

**Portland Utility Board**  
September 20, 2018 11am – 1pm  
Pettygrove Room, City Hall  
Meeting #52

**Attendees:**

*PUB Members:* Ana Brophy, ex officio  
Allan Warman  
Colleen Johnson  
Dan Peterson  
Dory Robinson  
Heidi Bullock  
Micah Meskel  
Robert Martineau  
Ted Labbe

*Absent:*

\* Vera Zaharova, ex-officio  
\* Lee Moore  
\* Van Le, ex officio  
Scott Robinson  
Mike Weedall

\*Notice of absence provided prior to meeting

*Staff:* Dawn Uchiyama (Deputy Director, Bureau of Environmental Services)  
Aaron Rivera (Business Operations Manager, Bureau of Revenue and Financial Services)  
Lester Spitler (Chief Procurement Officer, Bureau of Revenue and Financial Services)  
Steve Behrndt (Wastewater Operations Group Manager, Bureau of Environmental Services)  
Paul Suto (Principal Engineer, Bureau of Environmental Services)  
Kathy Koch (Customer Service Group Manager, Portland Water Bureau)  
Gabe Solmer (Deputy Director, Portland Water Bureau)  
Adelaide Nalley (Financial Assistance Program Manager, Portland Water Bureau)  
Fabiola Casa (Program Specialist, Portland Water Bureau)  
Ashley Tjaden (Community Outreach and Information Specialist, Portland Water Bureau)  
Corbett White (Customer Service Supervisor, Portland Water Bureau)  
Cecelia Huynh (Director of Finance and Support Services, Portland Water Bureau)  
Jonas Biery (Business Services Manager, Bureau of Environmental Services)  
Steve Hansen (Program Manager, Capital Controls, Bureau of Environmental Services)

Ken Bartocci (Ken Bartocci (Principal Financial Analyst, Bureau of Environmental Services)  
Melissa Merrell (Principal Analyst, City Budget Office)  
Shannon Fairchild (Senior Financial Analyst, City Budget Office)  
Yung Ouyang (Senior Financial Analyst, City Budget Office)  
Alexandra Martin (Executive Assistant, City Budget Office)

*Public:* Janice Thompson, Citizens Utility Board of Oregon

**I. Call to Order**

Allan called the meeting to order. He reminded everyone that the meeting was of community volunteers tasked to advise City Council on items related to the Water Bureau and the Bureau of Environmental Services for the benefit and on behalf of the community of Portland.

He gave an overview of the [agenda](#) which included the annual report, updates on budget adjustment items, information on changes to the Low Income Assistance Programs, and the City Plans items that was carried over from last meeting.

Allan noted the sign-up sheet for public comment.

**II. Prior Meeting Minutes**

Allan asked if there were any changes to the minutes of the September 4 meeting. Melissa reviewed some changes that had been submitted since circulation. Van and Jonas both sent revisions which are included in the packet on pages 4, 6, and 8. Melissa noted there were track changes included in the packet she provided.

There were no other changes. The [minutes](#) were accepted as revised.

**III. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**IV. Disclosure of Communications**

Ted has regular communication with bureaus, including BES, related to non-profit volunteer or work for Depave.

Dory had a meeting with Melissa and Megan Callahan of BES on elevating PUBs social media presence, best practices in social media, creating literature and information that defines PUB's purpose and raises visibility and access. She noted board members may ask her if they are interested in learning more before she brings recommendations to PUB.

Allan had communication with BES on facilities at the waste treatment plant.

**V. Annual Report Preview**

Melissa sent a draft annual report for review. Colleen and Van sent revisions which are tracked in the version in the packet.

Allan asked members if they had any general comments or changes and after which he'd like to focus on three specific items:

Opportunities and Challenges on page 10  
FY 2018-19 workplan on page 11  
Board values on the top of page 8

Ted said he felt grateful to have City staff member Melissa draft the report and help PUB focus on the highlighted parts to discuss.

Melissa asked PUB members to who volunteered for administrative review committees over the past year to confirm their participation. That information is included in the report.

Allan moved on to review, "Opportunities and Challenges." He asked if there was anything they want to highlight.

Dan raised the issue of PUB's involvement in the early phases of the filtration project and suggested adding a statement about PUB being more involved in the initial phases of capital projects

Ted said the reassignment of the utility bureaus to two commissioners may be a benefit to PUB, commissioners, and bureaus. He acknowledged it might seem like a step back from having only one commissioner assigned to utility bureaus. He noted BES can help other city bureaus and elevate how they do business. There is also a benefit of Commissioner Fish having the Parks bureau in that they work closely with BES on some projects. There are opportunities to interact in more productive ways with that part of Parks. The reassignments will help parties get on same page and it is important to acknowledge the benefit for PUB. He concluded that silo busting is part of BES's strategic plan.

Allan asked if there were other thoughts with regards to "Opportunities and Challenges."

Heidi said engagement and community outreach should be added to the section. She asked when comments were due.

Melissa said by ordinance, the report should be submitted in September. If members want to continue with changes, they can discuss the report again on October 2. She explained that when creating the report, she pulled information from last year and noted PUB could add current goals such as holding more accessible community meetings and broadening engagement with the community, but that she did not add that to the report on their behalf.

Heidi said she thinks community engagement should be an opportunity bullet.

Ted agreed.

Micah also agreed and noted including the work Dory is doing.

Dory said she agreed on the public engagement piece and the report should also note that PUB members are participating in trainings, for example the equity training that the co-chairs and

two other members attended. The report should reflect that PUB is interested in increasing equity initiatives.

Allan agreed, saying the report should mention PUB is engaged in equity initiatives.

Allan moved to the conversation of the identified PUB values on page 8: “PUB identified ten values it would consider when providing input and making recommendations to the Council: affordability, efficiency of operations and value to customers, assistance to low-income residents, protection of public health and watershed health, improvement and sustainability of infrastructure, regulatory compliance, equity, service delivery, system resiliency, and transparency and public engagement.”

Allan said the PUB stated these values for last year and asked if PUB would like to reaffirm or change the values. At the October meeting with Mary PUB will go more in depth into the values PUB stated. Allan asked if anyone would like to offer additional values for discussion and there were none.

PUB concluded discussion of the report and directed Melissa to incorporate the changes and circulate to the board before submitting it to the City Council. Dory moved that the board approve the report with the incorporated changes and the motion was seconded. There was no further discussion or public comment. All members voted in favor, none voted against or abstained.

**VI. BMP Updates – Procurement**, Aaron Rivera, Business Operations Manager, Bureau of Revenue and Financial Services, Lester Spitler, Chief Procurement Officer, Bureau of Revenue and Financial Services

Allan introduced the Budget Monitoring Process and Procurement items on the agenda. He noted there were budget adjustments submitted by BES and Water last week. At the October 2 meeting the PUB will have another chance to ask general questions about the submissions. The Budget Office give an overview of its reviews and recommendations at the October 18 meeting and at that time PUB can decide whether to provide written input to Council. In addition, Colleen and Allen asked Melissa to provide PUB with analysis of the requests in light of the framework last year. Allan noted the Council work session on October 30 and the hearing November 7.

He introduced Lester and Aaron.

Lester began and thanked PUB for time on their agenda. He noted he is the Chief Procurement Officer at the Bureau of Revenue and Financial Services. He explained he was attending the PUB meeting on behalf of Jennifer Cooperman. He said they would go through a short [Powerpoint](#) outlining Procurement’s fall BMP proposal, why the proposal is important, and ask for PUB’s support.

Aaron said he is the Business Operations Manager at the Bureau of Revenue and Financial Services. He said OMF contains a number of bureaus of which Procurement is one. Others include the Bureau of Human Resources, Internal Technology Services, and Internal Business Services, including Facilities.

Lester said he started at the City in April. He heard from major customers that procurement needs to provide higher service levels. Bureaus saw issues with the amount of time it takes to procure funds. Procurement initiated an organizational assessment and contracted a third-party consultant to facilitate focus groups on pain points in dealing with internal procurement support. Procurement is a centralized office for all bureaus. It uses a competitive and open process to leverage tax dollars as well as possible and minimize impacts on the General Fund. Procurement is funded by the General Fund. It has been difficult to size up to current workloads and this has been an ongoing issue; staff levels have remained stagnant while work increased.

Bureaus said that more work is coming in the future and asked Procurement what they are doing to prepare and support the bureaus.

Procurement began a process to simplify initiatives and proposed a dedicated team to support targeted bureaus via an IA with performance requirements. The Service Level Agreements proposed will allow Procurement to measure performance.

BES, Water, and PBOT voiced a need to have service levels funded in Fall BMP instead of waiting for the 2019-20 budget process. With the solution presented, there is a net zero impact to the General Fund with increased customer service and service level agreements and performance measures. Lester acknowledged there is a need to simplify the process; procurement is very bureaucratic in nature but important.

Lester pointed out the flat horizontal line in the graph on page 3 of the presentation which represents the number of staff procurement has employed. Work has more than doubled while staffing level is flat. Work has increased year over year.

Aaron explained that the pie charts on page 4 show that the majority of work for procurement comes from four bureaus: BPS, PBOT, Parks, and Facilities. They comprised 96% of construction contracts in FY 2016-17. Their portion has increased over the last five years.

The goal of the effort is to improve service challenges of being funded wholly by the General Fund. Staffing is required to improve service; Procurement has been unable to hire additional staff to improve service.

Under the current process, the General Fund subsidizes support to these bureaus, because costs are part of the overhead model which is allocated across all bureaus. The downside is that Procurement has not been able to increase service levels without additional funding, even though bureaus have an urgent need to get projects done.

Colleen asked what the pie charts would look like if the only bureaus included were BES and Water. Aaron responded that their portion would be about half, but he could provide an exact percentage later. Colleen said she would like to see the data.

Allan reiterated Colleen's point that PUB's focus is BES and Water. He asked if the slides represented fiscal years. Lester said yes, the charts reflect fiscal years.

Lester continued, saying that this process has helped Procurement understand pain points bureaus experience. Procurement engaged three different groups. The feedback was consistent and thematic. The Six Sigma process was conducted with Procurement staff. They considered the requirements for proposals and other processes. They highlighted steps that did not add value or were no longer relevant. They gave attention to areas most ripe for improvement. Procurement has an opportunity to make their processes more effective, but the changes are contingent on fall BMP requests being approved by Council.

Lester referred to the presentation and clarified some acronyms used as Procurement types; Construction ITB is Construction invitation to bid, Construction RFP is request for proposal, and PTE is professional, technical, and expert services.

The left column (Present State SLA) provides consistent and uniform reporting to measure against the proposed SLAs. Procurement used historical data to calculate the days in each column. They plan to continue to measure performance and improve. Lester is confident they can improve upon the SLA days listed if their BMP request is approved.

Heidi asked if these slides represent when Procurement initiates the RFP. Lester explained the count of days begins when they initially to engage and represent the full cycle from conception to contract.

Micah asked which procurement type fleet vehicles are. Lester answered Goods and Service.

Lester continued the presentation, explaining kaizen is another name for opportunities for improvement and shows the number of days the process could be shortened if implemented.

Allan asked if the column shows the delta.

Lester said yes, theoretically. The kaizen factor goes into what the SLA will buy BES and Water. The SLA, new staff, performance monitoring, performance reporting, a qualitative business review to meet and get a sense of areas for improvement. An IGA with bureaus would also include resolutions language for disputes.

Lester referenced page 7 and said the page explains how Procurement came up with amounts to charge infrastructure bureaus for the IGA.

Aaron explained the methodology Procurement is using; they sized the groups and allocated back to customer bureaus based on the metrics on page 7. The metrics were number of contract weighted 75% and the type of contract weighted 25%. The numbers were smoothed out over three years. This methodology is consistent with prevailing corporate methodology and reduces volatility in the rate. It is a consistent process and methodology.

Lester added Procurement is proposing to charge bureaus at 5/12 for this year due to when the BMP would be approved. The SLA will not be in effect until February.

Allan asked what the annual request amount was. Aaron said there are a lot of factors about what council adopts and would allow them to staff up. At the 5/12 amount and all other factors

equal it is a little more than double. Allan said about \$2 million. Lester said yes, about \$2 million across those bureaus.

Colleen asked about the metric methodology. She asked if the number of contracts is weighted by 75%, how is the dollar amount of contract weighted or included? Lester said the number of procurements in support of the project and dollar volume of each project are included. The resulting number is indicative of how much support is provided to the customer. A larger dollar amount is more time. He said the number of solicitations is weighted 75% and the amount is 25%.

Allan asked what the bureaus receive for \$2 million and asked is it was anything more than just staff. Lester said it included the five individuals loaded with computers and rent costs.

Dan asked if staff would be dedicated to the bureaus listed. Lester explained the bureaus are buying a level of service and not dedicated staff. This allows Procurement to have flexibility to meet objectives across the board.

Lester said that if infrastructure bureaus ramp down, Procurement is prepared to downsize the team if economy turns and they are not doing as much work.

Lester said the group currently has 40 FTEs dedicated to procurement, including compliance staff and other programs managing city-wide issues. There is no dedicated design staff, just construction. There are 6 people and a supervisor on the team now.

Ted referenced page 6, which intends to show a measure that bureaus can use to assess the value for their money. He said the proposal does not deliver huge improvements. He asked if Procurement has negotiated with the bureaus about how much of an improvement they can live with.

Lester said the current state of service was not good. There has never been a transparent report on metrics or the cycle time for solicitations. Procurement used data to come up with the details of the SLAs. There are flaws in the data, but it allows them to determine a baseline. They will have better data in the future and as they accumulate data they can make more informed decisions and it is an improvement to be transparent.

Jonas said he has been involved in the program for more than a year and 30 days may not seem like a lot, but it can move projects to the next fiscal year and have bigger capital impacts. The change may not seem like many days but could have a big financial impact. It is a big value-add to have measures and set metrics. It is a great tool to hold Procurement accountable.

Ted asked what does PTE mean in the last row. Lester said it is professional, technical and expert services, and would include consulting, architects, services related to designing capital projects.

Colleen asked about how this will be tracked. She noted that when revenue comes into BES and Water, the rates paid are required to be dedicated to those services. She noted if some person filed a suit alleging that funds are going beyond BES and Water, would there be good enough tracking to show what Procurement is charging BES and Water. The tracking should indicate that the funds solely support the two bureaus and are not syphoned off. Lester said yes there is

adequate tracking using a cost allocation method. Procurement will be able to charge them exactly for the work. Aaron mentioned silos are good at times; the cost allocation methodology creates firm walls and bold lines in financial systems to adequately track and monitor customers.

Allan indicated monitoring hasn't existed in past. He asked if monitoring will make work more efficient. Lester aside from changes in the fall BMP, Procurement is investing in a list of kaizens, including code changes and some other efforts.

Ana mentioned a Procurement annual report and work plan. She asked if there will be people working with bureaus on metrics, performance, and challenges. She asked if they will review specifications and noted that in the past a staff member reviewed to check for consistency.

Lester said they have established uniform tracking throughout all Procurement requisitions. There is a dashboard to see every project and where it is at. They are tracking consistently, in real time, and with transparency. There will be quarterly updates as Procurement accumulates more projects in the future. There will also be a yearly report. The answer to Ana's second question is to be determined. Lester explained if several people have reviewed and it is determined to be a non-value added step it would be eliminated. They will work in collaboration and find a final role.

Ana said there are rules about compliance. Lester said there are going to have bureau partners. He mentioned Annette in BES and said they will look at how to report properly. They will continue to work on this issue and they cannot do it in a vacuum. They will continue to work to find efficiencies.

Allan said if there were no other questions they should conclude and thanked both Lester and Aaron for their presentation.

**VII. Biosolids** Steve Behrndt, Wastewater Operations Group Manager, Bureau of Environmental Services, Paul Suto (Principal Engineer, Bureau of Environmental Services)

Allan Introduced the biosolids item. BES's budget adjustment includes a significant request for biosolids that Mike Jordan and Jonas referred to at the last meeting. Melissa forwarded a technical memo last Friday from the bureau and Steve and Paul had a [presentation](#).

Steve introduced himself as the Wastewater Operations Group Manager at BES. He manages the pumping and treatment facilities. Paul Suto introduced himself as a Principal Engineer who manages capital projects and support for the waste program.

Steve began the discussion, saying that PUB members are familiar with sewer sludge. They were going to be talking about the treatment of the solid portion of waste water.

The Columbia Boulevard plant has exceeded design capacity and is near physical capacity. More solids are coming in than going out. This is not unusual in the over 50-year history of the lagoon. It began as storage lagoon though over time this has changed. They do not have adequate equipment to move solids out and they don't know how much solids are in the lagoon. A sophisticated sludge survey is required to tell how many solids exist. It seems they are very near

physically full, though it is difficult to tell. Winter will bring more solids. In October rainfall increases. During summer, the sewer system has been dry, and sediments settle. When rains arrive, solids are flushed to the treatment plant. There is an influx of solids to the lagoon.

Steve referenced a picture of biosolids in the lagoon at the north portion. Heron Lakes Golf Course and Smith and Bybee lake are adjacent. The lagoon is about 35 acres in size. The two cells in the middle are in operation.

There is a long-term capital investment plan to manage solids which includes investing in the lagoon rehabilitation project. They will reinvest by replacing the sludge facilities.

When they discovered they were near full a couple of months ago, they engaged a team and determined that the main objectives should be to maximize land application facilities and beneficially reuse the biosolids. They are doing their best with those processes. The goal is to reduce inventory. Since the lagoon is near full there is a risk they will violate their permit and allow excessive amounts of solids into the treated liquid stream. They take pride in not violating their permit.

It is a goal to achieve mass balance. In the future, they want to reduce unpredictability and produce a biosolids management plan. The plant could be operated as a processing unit and not a storage location. The lagoon has been used as a place to store biosolids and defer cost over time. Occasionally the built-up solids are removed and go through a cycle. They are in the middle of a reinvestment process to manage solids in current time. The goal is to process whatever comes in within an appropriate period of time and forwarded for beneficial use whatever can be used. If they decide to store solids it should their choice or because it is an emergency.

Allan asked if right now the solids go to eastern Oregon. Steve said yes at Sherman County in summer and the rest of the year at Madison Farms.

Colleen asked if they were maximizing on the land application. Steve said additional application may happen in the future and but for now they have maximized what they have. They have a challenged ability to transport all the solids. First, the BES is negatively impacted by the trucking shortage. Second, they haven't been able to produce the solids content at a quality to match inputs. Solids generally have a lot of water content but should be 20% of the cake. Now it is only 15%. That means they are paying to haul more water and removing less solids with each load. They are limited by the amount trucks and are hauling more water and storing more solids. They need better equipment to produce drier cake. He added the round trip to move the biosolids is around 400 miles.

Ted asked if rail is an option. Steve said no. Hauling to and from the train to the land application site is not efficient. He added that material handling was more expensive than trucking alone.

Micah asked if there was local demand for the cake.

Steve said that over the history of the program they have explored many options. Land application with the partners they have is reliable and thoroughly regulated. They have

conducted studies and solicitations and found this program is one of the best. Many of peers in the region do the same thing at the same location.

Steve continued, saying the immediate challenge is there is not much time to start removing the solids. They are engaging with a contractor and there is limited flexibility with contracts. He said they have a talented team in operations and engineering with access to contractors. They receive many responses when they asked for cost estimates and bids. They will regain use of the north lagoon cells in about two years. They are being rehabbed now even though they may not have a new process in the near-term.

Steve explained that they plan on spending money on dewatering equipment. The current equipment is not as efficient as when it was new. Perhaps they will get closer to 20 percent solids.

They are working with trucking to be sure 5 to 6 trucks a day are shipping biosolids. Adequate movement of biosolids requires a rate of 6 to 7 trucks per day at 18% solids in the cake. They are struggling with their current resources. In the meantime, they must remove more solids. They need to remove 10,000 to 15,000 dry tons. They are starting the process to remove the solids and have engaged contractors. Removing solids reduces risk since there will be room to put additional solids in case of an emergency. The 5-year financial plan will include the cost of projects to match inputs with outputs. In the interim they will work with a contractor. This is outside of their normal operation expense. They don't want to surprise anybody and typically they don't have surprises. In 2024, they will have facilities, equipment, and a financial plan with redundancy to allow to them to manage solids without surprises in the future.

Heidi asked if it was a surprise that input has dramatically increased even though they have been in operation for 30 years. Steve said he has never had a mass balance except for short periods of time. With optimal performance in trucking and management they can match inputs with outputs. Over the 48-year history the city deployed solids in the lagoon and extracted occasionally. The capital improvement is part of the process to change that; it includes securing equipment.

Heidi asked if the process was going to change overall. She asked if they would continue to store and then truck the biosolids. She asked if there would be changes in the long-term, if there would be different equipment or systems. Steve said the site would be used as a processing unit with four cells. They would feed one cell, let solids settle for a couple of years and rotate through and have steady throughput. If something happens, such as weather prevents trucking, there would be emergency storage for a month to a year.

Allan asked Steve to define dry ton. Steven said a dry ton is the equivalent weight if the solids were dry. It is a unit to measure biosolids. A dry ton is 20% solids.

Allan asked if the CSO has exasperated the process. Steve said yes there are more solids because of the CSO system. Since 2011, the east side pipe has been the largest capacity conduit. Collectively this has increased demand, so has population growth and other factors. They cannot isolate the factors.

Allan asked what they will do between now and 2024.

Steve said they will do more of what they have described. They will employ contractors to remove some solids. They need to keep up with operations and keep up with the plan. In two years there will be two additional cells and more room. It will give them more time to plan.

Paul said they will need supply equipment to process in the future and will keep up at the interim level.

Ted asked them to speak more on the financial end. He asked if they were limited in leveraging income at Madison farms. Steve said biosolids is a disposal option. They pay for the hauling and land application. There is a modest amount of nutrient value money coming back but it is a nominal amount.

Ted asked if was possible biosolids could be a market with people at farms competing for the biosolids. Steve said that would not be the case in the foreseeable future. Biosolids do replace fertilizer but it is not so marketable that they will ever have net revenue. It can only lower disposal costs. Alternative methods would cost more. It is arguably better for the environment and is the low-cost option.

Steve continued, saying they also have opportunity to do some cleaning and capital improvement including repairs. They will keep working on data analysis and management to know as much about biosolid inputs and outputs. They will robustly maintain the system to keep the throughput they have, otherwise they will buy more equipment and initiate more contracts to extract. They would like to rent additional dewatering equipment and look at hauling more to Madison Farms. They can haul up to 45 trucks a week. That is the goal and is Madison Farms maximum. In the future, they may need more access to land application properties.

Allan asked how much money they are requesting. Steve said they are planning for \$7 million over three fiscal years and are building in a five-year plan for 100 % program inputs matching outputs. The plan will bring them to the point that they have new facilities and then they will create a new five-year financial plan.

Steve said they have already received bids for the near-term work and have one bid that matches. They plugged in the estimate before they got bids from contractors. They plan on negotiating for a bid that matches their requirements.

Rob asked about the plan for Lake Oswego, observing they don't have the capacity to store biosolids. Steve said that 2 trucks per day arrive from Lake Oswego and the biosolids are treated at Columbia. They are not part of the remedy and have a small capacity.

Rob asked if they could increase to 5 trucks during the days that would yield a 20% increase. Steve said the trucks are occupied for a full day going to Madison Farms and it is a different kind of truck. Robert asked if it is not possible to use the trucks that haul the solids from Lake Oswego. Steve said solids at Lake Oswego are more pumpable. The biosolids sent from CBWTP are different.

Steve said they are developing contingency plans to fill gaps.

Colleen said they had to conclude due to time and asked members to send questions to Melissa.

VIII. **Low Income Assistance Program Update** Kathy Koch, Customer Service Group Manager, Portland Water Bureau, Adelaide Nalley (Financial Assistance Program Manager, Portland Water Bureau),

Colleen explained that last year PWB's budget request included many changes to the Low-Income Assistance Programs for the utilities. She introduced Kathy Koch to talk about the implementation of those changes and introduce some new staff.

Kathy introduced the low-income assistance team. PUB had talked about the amount right number of staff to manage the changes. She said she wanted PUB to know who was hired.

Corbett introduced herself. She is the supervisor of walk-in services and assists people with financial assistance applications.

Adelaide is the new Financial Assistance Program Manager. She has 15 years of experience in program design management, she has worked in partnership creation with a range of access issues, including support for indigenous people, farm workers, and refugees. She spent a decade working in different countries in Latin America and 4 years working as a consultant. Her undergraduate degree is from UC Berkeley and her graduate degree is from UC Los Angeles in resource management.

Fabiola introduced herself. She has a social services background and has worked for various organizations in Portland and Seattle. She was a Peace Corp volunteer in Chicago and draws from her experiences to be the best program specialist possible.

Ashley reintroduced herself, she has talked before PUB several times and is part of the outreach staff.

Colleen referenced the meeting materials provided which contain [highlights](#).

Adelaide wanted to recognize Portland, which is known for having one of the most robust financial assistance programs and continues to provide a high-level of support. She noted there is a rising cost of water and sewer bills and community members need more support. A goal of the program is to make sure they are aware of traditionally underserved populations and to enhance and expand the program to serve more people. She wanted to go through the expansions and the base level of service. Though the financial assistance program has been expanded, the changes are still recent. Quantitative evidence is minimal, but they see promising data.

One of the first changes was a measure to change the eligibility from state to city income levels. The cost of living in Portland not same as Oregon overall. Switching the eligibility required using Portland affordability measures. For example, the annual income limit for qualifying for assistance was \$23,000 for a single person and is now \$34,000. Additional examples were described.

In terms of base numbers, enrollment in FY 2017-18 fluctuated between 6527 and 6629. August 2018 enrollment was 6670. This is slightly higher than last year. They have seen program growth but not the amount they expect to get to.

The second change was a secondary tier of assistance for customers below 30% of Median Family Income. They are manually converting customers as they are changed to new levels and new customers are receiving assistance at levels correlated to income. 3,983 customers are receiving this discount.

The third change was an increase to the crisis vouchers. This is the first increase since 2000. In FY 2017-18 PWB averages 211 crisis vouchers per month, almost all at the maximum amount of \$150. Going forward, they are evaluating the ideal value of the vouchers; \$500 may be the right amount.

Qualitative factors have shown how valuable the program has been. On the first day one of the representatives stopped service from going to shut off that day. Crisis vouchers have also helped customers. One person called to ask for help with paying a bill. The person was deciding whether to spend their remaining money to pay their water bill or fly to a funeral. A customer service representative helped the person pay their bill by using the crisis voucher.

Colleen asked how they assessed if \$500 was too much or too little. Adelaide said they are gathering data now and looking at trends in how they are using the vouchers. Adelaide said it may not be enough since people are routinely using the full amount. Some customers used the full \$500, though there is a small copay required. They are tracking these details.

Adelaide said partner organizations are excited about the changes and some are suggesting different amounts. They appreciate the program and see a benefit to clients.

The fourth change is the multifamily assistance with Home Forward. They also have administrative funds. Prior to funds becoming available July 24, they conducted two trainings.

They will be conducting quarterly audits to ensure households referred by service agencies qualify for the program. Home Forward is doing audits as well.

They are tracking customers who remain at the same address after one year. They are tracking rental assistance to support staying in homes and investigating obstacles for future programs.

They are also researching the amount of money required to assist those at risk of evictions.

Home Forward has given vouchers at the full \$500 amount.

The financial assistance team responds to email and phone inquiries. They are ramping for up so in the future customers can contact them directly rather than the larger customer service team. They are also developing their work plan and outreach plan. They need to develop the plan prior to hiring a third team member. They have been doing outreach for past several months and have distributed 1,800 brochures at events in addition to brochures distributed to customers.

They are also meeting with agencies. Fabiola reinforced the need to create relationships. The agencies must come to the bureau with questions without hesitancy. They must ensure the agencies understand all the details. Certain things have changed while some are the same.

The program provides an opportunity to work with agencies to make sure they have correct information. They need to identify information that has been miscommunicated or misunderstood. One agency didn't bring any applications last year and weren't providing with customer referrals. They thought the program only covered \$15 when it had covered \$150. They were able to inform the agency about other services. It was a useful meeting and when they returned to the office there was already an application to process.

Allan asked what the timeline was for outreach highlights. He asked the bureau to send that information to PUB. Adelaide said they have been doing outreach since June. Allan said he would like to know which neighborhood associations they have been in contact with.

Ted said thanked the team for sharing encouraging details. He added to Allan's comment, asking if they planned to meet with Proud Ground, Hacienda CDC, and others, noting they may have some of the same connections.

Adelaide said she is working on a plan now, following up on promises already made, she is now identifying with whom to create strategic partnerships.

Colleen suggested sharing the contacts; the bureau can send contacts to Melissa and Melissa can forward those to the bureau.

Adelaide said she wanted the program to be as robust as possible. She is also accessing county contracts with additional contacts. There is a partnership with Sun Schools. They have provided information with all 90 Sun School coordinators. They also are partnering with Urban League at the first Biannual Community Provider Training. They are updating new energy assistance providers, and providing a general overview, stating best practices, and soliciting feedback.

Adelaide learned that prior to her arrival, there were issues with terms. Some agencies are using other names for the program; the financial assistance phrase led clients to believe the bill would be paid in full. This added complications and disappoints. The phrase financial discount program has been used instead. They are continuing to gather feedback on language to ensure the terms used are appropriate.

Colleen asked the bureau representatives to end their presentation due to time. She asked PUB members to send their questions to Melissa.

IX. **City Plans 101** Dawn Uchiyama, Deputy Director, Bureau of Environmental Services and Gabe Solmer, Deputy Director, Portland Water Bureau

Colleen introduced the last agenda item. Last fall PUB identified Citywide plans as a topic to learn more about. She introduced Dawn and Gabe to talk at a high level about how the bureaus are involved in the front end as plans are developed and in the implementation.

Gabe said she and Dawn will partner for this [presentation](#). Gabe will cover the first part and Dawn will cover the second part.

Gabe highlighted current efforts with city plans. She said that this is an area where one doesn't know what one doesn't know. She wanted to provide an overview of what the bureaus do with city plans and they can return with more specific info. The information today will be high level.

BES and Water are very involved with different city-wide plans. There are many issues that could be explored in detail, but they used the Comp Plan 2035 as an example.

Plans generally covers a wide range of details, from governing the city to particular street plans. For example, there is the Salmon Safe plans, the Southwest Corridor Safe plans and the effect on the city and utilities bureaus. Other plans include the Master Sustainability plans and emergency plans which all bureaus are involved in, for example Continuity of Operations Plans involve all bureaus and talk about how the city will work after an emergency.

In terms of engagement, these plans are focused on all levels of the organization. This area is not as siloed as others in the city. A lot planning involves BES and watershed services and PWB with the Resources Protection Group.

Dawn noted Development Services monitors plans coming through.

Gabe worked on Street Trees which was covered by Complete Streets through PBOT. It involves other bureaus and there is overlap.

In the 2035 Comprehensive Plan, there are 6 areas of city growth: prosperity, human health, equity, and others.

Gabe noted the Water Bureau's work is intersecting with the plan. The group needs information from the bureau on how to drive processes. The main issue of water systems is growth. It is integral to have a growing city that works; they are examining growth in neighborhoods and the city center. For example, they need to understand which areas need more hydrants. That's how Water approached the issue.

Other parts of the plan affect other parts of the bureaus. They focused on down zoning in places where natural hazards exist. It's necessary to protect green infrastructure and the bureau is looking at how green infrastructure can be integrated in transportation plans. They worked with BPS to describe habitat strategies and eco roofs. BES has contributed to the Comprehensive Plan. The bureaus are comparing notes. They have shared Water plans with BES. They are looking forward to collaborating more.

Colleen asked about bird-safe building requirements. Dawn said the requirements involve lighting and window cover. There are resources specific to this area and it's important to bring together resources. Colleen asked if the requirement is that glass is nonreflective. Dawn responded yes.

Ted said this is related to BES's assistance role at other bureaus to get in compliance.

Dawn said lessons learned in utilities work is comprehensive but interactions are project-based and not city-wide. They are also ad hoc. An issue is who gets invited. Challenges are staff participation in engineering services, workload, program budgets. They have struggled with schedules and getting involved at the right time.

Gabe said this is true with Water as well. It depends on the person and in cases where people transition out there is a delay.

Dawn also noted the timeline challenges. Utility planning horizons are not in the system. There are various time horizons: ongoing term versus near-term or five years out. Budget considerations are also a factor.

BPS has a limited ability to influence growth. Some assumptions may not be accurate, for example pervious area. How runoff happens is based on older zoning. The goal is to use projected zoning. They cannot be not sure if that's real. They are looking at the best way to influence zoning assumptions.

Gabe had the same issues at Water. Service needs to become more efficient as the city becomes denser. Plans had forecast water needs skyrocketing but the stress has not happened as models suggest. The issue is rooted in making sure assumptions match reality.

Dawn said the take home lesson is that utilities objectives and assumptions evolve. Analysis must become more sophisticated. Staff changes and new technology bring a new level of awareness. There is a need to move away from the idea that planning efforts decide where growth is going. The bureaus need to figure it out in the development services process. They have started the conversation but there is room for refinement. The recommendation is the bureaus continue to be a part in BPS's planning efforts. They have an impressive team and continue to be aware of utilities models and assumptions. Bureaus can look at how to update regulations to respond to system-specific needs. It would be good to talk to regulators about needs beyond utilities and to connect with infrastructure bureaus to talk to regulators in broader city context. This will influence facilities design.

Dawn and Gabe said will continue to work collaboratively across infrastructure bureaus in planning and implementation. They said that having one Commissioner had helped with the coordination, but it is something they plan to continue.

Dawn pointed out the last slide that shows the CIP Future State map and a piece of that includes analysis of citywide context. It was influenced by lessons learned from BPS Comprehensive plan and city-wide planning draft and how that influences work. The exercise informed work and will continue to do so.

Gabe asked if there were questions on the broad overview.

Ted commented that before the presentation and before he joined PUB he wanted to know about this. They don't talk about other services the two bureaus provide often enough. He noted a member of the public mentioned the South Reach Plan being inspired by the Central City Plan which is part of the Comprehensive Plan. The member of the public asked technical

questions that the BPS staffer couldn't answer, but BES staff at the meeting did. BES and PWB provide important services to other city activities.

Colleen said they would continue to learn more and thanked Dawn and Gabe.

X. Upcoming Board Meeting Agendas

Colleen previewed the upcoming agenda for the next board meeting.

October 2, 2018

Location: Columbia Boulevard Wastewater Treatment Plant

3pm CBWTP Tour

4pm Board Meeting

Agenda: Continued Board Development, BES Plant Facility Plans, continued BMP conversation.

Upcoming meetings:

November 8 – Bull Run Watershed Onsite Tour – ALL DAY.

The meeting adjourned at 12:53.