

**FY 2006 Summary of Program Offers by Priority & Department  
(as of February 25)**

<b>Priority</b>	<b>Feb 1 Offers</b>	<b>Current Offers</b>
Basic Needs	106	111
Safety	99	137
Accountability	98	98
Thriving Economy	20	19
Education	28	28
Vibrant Communities	29	28
	<b>380</b>	<b>421</b>
Admin/Support	89	89
Fund Level	2	2
	<b>91</b>	<b>91</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>471</b>	<b>512</b>

<b>Department</b>	<b>Feb 1 Offers</b>	<b>Current Offers</b>
Non-D	52	53
District Attorney	15	14
DSCP	19	21
DCHS	84	83
Health	28	32
DCJ	46	50
Sheriff	27	56
Business Services	46	49
FBAT	24	24
Community Services	23	23
Library	16	16
	<b>380</b>	<b>421</b>
Admin/Support	89	89
Fund Level	2	2
	<b>91</b>	<b>91</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>471</b>	<b>512</b>

For reference, during the FY 2005 mid-year process, there were 393 programs assigned to a priority area and another 62 classified as either admin or support, for a total of 455 programs. 85 of these programs were assigned also assigned as being linked as secondary.

**FY 2006 Program Offers by Date Submitted or Revised  
(as of February 25)**

Date Offer Submitted or Revised	# of Offers
31-Jan	5
1-Feb	140
2-Feb	4
3-Feb	4
4-Feb	20
7-Feb	3
8-Feb	26
9-Feb	39
10-Feb	5
11-Feb	60
14-Feb	159
15-Feb	33
16-Feb	2
18-Feb	11
24-Feb	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>512</b>

Roughly two-thirds of all program offers were re-submitted in response to outcome team comments, to correct errors, or to comply with submittal guidelines.

### Board and Outcome Team Agreement on 2nd Round Rankings

	Board Agreed <i>(not yellow)</i>		Board & Outcome Team Agreed <i>(not blue or purple)</i>	
	#	%	#	%
Basic Needs	101 out of 111	91.0%	82 out of 111	73.9%
Safety	123 out of 136	90.4%	121 out of 136	89.0%
Accountability	87 out of 98	88.8%	85 out of 98	86.7%
Thriving Economy	18 out of 19	94.7%	14 out of 19	73.7%
Education	25 out of 28	89.3%	26 out of 28	92.9%
Vibrant Communities	25 out of 28	89.3%	28 out of 28	100.0%
<b>Total</b>		<b>90.2%</b>		<b>84.8%</b>

## Board Program Offer Funding by Priority and Round (General Fund)

	Basic Needs	Safety	Accountability	Thriving Economy	Education	Vibrant Communities	Total CGF Spent	Total CGF Remaining	Agreement on Funding
Round #1	63,654,030	153,739,208	36,896,997	396,046	18,884,231	20,505,061	294,075,573	24,008,427	92.5%
Round #2	69,571,186	155,850,631	43,634,770	396,046	18,913,097	22,232,606	310,598,336	9,855,669	96.9%
<b>Adopted</b>	<b>68,715,551</b>	<b>156,543,827</b>	<b>43,216,632</b>	<b>396,046</b>	<b>19,211,456</b>	<b>22,082,779</b>	<b>310,166,291</b>		
							One-time-only Debt Retirement	4,800,000	
							One-time-only ramp down funds for River Rock	1,870,000	
							One-time-only City of Portland funds for Public Safety	<u>1,800,000</u>	
							<b>Ongoing Adopted Expenditures</b>	<b>301,696,291</b>	

*Note: Does not include the \$10 million ITAX Sunset Reserve, ITAX supported payments to schools, and other Contingency and Reserves. See the Budget Manager's message and Board Budget Notes for more detail.*

The data above shows that the Board agreed unanimously on 97% of the program offers to fund after two rounds of funding; that the Board's adopted ongoing expenditures matched the ongoing resources available to spend; and, that one-time-only resources were used for one-time-only expenditures, such as debt retirement and the ITAX sunset reserve.

### How the Last \$10 million or 3% was Spent

The Board adopted a short list of amendments that modified several offers and traded out a few offers for others. From a program offer perspective, there were 20 offers after the two rounds of funding that had majority votes that the Board adopted. In summary, there were:

- 7 Program Offers with 4-1 Votes to Fund *(Several "savings" offers used to fund MH Services for Young Children)* (75,487)
- 13 Program Offers with 3-2 Votes to Fund *(Several "savings" offers... main action to fund \$10 million ITAX sunset reserve)* 9,801,519

*Note: There were several \$1 million incremental program offers created for the ITAX sunset reserve so the Board could decide to it at fund at various levels. They are considered one offer above.*

The data shows the Board took the last 3%, or \$10 million, that did not have unanimous agreement on and placed it into the ITAX Sunset reserve. (i.e., they did not spend it.)

## Chair's Proposed Budget Funding vs. Board's Adopted Funding by Priority (General Fund)

	Basic Needs	Safety	Accountability	Thriving Economy	Education	Vibrant Communities	Total CGF Spent
Adopted	68,715,551	156,543,827	43,216,632	396,046	19,211,456	22,082,779	310,166,291
Chair	71,807,477	157,526,398	43,964,717	396,046	18,947,649	22,250,606	314,892,893
<b>Difference</b>	<b>(3,091,926)</b>	<b>(982,571)</b>	<b>(748,085)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>263,807</b>	<b>(167,827)</b>	<b>(4,726,602)</b>

↑  
\$2 million due to a single, new offer

*Note: Chair Proposed Funding does not include the \$3.5 million Investment Pool (similar to ITAX Sunset Reserve), ITAX supported payments to schools, and other Contingency and Reserves.*

The data above shows that the Chair's Proposed Budget and the Board's Adopted Budget allocated resources by priority in a similar fashion with little difference on a percentage basis. The Board's lower funding for most priorities is attributable to setting aside more funds in the ITAX Sunset Reserve.

## Board Funding in Relation to Ranking by Priority

-- The table below shows the percentage of Program Offers funded within each priority. The offers within each priority have been divided into roughly thirds to reflect high, medium, and low rankings. There are also a set of offers designated as "No Rank" as new offers or program offers that were scaled after ranking were not ranked. The initial rank was not transferred to the scaled components.

-- Generally, Program Offers that were ranked higher were funded at a higher rate. (i.e., the Board bought down the list.)

-- Program Offers with "No Rank" because they were scaled or added after ranking were typically not funded. (Almost no new offers were submitted after ranking. However, a modest number of additional scaled/clarifying offers were made.)

	Total #	# Funded	% Funded	Note
<b>Basic Needs</b>				
Top Third	30	29	96.7%	<i>Offer not funded was withdrawn</i>
Middle Third	38	35	92.1%	
Bottom Third	36	30	83.3%	
No Rank	13	5	38.5%	<i>Large # due to requested scaling</i>
<b>Safety</b>				
Top Third	37	32	86.5%	<i>Funded offer % distorted low because of</i>
Middle Third	42	37	88.1%	<i>Inverness Jail accounting</i>
Bottom Third	54	40	74.1%	<i>Most offers not funded for Wapato Jail</i>
No Rank	14	9	64.3%	
<b>Accountability</b>				
Top Third	34	34	100.0%	
Middle Third	30	27	90.0%	
Bottom Third	29	20	69.0%	
No Rank	22	13	59.1%	<i>8 of the funded offers are for ITAX reserve</i>
<b>Thriving Economy</b>				
Top Third	6	6	100.0%	
Middle Third	4	4	100.0%	
Bottom Third	7	6	85.7%	
No Rank	8	2	25.0%	<i>Large # of offers due to SIP alternatives</i>
<b>Education</b>				
Top Third	9	8	88.9%	
Middle Third	10	7	70.0%	
Bottom Third	8	4	50.0%	
No Rank	3	0	0.0%	
<b>Vibrant Communities</b>				
Top Third	8	8	100.0%	
Middle Third	13	8	61.5%	<i>4 of 5 offers not funded new or expansion</i>
Bottom Third	7	5	71.4%	<i>a # of these are 'required' programs</i>
No Rank	1	0	0.0%	