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Abstract

In November 1997 Oregon voters passed Measure 47, a "cut and cap" tax reform measure which rolled property taxes back to earlier levels and capped all future tax increases at 3% per year. The terms of Measure 47 reduced the City of Portland's General Fund revenues, forcing General Fund-reliant bureaus to significantly reduce their budgets. The revenue shortfall was so large that the City Council mandated all bureaus to devise an inclusive decision-making process. At the time the measure passed, one such General Fund reliant bureau was nearing completion on an organizational assessment that identified the bureau’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and challenges. Historically, the bureau in question had a very strong oral culture and the Management Team has made decisions based more on intuition than on explicit criteria. The information acquired through the organizational assessment process provided the budget team a rational justification for their decisions, something that had been unavailable prior to that point in time. The newly available data, used in conjunction with a mission-based set of priorities and broad stakeholder input resulting in a budgeting process deemed successful by the Mayor, City Council as well as the bureau’s staff and stakeholders. The Measure 47 budget process was highly successful because there was both an effective balance of public acceptability and defensible analysis.

Portland Parks & Recreation

Portland Parks & Recreation (PP&R) is the single largest recreation provider in the Portland Metropolitan Region with a park system that in 1997 (the period covered by this paper) was comprised of 10,000 acres divided into 200 parks and 50 recreational sites. In order for PP&R to continue offering its then current level of service, the bureau would have needed $31.7 million for operating expenses and an additional $3 million for capital expenditures. Approximately 24% or $7.5 million of PP&R's operating budget was comprised of grants, external contracts, interagency agreements with other bureaus, fees and permits. The remaining $24.3 million, drawn from the City's General Fund, was derived largely through property taxes, utility franchise licenses, business licenses, and lodging taxes. The operation and upkeep of PP&R's parks, facilities, and programs required a workforce of 310.7 FTE at its then current level of service. In addition, PP&R leveraged its full-time hours through the use of seasonal, temporary and part time employees. The numbers detailed above exclude PP&R's enterprise funds which operate PP&R’s four golf courses and the Portland International Raceway, as well as the General Obligation Bond Initiative (GOBI), which was the bureau's bond-funded capital construction effort.

Measure 5

In November 1990, Oregon voters passed Ballot Measure 5 (Measure 5)—a tax compression initiative which limited the total property taxes which the state could assess. In addition, Measure 5 restricted the amount local government and school districts could receive per $1000 of property value. As a result, in FY 1991-92, PP&R was faced with an approximately 13% percent reduction to its current service level budget. Prior to the Measure 5 budgeting process, PP&R’s budget decision-making had been fairly routinized with the primary decision-making criterion being the historical provision of certain services. The depth of cuts necessitated by Measure 5 required a significant shift in the way decisions were to be made.

In early 1991, PP&R’s senior management team met with their budget center managers to develop a tool to help facilitate the budget decision-making process. The resulting tool, the Measure 5 Matrix, portrayed an analysis of PP&R’s cost effectiveness, mission
alignment, and service provision to target. At that point in its history, PP&R did not have any organized system for collecting objective data. Instead, PP&R relied on its oral culture of assumptions and intuitions to complete the Measure 5 Matrix.

Reflecting back on the usability of the Measure 5 Matrix, many of those interviewed who had participated in the Measure 5 budgeting process felt that the application of the matrix categories was a tedious, time consuming process, with results too subjective to usefully enhance the quality of the decisions. Additionally, the weakest aspect of the matrix was its reliance on similar criteria to assess all of PP&R’s diverse range of programming and operational functions (i.e. aquatic programming and turf care). When asked how they felt about the Measure 5 budget process, staff at all levels of the organization responded that the process had been fairly closed and that the decisions had been made subjectively by senior managers without adequate consideration of the impact on the bureau as a whole.

**PP&R’s Strategic Planning Process**

In early 1996, at the direction of the City’s financial office, Portland Parks & Recreation began an intensive self-evaluation as the first step in developing an integrated work plan that was to include a strategic plan, an operating plan, and a financial plan. The bureau formed a committee (Strategic Planning Committee) that included representatives from every level of the organization to coordinate the organizational assessment process. The organizational assessment process extended throughout the entire bureau with 4 key divisions identified for more in-depth analysis.

The data that was gathered during PP&R’s organizational assessment process included: the results of 2 customer surveys, an inventory of PP&R’s programs, an assessment of the impact of parks and recreation programs on people’s lives, an assessment of unit cost by division, ratio of preventive maintenance to emergency repairs and a survey of organizations whose budget, mission, and/or facilities were comparable to those of Portland Parks & Recreation. Another outcome of PP&R’s strategic planning process was the Policy on Program Prioritization (PPP), a decision-making tool developed with broad input from staff at all levels of PP&R. The PPP articulated the priorities and principles that would guide PP&R in the event that there is a significant reduction in the level of funding. The PPP opened with a statement of PP&R’s mission and a set of overall priorities based on that mission. The three components that comprise PP&R’s mission (in priority order) were then broken out individually:

1. Protecting park land and infrastructure
2. Providing recreational facilities that are open, clean, and safe
3. Providing recreational programming

Within each of these responsibility areas, responsibilities were further prioritized by the centrality of the role served by PP&R and the reversibility of the decision should funding be restored. For example, protecting park land and infrastructure is central to PP&R’s mission. Once park land is sold, it is very difficult and potentially very expensive to re-purchase, and has broad implication for the livability of the city. Therefore, in the case of
a budget shortfall, protecting park land by keeping it safe and clean has a higher priority 
than ensuring that it is attractively designed and developed.

**Measure 47**
In November, 1996, Oregonians passed yet another a property tax reform measure, Ballot 
Measure 47, which severely affected state and local property tax revenue. Measure 47 
rolled Oregon property taxes back the maximum amount of the 1997-98 property tax to 
the amount imposed for FY 1994-95 or 90% of the property tax imposed for 1995-96, 
whichever was lower. In addition, the property tax restricted the maximum annual 
increase to no more than 3%. The only exemptions to the 3% increase limit would be 
taxes approved by a double-majority or over 50% of votes in an election in which not less 
than 50% of the registered voters cast a ballot. The 3% limit on annual increases created 
a situation in which financial losses to state and local governments would worsen as 
inflation exceeds property tax growth. In addition, Measure 47 placed restrictions on 
governments' ability to raise fees to shift, transfer or convert revenue lost through 
property taxes by requiring all increases to be subject to voter approval.

**PP&R’s Response to Measure 47**
*PP&R’s Budget Decision-Making Process*
In December, 1996, PP&R's Director convened the first of five full and half day Budget 
Team retreats. The Budget Team was comprised of the ten members of the Parks 
Management Team, three representatives from the major unions which represent PP&R 
employees, The Senior Financial Analyst who is responsible for the budget, and the 
author, who had collected and analyzed the bulk of the data for the organizational 
assessment. After passage of Measure 47, PP&R’s senior management team shifted the 
bureau’s orientation away from the creation of a strategic marketing plan towards 
preparing for budget cuts that resulted from the passage of Measure 47. The data that had 
been collected as part of the strategic planning process as well as the PPP were given to 
the Budget Team to facilitate their decision-making process.

Prior to its organizational assessment, PP&R did not have any rational information from 
which to justify budget decisions. This absence is what made the Measure 5 process so 
arduous, and the strategic planning process proved to be an effective impetus for 
initiating efforts to identify, collect and utilize rational information to support major 
decisions. However, because there was no historical precedent, no one was quite sure 
what information would prove to be useful.

The PPP provided a strong basis for the decision-making process. This is not surprising, 
considering that the PPP was primarily a documentation of the PP&R's values which until 
that time had been transmitted through PP&R's long standing oral culture. Historically, 
PP&R has tracked the quality or effectiveness of decisions, programs or initiatives very 
sporadically and success or failure was solely based on the intuition of the person in 
charge rather than reliance on any explicit criteria. This culture affected the quality of 
budgeting decisions, as the Budget Team was always forced to rely solely on the 
judgment of the manager in charge. Although the PPP was little more than the 
documentation of the prevailing philosophy, it crystallized the priorities in such a way
that they could serve both as a conscience check and as a guide for decision-makers, both within and outside of the bureau. After the decisions had been made, all of the cut packages were placed on a matrix containing the criteria detailed in the PPP. The PPP matrix alone assured City Council, PP&R’s staff and the general public that all of PP&R’s decisions remained true to PP&R’s mission.

The data collected as part of the strategic planning process was used to further clarify and inform decisions based on the priorities detailed in the PPP. As useful as the available data was, there remained a concern with the poor reliability of the data. Data collection was inconsistent between sites, making analysis difficult to generalize. In addition, some aspects of the analytical methodology were suspect because there was inadequate time to test various assumptions and hypotheses. Nevertheless, even questionable data proved to be more useful to the Budget Team, and most trusted by PP&R’s stakeholders, than the subjective measures used during the measure 5 budgeting process.

Stakeholder Input
Due to the extensiveness of the cuts necessitated by the terms of Measure 47, the Portland City Council made the decision to mandate that all bureaus be inclusive in the budget reduction decision-making process. Both line employees and the unions were expected to have an opportunity to express their opinions and to be kept informed as the decisions were being made. PP&R took several approaches to making its decision process as open and inclusive as possible. First, the Management Team invited union representatives to participate as members of the Budget Team; second, the Director instructed budget center managers to communicate with their staff; and, finally, the Budget Manager distributed "Good Ideas" forms to all staff so that employees could share their own ideas, with the option of anonymity, in a safe and comfortable way. PP&R has worked very hard over the past few years to improve its relationship with the unions that represent its employees. The inclusion of union representatives on the decision-making body is indicative of the open and trusting relationship that has been established between management and the unions.

The overwhelming majority of PP&R's line staff do not work in the administrative offices located in the Portland Building, a situation which had created some communication challenges in the past. PP&R’s Director had made bureau-wide communication a priority during the Measure 47 decision-making process and PP&R's Director and Commissioner-in-Charge set the tone by outlining the budget process to all-staff at PP&R's annual holiday party in December. This was the first of two all staff meetings designed to keep the staff informed about the budget process and decisions. In addition, PP&R utilized its biweekly newsletter, PayDirt, to facilitate communication throughout the bureau. During the budget process PP&R's Budget Manager wrote articles for PayDirt to ensure that all staff were kept up-to-date on the budget process. In February 1997, PP&R held a second all-staff meeting at a community center. PP&R's Director described the decision-making process and outlined the types of reductions that the Budget Team had selected and opened the floor to questions. A written description of the cuts and decision-making process was distributed at the end of the meeting.
PP&R's Director also sought to incorporate the public into the decision-making process. PP&R has many non-profit friends groups which support programs and facilities. These groups range from those with regulatory responsibility to those with primary responsibility for the maintenance and operation of a facility to groups that serve in an advisory capacity. Friends groups are considered to be part of PP&R's extended family, and PP&R felt an obligation to include them in the decision-making process and offer them an opportunity to have their voices heard. The friends group meeting was held in December 1996 and 35-40 representatives attended the meeting. The representatives were updated on Measure 47's projected impact on parks, PP&R's budget process was outlined, good ideas forms were distributed, and the customer survey and impact survey were distributed.

PP&R’s Director also established a Budget Advisory Committee whose members were chosen for their ties to the community and their ability to consider the broader context of PP&R's decisions. Their role was to provide a community perspective and serve as a conscience for the process (similar to the kind of check provided by having the union representatives sit on the Budget Team). The Committee was provided with a draft copy of the PPP, as well as a prioritized list of cut packages with their impact areas checked against the priorities laid out in the PPP. PP&R's Commissioner-in-Charge attended the second meeting of the Budget Advisory Committee in order to hear the committee's feedback on PP&R's cuts and their general impressions on the process. The group was very supportive of the proposed decisions and appreciated being shown the rationale behind the tough decisions PP&R was forced to make.

**Budget Feedback**

PP&R's Management Team put a great deal of effort into making the Measure 47 budget process open and inclusive. After the budget document was submitted PP&R's Director, Deputy Director, a selection of Budget Team members including all of the union representatives, a selection of Budget Center managers, budget technical staff, and several line staff on the both the Recreation and Operation side of the bureau were interviewed to solicit feedback on the Measure 47 budget process and their recommendations for future budget efforts. PP&R's Measure 47 budget process introduced several new elements and the interviews were designed to assess the success of the Management Team's efforts, as well as to collect a subjective appraisal of the value of the regularly collecting and analyzing data as a way to improve decision-making. The decision to collect feedback from staff and union representatives was also based on an interest in bringing closure to the decision-making process.

The interviews included questions about the usefulness of the process, the quality of the information received, the elements that were worth keeping in a crisis budget year, those elements that were worth keeping in a normal budget year, any strengths or weaknesses that the participants had recognized in the budget process and finally any recommendations for elements to be changed or added into the budget process.

*Summary of Responses*
Staff at all levels of the organization, from line staff to the Director, both represented and not, felt that the increased communication and the availability of the analytical information that had been prepared as part of the organizational assessment made the Measure 47 budgeting process a success. Although cutting budgets and eliminating positions is always difficult, everyone interviewed felt that the decision-making process had been open and equitable.

There was a consensus that the additional information provided by the organizational analysis was responsible, in a large part, for the high quality of the budget proposal. Unsurprisingly, there was a perception that the cuts were more rational and well thought out in the areas where the analysis had been more in depth. Although some of the data that the process produced proved very useful and informative, there were also some data that were time-consuming to compile and not perceived as particularly useful. The interviewees felt that the most useful analytical tools should be updated regularly (if not annually) so that the quality of the data would improve and PP&R continue to make informed, rational decisions.

Responses were mixed regarding the communication of budget decisions throughout all levels of the bureau. The wide distribution of information through PayDirt proved to be the most successful means through which to communicate with all staff. Staff at all levels felt that the PayDirt articles were informative and appreciated the effort to keep them up to date on the process. The impressions of the line staff seemed to depend on the communication style of their direct supervisors. Staff whose supervisors had communicated with them throughout the process, had explained the rationale behind the budgetary decisions were generally more positive about the whole budget decision-making process. This held true even when an employee's job was slated for elimination. PP&R has many staff members with many years invested in the bureau, and they are genuinely concerned with the continuation of PP&R's high quality service. The line staff who worked for uncommunicative supervisors felt a stronger sense of isolation and the cuts were perceived as more arbitrary. It should be noted that communication within the bureau was one of the topics that was addressed through the strategic planning process. The Measure 47 budget included a restructuring of the organization to help improve communication within the bureau.

Union participation in the budget decision-making process was generally perceived as a positive element. There was disagreement among the parties involved about whether there should be union representation on the Budget Team during non-crisis years. Some of the hesitation may be due to the information gap between the Management Team and the union representatives. This information gap could have been eliminated if the time had been taken prior to the meetings of the Budget Team to bring the union representatives up to speed on the organizational assessment and PP&R's current service level budget. Another way to eradicate the information gap would be to include union representation on the Budget Team every year. This would also further develop the relationship between the unions and management with the hope that this would further foster communication and cooperation.
Line staff and middle managers felt that regularly scheduled all-staff meetings should take place both in regular and crisis years. Staff only come together when there is a crisis and there is no a concentrated effort to inform staff when there is an increase to a current service level budget, nor was there an opportunity for line staff to make their case to management, correct misconceptions, or even just provide some additional support for a program.

**Lessons Learned**

Stakeholder input is a critical component in the success or failure of crisis budgeting. During the Measure 5 process, PP&R employees felt disenfranchised after a 13% budget cut. The cuts were perceived as arbitrary by staff, some of whom had the responsibility to explain to the general public why some of their favorite programs had been cut, but had no good answers. Unions were upset by lay-offs and the task of rebuilding relationships and improving employee morale went on long after the budgeting process was over.

In contrast, there was very little work to be done after the Measure 47 budgeting process. Although staff positions were cut, the unions filed no complaints after the budget submission. Staff were empowered with the knowledge to explain program reductions and changes to the public at large. Overall, morale within the bureau remained fairly high, despite deep budget cuts. City Council, the Mayor and the Office of Finance & Administration all lauded Portland Parks & Recreation's Measure 47 budget process and suggested that the other city bureaus emulate PP&R's style and methodology. There were three key differences between the fiscal crises of 1991 and 1997. They were:

- Stakeholder input, incorporating elements of:
  - Education
  - Communication
- A mission-based system of priorities
- Objective and meaningful data

Bureaus at the local level vary widely in their organizational culture, structures and governance. Nonetheless, these 3 key lessons to be learned from PP&R’s successful budgeting process in a crisis year have broad applicability.

**Stakeholder Input**

During the Measure 47 budget process, PP&R included union representatives in the budget team. Everyone interviewed felt that including the union representatives in the budget meetings was a critical element in the success of the process. The union representatives were able to ask questions as decisions were being made, and not in retrospect. By participating in the budget negotiations, the union representatives broadened their perspective so that they were able to understand how their concerns fit in to the big picture of the bureau as a whole. Due to their broadened perspective, the unions and the employees they represent came to understand that the Budget Team did
everything possible to reduce the number of layoffs, and that any cuts made were based on objective criteria and were mission-based.

All of the members of the Budget Team (including the union representatives), complained about the union representatives’ lack of knowledge regarding the budget process. This slowed down the budget decision-making process because too much meeting time was taken up educating the union representatives. These issues could have been resolved by taking some time prior to bringing the whole Budget Team together to educate the union representatives about the budget process itself, how the bureau makes budget decisions and the data used to inform those decisions. This time taken before the whole Budget Team came together would have made the budget meetings more efficient.

Stakeholder education is a key element in an open and successful budget process. Most stakeholders are not professional public administrators and may be completely unfamiliar with a public budgeting process at the bureau level. Educational meetings result in a more informed public who can better understand how and why certain decisions are made. Public meetings can be expensive and are not always conducive to effective learning when working with large groups. One way around these concerns is to utilize representatives from friends groups or other groups with strong community ties, to educate them in smaller groups that can then go out and educate others on the bureau’s behalf. This same technique is also very effective when communicating ideas or decisions to constituent groups.

Communication was another critical aspect of the stakeholder input. Staff were updated continuously throughout the budget process and had a sense of what issues were being wrestled with at any given time. They learned about the tools that were being used to make decisions and were able to monitor the process as it unfolded. Those who had a particular concern or question were able to raise the issue with a supervisor or senior manager in real-time rather than after the fact. Although staff who worked under less-communicative supervisors felt less informed about the cuts in their own divisions, they felt that bureau-wide communication kept them informed of the process overall. Line staff also felt that had had enough information to be able to address concerns raised by friends groups or the general public. No one was unpleasantly surprised at the end of the process because they had been observing the process throughout. Many felt that the final meeting at the community center relating the outcome of the budgeting process was unnecessary because they had already learned all they needed to know through the communication they received throughout the process. This was in sharp contrast to the shock, anger and confusion that was a result of the Measure 5 process in which the only communication with staff took place at the outset and at the completion of the budget decision-making process.

Creating a citizen advisory committee gave the Budget Team an educated and informed group of citizens to test the public palatability of some of their ideas. This pre-testing also served to improve the quality of decisions and reduce the shock that might have come from some of PP&R’s strongest supporters had they not been kept informed of what was going on. The advisory committee also served as a intermediary in an
educational context and helped communicate decisions to other PP&R stakeholders with whom they had strong relationships.

**A Mission-Based System Of Priorities**

One of the common complaints about the Measure 5 decision-making process was that the decisions felt arbitrary and subjective. Even if PP&R had possessed the objective data for the Measure 5 decision-making process, it wouldn’t have made a significant difference. The decisions would not have been perceived as subjective, but they still would have felt arbitrary. The PPP provided the Measure 47 decision-making process with its fundamental sense of direction. The PPP was developed with input from representatives at all levels and from all divisions of PP&R so it was true aggregation of how the staff of PP&R interprets its mission. Prioritizing based on an organization’s mission results in decisions that are not only defensible, but are also likely to achieve broad support (assuming of course that the rationale has been well communicated to a bureau’s stakeholders). In order to be maximally effective, a mission-based system of priorities needs to include both an overall mission statement for the entire bureau, as well as for the key functions of the bureau. These functions will most likely cross over organizational divisions, but they should encompass the work the bureau does to complete its mission.

In the normal course of things, budgeting is done on the divisional level within a bureau. However, the fulfillment of a bureau’s mission is played out across many divisions. A bureau’s mission gives direction to the bureau as a whole and provides a great deal of guidance when making decisions with far-reaching implications. Often within an organization, there are several sub-groups that are charged with implementing the same components of the overall mission. For example, you will find in one division direct service delivery (recreation programs or arts classes or maintaining parks), while in another division you will find the administrative functions that support direct service delivery (i.e. producing program catalogs or billing classes or paying staff). Budget decisions made at the divisional level can easily miss the cascading effects of those changes upon other divisions. When setting mission-based priorities with an eye on the components of the organization’s mission, budgeters are able to refocus their attention on the big picture and make decisions at a level that transcends a single division or functional work-group.

Although the PPP was the backbone of PP&R’s Measure 47 decision-making process, it clearly could not stand on its own. A mission-based system of priorities may be able to demonstrate that decisions were not made arbitrarily, but it cannot address the concern that decisions were made subjectively.

**Objective And Meaningful Data**

Objective and meaningful data are the limbs that support the mission’s backbone. A set of mission-based priorities will help group sets of decisions, but provides no mechanism for ranking within those sets. That is the role of the data. Despite the fact the PP&R’s data collection processes were suspect and that there were no historical trends available for comparison, the use of objective data was invaluable to the decision-making process.
Objective data alone is not an adequate tool to rank budget options within a set of priorities. The Budget Team was presented with many data sets and matrices; and at the end of the process were very clear about the differences between what was a waste of time and what was valuable to the process. Although their responses may seem like common sense, tools that seemed useful in the abstract proved to be useless in decision-making and the inverse was true as well. The tools that were perceived by the Budget Team to be most useful contained these elements:

- **The comparisons had to be comparable (apple to apple)** – This is one of those areas where common sense and practicality collide. Different divisions of any bureau do different work and therefore have different workflow measures. When looking at a bureau as a whole, it is tempting to try to measure divisions against each other. While data can be manipulated to make these types of comparisons possible, the results are meaningless.

- **The underlying data need to be reliable** – When the data collection was suspect, people were less likely to trust the decisions based on that data. One way to improve data collection is to make the data-collection process easily integrated into existing duties and responsibilities (see next bullet).

- **The data collection had to be feasible for staff** – PP&R had never before created a unified effort to standardize data collection throughout the bureau. The most successful data collection methods were those in which the staff collecting the data, the managers that supervise that staff, and the senior management all gleaned meaningful data as a result.

- **A limited amount of subjectivity is good** – Although objectivity is useful, some subjectivity integrated into analysis is important. Quality assessment tools provide subjective feedback about the quality of service delivery and help flesh out a purely objective analysis.

PP&R was fortunate in that it was already engaged in a strategic planning process when Measure 47 passed. Having completed the data collection phase of an organizational assessment, PP&R had available data that facilitated rational decision-making during its budget process. Had data collection not already been completed, there would not have been time to gather the necessary data. PP&R’s non-documenting culture made people initially resistant to collecting data. Staff often felt that data collection would add to their workload and that the information would sit in a file drawer somewhere, unused. Because of its applicability to the Measure 47 budgeting process, staff who were at first uncomfortable and suspicious of the data collection process were able to see that there was immediate applicability to the information they were gathering. This kind of immediate gratification brought about a sea-change in the culture at PP&R.

**Conclusion**

Bureaus and municipalities vary widely in their organizational structures and cultures. Nonetheless, this case study of PP&R’s Measure 47 budgeting process in a crisis year should be readily generalized to local-level bureaus. Many, if not all of the key lessons learned are likely to be broadly applicable and may increase the acceptability of inevitable difficult budgeting decisions.
Communication and defensible criteria are the keys to success. If stakeholders feel included in the process, and they understand the rationale for decisions, they are more likely to be supportive of decisions that negatively impact themselves or their interests. Time is a key factor in both communication and data collection, and that time may be difficult to allocate in bureaus with ever shrinking budgets. However, to whatever degree bureaus are currently conducting outcome assessments, they can begin to share the results with their stakeholders on a regular basis if they are not already doing so. A mission-based system of priorities may be used not only during a budget reduction year, but also as a guide for creating budget add packages when additional funding becomes available. Taking steps like these before a crisis hits will help put an organization in a better position in the case of a financial downturn.

**Epilogue**
Five years after the Measure 47 budget process, PP&R is continuing to improve the quality and reliability of their data collection and analysis because it proved to be invaluable in making difficult decisions. In May 2002, PP&R suffered yet another blow to their budget as the result of Measure 47. PP&R put a tax levy on the ballot to help sustain program delivery in under-served areas. Although 70% of voters supported the measure, only 48% of voters went to the polls on Election Day, thereby not meeting the double-majority standards set forth in Ballot Measure 47. Due to the broad support for the levy, Portland’s City Council elected to place the levy back on the ballot in November 2002, when voter turnout is expected to be much higher due to a gubernatorial race on the same ballot. Without being able to count on the anticipated funds from the levy, PP&R just faced another round of budget cuts. Utilizing many of the same techniques PP&R completed another successful budget-cutting process, although this time, there is hope of quicker restorations.
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