

**Portland Children's Levy
Allocation Committee Meeting Minutes
February 3, 2019 3:00 p.m.
Location: Portland City Hall Council Chambers**

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

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=0tom51-Yi-k>

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

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

Ted Wheeler: Here we are, the Portland Children's Levy meeting and today is the third of February. I'm Ted Wheeler, the Allocation Committee chair. I would also like to introduce the other committee members. On my left is Multnomah County Commissioner Jessica Vega Pederson. Great to see you. Notion her, of course is Felicia Tripp Folsom, our county-appointed member. Good to see you again. The far right over here is Mitch Hornecker, our business community representative.

And, it is with great pleasure that I would also like to introduce our new city appointed Allocation Committee member, Traci Rossi. We welcome you. She is the Executive Director for Women's Leadership. She has a long and successful career working in higher education, nonprofit organizations and youth development, focusing on service to women and student leaders. We're delighted to have you on the board over the course of the next few months, they are going to be very, very busy months for the Allocation Committee and I am sure everybody in this room, and Traci, I don't mean put you on the spot but if you want to say a few words.

Traci Rossi: Thank you, yes. I want to say thank you for the opportunity to serve and be a part of this process. As a long-time Oregonian, it feels nice to be able to give and contribute to the community in this way so I look forward to working with my colleagues here.

Wheeler: It will be quite the adventure and we're appreciative of your willingness to serve. Next up, we have a hello from the entire Children's Levy's staff. A special introduction to the levy's new small grant funds manager – Arika Bridgeman-Bunyoli. Can you stand up so we can all see you? We're excited to have you here. Thank you. I believe we're going to hear from you later so actually look forward to that.

Approval of Minutes from November 4th Allocation Committee Meeting

Wheeler: All right, so starting with the most boring thing imaginable can recollect we approve the minutes from the November 4th meeting?

Vega Pederson: So moved.

Tripp Folsom: Second.

Wheeler: We have a second. Any objection?

It is approved without objection.

Public Comment on Non-Agenda Items

That gets us to public comment on non-agenda items. There will be opportunities to comment on things on the agenda later but does anybody want to make a comment not related to anything on today's agenda?

No Public Comment

Revised Levy Revenue Forecast

Wheeler: Okay, our first main eat of business is the revised levy revenue forecast. Fiscal specialist John Kelly will walk us through these projections and there is time for committee questions and public comment before we will be asked to vote. Lisa is joining him, of course. I don't know who wants to start us off?

Pellegrino: I'm going to start off because I want to remind what you decided last time. It has been several months and Traci was not with us. It will benefit us to remind us where we are and how we got here.

Just to remind folks of the rules that govern the allocation of the overall funds. We have a 5% administrative cap and the rules require that 90% of available funds be granted out through competitive processes. 10% of funds can be allocated in a noncompetitive process for three purposes: special initiatives that address multiple program areas; quality improvement and training and technical assistance for grantees; and improving systems that affect children and organizations that serve them.

In the fall meetings, you allocated there was projected revenues are \$81.1 million for three years, \$72 million in projected tax revenues and \$9.12 million in fund balance, so that was the resources you were working with. The total of a little over \$70 million was allocated for competitive grants with \$1 million set aside for the small grant fund and the remainder in the competitive process, which is happening right now. The noncompetitive grants you all allocated \$7.1 million total. \$5.1 million was to renew the childcare initiative. You chose to do that last time and City Council approved that grant. You set aside \$1 million for training and quality improvement, and \$1 million was left unallocated for system improvement grants. John will tell you about the improvements and how staff proposes to deal with that.

Kelly: Last month we received new revenue projections for the next three fiscal years for the City Economist, Josh Harwood. He gives us revenue projections every year going out six, seven years. This year revenue projections show 2.2 million fewer dollars than previously projected. So \$2.2 million less than anticipated when we set up the funding. The City Economist has a new calculation of compression. Other ballot measures, other taxing directs compress how much money we bring in, we don't get the full amount on every property.

So, given the reduced revenue projections, we came up with new recommendations for how to use the funds given that the pot was a bit smaller. First of all, we are recommending no changes to the allocation of \$1 million for the small grants fund over the next three-years, so that money we want to keep where it is, or we recommend that. We would like to reduce by \$1 million the allocation to the noncompetitive grants for the next three fiscal years. Originally, \$7.1 million set aside for that, now we are suggesting \$6.1 million. After those reductions that pot of funds will look like: 5.1 million for the childcare initiative which Lisa mentioned that is already approved and the contract is being created; then \$1 million for quality improvement, training and technical assistance and support for grantees. So various projects for quality improvement, technical assistance and training at grantee organizations.

The next recommendation is to reduce the allocation to the competitive grant fund under way by \$1.2 million. The total pot of funds we previously recommended in the second column. First column is percentage allocations. The original allocation was the \$69,350,000 so we're recommending dropping that to \$68,150,000.

What we chose to do is use the same allocation percentage from the original allocations. We applied those percentages to the new pot of funds and that gives us the proposed revised allocations in the fourth column there.

Program Area	%	Original	Revised
Early Childhood	30.7%	21,297,000	20,928,487
Child Abuse P&I	19.8%	13,740,000	13,502,249
Foster Care	10.8%	7,520,000	7,389,877
After-School	18.8%	13,053,000	12,827,137
Mentoring	8.9%	6,183,000	6,076,012
Hunger Relief	10.9%	7,557,000	7,426,237
Total	100%	69,350,000	68,150,000

Wheeler: So it is just a pro-rated?

Kelly: Exactly.

Wheeler: And just to be clear, these numbers are for over a three-year period.

Kelly: Yes, because we are about to let the money for three-years beginning next fiscal year, beginning July 1, 2020, through June 30, 2023.

Wheeler: It seems like the reasonable way to go about it.

Pellegrino: Do you want to take any public testimony?

Wheeler: Anybody want to testify?

Joseph Tietz: It is more a couple questions so that I understand compression. Is there no advocacy or potential given the mandate of what the children's levy does, can we push back on compression? or is it just non-negotiable?

Wheeler: The answer is no. But, no, it is a structural problem with the way our property tax system works, given ballot measures that were passed by the public statewide, measures 547 and 50, particularly 5 creates compression.

Tietz: So the next question was, if I remember the last time Mitch had made a suggestion about increasing a certain allocation, was it for foster care and other -- was there any consideration around -- because, at that least meeting we thought, oh we're good with money so if we had extra, we will do that. Given that we now know we're having \$2.2 million, and for somebody in the direct service, our population is growing, not shrinking so the same dollars means less dollars so there is going to be some reality checks going. And I don't want to be presumptuous or difficult but was there any consideration around that change?

Pellegrino: We did make that change at the last meeting. Of the full pot, he wanted to move money out of. Staff recommended a larger pie and he adjusted moving \$650,000 of that and we did that at that meeting. The totals today included that move of the money out of the unallocated dollars. The dollars were already shifted, the dollars were already shifted and we applied the same percentages.

Tietz: Is there a way to unshift it? Or what was the thinking so that 650,000 could go back into the general pool?

Wheeler: We already shifted the percentages so what John has proposed in terms of effectively reallocating a smaller pie is we simply take a pro-rated reduction across the categories. But we already had the discussion about the relative size of the categories.

Tietz: My feeling was if that was smaller work we have voted that way? Maybe we would have kept the allocation as it was given.

Wheeler: I'll speak for myself; it wouldn't have impacted my decision. It is fair question, thank you for asking it. All right. Any objection to the proposed allocation, given the new forecast? Without objection.

Vega Pederson: Motion to adopt staff recommendation on allocation

Tripp Folsom: Second

Motion passes without objection

Wheeler: Okay. So, thank you for that. Thank you, again, for keeping everything under the 5% administrative cap. That's been an important bellwether of this levy since the get-go and it's that Dan Saltzman felt very, very strongly about and if he were sitting here he would thank you for keeping us under that administrative cap.

New Allocation Committee Bylaws

[bylaws are appended to these minutes]

Pellegrino: I might take this detour to legalese and I can see the eyes beginning to shut and I will have to offer you coffee or something but coming up on funding we have to review these things because there are some changes. Traci didn't know the old set so this would be your operating plan for going forward.

The Office of Community and Civic Life here at the city has put into effect a standard by laws template that all city advisory committees that advise City Council must use. So, in complying with that rule, we had to redo the bylaws. Last time they were changed was 2010 so it has been a while since they were changed. Most provisions are similar and very little change but I want to highlight those and make it clear before the funding round, because some will come up there.

The bylaws include term limits now, no more than 8-years, so that's the limits should you choose to accept that.

Second is communications. There are specific provisions in the bylaws now that require committee members who communicate with interest groups in some way, shape or form or the media, or to say and the media, you need to copy staff on those communications and they have to be part of the public record and they can be requested as part of a public record. If you're communicating with interest groups about the allocation committee, and you all voted you would not do that in the funding round so you shouldn't have anything to communicate with me about what is going on in the funding round, but if you were to have any communication in the future after the funding round is over, those need to be cc'd to staff.

We're not allowed to deliberate towards a decision by e-mail. That is explicitly stated in the bylaws now. We have to deliberate in public meetings.

The last section is around conflicts of interest. The new bylaws specifically state you are public officials since you are on a committee that advises the City Council on funding recommendations. You are required under the state ethics laws to disclose any conflicts at each meeting, if the issue giving rise to the conflict is being discussed or debated. Staff has to keep a record of all conflicts of interest and we have to include them in the recommendations of funding to City Council, which is something we've done in the past but we will continue to do that.

State law defined actual conflicts of interest as any action or decision or recommendation by any person acting as a public official, the effect of which would be to the private pecuniary benefit or detriment to the person or person's relative or to any business with which they're associated. Businesses include nonprofit corporations, but the law specifically exempts officials holding non-compensated positions on other nonprofit boards. I want to make sure we get clear about this.

Our previous bylaws for the Allocation Committee specifically required that Allocation Committee members not vote or debate or give any comment on any allocations to organizations where they

set on the board. However that is exempted from the conflict of interest under state law. So I wanted to, staff wanted to come forward and recommend that you all continue with the higher standard, even though it isn't required by the law, since that has been our practice. Because some folks do sit on boards where it might be an issue, potentially. That is an overall review of the changes and what our recommendation would be going forward. I would like your thoughts and whether or not you all agree with that. Any questions about it?

Wheeler: I have a question about the term limits. So 8 consecutive years, just to be clear, that does not preclude somebody from serving eight-years and take time away and potentially being reappointed for eight-years, is that correct?

Pellegrino: Yes, but you have to wait two years, the length of a term, and then serve another eight should you desire do that.

Pellegrino: I imagine so. Any other questions about these rules and how they affect you all? Okay. Is everybody okay with continuing to state conflicts regarding boards? Any objection to that? Great.

The bylaws are there and in effect right now, not a matter of voting. I wanted to check from you for the coming meetings we're all agreed to state those conflicts.

Wheeler: Yes.

Small Grants Fund Update

Arika Bridgeman-Bunyoli: Thank you, Mayor, Commissioner and Allocation Committee members. I'm really excited to be here today in my new role and to talk about our upcoming plans for the small grants fund. So the purpose of the small grants fund is to increase equity. The Children's Levy has heard through multiple processes and sources there are numerous barriers that small organizations face when applying for Levy funds. Many of these smaller organizations don't have a full-time staff person who is and experience ad grant writer. Some are attempting to apply while writing in a language that is not their first language and may be their third or fourth language, And applications are not truly reflective of the quality of their work, which is emerging directly out of the communities most affected by inequities.

So the small grants fund sets up a pathway through which the small organizations with budgets of \$1 million or less that they can be able to access levy funds, expand their valuable work and increase their capacity, including eventually to be able to apply for a larger grants. That will allow them to serve more children, youth and families from marginalized communities here in Portland.

So we are proposing to launch the small grants fund through a two-step process. The first step is that applicants will be submitting letters of inquiry, describing their organizations and/or their program and then they will be narrowed down into a smaller applicant pool that will be chosen to move forward. In a second I will talk more about how that narrowing can happen. In the second step, they will be invited to submit the full documentation - organizational budgets and additional supporting materials. One thing that we're really thinking about this is that, in the interests of equity, we will like the second step not to be 100% written process. We want to have some sort of

interactive way through videos or interviews or site visits and we're still exploring what that could look like so that the entire process isn't weighted just on the written word.

So another part of thinking about how to design this process is put together an ad hoc committee, called a design team, to help me design the process and how we can make this to be a community participatory process that gets us to the organizations that we really most want to be able to fund. So, the design team, has six members that include expertise from public and private foundations, and the lived experience represents the communities that we are also trying to outreach. So, they represent African refugee community, disabled community, Latinx, Vietnamese refugee, Native American, African-American, LGBTQ and immigrant. Most of our design team members have two or more of these identities at the same time as well as experience in the Children's Levy funding areas.

So the first step in the process that I am really looking forward to and really gearing up for as we speak are the community conversations. So I have a list of over 50 small organizations throughout the Portland area; some I inherited because there was an intern doing some work at the Children's Levy before I came that was researching organizations working in our funding areas. Others I have outreached to through looking at specific cultural communities that are underrepresented in the larger funds and reaching out to community health workers and community leaders from those cultural communities. Once I reached out to one small organization that organization is like, you need to know about these other three organizations. So they began cross-referring to each other. So, through that we have outreach through e-mail, through mail and many other ways invited them to these community conversations.

And the community conversations are designed for us to be able to tell them about the Levy's small grant fund. But also to be able to get additional information how we can make the grant make process to be supportive and equitable. So, one of the questions or the topics we would discuss and we would hear feedback from the small organizations themselves is what kind of technical assistance would help them in the process. There are some things they may be able to build into their own budgets when they create their grant. There are some things we could provide and some resources I could refer them to. So just wanting to know what would technical assistance needs look like for these organizations.

And, as I mentioned in the second step of the process, we didn't want it to be entirely in writing. We wanted to find some interactive way but are not entirely sure what's the best way to go about doing that. We wanted to get feedback from the organizations and what their thoughts are. And then just anything additional that they would like to give us in terms of what a strength-based grantmaking process could look like for them.

Our timeline in this is in the first quarter of the year, January to March, we will be having the conversations with the communities; taking this information back; looking at what we've heard and starting to create draft application materials for the letter of inquiry, which is the first step in the process. And, then, get that to you for your review for approval for your meeting in April. And then have the letters of inquiry come in, in the April to July period. Then we would like August and September for the design team and a group of reviewers recruited from the community to look at all the applications. I'm anticipating 30 or 40 in the first round; narrow them down and make recommendations who can move forward to the next round. Then, we would have, after we have all the materials for the next round, we present our slate of recommendations to all of you all for

approval and hopefully have the entire slate approved by City Council by the end of this year. So that we can start funding in the beginning of next year and have those funds go out to the community organizations.

Along the lines as we're moving along and we have applications approved, I am planning on having kind of brown bag lunch or small workshops where people can come and kind of learn, okay, this is what the city means by our insurance requirements or our background check requirements or other kinds of requirements they may not be familiar with. Because one of the goals I have is to make this as accessible to people as possible, especially organizations that are led by people who may not have had this kind of access to government funding or this kind of democratic experience. So I really want to be able to provide venues where people can come and ask questions and be able to get all of their materials together so we can get them through the process. That is what I have for you, and I am open for questions.

Wheeler: Very good. Colleagues?

Vega Pederson: Thank you, Mayor. Thank you so much for all your work on this. It is great. Welcome aboard to the Children's Levy and I think all of us are excited about the opportunities that the small grants program can provide to those organizations. It reminds me a little bit of the granting that the East Portland Action Plan does to some of the community based organizations, especially those from populations that aren't familiar with how this process goes so, appreciate the thoughtfulness and the intentionality you've done of looking at all of different ways from not relying so much on written to making sure people have a basic understanding of definitions that this is a process people can be successful with. Thank you so much and I look forward to going through this for the next year.

Wheeler: Thank you. Appreciate it. Is there any public testimony on this item? All right, thanks, Arika. We look forward to hearing a lot more from you in the coming months.

Annual Data Presentation

The data report can be found on the Children's Levy website:

<https://www.portlandchildrenslevy.org/about-us/performance-and-results>

Slides from the report presentation are appended to these minutes

Wheeler: Next, Meg will present the annual data presentation, including a status report on families served in the 2018-2019 cycle and comparisons from previous years. Good afternoon.

McElroy: Thank you, Mayor.

First I just want to say before we get started that the data I will discuss comes from all of the programs that are funded by the Levy, so there are a lot of people in this room that track the information we require and we put it together the nearly 40-page report you all have and the handful of slides I will walk you through. So a big thank you to all of them for their hard work.

As I said, there is a full report. This reviews the goals of the Levy and the performance metrics. What I will talk about today is a very high-level summary looking pretty exclusively at the Levy-

wide highlights. There are program area specific details in the larger report. Each program year gets about a 3 to 4-page deeper look for those who are interested in that.

So just a reminder, when the Levy was passed for the 2014 to 2019 levy period, it included three goals. Those same goals remain for the new Levy. They are to prepare children for school, support children success inside of school, and as currently written to reduce racial and ethnic disparity and ensure children's well-being and success. During our community engagement, the contractor pushed back and said don't you want to eliminate those disparities? And we said yes. Unfortunately this was the way this was worded in our ballot measure. But in the spirit of honoring her good feedback we should think about in the future, setting our goals, eliminating racial and ethnic disparities.

For 2014-19, there were two investment goals set by this body when we began grant making in 2014. One was to invest 30% of funds in culture specific services levy wide and in each program area. And to increase access to services in east Portland.

So we were looking at how do our metrics tell us we did that in this five-year period and we looked at that time each year, compared to the previous five-year period and compared to that 30% goal so just some additional context in 18-19, a total of \$18.9 million in grants were invested. That is an increase of \$11 million from 14-15 so our pie increased over time. In the 14 to 19 period, nearly 35% of funds were invested in culturally-specific organizations and programs, and that is compared to 31% in the previous levy. So, we exceeded that 30% goal and improved it from the '09 to 13 period. As well as the pie went up, the amount of money we invested total so as that percent went up, more money went into the services.

Unfortunately, we did not meet that goal in two program areas, hunger relief and child abuse prevention and intervention in part because of what kinds of applicants applied. In hunger relief, for example, few to no applications from culturally specific programs. And in child abuse prevention, intervention, 27% were invested so just shy of that 30% goal.

For services, increasing access in east Portland. In the previous five-year levy period, 09 to 13, we were at 38% of children served resided or attended school in east Portland and that is up to 44% for this levy period, so we did increase access.

So the next thing we tried to understand is who is participating in the services funded by the Children's Levy. So we want to try to understand equity of access, given our goals. For specifically in this last year, 2018-19 now we're looking because we try to understand these numbers each year, each grantee sets a goal for how many children or parents they will serve and they exceeded those goals by 14%. Even if the primary client is a family who they track their outcome goals on or how they set their numbers who they are going to serve, we also ask them to tell us the total number of children that shall part of those families and demographic information about them. For the 12,000 children the majority were from homes of an annual income of 185% of the federal poverty level or less. For context that is about \$46,000 a year for a family of 4. The median income in Portland is \$81,000 for a family of four.

About 30% of the children served were from homes with a primary language other than English. Under that, about 20% are the primary homes language is Spanish and the other 10% is one of 50 other languages that are reported by grantees.

Nearly 70% of the children served identifies as a child of color and in 18-19, 42% resided or attended school in east Portland. For additional context, these numbers are pretty similar as they have been for the past couple of years so there haven't been dramatic changes in 18-19 compared to past years.

So, in this slide, one thing we try to understand is how well do programs funded by the Levy reach the diversity of our child population, so to try to understand that, we look at the demographics of the children served by levy-funded programs compared to the school-aged population in our community. So what this graph is showing us in the top bar is the race ethnicity identity data of the children served by the Levy in 18-19 compared to the racial and ethnic identity of students enrolled in Portland area schools in the same annual period. When I say Portland area schools, I'm not just talking about Portland Public Schools, but also David Douglas, Centennial, Parkrose and part of Reynolds. What this graph tells us that the levy-funded program served a racially and ethnically more diverse population than is served in our area public schools. One thing we want to be sure of at a minimum is the figures are proportional, we are at least reaching the population, proportional to their makeup of the child population. But, given our goals, what is really more important is that we're reaching proportionally more children of certain populations who are experiencing racial and ethnic disparities in their outcomes than they comprise in the population.

For example, this top bar shows that among children served by the Levy in 18-19, 17.5% identified as African American. When we look at enrollment data for Portland area schools, 9.4% of children identify as African American or African, because the school's data groups those two populations together. Our data breaks it out so the Levy data, they identified at African immigrants, so you can see the difference who we're reaching compared to the population in Portland public schools.

You can ask questions or save it until the end, I'm happy to do whatever works best.

The next I thing that we look at is not just who came into the programs that are funded but how well they engaged and sustained participation over time. So, again, we want to see these figures look similar. We don't want to see big gaps between the population that came in and the population that remained over time. So, nearly 80% of participants stay in the program long enough to have outcome goals tracked and measured about them. About 6% leave early before that can happen. Again, we're trying to understand, for the participants that stuck around to meet participation goals what does the racial and ethnic diversity of that population look like compared to the people who came into services. So what these two graphs are showing you that those populations are pretty similar. So who comes in and enrolls in services, programs are doing a great job of sustaining their participation over time. There are some slight differences or disparities but they're typically less than 1 percentage point between populations.

So, since we know that -- I'm going to go backwards for a minute. We know the population of who enters levy-funded programs and stays over time is a pretty racially and ethnically diverse population, when we start to look at outcomes, which we don't have disaggregated by race and ethnicity we make the assumption that the outcomes we're talking about is about the population we told you sustained participation over time. It would take a lot of work for our programs to do further disaggregation of outcome data. So I don't have that information to show you but I will walk you through what we do have.

Each program set as number of goals of outcomes they track annually with the children and families that they serve. One program might have three goals, one program meet have eight goals. Of the total goals they set. 82% of them were met. How they set goals varies by the type of program model funded, intensity of the services offered and population they serve. To the extent there are programs doing similar work and similar outcomes we will do that on the next slide. I want to remind people not every program in the Levy is tracking the same types of outcomes because they're not all doing the same thing. So we will get into some numbers that might look small to you but it is important to remember we can only talk about similar things across programs that track similar outcomes.

In early childhood, for example, close to 90% of the children served met expected developmental milestones. That is keeping in what we would expect because the prevalence of delay in disability, according to CDC data is around 13% in this population. So we see our programs are reaching children and families early and helping get them connected to other services and staying on track with what we would expect to see in this population. I'm not going to state everything that's on the slide but I want to just let you know underneath the outcome is the number of programs that track this outcome that I'm talking about, out of the total in that program area. So, for example, we fund 16 programs in early childhood, 12 of them track this particular outcome. Then the next piece of information tells you the total number of children for which this data were reported and the total number that met the outcome.

So, in child abuse prevention, intervention, over 90% of parents met their parenting outcomes in foster care, close to 95% of children met the academic outcomes tracked by the program. After school, 86% of children met youth development outcomes and 96% met school engagement outcomes.

We also look at staff turnover in all of our programs. It impacts the relationships that the programs have with the clients they serve; it has an impact on how well youth and family stay engaged in anticipation over time and it can impact outcomes, as well. What we've seen over the years is 15 to 20% of staff turnover annually and an average of 16.9% last year. That varies and there is more investigation in the report. We don't know if it turned over because they received a higher degree or retired. But our data mirrors sector trends across all of our program area sectors.

All right. I should have said it earlier, the data and the slides I just reviewed look at five out of our six program areas and did not talk about hunger relief because the hunger relief services don't track sustained participation over time; they don't look at changes and outcomes but more about getting emergency food to children and families. So the next few slides will look exclusively at our hunger relief area.

Over 11,000 children and close to 3,000 parents were served in that area. School food pantries comprise the biggest source of emergency food. 55% of the total served there accessed resources through school food pantries and then other emergency food resources serve the remaining children and families. Those include home delivered meals, the summer school lunch program, produce and prepared food donations from partner organizations and food from community gardens. About 53% of the children served, in the hunger relief programs, attend school or live in east Portland and they served more Latinx and Asian children and fewer African American children than were enrolled in Portland area schools. So there is some need for increased attention to access for the

African American population in this program area. However, we're missing data for 30% served; it wasn't reported so there is some caution on how we interpret the race ethnicity data in this area.

In terms of highlights, two grantees provided emergency food at nine SUN school sites where there were no pantries in 18-19. There has been an increase in the past three-years in families using the pantries, six times a year, so when we look back at 16-17, 39% of families were using it six times a year. That's up to 53% in 18-19. In addition, home delivered meals increased 12% from last year and a major source of referrals is through the Women Infant Children federally funded nutrition program. In addition, there is great demand for the free fruits, subsidized produce and whole foods program and village market that offers free fruits and discounts on produce and whole foods and a customer loyalty program. 491 people and 456 households at new Columbia were using that program at village market.

So, in thinking of implications of these data and looking ahead, just a couple things to keep in mind as we enter this upcoming funding round. There are things that have been going well with service access equity. So for example, the current programs funded by the levy are reaching priority populations, particularly proportionally higher than school enrollment so the Levy is doing a good job of reaching the African American and African immigrant population and we want to make sure we don't backward from that as we fund new grants. We want to keep in mind the service access question. When we look at some of the other populations, for example, we're not reaching the Asian immigrant population, the Native American population and Pacific Islander population proportion their enrollment in the school population. So those are some things we will have to keep in mind as new funding decisions are made. Happy to answer any questions.

Vega Pederson: Thank you. I would say as a takeaway on this slide, it looked like the Latinx population we were only reaching people where they appeared in the school population.

McElroy I am so glad you asked that or pointed that out. It is hard to know; it is a little bit of a data issue. The way -- this is going to get deep in the technical weeds but bear with me. The way that we, the Levy ask grantees to report data ... in this slide the top bar, any child who identifies only as Latinx is counted in that 22.5%. If a child identifies as Latinx and some other background, that is counted in multi-racial. ODE data is done differently; they count any child that identifies as Latinx and anything else as Latinx. Their multi-racial data is only children, excluding Latinx so it is hard for us to interpret the relationship between how well we're reaching proportionally that population. So, for example, like our multi-racial population, we do get data from programs about, for the individuals they serve who identify as multi-racial what are all the identities that person has. That is in the report and it shows you how much the Latinx, the Native American and Pacific Islander population are actually more represented in our data than how this shows, when we ask for that disaggregated multi-racial data. But, it is not an even comparison such that we can tell how well we did or didn't reach the population compared to their composition in the school population. So it is a good question.

Vega Pederson: I get there is complications with the data, it is really important we try to figure out how we're serving people, especially some of these challenging populations like the Latinx community which does identify as multi-racial, because ethnicity and race are two different things so there is ambiguity in data. But we still need to figure it out. It sounds like we're challenged with that right now but that might be interesting, too.

McElroy I would say to your point as we talk about service access and funding, we wouldn't want to go backward from these numbers, absolutely, and forward is better. Thanks.

Rossi: I did have a question, thanks for your work. I saw in a couple areas that about just over half of the children lived in east county, and I wondered if there was any other trends in terms of where the other 48, 49% where.

McElroy That is a good question. It is I believe, in our report, I don't know off the top of my head. I would say typically 12% are in north Portland, I think 2.5% indicated that they're homeless and the others are about town. We ask grantees to report that data by zip code so I could give you a more detailed breakdown by zip code, if you want it.

Rossi: Okay. I was curious. It sounds like they're scattered around. Thanks.

McElroy: You're welcome.

Wheller: Very good. Is there any public testimony on this item? Come on up. Can you come up to the microphone.

Joseph Tietz: We serve the Latinx community and we've seen significant reduction in the past two-years, attributable to national policy, being afraid to fill out forms for services. So I think it is a bigger problem than data, it is a reality of an underserved population.

Wheeler: That is a great point.

McElroy: We've definitely seen that, too.

Wheeler: Meg, thank you for that. I know there is a lot of number crunching and data analysis so thank you for that. A shout out to the providers for providing the data Meg and her team use to provide the annual data report so thank you for that.

That concludes the agenda, correct, for our meeting today so I want to thank everybody for that and their work during what is a very busy pre-grant making time; there is a lot of work behind the scenes and thank you for that. You can stay posted on all information related to the Levy on the website. We stand adjourned.

Adjourned 4:00 pm