

**Portland Children's Investment Fund  
Allocation Committee Meeting Minutes  
November 13, 2009 12:30 p.m.  
Location: Portland City Council Chambers**

---

*The full record of the meeting may be viewed on the Portland Children's Investment Fund website:  
[www.childrensinvestmentfund.org](http://www.childrensinvestmentfund.org).*

**Attending:** Ron Beltz, Alissa Keny-Guyer, Adrienne Livingston, Dan Saltzman (Chair); Ted Wheeler

**Welcome/introduction of Allocation Committee and CHIF staff**

**Approval of minutes of October 12, 2009 Meeting**

**Livingston:** Motion to approve

**Wheeler:** Second

**Vote:** All in favor

**Public Input on Funding Process**

**Lisa Hansell:** At the October 12 meeting, the Committee and staff discussed issues related to the funding process. These issues included: funding new vs. existing programs; challenges encountered around administrative rates of up to 15%; and the need for technical assistance of programs applying for grant funds. Today we invite public comment on the process.

**Joshua Todd** spoke as Director of **the Multnomah County Commission on Children, Families and Community**.

**Michele Lanctot** spoke as a representative of **the Library Foundation Raising a Reader Program**.

**Allyson Yoshiwara** spoke as a representative of **Portland Public Schools** supporting the **Raising a Reader Program**.

**Debra Lippoldt** spoke as a Director of **Growing Gardens**.

**Jane Holbrook** spoke as a Board Chair of **Morrison Child & Family Services**.

**Julie Young** spoke as Board member of **Morrison Child & Family Services**.

**Judy Strand** spoke as representative of **Metropolitan Family Service**.

**Public Input on Leverage Fund**

**Meg McElroy** summarized past process for the leverage fund. Ideas discussed at the previous meeting of the Committee included: challenge grant; work with the Early Childhood Funders Circle; formation of a collaboration committee of local funders; seeking corporate matching funds.

**Karie Trumbo** spoke as a representative of **the Library Foundation**.

**Carlos Romero** spoke as a representative of **Northwest Family Services**.

**Elana Emlen** spoke as a member of the **Multnomah County Commission on Children, Families and Community**.

Keith Thomajan spoke as a representative of **Campfire USA**.

**Parameters/Process for Allocating Additional Funds**

Lisa Pellegrino presented:

**Remaining Funds**

**A. “Leftover” Funds**

As you all may recall, when staff made funding recommendations during the most recent funding process, we recommended “up to” grant amounts that included “up to” 15% administrative costs. This was done because the rates applicants claimed in their applications did not necessarily bear any relationship to the applicants’ actual management and general expense rates in their audited financial statements or 990 tax documents. Staff then negotiated administrative rates with each grantee based on agency rates and other relevant factors.

Staff recommends that the committee prioritize allocation of the remaining funds (\$350,072 over 3 years; and \$1,409,082 over 5 years) as set forth below.

Note: The leftover amount listed below represents funds that we expect to be available over the next three years.

<b>Funding Area</b>	<b>Amount “Leftover”</b>
Early Childhood	\$87,131
Child Abuse Prevention/Intervention	\$37,033
Foster Care	\$14,428
After School (Enrichment and Full Service)	\$44,600
Mentoring*	\$180,692
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$363,884</b>

\*The total leftover in mentoring is higher for the following two reasons: (1) \$90,000 was included in the grant to Boys and Girls Aid to cover a sub-contract with the Urban League. As staff discussed with the Committee over the summer, it did not make sense for the grantee to go forward with the subcontract. These funds were thus returned to the pool. (2) The largest grantee in the mentoring category was Friends of the Children. While a grant of up to \$1,201,655 was made to cover possible administrative costs of 15%, their actual administrative rate was 8.8% and the total grant amount was \$1,139,985, leaving a \$61,670

**B. Fund Balance**

In addition to “leftover” funds from the contract negotiation process, we also have a significant fund balance of program dollars (as distinct from administrative dollars) from the previous levy that staff recommends the Committee now allocate. The program fund balance as of the close of the last fiscal year (6/30/09) is shown in the table below.

Note: These funds are essentially “one time” money because they were left from the previous levy. We have made grants of the new levy funds that represent all of the funds we expect to be available under the new levy. The total shown in the table below would have to be divided over 5 years to arrive at an annual amount (\$281,816) to grant if the Committee intended to make these funds available for the life of the current levy.

<b>Encumbrances on Fund Balance</b>	<b>Program Fund Balance 6/30/09</b>
	<b>\$5,470,487</b>
Mt. Hood CCR&R Grant	(\$2,332,049)
Neighborhood Partnership Bridges 2 Housing Grant	(\$229,356)
Leverage Fund	(\$1,000,000)
Technical Assistance and Contingency Funds	(500,000)
<b>TOTAL TO ALLOCATE</b>	<b>\$1,409,082</b>

The allocable program fund balance shown above has accumulated due to several factors including grantees failing to spend all budgeted funds, no carry-over available at the end of the last fiscal year, revenues exceeding projections upon which grants are made, and the variability of interest revenue which depends upon the rate at which grants spend out versus when revenues come in.

**Staff Recommendation of Priorities in Allocating Remaining Funds**

Staff recommends using the following criteria to prioritize allocation of additional funds:

**A. New Full Service After-School Programs**

Staff recommends prioritizing funding new full service after-school programs for several reasons. First, this was the most competitive category for funding (i.e. 3.8 dollars requested for ever dollar awarded; early childhood was 1.8, and child abuse and mentoring were each 2.8; foster care was 3).

Second, despite moving funds originally allocated for mentoring and after-school enrichment programs to the full service category, the Committee struggled to find funding for additional full service programs that all members wanted to fund.

Third, when staff compared the dollars requested for new programs in the after-school category with the dollars allocated for new programming in this category, after-school had the lowest proportion of dollars awarded for new programming compared to dollars requested for new programming (7% for AS; 16% for child abuse; 12% for EC, and 15% for mentoring). In other words, the demand for new programming funding in this category significantly exceeded the supply when compared to the other funding categories.

**B. Programs that are both New and Culturally Specific**

Staff recommends that the Committee next prioritize funding programs that are new (i.e. not continuing grants or expansions of programs we are currently funding) AND culturally specific. Staff recommends funding culturally specific programming because although we sought to increase funding for culturally specific programming, and awarded extra points in the RFI to culturally specific programs, the percent of total dollars invested in culturally specific services in the old levy and in the new levy remained at 28% of the total dollars invested annually. [See Appendix A for a chart with the relevant statistics]. Staff recommends increasing the proportion of total funds invested annually in culturally specific programs in order to achieve one of the goals of the new levy RFI.

**C. Increase Funding for Current Grantees ONLY for Culturally Specific Programs**

Staff recommends that if the Committee chooses to grant additional funds to any program that received funding in the last round, it do so ONLY to increase funding for culturally specific programs. In addition, staff recommends that the Committee prioritize culturally specific programs that received relatively little of what they requested. This would help achieve the goal of increasing investment in culturally specific programming.

Staff recommends against generally re-opening any/all previously made grants for funding increases because nearly all grantees received less funding than requested, there were many cases where some Committee members wanted to give higher grants than the eventual award, and there would not be a principled way to determine which grantees should receive the relatively limited funding available.

**D. Additional Parameters to Screen Allocations**

Finally, staff recommends the Committee take into account the following parameters after applying the priorities stated above:

- Prioritize programs that the most committee members wanted to fund i.e. 3 of 5 committee members wanted to fund X program, versus 1 of 5 committee members wanted to fund Y program.
- Prioritize higher scoring programs over lower scoring programs.
- Consider advocacy efforts of applicants.

**Public Comment on Allocating Additional Funds**

**Andy Ferguson** spoke as Director of **Friendly Chaps**, a program of **Friendly House**.

**Julie Young** spoke as a Board Member of the **Children’s Institute**.

**Janice Gratton** spoke as a representative of the **Early Childhood Council**.

**Anne Whitsell** spoke as Executive Director of **Kinship House**.

**Debra Lippoldt** spoke as a representative of **Growing Gardens**.

**Alissa Butterfield** spoke as a representative of **Volunteers of America, Integrated Family Service Program**.

**Gerald Deloney** spoke as a representative of **Self Enhancement**.

**Committee Decisions on Parameters for Allocation of Remaining Funds**

**Wheeler:** Motion to accept staff recommendations.

**Beltz:** Second the motion.

**Livingston:** I propose an amendment to the motion to include both enrichment and full service after-school programs in the parameters.

**Keny-Guyer:** Second.

**Vote on Amendment:**

**In favor:** Livingston, Keny-Guyer

**Opposed:** Beltz, Saltzman, Wheeler

The Amendment failed.

**Vote on Staff Recommendations:**

**In favor:** Beltz, Saltzman, Wheeler

**Opposed:** Keny-Guyer, Livingston

The motion passed.

Next meeting is Monday, December 14 at 9am.

**Adjourned at 2:30 p.m.**