facilitation services provided by one long-term grantee, Resolutions Northwest (RNW). While the City and individuals benefited from the services provided by RNW, the termination of a long-term contract provided the bureau opportunity to think beyond the traditional mediation model offered by RNW. This model assumes individuals can no longer effectively communicate with each other, as they have sought third-party intervention.

The new program hopes to work upstream. This means giving people better tools and training at engaging each other long before mediation is needed. As our city continues to diversify, this new model hopes to help build bridges in communities of various cultures, ages, abilities and races. Helping construct ways at disagreeing without divisiveness will help Portland be a more welcoming place for all.

Crime Prevention: The Crime Prevention Program was developed to help reduce fear of crime and help address public safety and livability issues by providing prevention education and outreach, facilitating community building, and helping bridge community-police partnerships.

Portland is unique in that this program is *not* housed within the police agency as it is in cities nationwide.

The Crime Prevention Program services help Portlanders become less susceptible to property crime, better informed about public safety resources, empowered in addressing public safety issues collaboratively in their communities, and more resilient and prepared for emergencies.

Diversity and Civic Leadership: Leadership development being the sole focus of the DCL program has produced strong and diverse leadership not only for City government, but has fed the creativity, collective wisdom and political clout of various communities throughout Portland's region and beyond.

Twelve years in, it is reasonable to expect this program to become a driver of results—results that can only be achieved through Community-City partnerships. Leveraging the power and assets of both DCLs and the District Coalitions may lead to opportunities for both while meeting the demands of whatever the future holds for Portland.

Let's broaden the impact of this program by opening future funding through a competitive process. More partnerships nurturing more creative or timely work that only municipal funding can achieve, positions our City to be innovative and competitive in interesting ways. There is reason and need to expand our number and types of partnership, while valuing current partners.

District Coalition Offices: As previously mentioned the new outcome based metric goal is to increase partnerships. The Small Grants Program has helped the seven Coalitions raise a half to one million annually in project funds, augmented by the contribution of 125,000 volunteer hours. These projects are primarily led by and for communities of identity and focus on community-building, capacity-building and civic engagement which helps increase Coalitions' community partnerships.

Civic Life is also restructuring to create efficiencies within the leadership structure. The funding for the Coordinator III position for NPNS will be combined with additional staff dollars from the Bureau to be converted to Manager I position which will oversee Civic Life's Partnership Programs. The Coordinator III position for EPCO will be converted to a Coordinator IV position and will oversee both NPNS and EPCO. The goal is to increase financial efficiencies and enhance the support to communities in East and North Portland.

Graffiti: Over the past three years, the Graffiti Program has moved from acting as a complementary program to the Police Bureau's now defunct graffiti vandalism investigations unit, to focusing on engaging more volunteers, increasing removal services, and using sanctioned street art as a strategy to celebrate and embrace the beauty of Portland's communities.

The implementation of a proactive graffiti removal program resulted in the increase of graffiti removal on private property across the city at a noteworthy cost savings to tax payers—eight times as much graffiti vandalism was removed as compared to prior fiscal years.

An evaluation of the current Graffiti Program codes highlighted the need for revision and re-alignment. Plans for revision are in development and the Graffiti Program is working to outline a project plan, stakeholder involvement, and timeline.

Additional changes to the Graffiti Program include the transfer of .5 FTE to the Diversity & Civic Leadership Program.

Liquor Licensing: Population growth, increased urban density and the thriving commercial districts in Portland continue to place a strain on the capacity and resources of the liquor program. Although the number of applications received for annual licenses has held steady over the past five years the number of special event licenses received has increased by 40%, going from 1500 to 2100 processed per year.

Key internal processes for liquor licensing were mapped and evaluated for opportunities to streamline internal and shared processes. The evaluation of liquor-relevant codes highlighted the need for revision and re-alignment. Plans for revision are in development and the liquor program is working closely with key partner agencies to outline a project plan, stakeholder involvement, and timeline.

Noise: The Noise Program is in a unique transition point in its history. As the City grows, the small number of noise staff must innovate and move their focus from the past that had a focus on enforcement and more permitting requirements, to a new direction in Civic Life that places a focus on education and community building.

The Noise Program will be striving to reduce the number of noise cases that need to be open by using more mediation and education to resolve neighbor to neighbor type disputes and those with businesses and their residential neighbors such as night clubs.

An evaluation of City's Noise Code, Title 18, highlighted the need for revision and re-alignment. Plans for revision are in development and the Noise Program is working to outline a project plan, stakeholder involvement, and timeline.

Cannabis: Since its creation in 2015, the Cannabis Program has been affected by the rescission of the "Cole Memo" which provided guidance to Federal law enforcement relating to cannabis issues, changing state laws and policies, a change in the Commissioner-In-Charge of the bureau and bureau leadership, among other changes.

There are also external factors that will require the Cannabis Program to continue adapting and changing, including cannabis market saturation, the decrease in the wholesale price of cannabis, and other factors.

In part because of these factors, the Cannabis Program may change in the following ways during the next fiscal year:

- Reclassifying an Office Support Specialist (OSS) II position to an OSS III
- Exploring the possibility of adding dedicated communications capacity
- Taking on more responsibility for allocating a portion of Portland’s local cannabis tax revenue
- Making changes in City code to reflect changes in State rule and “code cleanup” for ease of reference and to reflect best practices learned since implementing PCC 14B.130.

Key Discussion Questions:

Does the sum of these proposed changes suggest that the bureau is growing it’s capacity, despite our 1% decrease in funding?

If so, is that growth reasonable and sustainable?

If not, in what ways might we make a clearer step in that direction?

Is the sum of these proposed changes consistent with Civic Life’s mission?

Additional Questions:

Cannabis: Why change OSSII to OSSIII if the market is saturated? Also, if the market is saturated why lower the license cost instead of increase to regulate the market?

We need someone to lead work and have authority to do so. More of an internal operations issue and dictated by our labor contract (union position).

First couple years were a startup and now the market is maturing. We are not making a profit, only need to recover cost. We will be watching and adjusting with the market.

Immigrant & Refugee: What data will you use track? What will we lose with 1 FTE, what will be different?

Data to be track will be determined once we hire for new position and develop the program.

We do not currently have the ability to partner and there is a lack of data that helps inform policy decisions. With new adapt to impact position we will gain this info.

Liquor: What percentage is revenue generated? Can we increase fees or reduce cost of admin?

72% cost recovery, liquor licensing is general fund.

We have tried to bring to legislature in the past to increase the fees. The legislature has not deemed it as a political impact.

Youth: How does the County and City budget for the program?

50/50 split negotiated by interagency agreement.

DCL: How do we better include disability as a target?

This is something we are working about. Disability program is doing a research project to better understand how we are serving and what the needs of the community are.

Adapt to Impact: How will we coordinate shared outcomes, process, and metrics with OEHR?

We are working on collaborating with them currently in many ways. Examples: advisory body and policy and best practices.