

Portland Clean Energy Community Benefits Fund (PCEF) Grants Committee
September 23, 2020 - MEETING MINUTES

Committee members present: Jeff Moreland Jr., Michael Edden Hill, Ranfis Villatoro, Maria Sipin, Megan Horst, Faith Graham, Andrea Hamberg, Shanice Clark

PCEF staff present: Sam Baraso, Cady Lister, Janet Hammer, Jaimes Valdez, Wendy Koelfgen

MEETING DECISIONS/ACTION ITEMS

Committee approved minutes.

Committee approved Bylaws with an amendment

6pm – Open and inspiration

Public comment - None

City Auditor overview of 2020 PCEF performance audit

Gordon Friedman, Performance Auditor, City of Portland, gave an overview of the city auditor's office and the recently launched audit of PCEF. Performance auditing looks for evidence of how something is performing versus how it should perform; audits are usually selected based on community input. PCEF was selected this year because of the amount of funding that will be distributed. The audit can be used to improve program operations. The audit uses interviews and documentation to understand what is going on. The office will write a report and release to public. Would like to hear from you if you would like to talk to us. Ballot measure and city code requires periodic performance auditing. This audit will fulfill that requirement.

- Sam: This audit will meet the program obligation for performance audit every two years. We also have an annual financial audit obligation.

Bylaws discussion

- Jaimes provided an overview of the work of the Bylaws subcommittee. The subcommittee is looking for feedback in particular around term limits for each committee member to serve. Current recommendation is to allow two terms (8 years), note that partial terms do not count towards that total.
- Andrea: We keep coming back to the question of term limits due to questions of turn over and bringing in new perspective versus how long it takes to learn the work and looking for a balance of the two.
- Michael: Concern about committee members getting entrenched, new perspectives make it harder to get entrenched. Other concern is that two terms (8 years) is a long service time to ask of someone. You can step out after four, but people might feel there is an expectation of serving eight. Concern over a single term (4 years) is that it won't give people time to get comfortable. We are recommending two terms. If I came to this as a second-round committee member, I would need more than a year to get used to it and find my place in it.
- Faith: I share all the concerns in both directions. Need to make a decision. Many people will self-select how long they serve. Curious about why partial terms don't count?
- Sam: Rationale is to preserve the staggered term. Putting aside those serving a two-year term in this initial cohort which will not exist for future cohorts. Wanted to make sure everyone had at least eight years, regardless of entry point.
- Michael: If someone leaves early, and you fill in, that time doesn't count toward eight-year maximum.
- Ranfis: Do I understand correctly "eight years of total consecutive service". If I took a four-year term and took a break, I could take an eight-year consecutive term in the future.

- Michael: After eight years, you have to take a two-year break.
 - Sam: Note that the committee would need to nominate you back in.
- Ranfis: Eight years is a long time but see the value in allowing people to serve that long. For me as a representative of east of 82nd, I was to see many different leaders in this role, regardless of demographics, age, income brackets. Want to see the space for people to grow and succeed. It takes some time to get firm on your leadership role among peers who have been here longer.
- Sam: Clarifying that as drafted, the bylaws say that the first set of Committee members serve a four-year term and the second set serve a two-year term. For the second set of the inaugural Committee members the maximum consecutive service for those currently serving two-year teams would be six years under the current modified proposal.
- Andrea: The partial term not counting would apply to Amanda who will serve out my term and still be able to serve eight more years.
- Maria: Do the qualifications for serving on the committee include people who live/work/worship/play in Portland?
 - Sam: Code says that committee members have to reside in Portland.
- Ranfis: For clarity sake, maybe say, cannot exceed two consecutive terms instead of cannot serve for more than eight consecutive years.
 - Jaimes: Made that edit, pending approval.
 - Sam: Will run final language by city attorney's office
- Jaimes: Bylaws proposal includes that co-chairs could each serve up to three years of consecutive service in that role. This would encourage rotation of co-chair duties throughout the committee.
- Andrea: Proposing co-chair model because the kinds of duties, media engagement, city council meetings, might work better as a divided role, with duties divided based on experience and interests.
- Michael: There is a list of co-chair responsibilities, that list would not be assigned out, it would be up to the co-chairs to divide based on strengths, would not be up to committee, would be up to co-chairs.
- Faith: No concerns, don't feel strongly about three-year co-chair term. Makes sense to have a rotation. Support the co-chair structure and decision making. Opportunity for mentorship/capacity building, any time we can create that, we should embrace it.
- Shanice: Co-chair model makes sense for the structure of our group, considering our agreements and values. Three-year term, given the relationship to overall committee terms, leaves room for a couple of folks to have leadership in the space, what does it mean to cycle through leadership. Encourage thinking more about distributing leadership among the group.
- Ranfis: I have a slight concern about burnout for co-chairs, any time we develop a leadership structure on the distribution of work, co-chairs take on a new executive structure which is not explicit in bylaws, a lot of work can be consolidated, people might be surprised at how much work co-chairs are taking on.
- Jaimes: Co-chairs can resign at any time. Working agreements will be reviewed annually, that might be a natural point for someone to step out.
- Andrea: The three years is a term limit not a requirement, want to make sure there is turn over.
- Megan: Fine with overall term limits. Appreciate the co-chair model, overwhelmed by the list of tasks, share Ranfis concern about burnout. There is a lot of discussion on staff liaison role. I am assuming a proactive staff role in assisting the co-chairs. Would like to hear more. Does a three-year co-chair term work with four-year committee terms? Would we always have people with experience on the committee as part of the co-chair pair?
- Andrea: If somebody has agreed to sit for a second four-year term and they want to stay in leadership, the three-year term forces change, we don't want the same board chair because of their willingness to continue, we also think a lot of people will serve less than three years in this role. Maybe you serve the

last year in your term. Regarding staff support, the co-chair role is to assure and ensure, not to do. Co-chair will advocate for staff to support the committee in the way the committee needs to be supported.

- Michael: If you take a co-chair position, there is no shame in leaving after any given amount of time, there is no expectation that anyone would stay a full three years.
- Ranfis: Did you consider revisiting co-chair role each year, then we are giving deference to someone stepping down before the three years.
 - Andrea: We focused more on the limit of three years. The only difference is that the committee will need to select co-chairs every year.
 - Sam: Language currently says co-chairs are reviewed once per calendar year, does that language creates enough space for check-in?
- Ranfis: How it is currently constructed sounds like three-year term is expected, changing to a one-year term with three terms max makes it a regular conversation around co-chair leadership, what do you do when there are multiple people interested in co-chair? Do we wait for someone to step down? One-year terms allow space for people who want to check in and have a vote, when current co-chairs don't want to step down.
- Shanice: I am aligning with Ranfis. Public bodies like ours, it depends on what the long-term needs will be for the committee. Leadership may emerge for different people at different times. In the future it might make sense to have shorter term limits, helpful to hear that three years in the max. It will be important to think about the communities we represent and to understand the function and expectations before signing up for the role. Maybe there can be some norming around the role, if three-year term limit is not an expectation then thinking about an expectation of a shorter term may encourage emergent leadership.
- Michael: One year of service with a three-term max sound great. Every year have the opportunity to step down or allow someone else to step in.

Suggested text edits to draft Bylaws (in italics)

- *Terms of the co-chairs shall be one (1) year, limits of a maximum of three (3) years of consecutive service shall apply to Co-Chairs and Co-Chair's appointment shall be reviewed with the Committee once per calendar year.*
- *Committee members may serve any number of terms not to exceed two (2) complete consecutive terms of service. Completion of an unexpired term does not apply toward the two-term cumulative. For the inaugural committee member terms that are two (2) years, committee members shall not exceed six (6) years of total consecutive service.*

Committee temperature check on edits

- Maria: I like the edits, no issues
- Michael: I like it
- Megan: Warm, I like it
- Ranfis: Looks good
- Shanice: Looks good
- Faith: Warm
- Jeffrey: Warm
- Andrea: Warm, it got better, thanks

Bylaws discussion cont'd

- Sam: Comments from Robin included grammatical edits and a question about whether email was included in statement that members can participate in person or by other electronic means. Participation needs to be live, via phone or other electronic means, cannot be email.
 - Andrea: Deliberations need to be public and transparent, include that intention.
 - Sam: We will figure out the way to capture that in working agreements along with additional pieces about recusing when there is a conflict of interest.
- Jaimes: Per the bylaws, the decision to adopt these bylaws would be to affirm the adoption, stand aside (counts as affirmation) or cast a no decision.
- Ranfis: Best for committee members to understand conflicts ahead of time, write them down and hold committee members compliant to the requirement. I am happy with the bylaws language and want to revisit bylaws, I am wanting to be pro-active and replicate best practices where we can, happy to set aside and vote for what we have here.

Motion to approve Bylaws

- Ranfis: Offer a motion to adopt the bylaws with edits (noted above).
- Andrea: Would like to amend to clarify that electronic participation is allowed but must be real time.
- Faith: second the amended proposal
- Maria: Affirm the proposal
- Megan: Affirm
- Michael: Affirmative
- Shanice: Approve
- Jeffrey: Affirmative
- Faith: Second and affirm

Committee meetings through November

Sam: There is a lot of work in December, propose two meetings during this open application period before heavy work during December. Would like to know other things you would be interested in seeing, noting that we cannot invite potential applicants right now. One discussion we will have is around how better to engage with the public. Please email us as you respond back to the meeting date survey.

Committee member comments

This was Andrea Hamburg's last meeting as a Committee Member. The Committee expressed appreciation for the time they worked together.

- Andrea: This has been a fantastic honor. Delighted to have spent the last ten months working with you. Deeply honored to be with a group of people who spent the time fixing an error in committee makeup. Everything is going fantastically. So excited to see what you accomplish in your eight years. PCEF winning at the ballot is one of my decade highlights. Thanks.
- Megan: Thank you for your service, appreciate your attention to governance issues, attention to detail and warmth and your leadership in stepping back to allow someone else to step in.
- Michael: It has been a pleasure working with you. This is my first board/committee, have learned a lot from you about ins/outs of committees. Thank you. Thank you for your commitment to bike commuting. We will miss you. I will miss you. Thanks for your hard work.
- Jeffrey: Thank you for your service. You were the first committee member I met. I love your calm demeanor and I appreciate your sacrifice. I am very inspired by you. It's been a pleasure knowing you.
- Maria: Thank you for answering the call to serve on PCEF. Always looked forward to your comments. Soft spot for public health people who do climate work. I can't wait to continue working with you.

- Faith: It's been so nice to get to know you. Everything everyone said and particularly your leadership in righting a wrong, that has meant a lot to me. Thank you.
- Shanice: My appreciation for the leadership you brought to this space. Group benefitted from you being here. Wish it could be longer. We need to stay connected. Before this uprising began, we were grappling with this. Appreciate and name your willingness to step up and create space for Indigenous voices. Really appreciate the example you set. Humble and thoughtful leader.
- Ranfis: Appreciate your leadership. Raised the bar for us in how we think about inclusion. Reminds of MLK "ultimate measure of person is not where they stand in times of comfort and convenience..." we can feel the framework and imprints of your leadership. I hope this is not a goodbye.

8pm = Meeting adjourned