

PCEF Grants Subcommittee Agenda

Date: January 29, 2020

Time: 12:00 to 1:00pm

Location: 1900 SW 4th Ave. Suite 7100, Portland, OR 97215

Teleconference: 1-877-465-2391 code: 3404499827

- | | |
|-------|---|
| 12:00 | Introductions |
| 12:05 | Discussion of proposed agenda content framework for subcommittee work (below) |
| 1:00 | Meeting adjourned |

Proposed framework for agenda content

- I. Timeline: From today to award of first grants (*see attached Gantt chart*)
 - Milestones: what needs to be accomplished between now and then
 - Challenges and trade-offs related to externally imposed timeline
 - Level of effort: examples from other funders
- II. Desired process characteristics: what do we value or aspire to with our process?
Sample list to spark ideas:
 - Ease of burden on reviewers AND applicants
 - User-friendly experience for applicants (e.g., offer multiple submission methods including simple electronic submission, multiple languages?)
 - Equity lens in review (e.g., diverse review panel, blind review)
 - Participatory grant making? - how much public involvement and when
 - Depth of review vs. timeliness of review
 - Transparency
 - Others?
- III. Begin addressing process sequence and questions - As time allows and into next meetings

Timing

1. Year one likely to be one solicitation
2. Future solicitation considerations: e.g., seasonal activities, other funding schedules, depth vs timeliness, staff review capacity, others?

Initial Screening

Potential components of eligibility and minimum application requirements

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Eligible non-profit | 5. Commitment to obtain necessary |
| 2. Project is located in Portland | insurance and/or bonding |
| 3. Project reduces GHG | 6. Application is complete |
| 4. Project includes equity component | 7. Others? |

Requirements

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| 1. Define small grant. Less than \$100,000? | 3. What budget info do we need? |
| 2. Narrative page limit? | |

4. What info do we need about partners, subcontractors?
5. What can be gathered after approval and before contract signing (e.g., insurance)?

Tools for receiving applications

1. Webform, email, mail/deliver, other?

Review process *(see two examples attached)*

1. External reviewers? Who? Why?
2. Benefits and challenges of using external reviewers
3. Types of review:
 - i. Environmental
 - ii. Social equity
 - iii. Financial and economic
 - iv. Capacity (e.g., staffing, experience)
 - v. Organization history (e.g., violations, past performance, DEI)
 - vi. Portfolio balance
 - vii. Additional due diligence

The City of Portland is committed to providing meaningful access and will make reasonable accommodations, modifications, translation, interpretation or provide other services. When possible, please contact us at least three (3) business days before the meeting at 503-823-7700 or use City TTY 503-823-6868 or Oregon Relay Service 711. 503-823-7700: Traducción o interpretación | Chuyển Ngữ hoặc Phiên Dịch | 翻译或传译 | Turjumida ama Fasiraadda | Письменный или устный перевод | Traducere sau Interpretare | Письмови й або усний переклад | 翻訳または通訳 | ການແປພາສາ ຫຼື ການອະທິບາຍ

Example of two types of review process below. Note that these are just two potential processes.

Example 1

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 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 review recommended projects and surface any questions
7. Dialogue to modified consensus of recommended packet
8. Committee recommendations presented to Mayor and City Council

Example 2

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. Initial scoring conducted by review panel (could include Committee members, community members, and/or staff)
4. Highest scoring receives due diligence by staff and external review as appropriate (e.g., technical review)
5. Staff prepare recommendations based on ranking, due diligence, and portfolio balance
6. Committee reviews recommendations (with scoresheets and short summary for each project) and surface any questions
7. Dialogue to modified consensus of recommended packet
8. Committee recommendations presented to Mayor and City Council