



CLIMATE INVESTMENT PLAN Preliminary Draft

Public Comment Key Takeaways

Public comment period: March 13 – April 7, 2023

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



THE BUREAU OF
**PLANNING &
SUSTAINABILITY**

VISIT US ONLINE
portland.gov/bps/cleanenergy

The following is the template that was used to organize and categorize comments received during the public comment period for the preliminary draft of the Climate Investment Plan (CIP)

Public comment dates: March 13 – April 7, 2023

Sections included:

Global comments, clean energy, transportation decarbonization, green infrastructure, regenerative agriculture, organizational capacity building, 82nd Ave., access to fair and flexible capital, schools, workforce & contractor development, accessibility & disability inclusion

Template:

KEY TAKEAWAYS

[Strategic Program # - Name or Community Responsive Grants or Other]

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
Noting general themes of support	Noting comments that are being considered for clarification, addition, revision of next CIP draft. Comments were included even if they are addressed elsewhere as it may suggest the need for greater clarification.	Rationale for why something is not being considered. May include, but is not limited to comment being: <i>Out of scope, out of alignment with PCEF’s climate/equity focus, Committee guiding principles, addressed in another SP, or detail too specific for CIP/best addressed in implementation.</i>

Global comments on the preliminary draft of the Climate Investment Plan

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Global Comments

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong support for the CIP's program purpose. • Support inclusion of budget for marketing and outreach. • Appreciation for clear outline of how the CIP is being developed • Targeting funds for clean energy improvements in homes and businesses and transportation • Using the equity + climate framework as an evaluation mechanisms for the CIP's strategic programs • Draft reflects interest and needs of communities impacted by climate change 	<p>Visual Design and Content Accessibility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include a clear, concise executive summary with funding allocations, eligibility criteria, and how Equity + Climate Framework requirements are satisfied for each strategic program • Include a dashboard high-level summary for each program outlining equity + climate framework, eligibility, allocation • Provide a central place where people can see a list of opportunities • List strategic program page numbers in the table of contents for easier navigation • Use concise, plain language and explain acronyms or jargon in footnotes or a glossary • Increase visuals through graphics, illustrations, design elements, and color coding to break up sections and improve understanding • Include photos and callout boxes to illustrate successful PCEF projects and share narratives • Improve table designs to make information clearer. • Bring “Guiding Principles” and “About PCEF” to the front of the document 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create community/neighborhood renewable energy solutions with back up power and off-grid resilient community centers <i>Already part of another strategic program and potentially eligible project through community responsive grant program.</i> • Focus on all Oregonians <i>Code explicitly lists priority populations, however, this does not exclude others from participating.</i> • Build NuScale reactors <i>Out of PCEF scope</i> • Reduce meat consumption <i>Out of PCEF scope</i> • Agencies need to talk to each other as opposed to community based organizations (CBOs) leading the space. <i>CIP process allows for agencies to discuss amongst themselves but also work with CBOs.</i> • Educate the community explicitly on climate change issues. <i>This is part of nearly every funded PCEF project. However, standalone education is not eligible outside of capacity building and upstream workforce development through community responsive grant program.</i> • Expand eligibility criteria to support projects proposed by Tribes with historic, cultural, and legal connections impacting the greater Portland Metro ecosystem. <i>PCEF funding is limited by the code to funding physical improvement projects in the City of Portland. Workforce/contractor development projects can serve individuals and businesses in the broader Portland MSA.</i>

KEY TAKEAWAYS
Global Comments – continued

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
	<p>Clarify the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic programs: describe alignment with the equity + climate framework, applicant eligibility, funding allocation, grassroots community projects, compliance, oversight, and expectations for compliance with the equity + climate framework • Describe staff and resource structure for plan implementation given the plan’s heavy administrative requirements • Describe implementation of services to the BIPOC community, including partnership details and barrier removal • Share evaluation of carbon sequestration and emission reduction criteria in each project area • Funding allocations: share rationale for each category and program, with flexibility depending on feedback and evaluation • Targeted funding for specific geographical areas to increase equitable outcomes • Clarify alignment with Climate Emergency Work Plan <p>Concerns about plan effectiveness and focus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nonprofits may lack the capacity to achieve desired results. • The plan may be too general and fund all projects instead of prioritizing those with the highest carbon reduction potential. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address houselessness by building climate-resilient housing. <i>PCEF can fund individual projects through the community responsive grant program.</i> • Recognize the disability community as a priority population. <i>The CIP is a planning document that strives to articulate inclusion of people with disabilities. People with disabilities are a priority population for workforce development and contractor support funding. Expanding the definition to include other funding categories requires changing the City Code, which is not within the scope of the CIP.</i> • Prioritizing some populations over others will not get us toward our outcomes. <i>Code explicitly lists priority populations, however, this does not exclude others from participating.</i> • Project ideas including testing new ideas through pilot programs that support change on Portland streets and parks, materials for houseless people to keep their campsites clean, mental health services that are culturally competent. <i>Individual project ideas will be considered for community responsive grant program.</i> • Zoning code changes. <i>Out of scope</i>

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Global Comments – continued

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
	<p>General concerns about the shift from community to government funding.</p> <p>Update the equity + climate framework by requiring each strategic program to address the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure that the program is led by and accountable to frontline communities, with benefits directed towards these communities in a clear, significant, and measurable way, and be held accountable to this end. • Evaluate whether the program will result in meaningful and measurable improvements in climate resiliency. • Be additional to existing or planned efforts. • Ensure that the plan remains community-based, despite the participation of businesses and government in the funding and implementation process. • Address the issue of businesses and government having an unfair advantage over local nonprofits in accessing funding for projects/programs. Consider measures to prevent this and ensure that nonprofits have equal opportunities to apply for and receive funding. <p>Target and prioritize environmental justice communities that may have limited nonprofit presence to increase PCEF's reach.</p> <p>Evaluation and Metrics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate projects holistically to identify multiple advantages. • Ensure consistent evaluation, tracking, and auditing of fund use and outcomes across programs. • Fund the evaluation and auditing of plan implementation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide retroactive support for existing grantees to access newer funds (such as capacity building and transportation decarbonization) if they need additional capacity during implementation to better meet the needs of their community <p><i>Level of detail is too specific for CIP and may be considered during program implementation.</i></p>

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Global Comments – continued

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration in draft	Not under consideration for next draft
	<p>Coordination and Collaboration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Coordinate with other organizations involved in clean energy retrofitting to ensure complementary incentives• Leverage efforts from other City bureaus and PSU to support clean energy initiatives <p>Application process, criteria, and eligible projects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Ensure flexibility in funding categories to accommodate projects that combine multiple strategies and funding categories• Provide clarity on the application process, including how to apply for projects in different categories and prioritize projects for nonprofits with limited administrative resources• Offer grant navigation services to support groups with limited resources• Consider affordable reuse projects for funding• Eligibility for projects that involve property acquisition and/or site control if they significantly advance the goals of the plan <p>From public agencies (Port of Portland, Portland Parks & Recreation, Prosper Portland):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clarify the decision-making process for public agency eligibility and how public agencies can participate effectively in the PCEF process to maximize their contributions and leverage resources <p>Outreach and public process feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Develop print collateral for targeted communities• Simplify the process to participate• Organize a roundtable for regenerative agriculture• Utilize culturally appropriate approaches to outreach	

Clean energy

- Community responsive grants
- SP2: Clean energy in unregulated multifamily housing
- SP3: Clean energy improvements in single family homes
- SP4: Clean energy in small commercial buildings
- SP5: Building upgrades for community severe weather response

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Overall clean energy funding

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Support for addressing multiple segments in housing market• Support for investing in efficiency first• Support for move to invest only in efficient equipment that uses electricity as a fuel source	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Existing regulated affordable housing may benefit from a funding path (strategic program) outside of the Community Responsive Grant program• Solar is unlikely to fit in budgets of many of the residential energy projects with focus on efficiency first.• Coordinate with existing programs to leverage resources• Multifamily housing investment should be higher	

KEY TAKEAWAYS

SP2: Clean energy in unregulated multifamily housing

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Focus on both renewables and energy efficiency• Heat pumps are important• Support for assistance to unregulated market• Support for rent stability agreement	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Work with CBOs to ID highest rent burdened• Create pathway for tenants to request program outreach to landlords• Obtaining income information from tenants is a barrier• Require electrification• Consider 30% health/safety cap at the program instead of site level• Don't do solar before weatherization• Include health outcomes like indoor air quality• Allow 25% match to be fulfilled through funding sources other than owner• Make upgrades free, landlord contributions will not work• Prioritize NE Sandy Blvd properties• Budget for rent stability enforcement	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Reduce investment, cost-prohibitive <i>We do not agree that these investments are cost-prohibitive</i>• Form public purpose real estate investment trust <i>Not aligned with PCEF focus</i>

KEY TAKEAWAYS

SP3: Clean energy improvements in single family homes

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low-income homeowners prioritized with options for moderate-income homeowners and renters. • Both GHG reductions and socio-economic metrics are targeted. • Funding for health, life, safety is included. • Workforce and contractor development included. • Government entities are eligible. • Solar is an option, after energy efficiency upgrades are completed. • We are focused on assuring rental investment benefits are realized by tenants. • Program leverages other funding, matches and financing options. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include outreach support and website improvements for easier access. • Limit ability of non-local entities to do work • Change renter eligibility from renter's income to rent level of the home. • Increase allowance for health, life, safety to 50% of project. • Require electrification. • Allow gas furnaces as back up heat source for heat pumps. • Include EV charging, combined storage, demand response and load-shifting capabilities to all projects. • Reduce funding allocation for single-family program. • Remove rent restriction requirements because they will stifle participation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fund seismic retrofits beyond what will fit into the health, life, safety budget limit. <p><i>Large seismic retrofits, roof replacements and other major deferred maintenance could use significant PCEF funding, substantially limiting or eliminating funds for carbon reducing activities.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make non-local entities ineligible. <p><i>The program cannot exclude entities from participation on the basis of geographic location.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make government entities ineligible. <p><i>There is not a compelling rationale to limit government eligibility for program implementation at this point given the need for additional implementation partners.</i></p>

KEY TAKEAWAYS

SP4: Clean energy in small commercial buildings

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target high energy use intensity business types • Focuses on both tenants and owners • Covers measures that utilities incentives don't • No revenue requirement for businesses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider larger buildings up to 50k square feet • Include strip malls • Focus on childcare facilities to maximize benefits to most vulnerable • Ensure energy efficiency is primary goal when including health related goals • Include EV charging stations • Allow required 25% match to come from any source, not specifically the building owner. • This building stock relies heavily on natural gas, greater opportunity for GHG savings with electrification • Ensure coordination with 82nd Ave initiative • Consider group-based, energy transition outreach strategies (similar to residential neighborhood approach) <p>Prosper Portland</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider small business definition: 50 or less employees, 3-5 locations, brick and mortar 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create utility collective bargaining entity to negotiate lower rates <i>Out of PCEF program scope</i> • Provide funding to support property ownership (e.g., low interest loan for real estate purchase) <i>Not in alignment with PCEF primary focus</i> • Encourage use of local, regional, ESG suppliers (i.e., businesses that promote environmental, social, governance practices) <i>Level of detail is too specific for CIP and may be considered during program implementation. Some elements to be addressed through workforce and contractor equity in CIP.</i>

KEY TAKEAWAYS

SP5: Building upgrades for community severe weather response

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for including seismic retrofitting as an eligible expense • Importance of battery storage to improve resiliency during outages • Prioritizing solar upgrades to buildings • Allowing religious institutions/churches as eligible spaces for upgrades • Technical assistance for feasibility studies • Importance of efficient cooling systems during heat events • Consider upgrades to public school buildings as part of its own dedicated funding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ETO assistance to pre-qualify buildings as part of eligibility review • Outreach efforts to reach potential applicants in low-income neighborhoods • Include disability accessibility as a PCEF priority for this strategic program • As part of selection criteria, prioritize sites along public transit • Explore overlap with transportation decarbonization work PCEF is supporting • Increases size of budget allowed for seismic retrofit beyond 30% life, health, safety budget limit <p>Portland Parks and Recreation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase total funding beyond \$30M to be able to do deeper retrofits in large public buildings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include requirements for ethical sourcing of battery storage systems <i>Level of detail is too specific for CIP and may be considered during program implementation. Additionally, not feasible at this time due to lack of availability in the market.</i> • Use the term “resilience hubs” as part of larger advocacy efforts <i>Naming will be revisited during implementation. Resilience hubs has led to confusion when communicating scope.</i> • Include public schools as eligible spaces for this program <i>Public schools are eligible to participate and also have other strategic program focused on public schools.</i> • Include outdoor shelter spaces such as rest areas, parks, bus, and MAX stops <i>Out of scope as meaningful carbon reduction opportunities do not exist in these areas.</i> • Funding for ongoing staffing costs <i>Out of scope given PCEF focus and funding structure</i> • Including food as eligible expense <i>Level of detail is too specific for CIP and may be considered during program implementation.</i> • Support building acquisition <i>PCEF may potentially be part of a capital stack to do an energy retrofit of a community building being acquired, but funding outright building acquisition is out of the program scope, unless it relates directly to a workforce and contractor development need defined in the CIP as detailed in an RFP.</i>

Transportation Decarbonization

- Community responsive grants & Other
- SP6: Comprehensive e-bike access and support
- SP7: Equitable clean transportation access

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Overall transportation decarbonization funding area/community responsive grants

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Widespread support & enthusiasm for inclusion of transportation decarbonization as a Climate Investment Plan funding area Support for clear measures of success Strong support for on-the ground projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increase clarity/specificity in: eligible infrastructure measures, workgroup selection, specific community outreach & education allocation, fleet electrification Include goal measure of actual users / unique users of clean transportation options Improve bike and pedestrian infrastructure, esp. in East Portland; invest in addressing safety concerns Increase youth-focused investment (“bike bus” programs, youth transit passes, transportation education) Focus on reducing VMT, supporting active modes, versus EVs and EV infrastructure Concern with funding EV infrastructure given perceptions of inaccessibility for low-income people Specifically include paratransit and other mobility options, prioritizing the needs of the disability community Consider lack of EV infrastructure in Portland and identify potential sites for community charging stations – multi-family housing projects, regional destinations (e.g. parks), with emphasis on shifting charging to optimal times Make a comprehensive plan integrating EV purchase and the need for infrastructure Coordinate PCEF investments with PBOT and TriMet with regards to infrastructure and service, including fee increase 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fund fareless transit, TriMet improvements, and widespread electrification. <i>Out of scope given need for measurable and meaningful carbon reductions; additionality; direct targeted benefits to priority populations.</i> Address concerns about lifecycle impacts of electrification, esp. lithium mining. <i>Out of scope for PCEF program level of influence</i> Improvements to roadways in ODOT jurisdiction; public transportation from Washington to Oregon; Rose Quarter to Gorge/Sullivan’s Gulch Trail. <i>Out of scope given need for measurable and meaningful carbon reductions; additionality; direct targeted benefits to priority populations.</i>

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Overall transportation decarbonization funding area/community responsive grants - continued

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration in draft	Out of scope of influence
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target transportation investments in industrial zones and specific neighborhoods based on need through a review of bus and MAX routes • Include electric skateboards and unicycles as eligible clean transportation options • Explore electric carshare sites at affordable housing sites; subsidize costs such as installation of charging stations • Support transportation decarb in freight/industrial areas • Integration of transportation decarb with other funding areas (green infrastructure elements, EV charging in small commercial program / business districts, transportation options for participants in workforce training programs) • Support school bus retrofits in addition to or instead of new electric buses <p>Portland Parks and Recreation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support EV charging at parks <p>Portland Bureau of Transportation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request participation in review of applications for infrastructure projects; opportunity to work with community & PCEF on project delivery and ongoing maintenance models for projects within right-of-way • Support investments in walking and biking infrastructure as increasing access to low-carbon transportation options depends on the availability of safe, well-maintained infrastructure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support Frog Ferry electric ferry system. <i>Project not suitable for strategic program given status as concept (see equity + climate framework). Project could apply under community responsive grant. Specific project ideas will be considered through request for proposals after CIP is finalized.</i> • Develop IGA with ODOT to explore clean transportation access at the Argay, Wilkes, Columbia South Shore industrial Zone <i>Out of scope with PCEF's CIP efforts.</i> • Incentivize builders, developers, and new homebuyers to create more options for multimodal forms of transportation <i>Not in alignment with PCEF primary focus based on current level of detail in the comment.</i>

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Transportation Decarbonization– SP#6– Comprehensive E-bike Access and Support

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for increasing e-bike accessibility, and benefits Interconnection of e-bike uses and support for BIKETOWN programs and infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to capital for e-bike matched savings purchases as well as EVs Concerns about safe storage, theft, and charging needs for people in apartments, and at people's work, given the high value of e-bikes. Articulate partnerships and education guidance / expectations with Portland e-bike retailers as they will help ensure community members access e-bike incentives Need to get mechanics and retailers trained and educated about e-bike sales and service. Efforts at state for rebate and coordination about layering of programs Concerns about people selling e-bikes and not using them Include funding for organizations to manage fleets of e-bikes for low income housing complexes. Consider moderate-income rebate with higher rebate for low-income individuals Describe additional public health and environmental health benefits for e-bikes Consider funding for e-bike maintenance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bike safety concerns, including need for systemwide bike safety infrastructure improvements on roads in East and Northeast Portland. <i>Out of scope given need for measurable and meaningful carbon reductions; additionality; direct targeted benefits to priority populations.</i> Building code requirements and changes related to parking and de-incentivizing cars <i>Out of scope for PCEF program – focus on decarbonization investment priorities.</i>

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Transportation Decarbonization – SP7: Equitable clean transportation access

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Exclude Uber/Lyft as an option as this will not decrease GHG emissions, labor issues, and human rights violations• Consider excluding Uber/Lyft and using local taxi companies instead• Work with organizations to distribute as well as directly to recipients• Include requirements for Lyft/Uber as corporations benefiting from this program• Program evaluation and research should be added to understand the impact of interventions and challenges through the lens of priority populations as part of an equitable mobility framework <p>Portland Bureau of Transportation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Allocate specific funding for BIKETOWN for ALL equity membership plan to complement wallet as demand outpaces the budget	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Use funding towards fareless transit system or programs like free summer transit. <i>Out of scope given need for measurable and meaningful carbon reductions; additionality; direct targeted benefits to priority populations.</i>• Limit purchase of unused credits in program design <i>Level of detail is too specific for CIP. Will be considered during program implementation.</i>

Green infrastructure

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Green Infrastructure (GI), Including Green Infrastructure Maintenance Reserve (GIMR)

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the general concepts and need for long-term thinking about green infrastructure • Demonstrated need for street tree care and maintenance as a tool to overcome barriers for people accepting trees on their property • Support for depaving and co-benefits of reduced urban heat islands, and protecting greenspace • Linkage between these programs and larger opportunities within PCEF 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns that amount allocated to GI and GIMR is not enough • Need to clarify long-term nature of benefits from trees, including the shade and carbon sequestration value • Desire to have street tree maintenance on a geographic basis instead of income-qualified by household <p>Bureau of Environmental Services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarity on whether maintenance will be greater than 5 years, what tree care is covered, and whether any areas beyond street trees are in GIMR <p>Portland Parks and Recreation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desire for public agencies to be eligible to apply for community grants in this area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address sidewalks and stormwater infrastructure on unimproved streets. <i>Sidewalks are outside of PCEF funding area focus. Stormwater infrastructure requires substantially greater understanding of City role and obligation for stormwater infrastructure.</i> • Desire for predetermined funding for specific cultural groups or organizations <i>Level of detail desired is too specific for CIP and may be considered during program implementation, if appropriate.</i> • Sidewalk repair as part of GIMR services <i>Outside of PCEF funding area focus, does not contribute to carbon reductions. Additionally, current allowable street trees species should not impact sidewalks.</i>

Regenerative agriculture

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Overall regenerative agriculture funding area/community responsive grants

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Demonstrated need for land access and funding to support labor/maintenance of sites and programs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Concerns that regenerative agriculture allocation is too low.Proposals should be reviewed for potential water quality issues.Language seems restrictive if Indigenous partners want to grow native crops for non-food uses.Clarify requirements around long-term management of properties, ownership, and instruments like deed restrictions.Expand description of "increasing soil carbon"	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Regenerative Agriculture eligible in Green Infrastructure Maintenance Fund. <i>The maintenance fund is being specifically established to support the urban tree canopy.</i>Public agencies should be eligible to apply for community responsive grants. <i>To maintain fidelity to prioritizing community-led climate action, community responsive grants will continue to only be available to community based non-profit organizations.</i>

KEY TAKEAWAYS

SP9: Increasing urban farming opportunities – planning and land acquisition

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none">General support for this Strategic Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Many feel like \$4 million is an under investment that could use more robust allocation.Have an option for the property to be owned by a land trust (e.g. Columbia Land Trust, Black Oregon Land Trust) or government entity (e.g. Metro, PP&R, BES) but managed by the grantee.Bureau of Environmental Services (BES): may be preferable to support co-locating food production on lands that serve other uses; schools, places of worship, unused right-of-way (ROW), public facilities, utility easements	

Organizational capacity building

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Capacity building generally and SP10: Organizational Capacity Building

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Supporting current grantees with capacity building support outside of cohort• Importance of providing capacity building support for organizations• Cohort model of implementation• Continuing mini grant program• Using a capacity assessment to determine needs and measure outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Prioritize disability-led organizations who are wanting to grow in the environmental justice movement• Ensure that cohort members are not exclusively new, and emerging organizations. Include organizations with longer history• Support organizations to develop their skills and knowledge of PCEF eligible climate action projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Retroactively including current grantees in cohort <p><i>Level of detail is too specific for CIP as an application process will be developed for the program. Current grantee may be able to apply, if they meet the application criteria developed.</i></p>

82nd Ave

- SP 11: 82nd Ave Climate infrastructure & community resilience grant
- SP 12: 82nd Ave Street tree expansion

KEY TAKEAWAYS

SP 11: 82nd Ave Climate infrastructure & community resilience grant

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Support for green infrastructure investments (depaving, tree planting, & other greening efforts)• Support for investing in clean energy infrastructure for small commercial along 82nd Ave• Widespread support for increased tree canopy along 82nd Ave	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Integrate SP4 and SP11 for greater program efficiencies• Include private property tree planting <p>Bureau of Environmental Services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clarify if green infrastructure investments on commercial properties include intensive greening projects for multi-family, schools, and nonprofit properties, if so, increase GI budget allocation beyond small grants.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Expand 82nd Ave geographic focus to include NE 122nd to address potential environmental justice issues from proposed freight warehouse development and transportation pollution impacts. <i>Outside of scope of strategic program as this is approximately 2.5 miles east of 82nd Ave. Other PCEF investments may have an east Portland focus.</i> <p>Bureau of Environmental Services</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Explore opportunities with BPS planners to include special zoning provisions that provide incentives for increased green infrastructure and trees on private property adjacent to 82nd Ave; increase the goals of the Comp Plan's Civic Corridor concept on 82nd Ave <i>Out of PCEF scope - bureau coordination will be a part of CIP programs, however, policy-level change is outside of PCEF's scope.</i>

KEY TAKEAWAYS

SP 12: 82nd Ave street tree expansion

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Increase street trees along 82nd Ave corridor. <p>Portland Bureau of Transportation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">Timing: align with the recent jurisdictional transfer and PBOT planning efforts for the corridor		<ul style="list-style-type: none">PCEF funds should be used to support the large tree median projects organized by PBOT for NE 122nd Ave. <p><i>Out of scope for this particular strategic program. - geographic focus of NE 122nd is well outside of 82nd Ave corridor.</i></p>

Access to fair and flexible capital

KEY TAKEAWAYS

SP13: Access to fair and flexible capital

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the general approach of making loans and financing tools available to small businesses • Interaction between other grant areas and the need for matching or bridge capital in some projects 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individuals from priority populations also could benefit from EV car and bike lending products, not just businesses • Concerns that the list of eligible financial entities is too narrow • Desire for more clarity and details about needs and gaps that this program is addressing, types of financial products, and outcomes • Concerns about oversight and connection to climate goals of projects that receive financing • Support for a larger Green Bank to further leverage federal, state and local funds <p>Prosper Portland</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expressed interest and capacity in administering funds for contractor and business development • Suggestions for defining "small business" = 50 or less employees, 3-5 locations, brick and mortar 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desire for funding for start-up capital and filing patent applications, doing R&D, and protecting intellectual property <p><i>Outside of PCEF scope</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support funding for mitigation banking for offsetting land development along waterways <p><i>Out of PCEF focus given need for measurable and meaningful carbon reductions; additionality; direct targeted benefits to priority populations.</i></p>

Climate-friendly public schools

KEY TAKEAWAYS

SP 14: Climate-friendly public schools

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Support for greening of school yards, energy efficiency measures and solar installations, electrifying school buses	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Provide technical assistance for schools interested in electrifying their buses including layering with federal fundingAddress challenges of green infrastructure including maintenance, vandalism, and safetyFocus on street-involved studentsProgramming and education about the climate crisis including technical training programs for middle and high school students and involving CBOs	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Create a BIPOC-operated charter school around regenerative agriculture. <i>Level of detail too specific for CIP - specific projects can be applied for through PCEF's community responsive grant program. Additionally, this is most relevant for workforce development community responsive grants.</i>

Workforce and Contractor Development

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Workforce development

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good input about maintenance of the trees planted needing better assessment of maintenance workforce • CIP represents a good starting point for engaging the community, identifying priorities, and reassuring the public that PCEF investments made under plan are sound and inclusive • Appreciation for set aside of funds for organizations that serve people with disabilities • PCEF is doing well at helping minority communities to enter the field and making it easier for various cultures to be engaged 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perception that funding allocation for workforce development is lower than what is needed • Expand workforce development beyond entry level to include technical, management and leadership roles • Include people with disabilities in career exposure and workforce development • Address language and cultural barriers that keep workers away • Workforce and contractor utilization metrics should be tracked as well as #'s of ea. and goals should be set • Need for more training opportunities through apprenticeships, certifications, and training and to recruit, starting in middle and high school as well as those looking to switch careers • Implementation of programs like tree planting before implementation of workforce may miss an opportunity • Regenerative agriculture not showing up enough in planning • Need for addressing wrap around costs such as childcare, transportation, health benefits to help with retention of workers • Workplace culture and safety are important for retention of a more diverse jobsite • Plan must make explicit that contractors of color are equally welcome whether they are union or open shop and have equal access, opportunities, and standing to participate in projects; and any advisory body must have equal representation between union and open shop contractors and organizations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding to support people to start businesses, not just putting up solar panels or energy retrofits. Even a beauty salon, a tax business, or a restaurant or cafe can be business that contribute to a climate resilient city <i>Outside of PCEF scope which is focused on promote job training, pre-apprenticeship programs, apprenticeship programs, and contractor development in businesses that produce goods or services that reduce or sequester greenhouse gases</i> • Needed health care positions in the PCEF target communities would benefit greatly in funding scholarships <i>Outside of PCEF scope</i>

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Contractor Development

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The good thing about the PCEF program is that they are not trying to make money off of these projects they are supplying funds to make these changes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> COBID is difficult to navigate. Desire for alternatives that could be used instead Hard for contractors to follow multiple report formats from different funders. Desire to collaborate w/an org to help manage this, or adjust reporting process to match other agencies Training opportunities should support business development and accessing certifications Desire for clarity on the types and scope of contractor supports that will be available, whether equipment, labor, business development Businesses assistance needed for back of house management beyond their contracted tasks Desire a clearer definition of 'contractor' is needed to determine scope of types of eligible industries Access to capital is needed in various capacities Contractors concerned about having enough projects before hiring and then retention of those workers. How can these be incentivized Desire for PCEF to incentivize big companies to hire and mentor smaller companies and retain them Desire for funding for linkage between projects funded and workforce and contractor development grants 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request for capital to purchase buildings as well as consulting service to help them buy buildings <i>PCEF may potentially be part of a capital stack to do an energy retrofit of a community building being acquired, but funding outright building acquisition is out of the program scope, unless it is relates directly to a workforce and contractor development need defined in the CIP as detailed in an RFP.</i> An annual Council review of the plan and its funding categories and requirements should ensure that the plan remains flexible and responsive <i>Annual review of performance is part of the PCEF Committee and Council workplan. CIP may be updated periodically to adjust funding allocations as necessary based on performance.</i>

Accessibility & Disability Inclusion

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Accessibility & disability inclusion

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Continue elevating connections between SP5 Severe Weather Response Buildings and positive benefits for disability communities	<ul style="list-style-type: none">SP3: Clean energy- Single Family: Need to consider restrictions on liquid revenue that SSDI/SSI poses on people with disabilities. Can PCEF include disabled homeowners for the higher investment category even if they rent or live in owner-occupied home but potentially exceed 80%AMI? Are we able to create an exception for this unique circumstance relative to systemic restraints of SSDI/SSI?SP5: How to reframe Life/Health/Safety expenses related to accessibility improvements as essential upgrades vs. additional eligible expense? How might this be a unique exception to Severe Weather Response centers vs. other physical improvement programs?SP5: Consider disability communities in site selection for PCEF investments to maximize accessibility during severe weather events. E.g., proximity to public transit, available in different areas of the City, and remove physical barriers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Include people living with disabilities as a PCEF priority population for investments beyond WCD <p><i>Outside the scope of the CIP development. This is an important conversation that the program is having across our investments to both understand the intersectionality and opportunities for greater inclusion of people with disabilities.</i></p>

KEY TAKEAWAYS

Accessibility & disability inclusion – continued

What was good / where there was support	Key takeaways that are under consideration for next draft	Not under consideration for next draft
<ul style="list-style-type: none">Continue elevating the positive impacts that transportation decarb investment can have in serving people with disabilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none">WCD investments: career exposure & job training. How can we explicitly engage people with disabilities in both of these funding opportunities to increase successful project applications.Transportation Decarb CRG: Uplifting paratransit and other adaptive transit modes to signal opportunities for disability inclusion.SP10: Intentionally engage disability-led organizations in environmental justice movement through SP10. Can there be a set-aside or some mechanism to encourage disability-led orgs to apply for the cohort.	