



## NETWORK OVERLAP

### PURPOSE OF SURVEY

The purpose of this survey was to provide an initial assessment of the current relationships among key community development, social justice and urban environmental networks working on a region-wide basis in the San Francisco Bay Area. (For this survey, a network is defined as an association of organizations formed to address a common interest, with a governing body consisting primarily of people who represent specific nonprofit organizations.)

A survey was developed and sent to 13 organizations, identified as networks by the consultants and the project sponsors. They are:

- Bay Area Alliance for Sustainable Development (Sunne McPeak)
- Bay Area Open Space Council (John Woodbury)
- Bay Area Transportation Choices Forum (Stuart Cohen)
- Bay Area Transportation and Land Use Coalition (Rachel Peterson)
- California Community Economic Development Assoc. (Ralph Lippman)
- California Futures Network (Steve Sanders)
- Environmental Water Caucus (Jean Auer)
- FAITHS Initiative (Dwayne Marsh)
- Greenlining Institute (John Gamboa)
- Metropolitan Assembly (Carl Anthony)
- Nonprofit Housing Association of No. California (Dianne Spaulding)
- Northern California Food Systems Alliance (Terrell Brand)
- San Francisco Bay Area Brownfields Working Group (Torri Estrada)

## NETWORK PROFILE

There is a great deal of diversity among the networks included in this survey with regard to budgets, staffing, office sites and membership.

The annual income for these networks ranged from zero dollars to 1.2 million dollars in 1998 and 1999. One network reported no annual income during the two-year period; 2 networks reported annual incomes of less than \$50,000; 5 networks reported annual incomes between \$50,001 and \$300,000; 2 networks reported annual incomes between \$300,001 and \$500,000; and 3 networks reported annual incomes in excess of \$500,000.

The number of full-time staff employed by these networks varied from 0 employees to 6 employees. Three networks had 1 or fewer full-time staff; 4 networks had 1 to 2 full-time staff; 3 networks had 3 to 4 full-time staff; and 2 networks had 5 or more full-time staff. One network did not respond to this question.

Seven networks had 1 office site; 2 networks had 2 office sites; and 2 networks had 3 office sites located in various regions of the State.

It was reported that individual networks had from 7 to 500 member organizations. Only 1 network had fewer than 10 member organizations; 5 networks had from 10 to 50 member organizations; 7 networks had from 51 to 100 member organizations; and 3 networks had more than 100 member organizations. One network did not respond to this question.

## SURVEY QUESTIONS

The network representatives were asked to respond to three questions: 1) Which Bay Area counties do your organization work in and how often? 2) Which other networks have you worked with in the last 12 months and with what frequency? 3) With which networks do you have overlapping staff, Board or organizational membership?

**Table 1** shows the frequency of network involvement in the nine Bay Area counties. The main findings include:

- One-third (4) of the networks work regularly in all 9 counties
- All of the networks (12) work in Alameda County.
- Alameda (12), San Francisco (11), Santa Clara (8), San Mateo (8) and Contra Costa (7) counties have the highest level of regular network activity.

**TABLE 1**

Bay Area Counties	Networks Involved on a Regular Basis	Networks Involved Infrequently	Networks Not Involved
<i>All 9 Counties</i>	4		
Alameda	12		
Contra Costa	7	5	
Marin	6	3	3
Napa	4	3	5
San Francisco	11	1	
San Mateo	8	3	1
Santa Clara	8	4	
Solano	4	3	5
Sonoma	4	4	4

N=12

**Table 2** shows the frequency that networks have worked with each other within the last 12 months. The main findings include:

- One-half of the networks (6) are working with at least one other network on a daily or weekly basis.
- Three-fourths (8) of the networks are working with each other at least on a monthly/quarterly basis.
- One-third of the networks (#1, 3, 5, 8) stated they have contact with a majority of the other networks on a daily to infrequent basis.
- Five of the networks (#2, 4, 6, 10, 12) stated they do not have frequent contact with other networks.

**TABLE 2**

<b>Network Organization</b>	<b>Daily/Weekly</b>	<b>Monthly/Quarterly</b>	<b>Infrequent</b>	<b>None</b>
Network 1	1	2	6	2
Network 2	0	0	2	9
Network 3	1	3	3	4
Network 4	0	1	2	8
Network 5	3	2	4	2
Network 6	0	0	0	11
Network 7	0	1	3	7
Network 8	1	2	5	3
Network 9	1	4	1	5
Network 10	0	1	1	8
Network 11	2	1	3	5
Network 12	0	0	1	10

N=12

**Table 3** shows the overlap of staff, Board or organizational membership among the networks. The main findings include:

- One-half of the networks (#1, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11) have staff overlap with at least one other network.
- Eight of the networks (#1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 9, 10, 11) stated that they have board overlap with another network.
- Eleven (all except #12) of the networks indicated that they had overlapping organizational membership.
- Overall, 11 of the 12 networks reported staff, Board or membership overlap with at least one network.

**TABLE 3**

<b>Network Organization</b>	<b>Staff</b>	<b>Board Members</b>	<b>Organization Members</b>
Network 1	3	2	4
Network 2	0	1	1
Network 3	1	2	6
Network 4	0	0	2
Network 5	0	2	7
Network 6	0	0	2
Network 7	0	0	1
Network 8	1	2	5
Network 9	1	1	5
Network 10	1	1	2
Network 11	1	2	6
Network 12	0	0	0

N=12

### Summary

In summary, these data indicate that the regional networks participating in the survey are working in all of the nine Bay Area counties with the highest concentration of activity in San Francisco, Santa Clara, San Mateo and Contra Costa counties. The majority of these networks are working collaboratively with at least one other regional network on a regular basis. All but one of the networks have overlapping staff, board or organizational members.