

PCEF Grant Committee Meeting

Feb. 24, 2021, 6 – 9 p.m.





Virtual Participation Check

Guidelines for public participation

- Committee meetings open to the public
- Public invited to comment at around 6:05 p.m.
- Public asked to observe and listen
- Opportunities for public engagement in other forums

Guidelines applied to virtual meeting:



Chatbox: open for introductions and public comment. All other times, host-only chats (PCEF Staff).



Raise Hand: used by Committee only.



Video: on for Committee only.



Microphone: public members muted unless giving public comment or for introductions.



Recording: this meeting is being recorded.



Captioning: this meeting is being captioned; settings > show subtitles.




Introductions

Public comment


Agenda

6:00	Open
6:05	Public comment
6:20	Review of application development and grant review process
6:50	Overview of applications received
7:10	Break
7:20	Discussion of grant funding recommendations - portfolio balancing approach and options
8:50	Committee member comments
9:00	Meeting adjourned





Timeline









Focused on climate action with multiple benefits.

Justice Driven

Advance systems change that addresses historic and current discrimination. Center all disadvantaged and marginalized groups – particularly Black and Indigenous people Invest in people, livelihoods, places, and processes that build climate resilience and community wealth, foster healthy communities, and support regenerative systems. Avoid and mitigate displacement, especially resulting from gentrification pressures.



Community-powered

Trust community knowledge, experience, innovation, and leadership. Honor and build on existing work and partnerships, while supporting capacity building for emerging community groups and diverse coalitions. Engage with and invest in community-driven approaches that foster community power to create meaningful change.




Implement transparent funding, oversight, and engagement processes that promote continuous learning, programmatic checks and balances, and improvement. Demonstrate achievement of equitable social, economic, and environmental benefit. Remain accountable to target beneficiaries, grantees, and all Portlanders.



Grant review process

Grant screening and scoring



Nine scoring panels

- Three members each
- Committee member on every panel
- BIPOC/non-White identifying majority on every panel
- SME on every panel
- 22 reviewers on 133 applications


Two phase process

- 1. Independent scoring estimated 300+ hours total
- 2. Scoring panel meetings:
 - three meetings for each scoring panel
 - total 27 scoring panel meetings




Applications received

Overview of applications received



PCEF

Eligible small and large grant applications for implementation (not planning)





^{*} Regenerative agriculture and green infrastructure (RA/GI)

Planning grants

\$4.8 million requested for 56 planning grants.

- Max request = \$100,000, Avg. request = \$86,599, Min request = \$13,770
- 48.2% of applicants were small or emerging organizations.
- 64.3% of applicants received full points for reflecting the communities they intend to serve.
- Future project type indicated
 - 22 multiple categories
 - 14 workforce
 - 9 innovation/other
 - 7 RA/GI
 - 4 clean energy



Planning




Portfolio balancing

Portfolio balancing considerations

- There is no expectation of a decision today
- Applicants that do not get funded will be provided feedback and will have opportunities for capacity building and funding in the near future.
- Are there other characteristics that would help guide your deliberations?
- How does each portfolio align with guiding principles?



Portfolio Comparison and Thresholds





Portfolio Option A: \$1.5M for Planning, Midpoint for Most Categories

Key Portfolio Characteristics:

Total Number of Grants: 36


Total lifetime GHG impact: 13,307 tons Projects* w/ PI serving E of 82nd: 10

Funding Allocation by Category

Fullding Allocation by Category					
	4 Grants	17 (Grants		
9 Grants	Workforce , \$1,858,206		ining , 76,781		
Clean Energy , \$3,993,544	4 Grants RA / GI , \$937,312		2 Multi , \$384,123		

Portfolio Scoring Indicators:	# of Projects	% of Total Funding
Applicant Reflects Priority Population	31 of 36 14 of 19*	78%
Small Orgs (< 6 employees)	14 of 36 7 of 19*	37%
Projects* with Physical Improvements (PI)	15 of 19*	61%







^{*} All grants that are not Planning grants

Portfolio Option B: \$2.5M for Planning

\$199,260


Key Portfolio Characteristics:

Total Number of Grants: 45

Total lifetime GHG impact: 11,469 tons

Projects* w/ PI serving E of 82nd: 8

Funding Allocation by Category



Portfolio Scoring Indicators:	# of Projects	% of Total Funding
Applicant Reflects Priority Population	38 of 45 12 of 16*	86%
Small Orgs (< 6 employees)	18 of 45 5 of 16*	38%
Projects* with Physical Improvements (PI)	12 of 16*	49%









^{*} All grants that are not Planning grants


Clean energy application scores




Workforce dev. application scores



Regen ag/green infr. application scores



Planning application scores





Using guiding principles

Committee is asked to evaluate portfolios for alignment with guiding principles.



Example:

Portfolio A

- Supports accountable with higher calculable greenhouse gas reductions through more clean energy projects
- Supports **climate action with multiple benefits** with 3 more implementation projects that address GHG benefits and reduce energy bills for priority populations.

Portfolio B

- Supports justice driven by adding 6 planning grantees who reflect the community they serve
- Supports community-powered by adding 7 planning grants, which increase capacity building for emerging groups





THANK YOU!



