

Portland, Oregon

FINANCIAL IMPACT and PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT STATEMENT For Council Action Items

(Deliver original to Financial Planning Division. Retain copy.)

1. Name of Initiator Amy Ruiz		2. Telephone No. 503-823-4046	3. Bureau/Office/Dept. Office of the Mayor
4a. To be filed (date): May 31, 2012	4b. Calendar (Check One) Regular <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Consent <input type="checkbox"/> 4/5ths <input type="checkbox"/>		5. Date Submitted to Commissioner's office and FPD Budget Analyst: May 31, 2012
6a. Financial Impact Section: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Financial impact section completed		6b. Public Involvement Section: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public involvement section completed	

1) Legislation Title:

Accept Mutual Agreements between PPS and the City of Portland relating to FY 2012-13 Budget Support (Resolution)

2) Purpose of the Proposed Legislation:

To accept a memo that establishes an understanding of the series of agreements that have been identified in relation to the 2012-13 budget support from the City of Portland (COP) to Portland Public Schools (PPS).

3) Which area(s) of the city are affected by this Council item? (Check all that apply—areas are based on formal neighborhood coalition boundaries)?

- | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> City-wide/Regional | <input type="checkbox"/> Northeast | <input type="checkbox"/> Northwest | <input type="checkbox"/> North |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Central Northeast | <input type="checkbox"/> Southeast | <input type="checkbox"/> Southwest | <input type="checkbox"/> East |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Central City | | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Internal City Government Services | | | |

FINANCIAL IMPACT

4) Revenue: Will this legislation generate or reduce current or future revenue coming to the City? If so, by how much? If so, please identify the source.

No.

5) Expense: What are the costs to the City related to this legislation? What is the source of funding for the expense? (Please include costs in the current fiscal year as well as costs in future years. If the action is related to a grant or contract please include the local contribution or match required. If there is a project estimate, please identify the **level of confidence**.)

None.

6) Staffing Requirements:

- **Will any positions be created, eliminated or re-classified in the current year as a result of this legislation?** *(If new positions are created please include whether they will be part-time, full-time, limited term, or permanent positions. If the position is limited term please indicate the end of the term.)*

No.

- **Will positions be created or eliminated in future years as a result of this legislation?**

No.

(Complete the following section only if an amendment to the budget is proposed.)

7) Change in Appropriations *(If the accompanying ordinance amends the budget please reflect the dollar amount to be appropriated by this legislation. Include the appropriate cost elements that are to be loaded by accounting. Indicate "new" in Fund Center column if new center needs to be created. Use additional space if needed.)*

Fund	Fund Center	Commitment Item	Functional Area	Funded Program	Grant	Sponsored Program	Amount

[Proceed to Public Involvement Section — REQUIRED as of July 1, 2011]

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

8) Was public involvement included in the development of this Council item (e.g. ordinance, resolution, or report)? Please check the appropriate box below:

- ☐ **YES:** Please proceed to Question #9.
☒ **NO:** Please, explain why below; and proceed to Question #10.

The memo attached to the resolution was negotiated and agreed upon between city officials and Portland Public Schools representatives.

9) If "YES," please answer the following questions:

a) What impacts are anticipated in the community from this proposed Council item?

b) Which community and business groups, under-represented groups, organizations, external government entities, and other interested parties were involved in this effort, and when and how were they involved?

c) How did public involvement shape the outcome of this Council item?

d) Who designed and implemented the public involvement related to this Council item?

e) Primary contact for more information on this public involvement process (name, title, phone, email):

10) Is any future public involvement anticipated or necessary for this Council item? Please describe why or why not.

No.

Mayor Sam Adams

BUREAU DIRECTOR (Typed name and signature)

Parsons, Susan

From: Mark Bartlett [bartlett.m@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, June 06, 2012 9:14 AM
To: Commissioner Fritz; "Commissioner Saltzman dan"@portlandoregon.gov; Commissioner Fish; Leonard, Randy; sam@portlandoregon.gov; Parsons, Susan; Schwab Mary Ann; Dufay, Anne
Subject: resolution #655

Council members,

I would like to see the fully developed details of this agreement before concluding anything about viability, legality, and legitimacy of the proposed IGA.

Please request that this be tabled until it comes back with the all important details.

Yes the budget must be completed and approved by a certain date, but that should have been part of the calculus to bring this to Council in a timely manner ready to execute.

I was told by Fred Kowell, accountant for PPR, that the amount was approximately \$300000 per year. I find it ironic that PPR has for years spent hundreds of thousands of non revenue funds to mow PPS fields without any agreement in detail nor any accounting transparency, and now you decide an IGA is needed. Why now?

Is the spending of TIF funds legitimate in this location and for this purpose?

What was the stated purpose for business licensing revenue at the time it was approved? Does this meet that definition?

Are there any deed restriction or encumbrances on this Foster site that would prevent mixed use development?

As you may be aware, PPS years ago created a dedicated fund for proceeds from leases and sales just as proposed in this agreement. These funds could never be accounted for and went to the general fund expenditures.

Would this repeat "real property fund" mirror that lack of accountability and transparency?

This simply is an end around the issue of public ownership when "leased" property moves from that ownership for more than a generation. At 99 years it is no different than a sale since a non public entity could enter into that agreement, and the public be shut out from the use of the property. This is a disturbing precedent. What you propose in no less that subsidized public housing on public land that was donated for other purposes. You attempt to blur the distinction by "maintaining" a small "education" center.

There are many important details that have not been clarified in this proposed intent and understanding (IGA).

Please table this resolution until that time the public can know just what the fully developed language includes and if those intentions are legitimate considering the possible conflicts and variables as yet to be determined and defined.

Thank you,
Mark Bartlett
S E Portland

please read this into the public record