

Reviewing Subcommittee Meeting Summary

111 SW Columbia St, Portland, OR 97201, Floor 5, Room 518
Friday, May 10, 2019

Attendees: Dory Robinson
Ana Brophy
Micah Meskel
Gabe Solmer (Call in)
Nadia Legorreta (Call in)
Cristina Nieves (Call in)

Absent: Angela Henderson
Colleen Johnson
Heidi Bullock
Jamie Dunphy (opted out of initial application review)

Staff: Cinthia Diaz Calvo (PUB Coordinator)
Amy Archer- Masters (PUB Analyst)

I. Introductions

Cinthia introduced everyone as they were joining the conference call. She addressed the concerns that were raised regarding the following:

- The Reviewing Subcommittee should meet in person or by phone to openly discuss applications.
 - Staff response: Accommodate a meeting for reviewing subcommittee to meet Friday May 10 between 3:30-4:30pm. Members can attend in person or join the meeting by phone. For those that could not make it, we encourage their comments and suggestions via email, to be sent to all Reviewing Subcommittee members.
- Reviewing Subcommittee Composition.
 - Staff response: Composition of the reviewing subcommittee was presented for discussion and approved by the Portland Utility Board February 21, 2019.
- Not enough PUB representation on the Reviewing Subcommittee.
 - Staff response: Jamie Dunphy decided to opt out of the initial review of the application. Staff also invited Ana Brophy, current ex-officio PUB member to have fair and equal representation between PUB members and external parties.
- Inconsistency between City Code *3.123.040* and application eligibility requirements.
 - Staff response: The Reviewing Subcommittee will use what is on City code to evaluate eligibility while reviewing applications. The City Code *3.123.040* goes as follows:

A. General Criteria. All members must reside in or work predominantly in the city of Portland and have an interest in water, sewer, stormwater, and watershed health issues, such as system development and maintenance, service delivery, service costs and impacts on low-income households, economic development, public health, conservation, green infrastructure or the environment. In making Board appointments, the Mayor and Council shall strive to have a Board which reflects the diversity of the Portland community, including, but not limited to, the following factors: areas of expertise, advocacy, experience, community involvement, profession, education and/or, economic status. Preferred appointees should have a

range of qualified professional and academic expertise, and community volunteer experience. Appointees will include a current employee in a represented bargaining unit with the Portland Water Bureau or the Bureau of Environmental Services. Skills that will serve the Board well include: technical knowledge of water, stormwater, and sewer utility operation and issues, accounting, civil engineering, conservation, environmental sciences, equity, health sciences, public administration, urban planning, or utility economics, financial and capital improvement analysis, ecosystem science, environmental protection, political process, group process, and communications.

B. Restrictions. No individual with any direct financial interest in either city utility other than as a rate-paying customer or as an employee of the utility bureaus.

C. The Mayor shall, in consultation with the Commissioner(s)-in-Charge, appoint three non-voting, ex officio members annually, to engage utility bureau employees in the budget process. The ex officio members shall be one represented and two non-represented utility bureau employees, appointed to participate in the process of developing recommendations on the bureaus' annual budgets. The voting and ex officio members shall be evenly distributed between the utility bureaus. The term of ex officio members shall be for 1 year. Ex officio members may be re-appointed up to three times.

Cinthia shared an email from Angela Henderson that shares thoughts regarding standards the subcommittee can apply to their individual reviews of the applications. Angela's suggestions go as follows:

1. Does the applicant meet the standards specified in section 3.123.040 (A) of Portland City Code?

This code provision establishes the general criteria each potential member must possess. I tend to agree with Colleen that there appears to be some amount of incongruence between PCC section 3.123.040 and the companion document derived from or in support of that code provision – i.e., the application. Chiefly, PCC section 3.123.040 specifies, in relevant part, that *[All members must reside in or work predominantly in the city of Portland...]*; whereas the City's Advisory Body Application is a *generic* advisory body application (i.e., not limited to nor specific to the PUB) and, as such, broadens the criteria to include play, worshipping, or going to school. However, the standard that must be met, is that specified in code. I recognize that it's not always clear from the applications, which criteria the applicant meets, and I think we must rely on best professional judgement at this phase in the process.

We must also consider whether each applicant possesses interest as specified in PCC section 3.123.040 as well.

2. Given the current composition of the Board, does the potential applicant bring skills, expertise, or interests that diversify the composition of the Board and reflect the composition of the Portland community?

3. Does the applicant possess a range of skills, competencies, and experience?

4. Is the application complete?

5. Does the applicant have any apparent financial interest in serving on the Board?

Cinthia asked if there were any comments and suggestions on the suggested method for evaluation. There were no comments or suggestions.

Karen Spenser

- There was mention that Karen's application was strong, but it was also incomplete since she didn't explain what her conflict of interest was.
- The subcommittee concluded to clarify her conflict of interest by phone or in writing.

Gabriela Saldañes-Lopez

- There was general agreement to invite her for an interview because of her unique attributes that were currently missing on the board. She would bring the community aspect that the board needs.
- It was mentioned that the board needs a community connection somehow and she would be a great candidate.

Max Jones

- It was mentioned that his equity questions were answered very reflectively, and he was also not from Portland and that was refreshing. The subcommittee saw value in the perspectives he would bring.
- There was mention he is also civil engineer and a local shelter volunteer.
- There was mention that he may or may not have enough time living/working in Portland or Oregon, but it was also mentioned that he had been working in Portland for two years and a half year.
- It was mentioned that he would bring good qualities.
- It was noted that he only wants to serve for one year.
- There was general consensus that Max Jones be placed on list of top candidates.

John Gibbons

- There was general agreement that there are stronger candidates on the applicant pool.
- There was general agreement that his application should not be placed on the list of 6 candidates to be invited for an interview.

Ignacio Falcon

- It was mentioned that his perspective on premium pay would be valuable.
- It was also mentioned that he has experience in GIS and that is a very important system in the utility world to identify transformers and meters. This would be useful to analyze the systems.
- There was general consensus to include him on among the 6 candidates to be interview.

Mia Sabanovic

- There was comment that she worked for Water Bureau and BES and she has experience in project management techniques and engineering.
- It was mentioned she is a good translator of technical material and that is valuable as PUB starts to do outreach, because she understands the technical piece.
- It was suggested to invite her for an interview because as a Stewart she understands the labor perspective and can speak the language of the workers and community and can explain things. She has also trained.
- There was also concern about her being a BES employee; if she would be an ex-officio but she applied for a voting-member position.
- There was a question about bureau employees in member positions on the board.

- It was clarified that there is no clear rule around bureau-employees in board positions.
- There was interest in presenting this topic to the board for discussion.
- Nadia said Mia was one of the applications on the top of her list because of her experience as a water engineer; she worked as an engineer for 13 years and then she moved. She would bring a lot of experience in water and sewer and systems.

Lisa Reynolds

- There was general agreement to invite her for an interview because she would bring the health-related perspective as a doctor and pediatrician.

Karen Williams

- It was mentioned that she would bring perspective from DEQ which was now missing because Dory no longer brings their perspective.
- Dory said that she will refrain from commenting because she believes she is biased.
- There was general consensus to not add her to the 6-candidate list.

Mike Weedall

- It was mentioned that he collaborates well and is very interested in low income and helping disadvantage communities. He focuses on the bottom line and saving money.
- It was mentioned that his perspective is valuable but suggests considering that Mike and represents similar interests as one of the co-chairs and that there is no need for duplication.
- It was mentioned that the 1-year term can be considered for Mike.
- It was suggested to interview Mike given there may be sentiment around it.
- It was mentioned that Mike's experience would be very helpful, but there were strong feelings around gender equality. It was noted that currently there are 6 male members and 3 female members, and the subcommittee saw the value in reviewing more applications and consider more female representation on the board.
- There was general consensus that Mike has served the PUB for years. He is committed to a 3-year term and that he should be interviewed either as one of the 6 (if Karen has a conflict) or as a 7th.

Kaliska Day

- There was mention that she has construction experience and her perspective on installations and project management would be valuable.
- There was mention that her background in construction and project management was already represented on the board.
- There was general agreement that her application should not be placed on the list of 6 candidates to be invited for an interview.

Erik Croswell

- There was general agreement that his application should not be placed on the list of 6 candidates to be invited for an interview.

Anne Boutwell

- There was general agreement that her application should not be placed on the list of 6 candidates to be invited for an interview.

Katherine Gillespie

- There was general agreement that her application should not be placed on the list of 6 candidates to be invited for an interview.

Summary of the 6 candidates considered to be invited for an interview:

- Gabriela Saldañes-Lopez
- Lisa Reynolds
- Max Jones
- Mia Sabanovic
- Karen Spencer (?)
- Ignacio Falcon-Dvorsky
- Mike Weedall***

Summary of the “possibly” list

- Karen Williams
- Kaliska Day

Summary of the applicants that were not considered for an interview:

- John Gibbons
- Katie Gallespie
- Annie Boutwell
- Erik Croswell