

PCEF Grant Process and Criteria Review Subcommittee Minutes

DATE: 2.12.20 FROM 1:00 TO 2:00 PM

Attendance:

Committee Members: Robin Wang, Ranfis Villatoro, Megan Horst

Staff: Cady Lister, Janet Hammer, Sam Baraso, Angela Previdelli

Logistics:

Next three meetings - 2/19, 2/26 and 3/4 from 1:00 – 2:00 pm

Next steps:

- Staff will provide interview protocol and introductory blurb about PCEF and reason for inquiry to external funders by 2/14/20.
- Committee members will sign up for external funders from the list below, and reach out to funders cc'ing staff.
- Staff working on insurance/bonding requirements, barriers, opportunities. Deliverable is short summary of findings for subcommittee. Due to subcommittee by 3/4/20 meeting.
- Staff will work with city legal to provide clear legal limitations regarding geography for PCEF programs and projects by 2/18/20.

Discussion summary:

Subcommittee agreed to bring recommendations to the full committee and then iterate on the feedback they receive. Schedule of subcommittee bringing info to full committee:

1. February 27 – **Work session, grant process.**
2. March 31 – **Work session, process and criteria for application review/scoring.**
3. April 9 – **Full meeting (nearly) work session, application review criteria and scoring.**
4. April 23 – **Work session on grantee requirements.**

Interviews/info gathering from external funders

Janet will send interview protocol/script (adding question on collaboration) and email introduction blurb. Note to review website of interviewee prior to meeting so that questions can be tailored (and time saved). Add questions as appropriate and let subcommittee know if you have identified other questions to include.

Subcommittee members agreed to try to participate in three meetings over the next 1.5 to 2 weeks, if possible. Each of these meetings should include one staff and one subcommittee member.

The updated list of funders is below. Some of the organizations on the list have been contacted already – staff can circle back with specific questions that weren't addressed in earlier meeting. Subcommittee intent is to complete interviews with funders that make grants in the areas of PCEF funding, and a mix of gov/nongov funders. Note- these folks fall on a spectrum of equity focus and may not represent systems that we would wish to recreate.

Subcommittee member commitments

- Ranfis will reach out to MRG and SJF, meeting with Worksystems tomorrow
- Robin will look at list when back at computer and email the staff
- Megan will reach out to food funders and cc staff (King County Regional Food Systems, USDA, and ODA Farm to School)

Please note in parenthesis the entities for which we have identified someone(s) to make contact or who have already made contact. The entities highlighted yellow are the organizations that do not have anyone currently assigned to them.

Non-government organization

- MRG Foundations <https://www.mrgfoundation.org/> (Ranfis)
- Meyer Memorial Trust <https://mmt.org/> - (Staff)
- Social Justice Fund Northwest <https://socialjusticefund.org/> (Ranfis)
- Collins Foundation <https://www.collinsfoundation.org/> (Staff)
- Worksystems Inc <https://www.worksystems.org/> (Ranfis, Janet, Cady)
- Clean Energy Works (Staff)
- Climateworks <https://www.climateworks.org/>
- Oregon Community Foundation
- PG&E (Staff)
- Bullitt Foundation
- California Climate Investments (Staff)

Governmental entities

- City of Portland – Civic Life and PCL (Staff)
- Community Opportunity Enhancement Plan
- EMSWCD (Staff)
- Port of Portland
- Energy Trust – (Staff)
- Metro
- USDA (Megan)
- ODA Farm to school (Megan)
- ODOE – (Staff)
- King County regional food systems (Megan)

Ask Grantmakers of OSW, Philanthropy NW, and community partners, to see if there are others we have missed.

Screening criteria

The subcommittee agreed to recommend seven screening criteria for full committee consideration. There was some discussion of including cursory due diligence such as IRS lien, pending lawsuits, violations of fed/state laws (past infractions), if contractor is listed – current license, record of infractions, BOLI “do not buy list.” No decision was made about adding cursory due diligence to list of screening criteria at this time. More info may be needed. The seven recommended criteria are listed below with some of the conversation and issues related to each.

- 1) Eligible non-profit
- 2) Projects located in Portland
 - a) Discussion of geography. Especially, ag, community solar, and workforce. Note that legislation refers to “in Portland.” First year push to keep within Portland boundaries, with the exception of workforce and training where more clarification is needed. For example: a pre-apprentice nonprofit may be located outside of Portland and receive funds if x% of the participants in the funded program are residents of Portland (and/or demonstrate that they have been displaced from Portland in the last x years).
 - b) Ranfis gave the example that there is not a plumbing training center within city limits and expressed support for the idea that workforce development and training have geographic flexibility.
 - c) Staff will bring clear guidance from city legal team about how much flexibility is possible related to location of PCEF funded programs and projects.
- 3) Commitment to obtain needed insurance/bonding
 - a) Staff will put together info on standard city requirements for insurance/bonding as well as some info related to barriers to accessing and opportunities to address those barriers (e.g., grant funds pay for, fiscal sponsor/aggregator, insurance pool specific to PCEF grantees).
 - b) Clarification of the reason for insurance (e.g., cost/risk to both city and grantee).
- 4) Application is complete. Discussion needed re what to do if there are minor issues (e.g., forgot to sign a form).
- 5) Floors and ceiling parameters
 - a) Not yet set by committee, subcommittee will need to discuss pros/cons and, if floors or ceilings are set what the thresholds would be.
- 6) Project reduces GHG and creates equitable social benefit
- 7) Project fits within at least one of the funding buckets

Suggestion to include examples of projects that are fundable and not fundable and why in in FAQs on website and in RFP outreach material

Suggestion to discuss what is the weight/scoring for each. The value of each section. The purpose we are trying to understand. With that understanding it's a template that we will modify.

Meeting adjourned