PCEF Grants Subcommittee Minutes

DATE: 1.23.20

Attendance:

Committee Members: Megan Horst, Robin Wang, Ranfis Villatoro

Staff: Cady Lister, Janet Hammer

Logistics:

- Next three meetings set: January 29th noon to 1:00pm, February 5th 1:00 to 2:00pm, and February 12th 1:00 to 2:00pm.

Next steps:

- January 29 meeting will focus on application process, agenda/material for this meeting on Monday 1.27.20.
- Staff will prepare content for full committee grounding in legal parameters of PCEF grantmaking, high level grantmaking principles, private vs public sector grantmaking (including attention to equitable grant-making, historical privilege, grants vs contracts).

Resources noted:

- MRG, Social Justice Fund NW, RFP process for Port re cleanup of river, Resource Generation, Children's Levy.

Discussion summary:

- There is a lot of work to get done to meet the deadline of sending out an RFP this summer. Time is short and we need to start the conversation.
- In thinking about the work session from the last committee meeting, it seems like we can do some pre-thinking on that and bring recommendations to the larger group. And do some research on best/worst practices.
- Create timeline and develop skeleton for grantmaking and making sure we are doing good research and due diligence around best practices. Would like to have a good skeleton developed with enough time to get public comment to iterate.
- Public sector is at the beginning of the journey in equitable grantmaking, we can look at community benefits agreements and how those have and have not been successful.
- Process discussion should include consideration of how many and how often solicitations are released throughout the year.
- Model needs to address biases (e.g., remove applicant name), due diligence, potential conflicts of interest, good reporting practices, interrater reliability (e.g., multiple reviewers).

Staff outlined potential structure for subcommittee work for next few meetings.

- Understanding parameters within the legislation

- o Group agreed that it would be helpful to present to the full committee what is required by law/code and the difference between public and private grantmaking to create a better shared understanding of the box we are working within. Suggest also having guest speaker to talk about history of racism and privilege in grantmaking, maybe PCL? Staff will put this together.
- Components of grantmaking
  - o Process
    - Application requirements
    - Screening
    - Tools for receiving applications
    - Application review process. Example review processes below. Note that this just one potential process.
      1) Committee assists with developing criteria by which applications are scored and recommended portfolio balance (includes public input)
      2) Staff performs initial screen for eligibility
      3) Scoring and due diligence is managed by staff and includes external reviewing as needed (e.g., technical reviewers)
      4) Staff rank applications based on points earned, portfolio balance
      5) Staff recommendations given to committee with scoresheets and short summary for each project
      6) Committee reviews recommended projects and surfaces any questions
      7) Dialogue to modified consensus of recommended packet
      8) Committee recommendations presented to Mayor and City Council
  - o Application review/scoring
    - Criteria
      1. What must all projects/programs include? (e.g., measure guidance: for all but workforce dev/training = GHG reduction and equitable social benefit. Workforce contractor equity requirements, etc.)
      2. Linking of criteria to evaluation metrics. E.g., standard units that PCEF will be able to roll up and report, balance of manageable and meaningful, ability to fit projects of different sizes and types.
    - Different application requirements for projects of various sizes/types
  - o Reporting requirements
    - Project reporting - what are we requiring, for how long and why?
    - PCEF program performance – project measures roll up to program performance, other measures such as process (e.g., satisfaction).