

Portland Clean Energy Community Benefits Fund (PCEF) Committee Meeting

June 2, 2022, 6 p.m. to 8 p.m.

Minutes

Committee members present: Michael Edden Hill, Megan Horst, Jeff Moreland Jr., Maria Sipin, Ranfis Villatoro, Robin Wang, Shanice Brittany Clarke

Committee members absent: Faith Graham

Staff present: Sam Baraso, Cady Lister, Jaimes Valdez, Janet Hammer, Christine Llobregat

Public attendance: Arthur Davis, Constructing Hope, Paul Kirk, Volunteers of America; Jeni Hall, Oregon Solar; Kim Christensen, Friends of the Children Portland.

Public comment: No public comment accepted at this meeting.

Announcements: Individual projects will not be discussed at this meeting, only portfolios.

Previous Committee meeting minutes accepted:

- 1/19/22, 2/16/22, 3/2/22, 3/17/22, 4/7/22

RFP2 Recommended Portfolio decision

- Anticipate going to City Council on July 13th if Committee makes a decision tonight.
- Workforce & Contractor Development (WCD) portfolio additional info request
 - Saw the greatest level of demand in this funding area relative to the allocation.
 - 51% will focus on training for union-registered apprenticeship workforce training programs
 - 12% for Regenerative ag/green infrastructure focus – Megan requests more insight.
 - Regen. ag focus of WCD projects, distinct from projects in Regen Ag/Green Infrastructure (RAGI) portfolio.
 - Megan: would like to see more outreach to encourage RAGI projects
 - Anticipate future discussion on targeted tree planting solicitation
 - Substantially fewer proposals focused on contractor support than workforce devel.
 - Jeffrey: note potential need for more outreach – one of the best ways to retain diverse workers is have diverse contractor landscape.
 - Ranfis: workforce and contractor support are very different, challenging to lump together and could be two different funding buckets.
- Portfolio creation considerations
 - Target funding area allocation limits – we had a high level of interest relative to funding allocations in WCD and Innovation areas.
 - Strength and number of applications received within each funding area
 - Follow up on questions re financial review and additional review phase
 - 9 organizations in recommended portfolio flagged during financial review.
 - Note a “red” flag doesn’t necessarily mean the org is doing something wrong. A lot of the variables we looked at are likely to be missing or underdeveloped in new/emerging organizations.

- E.g., lacking the financial history or written financial management policies, or only have unaudited financial statements.
- Mitigating risk through measures like checking references (prior funders, partners, fiscal sponsors), requiring project stage gates, increasing funding for staff time or length of grant, down-scoping project size
- Robin: what percentage of the portfolio are these 9?
 - Approx. 7% of the \$110 million portfolio.
 - How many of the 9 are for more than \$1 million?
 - 3, all multi-year (not more than \$1 million/year).
 - Are there any flagged that do not have mitigation measures?
 - 1 did not receive mitigation measures – but has deep partner and institutional support, long-term effort.
 - Do any of these make staff uneasy?
 - Inherent challenge to working with the City as a new org, grantees must learn all the City systems and reporting. It takes more time and staff capacity for the grantees, and the biggest risk is that the projects slow down, don't deliver outcomes on same timeframe.
 - PCEF staff will be supporting them through this process.
 - While orgs may be new, the groups of people are not new to the community or their work. Historically under-resourced. These are the kinds of organizations PCEF wants to resource.
- Excited about this portfolio and excited to share the projects soon.
 - Seeing organizations in this portfolio that received funding last year and coming back to scale up, and organizations that didn't get funded last year that came back with improved proposals.
 - Moving forward, we will want to evaluate our process changes including prelim scoring, application modifications, additional vetting, community members on scoring panels.
- Final questions and comments from Committee
 - Maria: more insight on what went into calculations of carbon reduction assessment and how you've increased your confidence around how that is calculated? A lot of people are interested in how we're investing in that.
 - Focused on clean energy and Innovation funding areas. Broke down each project, number of units, measures installed, baseline assumptions on building energy use. If it is PGE or Pacific Power, and assoc. grid intensity. Accounting for some projects having more specifics identified than others. Worked with a contractor on the calculation tool.
 - Lifetime GHG reduction estimate, based on the total life of different measures (e.g. 30 year useful life for solar panels)
 - Did any of the self-reported GHG reduction figures provided by grantees trigger red flags? We asked for description of work and did our own calculations for consistency. Getting more detailed information was a lot of the back-and-forth communications with applicants.
 - Shanice: Regen. ag. projects have direct benefit to key populations, we can do more to articulate that, identify metrics.
 - Potential for project delays or adjusted outcomes due to supply chain issues, labor shortages, price hikes.

- Megan: bookmarking for future discussion – Committee members seeing a list of applicants in portfolio versus no names.
- Robin: concern about the 1 project with financial flag with no mitigation measures. Strong partnerships aren't enough. Would like to see an amendment with the decision proposal to apply some appropriate mitigation measure.
 - Ranfis – supports amendment, prudent
- Committee members express excitement about this funding opportunity and gratitude for everyone involved in getting to this point.
- Maria: requests insight on staff capacity and managing this amount of grants
 - It will be busy, but we have an open recruitment for another project manager position. Processes improved from RFP1, team has gained experience and familiarity with processes.
- Move to recommend that City Council fund the portfolio of grants as described in the committee meetings on 5/26/22 and today. This portfolio includes 66 grants totaling \$110,695,441 in funding.
 - Amendment to place appropriate risk mitigation and controls on the one application that was flagged during financial review and was passed to scoring panel without any additional requirements/mitigation measures.
 - Megan made the motion including amendment, Ranfis seconded the motion
 - Shanice, Jeffrey, Michael, Maria, Robin affirmed.
 - Appreciations to all for this exciting decision.

Meeting adjourned