

**DATE:** September 7, 2011

**TO:** Councilmember Mike O'Brien  
Councilmember Bruce Harrell  
Councilmember Richard Conlin

**FROM:** Bernie Agor Matsuno, Director, Seattle Department of Neighborhoods

**RE:** Response to 2011 Statement of Legislative Intent: #116-1-A-1 and #113-5-A-1

---

## **STATEMENTS OF LEGISLATIVE INTENT**

The City of Seattle faces a new economic climate that requires we re-engineer how we do business. Simultaneously, high unemployment and worldwide economic instability make it more important now than ever to make critical city services accessible and successful in supporting communities with job creation, affordable housing and maintaining a vibrant culture and a high quality of life.

During the 2011 budget process, the City Council developed two Statements of Legislative Intent (SLI):

1. **Community Granting** - Council directed the Executive to:
  - a. review the City's community granting programs to ensure that they are easily accessible to the public;
  - b. support all communities including communities who have been historically underrepresented in civic projects; and
  - c. maximize dollars being granted to communities by seeking administrative efficiencies.
2. **Department of Neighborhood's (DON) Outreach and Engagement Functions** – Council directed the Executive to review DON's outreach and engagement functions and determine the appropriate level of resources needed to support them.

A review process for each SLI was undertaken. The findings from each included bodies of work, organization structures, fiscal challenges and overarching policies that

pertained to both the granting and outreach and engagement functions. As a result the findings of each individual SLI have been combined into an integrated response.

## **BACKGROUND**

The role of the Department of Neighborhoods (DON) in community outreach and engagement, as well as community grant opportunities, places it at the center of the City's efforts in supporting job creation, affordable housing and the maintenance of a vibrant culture. Recent staffing changes to DON's Neighborhood District Coordinator (NDC) program as well as the needs of individuals, businesses and organizations for better collaboration among City departments offers an opportunity to redefine the role of the NDC.

The City also supports a variety of activities by delivering direct funding to the public. These funds are currently delivered in a disparate, inefficient and cumbersome manner with high overhead costs. A review request by the Executive revealed administration costs for some granting programs were as high as 57%. We can do better. Not just in the amount of overhead these programs incur, but in their ability to serve all communities, equally and equitably.

In 2011, in light of constrained revenues, and in response to public concerns about the challenges of working with many different City granting programs, an effort to determine a way to streamline the community granting program was undertaken. The Mayor asked, without reducing dollars for neighborhood projects, can the City operate its granting function more efficiently and reduce administrative cost while still allowing easy access to funds to all community groups?

**Administrative Costs:** Six city departments administer grant programs for a total of \$6.2 million of grants in 2011. The administrative costs are \$1.4 million, or 24% of the total. Individual grant program administrative costs range between 13% and 57%. The details can be seen on **Attachment B**. These costs are driven by the various components that go into how the City distributes these funds, including outreach, intake, review, awarding, and monitoring. Each City grant program approaches these aspects differently, resulting in different costs, inherent inefficiencies and in some cases customer frustration.

Some programs are more successful in certain aspects of administration than others, but given the high overall costs to administer these grant dollars, we must re-engineer the process, while preserving our commitment to support public activities with direct funding.

**Public Accessibility:** Members of the public now have to navigate six different grant programs, determine which ones they have the best chance of succeeding at and then apply. In order to increase the chance of success, applicants might make requests of multiple grant programs. The time spent filling out applications is burdensome for applicants and creates additional costs for city staff to process and review multiple applications. It's neither efficient nor good customer service.

**Silos:** City grant dollars are a scarce and valuable resource. As we learn how to do business within our new economic reality, we must better coordinate decisions and investments. We can no longer afford to silo community discussions, but instead must look more broadly at how the City uses its funds to create and enhance opportunities for job creation and employment, affordable housing, community building and cultural projects for all. Consideration can then be given to projects that cut across boundaries, break down barriers and have a holistic impact on our City.

## WHAT ARE WE TRYING TO ACHIEVE?

### CHALLENGE #1: COMMON SENSE SERVICE DELIVERY

Excellent customer service. The Mayor, Council and City employees are committed to providing excellent customer service. The question is how do we get there?

The Mayor's experience as a community leader who used these services informed his approach. He was prepared to ask why things were structured, funded and managed in the way they were. Over years, programs can be designed and implemented in a way that makes sense for that point in time, but that structure may not stay efficient or effective over time.

Questions included, what if the public could come to one place to apply for a grant? Regardless if it was an economic development grant, a technology grant, an arts or

cultural grant? What if a unified City team assisted them in their work to help support job creation, community building and maintaining a vibrant culture?

## **CHALLENGE #2: BUST AND BOOM CYCLE**

We are slowly recovering from the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression. Revenue growth is subdued and is not sufficient to sustain all base services. Many in our community are hurting. It is during these very times when the demand on City services is the greatest. Those services are currently strained not only by the economy, but by persistent bureaucratic problems that prevent City departments from coordinating their work to help support job creation, community building and maintaining a vibrant culture.

We can no longer afford to simply nip and tuck the budget, as it is currently structured, and hope we can continue with business as usual. Real efficiencies and economies of scale are needed. Simple stop gap measures and one-time fixes do not yield the cost savings needed to protect direct services. Only a fundamental rethinking of how business is done can do that. Only a really commitment to preserving direct services even if at the expense of entrenched special interests, can yield the most positive outcomes for the people of this city.

## **THE SLI REVIEW PROCESSES**

### **OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT REVIEW: WHAT WE DID**

The Department of Neighborhoods, including the Neighborhood District Coordinator (NDC) program, exists to *“bring government closer to the residents of Seattle by engaging them in civic participation; helping them become empowered to make positive contributions to their communities; and by involving more of Seattle’s underrepresented residents, including communities of color and immigrants, in civic discourse, processes, and opportunities.”*

To realize what's described in the department's mission statement, DON undertakes a variety of Outreach<sup>1</sup> & Engagement<sup>2</sup> activities to:

- Promote and solicit applications to the Neighborhood Matching Fund.
- Involve more people as participants in P-Patch community gardening.
- Participate in updating neighborhood plans.
- Inform community members of City programs and services.
- Provide information about city-related activity (as well as other public/government activity) taking place or planned for the neighborhood/community.
- Serve as liaison between the City/city department and community members.
- Inform and invite participation/involvement in District Council activities.
- Staff and support the city's 13 district councils.
- Create citizen advisory committees for Major Institutions work; to implement and oversee the City's historic preservation activity.
- Assist city departments with their Outreach & Engagement work.
- Reach into refugee and immigrant communities; to engage and involve underrepresented groups by utilizing the Planning Outreach Liaisons (POLs).
- Offer assistance and guidance so that community groups can navigate City bureaucracy successfully.

Given these types of Outreach and Engagement activities by DON, and NDCs in particular, DON conducted surveys of community members and representatives of City departments, and a number of focus groups, to get feedback about these functions.

More than 700 community members from neighborhoods across the City and representing all 13 districts responded to the survey. These included neighborhood advisory committee members, business owners/operator, chamber of commerce members, community council and district council representatives, Planning Outreach Liaisons and members of refugee and immigrant communities, as well as community members who heard about the survey and were not "affiliated" with a particular group.

---

<sup>1</sup> **Outreach** is defined as activities that are intentionally employed to make contact and potentially develop working relationships with specific individuals and/or groups for purposes, but not restricted to, sharing information, education, or service provision.

<sup>2</sup> **Engagement** is defined as activities that intentionally enable community members to effectively engage in deliberation, dialogue, and action on public issues and in the design and delivery of public services. Developing and sustaining a working relationship between government and one or more community groups to help both understand and act on needs or issues that the community experiences.

Of the 452 survey participants who provided information about their racial background, 19.3% were identified as African American, Asian/Pacific Islander, Native American, Latino, or mixed race/other.

To compliment the surveys, eight focus groups made up of city staff were also conducted. 80 staff members participated and representative all city departments.

## **OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT REVIEW: WHAT WE LEARNED**

- Community members were most familiar with DON's Neighborhood Matching Fund program, Neighborhood Payment and Information Services/Neighborhood Centers, Neighborhood District Coordinator program, and P-Patch-Community Gardening.
- Programs with the least community involvement: Historic Preservation, Major Institutions and Schools, and Neighborhood Planning.
- Face-to-face interactions with DON staff are highly valued.
- Engagement with City government, especially for those who are unfamiliar or inexperienced, is more likely via face-to-face interaction with trusted city staff. This is particularly true for people who have been underrepresented historically.
- NDC presence in communities – offices located in communities – is important for staying aware of community issues/needs/opportunities and build personal relationships.
- City staff rely on Neighborhood District Coordinators for assistance w/outreach and engagement activities because of the Coordinators knowledge of the community and relationships w/community members.
- City staff who know about Planning Outreach Liaisons (POLs), expressed interest in utilizing POLs more frequently to reach into underrepresented communities, including renters, seniors, youth, and refugee and immigrant communities.
- Personal contact (e.g. presentations by DON staff at meetings or gatherings of community organizations) and the use of online tools (e.g. email listserv) are good for undertaking outreach and engagement activities.

## **OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT REVIEW: ACTION RECOMMENDED**

### **Action #1: A Team Approach to Neighborhood District Coordinators**

In the 2011 budget process, funding for the Neighborhood District Coordinators (NDC's) program was reduced. The budget was reduced around the edges. Instead of 13 coordinators serving 13 districts, staffing was reduced to 10, amending a more than 20 year model for how NDCs service Seattle communities. Currently 9 positions are filled; one position was vacated earlier this year due to retirement and was left unfilled to meet DON's 2011 mid-year budget target.

DON has taken this reduction as an opportunity to redefine how the NDC's operate. NDCs are now operating as regional teams – with 3 dedicated to north Seattle; 4 dedicated to the central region (1 position of which is currently vacant) and 3 dedicated to serving south Seattle. This new model recognizes the City's new budget reality as well as a commitment to preserving direct services by switching to a team approach. This new model allows a sector to benefit from all the unique strengths of their team members. It's like having the expertise of a plumber, electrician and carpenter combined rather than when a community was tied only to one of the above.

With the team approach the NDCs are better positioned to facilitate problem-solving on specific, localized neighborhood issues. The NDCs should be the "first point of contact" for community groups who are experiencing problems. NDCs need to understand the concern and know which resource people (city staff or others) to gather/convene to address or resolve the problem. At times it might be best to form a time limited interdepartmental team (IDT); or simply assist the group to problem-solve themselves by connecting them to the appropriate people. What's important is the NDC's ability and role to help solve neighborhood issues or to expand on opportunities when they arise.

## **Action #2: Expand the Use of the Public Outreach Model**

The Executive plans to expand the use of the Public Outreach Liaison (POL) model beyond neighborhood planning. For the past two years DON's POLs have primarily worked with the Department of Planning and Development (DPD) – reaching into underrepresented communities – for the purpose of engaging them in the process of updating the Rainier Beach and Broadview/Haller Lake/Bitter Lake neighborhood plans. By all accounts, the POL program has yielded significant success, and the demand for their services is increasing. By expanding the POL program, other City departments could use their expertise for involving refugees, immigrants, seniors, renters, youth in their upcoming initiatives or projects.

## **Action #3: Outreach and Engagement Pilot Project with City Departments**

Establish NDC Outreach or Engagement Pilot Project with City departments. In focus groups, city staff discussed their reliance on NDCs to put them in contact with key community members when undertaking outreach or engagement activity in neighborhoods. NDCs, upon request, have also given advice about “how to conduct outreach” in neighborhoods that are familiar to them. Since NDCs are a valuable resource to city departments (as well as other public entities), the NDCs will continue to pursue their plans to develop, market, and pilot their outreach and engagement expertise to City departments. Functioning as a consultant or coach, NDCs will assist departments in preparing an outreach strategy and implementation of the same. If this service proves to be of value (NDCs will know this by undertaking 2-3 pilot projects in early 2012), then it may be provided to departments in the future for a negotiated fee. This year the following departments expressed some interest in partnering with DON for outreach services: Seattle City Light, Seattle Public Utilities, Seattle Public Library, Seattle Center, Department of Parks and Recreation, Human Services Department, and Office of Emergency Management. By establishing this kind of working relationship, NDCs share their expertise, and other departments become more confident about their ability to do outreach work.

## **Action #4: Maintain Support of the District Councils**

Support to district councils will continue at the current level, including assistance with setting meeting agendas, maintaining meeting summaries and following-up on requests, providing outreach and meeting notification, handling and retaining electronic records of district council actions, and providing staff support when the councils

undertake city-related work, such as the Neighborhood Matching Fund Large Projects review and the Neighborhood Projects Fund process.

### **Action #5: “Train the Trainer”**

Participate in “Train the Trainer” Inclusive Outreach and Public Engagement (IOPE) training and, with SOCR, take the lead in training city staff and community members. This role complements the consulting/coaching work NDCs hope to do with city departments that are planning to undertake outreach or engagement activity of their own. NDCs will also become a training resource for community organizations that want to become more inclusive and interested in learning how to engage all community members in the activities of the organization, as well as city government.

## **COMMUNITY GRANTING OPPORTUNITIES REVIEW: WHAT WE DID**

In addition to gathering information regarding DON’s outreach and engagement activities via surveys and focus groups, DON also created an Interdepartmental Team (IDT) to discuss and determine whether the consolidation of the City’s community granting opportunities is a viable option for improving access to funds, maximizing dollars to the community, and realizing administrative savings. Specifically, the funds operated by the following organizations were considered for consolidation: DON/Neighborhood Matching Fund, OED/Only in Seattle, DoIT/Technology Matching Fund, SPU/Waste Reduction and Recycling Matching Awards, OACA/Arts funding, and Seattle Youth Violence Prevention Initiative (SYVPI) Matching Grants. **(Refer to Attachment B** for details about each fund, the administrative costs, and dollar value of awards made.)

Although the City operates other types of community award programs – Parks Department Opportunity Fund, SDOT’s Neighborhood “small” Projects Fund, and Bridging the Gap “large” Projects, the IDT did not consider these in the consolidation discussions. All other funds make monetary awards to groups for community projects that, in most cases, require involvement by the community to make the project happen. The SDOT and Parks award programs rely on input from the public, which is factored into the department’s decision-making process. Then projects are designed and constructed by City departments, with little or no role for the community beyond the

public input phase. For this reason the SDOT and Parks programs were not included in the current consolidation conversations but could be considered in the future.

Simultaneous to the work of the IDT, the Mayor convened the department directors of the Department of Neighborhoods, the Office of Economic Development, the Office of Housing, the Office of Arts and Cultural Affairs, the Office of Sustainability and Environment, and the Department of Planning and Development to explore opportunities to better align functions in the City and to breakdown silos. A common thread through many of these departments is their role in distributing grant dollars in order to help enhance the quality of the City's neighborhoods, whether that is through funds that help grow businesses and jobs, neighborhood improvement dollars or funds that expand the cultural amenities available to residents. The health of the City's neighborhoods depends on the successful intersection of all of these factors.

## **COMMUNITY GRANTING OPPORTUNITIES REVIEW: WHAT WE LEARNED**

- Outreach is common to all funding programs. Tools used to do outreach are similar (e.g. social networks, websites, workshops, media, listserves, blogs, community contacts); variety of staff do outreach; all experience similar challenges trying to reach underrepresented communities.
- Application processing occurs in multiple ways across departments.
- Multiple application dates across departments, as well as different application forms.
- Award decision-making varies: some award decisions are made internally, i.e. by city staff and/or department director; other decisions begin with a citizen review process, resulting in funding recommendations submitted to Mayor and subject to approval by City Council.
- With exception of one funder, all others execute a contract with awarded organizations to provide a service (e.g. organizing residents and business operators) or product (e.g. beautify the neighborhood/community with public art pieces) and funds are provided on a reimbursement basis.
- Monitoring project progress and providing project management is also common across all funders. This can be particularly time consuming when working with newly formed or inexperienced grass-roots organizations. This is important

element of community granting to ensure successful completion and achievement of project outcomes.

- SYVPI stood apart from other grant programs. It is currently staffed by the Office of Education (OFE) and the program awards community matching grants which specifically focus on reducing and preventing youth violence in central and south Seattle. These grants, which are relatively small in size, are administered by the Seattle Neighborhood Group at a low cost. Due to this highly explicit, dedicated use, the small size of the grants and the current efficient use of a local administrator, SYVPI is excluded from recommendations described below at this time.
- Significant differences do exist across grant programs that may not easily lend themselves to immediate consolidation. For example, the Office of Arts and Cultural Affairs (OACA) grant system relies on standards of other local and national organizations. Additionally, technical assistance related to preparing artistic work samples for existing OACA grant programs differs from technical assistance required for other City granting programs. These differences warrant further discussion prior to altering the City's approach for administering these programs.

The work of the IDT made clear that many City departments/offices employ a granting process with similar elements: outreach, application submittal and processing, application review/evaluation, followed by award decisions, contracting, and project management. These are described more fully in Attachment A. More importantly, the work of the IDT highlighted that the cost to administer these grant programs is high. These costs are described in Attachment B.

While some of these costs are driven by the unique nature of the grants the city awards – small grants to community organizations that are not experienced in securing grant dollars – generally speaking, these costs are simply too high. The similarity of process elements begs the question: Can the City funders consolidate operations, be more efficient, reduce operating/administrative costs, operate in a more customer-friendly way, while maintaining good access to the funds? Based on the work of the IDT, the answer to the above question is “yes” if the city's granting opportunities are consolidated.

## COMMUNITY GRANTING OPPORTUNITIES REVIEW: ACTION RECOMMENDED

**Vision** – Seattle is a model of economic prosperity, environmental sustainability, and social equity.

City government must be more effective at directing resources across all functions to achieve this vision, particularly in response to the increasing needs of neighborhoods and communities during a period of declining public resources.

The driving force of the consolidation of granting functions is to achieve programmatic integration and administrative efficiencies in the City's grants programs in order to preserve granting dollars that are distributed to the community and to improve access to these opportunities.

There are two major elements that combine to make up the consolidation approach:

- The long-term vision of how an integrated granting function could be transformed overtime, and
- The immediate term (i.e. 2012) operational changes that can be made in order to start moving the City toward this long-term vision.

To advance the City towards this vision, the 2012 Proposed Budget will take the following steps:

- **Combine the staff involved in the administration of grant functions into a single unit under a new Community Grant division in the Department of Neighborhoods.** Specifically, administrative staff and resources from
  - Neighborhood Matching Fund (NMF) community grants
  - Office of Economic Development's (OED) *Only in Seattle* grant program
  - Department of Information Technology (DoIT) Technology grants
  - Seattle Public Utility's (SPU) Waste Prevention and Recycling grant program

Policy expertise as well as input from community groups, such as the District Councils, the Citizens' Telecommunications and Technology Advisory Board (CTTAB), and the City Neighborhood Council will be

preserved in their current departments and will still play a key role in helping decide which grants to award. But, the administrative aspects of community granting will be consolidated. The consolidation will allow the City to eliminate 3 positions and save over \$300,000 while still preserving the amount of grant dollars out the door.

- **Form a functional partnership with other city granting units to enable enhanced collaboration and to identify additional improvements that may be possible to the City's grant making processes.**
  - Office of Arts and Cultural Affairs (OACA) arts grants
  - Seattle Youth Violence Prevention Initiative grants

While these granting functions are not recommended for consolidation in 2012, sufficient nexus exists between the programs to warrant focused collaboration in the near term, while the potential for additional integration can be explored in the future.

- **Streamline the grant application and award processes.** In order to effectively administer the grant programs under a new consolidated unit with fewer staff resources, it is essential that the grant application and award process be streamlined. Potential changes include:
  - **Coordinate grant outreach and grant award cycles.** Coordinating the award cycles eliminates multiple award processes and provides administrative savings by reducing the amount of staff time dedicated to outreach, project development, and award proposal review of each individual funding source. Specifically,
    - Synchronize timing of grant solicitation and review processes across fund sources;
    - Standardize public informational materials and internal review materials; and
    - Cross-train District Coordinators to provide outreach and support for community proposals across all types of grant support. The community focus should be on the merits of the project, rather than on the specific restrictions of the funding sources.

- **Consolidate administration of awards.**
  - Standardize award contract development; and
  - Realize economies of scale and improved accountability from central and standardized distribution and tracking of funds.
  - Although the Office of Arts and Cultural Affairs' (OACA) grant administration is not directly consolidated into the new granting unit, OACA has identified changes in how their grants are administered that allow for additional cost savings.
  
- **Single portal through which the community can make grant proposals.**
  - Community members will be able to propose their ideas and concepts for funding without having to wade through multiple different program criteria and procedures, and without having to fill out multiple applications. All of these changes require city staff to maintain, update, and be familiar with and able to explain the various award opportunities.
  - This will improve access and reduce administrative costs.
  - One step already taken as a result of the analysis and work done this year is the creation of a web portal that serves as a single place to find information on various grants: <http://www.seattle.gov/grants/>
  
- **Adjust approach to matching requirements.** Instead of requiring a match of funds and necessitating the administrative burden associated with tracking and verifying matching contributions, the ability of a project to leverage matching funds can be evaluated during the review process and the proposal weighted accordingly. Also, removing the matching fund requirement could provide greater access for underrepresented communities which may not have the wherewithal to provide a match requirement.
  
- **Encourage strategic thinking from grant applicants.** Develop overarching criteria that encourage neighborhoods to think strategically across multiple sectors to achieve greater impact for their community. Community proposals

should be considered not only in the context of the specific requirements of the various grant dollars available, but also in the context of other community proposals and community needs across what have been traditional sector silos. This is NOT a change. This will entail a broader look at proposals that considers the impact on jobs and education, affordable housing and stability, environmental and community sustainability, and quality of life issues. Under this approach, the City would still preserve the policy expertise that departments offer making award decisions. All advisory bodies (e.g. District Councils, the Citizens' Telecommunications and Technology Advisory Board (CTTAB), and the City Neighborhood Council) would still be involved. The high level consideration described above would not replace these bodies, or supersede existing policies around the intended use of these grant dollars. Rather this broader consideration of community proposals that cuts across sector silos will add to the robustness of the conversation about how we invest in our community.

#### *Looking Further Ahead on Community Granting:*

The changes proposed here are initial steps in what must be an iterative process. Looming General Fund budget challenges in 2013 and beyond, as well as public expectations to continuously improve how we deliver services, require that we do not be satisfied with the status quo, or with what will soon become the status quo. We must continue to challenge ourselves, find efficiencies, and improve service where possible.

The consolidated granting unit will therefore also be tasked with performing additional analysis and evaluation of potential changes, which may include:

- **Efficiencies in how we track information and conduct application reviews.** The new grant unit will develop new ways of administering grants. Some changes will take place in 2012, while other changes will take place over time and will be informed by experience gained as a new consolidated unit.
- **Additional partnership opportunities in reviewing proposals.** Evaluating where it may make sense to partner with local, non-profit agencies that already process grant applications. In some cases, the City's award programs are

duplicated in the community through local, non-profit agencies. With existing, non-profit staff already processing grant applications, a contract with these agencies may prove to be more efficient alternatives to a City-run program for specialized grants. For example, the Technology Access Foundation (TAF) or 4Culture both provide similar programs to the City's grant programs.

- **Administrative costs of policies.** The new granting unit will analyze how existing policy requirements drive administrative costs. This information will enable city decision-makers to better consider the costs and benefits of grant dollar policies.
- **Policy changes that leverage grant funds to achieve multiple objectives.** While the core mission of existing grant dollars is not proposed to change, the addition of criteria that focus on strengthening the local economy, supporting local jobs as well as improving quality of life can enhance outcomes for City grant dollars that have formerly been narrowly focused.
- **Potential for additional consolidation of other City grant functions.** As described above, some City grant programs do differ significantly and are not proposed for immediate consolidation. Improved collaboration and cooperation though will be implemented across all grant programs. This collaboration may reveal additional steps that can be taken to achieve cost savings and improve service in future years.

## ATTACHMENT A

There are essentially five components to the granting process: outreach, award intake, award review, contracting and monitoring.



**Outreach.** Outreach encompasses both the marketing of the various grant opportunities to communities and the technical assistance typically provided to communities in developing a grant proposal. Within the new consolidated Grants unit, the Project Managers will continue to provide outreach and technical assistance, but will also look to collaborate with the Neighborhood District Coordinators to provide both marketing and support, as they've provided in the past. By streamlining the outreach process, the City projects a consistent marketing message and better coordinates its assistance to the public.

**Intake.** The award intake involves receiving and categorizing the grant proposals. The project management staff would handle this work and prepare the proposals for the review process. The new consolidated website ([www.seattle.gov/html/citizen/grants.htm](http://www.seattle.gov/html/citizen/grants.htm)) will be developed to allow easy submission of proposals with the exception of Arts grants, which currently has a separate web tool for intake due to the nature of their proposals (mixed media). As we look to the future of grant centralization, the City will look to a single technology for all grant proposals.

**Review.** For the award review, the City will maintain its process to evaluate the awards, but on a coordinated grant award cycle. Currently, the review team is staffed from the Granting unit for those grants that allow for internal review only. For those grants which require community involvement (including the NMF Large Projects and the Arts awards), a separate review process for community grants takes place as part of the award cycle.

As mentioned, a coordinated grant award cycle will also be part of the new streamlined process. Currently, there are 18 different review cycles throughout the year. By coordinating the process into two cycles, the review process will be more straight-

forward to the public, while reducing the staff time dedicated to outreach, project development, and review. The review cycles will occur in the Spring and Fall and will encompass those grants which can be reviewed internally. A separate review cycle will occur simultaneously with the Fall internal cycle and be dedicated for those grants requiring community review. The community review cycle will be staffed by grant project management staff.

**Contracting/Monitoring.** By designating a position to handle the contracting workload, we are able to centralize this function and achieve better consistency and administration of the work. The project management staff will continue to be responsible for monitoring their portfolio of grants for compliance. This area of the process is also where streamlining current City practice would provide greater efficiency to the grants process, while bringing administrative costs down.

**ATTACHMENT B**

See attached “Summary of Annual City Granting Program Award and Program Costs”