

THE CITY OF  
**PORTLAND**



**OREGON**

October 27, 1978

OFFICE OF  
THE MAYOR

NEIL GOLDSCHMIDT  
MAYOR

1220 S. W. FIFTH AVE.  
PORTLAND, OR. 97204  
503 248 - 4120

TO: JOE GROSS, Bureau of Neighborhood Associations  
FROM: MARTY COHEN *Mart*  
SUBJECT: CITIZEN PARTICIPATION COSTS, PPS

When you try to assess just how much money or effort the Public Schools put into Citizen Participation, your answer is going to be determined by exactly where you draw the boundary line. The information here leaves out areas like teacher-parent relations, Board of Education activities, notices of school elections, and the child development specialist program; all of which feature significant citizen participation. The figures are mostly from the 1978-79 PSD budget.

- A. FEDERALLY FUNDED EFFORTS (including City pass-throughs of Federal money)
1. Projects under ESAA Title 7, ESEA Title 1, Title 4, and other Federally funded programs require citizen advisory committees to function at each participating school.
  2. CETA PSE-In Spring 1978 the following positions included major citizen participation elements:

Parent Education Specialists	3
Communication Involvement Specialists	28
Desegregation Aides	10

I don't believe these projects will continue this year.

I'm not including any dollar estimates for these federally-related programs, as the activities are defined by the original proposals under Federal and local guidelines.

---

B. LOCAL PROGRAMS

1. Superintendent's Office--a portion of the expenses identified here go for citizen participation. NA
2. Public Information (total) *does all printing* 56% <sup>102,090</sup> 204,179  
This includes enrollment reports, press releases, and miscellaneous flyers. A significant portion could be considered citizen participation.

Cohen/Gross  
October 27, 1978  
Page 2

- |   |               |
|---|---------------|
| 3. Administration/Planning  | 196,504       |
| Only a small portion (under 10%, perhaps)   |               |
| would be for citizen participation.   | *232,009      |
|   | 252 232,009   |
| 4. Assistant Superint. for Community Relations (total)                                  | 928,039       |
| A significant proportion of this budget would be tied to citizen participation efforts. |               |
| 5. Community Involvement  | <i>salary</i> |
| Includes Boise School support person and miscellaneous.                                 | 19,820        |
| 6. Community Relations  |               |
| Includes Community Schools, Civic Use of Buildings, etc.                                | 229,237       |

---

I couldn't do more than to guess what proportion of the above expenses go for the activities you are interested in. I can say, however, that the School District's efforts in the field of citizen participation are substantial, and are in many cases tied to legal and Board Policy obligations.

The person in the District to talk to about these meetings in more detail is:

Dr. Ernest Hartzog, Assistant Superintendent,  
Community Relations                      234-3392 x242

MC/mp

The Citywide Citizen Participation Working Committee has requested that the Office of Neighborhood Associations identify funds used for citizen participation by certain organizations and grants. Specifically, these organizations and grants are: VISTA, operating under the umbrella organization known as ACTION; the Economic Development Grant under the Department of Commerce; the Indian Education Grant under the Department of Health Education and Welfare; the Community Development Block Planning Grants under the Department of Housing and Urban Development; the Urban Mass Transportation Fund under the Department of Transportation; the Columbian Region Association of Governments; the Community Action Grant under the Community Services Administration; and the Port of Portland.

In most cases, "Citizen Participation" was not a line item allocation in the budget. In those cases, the time spent in citizen participation related activities had to be estimated and computed on annual salaries of the people involved. As a result, the figures are only rough approximations.

The funds for citizen participation for VISTA were among the most elusive to identify. There are several reasons for this problem. Much of the time VISTA devotes to citizen participation related activities is volunteer time. As a result, accurate accounting of time spent on various projects is difficult. VISTA has a high turnover of workers, both volunteer and salaried. This further obscures the amount of time spent in citizen participation activities. As a result, the VISTA source that was consulted about citizen participation in the federal grant to Portland could only estimate the amount of time spent by the program in this activity. Using the estimates of 75 hours/year at an average annual salary of \$12,000, VISTA spends an average of \$3,200 annually on citizen participation.

The Economic Development Grant from the Department of Commerce is a \$12,000,000 grant. Of that total, approximately \$20,000 is used for citizen participation. These figures were arrived at by averaging the number of hours spent on citizen participation times the average annual salary of those who worked on citizen participation.

A total of \$111,000 has been granted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the Indian Education Grant. Of that total, a line item total of \$2,105 has been allocated for citizen participation.



LCDC - Grant to P  
TRIMET - Dept of Trans 1-2 } To be  
P of P - gen budget - } investigated  
OONA - has \$700,000 at this time.  
Not for cit. involvement.

---

Don Macgillivray raised on all CP  
in city bureaus.  
Loving - bureaus contribute  
up ONA but don't

Mossini is sending copy of NH Assistance  
Act which is tax credit plan. Also in  
effect in Penna & Indiana. Being considered  
in Maryland & Minnesota.

Copies of budget chart.



The total budget for the Community Development Program is approximately \$23,200,000 for fiscal year 1978-1979. This total includes HCD and non-HCD funds and carryover monies from previous years. The operating costs of the Northeast Killingsworth, St. John's, and the Southeast Uplift offices, and the total salaries of the people working at those offices is shown in the table below:

<u>Office</u>	<u>Operating Costs</u>	<u>Salaries</u>
Northeast Killingsworth	\$ 9,000	\$76,000
St. Johns	\$ 4,000	\$59,000
Southeast Uplift	\$13,000	\$80,000

The Community Development 701 Grant is approximately \$100,000. The amount of this total used for citizen participation is approximately \$32,000. Again, this total was arrived at by the average number of hours spent times the average annual salary of the individuals involved.

Urban Mass Transportation funds are received by CRAG. Citizen participation, not only for Urban Mass Transportation funds but for everything under the jurisdiction of CRAG is a line item of \$69,500.

The Community Action Grant under the Community Services Administration had \$100,000 in it for citizen participation. This grant was given to the Regional CSA Office to be awarded on the basis of a competitive application process. The grant was open to competition in Region 10 (Washington, Oregon, Idaho, etc.). No grants were made in the Portland area. There are no more grants scheduled to be awarded to this region this year. None of the Portland Community Action Agencies have any citizen participation money. The agencies are PACT, North Portland Community Action Agency, and the Albina Community Action Agency.

Citizen participation for the Port of Portland is used in getting input into the Portland International Airport Master Plan and the Portland-Troutdale Airport Master Plan. The total allocated for citizen participation for the Portland International Airport Master Plan was \$52,000. The amount allocated for the Portland-Troutdale Airport Master Plan was \$41,000.

The information contained in this report has been condensed in the following table. If there are any question, call the Office of Neighborhood Associations at 248-4519.

Meeting called 12<sup>20</sup> Noon.

Jas Loring - Pres.

① Concerned about meeting - absent more than present. Should have 2 members from ea. group. No commitment kept.

② Not having previous minutes. John W. missing. Partial fault of John W & staff. Staff should provide minutes. Waste of time for all parties.

Recommended - Hours not supplied.

S.W. area reported to Mary P. in off-hand phone call 10/24.

Jas L. handed in report of his area. very cpt.

Mary Boyle gave out min. of last meeting.

Meeting Noon <sup>THURS.</sup> Oct. 26<sup>th</sup> - 106 City Hall

for OWA reports.

Decided to get all done that day.

Mary P. may send J. Gross as sub. due to budget meeting in her dept. in afternoon.

Joe G. explained figures passed out as to what monies (grants) had CP money. Crag & Dept of H. are clear-cut - line items.

James wants total of monies available as "identifiable" money.

P. of P. not line items.

1<sup>st</sup>. Estimates - costs not clear.

2<sup>nd</sup> cost - Salaries, operating costs, etc.

No report from Tri met - run around.

P of P also very vague.

5 almost \$461,000 incl salary est.

BUREAU	ORGANIZATION OR GRANT	UNDETERMINED COSTS	OPERATING COSTS	SALARIES
ACTION	VISTA	\$ 3,200*		
Department of Commerce	Economic Development Grant	\$ 20,000*		
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	Indian Education Grant	\$ 2,105		X
Department of Housing and Urban Development	Community Development 701 Grant	\$23,200,000* (Total Budget)		
	Northeast Killingsworth Office	\$ 32,000*	\$ 9,000	\$76,000
	St. John's Office		\$ 4,000	\$59,000
	Southeast Uplift Office		\$13,000	\$80,000
CRAG (Includes Urban Mass Transportation Funds)	CRAG	\$ 69,500		X
Community Services Administration	Community Action	Ø		
Port of Portland	Portland International Airport Master Plan	\$ 52,000		
	Portland-Troutdale Master Plan	\$ 41,000		

\* Approximate Figures



Gas Loving  
Joe Gross  
Mary Pederson  
Larry Day  
SE Don McGillivray  
Mary Boyle

10/

CITY-WIDE WORKING COMMITTEE ON CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

A Report

Committee Members:

James Loving, Chairman  
John Werneken  
Sharon Roso  
Larry Day  
Dell Taylor  
Robert Taylor  
Don MacGillivray  
Mary Boyle  
Ed Leek  
Bob Johnson

December 4, 1978

In anticipation of cuts in the Office of Neighborhood Association's budget if Ballot Measure 6 passed, a city-wide meeting was held on September 21 to discuss the future of the Office of Neighborhood Associations and its citizen participation support services. Some 35 participants from all areas of the City agreed that those support services are vital to both the City and the neighborhoods and should be sustained, and that a city-wide working committee should be established to that end. The Committee was charged with the responsibility of determining the range of citizen participation activities now supported by area governmental bodies, and with identifying alternative funding sources for neighborhood associations.

The City-wide Working Committee on Citizen Participation, with assistance from the Office of Neighborhood Associations and from Commissioner Jordan's Office, has undertaken those responsibilities. An additional effort it has undertaken is to identify the support services that citizens now provide to government in terms of the value of their participation in the process of governing. That participation, without which government would be paralyzed, is as important to government as the support services government provides to citizens.

The Committee learned that the city (including PDC), the county, the school district, CRAG, Tri-Met, and the Port together spend over \$1,000,000 annually for ongoing efforts to involve citizens. Another \$805,000 has been or will be spent on special projects such as crime prevention and the study of the Banfield alternatives, spread over a three year period.

The coordinators in the neighborhood offices worked with citizens to identify how many citizen hours were involved in meetings alone during a "typical month". The figures show that nearly 10,000 citizen-hours a month are coordinated through the City's neighborhood offices alone. Time invested in volunteer work outside meetings or in special projects coordinated by the school district, Tri-Met, or other agencies are not included in this total. Clearly, government is receiving quite a return on its investment.

Nevertheless, the Committee does not argue that the level of funding be increased at this time. Instead, we suggest that a more comprehensive, agency-wide approach to citizen participation will yield greater results for the same dollars. Further, we believe that a more comprehensive approach to citizen participation, as opposed to the present fragmented system may even allow cuts to be made in some citizen participation budgets without hindering the citizen participation process itself, if such extreme measures are necessary as a result of future legislative action.



The Committee has arrived at recommendations to provide for this more comprehensive approach. These recommendations are:

- 1) Relevant city services should be consolidated in the neighborhood offices and be disbursed from there. For example, much of the work of the Portland Development Commission, the Bureau of Neighborhood Environment, the Bureau of Planning, and street maintenance should be provided from the neighborhood offices.
- 2) A management strategy of assigned field days should be used, making centralized staff (such as with street lighting) available to the public in the neighborhood offices at regularly scheduled times. Through inter-agency agreement, the Neighborhood Coordinator should be able to respond to citizen requests by scheduling additional field days. With special projects (such as the comprehensive plan) staff should be available in the field at key times.
- 3) All agencies' efforts for city-wide citizen participation should be coordinated through the Office of Neighborhood Associations under inter-agency agreements. Specific services such as answering the telephone, minute-taking, or public notification should be contracted to the individual neighborhood office concerned. The distinction between neighborhood offices and the downtown office should be kept.
- 4) Neighborhood-based corporations should be established (as neighborhood-controlled corporations) to respond to community needs. The development corporations should be co-located and coordinated with the neighborhood offices. The Office of Neighborhood Associations should be directed to develop a strategy with the neighborhood associations for establishing such development corporations.

An additional source of funding for the citizen participation process identified by the Committee is modeled after the Missouri and Pennsylvania Neighborhood Assistance Programs. In those programs, state tax credits are given to businesses who contribute in financial ways to neighborhoods and community services. The Committee recommends that an Oregon version of this program be drafted in cooperation with State Legislators, and submitted to the legislature with the support of Council and other bodies.

We believe that a more comprehensive citizen participation process combined with a State-funded Neighborhood Assistance Program will ensure that vital citizen participation support services will be more effective to citizens and local government.

The following report was compiled by Joe Gross, Pacific University, and Mary C. Pedersen, Office of Neighborhood Associations on November 3, 1978.

In order to determine how much is being spent for citizen participation, we have had to be more specific in our definition of citizen participation. We did not include just any project where volunteers work, rather we said that citizen participation includes those activities where citizens are involved in decision-making. We then looked for the salaries of the people who staff citizens committees and the operating costs of the projects.

The Police Crime Prevention Unit pays one officer to serve the police precinct councils. The cost of this position is approximately \$18,000. In addition, at least 10% of the time of the other fourteen crime prevention staffmembers (8 civilians, 6 officers) could be counted, but we have set no dollar figure on those activities.

A total of \$45,000 has been set aside as seed money for citizens crime prevention activities. In addition, \$70,000 has been earmarked for public information (mailings, included with water bills, billboards, films, videotapes, etc.).

The citizens crime prevention grant, \$245,855, from LEAA includes \$202,615 for staff salaries, and \$43,240 for operating expenses.

The citizen participation funds for the school district were arrived at by separating out the budgets of the appropriate sections by the percent of the time spent in citizen participation activities, as defined above. This procedure was used in all cases except for the Community Involvement section which we were able to separate the salary of the Boise School support person from that section's operating expenses.

Additional citizen participation funds in the Oregon Department of Transportation (ODOT) were also identified. In each case, these were project costs and as such are one-time expenditures.

The source consulted concerning the Banfield Transitway could only identify the total citizen participation funds for this phase of the project. It was pointed out, however, that the degree of citizen participation in a project traditionally appears to be highest during the third quarter of any given phase of a project. The Banfield Transitway is currently at such a point.

The Bureau of Streets and Structural Engineering is conducting the Union Avenue Improvement Project. This dollar amount is then a one-time expenditure. Half of the salary of the engineer involved in the project is included in the figure quoted.

The costs to Multnomah County in maintaining a legislative liaison office in Salem were separated out from the County figures. These costs included salaries for a staff assistant available to the legislators and part-time clerical help in the office in Salem. Also included were the operating costs of maintaining the office. The subtotal for this is \$37,735.

The citizen participation totals are approximate in most cases. The reason is that most agencies and bureaus do not split out their citizen participation funds from other costs. As a result, accurate figures are impossible.

# X Volunteer Hours for Southwest Neighborhood Associations

Ash Creek	
Meetings & Planning	18 hours
Arnold Creek	
Meetings, planning, crime prev.	40 hours
Bridlemile/Robert Gray	
Meetings (Planning, Hearings, Board, etc)	103 hours
Research (Polling, staff reports, etc)	28 hours
Collins View	
Meetings (General, Board, Hearings, etc.)	58 hours
Research (Polling, staff reports, newsletter	15 hours
Corbett/Terwilliger/Lair Hill	
Meetings(Planning, Board, General,Hearings	150 hours
Research (Polling, staff reports, teleph.	80 hours
Newsletter (Layout, report. typing, mail	
and distribution, etc)	140 hours
Fundraisers (Art Quake)	60 hours
Homestead	
Meetings, hearings, research, polling	112 hours
Jackson	
Meetings (General, Board, Planning, Hearings)	84 hours
Mailings	12 hours
Letter, Secretarial, filing	30 hours
Planning and Research	50 hours
Candidates Fair	50 hours
South Burlingame	
Hearings, meetings	20 hours
Vermont (Hayhurst, Maplewood, Wilson Park,	
Multnomah)	
Meetings (Board, committee, planning, general)	42 hours
Hearings, Reports, letters, Crime Prev.	68 hours
<sup>CITIZEN</sup> SW people-Advisory Boards	60 hours
SWNI (Organization & Meeting time)	40 hours
Workshops & Bureau meetings	32 hours

---

Total 1292 hours



In anticipation of cuts in the Office of Neighborhood Association's budget as a result of the passage of Ballot Measure 6, a citywide meeting was held to discuss the future of ONA and its citizen participation support services. Some 35 participants from all areas of the city agreed that those support services are vital to both the city and the neighborhoods and should be sustained, and that a <sup>citywide</sup> working committee should be established to that end. The committee was charged with the responsibility of determining the range of citizen participation activities now supported by area governmental bodies, and with identifying alternative funding sources for ONA.

The Citywide Citizen Participation Working Committee, with assistance from ONA and Commissioner Jordan's office, has undertaken those responsibilities. An additional effort it has undertaken is to identify the support services that citizens now provide to government in terms of the value of their participation in the process of governing. That participation, without which government would be paralyzed, is as important to government as the support services government provides are to citizens.

The Committee estimates that some \$ \_\_\_\_\_ per year is spent by various governmental agencies in Portland for citizen participation (see attached summary). The committee estimates that the <sup>monetary</sup> value of citizens' contributions to government is approximately \$ \_\_\_\_\_ annually. (Attachment)  
Clearly, government is getting the far better part of the bargain. <sup>D</sup> Nevertheless, the Committee does not argue that

1000  
the level of funding be increased, as well it could.

Instead, we suggest that a more comprehensive, agency wide approach to citizen participation will yield greater results for the same dollars. Further, we believe that a more comprehensive approach to citizen participation, as opposed to the present fragmented system, may even allow cuts to be made in some citizen participation budgets without hindering the citizen participation process itself, if such extreme measures are necessary as a result of the passage of Measure 6.

insert additional wording

An additional source of funding for the citizen participation process identified by the Committee is modeled after Missouri's Neighborhood Assistance Program (Attachment 3). In that program, state tax credits are given to businesses who contribute in various financial ways to neighborhoods and community services. The Committee recommends that an Oregon version of this program be drafted in cooperation with Portland area State legislators, and submitted to the Legislature with the support of Council and other bodies. We believe that a program of this type should be instituted in Oregon regardless of the outcome of the Measure 6 voting.

In the event that Measure 6 is enacted, however, we believe that a more comprehensive citizen participation process combined with a State-funded Neighborhood Assistance Program will ensure that no vital citizen participation support services will be jeopardized.

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION1978-1979 BUDGET YEAR

<u>Departments/Agencies</u>	<u>Ongoing</u>		<u>Special Projects</u>		
	<u>Salaries</u>	<u>Operating</u>	<u>Salaries</u>	<u>Operating Costs</u>	<u>Unspecified</u>
<u>City of Portland</u>					
Office of Neighborhood Assns.	\$187,632	\$ 57,329			
OPD (Economic Development)					\$ 20,000
PDC					
Killingsworth	76,000	9,000			
Southeast Uplift	80,000	13,000			
St. Johns	<u>59,000</u>	<u>4,000</u>			
Subtotal	\$215,000	\$ 26,000			
Planning					
701 Grant					32,000
LCDC					167,000
Comprehensive Planning	16,000				
Parks (.5)	9,000				
Police					
Crime Prevention			\$ 18,000 + 10% of 14 Positions	\$ 45,000 (SEED Money)	
Public Information				70,000	
Citizens Grant (CUE & Policy Board) 18 months			202,615	43,240	
Streets and Structures					10,000
	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>	<u>          </u>	<u>Union Ave.</u>
Total	\$427,632	\$ 83,329	\$220,615	\$158,240	\$229,000
	<u>\$510,961</u>			<u>\$607,855</u>	
			<u>\$1,118,816</u>		



CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

1978-1979 BUDGET YEAR

Department/Agencies	Ongoing		Special Projects		Unspecified
	Salaries	Operating	Salaries	Operating Costs	
Regional (Continued)					
Port:					
Citizen Participation	\$ 19,500	\$ 7,000			
			Airport Study		\$ 51,896
			Rivergate		6,000
			Swan Island		10,000
			Subtotal		\$ 67,896
Public Information (5 Positions)					
Tri-Met:					
Public Involvement	30,000	7,000			
Marketing		2,000			
Service Planning	14,000	1,000	Banfield Project		57,500
Subtotals	\$ 44,000	\$ 10,000			
Total		\$111,500			
Federal					
ACTION					
VISTA	3,200				
HEW - Indian Education		2,105			
HUD	9,289	2,236			
Subtotal	\$ 12,489	\$ 4,341			
Total		\$16,830			

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

1978-1979 BUDGET YEAR

<u>Departments/Agencies</u>	<u>Ongoing</u>		<u>Special Projects</u>		
	<u>Salaries</u>	<u>Operating</u>	<u>Salaries</u>	<u>Operating Costs</u>	<u>Unspecified</u>

County

Intergovernmental Relations and Community Affairs	\$130,160	\$ 40,200			
--	-----------	-----------	--	--	--

School District

Public Information:					
Citizen Participation	32,000	35,000			
Information	142,000	19,000			
Community Relations	80,000	120,000			
Title I (Desegregation Federal Funds)	19,046	5,725			

Subtotal (C.P. Only)	<u>\$131,046</u>	<u>\$176,725</u>			
----------------------	------------------	------------------	--	--	--

Total (Inc. Public Info.)	<u>\$278,046</u>	<u>\$176,725</u>			
---------------------------	------------------	------------------	--	--	--

Regional

CRAG:					
Citizen Participation (4 Counties)	31,450	38,050			CETA
Public Information	11,000	30,000			\$ 72,000
Subtotal	<u>\$ 42,450</u>	<u>\$ 68,050</u>			

Total		<u>\$110,500 + CETA</u>			
-------	--	-------------------------	--	--	--

PORT

SUMMARY

ONGOING COSTS OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

<u>Department/Agencies</u>	<u>Salaries</u>	<u>Operating Costs</u>	<u>Total</u>
City	\$ 427,632	\$ 83,329	\$ 510,961
County	130,160	40,200	170,360
School District (Tentative)	131,046	176,725	307,771
CRAG	31,450	38,050	69,500
Port	19,500	7,000	26,500
Tri-Met	44,000	10,000	54,000
Federal	12,489	4,341	16,830
Total	<u>\$ 796,277</u>	<u>\$ 359,645</u>	<u>\$ 1,155,922</u>

SPECIAL PROJECTS

<u>Department/Agencies</u>	<u>Salaries</u>	<u>Operating Costs</u>	<u>Unspecified</u>	<u>Total</u>
City	\$ 220,615	\$ 158,240	\$ 229,000	\$ 607,855
CRAG	72,000			72,000
Port			67,896	67,896
Tri-Met			57,500	57,500
Total	<u>\$ 292,615</u>	<u>\$ 158,240</u>	<u>\$ 354,396</u>	<u>\$ 805,251</u>

PUBLIC INFORMATION

<u>Department/Agencies</u>	<u>Salaries</u>	<u>Operating Costs</u>
School District	\$ 142,000	
CRAG	11,000	\$ 30,000
Port		
Tri-Met		

(All are  
Approximate Figures)

MINUTES: Submitted by Mary Boyle

# CITIZENS' WORKING COMMITTEE ON CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

MEETING: OCTOBER 5, 1978, 7pm, rm 106 City Hall

Present: S.W. Dell & Bob Taylor  
Larry Day  
N.W. John Werkner  
Mary Boyle  
N.E. James Loving  
North Sahron Roso  
SE Don McGillavry

James loving called meeting to order at 7:25. Requested materials from OONA staff had not arrived, so persons present reviewed objectives of committee.

JOHN : Discussed possibilities of money from HUD for neighborhood office services. Alternatives will be needed by December if Measure 6 passes. Recommendations should justify funds to OONA and strengthen communication between offices and duplication of services. John suggested: rating other agencies and form one central Citizen Participation agency.

Mary Pedersen brought research compiled by OONA staff, including lists of federal grants requiring citizen participation, received by City of Portland. She gave a brief description and analysis of requirements of C.P.; and an explanation of funds allocated for C.P. money and who is utilizing these monies. State money was not incorporated in the information given. The state passed a law in 1974, all state grants must have citizen participation.

JAMES: Requested that OONA grantsman compile total dollars allocated for programs requiring CP.. It was noted that LCDC has CP grant money as does the Port of Portland.

Sharon: Suggested that each neighborhood office compile how much time, committees and meetings are spent on C.P., to itemize the volunteer and funded programs neighborhoods now participate in: This could result in:

- a) cross-city idea sharing
- b) possibility of consolidation of research and services to other agencies

James: We should have a solid recommendation by November. Alternatives to maximize OONA resources, but to maintain no cut in present OONA services.

Mary: Reported on National C.P. conference in Washington D.C. she had just attended. Sponsored by Tufts University, it involved consumer, environmental, neighborhood, women, civil rights and wide cross section of activist movements. General sense of conference was on funding neighborhood activities; most diversified base is best. State income check-off towards neighborhoods was an idea at conference. (not in use anywhere) The state of Missouri has a unique plan/law: any business contributing up to \$20,000 to a neighborhood non-profit group can deduct \$10,000 on state income tax and \$5000 on federal.

James: The committee requested Mary to acquire more information and data on "Missouri Plan".

The meeting was adjourned at 9pm.

Next Meeting: October 20, Noon, Rm 106, City Hall

The Citywide Citizen Participation Working Committee has requested that the Office of Neighborhood Associations identify funds used for citizen participation by certain organizations and grants. Specifically, these organizations and grants are: VISTA, operating under the umbrella organization known as ACTION; the Economic Development Grant under the Department of Commerce; the Indian Education Grant under the Department of Health Education and Welfare; the Community Development Block Planning Grants under the Department of Housing and Urban Development; the Urban Mass Transportation Fund under the Department of Transportation; the Columbian Region Association of Governments; the Community Action Grant under the Community Services Administration; and the Port of Portland.

In most cases, "Citizen Participation" was not a line item allocation in the budget. In those cases, the time spent in citizen participation related activities had to be estimated and computed on annual salaries of the people involved. As a result, the figures are only rough approximations.

The funds for citizen participation for VISTA were among the most elusive to identify. There are several reasons for this problem. Much of the time VISTA devotes to citizen participation related activities is volunteer time. As a result, accurate accounting of time spent on various projects is difficult. VISTA has a high turnover of workers, both volunteer and salaried. This further obscures the amount of time spent in citizen participation activities. As a result, the VISTA source that was consulted about citizen participation in the federal grant to Portland could only estimate the amount of time spent by the program in this activity. Using the estimates of 75 hours/year at an average annual salary of \$12,000, VISTA spends an average of \$3,200 annually on citizen participation.

The Economic Development Grant from the Department of Commerce is a \$12,000,000 grant. Of that total, approximately \$20,000 is used for citizen participation. These figures were arrived at by averaging the number of hours spent on citizen participation times the average annual salary of those who worked on citizen participation.

A total of \$111,000 has been granted by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for the Indian Education Grant. Of that total, a line item total of \$2,105 has been allocated for citizen participation.



The total budget for the Community Development Program is approximately \$23,200,000 for fiscal year 1978-1979. This total includes HCD and non-HCD funds and carryover monies from previous years. The operating costs of the Northeast Killingsworth, St. John's, and the Southeast Uplift offices, and the total salaries of the people working at those offices is shown in the table below:

<u>Office</u>	<u>Operating Costs</u>	<u>Salaries</u>
Northeast Killingsworth	\$ 9,000	\$76,000
St. Johns	\$ 4,000	\$59,000
Southeast Uplift	\$13,000	\$80,000

The Community Development 701 Grant is approximately \$100,000. The amount of this total used for citizen participation is approximately \$32,000. Again, this total was arrived at by the average number of hours spent times the average annual salary of the individuals involved.

Urban Mass Transportation funds are received by CRAG. Citizen participation, not only for Urban Mass Transportation funds but for everything under the jurisdiction of CRAG is a line item of \$69,500.

The Community Action Grant under the Community Services Administration had \$100,000 in it for citizen participation. This grant was given to the Regional CSA Office to be awarded on the basis of a competitive application process. The grant was open to competition in Region 10 (Washington, Oregon, Idaho, etc.). No grants were made in the Portland area. There are no more grants scheduled to be awarded to this region this year. None of the Portland Community Action Agencies have any citizen participation money. The agencies are PACT, North Portland Community Action Agency, and the Albina Community Action Agency.

Citizen participation for the Port of Portland is used in getting input into the Portland International Airport Master Plan and the Portland-Troutdale Airport Master Plan. The total allocated for citizen participation for the Portland International Airport Master Plan was \$52,000. The amount allocated for the Portland-Troutdale Airport Master Plan was \$41,000.

The information contained in this report has been condensed in the following table. If there are any question, call the Office of Neighborhood Associations at 248-4519.

# COSTS OF CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

3

BUREAU	ORGANIZATION OR GRANT	UNDETERMINED COSTS <i>estimates</i>	OPERATING COSTS	SALARIES
ACTION	VISTA	\$ <del>3,200*</del> <i>line item</i>		3,200*
Department of Commerce	Economic Development Grant	\$ 20,000*		20,000*
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	Indian Education Grant	\$ 2,105		
Department of Housing and Urban Development	Community Development 701 Grant	<del>\$23,200,000*</del> (Total Budget)		
	Northeast Killingsworth Office	\$ 32,000*	\$ 9,000	\$76,000
	St. John's Office		\$ 4,000	\$59,000
	Southeast Uplift Office		\$13,000	\$80,000
CRAG (Includes Urban Mass Transportation Funds)	CRAG	\$ 69,500 <i>CETA.</i>		
Community Services Administration	Community Action	Ø		
Port of Portland	Portland International Airport Master Plan	\$ 52,000		
	Portland-Troutdale Master Plan	\$ 41,000		

LCDC (B of Planning)  
 D of Transp.  
 \* Approximate Figures  
 Tri-Met  
 Port. (gov &)  
 County.

196,605  
 26,000  
 238,200  
 \$ 460,805

26,000 238,200  
 Star for estimates.  
 Mark for line items specific to C.P.

Some of the information on citizen participation requested by the Citywide Citizen Participation Working Committee was incomplete as of the committee's last meeting date. An attempt has been made to complete this information during the last week.

This additional information includes the CETA Public Involvement Program within CRAG, the costs incurred by Multnomah County in maintaining their quadrant offices and the costs to Tri-Met for citizen participation. The figures given for citizen participation at the last meeting for the Port of Portland have been broken down farther. According to the last source consulted, there is no citizen participation money for the Portland-Troutdale Airport. This point corrects information given to the committee at the last meeting.

According to sources in the Oregon Department of Transportation, funds for citizen participation cannot be broken out. At ODOT, all time whether citizen participation oriented or not is charged to one project number. Because of that system of accounting, an estimation of funds used for citizen participation would be difficult to make with any accuracy.

The information given at the last meeting has been combined with this new information in the table on the following page. If anyone on the committee has any more questions, please contact the Office of Neighborhood Associations at 248-4519.

Compiled by:  
Mary C. Pedersen, Coordinator  
Office of Neighborhood Assns.  
Joe Gross, Pacific University  
October 26, 1978

BUREAU	PROJECT OR GRANT	SALARIES	OPERATING COSTS	UNDETERMINED COSTS	ONE TIME EXPENDITURES
③ ACTION	VISTA	\$ 3,200*	\$	\$	\$
② Department of Health, Education & Welfare	Indian Education Grant			2,105	
① <del>Department of Community Development</del>	Economic Development Grant	20,000*			
② Department of Housing & Urban Development	Community Development 701 Grant	32,000*			
④	Northeast Killingsworth Office	76,000*	9,000*		
	St. Johns Office	59,000*	4,000*		
	Southeast Uplift Office	80,000*	13,000*		
① CRAG (Includes Urban Mass Transportation Funds)	CRAG			69,500	
	CETA Budget				72,000
② <del>Community Development Administration</del>	Community Action	Ø	Ø	Ø	Ø
③ Port of Portland	Portland International Airport Master Plan	14,900			51,896
② ODOT	Rivergate Task Force			6,000	
① County	Swan Island Task Force			10,000*	
② SCHOOL DIST.	North Portland Support for Neighborhood Assns.			20,100*	
⑤ CLCDC	Grant to Portland	95,000	88,939		
④ Tri-Met	Service Planning	14,000*	1,000*		
	Marketing	2,000*			
	Public Involvement	30,000*	7,000*		
	Planning (Banfield Transitway)	57,500**			
TOTAL		\$484,363	\$122,939	\$107,705	\$ 123,896

\*Approximate Figures

\*\*Includes \$15,000 Consultants Time and \$7,500 for time spent going to public meetings and hearings.

16,000 ongoing info + clerical spec.

54,000 printing workshops.  
3,100  
9,400  
67,000  
\$87,000  
graphics 20,000.

① ONA } CITY  
② POLICE }  
③ STREETS AND STRUCTURES

$$23.10 \quad \frac{250}{500} \rightarrow \$12.50$$

$$23.10$$

$$\boxed{250}$$

$$500 \cdot 2\frac{1}{2}$$

$$1250$$



Neighborhood All-City Meeting  
September 14, 1978

Citywide Working  
Committee on  
Citizen Participation

James Loving - Northeast Coalition, Chairman  
Sharon Roso - North Portland  
John Werneken - Northwest  
Dell Taylor - Southwest  
- Southeast Uplift, absent

Mr. Loving stated that the purpose of the meeting was to deal with concerns regarding the reduction in OONA's budget, city-wide. This concern was brought to the Northeast Coalition in July by Mary Pedersen requesting an alternative budget in case proposition 6 passes.

Each area chairperson gave background information on their neighborhood areas and what their neighborhood offices have done in the past and what they have proposed for the future.

#### Audience Discussion

Mr. Mark Mahon, Hosford Neighborhood, stated that they feel any cuts in the budget are inappropriate because if the city wants to maintain citizens participation they are going to have to leave some avenues open for citizens to participate in.

Chairman of Sellwood Association suggested that the budget could be trimmed administratively.

Ms. Patricia Holbert, North Portland protested against the tape recorder being used. Following the protest there was a vote to decide whether to continue using the tape recorder. The recorder was left on.

Ms. Marlene Bayless, S.E. citizens, stated that the city receives approximately 12 million dollars for HCD funding, which requires citizens participation by HUD guidelines; if OONA disappears what will provide citizens participation to continue the City receiving the HCD monies?

Mr. Loving stated that HCD funds could be an alternative to research.

Mrs. Ella Mae Gay, Northeast citizen, spoke against any budget cuts to OONA.

Mr. Gordon Ware stated that maybe neighborhoods needed to find alternative meeting spaces. He suggested that perhaps businessmen might donate space for offices and neighborhood volunteers could staff offices.

Chairman of S.M.I.L.E., suggested that they look at the services which neighborhoods receive, decide what is important by prioritizing services, and then look elsewhere for certain services.

Mr. John Werneken suggested the following:

- (1) develop alternative budget.
- (2) study ways and means of getting funds from other sources.
- (3) form a committee to discuss and develop future alternatives.
- (4) begin an organized effort.

Ms. Sharon Rosso stated that they should begin work on finding out where other monies can come from, but there should be no cuts whatsoever in services.

S.M.I.L.E. suggested that since there are five (5) areas funded by OONA, two (2) representatives should be chosen from each area to form an advisory board (working committee).

Mr. Loving stated that they would do the following:

- (1) form a committee to work on the budget issue
- (2) call a general meeting thereafter
- (3) have information before November election
- (4) maintain no cuts in OONA budget

Mrs. Rosso requested the citizens participation regulations and funding sources from OONA staff. Mr. Gordon Ware asked that letters be sent to individual neighborhood associations informing them that the project is underway and their input will be appreciated.

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 9:30 p.m.

MINUTES: Submitted by Mary Boyle

CITIZENS' WORKING COMMITTEE ON CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

MEETING: OCTOBER 5, 1978, 7pm, rm 106 City Hall

Present: S.W. Dell & Bob Taylor

Larry Day  
N.W. John Werkner  
Mary Boyle  
N.E. James Loving  
North Sahron Roso  
SE Don McGillavry

James loving called meeting to order at 7:25. Requested materials from OONA staff had not arrived, so persons present reviewed objectives of committee.

JOHN : Discussed possibilities of money from HUD for neighborhood office services. Alternatives will be needed by December if Measure 6 passes. Recommendations should justify funds to ONA and strengthen communication between offices and duplication of services. John suggested: rating other agencies and form one central Citizen Participation agency.

Mary Pedersen brought research compiled by ONA staff, including lists of federal grants requiring citizen participation, received by City of Portland. She gave a brief description and analysis of requirements of C.P.; and an explanation of funds allocated for C.P. money and who is utilizing these monies. State money was not incorporated in the information given. The state passed a law in 1974, all state grants must have citizen participation.

JAMES: Requested that ONA grantsman compile total dollars allocated for programs requiring CP.. It was noted that LCDC has CP grant money as does the Port of Portland.

Sharon: Suggested that each neighborhood office compile how much time, committees and meetings are spent on C.P., to itemize the volunteer and funded programs neighborhoods now participate in: This could result in: a) cross-city idea sharing  
b) possibility of consolidation of research and services to other agencies

James: We should have a solid recommendation by November. Alternatives to maximize ONA resources, but to maintain no cut in present ONA services.

Mary: Reported on National C.P. conference in Washington D.C. she had just attended. Sponsored by Tufts University, it involved consumer, environmental, neighborhood, women, civil rights and wide cross section of activist movements. General sense of conference was on funding neighborhood activities; most diversified base is best. State income check-off towards neighborhoods was an idea at conference. (not in use anywhere) The state of Missouri has a unique plan/law: any business contributing up to \$20,000 to a neighborhood non-profit group can deduct \$10,000 on state income tax and \$5000 on federal.

James: The committee requested Mary to acquire more information and data on "Missouri Plan".

The meeting was adjourned at 9pm.

Nest Meeting: October 20, Noon, Rm 106, City Hall