

Portland Children's Levy
Allocation Committee Meeting Minutes
May 4, 2020 3:00 p.m.
Location: Virtual Meeting via Zoom

The full record of the meeting may be viewed on the Portland Children's Investment Fund website: www.portlandchildrenslevy.org or PortlandOregon.gov at:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=85AmAEyrJFc>

Attending: Mitch Hornecker, Jessica Vega Pederson, Traci Rossi, Felicia Tripp-Folsom, Ted Wheeler (Chair).

Welcome/introduction of Allocation Committee and Children's Levy staff

Approval of Minutes from April 24 Meeting

Minutes approved as presented.

Wheeler: Hi, everybody, I'm Ted Wheeler. In late April we allocated nearly \$42 million out of the total \$68 million to programs in early childhood child abuse prevention. Today, we're using the remaining funds towards programs in hunger relief, after-school and mentoring. All decisions will, of course, go before the City Council for final approval in June and all of these new levy grants begin effective July 1st. During this stressful time, we hope you and your loved ones are safe. We thank our first responders, front line medical staff and caregivers and everyone keeping our stores and restaurants operating as well, to the degree that they are. I'm proud of how our community has risen to this unprecedented challenge and appreciate everyone's patient and said generosity as we navigate this pandemic.

I want to acknowledge the work of our nonprofit partners who are providing important services to our children and families during a critical time. While we obviously can't meet all of the funding requests that come before us, and have had to make some difficult decisions, and I think we're going to make more today. We greatly appreciate your work and your dedication.

Today, we're joined by all members of the PCL committee, including Multnomah County Commissioner Jessica Vega Pederson, our county appointed member, Felicia Tripp Folsom, and, of course, our city-appointed member, Traci Rossi who's done a fantastic job. And, of course, our business leader, Mitch Hornecker. We have Lisa Pellegrino, Lisa Hansell, John Kelly, John Coughlan, Arika Bridgeman-Bunyoli and, of course, Mary Gay Broderick. For everyone joining us through our YouTube link, it will note which of us is speaking at any given moment and you'll be able to see a couple of PowerPoints shown later.

We approved the minutes from April 24th.

Overview of Funding Process

First, up is Grant Manager Lisa Hansell, providing an overview of the funding process and some protocol around the decision-making process. After that, and any questions or discussion from committee

members, she will turn the meeting over to Lisa Pellegrino and Meg McElroy to lead us in program funding decisions. So with that, Lisa, take it away.

Hansell: Thank you, Mayor. We have a PowerPoint that we will be sharing with the allocation committee and the viewing audience. There may be a brief pause before it shows on your screen, but you should see it momentarily if you aren't already. John Kelly will be running the slide show for me. Thank you, John.

I'll take you briefly through an overview of all that has happened to bring us to this day, and then you'll move into making funding decisions for hunger relief, after-school and mentoring. PCL staff recruited and trained 63 volunteers to review and score applications. In most cases, five reviewers scored each application. PCL staff averaged the scores for each application to reflect the total scores that were provided to the committee and all applicants. Due to the variability between reviewer scores, staff did not eliminate any applications from consideration for failure to meet the minimum score requirements that were published in the RFI. So the committee is reviewing all applications that were submitted.

Before developing our staff recommendations, we've reviewed all the applications, reviewer scores, past performance of grantees and the financial health of the organizations submitting applications. Our recommendations were based on all of that information and the criteria published in the RFI. Staff did not communicate with applicants about their applications after they were submitted. On March 17th, we sent application scores, staff recommendations and rationale to the Allocation Committee and to all applicants.

On March 19th, we sent reviewer score sheets to all the applicants and made the score sheets available to the Allocation Committee for review. Applicants then had the opportunity to submit written and recorded oral testimony in support of their applications. Unfortunately, due to the covid-19 outbreak, we had to cancel all of the video recording of testimony that was planned. We substituted oral recorded testimony for the video recording. The written and oral testimony was sent to the allocation committee on April 10th, allowing time to review the information before the decision meetings. We also made all the testimony available to all applicants.

As we were sending our staff recommendations in mid-March, the covid-19 emergency measures were just starting to go into full effect. The economic impacts of the state of emergency were immediate and severe on community members, service providers, and had direct effects on service delivery. As the emergency continued, Allocation Committee members expressed some concerns to staff about the impact of the pandemic on PCL revenue and asked staff to develop options to allocate less funding in anticipation of future revenue decline. Staff developed options for reducing the funding level and sent those to committee members and all applicants on April 15th. Applicants were invited to submit additional testimony in response to the funding options to staff by April 17th. Staff sent the additional testimony to committee and all applicants on April 20th.

At the April 24th Allocation Committee meeting, the committee decided to allocate the full \$68.1 million in funding -- in current funding round in an effort to meet equity goals and support organizations responding to emergency needs. In spring 2021, the committee will consider revising grant totals when the economic impact of the pandemic is clearer and with updated revenue projections.

Funding decisions for early childhood, child abuse prevention and intervention and foster care were made on April 24th.

In advance of today's meeting, you each indicated your individual funding preferences to staff using an excel spreadsheet. Staff aggregated your individual funding preferences by program area to help facilitate today's discussion. At the April 24th meeting, as a time-saving measure, Commissioner Vega Pederson

suggested the committee vote on the group of foster care applications that all committee members indicated a preference to fund at the same amount. The remainder of applications were then discussed and voted on individually.

Today's decision meeting will run as it did for foster care program area. The committee will start by making decisions on the set of applications that all committee members indicated an interest in funding the application, and at the same amount. The committee will vote on these applications as a group. Then the remaining applications will be discussed individually, beginning with the applications that all committee members indicated an interest in funding and proceeding in score order. The committee will vote on each of these individual applications.

If no committee member indicated an interest in funding an application, it is unlikely to be discussed today.

Now, moving on to the mechanics of the decision making. For each program area, staff will state the application number and name of the application, the number of you out of five who are interested in funding it, and the funding amount or range of funding amounts. They will also say if anyone abstained from an application. After that, staff will turn it over to the Mayor to facilitate voting. John Kelly will share a spreadsheet on the screen. John, if you could please stop sharing the PowerPoint and now share the hunger relief spreadsheet. Wait a moment so you'll be able to see what you'll see during the decision-making process. There we go.

This spreadsheet will be used to track your decisions as you make them. John will fill in the application number, applicant name, and the grant amount. The original allocation amount for the program area is listed in the top, on the top of the sheet and the balance is also listed. John's pointing to both of those places. The balance will change with each funding decision. In addition to the original allocation amounts for each funding area, there is a \$120,179 balance from the April 24th meeting that may be allocated today. So do you have any questions before you proceed with decision making? That's all I have. I will turn it over to Llsa Pellegrino to start with hunger relief.

Hunger Relief Funding Decisions

Pellegrino: Okay, thanks, Llsa. Before we turn into decision making in our many program areas, at this point, I want everyone to keep in mind that you do a balance of approximately \$120,000 that can be transferred to allocate today. And to remind everybody that this balance is smaller than the balance that staff transferred in their recommendations to the mentoring program area so staff's original recommendations resulted in a negative balance of \$50,000 after all allocations were made. And staff recommended that that could be taken from unspent balances on grant contracts ending this fiscal year, which is on June 30.

As you approach your decision making today, I just want everyone to keep in mind that if you want to allocate all of the money that staff had recommended be allocated, that that would result in a total deficit of approximately \$350,000 due to the fact you made an additional grant in the last set of decisions. So I just want folks to keep that in the back of their mind as we approach the end of the line today. We were -- as I said, we've made recommendations based -- that resulted in a deficit of \$50,000. 350 is quite a bit more. We looked back, just to give you some background, fund balances that we've had in previous years and in the last three years, fund balance has ranged from 2.9% to 3.4% of grant budgets. However, given the current emergency, we're expecting that that will likely lower the current grantee's ability to use grant

funds for emergency needs, and it's likely -- or at least it's forecasting that that balance is likely to be lower.

So our best estimate is a fund balance -- or I should say -- a contract balance at the end of this fiscal year of about one to 1.5% of current grant budgets, which is approximately \$250,000. So just to give you some parameters as you approach the end of your decision making, I wanted to say that at the beginning because it always gets hard at the end to keep in mind whether, you know -- just how much you're willing to spend over what the original allocation amount was.

Okay. Keeping that in mind, let's turn to hunger relief. As Lisa said, we've grouped all of the applications together where there is no disagreement between the individual preferences of committee members and on the funding amount so you can decide those as a block today. And hunger relief, we have an historic moment in levy history. There are no disagreements among you about what to fund so I will read through your preferences and these preferences were preferred by everybody.

Proposed Slate

Application Number	Applicant Organization	Program Name	3-Year Grant Amount
HR-4	The Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization	Hunger Relief	\$ 757,015
HR-7	Metropolitan Family Service, Inc.	Hunger Relief	\$ 478,029
HR-9	Oregon Food Bank, Inc.	School Based Food Programs	\$ 1,848,210
HR-5	Janus Youth Programs, Inc.	Village Gardens	\$ 430,225
HR-1	Familias En Accion	Latino Food Equity Program	\$ 547,584
HR-2	Growing Gardens	Growing Gardens	\$ 387,194
HR-8	Neighborhood House, Inc.	Mobile Food Delivery Service	\$ 255,197
HR-10	Portland Opportunities Industrialization Center, Inc.	Portland Opportunities Industrialization Center: Nutrition Program	\$ 277,254
HR-6	Meals on Wheels People, Inc.	Meals 4 Kids	\$ 1,916,358
HR-3	Human Solutions, Inc.	Learn Links Food Pantry	\$ 200,909
HR-11	Sunshine Division, Inc.	Community Transitional School	\$ 210,000

**Hunger Relief Total Funds
Granted \$ 7,307,975**

Wheeler So first of all, let me ask is there any further discussion on this before I call for a motion? And what I would suggest we do is that we vote on all of these as a slate, move these as a slate, second them as

a slate, and vote on them as a slate, but I want to make sure -- first of all, find out if there's any discussion on any of the specific proposals or on the proposal that we move these as a slate. I'm not seeing anybody raise their hand as of this moment. Let me slide up here and make sure I'm not missing somebody. I am. Mitch, and then Commissioner Vega Pederson.

Hornecker: Oh, sorry. I thought I was moving to go as a slate. I don't have any changes.

Wheeler: I'll take that as a motion. Commissioner Vega Pederson, are you seconding or did you have further discussion?

Vega Pederson: I was seconding.

Wheeler: Very good. We have a motion and a second. Is there any further discussion? Is there any opposition to the slate? Seeing none, the motion carries. Very good. Thank you to Lisa, congrats to our new hunger relief grantees. Now, we'll be moving on to the after-school investments.

The Slate above was unanimously approved without abstention.

After School Funding Decisions

Pellegrino: Yes, thank you, mayor. Okay. We're going to take the same process again. We're going to start with all the applications, where there was no disagreement, whether to fund and the funding amount. So I will list those first and then mayor you can take that as a slate assuming there's no further discussion.

Proposed slate

Application Number	Applicant Organization	Program Name	3-Year Grant Amount
AS-13	The Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization	SUN Community Schools	\$ 388,062
AS-14	The Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization	INSPIRE	\$ 1,615,073
AS-17	Metropolitan Family Service, Inc.	SUN	\$ 453,937
AS-11	Impact NW	AKA Science	\$ 346,589
AS-15	Latino Network	Conexiones, Escalers, Collegio de Padres	\$ 1,399,309
AS-12	Impact NW	Urban Opportunities	\$ 422,527
AS-22	Open School, Inc.	Step Up	\$ 1,390,617
AS-24	Portland Opportunities Industrialization Center, Inc.	Afterschool Program	\$ 309,090
AS-20	Neighborhood House, Inc.	Connect Program	\$ 264,464

AS-9	Human Solutions, Inc.	Learn Links	\$ 592,005
AS-3	Oregon Bravo Youth Orchestras	BRAVO Youth Orchestra	\$ 330,779
AS-4	El Programa Hispano Catolico	El Programa Hispano	\$ 578,459
AS-6	Girls Inc. of the Pacific Northwest	Girls Inc	\$ 231,332
AS-19	Native American Youth and Family Center	Native Student Success	\$ 618,279
AS-10	Human Solutions, Inc.	Learn Links at Lilac Meadows	\$ 200,909
AS-5	Ethos Inc.	Music Corp	\$ 328,338
AS-8	Hacienda Community Development Corporation	Expresiones	\$ 586,472
AS-2	Boys and Girls Clubs of Portland Metropolitan Area	Building Great Futures	\$ 226,152

Wheeler: Okay. Hang on, let me just glance. So as Lisa just mentioned, this is a block where we are all in agreement. There is no dissent on this block. We can move this as a block, but first, before we do that, is there any further discussion on any of the items listed in this particular block? Seeing none -- yes?

Rossi: Is AS-28 self-enhancement a part of the slate?

Pellegrino: We will get to that because there wasn't agreement on amount. So we're taking only the ones first where there was agreement to fund and there was no disagreement on the amount.

Rossi: Okay, maybe I have the wrong sheet. Okay, thank you.

Wheeler: All right. Very good. I'll entertain a motion. And a second. Commissioner Vega Pederson makes the motion to accept the slate. I'll entertain a second. And Mr. Hornecker seconds it. Any further discussion on this slate? Seeing no discussion on this slate, and is there any dissent on this slate? Seeing none, the motion carries.

The above slate was approved without abstention

Wheeler: Congratulations to those organizations that are now receiving funding. Now, we'll get to the part where there is some disagreement.

Pellegrino: Yes. So again starting from the place of most agreement in score order. So the next application to consider is REAP solutions. 5 of 5 committee members prefer to fund the application. The range of funding preferred was \$373,433 up to \$553,433.

Wheeler: Yes, and I guess I'm the dissenter here by suggesting we add more to REAP so let me go ahead and explain my logic there. And I might also request clarification from staff on this. So we have a portion that REAP has requested that has been funded, but my understanding is this does not include funding for their current program, is that correct?

Pellegrino: You're correct, Mayor. They did not put that in their application, but in their testimony noted that they did want to continue providing that programming.

Wheeler: And so the reason I put this in is their current program is a good program. I will admit I'm somewhat confused as to how the current programming did not get included. I personally would encourage us, given the population that they serve, to continue to keep the current program whole. To do that, it would require us to add the \$180,000 to that. They didn't apply. But I believe they've also made it clear on the record that that was an administrative oversight and I just wonder how comfortable people are making the decision to fund what are -- what is effectively new programming while leaving the current programming unserved. And so I just felt that given the need particularly to focus on African American youth, this was a lost opportunity and in the interest of full transparency, they didn't apply for it. It appears to have been a mistake. Unless somebody tells me otherwise. Mitch. Mitch, you are muted still.

Hornecker: I was just going to ask for the staff to remind us on how their performance was on their underlying program that they neglected to apply for.

Pellegrino: There have been no performance issues in the last year and a half. There was a little bit of a rocky start, but there's been no issues.

Hornecker: Out of the box, and then they've been meeting there. So that's important to me. That's good news.

Wheeler: First of all thank you Mitch. Lisa, did I characterize the situation accurately? I want to make sure that on the record here, I'm being completely accurate in how I represented this.

Pellegrino: Yes, mayor, that's correct. Staff had recommended funding part of the program expansion that they asked for in their application, and there was not an ask to continue the current program that was funded in their application, and then in their testimony, they noted that they did want to continue offering the existing program that we had funded in originally 2017. So that's a correct characterization, yes.

Wheeler: And I don't want to be unfair to those organizations that played by the rules, filled out the applications. On the other hand, given that we know there's a gap here for the kinds of services that are provided by REAP, I -- I honestly just thinking about this in terms of what I think is important for the community, I feel it's important to include this. Commissioner Vega Pederson.

Vega Pederson: Thank you, Mayor. I had a question for staff in terms of the two elementary schools that they didn't request the grant funding for. Where are those elementary schools located?

Pellegrino: They are Oliver and Park Lane in east Portland.

Vega Pederson: And the difference it looks like is about \$180,000.

Wheeler: Yeah, it's about \$57,000 a year over three years. If people would like to stew on that, what we could do, Director Pellegrino, is we could hold off on this one until the end if people would like to consider that.

Pellegrino: That's fine, mayor. You can continue and not assign a funding amount. You can look at your balances. We can proceed that way, if you want.

Wheeler: I would sort of like to poll the committee first and just see if people are still confused and want to think on this. I certainly want to give people the space to do that. It's somewhat of an unusual situation, but if people are ready to go, I certainly am prepared to move forward.

Hornecker: This is Mitch, Mayor. So can I just get a little more clarity on this? Are the two schools that they neglected to propose for, is the programming the same that staff is recommending we fund it at the new schools?

Pellegrino: It's along the same lines. They have the solutions program at Oliver and Park Lane and they also have an additional after-school person at those two schools that offer specific after-school programming to the elementary school kids. Their proposal for expansion for solutions to new schools, schools they are not currently serving, was in their proposal and staff had recommended that we fund two schools for expansion of the solutions program. So they're knit together, but they're not the exact same services.

Hornecker: And all the schools are east and presumably have a somewhat similar demographic. What I'm trying to get at, if they would have applied, would it be reasonable to expect kind of the mid-80s scoring total like we gave the -- like the score was for the program that we all agreed to fund?

Pellegrino: I think that's a reasonable assumption.

Hornecker: It seemed like it would logically be that. It would be highly rated in my mind.

Pellegrino: You all voted to fund it in 2017. Relatively recently.

Hornecker: Okay, again that's helpful for me.

Wheeler: Is there a dissenting opinion on this? Does somebody want to make the case? I don't see it. So I will move that we fund reap solutions, AS-26 at \$553,433. Is there a second? Traci seconds it. Any further discussion on this item? Any opposition to this item? The motion carries.

AS-26	R.E.A.P.	REAP: Solutions	\$ 553,433
-------	----------	-----------------	------------

Thank you, colleagues. Lisa, next item?

Pellegrino: Okay. Next item is Self Enhancement, Inc. Their after-school program, AS-28. Five of five of you wanted to fund this. There was a range of preferred amounts, starting at \$1,028,774 and going up to \$1,330,274.

Wheeler: All right. And mitch, it looks like you are the one person with a different recommendation. Would you like to have the floor?

Hornecker: Yeah. This is somewhat of a blunt instrument, but I was in favor of funding the CAPI-1 Bridge Meadows project, which was \$301,500. So what I did was look at all the programming that was recommended and took the program that scored the lowest of all, which is this program at 62.3, and subtracted the \$301,500 from the staff recommendation of \$1.3 million. So it's just a math reduction.

Wheeler: Well, it's not illogical. I think I personally would still stick with the higher amount, that I would be interested in other opinions. Commissioner Vega Pederson.

Vega Pederson: Thank you, Mayor. And, you know, I appreciate Mitch, you looking at how we can address the changes that were needed with the funding for the CAPI program, that we funded the last time around. I did the same thing also in afterschool, but I did it with a different program and did it a slightly different way just looking at, you know, potentially how it would make the most sense. So I think it might be worthwhile to have that -- a little more conversation around the thinking behind it, and how it relates to this one.

I guess for this one, I looked at this one as well, and, you know, it was already a staff funding recommendation at a lower level than what the original request was and I was hoping staff could provide a little bit more insight into the reasoning for the low score primarily due to lack of response in one section of the application. Is this something that was -- raises any concerns among staff or this program, is this something that we've funded in the past as well and so just curious on how staff is feeling overall about the program and funding it going forward.

Pellegrino: Yes. This is a program we funded in the past. There was -- it appeared to be to staff a fairly perhaps on the part of the grant writer. There was extremely little information given in response to a very high point question, so that meant that reviewers were forced to score it low because they didn't answer the questions that were asked. However, on the strength of their past performance, staff recommended them for continued funding, and especially in light of the population that they serve, and there being for the most part no issues in their service delivery in the last five years that we've funded this grant. The slightly lower funding recommendation was due to a lack of budget justification information in the application that staff couldn't rationalize that full funding recommendation, so that was the reason why it was somewhat lower.

Vega Pederson: Okay, thank you. So what I'm hearing is that despite the low score in the grant program, you haven't -- that hasn't borne out in terms of the actual experience in terms of program results, quality improvement in the program?

Pellegrino: That's correct.

Vega Pederson: Okay. Thank you for that clarification. And I would just put out there, I looked at how we could make up the balance for the investment and I looked at the new program that we were funding versus one that had -- that we've already been funding that's been successful and so that's where you'll see, I made a recommendation for not funding a program around that. I balanced that with a reduction -- I said that we do a reduction in the amount that we actually

granted to Bridge Meadows, looking at their staff positions and looking at essentially not funding one of the partial director positions to help balance the amount that I was proposing to cut in this area versus what we would be funding for the Bridge Meadows ask to help it balance out. That's how I solved the problem. You know, but obviously, there's different ways to do that. I personally would rather look at a new program rather than cutting from an existing program that's been successful.

Pellegrino: You all could consider there are several programs left for consideration, that would be new grants for the levy and involve expansions of existing activities. You could consider those if you want first before you make a decision about whether you want to lower that grant amount. I mean, I can put those on the table and you can discuss them. That's all I can offer in terms of trying to figure out what you prefer.

Rossi: This is Traci. I would like to do that, to look at those programs first.

Wheeler: So we will table AS-28 for a moment and Lisa, will you remind me to come back to that, so we don't forget?

Pellegrino: Okay. So there are three more programs that there was some level of disagreement about and why don't I have John put them all on the list so you can see them. And then you all can discuss each of them and figure out where you land. So the next program in terms of again order of preference and score order. So this next program, four or five of you wanted to fund and that is AS-16, Latino Network studio Latino. And the -- one person did not want to fund it at all and the other four preferred to fund at the staff recommended amount.

Wheeler: All right. So I was the one who proposed that we not fund it at all. And I want to explain that position. First of all, I am a huge fan of the Latino Network. I think they do outstanding work and I hope that's reflected by the fact, unanimously voted earlier for \$1.4 million for other after-school programs.

The Studio Latino, the after-school arts program, would be a new program. It has not received existing dollars, the program as I understand it, and staff can correct me if I'm wrong, has not yet been set up and given that we have supported \$1.4 million to the Latino Network for the other after-school program, as much as I do love the arts, I think the arts are an important part of the educational process, I'm concerned that we do not leave enough resource for our mentorship programs, particularly mentorship programs focused on African American youth. And so I was trying to find a way to more fully fund mentoring programs, particularly those geared towards African American youth, I happen to find the resources somewhere. I chose not to take it from existing programming but to do it from new programming. And that was the basis for my decision to recommend that we do not fund this new program.

Pellegrino: Mayor, do you want me to run through the others as well?

Wheeler: Absolutely. Why don't we put them all on the table because there's interaction I think here.

Pellegrino: Yes. So the next, and I think there are perhaps -- AS-25, Portland State University. Oregon MESA Program. Again, 4-5 people wanted to fund it at at the \$350,243 level and one person elected not to include in that their slate.

And then the next program, AS-1, Active Children Portland. This program, 3-5 of you indicated a preference to fund at \$210,909 and two of you indicated a preference not to fund it.

So all three of these grants would represent new grants for the levy and are for either expansion - for expansions and some support for existing programs.

Wheeler: Why don't I start with the last one, since I'm one of the dissenting opinions there on the active -- the Active Children. My logic is very much the same here. There is not currently an investment in this program. This is a new grant. There is free access to soccer, which is a good thing. It's a relatively -- I think it is -- correct me if I'm wrong, Lisa, it is a virtually brand-new organization and given that we're going a begging finding resources, again in particular for the mentoring programs, and even existing after-school programs that are showing good results, I simply made the hard choice here not to fund this in the cycle.

And then the PSU one, same reason. You know, I certainly would be open to my colleagues' thoughts, as well. Commissioner Vega Pederson. Commissioner, do you have a comment? You're muted.

Vega Pederson: Thank you, mayor. I wanted to speak about the Active Children Portland because I also suggested not funding this program for the same reason. They're very similar reasons to the ones you stated. Investing in a new program, in a new organization and trying to just fill the gap and the dollars that were needed for the Bridge Meadows program, it had roughly the same match and it did score significantly -- well, noticeably lower than some of the other new programs that were proposed in this category. And so -- that's why I proposed not funding this and using the \$210,000 to apply to the Bridge Meadows program with a reduction in the grant for that, as well. So that was my thinking around this.

Wheeler: Thank you, commissioner. Other thoughts?

Tripp Folsom This is Felicia. I think this is where it really got tough after we funded Bridge Meadows. Really, where do you cut once you're out of the top applications? And I do think we have to have some thoughtful conversations on this and already have been, who we fund, how much we fund, who already has funds, but I think this is -- [audio breaking up]

Wheeler: Felicia, I'm sorry, we can't hear you. Your connection is breaking up. Is it -- do you have other wi-fi instruments are where you are that can be turned off?

Tripp Folsom: Let me try to transfer to another computer.

I was just saying that I think this is going to be our struggle, now that we're out of the top applications, and we're trying to -- [audio breaking up] I funded Bridge Meadows over here, so I'm going to take it away from over here and same with you, Mayor. So I think we were all trying to do that. We just did it in different buckets. So I think now, it's really going back. Who do we fund? How much? And if we shave a little off here and a little off there, can they really do their

programs? So all I'm saying is I think right now as a committee, we're hitting the struggle section of our work as far as funding.

Wheeler: Agreed. No disagreement there whatsoever. So the question then is how do we move forward and find -- and Mitch, I assume that you're hearing and agreeing with this logic as well? And so it's really a question of where to take it from, or would you not necessarily agree with the logic?

Hornecker: Oh, no, I'm fully invested and engaged in the struggle of trying to decide which admirable program we're not going to be able to fund fully or at all. So yeah, no. A familiar spot to be in, at this time of the funding cycle. It doesn't make it any easier. I really appreciate the logic that's been expressed so far, and that is I thought very thoughtful and has made an impression on me listening to the way you guys have set it up.

Wheeler: Okay. So I'll express a clear preference. I would support Studio Latino and the PSU proposal over the Active Children proposal. If somebody forced me to make a forced choice decision, that is how I would rank them. I don't know if other people have similar or different thoughts?

Rossi: Are you saying you would fund the MESA program?

Wheeler: I would prefer to fund both studio latino and the Oregon mesa program through psu over the active children. That is how I would rank them.

Rossi: Okay. And based on our conversations, I was doing some ranking on my own, I would agree with that.

Vega Pederson: I agree with that, as well.

Hornecker: Yep. Makes sense to me. Hard choice, but a logical one.

Wheeler: To be clear, for people listening associated with these organizations, they're all good. And they're all worthy. At this point, we're dealing with a math problem as much as anything. Good. Okay. So why don't we vote on -- and I guess going back to AS-16, Lisa, I would be the one who would be changing my original recommendation and I would go back up to the staff recommendation at \$231,818, which would make that unanimous.

I'll move that at \$231,818.

Is there a second? Commissioner Vega Pederson seconds it. Is there any dissent? Very good.

AS-16 is approved at the staff recommendation level.

AS-16	Latino Network	Studio Latino	\$ 231,818
-------	----------------	---------------	------------

Wheeler: And then the Oregon MESA program through Portland State University, that is AS-25. I would be moving to the staff recommendation, which is \$350,243. That puts us again at unanimity.

I will move that at the staff recommendation. Is there a second?

Traci Rossi seconds it. Thank you kindly.

Is there any dissent?

AS-25 is approved.

AS-25	Portland State University	PSU Oregon MESA	\$	350,243
-------	---------------------------	-----------------	----	---------

Wheeler: And then I would move that AS-1 be moved towards my position on that which was a recommendation not to fund. I will entertain a second. Mitch seconds that. Is there any dissent to funding that at zero, to not funding as-one? Is there any dissent to that? Seeing none, the motion carries. AS-1 will not receive funding during this cycle.

Very good. And we have outstanding -- Lisa, AS-28, is that correct?

Pellegrino: That's correct. So I don't know whether you want to consider -- you can make the decision now, you can hold off making the decision until you look at mentoring, as I hear many of you saying in your comments today that you made certain decisions or certain balances on your preferences, based on wanting to preserve some funding for mentoring. I saw different priorities from Jessica and the Mayor. I'm not sure how you want to approach that. It's up to you.

Wheeler: So I'll just throw all my cards on the table here. Where I was going to use saved resources in the mentoring program, ironically was going to be for the SEI in-school programming piece, that is M-18, under the mentoring program. I was going to give half of their requested funding so that we could get something in the Parkrose School District, an elementary site.

So why don't we do this? Why don't we hear what people have to say on mentoring? Let's move to that. Let's hold off on AS-28 for right now and go through the mentoring and come back to AS-28 unless somebody has an objection to us doing that. Commissioner Vega Pederson?

Vega Pederson: Thank you, Mayor. I just wanted to note, though, that I believe we still have another gap with the REAP solutions and funding that at a higher level than what was originally in the staff recommendation, so I just want to make sure we don't lose track of that one.

I just want to make sure we're keeping that in mind, as we have these discussions, too, where we're still off-balance.

Pellegrino: That's correct. You've saved some money in afterschool, but not as much as you would need it to make up for the grant that you made in the child abuse prevention additional grant. You also can consider how much deficit are you willing to have. We're betting the odds in understanding what possible fund balance we might have from this year, so you know, that's kind of up to you about how you feel about that, as a committee. I feel like our conservative estimate, the most deficit you should consider having is \$250,000, that's our best guess of what might be left over to use, but going higher than that is just some level of risk there. So just keep in that mind as you proceed through mentoring so you can understand what level of deficit you're entertaining.

Wheeler: Okay, that's fair. Of course, we can always -- we can always true this up at the end of the process here, as well.

Mentoring Funding Decisions

Wheeler: And now, we have Meg McElroy who's going to take us through the mentoring.

McElroy: All right. Thanks, everyone. So as you just did in the afterschool and hunger relief program areas, we will walk you through the group of applications and the mentoring program area where all five of you expressed an interest in wanting to fund the application and at the same amount of funding.

Application Number	Applicant Organization	Program Name	3-Year Grant Amount
M-9	The Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization	Refugee & Immigrant Mentoring	\$ 1,125,913
M-10	Latino Network	Padrinos Portland	\$ 772,494
M-15	Portland Opportunities Industrialization Center, Inc.	School-based Mentoring Program	\$ 445,488
M-14	Pathfinders of Oregon	Pathfinders Network Mentoring Inside Out	\$ 463,635
M-12	Native American Youth and Family Center	College Preparation Mentoring Program	\$ 530,798
M-3	Camp Fire Columbia	Camp Fire Middle School Program	\$ 1,489,145

Wheeler: Meg, is there a reason -- there's quite a few here that were unanimous in not funding.

McElroy: Correct.

Wheeler: Did you want to include those in the slate or do those differently?

McElroy: We have not typically -- in the past program areas that you all have done, you have not voted on the ones that you didn't express an interest in funding, only voted on those that you did.

Wheeler: Thank you for that clarification. I appreciate it.

Wheeler: All right. So that is the slate of organizational support where we're in agreement. Is there -- I'll entertain a motion and a second to accept the unanimous slate for funding.

Commissioner Vega Pederson moves, Traci Rossi seconds. Any dissent?

Those are approved. Congratulations to those organizations.

The above slate was approved without abstention.

McElroy: All right. I failed to do something at the beginning of this round of discussion which was to invite the allocation committee members who have a conflict of interest in this set of

applications to declare that conflict, and so I would like the two of them to do that now, before we proceed with the next set of applications.

Wheeler: Yeah, and I was watching that, I figured we would wait until we actually put the vote on those items, but if we can do that now. So M-6, friends of the children. Traci, you have an abstention.

Rossi: I have an abstention because of a conflict of interest.

Wheeler: Very good. And Mitch, you have an abstention on M-13.

Hornecker: Yep, I'm on the board. Thanks.

McElroy: So the next application that 4 of 4 of you expressed an interest of funding at the same amount is Friends of the Children M-6. The amount that you indicated was \$1,597,047.

Wheeler: Yes and just to clarify for the record, we're all in agreement on the amount, and then that's the one where Traci has abstained. I'll entertain a motion to accept the motion and second.

Motion from mitch, a second from commissioner Vega Pederson. Any dissent other than the abstention? It passes. M-6 is approved.

M-6	Friends of the Children - Portland	Friends of the Children	\$ 1,597,047
-----	---------------------------------------	-------------------------	--------------

The above was approved with Traci Rossi abstaining.

McElroy: Then the next one, where the most of you wanted to fund it was 4 of 5 of you indicated an interest in wanting to fund the College Possible college access program, that's application M-4. And the amount that you indicated -- that 4-5 of you indicated an interest in funding, it was all the same amount, \$313,511.

Wheeler: All right, Felicia, did you have thoughts on this one?

Tripp Folsom: I only didn't recommend it for funding because I was trying to replace the Bridge Meadows money, and I was just thinking there are a lot of college programs, but this one is amazing, and I think it's wonderful so I will go with the group, but it was more of me trying to cognizant of the Bridge Meadows funding so that was the only reason. I think the work they do is incredible, all of that. I was just trying to balance it out so I'm happy to go with the group. That was the only reason why the funding was -- I was trying to look for other resources.

Wheeler: All right. Very good. Thank you for that. It sounds like we're unanimous. I'll entertain a motion and a second. To accept M-4 at the staff recommended level.

Commissioner Vega Pederson moves. It looks like Mitch Hornecker snuck in there on the second. Any dissent on this item? Seeing none, the motion carries.

M-4	College Possible	College Access Program	\$ 313,511
-----	------------------	------------------------	------------

College possible is fund at the staff-recommended level.

McElroy: Okay. And before we move forward, I just want to point out the balance right now in this program area. You all started with a possible amount in this program area of just over \$6 million and if I'm understanding the spreadsheet correctly here, the total that you've allocated so far exceeds the balance by over \$600,000. There is money that you have not used yet that could be added to this program area. John has that amount shown here on the sheet. That red color is a little hard to see. I can have you add the last application in this program area that you wanted to discuss, but I want to point out wrestling with the balance here.

Wheeler: And just to be clear on that balance, so that's the 317 plus what you have described as a conservative carryover or that's probably not the right way to put it. The cushion of up to 250, is that accurate or no?

McElroy: Yes, that 250 is what we project could be unspent by organizations that currently have PCL grants by the end of this fiscal year, June 30.

Wheeler: However, if that turns out not to be the case, then we would have to find actual program reduction cuts, correct?

Pellegrino: Mayor, if I could just interrupt. I want to make clear that the 317 I don't believe, that's coming from other program areas, just to be careful.

I think that's the 120 that you didn't allocate in the first set of funding decisions on April 24th, plus whatever didn't get allocated in hunger relief today. There was a balance there, if I'm not mistaken. John Kelly, can you unmute?

Kelly: I would have to double check, it's a little sketchy to do on the supply. I'm going to try to get on the screen with all the pieces of that. I think you're right in what you said.

Wheeler: Yeah, that would -- that would match. So that makes good sense.

Pellegrino: Mayor just for your own thinking, when you're looking at that balance, whatever's in that right column, okay. We've gone traveling. But when you're looking at that balance column, I guess what we're trying to say is that our recommendation to be conservative is not to have that be a negative of more than \$250,000.

Make sense? You can make a decision not to do that, but that's our best guess knowing we don't have perfect information.

Wheeler: Thank you for that clarification. I appreciate that very much. All right. Meg, what's next?

McElroy: The final one in this category, one of you expressed an interest in funding it, which is M-18. SEI's in-school program, and the amount that one of you indicated was \$246,022.

Wheeler: That was my -- that was my doing and part of what I was trying to do, particularly in the other allocations is save some funding for this. This is in-school programming. It is particularly targeted towards African American youth around mentoring, that's an issue that is very important to me. I see it as high priority. SEI asked for \$492,045 over a three-year period. It was not funded. I was trying to get back half of the requested funding with the hope that they could keep one site operational in the Parkrose school district, particularly in an elementary school site. We, of course, have -- we have funded them elsewhere, but I was hopeful we could find the funding here, but I'm not sure we'll be able to under the current circumstances, based on what we voted for so far. Felicia.

Tripp Folsom: Thank you, Mayor. I am starting to lose a little bit of track. I want to be cognizant of the money that we had in afterschool. Is this new balance taking into account the money that's sitting in afterschool that we have to still go back to? Does that deficit take that into account, too?

Pellegrino: I think John Kelly is trying to come up on the spreadsheet. I know this is confusing and hard to do that. It would be so much better in a human meeting, then we could show you in a different way. So the \$118,262 was the balance that was unallocated after you made all the hunger relief decisions. The hundred \$120,179 is what was unallocated after the child abuse and foster care decisions.

And from what I understand, there was a balance that was unallocated in afterschool because you didn't make a decision about the level of funding for SEI. You aren't sure about how much. So what John Kelly was doing I think was putting in the maximum amount that anybody wanted to fund sei at and that was \$1,330,274 and if we subtract that, then that balance of \$78,976 is essentially what would actually be left in after-school. Does that make sense? If you funded SEI at that full amount, \$78,976 would be the additional balance in after-school. When we take all of the balances and put them together, that totals \$317,417. So that's green up here in the added column. Does that make more sense, Felicia? I want to be sure everybody is clear.

Tripp Folsom: Yes.

Pellegrino: Okay. And then the balance you see there, the negative \$334,601, that's essentially if you don't make any further allocations, that's where you're at. And that's if you give sei and after-school that \$1,330,274 amount.

Wheeler: So help me understand one piece of math here, Lisa. So if I'm understanding this correctly, we could still fund and -- I understand I'm an outlier here, I'm not assuming this, but I'm just asking a question. You could potentially fund M-18 at the 246 level?

Pellegrino: Then your negative balance is going to go up. Again, it depends -- you're talking about sei and -- you're going to add 246 onto that negative balance, assuming you decided --

Wheeler: I understand. And I will tell you my preference to be clear is to fund their base request in the -- in the after-school programming here, I think from my perspective that's a must-have.

Pellegrino: Okay. And if you do that -- again there was -- there was a discussion about the funding level in afterschool. So the number that John, that you can see right now is the, that was the maximum amount.

Wheeler: That's where four of us landed.

Pellegrino: Exactly. And then one person was below that, I think taking into account the bridge meadows grant. So that's, you know -- that's your decision.

Wheeler: Okay. So let me play what if for a moment. If we were to fund AS-28, the core after-school programming for SEI at the staff-recommended level, and I was able to persuade my colleague to come up to that level and we did not fund M-18 where I am the outlier. It looks like everybody else was in agreement on that. I was the outlier. If I back off on that, then what does that do to our balance?

Pellegrino: It doesn't change it. That essentially -- the balance you're seeing there right now is hypothecating that you funded SEI at the \$1,330,274 level.

Wheeler: We're still 100,000 on the hot side, even if I take the m-18 off the table. Assuming that SEI gets its full funding at the staff-recommended level.

Vega Pederson: Thank you, Mayor. So as John's putting in the numbers here, I do want to I guess officially move that we lower the previous Bridge Meadows request to \$210,909 to match the amount that was allocated to different programs and make sure that these numbers that we're trying to deal with here are accurate. And really kind of represents the work that we've been trying to do over the past meeting.

Wheeler: Commissioner Vega Pederson, could I just throw out another question, since I like the way you're thinking here. We also funded the Studio Latino and the PSU program earlier. If you had to prioritize in terms of the Bridge Meadows funding that was agreed to last time versus potentially reopening Studio Latino or the PSU program for discussion, would you have a preference?

Vega Pederson: You know, I really liked both the Latino Network program and the other program, especially, you know, as it related to the STEM work with the MESA program. So I feel like in -- I've been more focused, you know, narrowly on filling the Bridge Meadows gap. And otherwise, I think both of those were very high scoring programs and seemed to come from organizations with focuses that would set them up for success.

Wheeler: Very good. Thank you, commissioner. Other thoughts on that, if any? All right. Commissioner, would you like to make the motion? Felicia has a question. Felicia.

Tripp Folsom: I really would prefer to keep the Bridge Meadows program in its entirety. I know I'm probably going counter to the group. And really look at cutting from the other programs. I just think -- this is just me personally. I think if we're going to fund Bridge Meadows just at the amount they're looking for, I'm just concerned that they won't be able to do their program at that amount and I would love to hear from staff first before I make that vote and because that's just my personal opinion, before I could make a decision on the others. I would like to know how that

would impact them if we lowered it that much. You know. So because they went from zero to, you know, the allocated amount, and now, we're looking to cut -- I need some feedback but can move forward on this recommendation.

Hansell: This Lisa Hansell. I'll chime in. As you'll recall, Bridge Meadows was not on the original staff recommendation. However, I am looking at their budget right now. It's a very minimal budget, about \$100,000 a year. They have let's see 1.5 FTE included in this budget. So it would mean cutting out staffing. They don't have any other program expenses or contracted services in there. This is strictly a staffing request. Community support specialist at 0.75 FTE, associate director at 0.25 and program assistant at 0.5. The recommendation of the \$210,909, I don't know Commissioner if there was a specific piece that you were seeing could be cut from the budget.

Vega Pederson: What I was looking at was the 0.25 of the Associate Director piece, approximately coming out to that amount. That's where I was thinking in terms of their budget, how they could make that work, understanding that, you know, that would still leave them with a gap for the new program, but potentially something they might be able to find and fund from other sources. But Felicia, I appreciate your comments as well and I'm not opposed to what you're suggesting, it's just a matter of where we would find those other funds.

Tripp Folsom: And so again, Mayor, I'm not trying to derail the process. Thank you, that is helpful. So moving forward, because I haven't gone back and looked at that particular proposal, I mean, if they were able to still do their program with that lowered amount, then I'm fine with it. I just think -- I think it's really hard because all of those organizations from the -- my dilemma is that we finished that funding round and now, we're digging into that round when a lot of those organizations I think feel like they've been funded at that amount. I don't know. It's just a struggle for me internally when we're now into this other group. I see where you're going and trying to make it all balanced. So I defer to the group on that one. That's where my struggle is coming from.

Wheeler: I agree with that. Mitch, sorry, go ahead.

Hornecker: I was going to ask, haven't we announced previous round and publicized it or is that held?

Pellegrino: We let the grantees -- or the applicants know that the Allocation Committee has made your decisions and we also let them know that city council has to approve all decisions before they're final so no one should be counting chickens before they're hatched so to speak.

Hornecker: But isn't there a mass e-mail from the levy that said these are the organizations that were funded?

Pellegrino: Yes, these are the organizations that the allocation committee decided to fund. That has been sent, but nothing is considered final before going before city council before approval.

Hornecker: But City Council has never to my knowledge modified any of the allocation committee's proposed funding?

Pellegrino: Are you trying to jinx us, Mitch?

Hornecker: No, just pointing that out. So I'm going to second Felicia's concerns. And I guess leave it at that.

Wheeler: So I'm in agreement, as well. I heard what commissioner Vega Pederson said and I am concerned -- I don't like the idea of going back and reopening a previous allocation decision. That just doesn't set well with me. We made a very forceful case for it at the time. We made the case, understanding that that would require us to find reductions or not funding as much in this round. That was made very, very clear by staff. And that is an existing program that we chose to fund, based on the strength of the program and what we knew about it. And we are weighing that against new programs that we're choosing to fund that sound important. They are, with good people running them. They are. But my preference would be to reduce those expenditures for new programs, assuming staff believes they can still deliver the results. If they can't, then it's a different discussion.

I had specifically proposed that we revisit the question of Studio Latino and the Portland State University program.

Pellegrino: Okay. John, do you want to take us back to that spreadsheet there and let's go down to those. So yes, there's two new grants, those two that are listed there and then there's the question of the level of funding for SEI.

Pellegrino: The choice would be to lower the amount you're giving SEI or to possibly not do one of those other grants, the Studio Latino or PSU basically. If you're trying to get -- basically, when you look at the balance that was left -- if you assumed full funding for SEI, you were above negative 344. You were trying to get to a negative 250. That's our most conservative guess as to what may be unspent this current fiscal year. So you have about \$100,000 gap. Or you can choose to have that much deficit and we can take our chances. I mean, I just -- that's another option.

Tripp Folsom: This is Felicia. I see where you're going with the deficit. In this pandemic, that concerns me and I just want to make sure, I'm trying to be really respectful of these nonprofits and I want to be able to make sure as close as we can, fund them in the amounts that they have requested and the last thing I want to do is to go back and say hey, by the way, we have to take away some of your funding. So I am one to allocate as much of a balance as we can. Only because I'm cognizant in this pandemic that they're all going to be running so lean and so I just want to be cognizant of that. This does not take into account -- I know we have some carryover money from grants that were unspent so minus that, of course. Being able to use the carryover money. I want to be clear about that, as well.

Pellegrino: Yes, we don't know what that will be, because we never can know. I just feel in the pandemic situation as you point out, it's possible that it will not run as high as it has.

Rossi: And this is Traci. I think you're right. We can't plan on it obviously, but I feel like the early childhood, some of the programming could be impacted by social distancing. As we talked about. But, as you said, we can't plan on that.

Pellegrino: Just to be clear I'm -- we're talking about two different things. It's possible that some moneys will be unspent in the first year of the new grants, and that's always possible. We were just thinking about unspent contract balances from the current fiscal year so everybody who's a current grantee, is currently doing some kind of service amidst the pandemic, how much those grants will all spend out, it's possible that there will be some unspent. Typically, that amount is between 2.8 and 3.4% in our most recent years, I don't know if it will be that high so our best estimate at this juncture was approximately \$250,000. But I don't know. It could be higher. There's no way for me to say for sure so I can -- I think you guys could go either way in terms of what your choices are there to fully fund or not. We'll have to come back to you if there is a deficit situation. Not in year 1 probably, we could spread that out to later years. But that's the reality.

Rossi: Thank you for the clarification.

Wheeler: At this point, what would be the will of the committee?

Tripp Folsom: I don't want to -- I personally don't want to open up the old process, and I went back to look and we did -- I mean, it's -- it's -- that meeting is posted online, we've already said we're going to allocate that round. So I just feel it would be hard. I would like to decide what the allocation is with the three that are in the cycle. But again, I don't want to be the outlier in this. I want to go with what the group is willing to go with. I just -- looking at the fair in this and the transparency of the process is what I'm looking through that lens is.

Wheeler: Yeah, no, and that's -- that's good. You know,, as I mentioned in the interest of balancing and potentially funding other mentoring programs for African American youth, I had originally proposed that Studio Latino not be funded as a new program, and the Portland State University MESA program not be funded for the same reason. I think it is important for us to fund the SEI after-school program, AS-28. But I'm open to different proposals. Commissioner Vega Pederson.

Vega Pederson: Thank you, Mayor. I am hearing you and some others about not wanting to go back. I mean -- and I'm fine. I don't think I officially made a motion, but I will take that idea off the table. Part of it I feel is a little bit like you know, the luck of the draw, who's in the first round of funding in terms of whose dollars got locked in first and who didn't. I have less compunction about going back and making changes in light of looking at everything as a whole, but I think for simplicity's sake in terms of getting a dollar amount to what we're discussing today, I will take that off the table. All right, thank you.

Pellegrino: Just to make one option on the table that I don't know if you're discussing, there was a lower amount, one of you proposed a lower amount for SEI. Your difference that you're trying to get to is only \$100,000. You could go less on SEI in that amount and still fund the other two new programs you wanted to fund.

Hornecker: First, I was just going to second Jessica's comments. It is -- that happens every year. It is not fair and it doesn't seem right, but that's the way we've already done it and maybe the next time you guys will be able to figure out a better way to do it. So it doesn't always feel

somewhat arbitrary at the end. And I was just going to say what Lisa just said, which is I had backed out the full \$301,000, but if we back out the \$95,000,ish, it would drop SEI to 1.235 instead of 1.328.

Wheeler: I'm sorry, Mitch, what was the number?

Hornecker: I just backed out around \$95,000 -- the round number of \$95,000 from the 1.330, and I think that number is 1,235,274, but I defer to John who's never wrong.

Vega Pederson: But I do appreciate the Mitch's thinking in this.

Kelly: My numbers agree with yours, Mitch.

Pellegrino: So that would balance you out to at least what we hope is a reasonable estimate of contract balances this year? To be carried forward. Okay. I just wanted to make sure that the math was all corrected.

Wheeler: Mitch, I'll entertain a motion.

Hornecker: I would move that we fund as the slate currently exists in mentoring and after-school that gets us to a balance for the three programs of negative \$249,601. And I believe as I look at the screen, that is consistent with all of the grant amounts in afterschool and mentoring that are currently on those slides.

Pellegrino: I think you might have to move to approve SEI at a specific funding level because nobody moved to enter any funding level or to vote on the grant. If that's what you want to do.

Hornecker: Sure. So that's AS-28. And I move to fund that at \$1,235,274.

Rossi: Yes, I'm seconding that.

Wheeler: We have a motion and a second. Further discussion on this item. Is there any dissent? The motion carries.

AS-28	Self Enhancement, Inc.	After School Program	\$ 1,235,274
-------	------------------------	----------------------	--------------

The above grant was approved without abstention.

Pellegrino: Okay. Thank you all for your long attention to difficult discussions. It's extremely difficult decisions and hard to make.

Wheeler: I want to thank, first of all, my colleagues, and I certainly want to thank all the levy partners. It is no fun getting down to the final choices here, particularly when there are so many really incredible organizations and those organizations are made up of people who are truly giving their all. They're giving their best, particularly right now in the face of the pandemic. And I want to thank not only the individuals and organizations that applied. I want to thank the levy staff and everybody who assisted in what amounted to nearly two years of community outreach and work for this funding round, and I want to thank everyone who applied for the levy funding, including

those who did not receive it this time around. Certainly, looking forward to working with our new community partners, your commitment, your experience, and your expertise has never been needed more than it is right now.

A complete listing of all grant recommendations are appended to these minutes.

Small Grants Fund Process Approval

Wheeler: And I also want to thank our small grants fund manager, Arika Bridgeman-Bunyoli who will be asking us to vote on documents to get the Small Grants Fund up and running at some point later this summer. And Arika, I know you wanted to say a few words on this, as well.

Bridgeman-Bunyoli: Yes. So the plan for today was actually to present on the documents for the step 1 part of the application, which I believe that you all have. And so I was prepared to do that today, because our proposal is to move to step 1 application forward to be published on May 13th, but am I hearing Mr. Mayor that you're wanting to defer the launch of the process to a later date?

Okay great. I will be quick. So thank you John. You can go to the next slide. So in our last meeting on the 24th, we went over how we had had the community conversation. The process changed a little bit during the pandemic, but we went ahead and were able to meet eight times with members from the community and get involvement from many different cultural groups and small organizations to move forward.

So what I have presented to the allocation committee are the process recommendations that came from the design team and from the PCL staff. There's a step one application that has five essay questions. Most of those are getting to what the programs do, the organizations do, and then different equity questions in terms of their inclusivity for Black, Indigenous, people of color and children and families with disabilities. After submitting the step 1 application, the design team and the reviewers would narrow down the step 1 applicants and choose who would be invited to go forward into step 2.

And then in step 2, the applicants would fill out a longer application, give us the full budget detail, not just the total amount of the request and participate in an interview. The interview was the interactive process that came out of the community conversations, because everyone felt it was very important to have a way that small organizations could tell their story that wasn't totally based on what was in writing, but that could be measured equitably, using the same measures, and that could be adaptable to wherever we might be in the covid-19 process later this summer. So they would go through that.

Then the step 2 applications would be scored by the design team and reviewers and those would go to the allocation committee. We also open it up for additional community input. We only had one question so we clarified our priority populations. We tightened our timeline for informational workshops and we updated fiscal sponsorship links to reflect changes that have happened in the organizations and communities because of the pandemic.

So our timeline is, as I said, we would like to publish all of the step 1 materials in May. And then I would be hosting two informational sessions also in May. The step 1 applications would be due in July and then in August and September, we would like to have the draft materials for the second round approved by the Allocation Committee, and invite organizations to the second step, which we would have a final slate approved in the fall and have city council approved by the end of the year. And the contracts out to the nonprofits by the beginning of next year. That's it.

So that's the end of that presentation, and now I just wanted to open it up and see if there are any questions or discussions on the materials that you all have been presented with.

Wheeler: Any questions for Arika? Mitch?

Hornecker: I think it looks awesome: That's great. We're getting this close. Thank you.

Bridgeman-Bunyoli: Thank you.

Wheeler: Great. Any further comments? I just want to say Arika, thank you, and we're obviously really excited seeing who applies in the small grants fund. And how those organizations are going to reach some of the marginalized communities who really haven't received levy funding in the past. This is an innovative new approach for PCL and we're excited to have you leading that effort. So thank you for that.

Is there any action that you're requiring from us today or is this just -- does this complete your presentation for today?

Bridgeman-Bunyoli: I need you to vote on the materials and to approve them so that we can publish them.

Mitch, do you want to make the motion here?

Hornecker: So moved.

Wheeler: We have a motion.

Jessica Vega Pederson, our esteemed Commissioner from Multnomah County seconds it.

Any further discussion? Any opposition? You've got it.

Thanks, Arika. Appreciate it very much.

That does conclude the formal portion of our meetings. As always, people can stay posted on all upcoming events through the levy website and other outreach communications. Until we meet again, stay safe, and we stand adjourned. Thank you, everyone. Have a good day.

Adjourned 5:00 pm