



OFFICE OF

PUBLIC SAFETY

CHARLES JORDAN COMMISSIONER

1220 S.W. FIFTH AVE. PORTLAND, OR, 97204 503 248-4682

MEMORANDUM

F: grants

DATE:

August 16, 1978

TO:

Mayor Goldschmidt Commissioner Ivancie Commissioner McCready Commissioner Schwab

FROM:

Commissioner Jordan

SUBJECT:

Self-reliant neighborhoods and alternative futures:

Pre-application grant proposal to the Mott Foundation

for "Project SNAP"

You are aware of my belief that healthy, self-reliant neighborhoods are the key to the long-term livability of the City as a whole.

This belief informs my actions in relation to the neighborhood and community functions for which I am responsible--Neighborhood Associations, Human Relations, Neighborhood Environment, Residential Care, Crime Prevention, the Neighborhood Livability Project--and to major planning and development projects.

My actions are also informed by what I believe to be a clear mandate from the citizens we represent. Regardless of the outcome of Ballot Measure 6, the message is unmistakable: Find a new way to do and pay for things, we'll no longer stand for the old.

Accordingly, I have asked each of my bureaus to prepare for alternative futures, to create new and less costly means for accomplishing neighborhoods/City ends. Among these means are renewed efforts to stimulate neighborhood self-reliance in ways that will have minimal impact on the City's resources. The attached grant proposal to a private foundation reflects such efforts.

"SNAP" is a Mott Foundation acronym for "Stimulating the Neighborhood Action Process." SNAP projects were funded in ten cities last year, with an emphasis on the development of "small citizens action groups." Although there is no assurance funding will extend to new cities this year, the Mott people asked that we submit a proposal (and gave us only two weeks to do so).

Our SNAP proposal is designed as a package of incentives, a "plan for a plan" that would be constructed, implemented and sustained by neighborhoods themselves. By targeting Northeast neighborhoods the grant would complement other revitalization efforts in the area. The aim is not just to enhance neighborhood livability by encouraging more extensive and higher quality citizen participation, but to explicitly promote the economic self-reliance of neighborhood-based organizations, Project SNAP August 16, 1978 Page 2

This would be no free ride for neighborhoods. Project SNAP provides seed money, up to \$5,000 per neighborhood the first year, declining by \$1,000 each subsequent year. After the first year participant neighborhoods would be expected to generate their own matching funds.

The City's contribution would be limited to the provision of administrative support through existing resources of the Office of Neighborhood Associations. Alternative resources are being explored.

I expect to meet with representatives of the Mott Foundation within the month. If it appears Portland stands a reasonable chance of winning a SNAP grant, I'll bring an ordinance before Council for formal action. In the interim I'd appreciate your review and comment.

CJ:ph

cc: Ken Jones, Budget Officer
Mike Lindberg, OPD
Tom Benjamin, Federal Grants
Mary Pedersen, ONA
James Loving, NE Coalition



CITY-SCHOOLS COMMISSION

CITY OF PORTLAND/SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 1

- 1. Revised January 18, 1978
- 2. Revised January 23, 1978
- 3. Revised January 23, 1978 at a meeting of the Board of Education

NOTE: New material in the third revision is underlined.

SUMMARY

The common commitment of the City of Portland and the Portland School District to stable and healthy city neighborhoods must be supported by a comprehensive and shared program to maintain quality schools and a desirable residential environment. Ad hoc efforts to integrate individual City and School District actions have been promising but limited in impact. What is needed is an overall strategy and an individual pilot project for coordinating complementary School District and City projects and use of resources directed at the improvement of the city as a home for all people to work, learn, and raise families.

To initiate actions fulfilling this need, the City of Portland and the Portland School District propose the formation of a "City-Schools" Commission. This Commission will operate to recommend coordinated broad planning efforts on a citywide basis and to plan, design, and recommend a pilot project effort in one high school attendance area. To support an administrative staff for the Commission, the ability to leverage private resources, and a capability to plan and assist in implementing, it is proposed that the City-Schools Commission be financed with a grant of \$250,000 per year for four years. Both the City of Portland and the Portland School District would contribute an additional \$50,000 per year.

THE CONCERN

In the past, Portland has enjoyed a national reputation for the quality of life in the city. As recently as 1970, a quality of life study commissioned by the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency rated Portland as the "most livable" large city in America. Despite this reputation, since the decade of the 1960's, Portland has begun to experience many of the same trends which have been characteristic of other older, declining central cities. An analysis of the data will show that the "most livable" status of 1970 only makes Portland the city with "most to lose", should present trends continue unabated.

In general, data reveal a population trend which indicates a growing disparity between the city and its suburbs. Increasingly, the city is becoming a community of social extremes: elderly and very young, single-parent households, poor and minorities. In the 1960's, the city experienced a net loss of 4,300 families (married couples with children), while Portland suburbs gained 19,000 families. By 1970, Portland housed almost as many single-parent households (7,880) as the rest of the combined Portland Metropolitan area (9,550). Between 1960 and 1970, Portland's population of elderly citizens (age 65 and over) increased seven percent, while the city's total population increased only 2.5 percent. By 1970, 15 percent of the city's population was age 65 and over; nationally, this age group comprised less than 10 percent of the population.

This growing sociological disparity between the city and suburbs is reflected in a growing economic disparity as well.

In 1960, the difference between Portland and suburban median

family income was 9.5 percent. By 1970, that difference had increased to 18.4 percent, more substantial than the national central city/suburban difference of 17.8 percent.

These negative trends have direct impacts upon the School District -- evidence of the close interrelationship between neighborhoods and schools. Between 1960 and 1977, enrollments dropped from a high of 79,000 to 58,000. At the same time, the cost of maintaining the District's physical facilities and buildings (which average 45 years of age), has increased at an average rate of 15.9 percent over the last six years. While the situation of declining enrollments and rising costs is a national phenomenon, it does appear to be unusually severe in Portland. Nationally, enrollments peaked in 1971 and declined an estimated six percent by 1975. By comparison, Portland's enrollments peaked in 1962 (and remained fairly constant through 1968) and have since declined 21 percent.

THE PRESENT ADMINISTRATION OF EFFORT

Both the City of Portland and the Portland School District have traditionally recognized their shared responsibilities for Portland's schools and city neighborhoods. In the early 1950's, when faced with an unprecedented growth in the number of school-aged children, the School Board requested the Portland Planning Commission's assistance in planning for that growth. The result was several years of coordinated planning and a Land for Schools document which guided the expansion of the School District's facilities during that decade. Within the last several years,

with the growing recognition by both jurisdictions of the trends threatening the community's quality of life, renewed efforts have been undertaken, separately and together, to preserve Portland's livability.

The City of Portland, since 1972, has sought to undertake a coordinated effort to stabilize and preserve its transitional neighborhoods, focusing predominately on innercity neighborhoods on the east side, including the racially imbalanced neighborhoods in the northeast. The City strategy has sought to utilize public spending, planning, and regulation to lever private investment. To implement this program, the City has targeted its federal Housing and Community Development funds in these neighborhoods, focused land use and transportation planning projects, undertaken crime prevention programs, as well as other capital and service-oriented efforts. This strategy is programmed to continue and expand, utilizing possible new sources of funding as broad as a proposed parks levy and the recently created federal Urban Development Action Grant.

At the same time, the School District has been coming to terms with the twin problem of declining enrollments and rising operating and capital costs. Solutions will inevitably include changes in the use of buildings, school closures, and modification of school program offerings. Often solutions that promise to increase operating efficiency are contrary to the preservation of neighborhood schools in their existing configuration.

To increase both educational and operational efficiency in the district, the Portland Board of Education has established a policy of shifting to a system of middle schools. This policy is designed to balance a present non-uniform distribution of school-age population within the city and to provide improved educational programs to meet the changed needs and capabilities of upper elementary-age students. Concurrently, this policy allows the retention of neighborhood primary schools whose homeroom oriented curricula is least compromised by small enrollments. Nevertheless, even large primary school buildings with small student bodies are expensive to operate so the district is forced to consider the closure of some buildings or to find supplementary community activities which can occupy and maintain the surplus space.

-Unlike most other urban school districts, the total minority population within the confines of the Portland School District is small (8.5 percent). This is compared with a district minority student population of 20 percent. But most of this monority population is concentrated in the near northeast areas of the city, where approximately 50 percent of the population is minority.

For almost a decade, the School District has been providing an expanding student transfer program to reduce racial isolation in this area. The two major components of this program, early childhood centers which attract a majority population to transfer to primary schools with

substantial minority enrollment, and a transfer program for minority children to schools in predominately white neighborhoods, have achieved a significant level of success. However, the desired solution requires a more balanced distribution of minority families, not just of students. This can be achieved with the help of the City, its housing, employment, neighborhood redevelopment, and social service programs.

Currently, the School District is in the initial stages of implementing an eight year capital construction improvement plan with money approved for major maintenance and renovation of schools by Portland voters in 1976. This is the first such money approved for capital improvements since 1964. Cooperation between the School District and City in the programming of these funds has been good: thus far, 75 percent of the funded projects have been located in neighborhoods which have been or are targeted for federal Housing and Community Development program dollars. Almost 50 percent of the projects complement or are complemented by adjacent and major city park, street, or residential improvement projects.

In the last several years, numerous other examples of joint or cooperative planning and programming have occurred: park and recreation improvements; planning the proposed park levy; since 1975, the earmarking by the City of over \$5 million in Comprehensive Employment and Training Act funds for School District use in support of District objectives.

Nevertheless, while communication between the School District and the City has been excellent, the limitations of the current informal and piecemeal arrangement to produce joint projects is not fully addressing the common needs and opportunities of the City and the District.

PROPOSAL

Justification and Assumptions

Recognizing the dynamic change caused by trends affecting the composition of the city's population and school enrollments, as well as the limitations of their present cooperative activities, the City of Portland and the Portland School District jointly propose the creation of a City-Schools Commission to develop a strategy for joint City/School District cooperation. The rationale for this proposed Commission is based, first, on the belief that neither the City nor the School District can effectively accomplish shared objectives such as increasing the percentage of city families with children, improving the racial balance and diversity in the city's neighborhoods, or strengthening support for public education, within the confines of the separate purposes these two governments are chartered to serve or the resources presently available to each.

The goal of the Commission and of the commitment of public resources to support it, is to develop a strategy to promote the balanced and diverse population and stable residential neighborhoods that are needed to sustain good schools, and to provide the good schools required to attract a balanced and diverse population and to stabilize neighborhoods.

Whether or not the special actions that are considered by this proposal and the targeting of public resources for their implementation will prove sufficient to reverse the present trends, the City and School District are prepared to undertake the challenge. In the past two decades, federal housing and interstate highway programs have demonstrated that public policy can exert a substantial influence on the movement and location of population. Past federal programs have often encouraged the decline of urban communities through their unintended impacts on population. Now, with the current national emphasis on energy conservation, and the rising costs of housing pushing suburban homes beyond the reach of most Americans, recent trends which indicate a return of capital and people to the city may provide a glimmer of hope. But this new trend -- too recent to measure with any certainty -- may exclude families with children, who continue to prefer to locate in the suburbs. location of these families is still determined by the same factors that have influenced their decisions over the past 15 years: quality of housing, space, and schools.*

Because of Portland's reputation as a good place to live and because of the changing economics of housing, it is the judgment of the City and the School District that a targeted effort to attract families with children has a reasonable chance to achieve success. And because of the strength of

^{*}The Portland Bureau of Planning is concluding this winter a residential mobility survey to isolate the factors in the Portland area that determine where people are choosing to live.

Portland's commitment to its livability, and its recognition of the interdependence between urban livability and educational quality, it is their judgment that they cannot justify avoiding that effort.

PROJECT PROGRAM AND ORGANIZATION

The program for the proposed City-Schools Commission will fulfill two responsibilities. One will be to recommend an effective strategy to integrate the implementation of shared city and school objectives on a citywide basis. To serve such a broad purpose and at the same time to measure its potential with specific application, the Commission will also be charged to recommend to the School Board and City Council and to assist the City Council and the School Board in the implementation of a joint city-school pilot planning and improvement program to be established and executed within a selected high school cluster so that the livability of the community may be substantially improved.

The high school cluster has been selected as the most appropriate unit for the pilot project in recognition of the unique administrative and functional relationship which exists between the schools in the cluster and the community which they serve. Schools are the significant public institution in every community; they are locally staffed and administered, and respond primarily to the requirements of the community they serve. Within a single high school cluster is expressed the full diversity of function in the educational system — primary, middle, and high schools — as well as the expanding of block, neighborhood, and district concerns.

It will be the purpose of the pilot project to further the common interests of a large and diverse community composed of many neighborhoods and activities. Therefore, the selected high school cluster must contain, or have the potential for, all of the employment, residential and educational components essential to a healthy urban community.

CITYWIDE STRATEGY

The City and the School District share objectives of a improving neighbrohood diversification and the stable city: balance of the residential population; supplying the range and necessary number of employment, service and recreational activities for that population; and providing the appropriate education for residents so that they may productively pursue those activities. To accomplish these objectives, the most typical and destructive urban ills must be remedied; among . them inadequate housing for a diverse population, inefficient and insufficient community services, poor schools, school closures resulting from a declining enrollment, crime and juvenile delinquency, racial isolation, and a lack of appropriate job opportunities. At a citywide level, the efforts of the City-Schools Commission should be to help develop a larger comprehensive strategy to coordinate public programs and available resources.*

^{*}In addition to the current programs previously mentioned, several new programs are anticipated: a HUD grant to increase single family housing stock, a parks levy integrated with the school renovation levy, and a variety of planning and campaign efforts evaluating and marketing the amenities and advantages of innercity living.

The strategy should include but not be limited to:

- 1. A joint program to promote neighborhood diversification, including a growing but balanced population, varied in its economic means, diverse in its ethnic composition and comprised of inhabitants of all ages.
- 2. A shared effort to provide the coordinated delivery of human and community services and the availability of housing and jobs required by a stable but heterogeneous population.
- 3. Joint administration procedures for related community service and school programs (i.e., schools and park programs operating out of the same facility).
- 4. Review and analysis of City and School District
 operating and capital budgets to maximize integration
 of effort, and recommend mechanisms to
 institutionalize such review.

The policies of both governmental agencies shall govern the deliberations of the Commission. It is intended that the Commission will examine the efficacy of current practices to carry out the complementary policies of the City and School District, and will recommend modification of those practices as appropriate. Further, where new policies appear necessary in areas where coordination between the two jurisdictions is necessary, the Commission may present recommendations to both bodies.

The present area and school citizen advisory committees, and city neighborhood associations, must and should continue their separate functions, responsibilities and roles. It is intended that the operation of the Commission may increase the opportunities for communication between such advisory bodies on matters having significant implications for both the School District and the City.

COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

The Commission would be expected to plan, design, and recommend a pilot community improvement program within a target high school area to be implemented by the City Council and the School Board. In planning and designing the project improvement program, the City-Schools Commission will:

(1) identify and recommend the public service improvements which will address critical community needs and most effectively stimulate resident confidence and complementary private redevelopment efforts and (2) recommend selective public subsidization of essential private improvements.

It is contemplated that <u>consideration of the pilot improvement</u> program <u>will</u> include, and therefore the Commission's recommendations <u>may</u> encompass, the following:

1. Building renovations and school programs to provide improved educational offerings, a complementary and attractive educational environment for those offerings, and facilities for educational, recreational, and local public service activities.

- 2. Joint use public facility improvements with particular attention given to the effective reuse of underutilized and underenrolled school buildings (i.e., integrated park/school/community school improvements.)
- New and renovated housing which can attract and satisfy a family-oriented residential population.
- 4. Strengthening the local employment base consistent with the job requirements of area residents and supported by career opportunity/work study programs provided by local schools, community colleges, and industry.
- 5. A concentrated application of city programs for community development/public works, transportation, human services and crime control activities in a manner complementary to the public facility, educational and employment improvements proposed.

Comprehensive participation by neighborhood associations, area citizen advisory committees, and local school citizen advisory committees, as well as all affected agencies and interest groups, will be required in the development of the community improvement program.

The overall strategy and solutions to be recommended by the Commission to the School Board and City Council within the pilot project area will recognize the need for subsequent applicability in other parts of the city.

It is anticipated that the recommendations of the City-Schools Commission to the School Board and City Council would be sufficiently analyzed and carefully timed to permit approval and implementation of the pilot project by the School Board and the City Council. The pilot project could provide a prototype of coordinated planning in the future as well as a source of longer range recommendations by the Commission to both the School Board and the City Council.

PROJECT AREA SELECTION

Together, the City and the School District have initiated or are planning major neighborhood redevelopment projects in four or five areas of the city. One of these programs could provide the foundation, data, and rationale for the community improvement pilot program to be recommended by the City-Schools Commission. The City Council and School Board would select the target area following consultation with the Commission and with candidate neighborhoods and high school cluster areas. The selection process and criteria used would necessarily reflect the commitment of both the City and School District to maximize the opportunity for the pilot project to succeed. The pilot project is seen as a catalyst for an existing public commitment to address recognized community problems and opportunities.

THE COMMISSION

The City-Schools Commission will consist of nine members, four to be appointed by the Portland City Council (from nominations by the Mayor), and four by the Portland School

Board. The ninth member will be appointed by the Multnomah County Board of Commissioners. No members of the Commission may be City, County, or School elected officials. The Commission members shall serve without compensation for terms of two years; at the end of two years members may be reappointed or replaced.

The Commission shall be staffed by an Executive Director employed by the Commission, and the Executive Director shall be authorized to hire adequate staff support.

The Commission will be advisory to the Portland City

Council and the Portland School Board, but will have the authority

to make contractual arrangements for the expenditure of its

funds for technical and professional advice relating to its

planning activities and to assist the School Board and City

Council to implement the pilot program, including expenditures

on specific physical improvement projects related to the

pilot program for which funds are not otherwise available.

However, because the Commission's activities will involve

recommendations respecting City and School District resources,

the Commission shall request and obtain the prior approval

of both the Portland City Council and the Portland School Board

of such assistance or such specific projects.

All meetings of the Commission shall be public.

The Commission shall have authority to receive and disperse its own funds and to employ and direct staff. (Note: It is contemplated that the fiscal agent for the project could be an organization such as Portland State University.)

RESOURCES

It is proposed that the City-Schools Commission be funded with \$250,000 per year for four years. The City of Portland and the Portland School District will each contribute \$50,000 per year to demonstrate their commitment to the intent of this proposal.*

At the end of the four-year period, the City of Portland and the Portland School District will be under no obligation to continue the life of the Commission. However, both the City and the School District recognize the fundamental importance of the purposes to which the Commission is directed. Should the Commission achieve a significant measure of success, it is presently the intent of both the City and the District to continue the Commission in being if this appears appropriate.

lc 1/24/78

*(The following condition was discussed by the Board after they had adopted the preceding language.)

- The majority of these funds shall be spent on technical assistance and capital improvements supporting the planning, design, and implementation of the community improvement program. In each year, no more than \$100,000 shall be expended for the staff and overhead costs of the Commission.

ORDINANCE No. 145210

An Ordinance endorsing the concept presented in the Grant
Application for a City-Schools Commission and authorizing submission to the Mott Foundation, and declaring an emergency.

The City of Portland ordains:

Section 1. The Council finds:

- 1. The City Council recognizes the common commitment of the City of Portland and the Portland School District to stable neighborhoods and quality public education.
- 2. The City Council recognizes the desirability of improved planning, coordination, and cooperation between the City of Portland and the Portland School District to achieve common objectives.
- 3. There may be funds available from the Mott Foundation of Flint Michigan, to undertake a program designed to further the common objectives of the City of Portland and the Portland School District.

NOW, THEREFORE, the Council directs:

- a. The Mayor is authorized to make application to the Mott Foundation for a grant according to the Grant Application for a City-Schools Commission, in the form attached.
- b. Should the described grant be approved, a contract or grant agreement is authorized.

Section 2. The Council declares that an emergency exists because regulations governing the grant application require immediate application, and delay in application may result in the loss of opportunity to receive the grant; therefore, this Ordinance shall be in force and effect from and after its passage by the Council.

Passed by the Council, FEB 2 2 1978

Neil Goldschmidt, Mayor Alan Webber:cm 02-17-78

Attest:

Auditor of the City of Portland

of the City of Port



August 15, 1978

EJ F41

OFFICE OF PUBLIC SAFETY

CHARLES JORDAN COMMISSIONER

1220 S.W. FIFTH AVE. PORTLAND, OR. 97204 503 248-4682 Dr. Norward Roussell Program Officer Charles Stewart Mott Foundation Mott Foundation Building Flint, Michigan 48502

Dear Dr. Roussell:

Enclosed is our revised SNAP proposal. It is, I believe, consistent both with SNAP guidelines and City priorities.

Like "Project Grass Roots," our previous proposal to the Mott Foundation, the current proposal is designed to fill significant gaps in Portland's neighborhood action/citizen participation program.

Unlike Project Grass Roots, however, this proposal targets Northeast Portland neighborhoods, provides for City and neighborhood matching support, and is intended not just to enhance neighborhood livability through more extensive and higher quality citizen participation, but to explicitly promote neighborhood self-sufficiency.

As part of a Washington, D.C., trip I intend to be in Flint sometime in the next three weeks. When my travel plans are firm I'll arrange an appointment with your office, as your schedule permits, in order to visit with you about this proposal.

Sincerely,

Charles Vordan/PE

CHARLES JORDAN
Commissioner of Public Safety

CJ:ph

PROJECT SNAP

Summary: The City of Portland made a commitment to neighborhoods in 1974, with an ordinance setting out neighborhoods and bureau responsibilities in communications and citizen participation. Since then the number of organized neighborhoods has increased from 30 to 65. Four of the 5 areas in Portland have developed area boards. The area of greatest need today is Northeast Portland, where there is no area-wide board, 3 neighborhoods are inactive, and 3 neighborhoods never organized.

This proposal for Project SNAP would provide seed money to 12-19 Northeast neighborhoods in a racially mixed, economically varied district. The emphasis would be on increasing neighborhood self-reliance and improving the community.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	I. Background			
	A. Organizational Situation	1		
	 Structure of Portland Neighborhood System Funding Sources Technical Assistance Institutional Support Economic Description Foundations Citizen Organizations Institutional Facilities Block Organization Relationship to Decision-Making Bodies 			
·	B. Needs in Portland	6		
	 Programs in Northeast Organizations in Northeast 			
II.	Rationale for Starting Project SNAP	7		
	A. Rationale B. Objectives	<i>7</i> 9		
III.	Scope of the Proposed Project	10		
IV.	Management Plan	10		
٧.	Proposed Budget			
VI.	Strategies for Continuation '			
VII.	Evaluation Design			
III.	Dissemination of Results			
ttachi	ments: listed on next page			

ATTACHMENTS

- 1. Ordinance: City of Portland Neighborhood Associations
- 2. Map: Portland Neighborhood Associations
- 3. Demographic Profiles: Northeast Portland Neighborhoods
- 4. Economic Profile: City of Portland
 - A. Employment and Unemployment in Portland
 - B. 100 Largest Employers: Portland SMSA
- 5. Oregon Foundations
- 6. Northeast Neighborhood Councils Profiles
- 7. Assessment of Neighborhood Associations Needs in Far Northeast Portland

I. Background

A. Organizational Situation

Structure of Portland Neighborhood System .

During the twentieth century, Portland has experienced waves of neighborhood activity. After the enthusiastic building years in the first two decades, neighborhood people organized to work with the city to develop a zoning pattern to preserve the livability of their neighborhoods. During the 1930's, neighborhood councils were formed to work on the problems of juvenile delinquency and lack of recreational opportunities for young people. During the 1960's, neighborhoods reorganized in order to solve problems with zoning, freeway construction, quality of the schools, and other aspects of the livability of the neighborhood. In February 1974, the City Council adopted an ordinance relating to neighborhood associations, setting out their responsibilities and those of the bureaus. In order to solve the problems of communication with the neighborhoods, the city established the Office of Neighborhood Associations. In 1978, the ONA is working through five field offices, three of which are under contract to neighborhood corporations to provide services in neighborhood participation.

The city actions in 1974 expressed a commitment to neighborhoods, and neighborhoods have risen to this opportunity. Thirty neighborhoods had been organized prior to 1974, and since then thirty-five others have organized. With some form of organization in sixty-five neighborhoods, the city now contains fifty-eight neighborhood organizations and three unorganized areas in the farther northeast section of town. A copy of the ordinance relating to neighborhood associations is Attachment #1.

Neighborhood Associations around the city are at different stages of development. Some have been reactive, that is, they respond only to a crisis situation, or to a major planning effort started by the city.

Approximately half of the neighborhood groups function on a year-round basis, although they may slow down in the summer. They are working in comprehensive planning, on housing problems, improving the schools and their grounds, traffic problems, recycling, community gardens, and other projects of interest to the people who live within their particular area. At a still more developed stage, there are a small number of the most active associations, who have contracted to run certain social services including senior service centers, youth service centers, neighborhood offices, and other projects.

These latter organizations have undertaken programmatic responsibilities, and most of them are currently thinking about developing revenue bases of their own. Although they have been successful in their fund raising efforts as needed, these few groups, particularly in the inner southeast, the west-northwest area, and north Portland

are realizing that an independent revenue base would give them more resources for projects of their own choosing. They could become more self reliant, and it is expected that they will be moving rapidly in this direction. (See map which is Attachment #2)

As neighborhoods have developed, they have also banded together into alliances or coalitions for action on problems of mutual concern. Thus, the West-Northwest Review Board which oversees the neighborhood office is incorporating, as are the neighborhoods in southwest. Meantime, in North Portland, the citizens in 1972 organized the North Portland Citizens Committee, Inc., which is a single organization, a federation of seven neighborhoods on the northern peninsula of Portland. In southeast all the nineteen southeast neighborhoods send representatives to the Southeast Uplift Advisory Board, Inc., and in addition there is an Inner Southeast Coalition.

The northeast part of Portland has lagged behind this area or district organizing. In the inner Northeast area, that is between the North-South freeway and 21st Avenue, the area which once was the Model Cities area, has formed a district coalition to succeed the Model Cities board. Of the eight neighborhoods which once belonged to Model Cities, one dropped out of the coalition, and two new neighborhoods joined in with the remaining seven. Although some efforts were made two years ago to reach out to other organized neighborhoods in Northeast, they did not join the coalition. Thus Northeast is the one section of the city wherein some form of coalition does not unite the neighborhood throughout the area.

In addition to this neighborhood structure, a network of citizens groups has grown up around the schools. Although a neighborhood association and a school advisory committee or a PTA may frequently cooperate, for organizational purposes, they are distinct organizations. Portland's citizens groups may be summarized in the following table:

Type of Organization	Northeast	City Wide (excluding Northeast)
Local School Advisory Committee	29	74
Neighborhood Associations	13	45
Neighborhood Coalitions	1 .	5
Civic Organizations	6 City-wide	organizations
Title I School Councils	23	43
Community Schools	2	7
Business Associations	. 1	. 9
	6.70	*

⁶ boosters clubs

² merchant associations

² industrial councils

2. Funding Sources

The following is a list of funding sources currently used by neighborhood associations.

- 1--<u>City General Fund</u>: for youth service centers, neighborhood offices, street construction, traffic improvements, etc.
- 2--Housing and Community Development Funds: physical improvement to houses, streets, parks, and other projects
- 3--LEAA Funds: crime prevention activity and block organizing
- 4--Administration on Aging Funds: 8 senior centers in the city
- 5--CETA Funds: revitalization projects in neighborhoods
- 6--Youth Employment Funds: such as YEP, and YCCIP (Youth Conservation)
- 7-- Additional grants: Oregon Committee for the Humanities, and HUD's Urban Revitalization Task Force
- 8--Local Foundation Funds: most recently for purchase of Northwest Community

 Service Center.

Technical Assistance

Technical assistance is available to neighborhood associations from a variety of sources, including:

The Oregon Accountants for the Public Interest--aid in establishing budget patterns and setting up financial records;

Tri-County Community Council--aid with grants-writing;

Center for Urban Education -- training in planning and organizing;

Office of Neighborhood Associations -- working with public agencies;

Community Design Center--aid with planning problems;

Portland State Center for Population Research--aid with sampling methods.

In addition neighborhoods have been assisted by a large number of volunteers who have provided legal services, both in court actions and in procedures for incorporation; technical assistance has also been available on a volunteer basis from architects, planners, and people of other technical skills. The three neighborhood corporations which are contracting with the City have received assistance from the Internal Revenue Service and the State Department of Revenue with the paperwork on withholding taxes, Social Security, etc.

4. Institutional Support

Citizen participation is currently supported and encouraged by a wide range of governmental institutions in Oregon. Included among these are:

- The City of Portland--(1) Neighborhood assistance and review of bureau budgets; (Office of Neighborhood Associations)
 - (2) A community schools program (Parks Bureau);
 - (3) A comprehensive land use planning process (Bureau of Planning);
 - (4) Four precinct councils and a city-wide crime prevention program (Bureau of Police);
- <u>Multnomah County</u>--four quadrant boards to review and improve social services provided by the County
- State of Oregon--law requiring neighborhood involvement with the planning of residential care facilities (half-way houses, etc.)--also funding through the Land Conservation and Development Commission for planning efforts around the state
- Portland School District No. 1--100 PTA's, 103 local school advisory committees, free use of school facilities for the Community Schools Program and neighborhood associations

5. Economic Description

Demographic data describing Portland are included as Attachment 3. This material includes employment and unemployment statistics for Portland. (Attachment #4-A) The major industries located in or near Portland include forest product companies (such as Georgia-Pacific, Publishers Paper, etc.) but an increasing proportion of Portland's economic base is due to shipping. (Attachment #4-B) The Port of Portland is one of the largest outlets on the west coast, because the Columbia River drains a large section of eastern Washington, Idaho, and much of Oregon. Hence railroad terminals are located in Portland, and a large number of trucking firms. The region still produces a large percent of the nation's aluminum and other light metals, but these are located outside the city. The city has been working with the port to develop the Rivergate Industrial District, and the Northwest Industrial District. Lately, the city has been successful in attracting a large electronic components plant and other clean industries are being sought.

6. Foundations

A list of the largest foundations, and of the largest contributions of these foundations has been prepared by the Tri-County Community Council in 1977. The full "Guide to Oregon Foundations" is available

for review by neighborhood associations and interested people in the Office of Neighborhood Associations and other locations around the city. (Relevant pages are included as Attachment 5.)

7. Citizen Organizations

Neighborhood organizations in Portland act independently of the city, but work in cooperation with city bureaus for projects benefitting their area. Neighborhood corporations include the North Portland Citizens Committee, Inc.; the N.W.D.A.; the Community Association of Northwest Portland Inc.; the Irvington Community Association; and a growing number of other nonprofit corporations. In addition, most of the area or district boards are incorporated.

The Portland Alliance of Neighborhoods formed in 1976 to act as an independent network of neighborhood associations. Its main purpose has been study of mutual concerns, and advocacy. Lately, the participants have been focusing on the possibility of elections for neighborhood associations to be held at the same time as regular city elections.

In 1977, with funding from the Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon, Oregon Fair Share was formed. This is an independent citizens advocacy group; it has formed four chapters in Portland, and three in other cities around the state.

In addition, the N.W.D.A. is spinning off a number of other nonprofit corporations, including Northwest Housing, Inc., the Northwest Community Service Center, Inc., and a new credit union.

8. Institutional Facilities

Many of the elementary school buildings are open for use in the evening by citizens groups, including neighborhood associations. On occasion, the school district has loaned audio-visual equipment such as projectors. Slide projectors are also available from the Portland Bureau of Planning. The community centers run by the Portland Bureau of Parks and Recreation are also available for citizens' use, usually at no charge.

9. Block Organization

Approximately eighteen neighborhood associations have expressed interest in forming block organizations, or block homes over the last few years. Of these, the longest existing network is in the Irvington area. The most recent effort has taken place in Buckman neighborhood, where a crime prevention effort gave rise to 50 block homes. One small neighborhood association, Lair Hill Park, maintains that they can get a message to the hundred and fifty houses in their area within two hours. Most block systems are located in larger neighborhoods, and are not this swift. With LEAA funding, neighborhoods will be able to follow-up on their desire to organize blocks during the next two years. The main problem with block organization seems to be maintaining the system, and procedures still need to be worked out to solve this problem.

10. Relationship to decision-making bodies

Neighborhood associations and citizens groups have an advisory capacity to the City of Portland and its bureaus, to the school district, and to agencies of the state. An objective observer would concur that the influence of the citizens groups has been growing in the last ten years. Although they have participated heavily and influenced the outcome of major planning efforts, the planning was difficult and the negotiations extensive for plans such as the Northwest Plan, the Buckman Rezoning, and the Corbett-Terwilliger Plan. Several issues, including two freeway disputes and a number of zoning issues, have been carried to the courts. Thus, although the neighborhood associations have been working very closely with agencies in planning, they have not hesitated to take their case to court when it has seemed appropriate, and they have been successful there. Thus, through the willingness to negotiate and to continue negotiating until satisfied, and with recourse to the courts, the major neighborhood associations have avoided co-optation.

B. Needs

The community associations in North and in West-Northwest have shown great vigor in recent years. There has been a great deal of community development activity in North Portland and in the Southeast area. Area coalitions and organizations have formed in the West-Northwest area, in the Southwest, in North and in Southeast Portland. By comparison, Northeast Portland has many social service agencies and a large number of programs, but is experiencing organizational problems.

Programs in Northeast

Current programs in Northeast Portland include a Youth Service Center, several youth employment programs, a senior service center, a County Multi-Service Center, a Social Security Office, an outlet for food stamps, and a number of private social service agencies funded by United Way. The city's emphasis has shifted from physical improvements which were first approached through the Neighborhood Development Program and the Model Cities Program beginning in 1968. When Community Development Funds became available in 1974, the Council decided to emphasize other areas of the city to help them catch up to physical improvements in Northeast. Although home loans are still available in Northeast Portland, and although there are a number of park planning projects, the bulk of the Housing and Community Development funds are being expended elsewhere in the city. The emphasis of the city efforts has shifted in northeast to crime prevention and economic development. The crime prevention effort is involving the entire Northeast, and the economic development effort has targeted the Inner Northeast which was the Model Cities area. Currently, the city is initiating efforts to form an economic development corporation in Northeast and planning a major thrust in crime prevention.

2. Organization in Northeast

Of the 19 possible neighborhood areas in Northeast, 8 have active organizations, 5 areas are organized and work intermittently, 3 have been organized but are not now active, and 3 have never been organized.

<u>Active</u>	Existing Organizations	Inactive	Never Organized
Alameda Boise Concordia Grant Park Irvington King Piedmont Sabin	Columbia Eliot Hollywood Rose City Park Woodlawn	Humboldt Vernon Wilshire- Beaumont	Gregory Heights Harvey Scott Jason Lee

So the strong neighborhood bases which are required for a strong, overall area organization have been weakened by inactivity. The Inner NE Coalition has survived, but has no resources at its disposal to act as an incentive to neighborhood groups. The crime prevention program will lead to the formation of an area board for the farther NE area; representatives from both NE area boards will then sit on the city-wide Crime Prevention Program Policy Boards. Other factors have contributed to the problem in Northeast. Among them are:

- In the inner northeast, there is a large population of people with limited incomes. Survival problems of the families and of the individuals often take priority over organizing neighborhoods merely for neighborhood planning purposes;
- In the farther northeast, the city has never initiated any programs of physical improvement or planning efforts, until the Comprehensive Plan began in the fall of 1977. This there has been little incentive for groups to organize, and the groups which have organized have done so primarily because of traffic problems or desire to work with the schools;
- 3. In 1968 when the Model Cities Program was established, a line was drawn along 21st avenue which separated the inner northeast neighborhoods which had the greatest needs from the farther northeast which enjoy higher income levels—in this way, a pool of talented professional people was separated from an area where those talents are greatly needed;
- 4. When projects were established through Model Cities for the Neighborhood Development Program, the emphasis was on getting the job done, rather than training citizens groups to be ongoing and to take the initiative on their own.

The situation today would require that any programs instituted in northeast should be area wide, with the emphasis on training and proceeding toward a greater self reliance. This need also exists in Southeast, but there at least, organizations have formed both at the neighborhood level and at area-wide levels to cope with the problems.

II. Rationale for starting Project SNAP in Portland

A. The Pacific Northwest area has participated in all the major reform movements of this century in the United States, including the cooperative movement, the municipal reform movement, and the environmental movement.

Each of these efforts here has produced innovative solutions to difficult problems, and the activities in neighborhoods today are also trying to approach problems creatively. If the Mott Foundation were to choose to include Portland in the network of cities participating in Project SNAP, this would bring a widened geographic balance to the Foundation, and bring into the network a city which already has a city-wide program with a strong commitment in dollars. For the city's network of neighborhood associations, this would mean an opportunity to try a somewhat different approach in an area which has responded less well to the approach used around the city.

The City's approach has been to make staff available and to respect the independence of neighborhood organizations. City staff has assisted neighborhood groups to look around for funding for projects that they have wanted to undertake, but customarily, the programs which actually are funded are those which fit into the guidelines of grant funds available to the city such as Housing and Community Development Funds, Economic Development Administration Funds, or LEAA funds. The Mott Foundation approach would make it possible for the Office of Neighborhood Associations to work with neighborhoods on devising projects at their own initiative based on what is needed, rather than what is available. This more open-ended approach might be just the incentive that is needed to reactivate or organize missing groups in Northeast and to stimulate the development of an area-wide board.

The expected outcomes include:

- A set of short video tapes on successful projects in other parts of Portland to be used in northeast;
- 2. At least eight new community involvement enterprises (at this time it is not known how many neighborhoods would like to pool their efforts, so it is difficult to estimate how many projects will actually result):
- 3. The reactivation of three inactive groups, with at least one reactivation in each of the first three years of the project;
- 4. The formation of at least three new neighborhood organizations, with at least one in each of the first three years of the program;
- 5. The formation of an area-wide board to serve as a review board for Project SNAP;
- A community dialogue on the advisability and feasibility of expanding the scope of the area review board to consider other area-wide problems.

The sixth expected outcome is a rather sensitive concern as it is a question which will have to be resolved by the neighborhood representatives themselves. Consequently, at this time, although

it is certain that a dialogue can be carried out, it would not be wise to assume that a general purpose area-wide board will automatically result.

Some of the community development projects which have been carried out in Portland already and which could serve as models for projects in the northeast area include:

skill bank
tool lending services
credit unions
senior grocery
neighborhood history projects
day care mothers association

youth employment projects community gardens home painting campaigns recycling centers playground reconstruction food buying clubs or co-ops

The area selected is the most racially diverse area in Portland ranging from neighborhoods which are predominantly of black population to those which are quite integrated, to those which are predominantly Caucasian. Neighborhoods of these different compositions worked well together during the Model Cities time, and are working together today in the "Desegregation Coalition." Forming an area-wide Review Board would lend strength to neighborhood organizing efforts, and could potentially have an impact on the integration patterns in the schools in northeast.

Finally, the approach of the Mott Foundation makes it possible to think of these potential grant monies as seed money for enterprises which can lead to greater economic self-reliance in the neighborhoods. Economic enterprises on a small scale may be feasible not only in low-income neighborhoods but also in middle income neighborhoods, and where such projects do not produce revenues, they may save people money. In this way, the traditional Oregon preference for cooperative action may take on a new meaning in the urban neighborhoods.

B. <u>Objectives</u>

The overall goal for Project SNAP in Portland is to stimulate neighborhood activity throughout northeast Portland and increase neighborhood self-reliance. In order to accomplish this goal, five objectives are essential:

- Develop a training program in organization and in community development which can be used by neighborhood groups to train themselves now and in the future;
- Assist neighborhood groups to assess their needs, design and implement projects, and evaluate their efforts in community development;
- Reactivate neighborhood organizations where they are currently inactive;
- Assist neighborhood associations to organize where they have not existed before in northeast Portland;
- 5. Stimulate a community dialogue which will lead to a decision about the formation of an area-wide northeast board.

Both the Commissioner of Public Safety and the Office of Neighborhood Associations are committed to developing this network in northeast Portland. The city is already supplying a neighborhood office to the area, and it would be our intention to seek any additional necessary funding from appropriate grant sources such as Housing and Community Development Funds, Economic Development/Administration Funds, and Law Enforcement Assistance Administration Funds. The city's commitment to citizen participation is extensive and long-standing, and has accelerated in the last few years. Project SNAP could be the incentive to filling the missing links and a leap forward to greater neighborhood self-reliance.

III. The Scope of the Proposed Project

At the beginning, thirteen existing neighborhood associations would be involved in the project. Efforts would be made to involve additional areas, three of which have been organized but are now not active, and three of which have never been organized as neighborhood associations. Each of these areas contains a number of community groups and school groups which can be approached to seek their involvement. Profiles of the neighborhood association boards and general memberships have been prepared and are included as Attachment 6. In addition, a report written in the spring of 1978 on the farther northeast neighborhoods is attached for additional information on the unorganized areas. (Attachment 7).

Mott Foundation involvement is requested for at least three years, but Project SNAP would be welcome for the five years mentioned in the request for proposals.

Projects which people in Portland have been starting have improved and enriched the quality of neighborhood life; it is anticipated the projects begun under the sponsorship of Project SNAP would also improve and enrich the quality of neighborhood life. In addition, it is anticipated that these projects would be innovative and creative, and could be shared with other cities in the country.

IV. Management Plan

As in other projects in Portland, the decision-making will be decentralized to the most appropriate unit. The Review Board will be composed of representatives from the neighborhoods which are participating and issues which touch all of these communities will be discussed and decided at the review board level. Customarily, the review boards set work programs for staff people and set deadlines for work to be finished. Individual neighborhood groups assess their own needs and bring projects to the area board for discussion with other neighborhoods. The neighborhood associations themselves will decide if they wish to pool their efforts under Project SNAP into common projects.

If a Project SNAP grant is awarded, the steps which must be followed include:

- 1. Notification of all the neighborhood and community groups identified in northeast Portland;
- 2. Orientation and training workshops will be established as soon as it is possible to arrange for them;
- Neighborhood Associations will begin to assess their needs and to develop projects;
- 4. The review board will be formed and will be the judge as to whether the neighborhood projects meet the guidelines established by the Mott Foundation.

It is understood that the review board will look only to see whether the project meets the guidelines of the grant, but will not attempt to dictate the content of the neighborhood project.

Staff assistance will be provided by the Office of Neighborhood Associations, both at the central office, primarily for training purposes, and at the northeast neighborhood office, primarily for coordination. The northeast neighborhood office is currently staffed by a coordinator and a senior steno secretary. In addition, if CETA funding is renewed, the City Council will be asked to contract two CETA position to the Review Board. One additional position will be needed for a trainer-evaluator. This role is critical. An adequate evaluation will supply information critical to neighborhoods' ability to steer the projects in productive directions. The CETA positions would be filled by the community organization holding the contract for them or by a committee established by the sponsor. Typically this committee is composed of citizens who are members of the board overseeing the project. A similar arrangement can be worked out for the hiring of the trainer-evaluator.

A letter of agreement between the review board, the individual neighborhoods, and the Office of Neighborhood Associations will be written to set out in clear language what the responsibilities of each of them are. A similar letter of agreement has been developed between the Bureau of Police, the Center for Urban Education, and neighborhood associations from around the city for the management of the community-based crime prevention program. This method of working out responsibilities and expectations in advance is a key component of the management plan. The Office of Neighborhood Associations will participate in the discussions only to the extent of identifying what neighborhood and area board opportunities and options might be, as it has been policy of the Office to assist neighborhood groups to make their own decisions.

1.0 Process Monitoring and Recording

Most neighborhoods in Portland do keep minutes of their meetings, and the ordinance relating to neighborhood associations requires neighborhoods to record discriting points of view. This procedure will dovetail well into the process monitoring which is required by Project SNAP. Where it is not possible for neighborhood groups to record their decisions, then the CETA staff assistant could establish the procedures for doing so, meantime helping the neighborhood to find a citizens recorder.

All records can be kept on file at the Northeast Neighborhood's Office for use by the evaluator. Records will include attendance lists, minutes, including decisions and dissenting points of view. Additional materials generated by the project such as brochures or reports will also be kept among the records.

2.0 Process Strategies

- 2.1 <u>Decision-making</u>. Decisions about Project SNAP proposals will be made at neighborhood meetings after notices given widely throughout the neighborhood. Fliers will be distributed by hand or mailed at a bulk rate to households in the neighborhood. Funds for this mailing and printing activity are available from the Office of Neighborhood Associations, Northeast Office.
- 2.2 Recruitment of Members and Volunteers. Recruitment of members and volunteers varies slightly from neighborhood to neighborhood. Usually neighborhoods assess the needs of people who are interested and draw the projects from among these interests. In this way they are able to draw new people into the organization. Each project needs to develop its own committee or organizational base from among the neighborhood people, rather than drawing still more heavily on the limited time of the neighborhood associations' board members. The Office of Neighborhood Associations advises its neighborhood groups to use the existing communications networks within the neighborhood, for example, sending fliers home with children from the schools, using the community newspapers, both weeklies and dailies, contacting groups already organized within the neighborhood area, including clubs, lodges, gardening groups, business associations, and church groups.
- 2.4 Communications and Feedback. Neighborhoods in Portland have been using surveys within their newsletter for communications and feedback. They could also do phone interviews by drawing a sample from the reverse telephone directory. The city has conducted livability studies in three neighborhoods recently, including Boise and Sabin in the northeast area. Planning for housing and community development activities have also taken place in Piedmont and Concordia. All of these materials will be useful to neighborhoods in identifying their needs.

The project staff will assist neighborhood associations to fill out neighborhood need report forms in order to file their needs and suggested resources. These forms will be kept at the neighborhood office and will set the work program for the staff. They will also be circulated to appropriate agencies and will serve as the basis for additional grant writing. These need report forms have been developed during the last three years by the Office of Neighborhood Associations and are currently in use.

2.5 <u>Identifying Resources</u>. For an effort as extensive as Project SNAP, it will be advisable for the Northeast Review Board to approach the Involvement Corps and the Volunteer Bank to recruit citizens to help with assessing needs and identifying resources.

In addition to approaching the Involvement Corp and the Volunteer Bank, Neighborhood Associations can approach the Tri-County Community Council for information about grant funding sources in Portland.

Identifying resources in neighborhoods will take place by contacting all the citizens groups in the area and setting up an information exchange program. The ultimate method to use for identifying resources is the establishment of an information or skills bank. At this time, this is mentioned as an option available to the northeast neighborhoods, but the choice is theirs.

- 2.6 Linking with Supportive Agencies. The linking with supportive agencies is facilitated in the inner northeast by the location of the northeast neighborhood's office in the neighborhood building attached to the Martin Luther King, Jr. Elementary School. This location has made it easier to work with other institutions, as Portland State University, the 4-H Program, and the Highland Community Center Office are co-located in the same building. Within a few blocks the Albina Multi-Service Center and the Youth and Senior Centers are located. Contacts with supportive agencies at the neighborhood level will be facilitated by the northeast neighborhood staff and contacts with city-wide organizations will be facilitated by the Office of Neighborhood Associations central office.
- 2.7 Fund Raising. The neighborhood coordinator and the city coordinator will review the need reports to identify possible funding sources. Neighborhood staff can work with Tri-County Community Council to be trained in grant writing or in identifying additional resources. Additional methods of funds raising in Portland include garage and bake sales, but these raise limited amounts of funds. Neighborhoods have been participating in the NeighborFair held by the television and radio stations affiliated with the NBC station in Portland and this participation has raised awareness of neighborhood groups and assisted in their fund raising. To endure the long run, however, a project must provide incentives to participants, either by providing them a service in some cooperative way that reduces their need for cash payments, or by developing a project which has or can develop a revenue base of its own. In this category are projects related to housing, credit unions and other financial institutions, and tool lending services. In general, any project which can become a part of the regular cash flow of the neighborhood can have a more long lasting and pervasive affect in neighborhood. Neighborhood Associations will be encouraged to choose projects of these types, and will be supplied with information about how other neighborhoods have started such projects.
- West Side television program has been highlighting neighborhood activities in an objective and interesting way through using video tape. As just one example, KGW covered the Buckman Community Association Drive for crime prevention. When the tape was completed and after it had been shown on television, KGW gave a copy of the tape to be used by the Crime Prevention Unit in informing other neighborhoods. This technique was instumental in bringing together representatives from many neighborhoods to write a grant for a city-wide crime prevention program. The School District has video taping equipment as does the Cencer for Urban Education, among others. Because this technique has been successful, ONA proposes the build it into the Project SNAP.

A fifteen to twenty minutes video is often more effective than written reports, especially with busy people or those who are more comfortable with television than the printed page. Portions of the video tape materials can be preserved by copying important excerpts, and it is then possible to re-use the tape. Video tape is both easier to use than film and more economical. In addition, it is easily transportable.

Through the use of video tape it is possible to show the neighborhood boards at work discussing and defining their needs, and it is possible to show them on the doorsteps in the neighborhood. Video taping real exchanges between citizens and city officials or school officials is a way to demonstrate that these officials are cooperative and responsive to citizens requests. Problems can be explored and when potential solutions are emerging, it is possible to video tape the discussions. This tape can then be viewed by citizens when they have time either in the school buildings or in the libraries. This medium is flexible and makes an impression where the written page does not.

Content Analysis. Content analysis is a technique that has not been used in Portland with regard to neighborhood minutes or decisions to this time. Part of the reason for not using content analysis is its general unfamilarity; and second, rarely are exact transcripts available. If actual discussions are video taped, then it will be possible to arrange for content analysis of the materials, including actual exchanges between citizens and public officials. If a content analysis is conducted, then the trainerevaluator will be responsible for collecting the information to be analyzed. He or she will be responsible for conducting the evaluation for the content analysis either by doing the work or by arranging for the work to be done through the University, if possible. In any case, the trainer-evaluator will write evaluative reports for discussion by the Review Board and will be responsible for incorporating citizen suggestions into the written reports.

V. PROPOSED BUDGET

SNAP FUNDS	FOR 12-19 NEIGHBORHOODS	MATCH FROM NEIGHBORHOODS
Year I	\$60,000 - \$95,000	
II	\$48,000 - \$76,000	\$12,000 - \$19,000
III	\$36,000 - \$57,000	\$24,000 - \$38,000
IV	\$24,000 - \$38,000	\$36,000 - \$57,000
v	\$12,000 - \$19,000	\$48,000 - \$76,000
* •		
TOTAL	\$180,000 - \$285,000	\$120,000 - \$190,000

ADMINISTRATION BUDGET FOR FIRST YEAR

			,		
Requested from Mott Foundation			City of Portland Contribution		
Trainer-Evaluator	\$14,000	\$14,000		City Coordinator (20% of time)* Valued at \$4,000 + fringes \$5,000*	
Fringes Sub-total	3,000 \$17,000		_	hood Office 50% mailing, % of	\$23,000
City Overhead (including financial	6.3.600		coordinator a	nd secretary's	
records @ 20%) - TOTAL	\$ 3,600 \$20,600		Training		\$3,300
TOTAL	\$20,600		Video-tape eq (from school		\$1,000*
			4	Sub-total	\$32,300
If CET		If CETA is re	CETA is re-funded, ONA will		
* *				cil for 2 CETA	\$19,200
			+ fringes at	12%	2,300
		-	Materials		1,000
	w.	,	-	Sub-total .	\$22,500
F				TOTAL	\$54,800

^{*}In-kind Contributions

TOTAL BUDGET

Administration Requested from Mott Foundation	\$20,600
Administration Requested from City of Portland Contributions	\$54,800
TOTAL ADMINISTRATION	\$75,400
SNAP Funds for Neighborhoods	\$180,000 - \$285,000
TOTAL BUDGET RANGE	
lst Year	\$255,400 - \$360,400

VI. Strategies for Continuation

The strategies for continuation begin with sound training at the start of the Project. Neighborhood associations have existed in Portland for over ten years, and there seems to be little concern at this time about whether or not they will survive into the future. Many are at the stage now, however, where they recognize the need to develop an ongoing revenue base. They have been reaching out to seek materials to train themselves to set up more self-sustaining projects.

Materials from around the country will be used to help train neighborhoods in greater self reliance. The National Conference on Neighborhood Councils, working with a contract from the HUD Office of Neighborhood Development, prepared two video tapes which are relevant to Project SNAP. The first tape is entitled "Economic Self Help for Neighborhoods", and presents the concept of the neighborhood as an economic unit. Projects from around the country are discussed by the people who helped them get started, including a discussion of their funding sources. The second tape is entitled "Neighborhood Organizing" wherein citizens groups reveal their organizing techniques and discuss three mutual concerns: organizing transient neighborhoods, developing coalitions or alliances, and developing working relationships with the government. These tapes will be used to lay a good foundation and will enable neighborhoods to develop some strategies for continuation in light of what else is going on around the country.

Neighborhoods will be encouraged by the staff to consider projects which can be developed into revenue producing enterprises or projects in which the exchange of services is a substitute for cash payments. These two types of enterprises provide their own incentives for continuation.

Models in Portland include: tool banks, skill exchanges, the day care mothers association, cooperative store for senior citizens, a non-profit housing corporation in Northwest Portland, and credit unions. Not all of the neighborhoods will be interested in producing a revenue enterprise, or in cutting their individual household expenses by exchange of services. It is anticipated that others will be particularly interested in working on projects for the improvement of the schools. If it is possible for them to save expenditures for the schools, then the schools may be willing to continue to carry on this innovation.

Success provides the most important incentive for neighborhood associations to continue working. Usually, neighborhoods start with small and medium size projects and gradually work their way to larger successes; thus they gain confidence as they go, and the group will be more likely to continue.

VII. Evaluation Design

Evaluation is an integral part of the project, because good information supplied in a timely fashion can be used by neighborhood people to steer their project to a successful conclusion. In order to fulfill the requirements of Project SNAP, evaluation must be conducted in two parts: a formative evaluation, that is, process monitoring to determine how well each element in the system is working; second, summarive evaluation, in which final outcomes are compared to the beginning situation or compared to a control group.

Formative Evaluation

The developmental elements of the project include 1) notification to the community about Project SNAP 2) orientation to the requirements of Project SNAP and its opportunities 3) developing a review board 4) conducting needs assessments 5) inventorying resources and developing a project, and 6) recruiting membership and volunteers.

It is not possible at this time to state what all the objectives of the evaluation will be, as these are decisions which lie in the hands of the project review board after advice and information from the trainer-evaluator. It is possible however, to give some illustrative objectives. They could include the following:

- 1. Announce the award of a Project SNAP grant widely throughout the city and the Northeast community. This objective will be met by placing notices in three weekly papers published in Northeast, and two daily newspapers. In addition fliers can be sent home with children in the Northeast schools and announcements can be placed on neighborhood fliers. The effort will be to reach all of those households currently listed on neighborhood mailing lists or on PTA mailing lists.
- 2. Conduct an orientation on Project SNAP within thirty days of the announcement of the grant in the newspapers. The first orientation workshop should be set at a time and place appropriate for 80% of the existing neighborhoods to be represented. The worth of the orientation session will be measured in part by evaluation forms which will be given to all those who attend. The orientations will be videotaped for re-play later by groups unable to attend the first orientation session. The videotape will include reactions of people at the orientation session.
- 3. Northeast neighborhoods will be encouraged to reach a decision about a project review board and its composition within sixty days of the orientation session. They will be able to choose between expanding the existing inner Northeast coalition of neighborhoods, or starting a new project review board. The effectiveness of the board can be evaluated through the ability of the member representatives to form at least three essential committees within ninety days of the announcement of the grant--committees for project review, evaluation, and training.
- 4. Conduct needs assessments in at least 80% of the neighborhoods represented at the initial orientation session. Need report forms will be filled out by the end of the sixth month of the grant by eight neighborhoods. They will be reviewed and a decision made by the project review board within two months of the receipt of the need report, or within a reasonable time, if two months is not possible.
- 5. Develop inventories of resources available to neighborhoods and indicate which resources are missing in order to meet the projects as shown on the need report forms. This inventory will be conducted along with staff assistance and will be finished within one month of the submission of the need report forms to the project review heard.

6. By the end of the first year of the project, begin the formation of two new neighborhood groups and start the reactivation of two neighborhood groups. It is expected that one group will have been organized to the point where it will be undertaking activities such as the need assessments and inventories by the end of that first year, and that both of the reactivated groups will be able to reach this point by the end of the first year. The videotapes prepared at the original orientation and in the study of any neighborhood projects around the city will be made available to these new and reactivated groups.

As part of the resource inventory process, neighborhoods will assess how many volunteers are actually available to work on any given project, and how many are needed to accomplish the project. Each neighborhood will be expected to decide by what percentage they would like to increase their membership and volunteer groups within the first year of the project. These percentages will vary from area to area depending upon how active the citizens group has been in the past.

Summative evaluation

Each neighborhood will be responsible for setting criteria for summative evaluation in cooperation with the evaluator-trainer. The overall criteria for summative evaluation will be decided by the project review board. It is suggested here by the staff that the summative evaluation shall be concerned with: the formation of the review board and its committees, the expected outcomes of forming new neighborhood groups and reactivating ones which once were active, the undertaking of new projects by neighborhoods within the chosen area, and the amount of community dialogue which results from all of this activity, both among the neighborhoods in Northeast and between these neighborhoods and other neighborhoods around the city.

Neighborhood representatives will probably ask the Mott Foundation to send examples of how neighborhoods in other cities set their evaluation techniques.

VIII. Dissemination of Results

The videotapes prepared with neighborhood people for their use in orientation and in training will be available to be used by neighborhoods in other parts of the city or in the Pacific Northwest. Neighborhoods themselves may be able to produce slide shows with a tape cassette accompaniment at a lesser cost which may also be disseminated to other neighborhoods around the region. These slide shows could focus on model projects, including projects and solutions which neighborhoods have developed to solve these problems.

With the kind of experience which can be gained by neighborhoods using seed money from Project SNAP, it should be possible to determine exactly what resources are needed to start projects of different types. Neighborhoods in other parts of this region would then be in a better position to start these projects by knowing just what the limits are, and how much they would need in the way of resources to be successful. Frequently, it

is reluctance to get too deeply into something without any chance of success that limits participation in a new project. With better information and with wider dissemination of the success stories, it should be possible to stimulate other neighborhoods to start.

When there is a track record of successes, other neighborhoods should be enabled to approach local foundations for small amounts of money to serve as seed money for projects of their own or projects similar to those already undertaken. In other words, Project SNAP and its results can lend credibility to neighborhood self reliance. This would be a major improvement in the organizational climate of Portland at the present time. The projects themselves would enrich community life and give a sense of pride to the founders.

DRAFT FOR



I. BACKGROUND

A. Organizational Structure,

The City of Portland formally inaugurated a citizen participation program in February, 1974 with the passage of an ordinance entitled Neighborhood Associations. Prior to this time, 30 organizations had already formed. In fact, Portland has known three earlier waves of citizen activity - from 1904-1914, citizens organized to gain the initiative, the referendum, the recall, and the direct election of Senators; in the twenties, they organized to develop zoning codes; in the 1930's, sixteen neighborhood councils formed to fight delinquency and start recreation programs for youth. Today's efforts focus on maintaining and improving the livability of the neighborhood through planning for land use, traffic control, zoning, and community development; as well as the delivery of social services (youth centers, senior centers) and crime prevention activities.

In addition to working with 48 organizations formed in a total of 61 neighborhoods, City bureaus review their goals and budgets with 8 budget advisory committees (now in their 4th year). Both the bureaus and the advisory committees receive "need reports" sent in by neighborgroups, which include requests both for services and capital improvements.

In order to address the important problems of safety and security, the City Bureau of Police has formed 4 precinct councils in the last two years, which will now be responsible for working with neighborhood groups to prepare crime prevention plans.

In sum, an active citizen participation program offers a variety of opportunities to the citizens at different scales: so far, the program in Portland has addressed the city-wide level, the district level, and the neighborhood level.

B. Needs

The problem now is that although neighborhoods have been asked to take on significant responsibilities and have gained a measure of influence, they have not yet received the technical assistance which would help them to reach the citizens at the grass roots in every part of their area. Thus, the neighborhood associations' ability to respond to the challenges facing them is limited to the time which can be afforded by the active members of the organization. Eighteen neighborhoods are known to have tried organizing either by the block or sub-section of the neighborhood. Of these, a few have functioning systems. The rest have encountered technical problems in planning and carrying out their idea of a grass roots membership drive, and have bogged down in frustration or lack of understan-

II. RATIONALE

A. Goal Statement

The goal of this proposal is to start <u>Project Grass Roots</u> whereby the City's Office of Neighborhood Associations provides technical assistance to each neighborhood in turn in order to help the neighborhood associations carry out the work of organizing their own residents and businesses at the grass roots level. The end result would be viable communications networks within the neighborhoods reaching from and to each corner of the area, where the basic unit

is the block or combinations of two to six blocks, depending on the population density, more citizens could be included in neighborhood decision-making and in programs to help make the area safer and more livable.

B. Objectives

The goal of Project Grass Roots is composed of four objectives both for the Office of Neighborhood Associations and for the neighborhood groups.

For the Office of Neighborhood Associations, the objectives are:

- To develop the technical expertise and training materials necessary for neighborhood groups to use;
- 2. To develop criteria for determining priorities of neighborhood needs:
- 3. To provide planning assistance to neighborhood groups as they develop organizing plans suitable to their neighborhood;
- 4. To evaluate and publish the results.

For the neighborhoods, the objectives would be:

- 1. To determine whether the neighborhood wishes to organize at the grass roots level and collect evidence of the neighborhood's wishes as to the utility and potential benefits of the system;
- 2. To work with the Office of Neighborhood Association's technical assistance to develop a plan for organizing, including:
 a) the goals and objectives and uses of the network, b) the type of scale (block or subsection), c) the number of volunteers and staff-time needed to carry out the work, and d) other aspects of implementation continuation and evaluation.

- 3. To aid in choosing, training, and coordinating volunteers and staff as the work is carried out.
- 4. To evaluate the results of their work, and assist in communicating information and process and results to other neighborhoods.

C. Expected Outcomes

Neighborhood responses will vary in form, but their commitment to a future for the neighborhood will be apparent. They will view the network as a communications system to pass messages out to as many households as possible and as a means of receiving back citizen opinions. The network should also serve as a means of bringing volunteers onto neighborhood committees and projects as well as developing neighborhood leadership. More blocks should also become active on their own behalf. Each of these elements can be measured.

Without compromising the neighborhoods' own decision-making process, it is probably accurate to say that the content of most neighborhood programs will focus on one or more of the following: safety of the area through crime prevention programs, comprehensive land use planning, development of skill and tool exchanges, clean-up and recycling efforts, development of recreational resources for the children, community gardens, and possibly, community education energy projects. Each of these programs exist now in Portland, but are not as widely spread among all the neighborhoods as they might be. Once again, the increasing numbers of programs and participants can be measured.

III. MANAGEMENT OF THE PROJECT

Funds are being sought for this project by the Office of Neighborhood Associations, and will be responsible for administering them with the

advice and consent of an advisory committee. The actual management of the project will be a joint effort between staff from the Office of Neighborhood Associations and the participating neighborhood associations. The coordinator of the Office of Neighborhood Associations will administer the funds with the aid of an administrative assistant funded by the project. The actual organizing will be carried out by volunteers with the aid of personnel selected through mutual consent of the elected Commissioner responsible for the Office of Neighborhood Associations and the participating neighborhood organizations.

Casacidios

Evaluation may be carried out by Office of Neighborhood staff hired for the purpose or by contract with persons or firms mutually agreeable to the Office of Neighborhood Associations and the participating neighborhood associations.

IV. SCOPE OF PROPOSED PROJECT

Today, 48 organizations have formed in 61 neighborhoods, leaving 5 or 6 neighborhoods still to organize. Project Grass Roots would try to work with each one of these neighborhoods to help them increase their depth and coverage. With the help of the advisory committee, the Office of Neighborhood Associations would draw up criteria for determining the number and types of neighborhoods to work with in each of the three years of the project. A start-up time of 8 months is projected to prepare standards, training materials, and the initial neighborhood plans for organizing. Possibly two neighborhoods in each of the city's five districts could receive aid the first year, and then volunteers from these could help the other aid the first year, and the remaining two years.

VI. STRATEGIES FOR CONTINUING WITHOUT FOUNDATION SUPPORT

grant for starting block or sector clubs, but neighborhoods may program the use of funds over more than one year. As part of their initial plan, neighborhoods shall indicate how much money is necessary, if any, to maintain their communication network annually, and the methods they will use to raise these funds. A three-year commitment will be requested. Since dues may be voluntary only according to Ordinance 3.96.030(a) neighborhood boards may wish to consult The Grass Roots Fundraising Book by Joan Flanagan.

The funds to the individual neighborhood shall be viewed as a one-time

The City currently funds all or part of five neighborhood offices for use by neighborhood associations. These offices will continue as a communication for as long as the City Council funds them, but each neighborhood should be able to continue the funding of their own network.

VII. EVALUATION

Each neighborhood plan will contain a section on evaluating their efforts. Expected outcomes can be used as measures (see II. c. Expected Outcomes), and neighborhoods will be asked to report on the reasons for the successes and difficulties of their work. These evaluation reports will be kept on file for use by other neighborhoods, possibly at the Main Library and its branches, as well as at the Office of Neighborhood Associations.

VIII. DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION

of Neighborhoods.

In addition to being kept on file at the Office of Neighborhood Associations and the library, summaries of the evaluation reports will be prepared for distribution to other neighborhoods or cities. Faculty at local colleges will be asked to analyze the findings, so that a booklet of reports can be published. This booklet could then be made available through the Mott Foundation, the National Self-Help Resource Center Network, the National Conference on Neighborhood Councils, and the National Association

The fundamental premises of the budget are: 1) each of the existing organized neighborhoods (61 in 1977) shall receive an equal amount of money to carry out their efforts to reach the grass roots; 2) funds are also prequested for the 6 non-organized coming can who because it is articipated that they will be combes plass ready by the end of the within 3 years; 3) the finds will be available one a 3.5 year timespan, including tight months of start-up time; 4) neighborhoods may prol their allocations to work together or work alone, and they may spread 5) at lest one pilot for 35 years project will be started in each of the city's budget tis calculated to total \$ 555,966 Lord of neighborhoods × 6,000, neighborhoods \$ 402,000 15,050 7 20% of SALARY FOR CITY COORDINATION AT ONA ASSISTANT AT 69, 256 ADMINISTRATIVE \$7/HR X 3.5 YEARS. (18,500/ANWWAL SALARYE BONEFITS 14 560 14,560 \$26%.) 3880 18360 10,500 Central Supplies, printing, etc. 18,200 19,474 City overhead cost on items 2,3 & 4 at 20%. 18, 960 20,642 694,806 40,200 6) Evaluation at 10% of Wh funds. 766 26,50\$.6 Ist year would

725,800 +5160

The budget for the first year would total \$6,800 7) Funds for 5 pilot projects, involving 8-10 neighborhoods using part of their 50,000 3) 20% of solary for ONA city coordinator as director 5,000 18,500 3) administrative assistant Salary & kenefits 3,000 4) Cerkal Supplies 5) City we head at 20% on items 2,3, & 4. 5,300 5.000 6) Evaluation

Neighborhood Desegregation

September 27

Featured Speaker:

EDWARD J. SULLIVAN, Legal Counsel to Governor Bob Straub

Former County Counsel for Washington County and a member of the American Society of Planning Officials.

Panel:

CHARLES JORDAN, City of Portland Commissioner. Former Director of Portland's Model Cities Program and a Divisional Director at the Northwest Regional Education Laboratory.

MARK P. O'DONNELL, Attorney specializing in exclusionary zoning.

E. JOHN RUMPAKIS, Realtor. Past President of the Portland Board of Realtors and a member of the National Association of Realtors Neighborhood Revitalization Council. Time: Tuesday

September 27 7:30 - 9:30 p.m.

Place: Westminster

Presbyterian Church

1624 NE Hancock

Real estate credit is available.

This forum on NEIGHBORHOOD DESEGREGATION will define and examine exclusionary land use regulations and practices which have isolated racial and economic groups. The evening will also explore realistic policy options which encourage racially and economically integrated neighborhoods.

The forum is being sponsored by the Center for Urban Education (CUE) at this time to address the broader implications of the school desegregation policy in the Portland metropolitan area.

This event is open to the public without charge. For further information contact: Center for Urban Education, 0245 SW Bancroft, Portland. (503) 221-0984.

mott doing it, maybe apportunity. SNAP Tuesday. has to come thru city thru ofice. December. no competitu an uls. I. Beckground - organ, city PDY, specific needs.

A. Describe city rogal. Sith.

B. city needs SNAP cd.

B. city needs SNAP cd.

The Rationale for starting - copy neight helps city in PDX neight helps city in prove guil of starting import guil of the list spec otypes.

B. Ohjo continue to the list specific the products of the products of the products.

B. Ohjo continue to the list specific the product of the point of the product of the p II Strategie for Contry wit Pala Support The Dissemination of Ruto

mitted to the maybe appelled. SNAP Tuesday. hesto come there will, there office. Deemler no complish on 265 I Bedegrand organicto PH, speik suda. Teel how & wil I manged so that
expenditure peflet unuil decs. I Prop Bulget you for next 3 yrs.

Show out to go to conscile to

admine costs. In him item

perflects a phase-out of fluctures.

In exouple, I considered, there year,

yr. I \$5,000, x # yr. I 3,000 commelles les 10 ove 3 yrs. with approp total leperly upon # involed. Describe adminir exits.

Veguetel fru Hu pruj local Support

inkink

I Strategies / Court

to continue SWAP projs + processes

efter film support ceases The Evaluate Design

Lesc plan timeline of +

Mi Dissemination m to othe conneys of how they will be assisted for starty proj. Sart. more mita in process. What much to done how need. H. librit hre enough involved.

expond + improve commo link. Joan Planagon - Grans Ports Fundais, How to Rais Money I'm You Commy. Bos Nichol Dr. Norward Konssell. Norwood Roussell. Program Officer. Mottel Peln Bllg.

Flint Mech 48502

BUDGET

The fundamental premises of the budget are:

- Each of the existing organized neighborhoods (61 in 1977) shall receive an equal amount of money to carry out their efforts to reach the grassroots;
- 2) Funds are also requested for six non-organized neighborhoods because it is anticipated that they will be ready within three years;
- 3) The funds will be available over a 3.5 year time span, including six months of start-up time;
- 4) Neighborhoods may pool their allocations to work together or work alone, and they may spend their allocation over one or two years;
- 5) At least one pilot project will be started in wach of the City's five districts during the first year; this would probably draw in 8 10 neighborhoods.

The budget for 3.5 years is calculated to total \$555,966.

1)	67 neighborhoods x \$6,000	\$402,000
2)	20% of Salary for City Coordinator at the Office of Neighborhood Associations	15,050
3)	Administrative Assistant at \$7/hr x 3.5 years (18,500/annual Salary & Benefits - \$14,560 pto 26%; - 6% Cost of Living	69,256
4)	Central Supplies, printing, etc.	10,500
5)	City Overhead cost on items 2, 3 & 4 at 20%	18,960
6)	Evaluation at 10% of neighborhood funds	\$555,966

The budget for the first year would total \$86,800.

1)	Funds for 5 pilot projects, involving 8 - 10 neighborhoods using part of their funds	\$50 , 000
2)	20% of salary for ONA City Coordinator as Director	5,000
3)	Administrative assistant - salary & benefits	18,500
4)	Central Supplies	3,000
5)	City Overhead at 20% on items 2,3 & 4	5,300
6)	Evaluation	5,000
		\$86,800

The remaining amount of the grant (\$469,166) would be pro-rated over the succeeding 2.5 years when larger amounts would be spent by the neighborhoods.



INTRODUCTION

In 1975, the State Community Services Program, Department of Human Resources, initiated the SCSP Discretionary Grant Program. The purpose of the program is to provide limited financial support to new research or demonstration projects designed to improve the quality of human services to Oregon's poverty population. The grant program's policies and procedures were established with the advice and counsel of the Oregon CAA Executive Director's Association. Both the initial and continuing advisory role of the CAA Executive Director's Association is in accordance with the Community Services Administration Directive 7501-1.

All proposals submitted for funding through the Discretionary Grant Program are considered via the following process: Upon reception, each proposal is initially screened by SCSP staff for eligibility qualification. (See page iii, ELIGIBILITY.) Those proposals which pass the initial eligibility test are submitted to the Discretionary Grant Review Committee. The Grant Review Committee is made up of representatives from the Oregon CAA Executive Directors' Association; the various agencies of the Department of Human Resources; and local human service providers. All proposals are reviewed and rated according to certain criteria detailed on page iv. Points are awarded according to these criteria. (See page iv, SCSP DISCRETIONARY GRANT REVIEW CRITERIA.) Proposals are divided and reviewed in two categories: (1) proposals submitted by direct CSA grantees and (2) all others. Priority for funding is given to those in category (1). Final decisions on grant awards are made by the State Community Services Program Manager.

All information and instructions needed to complete the grant application process are included in the accompanying package. Agencies intending to apply are encouraged to contact the State Community Services Program for additional information.

NE-not tap deluctible. NW-trol bank N- 20.

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

- 1. Grant awards through the State Community Services Discretionary Grant Program are Federal Community Services Administration (CSA) funds, subject to the policies and regulations required under the National Community Services Act of 1974 and its amendments. In accordance with the mandate of CSA, the State Community Services Program shall give preference to direct CSA grantees within the State of Oregon.
- 2. Grant awards are one time only per project. Under this program, continuation or expansion of an existing program is not allowed. Determination of project status is made by the SCSP Program Manager with advice from the SCSP Discretionary Grant Review Committee.
- 3. To qualify, applicant's proposals must be "demonstration" or, secondarily, "research" projects designed specifically to serve the poverty population or some portion of it within the State of Oregon. For the purposes of this grant program, "demonstration" is defined as: a project to establish or show clearly the feasibility of new methods or new types of services available to the poor in Oregon. For the purposes of this grant, "research" is defined as: a project to develop new knowledge in new settings which will impact the operation or initiation of new services to the poor in Oregon.
- 4. It shall be the responsibility of the applicant agency to document adequately that other appropriate funding sources for the project have been exhausted prior to submission of an application to the State Community Services Program. This application package includes instructions on documentation and other funding resources sought for the project.
- 5. The State Community Services Program will not be responsible for requesting required information which is not included in the grant application. Applicant agencies are responsible for providing all information requested in the accompanying grant package.
- 6. Funding requests shall not exceed a maximum \$15,000 per project, with a required non-federal inkind contribution of no less than 20% of the total project cost. Application packages must adequately document the non-federal match by source and amount. Non-federal inkind is considered to be cash or funds from non-federal resources, except as may be specifically authorized by federal legislation (i.e., revenue sharing); or the fair market value of non-cash contributions provided to the grantee by other public agencies, institutions, or by private organizations and individuals. Inkind contributions may consist of charges for real property and equipment and the value of goods and services directly benefiting the grant program and directly identified to the project.
- 7. Proposed projects must have both a specified beginning and ending date which are within the fiscal year in which the grant is submitted for review.

- 8. Application packages submitted for SCSP Discretionary Grant review must meet the following requirements:
 - a. Prior to submission, proposal packages must be approved by the applicant agency governing board and signed by the board chairperson and agency director. Proposals submitted without proper signatures will not be accepted.
 - b. Requesting agencies must submit six (6) copies of the full application package to the State Community Services Program Office located at 772 Commercial Street SE, Salem, Oregon, 97310.

State Community Services Program will not accept proposals delivered after the time and date established as the deadline. The applicant agency is totally responsible for the delivery of proposals by the deadline.

- 9. Proposals submitted for SCSP Discretionary Grant review are not required to go through the A-95 Clearinghouse process. The State Community Services Program does encourage the applicant agency to coordinate information with the local Council of Governments.
- 10. PROPOSAL DEADLINE: NOVEMBER 4, 1977, 5:00 P.M. STATE COMMUNITY SERVICES OFFICE, 772 COMMERCIAL STREET, S.E., SALEM, OREGON 97310.

ELIGIBILITY

Any nonprofit agency or organization incorporated under Oregon Law to serve low-income persons may apply for SCSP Discretionary Grant funding. The agency or organization must be located within the State of Oregon boundaries and the proposed service must be within the same.

In select cases, profit-making organizations may apply for research project funding. The State Community Services Program Manager must authorize, in writing, any profit-making organization prior to proposal submission.

An applicant organization must have a copy of a currently valid Internal Revenue Service Tax Exemption Certificate or a statement from the State taxing body or State Attorney General certifying that the applicant organization has a nonprofit status and that none of its net earnings may lawfully accrue to any private stockholders. Applicant agencies who have not previously received Community Services Administration funding will be required to submit proof of their nonprofit status with the grant application.

The State Community Services Program reserves the right to refuse proposals from applicant agencies who previously failed to meet SCSP accountability reporting requirements or were deemed out of compliance with a previous contract with the State Community Services Program.

SCSP DISCRETIONARY GRANT REVIEW CRITERIA

Each proposal accepted for consideration will be individually rated by the SCSP Discretionary Grant Review Committee using the following criteria and point basis:

I. <u>DEMONSTRATION</u>

The proposed project is a "demonstration" project which will establish or clearly show the feasibility of new methods or new types of services available to the poor in Oregon. Adequate information must be provided in the grant package to assure the maximum utilization of existing information and experience which is incorporated into the project. The proposed project must either directly yield a direct human service or impact existing services. (Judged on overall proposal package.)

II. RESEARCH

The project is "research" oriented, designed to develop new knowledge in new settings which will impact the operation or initiation of new services to the poor in Oregon. Proposal 20 10 5 package reflects the use of existing research available in the proposed area of study. Examples of research projects include: feasibility studies, needs assessments, etc. The result of research projects is to yield information as opposed to a direct service. (Judged on overall proposal package.)

NOTE: POINTS WILL BE AWARDED UNDER EITHER I OR II BUT NOT BOTH.

III. NEED

The applicant agency adequately documents the need for the proposed service or research in the service area of the applicant agency. The project does not duplicate a service 40 20 10 presently provided by another community agency. (Judged on Section II of the proposal package.)

IV. COORDINATION

All information concerning coordination of resources and HIGH AVG. LOW referral services contributed to the proposed project must be included in this section. The section should describe 20 10 and document the utilization of all local, state, federal and private organizations resources directed to the project. This section is not limited to the non-federal resources used as inkind contributions. This section will also be used to judge the overall cost effectiveness of the proposed project. (Judged on Section III of the proposal package.)

5

AVG.

10

LOW

5

RESOURCES SOUGHT

Section IV of the grant package describes and adequately AVG. HIGH LOW documents the other available funding sources which were 5 20 10 sought prior to submission of the grant application for SCSP funding. (Judged on Section IV of the proposal package.)

VI. EVALUATION PLAN

Section V of the proposal package describes the process, HIGH AVG. LOW methods, data, staff and time frame to be utilized to 40 20 10 evaluate the implementation and effectiveness of the project, if funded, in terms of prescribed objectives. Objectives must be thoroughly stated in measurable terms on OEO Form 419. (Judged on Section V and OEO Form 419 of the proposal package.)

VII. CONTINUATION AND FOLLOW-UP

Section VI of the proposal describes the projected outcome HIGH of the project and how the information which results may be used within the local service area to improve or per-20 manently establish programs which will impact services to the poor. In addition, the proposal must show how the resulting information will be made available to other antipoverty agencies interested in establishing a similar pro-This section must also outline how the project will be continued if it is an ongoing program, following expiration of SCSP Discretionary Grant funding. (Judged on Section VI of the proposal package.)