

---

**A - Recommendation: Across the board cut up to 5% (Approximately \$400,000)**

Consequences:

- “Death from 1000 cuts” – everyone is struggling, maybe not best approach to program as a whole.
- Cuts affect everyone the same; could consider exempting DCL and Neighborhood Coalitions.
- ONI might lose staff, about \$80K cut to Crime Prevention.
- Strain basic services and capacity.
- Not moving toward equity.
- Consider cutting only non-staff funds.

Summary: This could be used to absorb part of the cut but not the entire cut if exempt DCL/Coalitions.

---

**A2- Alternate Recommendation: Cut 5% across the ONI programs. Leave the COLA increase alone.**

Impact: Groups will lose 5% of their funding but will gain 3% back as a COLA increase

---

---

**B - Recommendation: Crime Prevention Cut (One FTE up to approx. \$80,000 ea)****Benefits:**

- Not filling vacancy has less harm, move geographic turf.
- No layoffs.
- Materials and Services cut will not impact FTE

**Disadvantages:**

- Potential cuts to livability may bump Crime Prevention staff.
- Lose least senior positions/Spanish speaker position.
- FTE/staffing cuts add to geographical turf to cover – less effective service.
- Loss of Materials and Services = less effective service
- Complicated bumping of staff positions (NOTE: staff are union represented and cuts are based on seniority if no vacancy).

**Discussion:**

- We recommend continuing mental health position as one time bridge funding.
- Preserve bilingual staff to fulfill equity purpose.
- Do not fill half-year vacancy, ask for bump to transfer next year with understanding that we don't use that position (NOTE: not possible to achieve an ongoing cut, position must be cut with the funding).
- Consider keeping June vacancy for the unfilled for next year (NOTE: not possible to achieve an ongoing cut, position must be cut with the funding).
- How long will OMF allow vacancies to be held before they just cut the FTE? (NOTE: holding vacancies can be allowed as part of a one-time cut, but not as an ongoing cut. Budget authority must come from Council for the funding and the position)
- Ask County to fund mental health position or part of it.
- Holding positions open may not guarantee they ever get filled in the future.
- Could mental health position be overhead funded? It exists in part to serve all bureaus.

---

---

**C- Recommendation: Cut entire Graffiti Program budget of \$331,000**

Intended consequence: 4% of 5% budget cut exercise

Unintended consequences:

- Staff cut – Juliette and Arolia
- No response to graffiti from the City
- More tagging – organized crews
- Greater impact on small businesses and residences
- Community cleanups no longer occur
- No response to hate graffiti/gang graffiti
- Greater economic/ethnic segregation (violates BAC values)

---

**C2 – Alternate/Preferred Recommendation: \$75,000-\$150,000 cut to materials and services – cuts contract for free removal services**

Intended consequence:

- No staff cuts, being more specific about free clean-up. (respects BAC values)

Unintended consequences:

- Disproportionate impact on disadvantaged communities by reduction in service.
- More enforcement on property owners that are victims (especially because Police cut investigator)
- Graffiti builds community capacity and efficacy – cutting program will reduce positive impacts.

Discussion:

- If Graffiti took a partial cut (reduced cleanups) could remaining clean up resources be directed to low-income neighborhoods?

- On the cards, the possibility of corporate/private investment was mentioned but this suggestion was not captured in the notes/small group discussion. Key Question – is private investment an option?
- Expand on potential of cleanup coordinator role?
- BES partnership?
- Remember this is potentially two people with families jobs lost.

---

**D - Recommendation: Cut General Funds from Liquor (\$10K), Cut 5% of Noise General Fund (\$13,250)**

Limited cuts due to high amount of revenue funding. Liquor about 96% self funded (NOTE: have cut general fund from liquor in the past but revenues cannot increase commensurate with personnel expenses due to legislative limits, so this will create a hole that will need to be filled from other programs funds in the future to sustain program). Noise about 70% self-funded (NOTE: participants listed 70% but Noise is actually only 33% funded by revenues, and 67% by general fund).

---

## **E - Recommendation: Cut Elders In Action (up to approx. \$155,704)**

Consequences:

- Staff cuts, service cuts.
- Seniors are a strong constituency; likely to be reinstated by commissioners.

Discussion:

- Both cuts are a challenge to values held by BAC (This leads us to: is there another way to fund any of it (e.g. overhead funding?))
- Could cuts but included in a politically strategic proposal? Both programs might be helpful with transitioning people out of houselessness, finding/siting campsites.

---

**F - Recommendation: Cut Resolutions Northwest Grants (up to approx. \$252,388)**

Consequences:

- Staff cuts, service cuts.
- Might be able to charge for services but this would exacerbate equity problems.
- \*Potential for overhead funding?\*
- Conflict doesn't go away. If RNW grant is gone conflict would have to be handled by other partners.

Discussion:

- Both cuts are a challenge to values held by BAC (This leads us to: is there another way to fund any of it (e.g. overhead funding?))
- Could cuts but included in a politically strategic proposal? Both programs might be helpful with transitioning people out of houselessness, finding/siting campsites.

---

## **G - Recommendation: Cut Small Grants (\$103,000)**

### Disadvantages:

- Lose ability to leverage volunteer time and social capital.
- Lost opportunity to engage/integrate into the neighborhood system.
- Lost the opportunity to empower leaders' abilities.
- Lose momentum, alienate people.
- Contrary to value statement by cutting district coalitions and nothing else, therefore not recommended!
- Grants are a proven best practice

### Advantages/Benefits:

- No staff cut
- So popular that we will likely get back soon.
- Integrating neighborhood needs into city services.

**Discussion/Alternative Recommendation for Small Grants:** Cut from ongoing budget now and then fight to secure for one time funding for FY17 and then advocate to get it back for on-going in future years. The problem is that this pot has been hit too much, promises were made to refill it but not kept. Trust is an issue in this. It is very disruptive and impactful cut to Coalition programs.



---

**H - Recommendation: Hold off/eliminate the newly authorized DCL partner organization. (\$134,752)**

Impacts/Cons:

- Broken trust between groups
- Increase parity gap between DCLs and Coalitions
- Small cut/not substantial compared to the loss
- Does not meet ONI value statement
- Lack of support
- Process already started – Mayor and Council requested the added partner group.
- Council will see this as an empty/passive gesture.

Pros:

- Partnership not yet awarded
- \$130,000 toward cut goal

Value Alignment: IT DOES NOT MEET CORE VALUES

---

---

## **Other Food For Thought (Items from brainstorm that did not fit within the theme areas captured in recommendations)**

- Establish program baseline or minimum operational budgets and only apply cuts to programs funded above their baseline.
- Communities of color have large issues of trust. DCL money is a large part of reestablishing trust. The fact that there is such parity issues however doesn't help.
- Cut ONI Materials and Services
- Work to develop a staffing hours cut across the board that equitably allows to reach the 5% cut. Of the \$9,096,100 FY 16 Budget, a \$393,555 cut equates to a 4.32% cut if applied across the board. This roughly equates to each employee working 100.9 less hours to achieve the 5%. (NOTE: the numbers not accurate here due to funding in the \$9M that is one-time including several staff positions, but could be explored further if this is pursued)
- We have a practice of moving toward equity with adds. Explicitly adopt practice of moving toward equity with cuts.
- Programs that do not fit with ONI's mission of civic engagement should be first cut.
- Provide equity funding on long-term process rather than year to year basis.
- Brown Bag/Sack Lunch all meetings and events and explain why.

# FY2017 Proposed Budget Reduction Package

1
---

<b>Title</b>	Package I- Graffiti/Crime Prevention/Management
<b>Program(s) impacted</b>	Graffiti, Crime Prevention, ONI Administration/Management
<b>Estimated Reduction(s)</b>	\$ 250,000
<p><b>Brief description of what is proposed to be cut:</b>                  Cut \$150,000 from Graffiti – cut contract for removal services, does not cut staff</p> <p>Cut \$80,000 from Crime Prevention – Cut 1 FTE Crime Prevention – as a vacant position there is no layoff and it represents approximately 5% of Crime Prevention Budget.</p> <p>Cut \$20,000 from Management - Cut 5% from ONI Management by the 5% programming cut. In principle, when cutting line programs, it is important to also proportionally cut management. This does not take into consideration whether ONI management is the right size for the program.</p>	
<p><b>Brief description of non-budgetary impacts, if any (impacts to staffing, service delivery, community and performance measures). :</b>                  Eliminates free graffiti removal services. Eliminates ongoing staff so service delivery would have to be reduced accordingly.</p>	
<p><b>The package supports ONI’s priorities including (check those that apply)</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Funding Equity for Civic Engagement Programs (does not increase the burden on ONI’s most underfunded partners)  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>Safeguarding jobs  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>not taking funds from one organization to fund another                  Explain how it supports or does not support priorities:</p>	
<p><b>Describe any strategy to manage the impact of lost services and funds in FY 2016-17 and future years.</b>                  Click here to enter text.</p>	
<p><b>Describe impact on performance measures – both in FY2016-17 and future years. How much less will we do (workload) and how will it reduce our service delivery (efficiency)? Will anyone be better or worse off (effectiveness)? How will it impact our 5-10 year strategic direction (benchmarks/targets)?</b></p> <p>Because this is a reduction in ongoing staff and services we would expect the service delivery and measures to be reduced accordingly</p>	

---

**Additional materials may be attached.**

# FY2017 Proposed Budget Reduction Package

J

<b>Title</b>	<b>Package J – Graffiti, Small Grants, Crime Prevention, ONI/CNIC</b>
<b>Program(s) impacted</b>	<b>Graffiti, Neighborhood Program, Crime Prevention, Community and Neighborhood Involvement Center</b>
<b>Estimated Reduction(s)</b>	<b>\$ 394,000</b>
<p><b>Brief description of what is proposed to be cut:</b>            Cut \$182,000 from Graffiti – cut contract for removal services, retain some funds for very limited emergency cleanups and supplies. Eliminate .5 FTE support staff for program.</p> <p>Cut \$100,000 from Neighborhood Program – eliminate Small Grants program. Although a best practice, it is a discreet program that could be suspended without impact on staffing and can generate advocacy to be reinstated when funding is available</p> <p>Cut \$80,000 from Crime Prevention – Cut 1 FTE Crime Prevention – as a vacant position there is no layoff and it represents approximately 5% of Crime Prevention Budget.</p> <p>Cut \$32,000 from Community and Neighborhood Involvement Center – eliminate .5 FTE supporting CNIC services including Spirit of Portland and other special events (shared with Graffiti, currently filled with temporary staffing)</p>	
<p><b>Brief description of non-budgetary impacts, if any (impacts to staffing, service delivery, community and performance measures). :</b>            Eliminates free graffiti removal services. Eliminates 1 of 12 FTE in Crime Prevention so services would have to be reduced accordingly. Eliminates support to graffiti and CNIC so services reduced accordingly (no more ONI support for Spirit of Portland and other special events, delays in administrative processing of graffiti abatement notices, etc). Eliminates a grants program that leverages a substantial amount of in kind donations and supports grass roots organizing efforts.</p>	
<p><b>The package supports ONI’s priorities including (check those that apply)</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Funding Equity for Civic Engagement Programs (does not increase the burden on ONI’s most underfunded partners)</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Safeguarding jobs</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>not taking funds from one organization to fund another</b>  <b>Explain how it supports or does not support priorities:</b>            Safeguards permanently filled jobs, but does result in layoff of 1 FTE temporary employee and 1 FTE vacant represented position. Impacts one of the most core civic engagement programs but not in a way that reduces staffing at partners. However, does not increase the funding equity gap for DCL program.</p>	
<p><b>Describe any strategy to manage the impact of lost services and funds in FY 2016-17 and future years.</b>            Each cut is something that could be advocated strongly for reinstatement in future years. Service delivery expectations would need to be reduced based on eliminated staff and services.</p>	

**Describe impact on performance measures – both in FY2016-17 and future years. How much less will we do (workload) and how will it reduce our service delivery (efficiency)? Will anyone be better or worse off (effectiveness)? How will it impact our 5-10 year strategic direction (benchmarks/targets)?**

Because this is a reduction in ongoing staff and services we would expect the service delivery and measures to be reduced accordingly

Graffiti program would not provide free removal services, would focus on enforcement, but this does impact those most vulnerable that cannot afford prompt removal of graffiti on their properties due to limited resources.

Impacts amount of dollars leveraged through grants and limits opportunities for partnership. Loss of grants has a negative impact on the broader community as it limits opportunity for funding of community priorities. Impacts trust from the community since grants have been reduced and defunded in the past as well. The grants reinstatement would need to be the top priority for future funding.

**Additional materials may be attached.**

# FY2017 Proposed Budget Reduction Package

K
---

<b>Title</b>	Package K - Graffiti/Crime Prevention/Management
<b>Program(s) impacted</b>	Graffiti, Crime Prevention, ONI Administration/Management, Diversity and Civic Leadership Program
<b>Estimated Reduction(s)</b>	\$ 384,752
<p><b>Brief description of what is proposed to be cut:</b>                  Cut \$150,000 from Graffiti – cut contract for removal services, does not cut staff</p> <p>Cut \$80,000 from Crime Prevention – Cut 1 FTE Crime Prevention – as a vacant position there is no layoff and it represents approximately 5% of Crime Prevention Budget.</p> <p>Cut \$20,000 from Management - Cut 5% from ONI Management by the 5% programming cut. In principle, when cutting line programs, it is important to also proportionally cut management. This does not take into consideration whether ONI management is the right size for the program.</p> <p>Cut \$134,752 from Diversity and Civic Leadership – This is a program that has no identified partner and in a budget reduction year it would be most prudent to put this portion of funding aside at this time</p>	
<p><b>Brief description of non-budgetary impacts, if any (impacts to staffing, service delivery, community and performance measures). :</b>                  Eliminates free graffiti removal services. Eliminates ongoing staff so service delivery would have to be reduced accordingly.</p>	
<p><b>The package supports ONI’s priorities including (check those that apply)</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Funding Equity for Civic Engagement Programs (does not increase the burden on ONI’s most underfunded partners)</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Safeguarding jobs</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>not taking funds from one organization to fund another</b>  <b>Explain how it supports or does not support priorities:</b></p>	
<p><b>Describe any strategy to manage the impact of lost services and funds in FY 2016-17 and future years.</b></p>	
<p><b>Describe impact on performance measures – both in FY2016-17 and future years. How much less will we do (workload) and how will it reduce our service delivery (efficiency)? Will anyone be better or worse off (effectiveness)? How will it impact our 5-10 year strategic direction (benchmarks/targets)?</b></p> <p>Because this is a reduction in ongoing staff and services we would expect the service delivery and measures to be reduced accordingly</p>	

**Additional materials may be attached.**

# FY2017 Proposed Budget Reduction Package

L
---

<b>Title</b>	Package L- Graffiti/Crime Prevention/Management/Resolutions NW
<b>Program(s) impacted</b>	Graffiti, Crime Prevention, ONI Administration/Management, Mediation/Facilitation
<b>Estimated Reduction(s)</b>	\$ 393,000
<p><b>Brief description of what is proposed to be cut:</b>                  Cut \$150,000 from Graffiti – cut contract for removal services, does not cut staff</p> <p>Cut \$80,000 from Crime Prevention – Cut 1 FTE Crime Prevention – as a vacant position there is no layoff and it represents approximately 5% of Crime Prevention Budget.</p> <p>Cut \$20,000 from Management - Cut 5% from ONI Management by the 5% programming cut. In principle, when cutting line programs, it is important to also proportionally cut management. This does not take into consideration whether ONI management is the right size for the program.</p> <p>Cut \$143,000 from Mediation/Facilitation – reduce and modify how mediation/facilitation services are provided.</p>	
<p><b>Brief description of non-budgetary impacts, if any (impacts to staffing, service delivery, community and performance measures). :</b>                  Eliminates free graffiti removal services. Eliminates ongoing staff so service delivery would have to be reduced accordingly. Reduces and changes how mediation/facilitation services are provided</p>	
<p><b>The package supports ONI’s priorities including (check those that apply)</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Funding Equity for Civic Engagement Programs (does not increase the burden on ONI’s most underfunded partners)</b>  <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Safeguarding jobs</b>  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>not taking funds from one organization to fund another</b>  <b>Explain how it supports or does not support priorities:</b>                  Jobs reduction through mediation/facilitation program</p>	
<p><b>Describe any strategy to manage the impact of lost services and funds in FY 2016-17 and future years.</b></p>	
<p><b>Describe impact on performance measures – both in FY2016-17 and future years. How much less will we do (workload) and how will it reduce our service delivery (efficiency)? Will anyone be better or worse off (effectiveness)? How will it impact our 5-10 year strategic direction (benchmarks/targets)?</b></p> <p>Because this is a reduction in ongoing staff and services we would expect the service delivery and measures to be reduced accordingly</p>	

**Additional materials may be attached.**



---

---

**Other Food For Thought (Items from retreat brainstorm that did not fit within the theme areas captured in recommendations)**

- Establish program baseline or minimum operational budgets and only apply cuts to programs funded above their baseline.
- Communities of color have large issues of trust. DCL money is a large part of reestablishing trust. The fact that there is such parity issues however doesn't help.
- Cut ONI Materials and Services
- Work to develop a staffing hours cut across the board that equitably allows to reach the 5% cut. Of the \$9,096,100 FY 16 Budget, a \$393,555 cut equates to a 4.32% cut if applied across the board. This roughly equates to each employee working 100.9 less hours to achieve the 5%. (NOTE: the numbers not accurate here due to funding in the \$9M that is one-time including several staff positions, but could be explored further if this is pursued)
- We have a practice of moving toward equity with adds. Explicitly adopt practice of moving toward equity with cuts.
- Programs that do not fit with ONI's mission of civic engagement should be first cut.
- Provide equity funding on long-term process rather than year to year basis.
- Brown Bag/Sack Lunch all meetings and events and explain why.

---

---

**Other Comments/Feedback received**

- Add packages: It is important to allot a generous amount of time to defining ONI strategic direction and goals and advocating for proposed add packages to move us toward those goals. While we understand and agree that the 5% cut is a required exercise, we can also agree that exercise will not move the ONI programs towards its goals. Please consider allotting sufficient time in this process to discuss how budget add proposals can meet ONI's strategic directions and goals.
- Cuts to union represented positions: There are no represented positions within ONI for which cuts will promote or support ONI's or the City's equity

goals. In fact, cuts to the programs within which our represented employees work will result in less equitable service for all Portlanders, but especially those most vulnerable and most in need of our help.

Proposing cuts to Crime Prevention will put service levels well below what we have now, which is not adequate to serve the diversity of neighborhood needs that the program currently serves. As it is, the program has only three crime prevention program coordinators per precinct. In one case, a single geographically-assigned crime prevention program coordinator supports 25 neighborhoods-that's one coordinator for more than a quarter of all of the City's neighborhoods.

In other cases, an individual crime prevention coordinator supports every Portland neighborhood through a citywide assignment. One example of a single coordinator serving Portlanders in every neighborhood is our program that provides special public safety system support to rental communities. Another is our single coordinator who supports community organizing programs such as community patrol and neighborhood watch in every neighborhood throughout Portland.

Our other represented employees work for programs who also depend on their support, such as administrative help for the liquor license program or the Information and Referral staff. Cuts to these programs will also reduce service below current levels to our communities' most vulnerable members.

[AFSCME 189 represented employees of ONI] oppose proposed cuts to programs that depend on the employees we represent to be effective and provide equitable service to all Portlanders.