

**PORTLAND CLEAN ENERGY COMMUNITY BENEFITS FUND (PCEF) COMMITTEE**

**MEETING SUMMARY DRAFT**

**March 21, 2024 • 6:00 PM – 8:30 PM**

**Zoom Conference Call**

<b>Committee Members</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Affiliation</b>	<b>Present</b>
Dr. Megan Horst	Co-Chair	Associate Professor, School of Urban Studies & Planning at Portland State University	Yes
Ranfis Giannettino Villatoro	Co-Chair	Oregon State Policy Manager, BlueGreen Alliance	Yes
Alicia Chapman	Member-at-Large	Willamette Technical Fabricators	Yes
DeAngelo Moaning	Member-at-Large	Raimore Construction	Yes
Faith Graham	Member-at-Large	Elevate Energy	Yes
Maria Gabrielle Sipin	Member-at-Large	Community Member	Yes
Paul Lumley	Member-at-Large	Cascade AIDS Project	Yes
Robin Wang	Member-at-Large	Vibrant Future LLC	Yes
Michael Edden Hill	Member-at-Large	Community Member	Yes
Sam Baraso	Program Manager	PCEF	Yes
Cady Lister	Deputy Program Manager	PCEF	Yes
Jaimes Valdez	Org. Development & Policy Manager	PCEF	Yes
Kris Grube	Project Manager	PCEF	No
Wendy Koelfgen	Project Manager	PCEF	No
Rachel Gilmore	Administrative Specialist	PCEF	Yes
Elizabeth Stover	Senior Communications Strategist	PCEF	Yes
Tracy M. Smith	Facilitator	Inhance LLC	Yes
Camerina Galván	Notetaker	Galvan Consulting LLC	Yes
Ciara Pressler	Consultant	Pregame	Yes

**Others:** Lenny Dee; Jason Skipton, Executive Director, Growing Gardens; Lynn Merrick; Darlene Chirman, Great Old Broads for Wilderness; Taylor; Joseph Perez; Joseph Gallivan; Gayle; Anne-Marie Oliver, Oregon Institute of Creative Research; Lynn Merrick; Mika Barrett; Dashia Kinsey Bey; Durrell Kinsey Bey, The BIPOC Rise Moor Healing Center and Portland Mayoral Candidate; Magan Reed; Judy Wilder,

First Unitarian Portland; Dr. Nathalie Paravicini, Pacific Green Party; Madeleine Lyu; Joseph Herbert; Babs Vanelli; Kaitlin Lovell; Shin Lee; Eric Noll; Toma Deavers; Adam Zucker; Bruce Nelson.

## **INTRODUCTIONS**

- Tracy M. Smith called the meeting to order at 6:04 PM.
- The quorum was met.

## **CO-CHAIR AND COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS: PCEF COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

- The Co-Chair appreciates the public comments and is working to incorporate feedback.
- The Co-Chair assured that the committee does not support PCEF dollars being redirected to non-climate action projects. She encouraged the public to share their concerns with Commissioners. The proposal at today's meeting is a reflection of incorporating community feedback. Today's meeting will not be a follow-up on approved bureau projects.
- Alicia Chapman joined the meeting at 6:12 PM.

## **PUBLIC COMMENTS: TRACY M. SMITH, FACILITATOR**

- Madeleine Lyu is active in environmental justice nonprofits and hopes PCEF works with those organizations to find ways to allocate additional funds.
- Joseph Herbert is horrified that housing developers are in cahoots with fossil fuel and energy companies and would like to see North American Passive House standards used in constructing housing that uses PCEF dollars.
- Dr. Nathalie Paravicini asks for fewer barriers to community-generated ideas, using PCEF funding for aligned projects, creating climate-resilient infrastructures, the same process for bureaus and nonprofits to apply for funding, and building staff capacity.
- Lenny Dee shared that PCEF didn't consider developing public support against conservative positions. Lenny Dee encouraged the committee to fund one or two big, highly visible projects.
- Babs Vanelli agrees with Megan Horst's opening comments and the previous testimonies. Babs Vanelli wants PCEF funding to be used as intended.
- Jason Skipton asked for funding for the Regenerative Agriculture Coalition, increased funding for RFP 3 projects, and increased regenerative agriculture (RA) general operations for \$500,000 a year.
- Judy Wilder urges that the PCEF dollars be used as the voters intend, reducing barriers for the community, investing in growing capacity, and supporting community processes when revenues exceed or fall short of projections.
- Darlene Chirman asked that the intent of PCEF be respected.
- Durrell Kinsey Bey feels this is a turning point and shared words of encouragement.

## **COMMITTEE MEMBERS RESPONSES TO PUBLIC COMMENTS:**

- A Co-Chair heard the themes of protecting PCEF, using it as voters intended, and prioritizing community.

## GENERAL PROGRAM UPDATES: SAM BARASO, PCEF

- **RFP #3:** RFP #3 closed on February 15, 2024. The staff is finalizing the technical review process, and training will be held next week. Scoring panels will meet in May 2024. The staff has hard deadlines.
- **Staff Recruitments:** Recruitment for some engagement staff started in September 2023, and they will begin on April 24, 2024. Recruitment is underway for the Single Family Homes Clean Energy Program, Senior Clean Energy Manager, and Workforce and Contractor Equity Policy Manager positions. Recruitment for Clean Energy Transportation Decarbonization and RA and Green Infrastructure project manager positions will start. The recruitment of a committee member to replace Michael Edden Hill's seat is closed with 20 applicants.
- **Continued Work on the First Set of Allocations Recommended on February 2, 2024:** The bureaus are working on detailed narratives and budgets to form the language for the Climate Investment Plan (CIP) amendment and track metrics. The information will be shared with the committee in May 2024. Sam Baraso shared that PCEF is changing how business is done in the city.
- Committee member questions and comments:
  - It's a bummer to hear how long it takes to hire staff, but helpful to know the reality. Regarding RFP #3, she wants the committee and staff to consider the RFP #3 proposals as we deliberate budget allocations.
    - Response: We can have this discussion in June or July 2024 after the review panels have been completed.
  - Does this mean we will have allocation discussions in the summer of 2024 regarding RFP #3?
    - Response: We won't discuss RFP #3 specifically because we have our process. We can discuss the right level of allocations to community-responsive grants in general.
  - Information on RFP #3 is on the [PCEF website](#). A committee member thanked all the staff and applicants.
  - A committee member asked about the first set of allocations. Have the budgets been added to the mayor's budget? Have they been officially approved by the council? How can the public still weigh in?
    - Response: They have been loaded into the bureau-requested budgets. The budgets will appear in the Mayor's proposed budget in May 2024, and the council will have public deliberation.

## ACTION ITEM: PROCESS AND SOLICITATION FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL FOR 2<sup>ND</sup> SET OF ALLOCATIONS: SAM BARASO, PCEF

- Sam Baraso summarized the CIP, the discovery of unexpected revenue, the first allocation to city bureaus, the Climate Emergency Workplan, and key timelines.
- Sam Baraso gave a high-level overview of the process and framework proposal for allocating additional PCEF Funds for Community Coalition and Innovation Funding. The [full document](#) can be found on the PCEF website.
- A Co-Chair feels this is a pivotal moment, and the framework proposal incorporates public comments well. Every community member needs to see themselves in climate action.
- A Co-Chair feels this opportunity excites community groups, especially coalitions.

- Committee member questions and comments:
  - Based on his experience working with nonprofits, a committee member's primary concern is the tight timeline. Can we give them more lead time? Is there an opportunity to disassociate the allocation from the city budget timeline?
    - Staff: More time would be beneficial. However, it is enough time for coalition proposals. A further delay in the timeline would cause the committee to lose its ability to direct the conversation.
    - Committee Member: Can we set aside \$10-\$20 Million to give more time? Not all groups have pre-incubated ideas. He would like the flexibility.
    - Co-Chair Response: Should the committee decide to set aside \$10-\$20 Million today, or can it follow through with the framework process and decide later?
    - Staff Response: The framework proposal provides opportunities for projects not funded in the past. Staff would discourage committee members from funding projects that are not ready. The committee can set aside funding, which would be earmarked as unallocated.
  - A committee member likes the framework proposal because it synergizes, not overlaps, with the CIP, RFP #3, and the first funding allocation. There is a timing issue that will serve projects past the ideation phase. Can we give more time for projects to get a robust community benefits agreement in place? The process should be as clear as possible to avoid ambiguity.
  - A committee member appreciates PCEF's flexibility. Is September 2, 2024, a hard deadline?
    - Response: It is a hard deadline for projects that would be funded within the city. If a project is not rising to the top after reviewing the letters of interest, then a discussion needs to be had.
  - Could there be two sets? One that does need to involve the city and another that comes later and doesn't involve the city?
    - Response: A single decision should be made. Some projects may need more leeway or details that we can work on during the process.
  - The intent is for the community benefit agreement to be developed in the full application.
  - What type of resources and support can PCEF provide applicants? How do organizations request support?
    - Response: Staff can provide a Q&A session and a contract facilitator. The RFP will explain this and other information in detail.
  - A committee member would like to focus on the proposal's positives. It may not have been the cleanest process, but it was unprecedented. He is pleased the community participated in developing the framework process. The committee will learn from this process.
  - The process favors shovel-ready projects and existing partnerships and coalitions. We need to provide technical support. There are concerns regarding nonprofits being tokenized by the public sector. Can committee members name coalitions that inspired this process?
    - Response: A committee member heard initial interest from teacher unions and schools regarding depavement, RA, and retrofits.

- A committee member thanked the public testimonies, staff, and co-chairs. He supports the framework proposal.
- A committee member shared his appreciation and support for the framework proposal.
- A committee member appreciates the framework proposal. The intent is clear, and she asked that the language be tightened to avoid loopholes and ambiguity.
  - Response: The framework proposal is a concept that will be built out to bring clarity.
- Sam Baraso asked the co-chair if the intent of the community benefits or community workforce agreement timeline and expectations should be captured before moving forward.
  - The co-chair is in support.
- A committee member proposed that applicants must finalize the community benefits or workforce agreements before receiving funding.
- What would we do if the first set of allocations didn't move forward?
  - Response: The resources would increase and become unallocated.
- When does an agreement with the city get signed?
  - Response: Before the disbursement of funds.
- Should there be language requiring the approval of the community benefits agreement?
  - Co-Chair response: The best practice is ensuring it was a community-negotiated community benefits plan, community benefits agreement, or community workforce agreement.
  - Committee response: It is not our place to approve a community benefits agreement. The proposal includes a link to an example plan as a reference.
- Sam Baraso wrote the draft committee proposal in real time:
  - I recommend that the PCEF Committee adopt the process and framework for allocating additional PCEF funds as presented in Item A on the agenda, with the modification of requiring a community benefits plan, community benefits agreement, and/or community workforce agreement to be executed before the disbursement of allocated funds.
- A temperature check was taken. All committee members supported the draft committee proposal.
- Ranfis Giannettino Villatoro made a motion to recommend that the PCEF Committee adopt the process and framework for allocating additional PCEF funds as presented in Item A on the agenda, with the modification of requiring a community benefits plan, community benefits agreement, and/or community workforce agreement to be executed before the disbursement of allocated funds. Faith Graham seconded it.
  - Approved: The committee unanimously voted affirmative.

**COMMITTEE WORKGROUP AND SUBCOMMITTEES: SAM BARASO, PCEF**

- **Strategic Program 8 Equitable Tree Canopy Workgroup:** This workgroup needs one PCEF committee member to participate. Maria Gabrielle Sipin volunteered.
- **Strategic Program 15 Federal Climate and Equity Funding Opportunities Workgroup:** This workgroup needs one PCEF committee member to participate. Faith Graham volunteered.

- **Recruitment Subcommittee:** At least two PCEF committee members are needed for four meetings from April to May 2024. Ranfis Giannettino Villatoro, Maria Gabrielle Sipin, and Paul Lumley volunteered. Maria Gabrielle Sipin will step down if it doesn't align with their schedule.
- Megan Horst motioned to appoint Ranfis Giannettino Villatoro, Maria Gabrielle Sipin, and Paul Lumley to the Recruitment Subcommittee.
  - Approved: The committee unanimously voted affirmative.

**DISCUSS POTENTIAL COMMITTEE PROCESS TO PROVIDE CODE UPDATE RECOMMENDATIONS: RANFIS GIANNETTINO VILLATORO, CO-CHAIR**

- There are potential ballot initiatives for changing the charter. Per city code, the committee can make code change recommendations to the city council or respond to code changes proposed by other actors.
- Committee member questions and comments:
  - A committee member suggested starting the conversation in small group meetings and bringing it to public meetings.
  - What is the anticipated timeline for entering a code change process?
    - Response: There is no timeline. A code change process would need to consider staff capacity and the committee's desired level of robustness. The mayor needs to put it on the agenda for the city council to discuss.
  - Should the committee have a process for responding to potential code changes, taking a proactive approach, or both?
    - Response: A hybrid. The committee was not involved in developing the proposed changes. We need an approach that includes how we want to be engaged. The current moment has created urgency.
  - The discussion will be continued at a small group meeting.
- **Action Item:** Sam Baraso will schedule small group meetings.

**UPDATES: MEGAH HORST, CO-CHAIR**

- Megan Horst and Ranfis Giannettino Villatoro are drafting an opinion piece for *The Oregonian*.
  - **Action Item:** Committee members who want to read or contribute to the opinion piece should contact Megan Horst immediately.
- A committee member thanked the Co-Chairs for being proactive.

**THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 8:36 PM**

**NEXT MEETING:** The next meeting will be on Thursday, May 16, 2024, from 6:00 PM to 8:00 PM.

Submitted by Camerina Galván, Notetaker, Galvan Consulting LLC.