

Reviewing Subcommittee Meeting Summary

111 SW Columbia St, Portland, OR 97201, Floor 5, Room 518
Wednesday, May 15, 2019

Attendees: Heidi Bullock (Call in)
Colleen Johnson (Call in)
Micah Meskel
Nadia Legorreta (Call in)
Cristina Nieves
Dory Robinson (Call in)

Absent: Angela Henderson
Dory Robinson

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

I. Background / Introductions

CBO staff had received a range of responses from the subcommittee, with clear support to reconvene the group to include those absent last Friday since their input varies from the group decision thus far. However, there are several members that would no longer be able to participate if we extend the interview date further. The majority supported proceeding with interviews this Friday, with a phone meeting today to finalize the list if possible. We have compiled the data received from absentee members (Colleen, Angela and Heidi) with the data from the meeting last week and have 4 that I would consider clearer candidates for interviews. Our goal was to have 6 candidates.

The next 5-7 candidates varied between being top from the meeting versus low for absentee or vice versa. Due to time constraints of panel members, 11 candidates is too many to fit into our schedule and allow meaningful interviews. I propose that the subcommittee continue to dialogue today to determine the top 6-7 candidates to interview.

Unless there is disagreement, we shouldn't need to discuss much for the top four interview candidates below and conversation could focus on the 6 listed in the subsequent lists:

Agreement from 5/10 subcommittee (and supported by either top or maybe category for absentee) -

Top 4 to interview:

Gabriela Saldaña-Lopez
Lisa Reynolds
Karen Spencer
Mike Weedall

Identify 2-3 from the following three lists to move on to interview:

Top from meeting but variation from absentee (some with a very strong objection, some also in top):

Max Jones
Mia Sabanovic
Ignacio Falcon

Top from some absentee, were in "maybe" from meeting:

Kaliska Day
Karen Williams

Top in one absentee, "no interview"/bottom from meeting:

John Gibbon
Katie Gillespie

Amy introduced reviewing subcommittee members as they were joining the call.

Prior to starting discussion there was a clarification question regarding how many candidates should the committee be selecting. A suggestion was made to select 7 or 8 members.

Amy explained that if we select 6 or 8, we should be ok, because Cinthia notified candidates far in advance that interviews will take place May 17th.

Amy opened discussion by confirming the top 4 candidates.

Gabriela Saldaña-Lopez

- General consensus to move her forward for an interview.

Karen Spenser

- General consensus to move her forward as well.
- Cinthia clarified her mistaken marked conflict of interest.

Mike Weedall

- There were questions about his conflict of interest.
- Cinthia clarified that his conflict was also marked by mistake.
- It was reiterated from the previous recruiting subcommittee meeting that there were other candidate applications that were stronger.
- It was mentioned that Mike does deserve a chance to be interviewed because he has been dedicated board member for the past 3 years. He also has a past experience and knowledge working with both bureaus.
- It was mentioned that Mike's skill sets exist already on the board and seeing that both Allan and Mike share the similar utility background. Their prioritization would be different if there wasn't already this type of representation on the board.
- It was mentioned that the current board has duplicates of skills, and more than one member selecting communications and equity or economics. It is acknowledged that the subcommittee doesn't want the same skills sets for everybody, but she also thinks it's a mistake to not elevate a candidate because people are similar or because their skill sets already exist on the board.
- It was mentioned that Mike had already been the 7th candidate approved to be interviewed, and it was suggested to move on to a different candidate.
- It was clarified that during the previous meeting, the reviewing subcommittee decided that there were stronger candidates and they decided to move 6 forward but that even if space needed to be made and adjust the schedule to accommodate 7, that they wanted to make sure Mike got an interview. It was the final decision that was made. He was one to interview but not

necessarily as far as people were looking as skill sets to bring to the board and that there were others they hoped to move forward as well.

Lisa Reynolds

- Both the reviewing subcommittee and one of the absentee members included her in the list of candidates to be interviewed.
- General consensus to move her forward as well.
- One of the members of the reviewing subcommittee didn't select her for an interview but also didn't feel strongly about her as a candidate. If others feel stronger about her as a candidate, it would be ok if she is moved forward.

Mia Sabanovic

- It was mentioned that since the PUB is a city-oversight committee that it would threaten the integrity of the board if more city employees are added. By ordinance, already there are 4 members that sit on the board, one of them being a represented position that can vote. Currently there are 5 city employees. They provide ideas and they have been articulate providing expertise and she believes this has helped shaped the board and decision-making. It was suggested that she could serve as one of the ex-officios from one of the bureaus.
- It was clarified that from the 5 city employees that were mentioned are on the board currently, only 4 are directly associated to either BES or PWB. From those 4 only two have been active, one from BES and the PWB represented voting member. The other city employee that was mentioned was not a City employee prior to serving on the board and is now an employed by the Bureau of Development Services, BDS.
- It was mentioned that the BES and the PWB represented voting member position have been very vocal and that this is a discussion that the board itself should have. It was also mentioned that whatever happens today, she intends to write it down.
- It was mentioned that even though Mia is a city employee, she also said that she represents herself and her affiliated communities. It was agreed that Mia would be great as an ex-officio member and that the subcommittee should explore that through interviewing her.
- Mia was on top of the list of a subcommittee member, because of Mia's water engineer background and 13 years of experience. Her affiliation with many other community groups is also valued. It was also noted that 6 members of PUB are male and only 3 are female. It would be great to see more gender equality on the board. Value is seen in giving Mia a chance to interview.
- It was mentioned that she was a really strong candidate and that she deserves and interview.
- The majority supports moving Mia forward with Colleen Johnson's objection. The recommendation was made to move Mia forward based on the vote understanding the concerns that have been shared and through the interview process explore that further.

Max Jones

- Concerns were heard and understood by the rest of the reviewing subcommittee members, however it was mentioned that an opportunity can be given to those candidates as well to read how they represent themselves and the skills they are going to bring to the board, regardless of

their affiliation with the City. During the interview process the decision can be made whether to select them or not.

- It was mentioned that the conflict of interest was taken care of with Karen Spencer and Mike Weedall and adds that it is unclear why the subcommittee would want to interview someone that clearly has a conflict of interest.
- It was mentioned that when a PUB member from DEQ applied, it was clearly stated that there was a conflict of interest and that didn't stop the PUB from choosing her as a candidate. There was also a very strict agreement regarding her involvement with the PUB and the member was able to manage that successfully.
- Different perspectives were acknowledged, and it was mentioned that Max is a contracted employee.
- CBO staff concluded to ask the City Attorney's office about conflict of interest and contracted work with the City.
- The recommendation was made to move Mia forward based on the vote understanding the concerns that have been shared and through the interview process explore that further for both Max and Mia.

Ignacio Falcon

- Ignacio had an interesting resume and background, so that would be 7th candidate.
- It was mentioned that Ignacio was a maybe.
- Both Ignacio and Karen were pretty close. His Puerto Rico and dual language background would bring a unique perspective that is not currently on the board.

Karen Williams

- It was mentioned that Karen could be the 7th candidate.
- It was mentioned that Karen was a maybe.
- There was no preference or strong opinions about either Karen or Ignacio.
- It was suggested to invite both Karen and Ignacio.

Kaliska Day

- There was no comment about Kaliska Day.

Summary:

It was concluded to interview the following candidates:

1. Gabriela Saldañes-Lopez
2. Karen Spencer
3. Mia Sabanovic
4. Lisa Reynolds
5. Max Jones
6. Mike Weedall
7. Ignacio Falcon
8. Karen Williams
9. Kaliska Day (possibly, based on candidate availability)