

## Portland Utility Board

February 5, 2019 11am -1pm

111 SW Columbia Street, Columbia Square, 8th Floor Conference Room

Meeting #61

### Attendees:

*PUB Members:* Allan Warman, co-chair  
Colleen Johnson, co-chair (by phone)  
Dory Robinson  
Heidi Bullock  
Lee Moore (by phone)  
Micah Meskel  
Mike Weedall  
Robert Martineau  
Ted Labbe  
Van Le, ex officio (in at 11:20)

*Absent:*

\*Ana Brophy  
\*Dan Peterson  
\*Vera Zaharova

\*Notice of absence provided prior to meeting

*Staff:* Gabe Solmer (Deputy Director, Portland Water Bureau)  
Jonas Biery (Business Services Manager, Bureau of Environmental Services)  
Cecelia Huynh (Director of Finance and Support Services, Portland Water Bureau)  
Jessica Kinard (Interim Budget Director, City Budget Office)  
Amy Archer-Masters (PUB Financial Analyst, City Budget Office)  
Cinthia Diaz Calvo (PUB Coordinator, City Budget Office)

*Public:* Carol Cushman, League of Women Voters

### **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 (PWB) and the Bureau of Environmental Services (BES).

He gave an overview of the agenda which included the budget letter from PUB and the FY2019-20 Narratives for the Water and Environmental Services.

Allan noted the sign-up sheet for public comment. He noted comments were limited to three minutes.

### **II. Disclosure of Communications**

Micah met with Jessica Tilicousky with BES regarding a super fun committee involvement assignment. Ted, usual interactions with BES staff.  
Heidi, interactions with 2 BES staff regarding a survey that they are preparing on Equity practices for their contractors.

### **III. Revision of Minutes**

Cinthia circulated the draft minutes from the January 17th meeting. Allan asked if there were changes or correction to the minutes.  
Rob clarified that on pg 6-7, Cayenta is not a “meter system” it is a customer service system and that is where meter data is tracked.  
Colleen mentioned she had minor edits.

### **IV. Public Comment**

Shedrick J. Wickins said that water quality was becoming a hot potatoe where to filter the water or not. He stated that people don't want to filter the water and that Portland water is cheap. He mentioned about the May 2017 bottle water warning and stated that there should have been a notice prior to that. He posed the question “we should get into the Columbia wells?” He advocated for PUB to lobby against filtering the water in Portland.  
Allan said thank you, appreciating the comment.

### **V. Introduction of PUB Analyst**

Jessica introduced the new analyst stating it is a part time position supporting the PUB with analyzing the bureaus' program budget and metrics.  
Colleen asked who were the analysts again for the bureaus.  
Jessica said Yung Ouyand is the analyst for the PWB and Elizabeth Gallagher is the new analyst fo BES and now Amy Archer-Masters is the PUB analyst. She mentioned she would not take too much time to allow Amy to share some more about herself. She said that unless ther are questions about budget she would pass the floor on to Amy.  
Colleen asked when the CBO reviews are due.  
Jessica responded the 1<sup>st</sup> week of March is when they are due, and that the last week of February is when the analyst conduct their reviews.  
Colleen said thanks.  
Amy said that she came from a variety of backgrounds working with different bureaus such as the Revenue Bureau, with a substantial work experience gained during her time as Operations Manager with the Office of Neighborhood Involvement/ Office of Community and Civic Life and then with Portland Parks and Recreation as the Finance Property and Technology Manager. She said she has had a wealth of exposure in finance at the City as well as working with Advisory Boards. She said her experience with the PWB and BES has predominantly been as a consumer and peer bureau. She said she looks forward to coming up to speed on the submissions and the depth and breadth of the work.  
Allan asked if there is flexibility on the part time 20 hours a week arrangement.  
Amy said yes. She said she is available to meet the need of the PUB and that if there are any areas on particular interest to let her know.  
Colleen asked if Amy if she had seen or read the analytical reports that Melissa has made for PUB about the Bureau reports.  
Amy said yes, she has seen the work and understands the expectations.  
Lee welcomed Amy in her new position supporting the PUB.

--DRAFT--

Allan motioned to swop the two meeting agenda items final program narratives and the discussion of the letter.

Rob agreed that the agenda items should be swapped.

Allan asked for PUB member consensus.

All agreed.

Allan asked Jonas if he was prepared to present.

**VI. BES FY2019-2020 Refined Narratives**

Jonas said yes. He said that not much has changed since the meetings in December. He said that it has been a stable year for decision-making. In terms of materials, nothing has changed enough to move the dial. The end result in this requested budget being a \$200,000 increase. 3% for this year and up to 3.1% at the end of the financial plan. The only thing that has changed was the employee development program and erroneous reference of a full time employee. Regarding questions about Equity and metrics, Jonas said that they will include those in the next year's budget.

Allan asked if PUB had any questions.

Micah asked if there are any general fund requests.

Joans said none, no requests.

Colleen mentioned that since Jonas brought up performance metrics, that she had noticed that many programs do not have good metrics to measure success. She asked Jonas "What do you see PUB's role playing in helping draft those performance metrics?". She also asked how those measures were being used. She also mentioned that there are no metrics that would measure equity, and said that if equity is as important as it should be, then metrics should reflect it.

Jonas said that the metrics they used are the same as last year's and the year prior to that. He said that those metrics have not changed because that is what made sense to them during this changed budget process. He said that BES will be reconsidering all performance metrics for future years.

Colleen asked again about how Jonas saw PUB playing a role.

Jonas said it would have to be discussed BES needs to engage the PUB more in that discussion.

Colleen said ok and added another comment to compliment how BES disaggregated the capital projects information for PUB and wished that the PWB consider doing the same.

Jonas thanked Colleen for commenting on that and credited Ken for his diligent work on it. He pointed out the value in doing that work not only for PUB but for other bureaus and city-wide as well.

Allan said thank you and invited Cecelia to present.

**VII. PWB FY2019-20 Refined Program Narratives**

Cecelia said she ditto's what Jonas said about the process and encouraged everyone to read the entire budget submission. She stated that the programs are the same and all the numbers should be the same. She said that the program offer table does not have the correct FTE so the narratives are where the correct staff numbers are listed. Cecelia is hoping to work with CBO to get that fixed for next year.

About the programs, she wants to emphasize that PWB is funding \$620,000 for Decorative Fountains and Mt Tabor preservation is included with a request for \$1.1M General Fund. She said that General Fund is going towards maintaining facilities, hydroparks and benches. She said there is no General Fund Requested for Dodge Park. The park will no longer be a campsite. Rate request is 7.4% and it will remain the same. At that moment she paused and allowed for questions.

Mike said that as far as tracking FTE, staff meeting describe... (?)

Cecelia said how much is actually... (?)

Micah had a question about the amount of the Mt. Tabor preservation request.

Cecelia said that it was \$1.1M, that it was the 4<sup>th</sup> year of a 4 year settlement so would be the final year.

Allan asked if the funds that PWB got from camping fees at Dodge Park were substantial.

Cecelia said yes, they received about \$20,000-30,000 in fees but it is more costly to operate than those fees.

Ted asked about if the rate in the long term forecast and sustained for 5 years for building the filtration plant.

Cecelia clarified that they project a 7.4% increase for 10 years for the duration of the filtration plant.

Ted asked if the rate goes down after the filtration plant is done.

Cecelia said yes, after 10 years it is projected to go down close to 5% unless there are other unknown charges that happen that impact the rate.

Allan asked for clarification if PWB was asking or not asking for General Funds for Decorative Fountains.

Cecelia clarified they are not asking and the number is \$620,000.

Allan asked for clarification on the \$620,000 and if that figure is to be paid to the Portland Parks and Recreation Bureau.

Cecelia said yes, Parks maintains the fountains.

### **VIII. Letter of Recommendations**

Allan, introduced the letter of recommendation from PUB for the two bureaus budget submittal to City Council and asked if anyone had any questions.

Heidi said that she didn't see recommendations but rather only a reiteration of what the PUB has heard from the bureaus about their program narratives. She said that it is not necessary to reiterate the programs and suggested reducing the letter content.

Allan said that his thoughts go towards using the letter as a tool to inform and educate City Council.

Colleen said that the letter is the initial look as to the requested budgets and a recommendation letter comes after.

Heidi asked if the PUB even needed to send this letter.

Colleen said yes and that the letter is also a requirement.

Gabe confirmed Colleen's statement and said that it is in the bylaws.

Heidi said that, if that is the case, that the letter in hand was not a letter of recommendation but more of a letter acknowledging the process and retracts her initial statement by saying that she now sees the value in the letter.

Allan mentioned that only two or three of the commissioners may be up to speed on the program narratives and that he sees the letter is an educational opportunity.

Micah said, regarding the Mt Tabor request of general fund, that he does not support funding this development on the PWB's expense. He said that he does not consider this decision equitable and that it creates a pinch on other things. (a deficit for programs and services)

Ted thanked Micah for bringing up the subject, he thinks that the way 4 million dollars were committed to this development as a result of a lawsuit is an abuse of white power. He thinks it is a great opportunity to bring it up to City Council.

Micah explains that this event will make an impact in future deals and that the PUB needs to make a signal.

Allan asked Colleen and Lee if they had any thoughts.

Colleen said that the PUB did highlight it on the prior letter of recommendations. She agrees the PUB should have this discussion. She asked if this subject should be brought up on the real letter of recommendations or if it should be brought up multiple times.

Heidi said that it can be brought up multiple times.

Dori agreed with Heidi.

Allan ask if the subject could be brought up in both letters.

Colleen said, yes.

Allan asked the PUB how and where the letter should be edited.

Heidi pointed out a section of the letter.

--DRAFT--

Allan said that he also agrees with where PUB is going.

Ted said that he thinks that commissioner Fish is aware that this was a result of a settlement. He said it was something that needed to be decided on and that it may be better to present it like: "We request that you revisit this decision".

Allan said that the PUB can T-it-up and put a note in this letter and then add it to the letter of recommendations.

Colleen said that the letter can be sent to everyone.

Mike said that the comments needed to be kept general at this point. Understanding this is a concern he also thinks that before finalizing there needs to be more background to provide City Council with a recommendation. They cut a legal agreement and there is a difference between undoing and revisiting legal stuff. We could end up in a worst position.

Heidi said that it was a good point and that it was highly unlikely that it can be undone. She said that continuing to highlight where the PUB sees inequities and where PUB wants leadership to go is a great example and it should be highlighted over and over again.

Mike said that its important to not get in these type of situations going forward.

Ted agreed.

Gabe said that the PUB is on the right track in terms of the settlement. She agrees that is inequitable that the City is funding this and that it needs to be very clear to the audience.

Allan asked the dollar amount that was going into Mt Tabor from the PWB at this time.

Gabe said that the \$1.1 million and the 4 million dollars over 4 years as all the general fund going to FTE. There are other PWB funds going into the distribution center and ongoing for capital projects.

(Someone) said that it is valid and reasonable to point out the inequities and the reason why this settlement shouldn't have gone the way it did and that PUB is positioned to advise the council to take different actions when the next settlement opportunity arises, but in the 4<sup>th</sup> year of it's legal settlement it seems like an odd time. He suggest the statement not be a new objection. He said that the PUB should be giving input but not request to revisit a decision like that because it risks the legitimacy of a lot of the legal settlements we make in general and the ability to make these arguments in good faith and it doesn't provide Council a lot of options for what to actually do.

Allan said it was a good preemptive way to make the comment.

(Someone) said absolutely and added an example of how to phrase "The reason we object to this is because it was done this way, were Council to face something like this again, then this would be helpful".

Amy said that the PUB still needed to approve the changes and make a formal vote on approving the letter. In order to submit it on Friday, the approval cannot be done electronically.

Allan turned to the PUB and asked for consensus on approving the letter as it is and add writing regarding Mt Tabor.

Ted suggested a short break and then get reconvene to get it done.

Mike said that when refining a letter and a break is given often people get on the phone.

Dory suggested the letter should just be worked on now.

Allan said that a 10 minute break or that PUB could sit there and hush it out.

Colleen said that Dan sent her his edits and he would like to commend the commissioners for their shared budget guidance and commitment to keeping bureaus aligned after the headline "annual rates of interest".

Mike said that he couldn't understand why the CUB statement was plopped on the drafted letter after the BES section. He said he was also struck by the use of the word "easily" in the section of Annual Rate Increases.

Allan asked Mike what he suggested.

Mike suggested taking out the word "easily".

Ted said that there was one sentence that he is concerned about and began by recalling that the PUB had just heard from Cecelia that we think that there will be rate increases of 7.4% over the next 10

--DRAFT--

years after which it will drop to somewhere below 5%. On page 3, it says that the combined utility bill will double in 16 years. Ted's concern is that there is a sense of affirmation that the rate will be a certain way and that this would add excitement and frenzy around a public that is concerned with rate increases and it's not consistent with the statements that we have made. Ted proposed to change or remove the mention about 16 years to make the message more true and accurate to what the bureaus are saying is more likely to happen.

Mike said that Ted is saying it's wrong but Cecelia is saying it's inaccurate. He continued that if it's an inaccurate statement PUB ought to remove it.

Allan asked Colleen about the sentence and if she agreed to strike it.

Colleen said that she agreed to strike it but she argued that the statement was accurate and that the 4.5% for a year rates will double in 16 years. She also agrees that no one knows what is going to happen in 16 years and that rates can decrease or increase.

Heidi said that the way the statement is stated was the concern. She said that while the math may be right, the statement implies a certain scenario.

Allan said he does label it as a concern because the PUB is acting on behalf of the citizens of Portland, and he thinks that the two bureaus through their services the rates will be substantially higher than they are today. He said that may be what Colleen was trying to say.

Mike said sure, but that statement is not consistent with the projections of the bureau.

Allan asked if at this time with this letter PUB wanted to strike it.

Ted said he votes for striking it but even changing the statement to have an "if", that would make the statement more accurate and less certain.

Dory said even having the statement in there was kind of shady.

Colleen said that since it was the PUB's letter she would be fine with what the consensus will be.

Allan said the word "easily" to be struck and that PUB can revisit this statement when drafting the other letter.

Heidi asked how minor edits would be edited. She asked if people liked the content of the letter.

Mike said everything could be simplified.

Van suggested background and process information is probably less important than the firm comments, such as the ones that have already been made.

Mike suggested streamlining of some things that have been said in the past.

Ted thinks that since there is a new Council member that he sees the value in leaving the information in the letter.

Allan said that there are times when things are said that have not been said before. He said that he likes the letter because it is educational. He asked if there were any propositions regarding Mt Tabor and recalled that the majority of PUB wanted to add something.

Micah said that the letter to Council that was sent last year focused on revisiting the agreement and reviewing the cost of operating the assets.

Dory said to tell it like it is and ask for Council to point out the inequitable outcomes of the Mt Tabor lawsuit and the distribution of funds.

Van said that PUB could be direct and asked if PUB wanted to raise this issue again as long as it's forward looking. She said that a one sentence stating a look onward would suffice.

Allan asked Van and PUB to provide examples forward looking thoughts.

Dory said that the framing needed to be useful and provide a precedent on how PUB looks at equity, and in all cycles of legal items.

Mike said that it would be good to discuss that with the general counsel because to say that PUB will start leaning in on legal matters that is a significant step forward and he didn't think PUB wanted to start getting involved in legal negotiations. He also mentioned that he would need to take a look at the bylaws to see if that was possible.

Dory recalled Ted saying that the statement was contentious with the PUB and that not everyone saw what you saw.

--DRAFT--

Ted said that for him it was more like how prominent did PUB want to be in their communication. He suggested it should be more prominent and some people felt otherwise. Concerned whether it is utility spending or general fund spending.

Dory said that she just wanted to clarify and that now she has a better idea that it was more about prioritization rather than dissent in the group. If it had been dissent then could have said there are new eyes and if the message is more prominent then it can be explained that it's because of the new members in the group.

Allan said that there was a time when they wanted to take the Mt Tabor's funds and put them back in the PWB's budget but the PUB pushed back.

Gabe said that that was a conversation from two years ago.

Allan said that is the reason why the subject came up in the first place.

Van said she recommends a sentence reminding Council about their growing commitment to racial equity. Even adding something about the the City mandate.

Dory added that it's a mandate and when the leadership is not following policy they are not doing their job.

Allan said that he thinks Ted got a lot of the edits down on paper and asked if he could share them.

Ted reiterated that – in the past the PUB has expressed concerns with expense of City utility and general funds for Mt Tabor historic preservation. The PUB is concerned with both the inequities around this decision and with its impact on general fund dollars... we encourage the new Council to consider the pattern/presedent of this decision in light of the City's growing commitment with equity.

Dory said she would just say "impact".

Rob said that it is important to note that they are facing a 7 million dollar shortage this year and that the money that is going to this park and the system for the past 4 years would have preserved a lot of funds for programs and services that now won't be available. Highlighting that this is only one park in one segment versus the programs and services that wont be funded in multiple other segmets of the City.

Colleen asked where that wordage will be placed in the letter

Ted said at the very end after the comments on budget proposals.

Colleen asked for clarification of whether it should go under a particular bureau.

Ted also thought the statement could go under equity.

Rob suggested to make a new heading and call it a General Fund Impact.

Mike said that the way they heard it read, it sounded more like it belongs in equity.

Rob said no problem, to drop in equity.

Dory said she really wanted to put it on the front page. She doesn't want the statement to be buried within the rest of the information. She wants to ensure where she stands is on the record.

Allan asked Dory where specifically she would put it.

Dory said right after discussing budget issues, because it is a financial issue.

Van said to remember that the advice is going forward because they need advice that they can use.

Ted agrees and adds that the other agreements that have been struck by previous Council. There are echoes of the Andersen decision in this thing and how it impacts the City. There is a looming legal challenge by some neighborhoods against what the city is trying to do with its comprehensive plan and providing more affordable housing. He thinks there is a pattern here and that's what he thinks this is about.

Allan said that if the PUB wanted it up front that the statement can go after the values.

Heidi said that any thing that is not a description of a process should be on the front page.

Dory said that they could add an introductory piece and possibly disregard or condesce other sections.

Van said there is a new Commissioner.

Allan said that the new Commissioner really needed introduction.

Heidi said that she didn't know if the values needed to be moved or not.

--DRAFT--

Rob said that he wanted it to remain under equity, and not have it overarching everything else they mention in the letter. He doesn't think it matters where the statement is placed and thinks that it will be read ultimately. He also suggested that an action could be to ask them to respond on the equity piece.

Van said that she didn't want to presume that Council didn't care or didn't do enough.

Rob said that asking for feedback or asking for a response on the equity piece would be a good ask.

Allan suggested that the statement be inserted before the program offers and right after the values.

Mike suggested the PUB talk about format now that everyone has a good sense of what they want changed.

Amy said that she wouldn't change any language but she does need PUB to be in agreement with the statement changes. Amy read the current draft of the statement: In the past, the PUB has expressed concerns with the expense of City Utility and General Funds for the Mt Tabor Reservoirs Preservation Project. PUB is concerned with both the inequities around this decision and its impact on limited General Fund dollars, particularly given current budget shortfalls. We encourage the new Council to consider the precedent and impact of this decision in light of the City's growing commitment to equity. Allan said insert it at the end of the general statements and before the narratives. Allan asked if the PUB wanted to take a vote.

Amy asked if the statement should go after the values.

Carol said she is glad that the statement is being made. To her this is an equity issue and commenting on this issue is emphasizing equity and that City needs to walk their own talk.

Heidi said the statement needs to be introduced because it can't be a dangling sentence.

Van suggested a subheading "equity in the 2020 budget"

Ted asked what should be done about the other equity section in the case of adding another equity heading.

Heidi said that is what she is wondering too.

Dory suggested moving the entire equity section right before program offers and leave with what happened with Mt Tabor

Allan added that leaving with Mt Tabor and suggestions.

Amy said that the first sentence would need to change because it talks about what the commissioners are directing. She read a suggested change.

Majority agreed and nodded yes.

Heidi said she wanted to make another recommendation.

Allan asked if it was different than the Mt Tabor changes.

Heidi said yes.

Allan said then let's hold off and take a vote first on the Mt Tabor. He explained the changes of moving the equity section and moving that before the program offers and then start with the Mt Tabor verpage. All in favor of that.

All agreed unanimously.

Amy asked for clarification, did we close with whether asking Council to respond was in this letter. I heard put it in there or leave it for the recommendations.

Allan said he did not put it in the motion.

Amy said ok.

Heidi explained her edit being to reword the subheading of the suggestions, as "next steps"

Allan asked Colleen if she heard what Heidi said.

Colleen said that she thinks that the budget proposals came from last years' letter and there aren't any specific budget proposals but it says more that recommendations will come in the future.

Heidi said that there is no specific comment and that the heading could be changed so that the section could be left there.

Rob said the first paragraph can be struck in its entirety because that is a risk of repeating the exact things as last year.

--DRAFT--

Amy said that what the letter is missing is a section on recommendations. She mentioned that it was important to note that recommendations will be forthcoming.

Heidi said ok and she then thinks that the section just needs a new heading.

Ted suggested “specific program offer comments will be forthcoming”

Allan asked Colleen what she would call it.

Colleen laughed and said she didn’t know.

Mike suggested to call it “summary comments”

Dory agreed with Mike.

Allan reiterated the way he sees the letter as educational.

Heidi suggested “future recommendation”.

Rob thinks that with Amy’s point the first sentence can be added to the second paragraph.

Amy said that she read the paragraph again and she advises leaving the language in. She sees value in leaving it in due to new Council members.

Heidi suggested calling the header “next steps”

Ted liked that.

Allan said ok and to take a vote.

Carol mentioned that there was a typo of “theses” towards the end.

Amy said that she sees it.

Allan asked PUB members if they wanted to change the subheading to “next steps”

Dory said she was having fun today and that what she really wants is an attention-grabber for Council.

Dory thinks that the letter reads as a friendly newsletter and she wanted the tone and emphasis.

Allan agrees and appreciates her suggestions. He summarizes the changes starting with removing the word “easily”, then the Mt Tabor section with the 4.5% sentence is to be struck; next take the Mt Tabor and adding it to the equity section and finally moving the equity section before program offers.

Carol reminded PUB that there was another addition but that she couldn’t remember the words - under annual rates of increase- something about “their working together”.

Allan said, yeah that’s right and referred to Colleen for that change.

Colleen said the comment was from Dan and he suggested “we commend the commissioners for their shared budget guidance and commitment to keeping the bureaus aligned.” That would go under annual rates of increase, as the second sentence.

Allan asked if PUB wanted any more changes.

Dory asked clarification on what the subheading is going to be called.

Allan said that PUB settled on calling the subheading “Equity in FY 2020 Budget Process”.

Rob recalled the quote from CUB and asked if PUB wanted to keep it. He said to consider striking it because there is no point in quoting a memo that City Council already received.

Allan said ok and asked if Colleen had any comments. Allan motioned to make the changes previously stated.

Rob added to grant Amy the power to make grammar and punctuation edits to things like “theses”.

Allan moved the motion and Rob seconded it.

Motion approved unanimously.

#### **IX. Discuss next Meeting Agenda**

Allan introduced the next meeting happening February 21, 2019, 11am at the 1900 SW Fourth Avenue, 1900 Building, Room 2500C. Started with Civic Life wanting to provide a 2 hour custom equity training. He states that he knows that some members have taken the training already. He said he is not sure that equity is a requirement for all PUB members and community affiliates.

Amy confirmed that it is a requirement for all boards and commissions

Allan asked if PUB had latitude with timing.

Cynthia explained late March or early April, given that Civic Life’s contract with the trainer ends sometime in late April.

--DRAFT--

Dory asked if it will be the same trainer as the one that conducted the training last summer. Cinthia said she isn't sure.

Van said this one sounds like it's a generic training that advisory boards must take.

Allan suggested to put that as an item on the next meeting agenda and then pick a date.

Van asked what the latitude was.

Amy said that because of the budget timeline that potential dates could be April 8<sup>th</sup> or 19<sup>th</sup>.

Colleen asked if it was a 2 hour meeting and suggested that by April 2 they should be done with budget related stuff and also suggested to forgo the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting in March.

Allan said that he is concerned about the budget fatigue and that that might drive members to quit.

Colleen said that for the most part budget should all be completed and nothing new should be up. She said that the March 21<sup>st</sup> should be left as a back up and schedule the Equity training for the first meeting in April.

Ted agreed.

Allan suggested to move beyond that.

Lee said he would agree.

Allan said that during the next meeting PUB should talk about member recruitment.

Heidi asked who the PUB lost.

Allan said Scott Robinson. He said that during the next meeting PUB can talk about that and the process. He also mentioned that CBO staff will be scheduling introductory meetings with PUB members. Allan also said only one person volunteered for the ARC meeting and he thinks it's Dan.

Mike said he signed up for one meeting.

Heidi said she also signed up for one.

Allan said he is sorry and that he didn't know that.

Rob said that as a bureau and city employee is seen as inappropriate to volunteer for those meetings because of the different services and items that are discussed that concern the community. He explained that if someone is disputing a water bill and a PWB employee is representing him/her it might not seem fair in the eyes of the public.

Allan said ok, and that he didn't know that.

Colleen agreed with Rob emphasizing that it must be a voting member and preferably not a City of Portland employee.

Allan said that Amy might probably be able to do some checking.

Heidi asked what the one on one introductions are about.

Cinthia said that those meetings would involve CBO staff and each of the PUB members.

Heidi asked what the curriculum would be and if it would involve budget.

Amy said the meetings are more to capture the fact that we want to get to know each of you. This may not be an in person meeting, it can be a phone meeting to understand what your needs and interests are in terms of staff support.

Allan asked if there are other agenda items PUB wanted to add.

Colleen said that Ted had brought up the drought plan, water efficiency and impact on low income; restoration project on green street and presentation on that report. She also thinks that Heidi or Micah brought up the Portland Harbor.

Allan said that these topics are better because they ensure we don't get fatigued.

Cinthia said that she found the volunteer for the ARC meetings. The meeting that still needs a volunteer is the one coming up on March 12.

Lee said he was going to pow wow.

Rob moves to adjourn the meeting.

Allan said the meeting adjournment has been moved and seconded.

The meeting adjourned at 1:01 pm.