

ONI BUDGET WORKGROUP
Summary Notes
Dec. 10, 2007
5:45-8:45 PM

ATTENDEES

Workgroup: Ann Balzell (PCDAC), Richard Bixby (EPNO), Sylvia Bogert (SWNI), Kate Bucko (Native American Youth and Family Center), Jan Campbell (PCDAC), Robin Denburg (NECN), Anne Dufay co-chair (NWNW), Vicki Hersen (Elders In Action), Patty Lee (Ashcreek NA/SWNI), Linda Nettekoven (HAND/SEUL), Linda Nguyen (IRCO), Dora Reyna (Latino Network and DCL Academy), Doretta Schrock co-chair (Kenton NA/NPNS), Mark Sieber (NWNW), Alison Stoll (CNN), Joseph Santos-Lyons (NECN), Richard Bixby (EPNO), Jerry Powell (NWNW), Betsy Coddington and Christina Albo (Resolutions NW), Pat Osborn (League of Women Voters), Bonny McKnight (Russell NA/EPNO)

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

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

Facilitators: Joe Hertzberg & Carol Turner.

Interpreter: George Flores

Welcome:

The proposed outcome for the meeting was to:

- Reach (Initial) Agreement re: Budget Priorities

Review Results of Preliminary Prioritization Exercise of proposed budget packages:

Amy shared results of the straw poll completed at the last meeting by Work Group members who rated the presented budget packages by "High", "Medium" or "Low" support. Those that received the most "High" and "Medium" votes were:

Permanent DC Staff Funding
Small Grants Expansion
DCLOP/DCL Academy Funding

Next highest were:

Permanent Funding for Effective Engagement Solutions
Portland Disability Advisory Committee Proposal
Elders in Action
Community Engagement Initiatives Expansion
Permanent Funding for Public Involvement Standards Commission

Update on Overall Budget Picture

Amalia shared that the majority of ongoing money in the budget has already been spoken for, with many in line for the rest of the dollars. The Mayor's priority is Public Safety. It will be necessary to create a cohesive package that unifies the programs and strategies. The Mayor supports having such a cohesive package and it is important to advocate for this throughout the whole building.

Colin stated that there is approximately \$26 m. available in one-time dollars, and the Mayor planned initially to have \$20 m. go to public safety. In response to a question, he said that one factor influencing the Mayor's priorities had been the findings of the TOPOFF/Emergency Preparedness exercise this fall.

Liesl noted that they want to do well by ONI, and it will "need compromise to get us there." In ongoing funds, \$5.5 m. is already spoken for, leaving about \$2 m. in ongoing- available for 24 bureaus.

Doretta said that we want to get the most money for the most important things. If the group does not agree, there is no chance of getting new money or even be able to continue much of the new money they got last year.

Determine Budget Priorities

Doretta, Anne and Amalia presented a potential budget package that included components of all but one of the strategies that received a strong combination of "High" and "Medium" priorities. (See attachment.) There is a request to include the "Elders in Action" request with the Police Bureau requested budget. Two other strategies are included that received lower prioritization: Accessibility Fund and an ONI FTE for implementation of initiatives. These were identified as very important for implementing the complete package.

Amalia noted that the package focuses on "3 legs of a stool": to bolster Coalitions, engaging under-represented community partners and building capacity for the ONI infrastructure.

Brian said that Recommendation H (to increase capacity in ONI) was important for being able to tell the story of all that the Coalitions and NA accomplish and to help build bridges.

Doretta stated that there are a lot of people who have not felt included who should have a chance to share their voices. When ONI has included others, it has brought in more money.

Questions and Comments about the proposed package were noted:

1. Have you examined duplication of efforts with Strategy I? Would it be better to have the money go to the local neighborhoods?
2. One time versus permanent funding?
3. Is the Coalition funding (A) enough (\$373,515) with the increased responsibility? *Noted that it had been decreased from a low recommendation of \$455,000.*
4. Two packages are rated as low: accessibility and increasing language skills with staff. Why choose the accessibility strategy over the other one? *There was concern about the small amount of money being used effectively for staff training. Did state that HR might be able to assist.*
5. Concern about the \$30,000 not being used yet this year. Can it be justified?
Response was that efforts are in the works, and predict the money will go quickly.
6. Important that communications need infrastructure.
7. Need training dollars for NAs.
8. Can we reallocate some DCL dollars to other programs?
9. What happens with DCLOP if other groups compete? Is this open to other groups?
Is competitive process with 16 applying and 4 being selected this year. Anticipate may have more applicants in the future.
10. Can view this as 3 legged stool (Coalitions, Communities of Color and Central ONI). Other view- the base is in the neighborhoods.
11. How do we become more inclusive?
12. We (with DCL) want to be involved and will do a good job.
13. Consider making the Coalition funding permanent before the DCL dollars.

During the discussion re: the package, Bob T. was asked if something is designated as permanent, does it generally remain so. His answer was that "permanent is fairly permanent, on the average."

It was noted that Coalitions do have some permanent funding, while the DCLOP does not.

Doretta said that the bottom line is to hope to create some other organizations that will work with the Coalitions to overcome challenges.

Anne clarified that the funding for DCLOP would not be permanent funding for any one organization but for the DCL program (reminder of the competitive process).

Amalia stated that it would be a “huge loss” if the DCLOP lost this funding. By making it permanent, it establishes this as a program. With the internal politics, any request that is made is a long shot. If the package is unified it will help get it adopted.

Joe reviewed the consensus process and that the group had decided if it cannot reach consensus that an endorsement of 75% would determine the decision.

In response to a question, Colin stated that with the \$26 m. (one-time), the Mayor had established \$20 m. for public safety but in work with the staff, that had potentially decreased to \$13 m. Thus the bureaus now may potentially compete for the remaining \$13 m. one-time dollars. Colin noted that the DCL request was about 6% of the existing Coalition base budget. In two years DCL program could be gone if it does not receive permanent funding, but the Coalitions would not be gone in two years.

Doretta said that it was her understanding that the request for \$300,000 ongoing was low enough that it had a chance of receiving funding.

Joe posed two questions:

1. Are we in agreement with the bottom line being \$1,069,515?
There was an initial question about why we were accepting this as a given and not asking for more. After some discussion, the group voted and agreed with this bottom line assumption.
2. Are we shooting for permanent funding about \$300,000?

This question led to a discussion and various options being put forward:

- Recommend that both Coalition and DCL funding become permanent
- Indicate we will support the Mayor’s decision
- Use the Coalition funds specifically for outreach (*It was noted that was indicated already*).
- Divide the \$300,000 amount of permanent funding in half and give one half each to DCL and the Coalitions.
- Recommend perm. funding for both, then if not, half permanent for each.
- Recommend only one as permanent.

A straw poll was taken with green paper indicating support, yellow- have questions or need more info and red indicating opposition.

Potential strategies:

- Both Coalitions and DCL are recommended as receiving permanent funding *(2 support)*
- Give half the allocation of perm. funding to both Coalitions and DCL. *(9 support)*
- DCL have permanent funding *(2 support)*
- Coalitions have permanent funding *(2 support)*
- One time funding for both *(5 support)*

In the discussion it was noted that we must emphasize that the two compliment each other. Both must be there and we value both being equally important.

Joe asked if this group selected one of the various options, could you support it going forward to the Mayor's office?

- Both Coalitions and DCL are recommended as receiving permanent funding *(11 would not support)*
- Give half the allocation of perm. funding to both Coalitions and DCL. *(5 would not support)*
- DCL have permanent funding *(8 would not support)*
- Coalitions have permanent funding *(6 would not support)*
- One time funding for both *(2 would not support)*

Next meeting: Monday, Dec. 17, 5:30-8:30 pm, City Hall.