



AARON PESKIN

MEMORANDUM

DATE: April 21, 2016

TO: Sunny Angulo, Chief of Staff, District 3 office

FROM: Vicki Larkowich, Policy Intern, District 3 office

SUBJECT: Summary of OEWD Response to Sup. Peskin Letter of Inquiry

Ms. Angulo:

The Office of Economic and Workforce Development has responded to Supervisor Peskin's Letter of Inquiry with a report which gives a concise overview of the five main questions around the OEWD grants, overall budget and "Invest in Neighborhoods" program, but lacks clarity in the following areas as the information is very sparse:

- **Grant descriptions** – The list of the grant allocations for FY14-15 and FY15-16 does include the name of the grant recipients, the amounts, and the division within OEWD the grant is a part of *but it only gives a very brief description of the grant* (no more than 6 words) and *does not* provide much information in regard to the project description. It also does not indicate whether it is an annual grant, an unofficial grant, or a one-time grant.
- **Allocation process** – More clarity is needed on the allocation process. All the report indicates is that OEWD has several RFP's throughout the year and they try to group "like programs and projects together" within an RFP cycle. No information is given on what the specific RFP cycles are. Is it on a rolling basis where one should be checking the oewd.org website once a month? Is it based on the city's/state's/federal fiscal year schedule? Are new RFP's released on a monthly, quarterly, or yearly schedule? What is the average time frame for the RFP process – is it from when the RFP is released to the public and when the grant is awarded?

- **Panelist transparency** – There is still a lack of clarity around who is making the decisions respective to the grant awarding. Mr. Rufo states “Panelists may be any combination of department staff, other City staff and non-City staff that are knowledgeable in the program areas being solicited.” But who are these people and do they just change at will? It would seem that a truly transparent process would list the “panelists” and have some evaluation or criteria that they must adhere to more specifically to ensure that favoritism and patronage are not factors in the Mayor’s staff’s decisions to award public monies for everything from “neighborhood beautification” to “capacity building.”
- **Public Notification/Outreach** – Other than posting on the oewd.org website and sharing with contacts in newsletters and meetings where else is the information posted? Is it posted at the public library? Public outreach seems to indicate a non-profit or for-profit business would need to know to go to the OEWD website or know the staff of OEWD to get information.
- **Evaluation/Oversight** – What is the process if it is determined that “program and City objectives” are not being met during the check-ins and performance reports? Only mentioned check-ins and audits but not what the process is for non-compliant grants. Is there any evaluation/oversight of OEWD besides audits from funding agencies such as State EDD, Department of Labor, or the Small Business Administration?
- **Budget priorities** – Did not provide information on how the other budget priorities are funded within the Invest in Neighborhoods program. Gave a list of priorities for “immediate and long term needs for businesses to stay and grow in SF” but didn’t talk about how they are funded. So how are they funded?
- **Difference in budget breakout** – OEWD stipulates that 34% of FY14-15 budget and 47% of the FY15-16 budget has been allocated to “general neighborhood beautification, public realm improvements, programming and capacity-building for community-based organizations” yet only 19% of the OEWD budget growth in the same time period is attributed to neighborhood grants. Why is there such a large difference in attributed numbers? What is the actual breakdown?

Please feel free to follow up with me on any of the topics detailed in this memo.

VL