

Portland Clean Energy Community Benefits Fund (PCEF) Grants Committee
April 14th, 2021 - MEETING MINUTES

Committee members present: Amanda Squiemphen-Yazzie, Shanice Clark, Maria Sipin, Robin Wang, Ranfis Villatoro, Michael Edden Hill, Jeffery Moreland, Faith Graham, Megan Horst

PCEF staff present: Sam Baraso, Cady Lister, Janet Hammer, Jaimes Valdez, June Reyes, Wendy Koelfgen, Jay Richmond, David Grandfield, Lokyee Au, Angela Previdelli

Program updates:

Sam provided the following program updates

- Behind on meeting minutes. Will approve in next meeting.
- Grantee onboarding – Goal is to have all 45 proposals executed within 60 days of City Council approval
- Capacity building and community engagement – connecting with priority population led orgs that did not receive funding as well as those who did not seek funding. Planning workshops where folks can come together and further develop proposals. Tract general public and for priority population cohort.
- Focus groups – to understand how to better talk about PCEF and the language to use. Committee will get a report out from the focus groups, will give updated timeline next week.
- Org chart and staffing update, 11.5 FTE soon, 12.5 FTE when fully staffed. Demand on staff time is extensive. Will bring up a discussion on admin cap in the future.
 - Maria: thank you for generating org chart. Earliest feedback from co-chairs. Need to know who does what on PCEF staff, to know who to reach out to with questions outside of the meeting. Co-chairs will check in following each meeting within a few days.
 - Megan: any other advisory boards we might interact with? Planning commission? They come up with policy proposals around planning which we may want to track.
 - Sam: will come back with more information on that

Next RFP planning

Sam provided an overview of timeline, key areas of input and decision points in planning for the next RFP. \$60 million planned to go out this year, if there are eligible projects, the intent is to award in order to stay ahead of what is coming. Two proposals, \$30 million each, based on feedback from community that they want more than one annual opportunity to apply. Over next four meetings, want to dive deep into updates needed in scoring and eligibility criteria. Update for both RFP 2 and 3. Intent is to release same RFP. Three-week public comment period for criteria, then approval to release draft RFP for public comment. RFP 2 reviews will be going on when RFP 3 is released. The intent is to space them out more in the future. RFP 3 will not have substantive changes from RFP2.

Committee discussion

- Megan: can you update on mini-grants?
 - Sam: Will present to committee on May 5th.
- Faith: why two instead of one RFPs?

- Sam: spread out the workflow in terms of onboarding grantees, with the increased cap, there may not be proportionally more grantees but feedback from the community that they want more than one application opportunity. Idea is that eventually an RFP would be released every six months.
- Ranfis: this is exciting, one note of concern, what this means for grant management going forward and what this means for staff. This seems like an intensive process. Going from RFP to RFP. Flag that the pace of what this means for staff, recognizing that we have already been working at a breakneck speed. Concerned what this means for staff going forward. Considering additional helping hands that will lead to thoughtful manner and no staff burnout.
 - Sam: understanding what happens when those grants all come through at the same time, grant cap larger \$5-\$10 million, application review may be bigger but number of grants may not.
- Sam talked about the two decision points: 1) releasing criteria for public comment and 2) releasing the RFP. The presentation then covered the areas staff has identified that need Committee input (bulleted below) and requested that Committee email staff thoughts on any other critical input areas to consider. These topics will be covered in more detail in the remaining April and May Committee meetings.
 - Threshold scores: minimum scores and screening to reduce number of proposals scored in full panels.
 - Community/committee scoring: a lot of interest in scoring panels, consider committee capacity to score, a variety of options for community scoring involvement.
 - Grant caps: large grants capped at \$1 million last time, what is the right level moving forward?
 - Workforce training grants: do we want to be more specific about grade level training?
 - Innovation: what does this mean?
 - Anti-displacement: identify areas of the city vulnerable to displacement, grants above a certain dollar amount would need to engage in an anti-displacement plan.
- Robin: send emails with feedback and follow up interviews, its been 3-4 months since we did this, maybe have the interviews with two committee members to help each other recall the experience of scoring.
 - Sam: appreciate and makes more efficient for us. Will check in with evaluation staff and may give committee members the option.
- Ranfis: enjoyed breakout mingling activity, hope to have broader turnout from community, transportation has greatest potential for GHG emissions, under innovation is not sustainable, glad it is being called out, needs to be beyond innovation. How will PCEF intersect with federal stimulus?
 - Sam: transportation would require a code change to move from innovation bucket

Evaluation update

Sam provided an overview of the evaluation and continuous learning work that the PCEF program has done since inception followed by a report from the Reporting and Evaluation subcommittee on their current efforts. Reporting and Evaluation subcommittee members are Maria, Ranfis and Megan, staffed by Janet and Angela.

- Megan (reporting and evaluation subcommittee report): accountability and community powered guiding principles featured in evaluation, have met 9 times, report back to inform full Committee of work and purpose and solicit input. Have worked on name and purpose, council report, RFP 1 evaluation input and planning for RFP1 feedback deliberation, workforce goals and establishing performance metrics. All high-level metrics include a focus on priority populations.

- Ranfis: note that the workforce goals could live with high roads committee, can provide recommendations to full committee.
- Robin: with the GHG metrics are we reporting what is estimated or what we measure later?
 - Cady: its modeled on what actually gets built, we won't be measuring for life of projects, we will model savings based on what actually gets built, more accurate than what is in the application
- Jeffrey: the workforce development and contractor support metrics need a few centered on contractors.
- Faith: is this a standing committee?
 - Megan: imagining it as an ongoing, standing committee
- Faith: imagine other committee members will be called on to serve at some point. Regarding performance measures, when we have big numbers down the road, will we be able to say that we got to the truth of equitable distribution of wealth, opportunity, power, ability to protect from climate change using these metrics?
- Shanice: affirm and appreciate the work, curious about the cadence of what is next and how I can support.
- Maria: we weren't quite ready to ask for adoption of subcommittee purpose, we are actively recruiting, how do we formalize participation and decision making inside and outside the subcommittee
- Ranfis: it will be helpful for us to approve this as a charter at some point, clear on when a subcommittee is appointed and accountable to full committee, the language is here for folks to review.
- Maria: there's a lot of work on how we evaluate planning grants, these tools are making space for success to be evaluated there.

Committee member comments

Ranfis closed the meeting with a unity clap that comes from social justice movement, farm worker movement rights, organized to improve conditions, wages and benefits.

8:00

Meeting close out