

COMMUNITY IS KEY



PCEF Grant Committee Meeting

June 2, 2021, 6:00 – 8:30 p.m.

— PORTLAND
**CLEAN ENERGY
COMMUNITY BENEFITS
FUND** —



Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

VISIT US ONLINE
portland.gov/bps/cleanenergy

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/meetings

➔ 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 & opening

Agenda

- 6:00 Open
- 6:05 Public comment
- 6:15 Timeline and path forward
- 6:25 Minimum scores and threshold review
- 7:10 Break
- 7:15 Committee member small group

Note: every other meeting Committee members are given this break time to get to know each other in private breakout rooms. Members of the public joining via Zoom will stay in the main zoom room and have the opportunity to speak with staff or take this time as a break.

- 7:30 Innovation/other funding category
- 8:20 Committee member comments
- 8:30 Meeting close

Public comment

Timeline

Timeline

Date	Topics	Notes
June 2	Minimum scores, threshold review, innovation/other	
June 16	Anti-displacement, workforce training and contractor support grants	
July 7	Land/building acquisition, return to grant caps	
July 21	Evaluation findings, recommended improvements, review first draft RFP	
August 4	Release draft RFP for public comment	Committee decision point
August 18	Potential Committee public comment listening session	
September 1	Review public comment and recommended changes to final RFP	Committee decision point
September 22	Target goal for release of RFP #2	

Getting from here to there

- We have identified topics that we want more input, guidance, clarification of values, from the Committee (see timeline slide).
 - Is there anything that else that committee members feel needs to be on this list?
- We will facilitate guided discussions to get your input, we won't be asking for decisions during these discussion. We will use your feedback/guidance to draft the RFP with improvements.
- Decision points
 - Committee will review and approve (when ready) draft RFP for release for public comment
 - Committee will review and approve final RFP for release

Minimum score & threshold review

Scoring sections

- 1. Organization information**
- 2. Project description and scope**
3. Environmental benefits
4. Social benefits
5. Workforce and contractor benefits
- 6. Budget**

Notes:

1. Planning grants are only scores on sections 1, 2 and 6
2. Applications without physical improvements are primarily scored on sections 1, 2 and 6.
3. Implementation projects with physical improvements are scored across all sections.

Minimum scores

Purpose of the minimum score – ensure we are funding successful projects that align with PCEF goals and guiding principles.

Minimum score options

- % of overall score (e.g. applicants must receive at least ?% of possible points to be considered for funding)
- % of score for each applicable section (e.g. applicants must receive at least ?% in each scoring section to be considered for funding)
- % of score in certain sections (e.g. applicants must receive at least ?% in organization information and project description and scope section to be considered for funding but there is not minimum score in other sections)

Initial scoring would be performed by two staff per application.

Audit subcommittee would evaluate process.

Minimum scores – Committee questions/concerns

What are the mechanisms for transparency?

- All apps that fail to meet minimum score would be provided all of their scores with rationale. Organizations led by priority populations would be invited to meet one-on-one and connected to capacity building resources.

Concern about priority community led organizations being filtered out

- Suggest that if an applicant for a small or large implementation grant scores well in organization information section but it is clear they will not score well overall, we ask if they would like to be considered for a planning grant instead.

Audit subcommittee – who, how, what happens if they disagree?

- Three committee members not on scoring panel score a sample of up to 10 applications that did not meet minimum score, if disagree meet with two staff who scored to discuss and calibrate interpretation of criteria. Note that project scores will not be changed, the audit subcommittee function is to see if the minimum scoring function is working and daylight potential improvements, not to reverse decisions.

What did we see in the last round?

Project type	Avg final points (of 100)	Applicants >70 points	Applicants 50+ points
Implementation only			
Clean Energy	67.68	50%	92%
Workforce	75.28	71%	95%
RA/GI	65.52	38%	83%
Innovation/other	57.10	36%	64%

Grant type	Avg final points (of 100)	Applicants >70 points	Applicants 50+ points
Planning	78.7	80%	93%
Small	65.4	50%	86%
Large	70.8	64%	88%

Applicants that reflect the community they serve.

- Planning grants
 - 89% scored >70
- Implementation grants
 - 76% scored >70

Only two applications from an organization that reflects the community they serve scored less than 50 points. Both were from the same applicant.

Improvement under evaluation

Set minimum that an application must earn 50% of points in all sections that apply to them, with exception of budget, to be considered for funding.

- Caveat: if an applicant for an implementation grant has a strong organization information section score staff can offer applicant option to be evaluated and scored as a planning grant.

Questions for Committee members

- What kind of projects do we **NOT** want to fund?
- What concerns do you have about minimum scores?
- Are there sections of the scoring where a minimum score feels more important than others?
- If a proposal is below minimum on scope but scores well in organization info, what are your thoughts about offering that their project be converted to a planning grant application?



Threshold review/process considerations

Committee member and community participation on each scoring panel is a significantly limiting factor which creates the need for a threshold review to reduce the number of applications sent to scoring panels.

Example path – Committee and community cohort scores applications on the margin.

- Purpose: Involve Committee and community cohort members in the process closer to decision.
- Step 1: Staff does initial scoring and ranking within funding areas of all applications.
- Step 2: Dependent on number of applications received and amount of funding requested: If more than 90 applications are received that exceed minimum score to proceed, scoring panels will review applications that are on the margin.
- Step 3: Six scoring panels comprised of one Committee member, one community cohort member and one staff member score the 90 applications that are on the margin.
- Step 4: Final scores are used to develop portfolio for Committee recommendations.

Questions for the Committee

- Do all Committee members want to commit to serving on a scoring panel?
- What concerns do you have about not seeing all applications go to scoring panels?
- Are there ways to mitigate these concerns?
- How do you feel about the example where the committee and community cohort scores applications on the margin?

Break (20 minutes)

Innovation/other

Code definition of innovation category

This category is intended to provide the Committee with flexibility to fund a project that does not directly fall under one of the other categories, but which provides an opportunity to further the goals of this Chapter [PCEF program].



- Round 1 applicants for innovation/other grants:
 - 14 implementation applications, 50/50 small/large, requesting \$5.5 million
 - Average request just over \$394,000
 - 3 large grant requests of just under \$1M each – 2 transportation and 1 leadership development
 - Included transportation projects, requests for building purchase for community space, curriculum development, use of new technologies, theater production, planning for land use and educational spaces, trash collection and leadership development. Some applications could have applied under different categories (e.g. leadership development under workforce training and contractor support).
 - Average score of 57.10 and the smallest percent that scored above 70 (36%). A little over 40 percent of applicants for innovation grants got a perfect score for reflecting the community they intend to serve, lower than the overall pool.

Questions for Committee

- Can you imagine an ideal kind of project that should this funding area support?
- Code language defines innovation in a way that is different than common understanding of the word, how does the Committee understand this funding area?
- Innovation/other should receive 5% of total funding (~\$3M of \$60M). Given smaller level of funding and less clarity around intention for funding, should Innovation only be allowed for planning and small grants, effectively capped at \$500,000 (proposed new small grant cap)?
- PCEF projects in other categories should use technologies that are commercially available, is this a space for research and development?
- Applicants interested in transportation projects need guidance on how they fit in the program, do you want to allocate 50% of innovation to these projects?

Breakout discussion (15 minutes)

For members of the public, breakout rooms are accessible by joining the meeting via Zoom.

COMMUNITY IS KEY



— PORTLAND —
**CLEAN ENERGY
COMMUNITY BENEFITS
FUND** —



Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

A program by City of Portland,
Bureau of Planning and Sustainability
VISIT portland.gov/bps/cleanenergy

Guiding Principles



Modified consensus decision making process

- **Proposal** – put forth for consideration by Committee member
- **Temperature check** – each Committee member indicates how comfortable they are with making an affirmative decision
- **Discussion** – additional discussion if needed
- **Amendments** – Committee members can offer amendments to the original proposal
- **Decision** – each Committee member can 1) affirm the proposal, 2) stand aside, or 3) indicate that “no” they do not support the proposal. Note that standing aside is counted as a decision to affirm for the purposes of approving a proposal.

The following minimum number of affirmative decisions is required for a decision to represent the position of the PCEF Committee.

- When 6 or 7 Committee members are present : 5 Affirmative decisions
- When 8 or 9 Committee members are present : 6 Affirmative decisions