

**PORTLAND CLEAN ENERGY COMMUNITY BENEFITS FUND (PCEF) COMMITTEE**

**MEETING SUMMARY**

**February 28, 2024 • 6:00 PM – 8:00 PM**

**Zoom Conference Call**

| <b>Committee Members</b>     | <b>Position</b>                   | <b>Affiliation</b>   | <b>Present</b> |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|----------------|
| Dr. Megan Horst              | Co-Chair                          | Associate Professor, School of Urban Studies & Planning at Portland State University | Yes            |
| Ranfis Giannettino Villatoro | Co-Chair                          | Oregon State Policy Manager, BlueGreen Alliance                                      | Yes            |
| Alicia Chapman               | Member-at-Large                   | Willamette Technical Fabricators   | Yes            |
| DeAngelo Moaning             | Member-at-Large                   | Raimore Construction   | Yes            |
| Faith Graham                 | Member-at-Large                   | Elevate Energy   | No             |
| Maria Gabrielle Sipin        | Member-at-Large                   | Community Member   | Yes            |
| Paul Lumley                  | Member-at-Large                   | Cascade AIDS Project   | Yes            |
| Robin Wang                   | Member-at-Large                   | Vibrant Future LLC   | Yes            |
| Michael Edden Hill           | Member-at-Large                   | Community Member   | No             |
| Sam Baraso                   | Program Manager                   | PCEF   | Yes            |
| Cady Lister                  | Deputy Program Manager            | PCEF   | Yes            |
| Jaimes Valdez                | Org. Development & Policy Manager | PCEF   | No             |
| Kris Grube                   | Project Manager                   | PCEF   | No             |
| Wendy Koelfgen               | Project Manager                   | PCEF   | No             |
| Rachel Gilmore               | Administrative Specialist         | PCEF   | Yes            |
| Elizabeth Stover             | Senior Communications Strategist  | PCEF   | Yes            |
| Tracy M. Smith               | Facilitator                       | Inhance LLC  | Yes            |
| Camerina Galván              | Notetaker                         | Galvan Consulting LLC  | Yes            |
| Ciara Pressler               | Consultant                        | Pregame  | Yes            |

**Others:** David Grandfield, PCEF; Barbara Byrd; Isabela, NAUF; Brian Liu, APANO and 82<sup>nd</sup> Ave Coalition; Kathleen Boylan; Jeni Hall, Energy Trust of Oregon; Ted Labbe, Co-Director, Depave; Je Amaechi, Unite Oregon; Jennifer Hamilton, Co-Executive Director, Rogue Farm Corps; Anjeanette Brown; Samantha Calamari; Anais Tuepker, Health Researcher and former PCEF volunteer; Lynn Handlin; Micah Meskel,

Bird Alliance of Oregon; Laura Feldman; Jim Labbe, Co-Director, Participatory Budgeting Oregon; Babs Vanelli; Laurie King; Samantha Calamari; Dave King, Climate Jobs PDX; Curtis Rystadt, Building 105 Affordable Housing; Michael Heumann; Lenny Dee; Loren; Jay Richmond; Isabela Villarreal, Policy & Communication Director, Next Up; Anamaría Pérez; Gosia Wozniacka; Jillian Schoene, COS.

## **INTRODUCTIONS**

- Tracy M. Smith called the meeting to order at 6:05 PM.
- The quorum was met.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS: TRACY M. SMITH, FACILITATOR**

- Ted Labbe encouraged the committee to raise the cap on the community-led RFPs and ensure the bureaus set benchmarks for a diverse workforce.
- Curtis Rystadt asked the committee to support mass timber projects and hydronic systems, which would benefit affordable housing and decrease utility costs for low-income tenants.
- Anjeanette Brown urged the bureaus to remember the fund's intent.
- Je Amaechi asked the committee to keep their promise to use PCEF to protect the community and fight climate change.
- Jim Labbe advocated for reclaiming the spirit of community benefit in PCEF's name, preventing backfilling budgets, and supporting participatory budgeting.
- Lenny Dee feels PCEF didn't consider developing public support against conservative forces. They encouraged the committee to fund one or two big, highly visible projects.
- Laura Feldman agrees with many of the prior comments. Laura Feldman is horrified the bureaus will dip into funds to fix their mismanagement issues and advocates for the Frog Ferry.
- Anais Tuepker is alarmed that bureaus will fill funding gaps not tied to environmental justice and reminds the committee of PCEF's origin and would not like the dilution of funds.
- Dave King circulated a letter in support of PCEF and asked the city not to take PCEF funds.
- Lynn Handlin says PCEF is not a slush fund for the city. The city needs to do climate work in addition to PCEF with city money.
- Isabela Villarreal called for PCEF funds to stay in PCEF and for the city council to use the funds as the program was designed and to ramp up its capacity.
- Jennifer Hamilton advocated for regenerative agriculture and farmers.
- Brian Liu advocated for greater investment in the 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue corridor. A letter with further details was submitted to the committee and Commissioner Rubio.
- Micah Meskel advocated bolstering the Community Responsive Grants, increasing staff capacity, and investing in projects such as what is proposed by the 82<sup>nd</sup> Ave Coalition.

## **CO-CHAIR AND COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS: PCEF COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

- The Co-chair appreciated everyone who provided testimonies and written comments. He encouraged the public to share their concerns with the City Council.
- The Co-Chair assured that the committee is considering the public comments.

## **GENERAL PROGRAM UPDATES: SAM BARASO, PCEF**

- **Sustainability and Climate Commission:** Work is ongoing to establish the Sustainability and Climate Commission in late 2024 or early 2025. It is a body designed to carry out the sustainability work and reset the city's climate action plan. It will replace the Planning and Sustainability Commission, which Commissioner Rubio has parsed out. The PCEF committee will work in tandem with the Sustainability and Climate Commission.
- **RFP #3:** It closed on February 15, 2024. Two hundred and twenty-three applications were submitted— the largest number of applicants received yet. Sam Baraso thanked the staff for the outreach work. The breakdown of the applications can be seen on [the website](#).
- **Staff Recruitments:** The Senior Clean Energy Manager and the Single Family Homes Clean Energy Program positions are being openly recruited. Recruitment for the Workforce and Contractor Equity Policy Manager, two Communication positions, a Data Performance and evaluation position, and several project management positions will open soon.
- **What's Next for the First Set of Allocations Recommended on February 2, 2024:** PCEF staff will send the Climate Investment Plan (CIP) template for bureaus to present program details. The content will be shared with the committee for feedback in May or June 2024.
- Committee member questions and comments:
  - Community demand is shaped by the parameters set on the grants; for example, regenerative agriculture has a cap. Demand could be higher.
    - Response: It's early to know. Staff will review the proposals, but we do certainly set the parameters.
  - Staff capacity is a limitation to operationalizing the CIP and increasing grants to community-based organizations. What are the possibilities?
    - Response: PCEF has always been understaffed and is working to build capacity. Staff is balancing the right number of staff to implement work and administering six-figure and smaller grants. Staff is happy to share their experiences.
  - PCEF-funded jobs in other bureaus should advance PCEF values. How can we ensure this is happening?
    - Response: PCEF supports city staff positions and has been involved in recruiting each one. This has been a heavy lift for PCEF because some bureaus are hiring for many positions.

## **DISCUSSION ON PROCESS FOR SECOND SET OF ALLOCATIONS: SAM BARASO, PCEF**

- Sam Baraso gave an overview of the committee and city budget timelines from December 2023 through May 2024.
- Paul Lumley joined the meeting at 6:54 PM.
- Sam Baraso reminded the community that the CIP, which is community-led, and the Climate Emergency Workplan, focused on city agencies, are large bodies of work that serve as resources and guide the city's climate work.
- Sam Baraso recapped the draft options the committee considered at the last meeting regarding moving forward with the second set of allocations. He shared the processes if the committee chooses option 2 or 3.

- Sam Baraso shared the information PCEF has or can produce soon. He asked the committee what they needed to conduct a temperature check and make a decision.
- Committee member questions and comments:
  - The slides shared give the impression that we will allocate more funding to city agencies. The committee member doesn't recall having a conversation about allocating funding for other purposes.
    - Response: Some projects that the bureaus wanted to be considered by the PCEF committee were left on the table. In the short term, the committee can consider those proposals. In the long term, in the Fall of 2024, the committee can consider more funding for Community Responsive Grants. The staff will provide feedback on their capacity to administer more grants.
  - We are being pushed to support more city projects. Where is the equity? Where is the \$30 Million coming from?
    - Response: The city has over \$300 Million in proposals. We used the \$30 Million as an anchoring number, and it is a fraction of the demand for city climate funding.
  - How does our community benefit from us allocating more resources to city agencies? We can boost allocations closer to the CIP. Entertaining any proposal outside of community-led projects deviates from PCEF's original intent and values and poses a legal risk.
  - A committee member agrees with previous committee members. Why was Option 2 proposed, and what are the benefits of Option 2 over Option 3?
    - Response: The benefit is we know additional city proposals didn't come before the committee in the first set of allocations. By choosing Option 2, the committee can consider and include them in the mayor's budget. Earlier action would happen on climate projects.
  - Are these bureau or community proposals?
    - Response: There would be additional city bureau proposals.
  - Regardless of our chosen option, we should work smarter, not harder. A committee member is leaning towards option 3. For example, schools are creating their own climate action plans. It would benefit the committee to know how to make sound investments. We must focus on eligibility and ensure many groups can apply for the second allocation.
  - We see city proposals here because of pressure from commissioners and bureaus. The committee has the right to pressure back. We felt the last process was rushed. Deciding in the fall of 2024 is timely. There is more need than PCEF has money for. The committee member would like to see proposals that collaborate across sectors. Can we find creative ways to administer the dollars if we need more staff capacity? She is leaning toward option 3.
  - The committee member supports the dynamics shared by the previous committee member. He reminded the committee that the committee makes recommendations per the code, and the city council makes the final decision. He hopes to be responsive to public comment and make the best choice for the committee.
  - A committee member doesn't like any of the options. He would like a more equitable process that includes an equal amount of community-based and bureau proposals that follow the same process.

- Response: Are you speaking to soliciting proposals in time for the mayor's budget proposal?
- Committee member response: Yes, as long as it is the same process, with half going to the community and half to the bureaus.
- A committee member supports the previous committee member's new option.
- A committee member asked to have the new option added to the slide deck.
- Sam Baraso shared the Fall BMP Proposal process priorities identified by the committee and co-chairs. The priorities would underpin the timeline for the Fall BMP, which will be presented at the March 2024 meeting. Soliciting proposals from the community takes time and would require a fall 2024 deadline. To meet the mayor's timeline, the call for proposals would need to launch next week, giving the committee twenty-three days to deliberate.
- Committee member comments and questions:
  - The process would be the same for the community. If they must submit proposals in time for the mayor's budget, then so be it. The process is not equitable if it is more arduous for community groups. Option 3 can work with this process.
  - A committee member agrees with the previous statement. Option 2 can be simplified for community groups. He still prefers Option 3 because it would allow for more inclusions for many community groups. He would like to see coalition-building proposals.
  - No timeline will help community groups struggling to respond to PCEF's current timelines, no matter how eager they are. The committee members don't like dividing 50% of the funds between bureaus and the community. The split needs more deliberation. They worry about PCEF's integrity.
  - A committee member is confident that good community-led and city-led proposals will be presented if given more time. She wishes to spend more time on the priorities for the Fall BMP proposals because key language, such as priority populations and labor, needs to be stated. She agrees with a simplified application process for Option 3 and would like a simplified RFP #4.
  - The committee member's suggestion of the 50/50 split was intended to spur conversation.
  - A committee member pointed out that number three on the priorities for the Fall BMP proposal gives the city priority access. Numbers one and two are top-down. Can the application process accommodate community organizations that haven't had 2-3 months, like the bureaus, to develop their ideas? The process selected needs to consider when there will be less money than forecasted.
  - A committee member supports allowing community groups to submit proposals in Fall 2024. He advocated for a process that encourages cohort projects.
- Sam Baraso hears that the committee is leaning towards Option 3. Staff will share with the committee what has been funded, what has been solicited, gaps in funding, administrative inefficiencies, and the implications of administering more resources. Staff will then return with a proposal for a process that doesn't replicate the Community Responsive Grant cycle. Sam Baraso says the process is not as simple as adding more funding to the Community Responsive Grants. PCEF staff can not administer hundreds of \$500,000 and \$1 Million in grants; administratively, it is insufficient. Bureaus do have the capacity to administer funds. Changing the current RFP application process is another conversation.

- Committee member comments and questions
  - A committee member liked the idea of cross-sector proposals and appreciated the proposal from 82<sup>nd</sup> Ave Coalition. Their proposal has the level of detail the committee is looking for. When will the committee discuss having a less arduous RFP process? Where will the sideboards from the previous meeting be captured?

**COMMITTEE MEETING IN-PERSON/VIRTUAL CADENCE: SAM BARASO, PCEF**

- This agenda item was not discussed.

**COMMITTEE WORKGROUP AND SUBCOMMITTEES: SAM BARASO, PCEF**

- **Recruitment Subcommittee:** Paul Lumley volunteered for the committee.
- Workgroups for Strategic Program 8, Equitable Tree Canopy, and Strategic Program 15, Federal Climate and Equity Funding Opportunities, were not discussed.

**THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 8:04 PM**

**NEXT MEETING:** The next virtual meeting will be on Wednesday, March 21, 2024, 6:00 PM—8:30 PM.

Submitted by Camerina Galván, Notetaker, Galvan Consulting LLC.