



THE CITY OF SAN DIEGO  
**REPORT TO THE CITY COUNCIL**

REPORT NO: 08-075

DATE ISSUED: June 4, 2008  
ATTENTION: Council President and City Council  
Agenda of June 9, 2008  
SUBJECT: Grants and Gifts Business Process Reengineering  
REFERENCE:

**REQUESTED ACTION:**

Accept the recommendations of the Grants and Gifts Business Process Reengineering (BPR) Study.

**STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Accept the Report on Grants and Gifts BPR and authorize implementation of the changes.

**BACKGROUND**

The Mayor of the City of San Diego has commenced BPR efforts to improve efficiencies, reduce the cost of City government and to maximize the services offered to our residents. A BPR study was conducted on the grants and gifts function, carried out by a number of departments across the City.

***Definitions of Grants and Gifts***

***Grant:*** Solely for purposes of this BPR effort, the word “grant” refers to money, property, service, or anything of value given to support the work of the City.

***Types of Grants:***

- ***Government:*** means grants awarded by federal, state, county and/or other governmental/quasi governmental agencies.
- ***Non-Government:*** means grants awarded by private, non-government entities or individuals.

***Gifts:*** Solely for purposes of this BPR effort, the word “gifts” refers to transfers of valuable property, including cash and non-cash assets, exclusive of government resources.

### ***Department***

The City historically has decentralized the management of its grants and gifts. Individual City Departments internally identify, request, accept, manage and track grants. While existing Administrative Regulation 1.80 provides guidance related to grant application procedures, it was created twenty years ago and does not reflect the current organizational structure and process, nor does it relate to current practices in the grant field. Existing Council Policy 100-02 *City Receipt of Donations* is thirteen years old and no longer reflects the current City structure and process, nor does it reference contemporary best practices in philanthropic giving and gift management. In addition, there are no policies and/or written guidelines related to fundraising. Each fundraiser uses his/her unique style of fundraising to identify, cultivate and secure funding from donors. While some elements of fundraising require flexibility, consistency and collaboration are critical to minimize confusion and duplication of efforts.

There are approximately eighteen City Departments that actively pursue grants and gifts; however, the number of individuals involved with the process is dependent on the City's departmental resources. There are limited formal methods of communication among the City Departments resulting in potential redundancy, inconsistent processes, competition for the same funds and a lack of coordination for tracking, reporting and audits.

The need to establish a centralized, coordinated effort is critical for maximizing the City's success in obtaining grants and gifts, effectively managing/tracking grants and gifts Citywide and improving efficiency and effectiveness related to governmental audits.

The Citywide Business and Grants Administration Department was created approximately eighteen months ago in order to coordinate grant activities, processes, reporting and management on a Citywide basis. Prior to this action, City Departments independently identified, processed, tracked and managed grant applications and awards. While the City had been fairly successful in applying for and receiving grants, this decentralized approach created significant challenges with tracking grants on a Citywide basis. These challenges include: inconsistencies in several grant processes, inadvertent discouragement of inter-departmental partnerships and communication, and inequities in staffing levels, knowledge and experience. The prior system also created a significant challenge for the Auditor & Comptroller and City Departments to prepare for and undergo compliance reviews conducted by grant agencies without incurring major findings

One of the initial steps taken by the Citywide Business and Grants Administration Department was to re-establish an informal citywide "Grants Coordination Team" with the mandate of maximizing grant opportunities. The team consisted of City staff members responsible for processing primarily government grants representing sixteen departments. The team quickly came to the conclusion that there was a need to organize and structure the various issues associated with grants management. It conducted

As the work of the Citywide Grants Coordination Team continued, a formal needs assessment identified "Eight Bold Steps" to pursue immediately. The "Bold Steps" are as follows:

1. Develop a training program for grants administrators;
2. Deliver a consolidated and coordinated reporting system;
3. Partner with Community and Legislative Services staff to develop a strategic plan;
4. Start an intra-agency collaborative plan;
5. Conduct a “mini” Business Process Reengineering (BPR) on the 1472 process for grants;
6. Clarify roles and responsibilities of the Auditor and Comptroller, City Attorney and the Purchasing Department;
7. Develop a business case for increased resources; and
8. Develop a Public Relations education effort that would showcase successful efforts. .

### ***BPR Study***

This original Grants and Gifts Grants Coordination Team became the BPR Team - the core resource for executing the Business Process Reengineering (BPR) study authorized by the Business Office to improve those processes associated with grants and gifts. The team formed subcommittees and began to put plans together to move forward when the critical decision to proceed with conducting a Business Process Reengineering (BPR) effort on grants and gifts was made. Now complete, this project addressed previously identified issues as well as many new concerns.

The scope of the BPR was expanded to include non-government grants and gifts. While grants and gifts represent different sources of revenue, this BPR effort identified several similarities in the processes analyzed. This report therefore combines findings and recommendations wherever possible.

### ***Grants and Gifts Management***

The City currently manages its grants and gifts in a fragmented manner. Individual Departments identify, request, accept, manage and track grants and gifts within their own organizations. While there is an Administrative Regulation in place that provides guidance related to grant application procedures, it is over twenty years old and does not reflect the current organizational structure and/or process. The existing Council Policy that provides guidance for accepting donations is thirteen years old and no longer reflects the current structure and process. In addition, there are no policies and/or written guidelines related to fundraising. Each fundraiser uses his/her unique style of fundraising to identify, cultivate and secure funding from donors. While some elements of fundraising require flexibility, consistency and collaboration are critical to minimize confusion and duplication of efforts. In spite of these issues, the City has been fairly successful with competing for grants and receiving gifts.

There are approximately eighteen City departments that actively pursue grants and gifts, however, the number of individuals involved with the process depends on department resources. There are limited formal methods of communication among the departments resulting in potential redundancy, inconsistent processes, competition for the same funds and a lack of coordination for tracking, reporting and audits. The need to establish a

centralized, coordinated effort is critical for: maximizing our success in obtaining grants and gifts, effectively managing/tracking grants and gifts citywide and improving our efficiency and effectiveness related to governmental audits. A Business Process Re-engineering (BPR) effort was undertaken to address these issues.

The BPR Team agreed that it was very important to review and analyze as many critical processes and relevant data as possible in order to make recommendations that support the following overarching aims:

- Be proactive rather than reactive;
- Speed up the approval process;
- Assure that grant and gift efforts meet both departmental and city-wide needs;
- Increase the number of awarded, sustainable grants;
- Standardize the management of the grants and gifts processes;
- Use technology to achieve efficiencies and effectiveness; and
- Achieve greater organizational support for grant and gift efforts.

The extensive experience and knowledge of BPR Team members, as well as the best practice information gathered from other jurisdictions, resulted in a number of recommendations that would improve the administration of grants and gifts on a Citywide basis (see attachment).

## **REENGINEERING FINDINGS**

### **A. Government Grants: “As-Is” and “To-Be” Processes**

#### **1. Acquiring**

The first step in the process of acquiring grants is identifying potential grant opportunities. This step requires significant time, effort and knowledge. Citywide Grants Administration is formally registered with the government grants notification service and the County of San Diego’s grants notification list to provide some level of assistance to the City Departments. City departments identified their major areas of interest, and for the past year have been receiving notices of grant opportunities related to their stated areas of interest. This process requires a daily review of both the federal and county notices by Citywide Grants Administration staff and matching potential opportunities with Departments. Due to a lack of time and staff, a daily review is not always feasible which can result in missed opportunities.

The internal survey conducted as part of the data collection effort, included a series of questions related to identifying potential grants. The results revealed City Departments identify potential grants differently and in a variety of ways. The reasons for this include: number of staff dedicated to grants (which will be discussed in a later portion of this report); aggressiveness of the department seeking funds; dependency on grants; and knowledge, or lack thereof, of available grants. Some departments are on notification lists, others are aware of and routinely search specific grant websites, and still others “do

the best they can.” This lack of consistency, coordination and information can also result in missed opportunities for the City.

Once a grant opportunity has been identified, City Departments then make the decision whether to apply. This process also varies by City Department for a number of reasons including, but not limited to: staffing levels available to prepare and process the grant application; the type of grant (i.e. competitive, non-competitive, matching requirements, etc.); application timelines; timelines for expending grant funds awarded; and the ability to manage the grant, if awarded.

The above circumstances compelled the BPR Team to focus the mapping process on obtaining the necessary approvals to apply for grants rather than how individual City Departments seek potential grant opportunities. The team did, however identify several broad steps to be taken to assist City Departments with identifying grants in a consistent manner.

### ***Recommendations***

1. Formalize the existing Citywide Grants & Gifts coordination team. The team would have a dotted line reporting relationship with Citywide Administration and would meet monthly for coordination, consistency and problem solving purposes. The team would also assist with the development, distribution and posting of guidelines, based on best practices identified through survey data, for City Departments to follow when they seek grant funds.
2. Establish a Citywide online Resource Center that includes web-based search engines, sample templates and checklists, “winning” proposals, training opportunities, shared contact group listing, etc.
3. Identify potential funding source(s) utilizing the “Grants and Gifts website/Resource Center”).
4. If legislative assistance is required, contact Intergovernmental Relations, Community and Legislative Services staff.
5. Prepare grant applications in accordance with both the City’s and the grantor’s guidelines and process necessary paperwork for City approval.

## **2. Accepting (Grant Approval)**

For purposes of this report, Grant Approval is defined as routing the Request for Council Action (1472). The team found that the processes associated with obtaining grant approval can be extremely time consuming, costly, cumbersome, inefficient and inconsistent. A “routine” request for approval can take two to four months to secure the necessary signatures and up to six months if an ordinance is required. Longer time frames have been experienced due to requests for revisions from the reviewing departments. However, exceptions do occur. The process can take one or two days if it is deemed an “emergency” and staff is assigned to hand carry the document from reviewer to reviewer. The team found that as many as 30 reviewers and 13 signatures may be required,

depending on the requirements of the grant, departments' internal checks and balances and reviewing authority processes. Because the process is manual, virtually all team members had experienced the "lost" document and had to begin the process over. In addition, several team members processed their documents "after the fact" if enough lead time was not available.

Numerous additional inconsistencies and unanswered questions were identified in the current process:

- What decisions are taken to City Council for approval?
- Of the items taken, who is required to review and sign?
- What should be included in the back-up material?
- Should electronic advance copies be provided? To whom?
- What is the order of the review process?

#### ***Recommendations***

1. Create a pilot ordinance to reduce processing times and allow the Mayor or his designee the ability to accept, appropriate and expend up to \$1 million per grant as long as no matching funds are required.
2. Create a standing item for approval on the City Council Agenda for grants and gifts.
3. Obtain a blanket exemption from Equal Opportunity Contracting Program for grants/gifts requiring City Council resolutions and/or approval.
4. Create a process to provide an opportunity for the Mayor to prioritize grants and gift opportunities on an annual basis.
5. Create a process to provide an opportunity for City Council to prioritize grants and gift opportunities on an annual basis.
6. Update Administrative Regulation 1.80 to reflect current processes.
7. Follow the recommendations listed in the acquiring section of this report.
8. Follow the "new" Request for Council Action (1472) process developed as a result of an earlier BPR. (Appendix 1).

### **3. Appropriating**

The San Diego City Charter Article VII "...establishes a complete budget and accountability system of municipal receipts and expenditures..." and outlines the processes associated with appropriating funds through the budget process. While grants are not specified in the Charter, they are subject to these rules and regulations. All grant funds must be appropriated prior to expending. The issues related to the 1472 process apply to this section as well.

#### ***Recommendations***

1. Consider including grants and gifts as a separate item in the budget development process similar to Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects.

2. Create a standing item for approval on the City Council Agenda for grants and gifts.
3. Implement the “new” Request for Council Action (1472) process when available, which automates and shortens the review process..

#### **4. Expending**

Once a grant has been awarded, it is important that it is expended in accordance with both the City’s and the grantor’s requirements and the guidelines established in the grant application. The BPR Team identified challenges associated with expending grant funds on goods and services. The process was mapped and the BPR Team found that most City Departments made their initial contact with the Purchasing Department after the grant was received. Often times, this creates significant challenges with meeting the timelines required by the grantor, and may require the City to request extensions or, worst case, to return the funds. The number of steps, reviewers and signatures required for processing the purchase of goods and services depends on the dollar amount and category of the procurement. Appendix 7 depicts the “as is” process. In mapping the “to be” process (Appendix 7), the BPR Team incorporated the recommendations listed below in order to address timeline and consistency issues. In addition, according to Auditor and Comptroller Department records, in Fiscal Years 2006 and 2007 approximately \$4.1 million in grant money was returned to the grantors as a result of the City’s inability to process the paperwork and expend funds in a timely fashion.

#### ***Recommendations***

1. Streamline and bring into alignment the process flows between the originating Department, Purchasing and Auditors.
2. Improve the timeliness and efficiency of processes by:
  - a. Establishing a collaborative team with stakeholders
  - b. Creating a game plan and project plan early in the process that includes:
    - A brief description of the grant that includes the grant number and dollar amount awarded;
    - A list of the grant requirements;
    - A list of all parties involved with the expenditure of the funds (i.e. Purchasing Department staff, Auditor and Comptroller’s staff, other City Department staff, etc.);
    - A list of items and/or services to be purchased and whether or not they have been purchased in the past;
    - The type of purchase (Commodity, Service, Consultant, Sole Source)
    - Milestones and timelines; and
    - A draft meeting schedule to include a kick-off meeting, with all parties involved, to discuss action items and timelines.
3. Establish a Grant Liaison in Purchasing.
4. Develop and post checklists and templates to assist City Departments with Purchasing, Auditor and Comptroller, Financial Management and the City Attorney’s

requirements.

5. Establish a reserve of funds for initial payments for goods and services to be reimbursed by grant funds.

## 5. Managing

Grants management can be defined as monitoring and executing grant requirements. The process of managing grants and gifts was not mapped as grantors define the tracking, reporting, reimbursement and other requirements of the funds. The BPR Team acknowledged that guidelines to assist with organizing grants management would improve efficiencies. In addition, the BPR Team identified a lack of consistency for gift administration. Best practices were reviewed and several recommendations were made. The jurisdictions who responded to the survey include: the County of San Diego, and the Cities of Atlanta, Denver, Los Angeles, Minneapolis and Phoenix. A summary of the survey data collected is included as Appendix 2. In addition, a review was conducted of the Grant Accountability Project's "Guide to Opportunities for Improving Grant Accountability". This project was lead by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and team members included 19 Federal, State and local audit organizations. The guide identifies challenges regarding grant accountability and highlights promising practices on specific ways to improve grants management. These practices are actions that agencies have used to successfully address challenges to grant accountability. Using the data sources described above as reference, the BPR Team made specific recommendations.

### ***Recommendations***

1. Develop and post a "Grants Management Manual" as a Citywide resource that includes the following information:
  - a. Grant documentation – project file application package, reference documents, terms and conditions and reporting requirements.
  - b. Financial information – invoice, billing and expenditure requirements, performance/timeline tracking of both City and sub-recipients (if applicable).
  - c. Special requirements – federal circulars, state, funding entity.
  - d. Close out/record keeping – certifications, retention.
  - e. Audit checklist – agency audit, City audit, single audit.
2. Develop policies and procedures for gift administration.
3. Standardize gift tracking and reporting.
4. Standardize donor recognition practices such as acknowledgement, naming opportunities, signage, Mayoral/City Council recognition and public relations plans.

## **B. Non-Government Grants and Gifts: “As-Is” and “To-Be” Processes**

The Non-Government Grants and Gifts Sub-Team identified four major phases that are the framework for the “As Is” process. The phases include Acquiring, Accepting, Expending and Managing.

### **1. Acquiring**

Acquiring gifts currently occurs in two ways. Either City Department Directors identify top priority funding needs and request that fundraising staff attempt to secure the funding, or City employees and/or elected officials are approached by donors who wish to contribute cash and/or in-kind resources to the City.

Fundraising staff identifies potential donors (individuals, companies, foundations and organizations) who may serve as a good match with City funding needs, as well as the City’s vision and values. The fundraising professionals compile information about the potential donors and present the information to City Department Directors to ensure there are no conflicts of interest (legal or perceptual) with soliciting cash and/or in-kind resources from the potential donors. Once a consensus is achieved, fundraising staff moves forward with cultivating the potential donors. The final step in the Acquiring Phase is for the fundraising staff to solicit and secure the cash and/or in-kind resources.

When City employees and/or elected officials are approached by donors who wish to contribute cash and/or in-kind resources to the City it is typically for a particular project or purpose envisioned by the donor to be of significant value to the City. In compliance with the process outlined in existing Council Policy 100-02 *City Receipt of Donations*, the fundraising staff compiles information about the potential donors and presents the information to City Department Directors to ensure there is no conflict of interest (legal or perceptual) with accepting cash and/or in-kind resources from the potential donor. In addition, fundraising staff works with City Department Directors to determine whether the offered cash and/or in-kind resources are compatible with the City’s vision, values and needs. Once a consensus is reached that the proposed gift should be accepted by the City, the Accepting Phase begins.

#### ***Recommendations***

1. Create a process for the Mayor to identify and prioritize Citywide funding needs on an annual basis.
2. Create a process for the City Council to identify and prioritize Citywide funding needs on an annual basis.
3. Create a public relations plan to educate the public at large about the City’s unique giving opportunities.
4. Conduct a comprehensive review of the resources available for fundraising staff. Make additional recommendations, if necessary once a full analysis has been completed.

## 2. Accepting (Grant Approval)

Accepting gifts occurs once the City and donor(s) agree to the terms and conditions of the gift. Currently, the transaction must be presented to the Mayor and City Council by way of the 1472 process for final approval and acceptance as described in Council Policy 100-02 *City Receipt of Donations*.

The Accepting Phase assures that the City responsibly conducts due diligence in evaluating the proposed donations, to prepare donors as to what they may expect when philanthropically partnering with the City. This phase also educates the Mayor, City Council and City employees, as well as the public at large, about the philanthropic transaction taking place. In addition, the presentation to Mayor and City Council creates an opportunity to publicly acknowledge donors for their generosity.

A group of multi-departmental City staff members responsible for processing and managing donations to the City recognized that existing Council Policy 100-02, *City Receipt of Donations*, most recently amended in 1994, had proven to be inadequate for addressing the legal and philosophical needs of sophisticated donors, for relating to contemporary practices in the field of philanthropic giving, for processing complex, multi-faceted donation proposals, and for appropriately managing the donations, once accepted by the City. A few of the policy's identified weaknesses include:

- Ambiguities which, depending upon each person's understanding, may appear to suggest that no review is required of donations, or, if required, it is limited to the specific City Department that will be impacted or type of asset involved.
- Permission of donations to the City of personal property, in-kind assets and cash without "City Council approval for acceptance," except for artworks.
- Singling out for special attention donations proposed by multiple donors for a "special purpose or project."

Consequently, to achieve improved relevance, efficiency and efficacy, this group began the process of evaluating Council Policy 100-02 and over the last two years, consulted with stakeholders and a broad base of national peers to generate a set of proposed revisions.

### ***Recommendations***

1. Amend Council Policy 100-02 *City Receipt of Donations*, to reduce processing times and allow the Mayor or his designee the ability to accept, appropriate and expend up to \$250,000 per gift as long as no matching funds are required.
2. Amend companion document to Council Policy 100-02, *Guidelines for the Donation of Works of Art to the City of San Diego*.
3. Amend San Diego Municipal Code Chapter 02, Article 06, Division 07: Commission for Arts and Culture, to work in tandem with an updated version of Council Policy 100-02.
4. Create a standing item for approval on the City Council Agenda for grants and gifts.

### 3. Expending

Once the transaction is approved and the City accepts the cash and/or in-kind resource, the City may expend the cash, when applicable. Several scenarios may occur when a donor contributes cash to the City. When the donor makes an unrestricted cash contribution to the City, Council Policy 100-02 *City Receipt of Donations* instructs that the funds are to be added to the City's General Fund. At this point, the Office of the Mayor determines how the money should be spent to best meet the City's needs. When the donor contributes cash to fund a program, service or facility, the cash is deposited into a specific account that can only be expended on the need determined by the donor and approved by Mayor and City Council. When the donor contributes cash and wishes for the cash to be used to purchase a product or service, the City Department Director must work with the Purchasing Department on expending the cash and procuring the need determined by the donor and approved by Mayor and City Council. The procurement process depends on the dollar value of the product or service.

#### ***Recommendations***

1. Work with appropriate City Department on the 1472 process to ensure the donor's intentions are fulfilled.
2. Streamline and bring into alignment the process flows between the originating City Department, the Purchasing Department and the Auditor and Comptroller.
3. Improve the timeliness and efficiency of processes by:
  - a. Establishing a collaborative team with stakeholders.
  - b. Create a game plan and project plan early in the process that includes:
    - A brief description of the gift
    - A list of the gift's terms and conditions
    - A list of all parties involved with the expenditure of the funds (i.e. any internal staff, Purchasing, Auditor and Comptroller, other Department staff, etc.)
    - A list of items to be purchased and whether or not they have been purchased in the past
    - The type of Purchase (Commodity, Service, Consultant, Sole Source)
    - Milestones and timelines
    - A draft meeting schedule to include a kick-off meeting, with all parties involved, to discuss action items and timelines
4. Establish a Grants and Gifts Liaison in the Purchasing Department.
5. Develop and post checklists and templates to assist departments with Purchasing, Auditor, Financial Management and City Attorney requirements
6. Establish a reserve of funds for initial payments of goods and services to be reimbursed by donor funds

#### **4. Managing**

Managing Non-governmental grants and gifts includes: (i) sustaining the donor's interest in helping the City to support its services, programs and facilities beyond the immediate donation, and (ii) engendering in the donor a growing level of comfort and confidence with the City's fundraising staff such that a relationship verging on being an advisor to the donor evolves. As often as possible, these processes are jointly and cooperatively undertaken by fundraising staff and the City Department Director who, during the acquisition and acceptance of the donation, was personally involved with the donor.

##### ***Recommendations***

1. Standardize the management of gift processes
2. Develop relevant and transparent accountability standards
3. Participate in a collaborative Grants and Gifts group to achieve improved efficiency, collaboration, reporting and integration between centralized resources and departmental grants and gifts actions.

#### **C. Technology: Government and Non-Government Grants and Gifts**

The technology team was formed to review and recommend technological options that would improve the efficiency of identifying, expending, managing and tracking grants and gifts. The following are their recommendations:

##### ***Recommendations***

1. Enhance the current internal CityNet site to include:
  - a. The City's grant application processes
  - b. Information on how to write grants
  - c. Sample grant applications
  - d. Grants management manual
  - e. Lessons learned
  - f. Grant opportunity announcements
  - g. List of contacts
  - h. Links to free or City-paid subscription grant web sites
2. Acquire City subscriptions to selected Grants and Gifts Search Tools such as:
  - a. Big Online America or eCivis Grant Locator (partner with County of San Diego)
  - b. Foundation Search America for Gifts/non-government grants
  - c. Acquire licenses to search services (\$3,500 to \$20,000 depending on number of users.
3. Acquire a Citywide database for tracking donors that includes:

- a. Contact management
  - b. Operational management
  - c. Sharing donor information across City Departments
4. Utilize the standard or a customized grant management module of the SAP (ERP) software

#### **D. Most Efficient Government Organization**

There are currently 43.68 FTEs assigned to identify, apply, and administer grants and gifts. These positions are spread throughout the eighteen Departments actively involved in grant and gift activities. The cost associated with these positions is approximately \$4.37 million. Funding sources include general, grant and enterprise. During 2006 figures, 36 grants valued at approximately \$33million were award, 110 grants valued at approximately \$160 million were being administered and 17 grant applications valued at approximately \$72 million were pending.

The external survey data revealed that like the City of San Diego, most jurisdictions (83%) have a decentralized system. Of the responses received, the two agencies with the most comprehensive, coordinated and successful programs were the County of San Diego and the City of Minneapolis. Minneapolis has a centralized group entitled the Office of Grants and Special Projects. This division provides coordinated leadership and direction to the City of Minneapolis and its departments in the areas of grant seeking, writing and management. They provide technical assistance and training on grantor expectations, requirements and performance reporting. They also have an extensive website that includes such things as: awards, finding the money, proposal submittals and follow-up, spending the money, forms and links to grant opportunities. The County of San Diego has a similar organizational structure and website. Minneapolis has five staff members, while the County has three. The Minneapolis Office of Grants and Special Projects also manages the Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and Consolidate Plan Programs, while a separate office in the County of San Diego administers these types of federal programs. The City of San Diego administers its HUD and Consolidated Plan Programs similar to the County of San Diego. Appendix 3 shows snapshots of each agency's website and organizational structure.

The BPR Team's process mapping for acquiring grants and gifts indicated a need for a centralized resource center, similar to those described above. In addition, the internal survey results indicated that City Departments place a heavy emphasis on the pursuit and management of grants and gifts. With this survey data and the BPR Team's review of best practices, a list of key recommendations was developed.

***Recommendations***

1. Formalize the existing grants and gifts coordination team by establishing a dotted line reporting relationship with Citywide Grants/Administration and establishing mandatory monthly coordination meetings. Appendix 4 shows the proposed organization chart.
2. Create a centralized Grants and Gifts Resource Center.
3. Create a pilot ordinance to reduce processing times and allow the Mayor or his designee the ability to accept appropriate and expend up to \$1 million per grant as long as no matching funds are required.
4. Develop and fund an “as needed” consultant list to assist City Departments with grant writing. Interested City Departments will contribute funds to establish a \$100,000 not-to exceed amount.
5. Survey major fundraising institutions and national fundraising associations to identify “best practices” regarding the Most Efficient Governmental Organization for gifts. Make recommendations for the City’s Executive Team review and approval.

Both the County of San Diego and the City of Minneapolis realized an increase in competitive grant awards with the establishment of a strong, centralized resource center that provides many of the services included in the BPR Team’s recommendations. With the approval and implementation of the above recommendations, the Team believes the City will improve its efficiency and effectiveness with grant and gift identification, proposal preparation, interdepartmental coordination/collaboration, grants and gifts management and award success.

**FISCAL CONSIDERATIONS:**

Implementation of the Grants and Gifts BPR recommendations carries no fiscal impacts in the current or next Fiscal Year.

**PREVIOUS COUNCIL and/or COMMITTEE ACTION:**

None

**COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND PUBLIC OUTREACH EFFORTS:**

The Department included a number of external stakeholders with background and familiarity with the Department’s operations.

**KEY STAKEHOLDERS AND PROJECTED IMPACTS:**

We do not believe that this BPR study includes recommendations that are subject to Meet & Confer. However, we will ask the relevant labor organization (MEA) to review and, if information is requested or the labor organization believes that Meet & Confer is required, we will ask to delay Council’s hearing of the item until such time as Meet & Confer issues are resolved.



Debra Fischle-Faulk  
Director of Administration



Jay M. Goldstone  
Chief Operating Officer

Attachment: Summary of BPR Recommendations  
Appendices