

## Portland Utility Board

March 14, 2019, 11:00am – 1:00pm  
1900 SW Fourth Avenue, 1900 Building, Room 2500C  
Meeting # 64 Minutes

### Attendees:

*PUB Members:*

- Heidi Bullock
- Colleen Johnson (by phone)
- Dan Peterson
- Micah Meskel
- Mike Weedall
- Robert Martineau
- Ted Labbe
- Dory Robinson
- Van Le, ex officio (by phone)
- Ana Brophy, ex officio

*Absent:*

- \*Lee Moore
- \*Allan Warman
- \*Notice of absence provided prior to meeting

*Staff:*

- Jonas Biery (Business Services Manager, BES)
- Cecelia Huynh (Director of Finance and Support Services, PWB)
- Gabe Solmer (Communications Director, PWB)
- Amy Archer-Masters (PUB Analyst, City Budget Office)
- Cinthia Diaz Calvo (PUB Coordinator, City Budget Office)
- Jamie Dunphy (Representative, Commissioner Fish's Office)
- Ken Bartocci (Principal Financial Analyst, BES)
- Jeff Winner (Capital Improvement Program Supervisor, PWB)

### **I. Call to Order**

Ted Labbe called the meeting to order. He reminded everyone that the meeting was of citizen volunteers tasked to advise City Council on items related to the Water Bureau and the Bureau of Environmental Services. He gave an overview of the agenda.

### **II. Prior Meeting Minutes**

Ted asked if there were any changes for the minutes of the March 5th meeting. The meeting minutes were accepted as submitted.

Colleen said that as an oversight committee, PUB is supposed to be critical and should be able to express that and does not believe it was beating up on the bureaus in any way.

Ted responded to Colleen by saying that he apologized if he made her feel like she was beating on the bureaus.

Van said that she was on the phone for the last meeting, just had it on mute so it wasn't disruptive.

Micah said that he would like a clear follow up on open items that have been requested and have them listed on the minutes, so they can be followed through. He would like something on the agenda.

Mike said that was a great idea.

Adopted minutes unanimously.

III. **Public Comment**

Ted asked if there was any public comment. There was no public comment.

Amy said that there was an announcement from Jonas.

Jonas said that BES hired 2 equity managers. Workforce development and the other is a general manager to work on equity overall. He said they can come in and introduce themselves.

Micah asked if PUB can get an overview of their roles and functions.

Jonas said that is possible.

There were technical difficulties with the projector, so the agenda was delayed. Ted asked if PUB would start with the letter and pause when the printouts arrive, as mentioned by Amy. All agreed.

IV. **Disclosure of Communications**

Heidi exchanged emails with BES staff regarding the Portland Harbor.

Ted said he has had his usual interactions with BES staff regarding environmental requirements.

V. **Launch of Public Involvement Presentation**

Annie Von Burg, Manager for the Superfund Project, introduced herself and Jessica Terlokowski and their interest in continuing to engage with the PUB. Annie stated that a little over a year ago had update on Portland Harbor and request for 1 FTE to do public involvement work and create long term program to fill a need. BES is lucky to get Jessica to join team and over past year has been meeting with community members and general public. Jessica is here to share results and introduce what a program could look like, specifically over next 5 years. Interested in getting feedback to use that for the plan. Annie couldn't stay for presentation but wanted to introduce. She said that PUB got the most recent quarterly update and gave a reminder that she is open to questions or more presentation.

Jessica presented her work and what resulted from her community involvement program. She also shared the City's reasons for creating the program and their priorities. Jessica shared that relationships are critical in order to engage the public in a meaningful way. She said the work requires building relationships with organizations throughout the city. She said they were able to build relationships with those whom the bureau had not had the chance to connect with. They want the community to have a more involved role in decision making.

Jessica shared a list of organizations listed in the power point presentation listed attached. She added that access to the river, safety and information on contaminants. She said the community also wants to know about the superfund and what progress can be anticipated. The community wants to understand who was involved and who had the connections as it relates to the river in

the past and presently. She said that funding comes from different entities and the community wants to access that information. The community is like a facilitator. Folks don't want to see a superfund, if there are opportunities on policy change the public wants to be involved. They also want to know how to keep water cleaned and that is something BES also wants to know. It's more than just a cleanup to improve overall health of the harbor. Decisions that are being made around this will impact communities and that's why they want to engage the community. BPA and Portland Harbor are in communication to ensure questions and concerns that are being raised then Portland Harbor can respond right away. Four areas public education, access, transparency, community benefits and convening & collaboration. Taking a look at contracting for example with an equity lens. She explained the program's 4 goals listed on slide 15. She explained five initiatives over the next 5 years. Found on pgs. 16-17.

Colleen asked about an example of a grant that they are applying for or what they would share to get that grant.

Jessica said that there are many grants and provided an example. She continued with the second initiative on the Willamette Cove, on pg. 17., to have the space to work from the same set of information. She said they are working with stakeholders.

Jessica asked if PUB had any questions.

Ana asked about the workforce development - what do they want?

- Jessica said jobs related to the cleanup.

Ana asked about the risks the river faced.

- Jessica said public eating the fish.

Heidi asked about the interim state, how will we get an update?

- Jessica wanted to get validation first and they got it and now they will engage with community and report back.
- Jonas flagged that there have been discussions about being responsive to the memo in 2019. May be something adjusted in the budget to make some effort in 2019. Will update once they know what that looks like. Expectation is that they would come from fund balance to avoid rate impact this year

Ted, asked about community benefits, what have you heard from community about anti displacement from housing and how do you integrate that in the affordable housing efforts?

- Jessica's said people are concerned about displacement, she said she can't define solutions, and hopes to engage with community to find solutions.

Micah thanked Jessica and said that there's interest for a dual role with the City and residents and that seems to be clear; continue on with tangible steps.

Dory asked Jessica about what the focus groups look like and what kind of questions have you been asking? Having even that list, how will you maintain consistent information?

- Jessica said facilitated workshops, asking the public how they want to be involved, what are the public's priorities, what are their questions, etc. They provide a venue to bring their members and one on ones with folks as well. Check-ins with folks that are highly engaged. Having online version of the information is important. Jessica said that in her role, she is the connector with other entities.

Dory asked how things are being tracked, year 1, 2, 3.

- Jessica spoke about metrics and how critical they are to achieve what they need.

## VI. Letter Recommendations Discussion

Colleen said that she had comments that she had sent to CBO staff and asked if Cinthia or Amy had those comments or print outs.

Amy said that since those comments were just sent out, that there are no printouts.

Ted asked if anyone had a comment or edits and laid out the process to go over the content.

Ted asked if there is anything PUB wanted to discuss.

Colleen wanted to ensure that Feb 7, 2019 is the right date for the first letter.

- Amy confirmed it is the correct date.

Mike asked about the number of members not in attendance at the meeting and suggested to change to a positive statement.

- Amy said that it was pulled from a previous letter and would change it to state how many were in attendance instead.

Ted asked about the section on FY 2019-20 requested budgets.

- Colleen commented that the section was nicely done. Ted agreed.

Ted suggested moving on to the next section Mt Tabor.

- Amy shared Colleen's comment suggesting including CBOs comments about not using General Fund. Colleen said that it would be appropriate to add it and that CBO had an opinion to be made.
- Dory said that as we are thinking about equity, millions of dollars going in to an already sustainable and strong, affluent community and she wants to show how this is showing more explicitly here.
- Micah and Colleen supported that.
- Ana suggested not using the word affluent, that a community and represented members, well-served, well-represented could be used.
- Colleen said that the neighborhood is affluent and has no problem with using that word.
- Dory asked what the challenges are with the word affluent.
- Ana clarified that it may be insulting, when the point is that the money could be spent more on underrepresented communities.
- Dory explained that affluent is not a derogatory word but is objectively drawing attention to the wealth and will help anchor the conversation.
- Ana suggested saying that the money can be spent where other people are underserved.
- Amy read the section "where more affluent communities and when there are other priorities..." and presented the option to also add on the underserved piece.
- Dory does not want to censor or dilute because PUB should not be coddling the feelings of white millionaires.
- Ted told Colleen and Van on the phone that there was agreement to add something and explained it for them.
- Colleen agreed with Dory that the word affluent is not used in a derogatory way and adding the second sentence at the end is a good idea.
- Heidi said that the expense to rate payers to add the Mt. Tabor neighborhoods, that there is space there to also add that the increase in rates will affect more than just the Mt Tabor neighborhood.

There was a break in the conversation to allow the presentation from BES, then conversation returned to the letter discussion returning to the section on Affordability.

Ted asked if PUB and Colleen and Van on the phone if they had questions or comments.

- Colleen asked about the section "annual rate of increase", if PUB wanted to add the data on the water bureau to be included 7.4% increase relative to other Cities, and Amy

also sent a graph comparing cities. Colleen suggested including the graph in the letter itself.

- Heidi asked if the graph was going to be included, what does PUB intend to say about the graph?
- Colleen said that the graph would show how the bill compares to that of other cities. It's more data that reflects on the annual rates of increase.
- Ted suggested adding a few sentences rather than adding the chart/graph.
- Mike suggests just adding it as a reference/attachment.
- Colleen mentions about past letters that have included charts and graphs and there is nothing unique about doing it this time.
- Ted wants clarification on the two things that Colleen wants.
- Colleen said that there could be a reflection of the before and after could be presented, but if PUB would add the graph that Amy created and a sentence referring to it, that it would be good.
- Ted reference the CUB and the compared bill, but they didn't provide the context of different cities.
- Colleen said that Commissioner Fish said something about other cities.
- Heidi said that in the interest of time, she struggles with idea of adding the comparison. In the context of the letter, she thinks it will open up to more complex comparisons that PUB doesn't have data on. Portland is not the same as other cities and there are many factors that make the comparison difficult to do.
- Colleen disagrees and said that it would be helpful, the bureaus picked those cities for a reason and assumes there is relevance in the selection.
- Heidi said if we don't know why the cities were chosen, then why include it.
- Micah agrees with Heidi that the comparison would to complex i.e. age, availability of water.
- Ted added debt services on projects that are done, etc.
- Colleen suggests that if PUB is unable to use the comparison of the Cities, the bureau should be requested to present the reasons why they chose those Cities.
- Micah says that there are different factors that weigh in to why the rates are different and thinks it would be difficult to compare those narratives.
- Ted asked Colleen what she suggested on the before and after.
- Colleen suggested coming back to that section. She suggests if the data is not relevant then PUB should ask the Water Bureau why they included it on their requested budget.
- Ted asked Colleen for a sentence, for PUB to take a vote on it. He suggested to take a vote on her statement or that can PUB move on for now to the next section.
- Colleen agreed to come back.

Ted asked on the section of Staffing and Low-income affordability.

- Colleen said she had input and suggested a sentence that says something like "if the new positions are approved by the Council then the PUB would request specific and measurable performance metrics that they would then use to evaluate effectiveness". She thinks that BES needs performance metrics to measure how these are being effective.
- Ted suggested Colleen's ask was taking the PUB back to the program level.
- Colleen said no.
- Mike agreed with Colleen that her ask is reasonable and moving towards accountability.
- Ana asked Colleen what accountability looked like for her.

- Colleen suggested if increasing # of FTE in engineering vs increase % of completion. The justification for FTE efficiency and effectiveness. For example, faculty member and increase in students and classes. There would be ways to measure.
- Ana said that they don't know how effective they are if they are learning how to even stay accountable themselves, because they have to create the structure.
- Ted suggested that Amy draft two sentences around the idea of adding specific metrics around the additional FTE.
  - VOTE: Rob and Ted opposed, Micah, Dan, Mike, Dory, Heidi, voted yes.

Colleen said about CBO and service measure in the water analysis, that household income might not be a good way to measure. She would like to see a reference of those two reports and that there is an issue here.

- Micah asked if Yung provided any alternative measure.
- Amy said that there is no final suggestion on alternative measure.
- Ted asked Colleen what her points are.
- Colleen thinks that those were interesting points in the CBO analysis.
- Ted suggested a vote on having Amy draft a couple sentences on the CBO analysis.
- Colleen suggested it can go into the affordability section.
- Rob said that the affordability for multifamily housing should be deleted all together.
- Colleen asks why.
- Rob said that PUB has been included in the process. The City is in the first year that does address the multifamily challenge and PUB has already been told that the bureaus will provide the metrics once they have them. He thinks that adding this mention again would be a redundancy.
- Heidi agrees with Rob.
- Amy said that the intent in a broader for it to be a City discussion. If City engages in a conversation, then PUB would like to be engaged. Not intended to be about rates or this specific budget.
- Rob said if there is a sentence it should be added to the low-income discount section.
- Micah said it is important to signal the importance of rate review.
- Ted asked if PUB agreed to embed in to the low-income section.
  - All agreed.

Colleen referred back to PUB conversations; she is fine with adding a sentence where the PUB stands on this.

Ted asked PUB about the program offers and performance metrics section.

- Colleen suggests adding the CIP to say some members of underspending of the CIP and are interested in further conversation.
- Ted asked PUB if they agreed on adding a sentence like that.
- Colleen said underspending is a concern.
- Ted suggest taking a vote.
- Rob asked how this underspending subject pertain to PUBs recommendation on this year's budget.
- Colleen said that the CIP is a huge bucket of money and it affects the rate increase, FTE requests. It's a foundational piece of the requested budget.
- Rob said he agrees it is a concern but not appropriate to include in this letter.
- Colleen thought about it as a second section about CIP and underspending, but it can also be under affordability.
- Ted suggested a vote on whether to include a CIP section.

- VOTE: Micah, Dan, Rob, Ted voted no. Colleen and Mike voted yes. Section will not be added.
- Ted said the section will not be included and that PUB is moving to the next section. Dan asked how PUB will be a participant with the bureau to add performance metrics.
- Rob said it already exists in what Amy has previously sent out and has been approved.
- Ted said we can get the language from previous letter that has been previously approved.
- Colleen said yes and that she would like to see it first.
- Rob said he was under the impression that everyone had seen it.
- Ted asked about next steps.
- Amy read the comments from Colleen “we look forward to reviewing the first of the metrics by the end of summer.”
- Colleen agrees, and she adds that she would like to see a timeline to see the performance metrics.
- Ted asked the PUB what they thought about a timeline.
- Rob asked how that would relate to this budget cycle.
- Colleen explained that there has been discussion on that metrics are necessary. PUB would not want to wait until April to next year.
- Rob said that that message should be delivered to the bureaus and not in the context of this letter.
- Ana suggested a subcommittee to work on this with the bureaus.
- Ted suggested a vote on a timeline to be included in the letter and developed by the bureau.

- VOTE: No one raised their hand to support the addition of a timeline.

Ted went back to Colleen’s comment on the annual rate of increase and asked her what she wanted to say on that.

- Mike suggested Colleen send Amy her edits and to move on.
- The PUB agreed to move on.

Rob said to take out the link between inflation and the combined increase. He doesn’t think it’s a relevant metric; The rates are not connected to inflation.

- Colleen asks for clarification on the section that should be deleted.
- Amy said from “although... 3% each year”
- Ted suggested a vote to have Amy draft the items on that section on annual rate of increase and vote during the next meeting on whether to add it or not.

- VOTE: All agreed unanimously.

## VII. Next Meeting Agendas

Ted reminded PUB that they have started the recruitment process. All expiring terms must reapply and all ex-officios also must apply. Co-chairs are elected each year and considerations will take place in July.

Ted continued by saying that there is a lead update that was requested by PUB and Micah’s suggestion to include action items at the end of the minutes on the agenda.

- Cinthia explained that she added a section on the agenda that includes action items and agenda items. She explains that section is meant for all to take a note on items that come up throughout the meeting and bring them up during the “next meeting agenda” discussion. This will add clarity to what those items and follow-up items are to be requested from the bureaus.

Amy added that CBO staff received notice from Vera that she will no longer be serving as ex-officio due to a family emergency.

Heidi asked about the application review and who receives the applications to review.

- Amy said that CBO has not done that yet, but whomever is the volunteer for the recruitment subcommittee will be receiving those applications to review.
- Ted asked what the timeline is to form that subcommittee.
- Amy said that within the next couple weeks the PUB should have volunteers in place because the meeting takes place in April.
- Colleen said some members volunteered last year and others may want to volunteer to be a part of that reviewing committee.

Ted asked if PUB had any other items to discuss.

Cynthia said that the two items PUB had for next meeting are to finalize the letter of recommendations and discuss recruitment process and volunteers and possibly get an update from PWB on lead.

Cecelia asked clarification on what the PUB wanted to know about lead.

- Mike clarified the PUB wants the bureau to bring the PUB up to date on what they are working on and doing on this matter.
- Cecelia said that she can have that update.

Ted made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Mike seconded.

Next Meetings: April 2, 2019, 4:30 pm, 1900 SW Fourth Avenue, 1900 Building, Room 2500C.

The meeting adjourned at 1 PM.