

**Portland Children's Levy  
Allocation Committee Meeting Minutes  
April 24, 2020 10:00 a.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](http://www.portlandchildrenslevy.org) or [PortlandOregon.gov](http://PortlandOregon.gov) at:*

<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/video/player/?tab=meetings>

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

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

**Wheeler:** Welcome to the meeting of the Portland Children's Levy Allocation Committee. Today we'll be making three-year funding decisions that will begin July 1st for early childhood, childhood, and foster care. On May 4th we'll make funding decisions for after-school, mentoring and hunger relief. All decisions will go before the city council for final vote and that's scheduled for June.

We hope you and your loved ones are safe and well as we work together through the challenges of this pandemic. We're obviously grateful for our first responders and our front-line medical staff and caregivers to everyone practicing physical distancing to keep our entire community healthy. I'm confident that our sacrifices today will make the difference for brighter days ahead.

So this morning I'm joined by my committee colleagues, Multnomah county commissioner Jessica Vega Pederson, we have county appointed member Felicia Tripp Folsom, we have our city-appointed member, Traci Rossi, and we have of course have business leader Mitch Hornecker with us today. And levy staffers, we have Llsa and Meg and Lisa and John and John, I see a trend here. Arika is here, Mary Gay is here. Welcome and thank you to our staff for their fantastic work. And for everyone joining us through the YouTube link, it will note which one of us is speaking and you'll be able to see a couple of power points and an Excel spreadsheet shown later in the meeting.

Before we begin just one other important note on behalf of the committee and the levy staff, we acknowledge the unprecedented anxiety and uncertainty our nonprofit providers face during this time. We've read and viewed your moving testimonials and appreciate the time and energy your staff and clients put into them. As well as the request for investments you submitted back in the fall. Thank you for everything you're doing to care for our city's children and families. Unfortunately as I'm sure you're keenly aware, fiscal projections do show a decline of levy revenue over the next three years, and we have to take that into account as we grapple with making these tough decisions before us.

So with that, unless there's any initial questions, let's begin by approving the minutes from the February 3rd meeting. And I'm going to switch my view here so I can see the participants, and if anybody wants to speak, just raise your hand, you all know how to do that over on the lower right-hand side. Just let me know. I would take a motion on approving the minutes for the February 3rd meeting. Somebody --

**Pederson** So moved.

**Tripp-Folsom:** Second.

**Wheeler:** Hearing no objections the minutes for February 3rd are now adopted.

#### Funding Process Summary

**Wheeler:** So up first we have Levy Director Lisa Pellegrino providing an overview of the funding process to date. After that any comments center community members, a discussion about the funding levels and whether we want to stand by the ones we made at our February meeting or revise them due to revised revenue projections. Good morning. Lisa.

**Pellegrino:** Thank you, mayor. I am going to share my screen, so that you all and the viewing audience can see it. There may be a brief moment while the facilitators at Portland Community Media get that up on the screen for everybody else, but hopefully that will be showing for everybody. I'm going to take us through what has brought us to this point of decision today.

While applicants were working on their applications, staff recruited and trained 63 volunteer reviewers to read and score all of the applications based on the criteria that was published in the RFI. In most cases five reviewers scored each application. The staff averaged all of the application scores, to reflect the total score that you all are viewing on your spreadsheets that were sent out to all the applicants. Due to variability between reviewer scores, staff did not eliminate any applications for consideration due to failure to meet minimum score requirements that were published in the RFI. So the allocation committee today is reviewing all of the applications that were submitted.

Before we developed our staff recommendations, we reviewed all of the applications; the scores that were submitted by the reviewers. We looked at past performance for current grantees, and also the financial health of the organization submitting the application. Our recommendations were based on all of that information and based on the criteria that we published in the RFI. Staff did not communicate with applicants about their applications after they were submitted.

On March 17th we sent all of that information including the scores, the staff recommendations, our rationale, to the allocation committee and all the applicants. On March 19th we sent the reviewer score sheets to all of the applicants and those score sheets were also made available to the Allocation Committee for their review.

Applicants as you alluded to mayor in your opening comments had the opportunity to submit written and recorded oral testimony in support of their application. Unfortunately, due to the pandemic outbreak, we had to cancel all of the video recording testimony that was planned as a different procedure this year. But we substituted the recorded oral testimony for that. The written and recorded oral testimony was delivered to the Allocation Committee on April 10th, so they would have a chance to review it before the meetings, and it was also made available to all of the applicants. So all applicants can see the testimony of everybody testifying.

As we were sending our staff recommendations out to everybody in middle of March, the covid-19 emergency measures were just going into full effect. The economic effects of the state of emergency were immediate and severe on community members, on service providers, and had direct effects on immediate service delivery. As the emergency continued through this process, the committee members expressed concern to the staff about the impact of the pandemic on PCL revenue. They asked us to develop options to allocate less money in the funding round in anticipation of revenue decline in the future. Committee

members specifically expressed concern that grantees would be counting on more resources than available, also whether grantees would be able to start new projects as planned.

The staff developed options for reducing the funding level and revised recommendations, and we sent those to the allocation committee and to all of the applicants on April 15th. Applicants were allowed to submit additional testimony about those revised recommendations and the options, to staff. Staff sent the additional testimony to the committee on the 20th and turned that back to applicants. So again, all the applicants can see the testimony that was submitted by all the other applicants. And we wanted to give it to you in time to read before this meeting.

Staff reviewed all of the testimony submitted and of the approximately 50 applicants who provided testimony after receiving the reduction options and the revised staff recommendations, more than half advocated for allocating the original amounts that were allocated to each program area, and instead considering reductions in 2021, when there's more information. Many applicants noted elevated needs for services right now during the pandemic, and the importance of helping people in the immediate term.

### Funding Level Decision

**Pellegrino:** Before we move to considering the individual applications, the committee needs to decide the total amount to allocate in these funding rounds so it will help us set the balances for each area. As we described in the paperwork,

1. Option one is to go ahead and allocate the full \$68.1 million as originally planned, with all of the allocations to program areas as you adopted in the February meeting. And to instead come back in 2021 and reduce total grants if necessary, if revenues decline as some have predicted they will.
2. Option two is to allocate a lesser amount now in anticipation of possible revenue declines later. If you all elect to allocate a lesser amount now you'll need to decide what your goal percentage of reduction is so we can set that balance at the top of the Excel spreadsheet that's calculating allocates as you make decisions.

Each of the allocation committee submits funding preferences to the staff before this meeting begins. And we gave on those individual funding preferences the option for you all to allocate less revenue than you planned. Staff aggregated all of the preferences of the committee; it looks like four of five indicated a preference to allocate the full amount as originally planned. At this point I'll turn it back to you for discussion by the committee, and then a vote on what level of allocation you want to start with as we begin the individual decision making.

**Wheeler:** Very good. Colleagues, any thoughts on this issue? And what would be the most helpful since I can't really see anybody, if you could raise your hand, then that will make it easy for me to call on you. So I'll start. My preference would be to allocate the full amount now with the understanding that that means that we would have less to allocate later. My basic logic for that would be that the need is going to be greatest right now. With high rates of unemployment and displacement, with people struggling not only with basic household needs like paying the rent and essential household supplies, we're obviously seeing a fairly rapid increase in the need for social services and wrap-around support. So as much as possible understanding there might have to be some reduction, I'd like to keep the support at a high-level right now because I personally believe based on the data that I'm seeing that the support is needed now. Traci has her hand up. Traci?

**Rossi:** Thank you, Mayor. I would agree with Mayor Wheeler, I feel like we should continue or stick with option one in our thinking. I think that the need is high, the need is great, as we all know right now, and I

also just don't think we have enough information to make informed decisions about how to make modifications, even though we have estimates. I don't think we have all the information that we need. And I also feel like by moving forward with option one now, when we revisit it later, there will be a lot more information, and perhaps even hopefully we'll be moving toward a recovery mode, and that there might be a preliminary dip in resources but perhaps it won't be as bad as we might guess, which is what we'd have to do today. I would ask that we move with option one. Thank you.

**Tripp Folsom:** Yes, I can. I agree with you, Mayor, and with Traci. I am in support of full allocation, because during this pandemic, I think nonprofits are going to need it more than ever, so I support option one.

**Hornecker:** I'm in favor of option one as well.

**Pederson:** I agree with going with option one, and I just appreciate the thoughtfulness that people have given to this -- of how to approach this really unprecedented situation in terms of making sure that we're holding our grantees whole as possible during the time of uncertain revenue. But I think for all the things that have been said before, this makes the most sense in terms of getting resources to organizations that really need it and to the people they're serving who really need it right now, and hopefully as we go in we will -- there will be other options in terms of any funding we would have to make up.

**Wheeler:** Thank you. Is there any further discussion on this, it sounds like we have our consensus on the original \$68 million funding level.

I'll entertain a motion, Commissioner would you like to make that motion?

**Vega Pederson:** Yes, so moved.

**Rossi:** I will second.

**Wheeler:** Thank you, Traci. Any objection? There being no objections the motion carries at the original \$68 million funding level. Thank you all for that.

Thank you, Lisa. And for the thoughtful comments from my colleagues, we're obviously committed to addressing the devastating effects of covid-19 as quickly as possible through funding front line organizations that can respond to the needs quickly.

#### Decision Process

Next up on the agenda looks like we have levy assistant director Meg McElroy who is going to describe the protocol around the decision-making process before we begin the funding decisions. Welcome, Meg.

**McElroy:** Thank you, mayor. I'm going to take a moment to share my screen right now with a slide that will describe.

I have only one slide, and I'm going to talk you through it as well. So just as Lisa indicated earlier, and as you all are aware, in advance of today's meeting you received an excel work sheet for you each to indicate your preferences for funding in each program area and regarding each application. You submitted those to us in advance of this meeting and reaggregated your individual results to help facilitate today's discussion. The order of discussion will be taken by program area, we'll start with early childhood. And within each program area we'll discuss the applications in the order in which the highest number of allocation committee members expressed an interest in funding the application in the amount that you expressed interest in funding it, and we will take them in score order as well. So a five out of five of you express interest in funding a particular application, we'll take the higher scoring one of those before the next.

If there are applications for which no one expressed individually an interest in funding the application, it is unlikely to be discussed today. I'm saying that for your understanding as well as for our listeners.

As we proceed and we get started in early childhood, the I'll say the application number and the name of the application, I'll say the number of you out of five who want to fund it and the range of fund being amount, and there was anyone who wanted to abstain from expressing interest on that application I'll indicate that as well. After I do that, mayor, I will turn it over to you to facilitate the voting.

John Kelly will have a spreadsheet that he will share on this screen momentarily. I'm going to stop sharing my screen right now. And John, you can begin to share your screen so as I explain this everyone understands what they'll be looking at. This spreadsheet will be used to track your decisions as you make them. John will fill in the application number and the applicant name, and a grant amount after you have taken two motions on an expressed funding amount. There is the original allocation amount listed at the top of the sheet, and there is a balance also listed that will track your decisions as we go.

Any balances left in any program area today can be used in another program area or carry forward into your decisions at the next meeting on May 4th. If you opt to allocate more to applications in any given program area than as originally available, please remember it will have to come from somewhere else. Do you have any questions before we get started on the next part of the process? Hearing no questions at this point, mayor, did you see any hands raised?

**Wheeler:** Meg, before you go, I just want to reiterate again that anybody who has any particular conflict of interest with the particular organization should state that, and object abstain from voting on that particular grant.

Early Childhood Funding Recommendations

**McElroy:** Thank you, Mayor, I appreciate that clarification. I believe in this program area there were no members that indicated a conflict of interest and there was no one indicated and abstained from their original preferences. With that I'll get started.

The first application for which five out of five of you indicated an interest in funding the application is ec-9, IRCO child and parent success program. All five of you indicated interest in funding that application at an amount of \$1,489,641.

**Wheeler:** Very good. Here's what I would propose colleagues, because this could get messy very quickly. I will ask you to raise your hand if you would like to either move or second the firsthand I see raised I will a-- I will call as the motion, the second hand I see raised I will assume is the second. Unless somebody verbally tells me something to the contrary. Does that work with everybody?

*Listing of Early Childhood Grant Recommendations appears as an appendix to these minutes. All votes were unanimous. Abstentions are noted below.*

EC-9	The Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization	Child and Parent Success	\$1,489,641
------	--	--------------------------	-------------

*EC-9 approved with no discussion or abstentions.*

**McElroy:** Thank you, mayor. Ec-10, Latino Network, five out of five of you expressed pressed interest in funding this application; four expressed an interest in funding it at the amount of \$1,712,050, and one expressed funding at \$900,000.

**Wheeler:** And did somebody want to have a discussion on the -- I believe that was Traci who put that proposal forward.

**Rossi:** Yes. I'll just share my rationale. You'll see there are a few in the early childhood section where I proposed to fund at a slightly lower level. Looking at the overview in our covid-19 times, unfortunately to me it looks like with some of these applicants, some of these programs that just because of social distancing considerations, it seems like it would be harder for those programs to get up and running this fall. And probably more realistically they would be programs that would start in January, as I hope we start to get back to a new normal. So that was my thinking around a reduction in funding in this particular program. You'll see a few others as we move through this. Thank you.

**Wheeler:** Thank you. Any comments on that? I'd like to hear from staff on that. There seems to be good rationale behind Traci's comments. Did -- Meg, do you or others have a comment?

**McElroy:** I do have a comment, thank you, mayor. This program is currently operating, they have pivoted virtually pretty significantly to support the over 150 children and families enrolled in this service. Part of what they propose to do here was to expand their services to serve two additional sites, so I agree there may be concerns with expansions getting up and running in this program area as well as other program areas, but I think that part of the considerations before you all is to see what applicants are able to do in the short term in response to the emergency. In addition, Traci you mentioned earlier in your comments the notion of recovery mode. In the case of this applicant and several others in this program area that are current levy grantees, I have concerns about giving them significant funding reductions right now and hampering their abilities in recovery mode.

**Rossi:** Thank you.

**Wheeler:** Traci, does that change your thinking at all?

**Rossi:** It actually does. I'm happy to increase to the staff recommended amount.

**Wheeler:** You made a good point; Meg I'd ask one follow-up on that. In the event that we allocate funds towards an organization and for whatever reason or because of the current prices and uncertainty they're not able to come up to speed quickly enough, what would happen with the remainder of the funds? Would they simply return to the balance at the end of the year? What typically happens?

**McElroy:** They do -- they can return to the balance at the end of the year or depending on the circumstances the grantee can be permitted to carry those funds forward into the subsequent year.

**Wheeler:** That would require a separate vote, correct?

**McElroy:** If it's a contract amount that we already have in place it doesn't necessarily require a separate vote. I think given the financial and economic uncertainty we're all facing in today's environment; we'll be back before you in the spring with additional considerations regarding this issue.

**Wheeler:** That would make sense. And then in the event that there was a carry-forward, I assume obviously that would happen at the staff level?

**McElroy:** Typically it's a substantial staff and grantee negotiation process.

EC-10	Latino Network	Junto Aprendemos	\$1,712,050
-------	----------------	------------------	-------------

*EC-10 approved with no abstentions.*

**McElroy:** EC-11, Metropolitan Family Services ready, set, go program; five out of five expressed an interest in funding this program. Four out of five of you expressed an interest in funding at \$404,554 and one at \$442,487.

**Wheeler:** Felicia do you want to make a pitch?

**Tripp Folsom:** For me it was such a well written application, it was pretty straightforward. I looked also actually I recommended pretty high recommendations for the top five because I thought they were actually well written applications. And it serves the Burmese community isn't a community that gets a lot of focus and I'm cognizant in listening to our audience members and community members in the past about the importance of east Portland, so that was only reason. But I'm happy to go with the 404,594, it was -- I am happy to go with what the committee has recommended, because I know funds are tight. So that was the only reason.

EC-11	Metropolitan Family Service, Inc.	Ready Set Go	\$404,594
-------	-----------------------------------	--------------	-----------

*EC-11 approved with no abstentions*

**McElroy:** EC-3, The Black Parent Initiative first 1,000 days program. Five out of five expressed interest in funding this and the range funding amount was 493,902, to -- and two of you wanted to do that to 503,902, and three out of five of you wanted to do that amount.

**Wheeler:** I'll just jump in here to start on this. First of all, BPI's struggles have been well documented. They did a really great job of reconstituting their board, they sought technical assistance partners, they have come back as a much, much stronger more focused organization, and they have a lot of support in the community and the work they're planning to do is unique relative to what other organizations have offered up. I believe their service is particularly in the midst of this crisis, are critically important. So I was one of those who recommended the 503,902 level. I don't know if somebody at the lower level would like to make a pitch for that.

**Vega Pederson:** I had originally put the lower level for this -- for EC-3, and I think the difference was not including the audit dollars, but it was more to the fact that the ramp-up for this program was 130 children served, which I thought was aggressive for setting up a new -- a new program from the start, especially compared to similar programs that have requested dollars and the number of people served that they had put in their application. I don't feel -- I don't feel incredibly strongly about this, if the extra dollars are helpful for getting an audit, which I know is so helpful for organizations, I'm fine with the higher amount.

**Tripp Folsom:** I was with Commissioner Vega Pederson; my reason was much different in the sense that I wanted to recommend what they requested. We are slashing so many other programs that I didn't feel -- this is me personally, can be giving someone above an allocated request amount, when we're slashing our top three significantly, and so I believe in BPI, I especially believe in new leadership with Ms. Overton leading the helm, but for me the ask for a specific amount, which I think they deserve, strong application, but then to go above that recommended amount while we slash a huge significant amount of it, or have only funded to the amount was my reasoning. And so I just didn't want to set that precedent to go above and an allocated request amount. That applicant actually asked for. So I am pretty firm at the 493,902, only for that reason. Because I'm thinking about the overall pool of funds.

**Wheeler:** Meg, the staff made a recommendation to include the extra \$10,000 for the audit. Do you want to talk about that briefly?

**McElroy:** Sure. That's a typical cost for a nonprofit audit. We require that all grantee agencies of the children's levy have at least one financial audit in the three-year grant period that they have with us. And bpi's application and their budget, they didn't budget for that cost, and so my recommendation included allowing them the \$10,000 to get the audit since it's a requirement of our funding.

**Tripp Folsom:** Again, I want to say I wholeheartedly support BPI, that's why I recommended funding at the requested amount they are asking for. But I really feel it's unfair to pay for one organization's audit and then not do it for others. And also to fund above the requested amount. Because we have -- we haven't done it for anybody else in this pool, and so again, it's just putting my hat on in that sense. And I will go with the committee wants, but I want to note that I think that going above a requested amount from the applicant is something especially in our -- our funds are so tight, and we're cutting so many other nonprofits, I'm really cognizant of that.

**Wheeler:** That's actually a very compelling argument, I have to say. Meg, what is our typical protocol with regard to audits? Do we typically pay for those audits, typically, or do the audits come out of the funds that are otherwise allocated? What's the usual process here? I think a good case was just made around -- by Felicia around consistency in how we approach these things.

**McElroy:** Yes. Understood. I think Felicia's points are all well taken. We have in the past allowed applicants who are going -- who are considered to be new grantees who are awarded new funds from the levy who haven't been funded in the past and have to meet the audit requirement to have levy funding to complete that audit requirement. In addition, the current grantees who are allowed to charge up to 15% of their grants toward administration of their grants could also use that 15% of funding toward their audit costs. So I think it's not complete -- I think we have consistently allowed applicants to find ways to be provided levy funds to adhere to levy requirements.

**Wheeler:** I think I would go ahead and support this at the level that staff requested, but I also -- I think that policy should probably be fleshed out a little bit for the future. I'd like to see a consistent and clear and transparent standard in terms of what we will do. Lisa, I see is you want to chime in on this.

**Pellegrino:** I just wanted to make clear in the RFI itself it specifically said that the -- you may budget for the cost of an audit. So that was specifically an allowed expense. This particular applicant did not happen to include that in their budget.

**Wheeler:** Why do you think -- why didn't they include it?

**Pellegrino:** I don't know.

**Wheeler:** Felicia?

**Tripp Folsom:** I didn't want to say that, but as Lisa knows, I read every application and the process -- in the process thoroughly and that added to my point why I kept it at that number, because they had that option and chose not to do it. So it's like us going in and doing it for them, when that was specifically part of the rfi. And again, when I look at how much funding we have available in this pot, \$10,000 might not sound a lot, but when we get down the pipeline of requests for early childhood, I just want -- I wanted to note that piece as well. Because you had the option. Because there's other new funding opportunities where we're cutting them significantly, which when reading them we should, but I just wanted to know, this is the only



one where we're going over the requested amount of the actual applicant, when that was actually part of the RFI process.

**Wheeler:** Mitch, you've been uncharacteristically quiet. There you are, right on cue. What are we going to do, Mitch?

**Hornecker:** I think this is a really good discussion.

**Wheeler:** It is.

**Hornecker:** And I think the points are well made. The reality is that we -- there's examples of related to low-scoring proposals that were not well written that staff recommended for funding in the foster care area and others, where we had knowledge of the performance and the performance essentially wasn't included well or at all in the draft. So we do have a history of saying, hey, we looked at the application, they clearly forgot to put something in, if we have -- if we're able to piece it together we have it in the past, and we may today, take that into account. So I guess I'm -- I could go either way. I really hate setting up a new funded program for failure. And \$10,000 is not a small chunk of change to raise, because it will have to come out of their general operating to do it. On the other hand, as Felicia accurately stated, they didn't ask for it. How's that for -- I could go either way.

**Wheeler:** Not helpful, mitch:

**Hornecker:** Sorry about that.

**Wheeler:** No worries. No worries. Of course looking at this in context, the \$10,000, while in absolute terms that is significant regarding the overall outlay, it isn't all that gigantic. Commissioner Vega Pederson is going to save us.

**Vega Pederson:** Well, we'll see about that. I appreciate the discussion as well. I feel like because of the organizational restructure that's happening and the role that this committee plays in terms of making sure that these public funds are going to be used, I think funding the audit makes sense, and possibly despite the fact it wasn't asked for, I did appreciate this was a question I raised to staff when I was submitting my work sheet, and I really appreciated the comments from them that it -- that we do require organizations without with audits to get one during the first contract year, and I think if this is the way we can help support with some of the technical support and the funding through PCL, I think it's a win-win for both our role as oversight of taxpayer dollars and with helping the organization be successful in starting this program.

**Wheeler:** Okay, great. Felicia, if I heard you correctly, maybe I can find a middle ground path forward, I don't disagree with what you're saying at all, with regard to it being odd that it was not requested. And what I'm hearing from both Lisa and Meg is there is a history of us increasing the funding for new asks in order to conduct these audits to help them get off on the right foot. But I also happen to agree with you that we should be more transparent about what our actual standardized policy is. So perhaps we could support this today with the understanding that staff will come back with a clear and more transparent policy for the future with regard to when and how -- when audits will be conducted and how they will be funded.

**Tripp Folsom:** That works for me. I just wanted it to be noted that I support BPI's funding at 100% of what they requested, because it wasn't a significant amount. I just -- I brought that more up as a flag for also the committee, so that we would know in the future. Because that to me works would fine for me, because I really do believe in the mission of bpi, that's why I said I'll go with the committee on this one. I just wanted

it to be known and flagged that I said, hmm, this is -- and I want the community to know that I have read every single one of these applications in their entirety and I really looked at fairness overall to every single applicant individually. And that was really important to me in using taxpayer dollars and really wanting the community to know that I took this very seriously, and I really was looking at fairness overall. As well.

**Wheeler:** Yeah. And I thank you for that. I think you've raised a really important issue, and frankly, it wasn't one that I had noted previously. So I actually really appreciate your daylighting that and hopefully putting transparency behind that policy going forward. So I thank you for that. I thought this was a really good discussion.

**Tripp Folsom:** If the committee wants to go with that other the amount, I will not block that. I want that to be clear to the rest of the Allocation Committee.

EC-3	Black Parent Initiative	First 1,000 Days	\$503,902
------	-------------------------	------------------	-----------

*EC-3 approved with no abstentions*

**McElroy:** EC-18, Neighborhood House, early Oregon prekindergarten program, five out of five expressed interest in funding that program. Four indicated in the amount of \$1,833,391 -- and one indicated an amount of \$900,000.

**Wheeler:** I just want to note, it is not technically a conflict of interest, so I will not be recusing myself, but I feel like I would be negligent if I did not mention many years ago I served on the executive board of Neighborhood House. Traci has the \$900,000 request. Did you want to talk about that?

**Rossi:** Yes, thank you. In light of our earlier discussion were the potential for the carryover funds, I am going to amend my recommendation so that if they aren't able to use these funds because of Covid-related restrictions, there would be a process to work through that. So I'm happy to amend my proposal to the 1,83,000 recommendation.

EC-18	Neighborhood House, Inc.	Early Head Start	\$1,083,391
-------	--------------------------	------------------	-------------

*EC-18 approved with no abstentions*

EC-17	Native American Youth and Family Center	Ten'as Sun Early Childhood Program	\$607,921
-------	---	------------------------------------	-----------

*EC-17 approved with no abstentions*

**McElroy:** EC-2 Albina head start for the head start services. Five out of five expressed an interest in funding this application, four indicated an amount of \$2,025,000, and one of you indicated an amount of \$1 million.

**Wheeler:** Traci?

**Rossi:** I'm going to continue with my consistent amendment and because of the carryover fund option, even in light of the covid-19 problems moving forward I will amend my recommendation to the level that the staff recommended of \$2,025,000.

EC-2	Albina Head Start, Inc.	Early Head Start	\$2,025,000
------	-------------------------	------------------	-------------

*EC-2 approved with no abstentions*

**McElroy** EC-4 David Douglas School District for preschool program, five out of five indicated an interest in funding this program, four indicated an amount of \$973,634, and one of you indicated an amount of \$800,000.

**Wheeler:** Traci.

**Rossi:** I'm going to do the same thing here. I'm going to amend it to the staff recommendation.

EC-4	David Douglas School District	Nuestro Futuro	\$973,634
------	-------------------------------	----------------	-----------

*EC-4 approved with no abstentions*

**McElroy:** All right, EC-1, Albina Head Start for their early head start serviced, five out of five interested in funding this application, four for an amount of \$2,025,000 and one for an amount of \$1.5 million.

**Wheeler:** Traci?

**Rossi:** Same rationale, I want to amend and recommend the staff recommendation.

EC-1	Albina Head Start, Inc.	Early Head Start	\$2,025,000
------	-------------------------	------------------	-------------

*EC-1 approved with no abstentions*

**McElroy:** EC-8, Impact Northwest, parent child development services, five out of five expressed an interest in funding this application and all of you indicated the same amount of \$775,019.

EC-8	Impact NW	Parent Child Development Services	\$775,019
------	-----------	-----------------------------------	-----------

*EC-8 approved with no discussion and no abstentions*

**McElroy:** EC-16 Morrison child and family services for their -- five out of five of you indicated an interest in funding this application and all of you indicated a funding amount of \$1,721,062.

EC-16	Morrison Child and Family Services	Listos Para Aprender	\$1,721,062
-------	------------------------------------	----------------------	-------------

*EC-16 approved with no discussion and no abstentions*

**McElroy:** Thank you. EC-20 Portland Public Schools head start, five out of five expressed an interest in funding this application, four expressed an interest in \$1,669,112, and one of you an interest in \$1 million.

**Rossi:** I'm going to amend my recommendation to the staff recommendation as well.

EC-20	Portland Public Schools	Head Start	\$1,669,112
-------	-------------------------	------------	-------------

*EC-20 approved with no abstentions*

**McElroy:** All right. EC-13 Mount Hood Community College head start, 5 out of five indicated an interest in funding this application, one of you at \$1,530,000, three of you at 1,481,868, and one of you at 700,000.

**Wheeler:** Meg, why don't you start the conversation here. The difference between the 1,530,000 and the 1,481,000, is the staff recommendation, which is a reduction from what was requested. Could you maybe

just briefly tell us about that and I'll turn it over to Traci, I'm going to guess a rationale may have been what was previously stated but I want to give her an opportunity to discuss it. If you could tell us the difference between 1,530,000 versus the 1,481,868.

**McElroy:** My recommendation had to do with maintaining their current funding level plus allowing them part of their additional funding requests to help them partner with an African immigrant specific organization that would help them hire a parent advocate navigator for one of their classrooms they want to make more specific to serving Somali families. I just didn't recommend their full request because I didn't think all of it was necessary to accomplish what they proposed.

**Wheeler:** Okay. And before I move off that, are there any other questions of meg on that particular recommendation? Very good. Traci?

**Rossi:** You're correct, I'm going to amend to the staff recommendation based on the carryover fund possibilities.

**Wheeler:** Okay. So Felicia had recommended the entire amount, did you want to give us a little discussion on that, Felicia?

**Tripp Folsom:** I think as you know this -- all of the head starts, this was the only one that was not recommended in the full amount, and I when reading all of the head start applications, and -- I feel like head starts in general are always on the line, and so that's why I recommended the full amount, and I was really impressed with them working with this new organization called Kiro, which is a refugees organization, it's a program in outer east which really needs that, so I really felt like the difference between the two amounts when reading the budget and the proposal was not significant enough for me to recommend going with the lower staff funding recommendation. So that's why I recommended it for the full amount.

**Wheeler:** I see. Okay. Meg, do you -- what is your level of confidence, meg, that the \$1,481,868, that they will be able to achieve the goals that they have specified in their application, including the partnership they've proposed?

**McElroy:** I feel reasonably confident in it. It's hard to know in light of the current emergency what that partnership can look like, I don't know how this emergency has affected Kiro, I have a better understanding of how its affected Mount Hood Community College head start services. I also just want to point out that there were -- there was at least one other applicant, Portland Public Schools head start that asked for more than I recommended, so I wasn't trying to single out Mount Hood head start --

**Tripp Folsom:** Meg, you were correct.

**McElroy:** That's okay, Felicia. I just wanted to make sure they understood I wasn't singling them out. I can go either way. I think you have to make a decision on this one. I felt confident in my recommendation.

**Tripp Folsom:** I want to be clear, I will 100% support the group, as you can see, I'm really pro-east county and getting funds out there. So -- but I will go with the group, because it's not that big of a deal for me. I respect staff decision.

EC-13	Mt Hood Community College	Head Start	\$1,481,868
-------	---------------------------	------------	-------------

*EC-13 approved with no abstentions*

**McElroy:** EC-14 Mount hood community college for their early head start services. Five out of five indicated an interest in funding this application and all of you indicated an amount of \$1,726,500.

EC-14	Mt Hood Community College	Early Head Start	\$1,726,500
-------	---------------------------	------------------	-------------

*EC-14 approved with no discussion or abstentions*

**McElroy:** EC-7. Hacienda CDC, all five indicated an interest in funding this application at an amount of \$665,308.

EC-7	Hacienda Community Development Corporation	Portland Niños	\$665,308
------	--	----------------	-----------

*EC-7 approved with no discussion or abstentions*

**McElroy:** EC-15 And this is the last one in this program area that you allocated an interest in funding, there were five of you that indicated that interest, four of you at the maximum grant amount of \$2,025,000 and one of you indicated a funding amount of what the applicant requested, which exceeds the maximum grant amount.

EC-15	Morrison Child and Family Services	Infant Early Childhood Mental Health	\$2,025,000
-------	------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------

*EC-15 approved with no discussion or abstentions*

**McElroy:** I am going to turn it over to Lisa Hansell to take you through the next two program areas before I do that, I want to indicate that there's a balance here of \$39,000, and that can be applied toward other program areas either today or at your next meeting.

**Wheeler:** Good. I just want to thank you meg for your hard work and congratulations to our new slate of early childhood grantees. That's exciting. So Lisa is coming up, and she's going to lead us in a discussion about foster care and child abuse prevention and intervention. Take it away, Lisa.

Child Abuse Prevention and Intervention Funding Recommendations

**Hansell:** Thank you, mayor. We'll start with child abuse prevention and intervention. Just want to allow the opportunity if anyone wants to state a conflict of interest, we do have some abstaining from votes in this category.

**Wheeler:** Would anybody like to declare conflict of interest? Or you can just do it on the items when we get to the items, either way works.

Why don't you go ahead and start and as we get to the items if people would like to declare a conflict they may do so at that time.

**Hansell:** Thank you for the clarification. So thank you John for putting up the spreadsheet, as you can see, the amount allocated to this funding area is \$13,502,249. As was done with early childhood, the decisions will proceed in the order of most agreement and highest score. And we're starting with CAPI-5, abuse to program and intervention program, all five of you are interested in funding this program, four of you at the level of \$1,054,118 and one at the full request.

**Wheeler:** Felicia, did you want to talk a little bit about your suggestion there?

**Tripp Folsom:** I'll go with the group. I just thought this was a phenomenal application. So I was trying to -- but I could understand what the staff went with, but I just -- it was my way of indicating that I thought it

was a fantastic application. I will go with it. I was -- if I was going to fund something in its entirety it would be this one.

**Hansell:** With this application it's a current grant that's funded by the levy, they're looking to expand to serve three new populations. Pacific islanders, Bhutanese and African. They requested 1.5 FTE to serve those populations yet they added another .5 beyond their current funding level. And it wasn't clear, there wasn't clear rationale for why that add with additional half FTE was needed to serve the current populations they're serving. And additionally the program expenses seemed excessive compared to what they're currently budgeted, even given the additional staffing and didn't see the justification for that as well. So the staff recommendation includes the current grant amount, plus a COLA, the additional 1.5 FTE and program expenses prorated based on the 19-20 expenses.

CAPI-5	The Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization	Child Abuse Prevention and Intervention	\$1,054,815
--------	--	---	-------------

*CAPI-5 approved with no abstentions*

CAPI-4	Impact NW	Parent Child Therapeutic Services	\$691,572
--------	-----------	-----------------------------------	-----------

*CAPI-4 approved with no discussion or abstentions*

**Hansell:** Lutheran community services, their pip program. All five of you indicated an interest in funding this application, four at \$736,347, and one at \$713,194.

**Vega Pederson:** Yes, thank you. I was just -- this was probably one of the first ones I did when I was still trying to figure out what the tactic was going to be in terms of funding at our original allocation level. So I was just thinking maybe two case managers might have been more appropriate, but since we decided to go with the original allocation amounts I'm fine with what the rest of the group is also advocating and what the staff recommendation was.

CAPI-9	Lutheran Community Services Northwest	Parenting in Portland	\$736,347
--------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------	-----------

*CAPI-9 approved with no abstentions*

CAPI-16	Pathfinders of Oregon	Center for Family Success	\$948,266
---------	-----------------------	---------------------------	-----------

*CAPI-16 approved with no discussion or abstentions*

CAPI-13	Portland Opportunities Industrialization Center, Inc.	Young Parent Program	\$474,526
---------	---	----------------------	-----------

*CAPI-13 approved with no discussion or abstentions*

**Hansell:** Next is CAPI-6 Janus Youth Programs, SEEDS. And all five indicated an interest in funding this program four at the level of \$762,170, and one at \$844,458, the full request.

**Wheeler:** Very good. Traci?

**Rossi:** Yeah, I just really like this application and I also -- the additional dollars would fund a new program, and I feel like in this environment if there's a new grant program they could launch, it would be something that we would all need. So that's why I recommended at the full amount. However I'm willing to go with the rest of the group at the staff recommended amount.

**Wheeler:** Lisa, can you give us some idea of your level of confidence in the 762 versus the 844?

**Hansell:** Sure. This just as clarification, this is a current grantee, a current grant, and they have requested expansion funding. I honestly struggled with this one myself because I would -- I believe in the services they provide and are very much needed. So I agree wholeheartedly with Traci. I was really just -- my reasoning was to be able to allocate resources to new programs, so recommended funding at the current grant level with a COLA.

**Wheeler:** That's current plus COLA. Were they proposing in the application, I'm sorry I don't remember this right off the top of mudslide head, this is an expansion of services, is it not?

**Hansell:** Right. What they -- they were requesting additional expansion funding to serve more families.

**Wheeler:** What we decided was to hold the line at the current service level?

**Hansell:** Right. In order to have funds available for -- of their programming.

**Rossi:** It was the expansion piece that resonated with me in this environment, and that's why I had recommended the larger amount. What they requested.

CAPI-6	Janus Youth Programs, Inc.	SEEDS	\$762,170
--------	----------------------------	-------	-----------

*CAPI-13 approved with no abstentions*

CAPI-2	Cares Northwest (assumed business name) Legacy Emanuel Hospital & Health Center	Trauma-Specific Therapy	\$622,644
--------	---	-------------------------	-----------

*CAPI-2 approved with no discussion or abstentions*

**Hansell:** CAPI-18 Volunteers of America, Family relief nursery. We have one abstaining.

**Wheeler:** All right. And that -- it looks like you have three remaining at the staff level recommendation, and Felicia recommending at the full level. Felicia, did you want to talk about that?

**Tripp Folsom:** I just -- I have to say I have a personal heart for relief nurseries and originally they were excluding funding for the proposed mental health therapy services and I was just recommending funding it, but I will go with the group. It's not that huge -- I will go with the group. That was the only reason.

**Wheeler:** It's a great organization as well. Very good. I'll entertain a motion and a second, please.

**Hansell:** Excuse me, mayor, do you need the person who is abstaining to state their conflict?

**Wheeler:** Traci, we probably should do that, just to make sure we have our is dotted and ts crossed.

**Rossi:** Thank you, mayor.

**Wheeler:** Can you state your conflict of interest for the record?

**Rossi:** I do have a conflict of interest with Volunteers of America.

CAPI-18	Volunteers of America of Oregon, Inc.	Family Relief Nursery	\$1,227,350
---------	---------------------------------------	-----------------------	-------------

*CAPI-18 approved with one abstention (Rossi)*

CAPI-3	El Programa Hispano Catolico	Parent-Child Intervention Program	\$703,102
--------	------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------

*CAPI-3 approved with no discussion or abstentions*

CAPI - 15	Self Enhancement, Inc.	Parent Engagement Services	\$421,802
-----------	------------------------	----------------------------	-----------

*CAPI-15 approved with no discussion or abstentions*

CAPI-8	Lifeworks NW	Family and Community Alliance	\$647,477
--------	--------------	-------------------------------	-----------

*CAPI-8 approved with no discussion or abstentions*

CAPI-12	Oregon Community Health Workers Association	Community Education Worker Program	\$974,353
---------	---	------------------------------------	-----------

*CAPI-12 approved with no discussion or abstentions*

CAPI-7	Lifeworks NW	Children's Refief Nursery	\$1,609,193
--------	--------------	---------------------------	-------------

*CAPI-7 approved with no discussion or abstentions*

CAPI-10	Native American Youth and Family Center	Child Abuse Prevention and Intervention	\$656,699
---------	---	---	-----------

*CAPI-10 approved with no discussion or abstentions*

**Hansell:** CAPI-19 This is the VOA's gateway child care application.

**Wheeler:** And Traci if you could for the record state your conflict, please.

**Rossi:** I have a conflict with the VOA.

**Wheeler:** Therefore you will be abstaining.

**Rossi:** Yes.

**Hansell:** We have three at 459,595, and one at \$468,096.

**Vega Pederson:** I think I just copied the wrong column over. I think I copied the original request instead of the staff recommendation.

CAPI-19	Volunteers of America of Oregon, Inc.	Gateway Drop-In Childcare	\$459,595
---------	---------------------------------------	---------------------------	-----------

*CAPI-19 approved with one abstention (Rossi)*

**Hansell:** There's one left where two members indicated interest in funding CAPI-1, Bridge Meadows, their intergenerational intervention. And the amount was \$301,500.

**Wheeler:** Very good. And maybe lisa, could you explain your -- the staff recommendation rationale of zero?

**Hansell:** Sure. It's really based on prioritizing higher scoring applications. And having money available for -- to transfer over into the foster care program area. There were fewer applications in child abuse prevention. This time around compared to 2014. I think there were 10 fewer this time. The amounts



requested in child abuse prevention and foster care were about the same. And saw some programming in foster care that really addresses some gaps in the current child welfare system that I felt deserved consideration.

**Wheeler:** Would it be fair to say this was not a referendum on this specific program, it was simply a decision to reserve resources for another program area where there was high demand, or is that not a correct assumption?

**Hansell:** That is a correct assumption. There were -- there were a couple of things noted by reviewers in terms of lacking detail in the equity, diversity, and inclusion section and some aspects of the program design were unclear. And this is not a program that has been funded in the child abuse prevention area in the past. So it could just be that -- I'm sure with conversation it would become clear, so yes, your characterization is accurate. If there was more funding I would have no objection to funding this program.

**Wheeler:** It would be my assumption, this is not specifically related to this item only, there will probably be substantial questions from a number of these service providers about staff recommendations, and I would assume that you have the opportunity at some point to go through the logic of the staff recommendations with the individual programs. Is that correct?

**Hansell:** That is correct. We will be negotiating all of the grants that are awarded and given the staff recommendation -- the funded amounts differ from the amounts that were requested, there will need to be discussion about how that is going to be handled for -- in each case. We do also offer the opportunity for applicants who are not award with ad funding to talk with staff as well and get further information about the recommendations that we've made.

**Wheeler:** Okay. And one final question, if this were funded at the \$301,500 level, what would be the impact elsewhere in our grant process?

**Hansell:** So with the staff -- it would impact either foster care or the mentoring decisions. I would say. Because with the staff recommendations, there was balance transferred to both of those funding areas.

**Wheeler:** Okay. And Traci, did you -- on my sheet it's sort of blotted out, I can't tell what your preferred recommendation was. I show commissioner Vega Pederson at the 301, I show Mitch at the 301, I was -- with the staff recommendation Felicia was with the staff recommendation, but Traci, did you have an opinion one way or the other? I can't tell from the sheet.

**Hansell:** Traci's slate showed zero. There were two who indicated interest in --

**Wheeler:** Oh, okay. Mine just looks like a squiggly dash or something. I must have printed it -- my printer isn't up to snuff, I don't know. Good. Commissioner Vega Pederson or Mitch did you want to make the pitch at the full level, the \$301,500?

**Hornecker:** I'll go first. For me, I always look at kind of carefully where we cut the line and stop funding. Sometimes it's really obvious because there's a big drop in scoring, sometimes it's a really tough call. And typically I support where we end up, on this particular instance I like the program, I thought it was close enough in scoring to justify dropping one more, and I am a big fan of Bridge Meadows, so that's why I pulled our funding down one more level to fund one more program.

**Vega Pederson:** Thank you, mayor. It was interesting, I was not expecting anyone else to also have, so it was interesting to see that mitch also had the same feeling I had to grant their request. For me I think looking at their application for this, really looking at the population they're serving, it serves both the foster care and the child abuse prevention and intervention outcomes, and there was such a big move

from this category into our foster care categories, which has been talked about already at this meeting, I felt like this program, which really also got at a lot of -- at the foster care population, should be funded again because I appreciate the work they do, the intergenerational partnership they have and how they scored on this.

**Wheeler:** Let me ask Lisa one more question on this. Because I'm torn on this one as well. Bridge Meadows is a great program, and the intergenerational intervention is clearly a proven best practice. And I agree that the proposal was a little vague in places where I would have liked to have seen more specificity. I could be persuaded to go along with the funding for this program, just based on my knowledge of the organization, what they're capable of. But before I do that, Lisa, you mentioned that this would have implications for other service areas. Can you be more specific?

**Hansell:** So in foster care, it would mean either you would have less -- if I -- if staff recommendations included the Bridge Meadows proposal, then it would mean 301,500 less for the foster care area and/or the mentoring area. And we haven't talked about any of those areas yet. And you'll be -- you'll be considering foster care today, there may be that you are interested in funding at different levels than what staff is recommended there. So it's hard to -- it's hard to answer that other than in the staff recommendations as a full we needed this in our other areas. So again, I have no objections to going forward with funding Bridge Meadows, other than it means that there would need to be other programming not funded or funded at lower levels than recommended by staff.

**Vega Pederson:** Thank you, Mayor. I have a question for staff about that. One of the reasons that I thought funding was in addition to the fact we had moved money out of this area into foster care and there seems to be overlapping in the population being served by this, and the foster care group was that when I was looking at the spreadsheet, it looked like there was enough of a balance left over in foster care to cover this, I didn't -- I hadn't looked as closely as mentoring because we weren't discussing that yet. So I just was -- that was one of the reasons, they did -- it did look like there was enough of a balance to cover this request. But Lisa, it sounds like that balance -- any balance in foster care was moved to mentoring.

**Hansell:** That's correct. You would have enough to go through foster care, but then when you get to mentoring on May 4th, then there would not be enough funding if you were interested in funding at the levels that staff has recommended in that funding area.

**Wheeler:** Wouldn't in a practical sense Lisa, wouldn't that mean that we would probably just fund -- we would not be funding the lowest ranking programs in that category? Is that correct on the mentoring side? Obviously an alternative is we could reduce others more, but wouldn't the smart approach be then to simply reduce by one or two the number of funded programs in the mentoring space?

**Hansell:** Mentoring is one of the -- has the lowest amount of funding allocated to it. And had high requests, almost as much as in the child abuse and foster care arena. So just to give you an idea, the amount requested in mentoring was almost \$18 million, the available funds are \$6 million in that category. So -- and the number of grants that are recommended are eight, and there's a shortfall of \$662,000 to do that.

**Wheeler:** Okay.

**Hansell:** To do those eight. So it would mean you'd have fewer than eight in that funding area. And it's -- this is one of the challenges with making the decisions of just three of the funding areas and one that you're not able to look at all at the same time. One thing that I -- that you may want to consider is to go ahead and go through the foster care, leave this one for now, and go into the foster care and after you

make your decisions there, if there's a balance, if you all award or make decisions at a lower level than what staff has recommended there, there could be enough of a balance that could give you enough for mentoring on May 4th, and then also be able to revisit bridge meadows. Just an option. Hopefully that made sense.

**Hornecker:** I was just going to say, when you look at mentoring, there's a really big drop from the proposed last program we're going to fund that comes in at 85.9, and then everything else is low 80s or 70s or 60s. Underneath it. So I don't -- I don't have a problem taking a hard look at mentoring in the proposals of mentoring. If that's what's necessary.

**Wheeler:** So Mitch, just to clarify what you just said, you would like to stay with the 301,500. Is that correct?

**Hornecker:** Yes.

**Wheeler:** Okay. Very good. You know, I'm just on the fence on this one, because I do -- I'm very familiar with Bridge Meadows, and so I would be inclined at this point to go with both commissioner Vega Pederson and Mitch Hornecker and support this proposal at the \$301,500 level, and that means we'll have to look at the foster care as well as the mentoring section, but just given the needs that are out there in the community right now, I do believe that this should remain a priority, and it certainly fits with the overall framework that both the city and the county have established around intergenerational services and intergenerational programming. So I would hate to leave this one aside. I think this is one that we should support, particularly given there is interest on the part of other members of the committee. So I will support it. It sounds like we may have a split vote on this, which is fine. But at this point I will move that we support this at \$301,500 level, and if there's a second, but first Felicia has a comment.

**Tripp Folsom:** Thank you. I just wanted to say I will go with the group here. I was looking at all of it, and I can see -- I'm a person, I love Bridge Meadows, I've been out there, I've seen their work, and it's incredible. It was just the staff rationale is what got to me on this, because there is -- as we go down the pike with the different allocation amounts, we still have a significant amount ahead of us, foster care, hunger relief, mentoring, after school, so that was only the reason, but I am willing also to support the group on this one. Because I do believe they do incredible work, and the team is phenomenal. So I wanted you to know you're not going to get an opposition from me.

**Wheeler:** Fantastic. So I moved it at \$301,500.

CAPI-1	Bridge Meadows	Intergenerational Interventions	\$301,500
--------	----------------	---------------------------------	-----------

CAPI-1 approved with no abstentions

**Hansell:** Yes, that completes child abuse and there's \$1,210,838 remaining.

#### Foster Care Funding Recommendations

**Wheeler:** With I'm going to try and speed things up a bit. Not because this isn't important, would, but I have a hard out at noon. So I'm going to -- I have another meeting that I'm supposed to be on a zoom call. Why don't you jump in.

**Hansell:** Okay. FC-7. Foster care program. All five indicated an interest in funding, four at 687,210 and one at \$500,000.

**Wheeler:** And Traci did you want to mention something about that?

**Rossi:** Yeah, there were two here where I was having a hard time envisioning how social distancing would impact their programming, however, I am going to give them the benefit of the doubt to be creative and because of the carryover options I'm going to amend my recommendation to the staff recommendation.

**Vega Pederson:** I do have a comment. Not specifically about this one, but just in the interest of time, and I don't -- and staff can let me know if I'm out of line in proposing this, but if there was a way to as a slate potentially move as a slate all of the ones we had unanimous support for and unanimous agreement on the level, that might save some time if that's appropriate for the PCL rules of order.

**Wheeler:** I would certainly support that. Lisa, can you give us some guidance on that please?

**Pellegrino:** Thank you. Yes, I think that would be fine. There's nothing specifically against that. We just want to make sure if you take those as a group, if Lisa reads all the ones off where there was no disagreement, and you all wanted the same amount you could vote as a group to ratify those.

**Wheeler:** Let's do that. But before I do that I know Traci had her hand raised. Did you have a comment?

**Rossi:** Yes. I would just say I would also -- the programs where there are abstentions as group those together.

**Wheeler:** Absolutely. Mitch did you have a comment?

**Hornecker:** I was going to say if we do them as a slate I need to declare a conflict on fc-12.

**Wheeler:** Why don't we do this, Lisa, could we go through and identify those where we're all in 100% agreement without abstentions as the first slate? Then as the second slate, we will do ones where people identify -- then we'll do have to dot abstention ones independently. But let's do all the ones we're in agreement where there's not an abstention. Can you go through those quickly? And put them --

FC-7	The Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization	Immigrant and Refugee Foster Care	\$687,210
FC-8	Janus Youth Programs, Inc.	ECHO	\$600,324
FC-13	Portland Opportunities Industrialization Center, Inc.	Work Opportunities Training Program	\$364,198
FC-18	Youth, Rights & Justice	SchoolWorks	\$648,763
FC-10	Native American Youth and Family Center	Foster Care Support	\$1,002,965
FC-6	Impact NW	Safe & Together	\$1,049,805
FC-9	Latino Network	Foster Care Support Program	\$669,154

*These 7 grants were approved with no discussion or abstentions*

**Wheeler:** Then I would recommend we go quickly individually through the remainder, Lisa, just because we have abstentions in a couple of places, if I have this right, FC-14 is the next one you would discuss.

**Hansell:** That's correct. That's Portland leadership foundation, one abstaining.

**Wheeler:** Okay. And Felicia could you state that just for the record?

**Tripp Folsom:** This is Felicia, I have a conflict and I'm abstaining.

FC-14	Portland Leadership Foundation - The Contingent	Know Me Now	\$509,176
-------	--	-------------	-----------

*FC-14 approved with one abstention (Tripp Folsom)*

**Hansell:** FC-5, Friends of the Children, foster care services, one abstaining here as well.

**Wheeler:** And we have one difference of opinion, looks like Felicia you came in slightly higher at the full recommendation.

**Tripp Folsom:** I will go with the group at \$780,128 especially after a conversation with early childhood.

**Wheeler:** Yes, thank you, could you state your conflict?

**Rossi:** I have a conflict; therefore I will be abstaining.

FC-5	Friends of the Children - Portland	Portland Foster Care Services	\$780,128
------	---------------------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------

*FC-5 approved with one abstention (Rossi)*

**Wheeler:** Next is FC-12, New Avenues for Youth.

Sorry, Mitch you have an abstention?

**Hornecker:** I do. I have a conflict so I will be abstaining on FC-12.

FC-12	New Avenues for Youth, Inc.	Avenues to College	\$953,719
-------	-----------------------------	--------------------	-----------

*FC-12 approved with one abstention (Hornecker)*

**Hansell:** FC-2, Boys and Girls Aid, permanency services, all five want to indicate interest in funding, very slight difference, 615,114, compared to 618,130.

**Wheeler:** So we have two at -- at the full recommendation, 618,130, that's commissioner Vega Pederson. And Felicia. The rest of us came in slightly lower than that at 615,114. I will increase mine to the 618,130.

FC-2	The Boys and Girls Aid Society of Oregon	Permanency Services	\$618,130
------	---	---------------------	-----------

*FC-2 approved with no abstentions*

**Hansell:** FC-15, SEI's foster care program. Four of five are interested in funding, three at \$636,449, and one at \$634,449.

**Wheeler:** Okay. And if Lisa could you explain the difference -- never mind. Commissioner Vega Pederson, you came in at the full \$636,449. I'm the odd person out, except for Felicia. So actually why don't I start with Felicia. You did not recommend funding this?

**Tripp Folsom:** I know -- I will go with the group. I know the work really well and I do know as I funded them in quite a few other areas. But this one I just -- it was just unclear on the really the delivery. So I just -- it's the program design section was really quite confusing for me. But I see the rest of you guys, and I want to -- I personally do would be to fund them, I just want -- that was unclear for me. And so that is what I'm struggling with. If you want to know. So if somebody needs to convince me, I just -- my grant maker hat comes on and it's just not a clearly -- the program design is not really clear to me for this.

**Wheeler:** Good. Lisa, could you explain it? And I just want to cop to a typo. The 634 is supposed to be a 636. So I just -- I typed a four instead of a six. I'm with the consensus at the higher level. But could you address Felicia's concerns, please?

**Hansell:** Sure. I understand the challenge, I had the challenge myself. This is a -- we've been funding SEI in foster care, and they in their proposal, though it's not completely clear, I believe that the changes they're making are in response to feedback they've received from DHS child welfare in how to be more responsive to youth in foster care, and the services will move from being part of their school-based services to part of their family services, and they'll have individualized support for the children and the foster in their foster homes, and in their testimony they provided some more clear information, they answered some of the questions that I have, and maybe that you had as well in reading the application. I do feel like it's a move in a good direction for serving kids and families and agree that there are a lot of questions that would need to be -- that will be discussed if this is funded with the applicant.

**Tripp Folsom:** I wanted to note, I really believe that the priority population of SEI and foster care is an important population. And so I -- I want to be clear that I do want to fund this proposal, but I really want to note, I listened to the testimony, I read the application, I want to note that the feedback I would give them is that clarity and program design in the future must be more clear. But I do not stand in the way of funding this proposal. Because a need is so great in the foster care system. So I want to note that I will change my recommendation to go with the committee.

FC-15	Self Enhancement, Inc.	Foster Care Program	\$636,449
-------	------------------------	---------------------	-----------

*FC-15 approved with no abstentions*

**Hansell:** Yes, that completes the slates. And just as a reminder, any of the balances that were left from today will be -- you can apply towards your remaining funding areas on May 4th.

**Wheeler:** Very good. I want to thank you, Lisa, and congratulate our new levy partners. I also want to thank the levy staff for their rigor and tremendously hard work to get us to this point and appreciation to my colleagues here on the committee for their dedication as well. And finally I especially want to thank those who applied for levy funding, both those who did not receive grants as well as those who did. We're grateful for the work that you do to make Portland a better place for our children and frankly our families, and all of the community. And I know we all wish there was enough money to fund all of these programs, of course there isn't, but I want to thank all of you who applied.

### Small Grants Fund Update

Last but not least today we have small grants manager Arika Bridgeman-Bunyoli here, she'll get us up to speed on where the small grant fund stands and what we can look forward to in the coming months.

**Bridgeman-Bunyoli:** Thank you, Mayor. My colleague John is going to put my slides up on the screen. But as that is happening, I want to just acknowledge that we have a short amount of time to go through all of

the information about the small grants funds, and so we've posted all of the materials, draft application materials, and supporting materials on the Portland Children's Levy website, and there should be a link going across the bottom of the screen for our attendees.

So thank you. John, can you go to the next slide? The purpose of the small grants fund is to increase equity and the Portland Children's Levy heard through Multnomah about processes that there are numerous barriers for small organizations who are trying to apply for Portland Children's Levy funds. So the small grants funds sets up a pathway through which small organizations with budgets of a million dollars or less can expand their valuable work and their capacity to receive additional funding and eventually apply for larger funds allowing them to serve more children, youth, and families in Portland.

So we went through on the February 3rd Allocation Committee meeting, we proposed the creation of a design team which is a community-based ad hoc team and community conversations. The purpose of the design team was to create the application criteria and ensure equity at each and every step of the grant making process. The design team members have both public and private grant making experience, and they come from multiple cultural communities. They met four times between January and April, once in person and three times virtually, and planned the agenda for the community conversations as well as along with the PCL staff crafted process recommendations for small grants funds.

The community conversations, we originally had two planned, one for February 24th, and one for March 16th. Due to the covid-19 crisis, the one that was scheduled for March 16th was canceled, and instead it was replaced with seven virtual community conversations. Doing so in that way allowed us to reach representatives from 31 small organizations, and they represented many different cultural communities as well as topic-focused communities. So here you see the different communities that were represented.

So what we discussed at the community conversations were ways that the types of technical assistance that small organizations may need in order to be able to handle the city contracts that would come through the Portland Children's Levy; equity-based ways of facilitating a two-step process for grant making; and just additional feedback on how we could create a strength-based grant making process for small organizations.

These are the things that we found. So first of all there was a lot of gratitude and excitement from the community to be able to be involved in this community engaged process. But there was a lot of concerns about making sure that the process was right sized to the size of the organizations and the size of the grants. Keep in mind the grants for the small grants fund ranged from \$10,000 to \$60,000, and so it was seen that the kind of process that we go through for, for example, a \$600,000 grant should be more rigorous than what one would go through for a \$10,000 grant.

There was support for the two-step process, but there was concern about the amount of effort and opportunity costs that might happen for small organizations.

There was support for the idea of having an interactive component, which would allow for community organizations to have a different way of telling the story of their organization that wasn't only based on their written application and their effectiveness in grant writing. But there was concern about the kind of evaluation criteria that could happen, and that interactive step and how it could be fair. As well as flexible to the different needs of the organization. One other finding was that in the midst of the covid-19 crisis, organizations were wondering and requesting if there was any way to make our grant making process shorter, so that we could get funds to underserved communities more quickly.

And they expressed the following technical assistance needs. The organizations that were more focused on black, indigenous, and people of color were especially concerned about wanting to get more training around culturally centered means for supporting children and youth with disabilities. There was ongoing technical assistance and support that was requested so that the organizations could continue to have continuous quality improvement, and there was miscellaneous different needs that organizations expressed.

And so staff will be creating resource lists about where they can find different resources that are available in our community.

So after hearing all these things from all of these different organizations and working with the design team and the staff over a period of time in the midst of this, we came up with the following process recommendation. First, we recommend a step one application. It's a short, written application with five essay questions, again, your Allocation Committee members do have a copy of that draft, but it is also available on the Portland Children's Levy website. So that public can view it and also comment. There's a link on there for comment on all of these materials.

After the organizations would submit the step one application, the design team and reviewers chosen from the community could be narrowing down the pool of applicants, and say, for example, if we have 40 organizations who apply, narrowing that down to a pool of 20 organizations who would then be invited to submit a longer application along with full budget details and an interview.

The interview was chosen by the design team as the interactive component because we looked at many different ways, but we felt that through an interview we could have the kind of flexibility that organizations wanted, as well as the fairness of criteria because it could be done in audio way, it could be done in person, it could be done with interpreters, if they wanted to bring people who needed interpretation. So it has a lot of flexibility.

And then the step two applications would be scored in a way similar to the large grants by the design team and the reviewers. And the recommendations would then go to the Allocation Committee for you all to create your slates and to approve and make funding decisions.

So the timeline that we're looking at, currently it is not a shortened timeline. My experience is that that is a challenge to meet that particular community desire in our current environment. And there are pieces of the step two process that we will be presenting at a further date at Allocation Committee.

But what we have here is that in May, on May 4th, after you all have had a chance to review all of the materials that we have given you, and we've collected the public comment, that you can approve the process design for the first step, and then we will be able to publish the application materials on May 13th.

And then as part of our ongoing support and technical assistance for the community, I will be holding informational sessions on May 20th and the 27th.

Then we will continue to move through the process, the step one applications will be due in July, and we're hoping to have the full step two process completed and funding decisions made and approved by city council by the end of 2020. So that is my whole presentation, and I am open to any questions.

**Wheeler:** Very good. Any questions for Arika? I don't see any. That was a good presentation, thank you, Arika. We're obviously pretty excited about how the small grants fund is going to help us reach marginalized communities and some of the organizations that haven't received levy funding in the past. So unless somebody tells me otherwise, that is our agenda. That wraps up our meeting. We will convene



again once again in a virtual session on Monday, May 4th, from 3:00 to 5:00 p.m., to make decisions in the mentoring, after-school and hunger relief areas.

And as always, people are interested can stay posted on all this information through the levy website, and other outreach communications. Is there anything else for the good of the order? Hearing nothing, we stand adjourned. Thank you, everyone. Have a good day.

**Adjourned 12:00 noon**

**Portland Children's Levy**  
**Early Childhood Grants allocated 4/24/2020**

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>Applicant Organization</b>	<b>Program Name</b>	<b>3-Year Grant Amount</b>
EC-9	The Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization	Child and Parent Success	\$1,489,641
EC-10	Latino Network	Junto Aprendemos	\$1,712,050
EC-11	Metropolitan Family Service, Inc.	Ready Set Go	\$404,594
EC-3	Black Parent Initiative	First 1,000 Days	\$503,902
EC-18	Neighborhood House, Inc.	Early Head Start	\$1,083,391
EC-17	Native American Youth and Family Center	Ten'as Sun Early Childhood Program	\$607,921
EC-2	Albina Head Start, Inc.	Head Start	\$2,025,000
EC-4	David Douglas School District	Nuestro Futuro	\$973,634
EC-1	Albina Head Start, Inc.	Early Head Start	\$2,025,000
EC-8	Impact NW	Parent Child Development Services	\$775,019
EC-16	Morrison Child and Family Services	Listos Para Aprender	\$1,721,062
EC-20	Portland Public Schools	Head Start	\$1,669,112
EC-13	Mt Hood Community College	Head Start	\$1,481,868
EC-14	Mt Hood Community College	Early Head Start	\$1,726,500
EC-7	Hacienda Community Development Corporation	Portland Niños	\$665,308
EC-15	Morrison Child and Family Services	Infant Early Childhood Mental Health	\$2,025,000

**Early Childhood Total Funds**

**Granted      \$20,889,002**

**Portland Children's Levy**  
**Child Abuse Prevention and Intervention Grants allocated 4/24/2020**

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>Applicant Organization</b>	<b>Program Name</b>	<b>3-Year Grant Amount</b>
CAPI-5	The Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization	Child Abuse Prevention and Intervention	\$1,054,815
CAPI-4	Impact NW	Parent Child Therapeutic Services	\$691,572
CAPI-9	Lutheran Community Services Northwest	Parenting in Portland	\$736,347
CAPI-16	Pathfinders of Oregon	Center for Family Success	\$948,266
CAPI-13	Portland Opportunities Industrialization Center, Inc.	Young Parent Program	\$474,526
CAPI-6	Janus Youth Programs, Inc.	SEEDS	\$762,170
CAPI-2	Cares Northwest (assumed business name) Legacy Emanuel Hospital & Health Center	Trauma-Specific Therapy	\$622,644
CAPI-18	Volunteers of America of Oregon, Inc.	Family Relief Nursery	\$1,227,350
CAPI-3	El Programa Hispano Catolico	Parent-Child Intervention Program	\$703,102
CAPI - 15	Self Enhancement, Inc.	Parent Engagement Services	\$421,802
CAPI-8	Lifeworks NW	Family and Community Alliance	\$647,477
CAPI-12	Oregon Community Health Workers Association	Community Education Worker Program	\$974,353
CAPI-7	Lifeworks NW	Children's Relief Nursery	\$1,609,193
CAPI-10	Native American Youth and Family Center	Child Abuse Prevention and Intervention	\$656,699
CAPI-19	Volunteers of America of Oregon, Inc.	Gateway Drop-In Childcare	\$459,595
CAPI-1	Bridge Meadows	Intergenerational Interventions	\$301,500

**Child Abuse Prevention and  
Intervention Total Funds Granted    \$12,291,411**

**Portland Children's Levy**  
**Foster Care Grants allocated 4/24/2020**

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>Applicant Organization</b>	<b>Program Name</b>	<b>3-Year Grant Amount</b>
FC-7	The Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization	Immigrant and Refugee Foster Care	\$687,210
FC-8	Janus Youth Programs, Inc.	ECHO	\$600,324
FC-14	The Contingent	Know Me Now	\$509,176
FC-13	Portland Opportunities Industrialization Center, Inc.	Work Opportunities Training Program	\$364,198
FC-5	Friends of the Children - Portland	Portland Foster Care Services	\$780,128
FC-12	New Avenues for Youth, Inc.	Avenues to College	\$953,719
FC-10	Native American Youth and Family Center	Foster Care Support	\$1,002,965
FC-6	Impact NW	Safe & Together	\$1,049,805
FC-18	Youth, Rights & Justice	Schoolworks	\$648,763
FC-2	The Boys and Girls Aid Society of Oregon	Permanency Services	\$618,130
FC-9	Latino Network	Foster Care Support Program	\$669,154
FC-15	Self Enhancement, Inc.	Foster Care Program	\$636,449

**Foster Care Total Funds**  
**Granted     \$8,520,021**