

## Portland Utility Board

June 4, 2019 4:00pm – 7:00pm  
1900 SW Fourth Avenue, 1900 Building, Room 2500C  
Meeting #69

### Attendees:

#### *PUB Members:*

Colleen Johnson  
Allan Warman (left at 6:00pm)  
Heidi Bullock  
Ted Labbe  
Robert Martineau  
Micah Meskel  
Dan Peterson (left at 5:45pm)  
Dory Robinson  
Ana Brophy, ex officio  
Van Le, ex officio (left at 5:45pm)

#### *PUB Members (terms begin July 1, 2019):*

Brian Laurent, ex officio  
Sara Petrocine, ex officio (left at 6:25pm)

#### *Absent:*

\*Mike Weedall  
\*Notice of absence provided prior to meeting

#### *Staff:*

Dawn Uchiyama (Deputy Director, Bureau of Environmental Services)  
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)  
Jeff Winner (Capital Improvement Program Planning Supervisor, Portland Water Bureau)  
Cristina Nieves (Representative, Commissioner Fritz's Office)  
Alexandra Martin (Executive Assistant, City Budget Office)  
Amy Archer-Masters (PUB Analyst, 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 and the Bureau of Environmental Services.

He gave an overview of the agenda which included a staffing update, a message from Commissioner Amanda Fritz on Charter Protection of Bull Run, new PUB member appointee discussions and recommendations, a BES Strategic Plan update, and a BES administrative review update.

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

**II. Prior Meeting Minutes**

Cinthia had circulated the draft minutes from the May 7, 2019 meeting. Allan asked if there were changes or correction to the minutes.

Seeing none, the minutes were accepted.

**III. Public Comment**

There was no public comment.

**IV. Disclosure of Communications**

Micah disclosed his communications with BES staff and staff in Commissioner Fish's office on urban forestry developments.

Heidi disclosed communications related to Portland Harbor and community engagement and communication on the PUB recruitments.

Allan disclosed communications with City staff in various bureaus including the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability, BES, and Water.

Ana disclosed communications with City staff on the PUB recruitments.

**V. Staffing Update, Jessica Kinard, Interim Director, City Budget Office**

Jessica summarized the staffing needs; the recruitment is for one full-time coordinator and one part-time analyst. The coordinator posting closed on June 3, 2019; the eligible list is being created.

Alexandra was been scheduling interviews. The Coordinator interviews will happen first. The first-round interview panels will be comprised of two PUB members, one Budget Office staff member, and one staff member from either BES or Water.

The second-round interview panels plan to include Jessica, Allan, and Colleen.

Jessica had asked for a volunteer to look through applications and is working on arranging this involvement. She said if any member would like to be involved they should contact the Budget Office.

Heidi asked about the number of candidates in the first and final round interviews.

Jessica said she normally allows up to seven first-round candidates. The second-round is usually three to four candidates. This is flexible based on the recruitment results.

Jessica noted Cinthia's last day was Friday. She said Amy had agreed to extend her temporary appointment to provide coverage while the permanent placement is filled.

#### **VI. PUB Member Recognition and Ex-Officio Member Introduction**

Colleen said this is the last formal meeting for a few PUB members.

She thanked Dan for his thoughtful and articulate contributions. She said Lee, though not at meeting, was a board member from the beginning or almost the beginning and that he is a gracious individual who brought great experience to the board. She noted Van brought managerial experience and expertise. She concluded that Mike decided to not continue with an application for a second term and that he brought passion and experience to his work at PUB. She said these four people have done a great job and deserve a round of applause for their service.

Dan said he appreciated working with the PUB and hoped for the board's continued success.

Van said she would miss the passionate discussion about the community and water supply.

Colleen and Gabe introduced Sara Petrocine, the new ex-officio member from Water. Sara said she does legislative work concerning Water and is the legal affairs coordinator, the intergovernmental coordinator. She said she administers legislative and federal programs and project work.

#### **VII. Charter Protection of Bull Run, Amanda Fritz, City of Portland Commissioner**

Commissioner Fritz introduced the topic of the charter protection at Bull Run. She is initiating her ballot measure campaign for three possible charter changes. The campaign started in relation to a discussion on the land exchange. She said there was nothing in the charter about Bull Run. Although code does provide protections, a charter should mandate code.

She mentioned the vulnerability of Bull Run. She said with the filtration plant coming online in 2028 and the recent fires in the Gorge which came close to the Bull Run Watershed there was a need for continued protections for Bull Run.

She also described a change which would allow the City to enter into intergovernmental agreements for mutual aid. She mentioned the Anderson lawsuit in which the City was told it should not have helped New Orleans after Hurricane Katrina. They have since determined that there are not legal issues but that the Charter should be updated to specifically allow these agreements. She said when a large earthquake event impacts Portland we will need other cities.

She also described a need for public access to green space incidental to water sites. She said when reasonable there should be public access especially considering the increasing density of Portland.

She concluded that she wanted to leave Water in better shape than when she started. She is not waiting for the charter commission because these issues could get buried in a host of other political discussions. The language is still in draft form. She welcomed feedback and noted the June 26<sup>th</sup> is the date the charter amendment resolutions will go before Council.

Allan asked what the acreage change was with regards to the land exchange.

- Sara responded about 2800 acres for federal and 2200 for the City.

Allan asked if that includes the future treatment plant.

- Sara said no.

Micah said this effort demonstrates concern and that even with filtration underway there are threats.

Commissioner Fritz said her first involvement with the City was when she participated in grant writing related to the Markham site and developed the Family Watershed Education Project. She said she has been to Bull Run twice, once as a field trip chaperone and once when she became commissioner. Access to Bull Run should be limited – it is a once in a lifetime trip.

Ted said this was great work and he thanked the commissioner for her leadership. Regarding the Anderson case, related efforts are important to do as a community.

Fritz said she thought the judge was wrong and council can decide when to use funds. \_\_\_ will not spend rate money, especially when the City is having issues funding programs that are purely recreational.

She solicited emails on this topic and provided her email address:

[Amanda@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:Amanda@portlandoregon.gov).

She said this campaign will rely on word of mouth. Staff can give out information, like the Parks bond measure, staff can disseminate information but cannot ask people to vote for or against any measure. She said people could ask their friends and neighbors to vote on it. She noted they tried to write the ballot measure in plain English and would take edits on the language.

Micah suggested that PUB should write a letter of endorsement at a future meeting and consider holding a public meeting with information on the measure.

Ted recommended cooperation with the Intertwine Alliance, given the significance as a regional water source and alignment with the Metro bond.

## **VIII. New PUB Member Appointee Recommendations**

Amy briefed the board on the progress of the subcommittee. She referenced memos and minutes sent to the board and provided in hardcopy. The committee last met yesterday. The

memos have information on applicants and their interest in serving on the board and includes a summary of the subcommittee committee's work and the status of the recommendations.

One of the subcommittees reviewed resumes and decided who to interview.

Interviews were then held. One of the applicants was unable to participate.

The memo includes the final recommendation on the front; included is background on what the full committee recommended.

Amy mentioned the candidate Mia Sabanovic is a BES employee. There was a concern about the ratio of City staff on the board. There are currently four City employees (one voting and 3 ex-officio). This candidate was recommended by a majority of the subcommittee. The subcommittee identified an alternate candidate pending the board's decision on the BES employee.

Allan noted that code allocates the positions.

Amy agreed and noted that there are 5 City employees - one of the current voting board members was sworn in as a community member before she became an employee of an unrelated bureau (BDS). There are three ex officio members. One voting member is required to be a represented employee.

Amy said there are four voting member vacancies. There are three three-year terms and one one-year term. The one-year term member would be able to apply for an additional three-year term after they have served one year. The subcommittee had asked Cristina get guidance from the Commissioner-in-Charge.

Cristina said that both commissioners were supportive of the candidates that would most benefit the board. Both commissioners noted individuals with community relationships would benefit PUB. They also questioned the individual's capacity to serve on the board as City employees with commitments to their work and were satisfied with her candidacy.

Micah said public perception is important and they should consider the optics and ramifications of having an advisory with heavy City employee representation.

Dan said it is significant that the candidate is a City employee and he was surprised the subcommittee would consider them.

Colleen said she has pushed the issue and is not anti-staff. She wanted to have an open dialogue about the different issues. The current membership is over 40% is City staff. If a Police advisory body had that composition it would be the same issue, though PUB is lower profile.

Ted said he appreciated what the subcommittee grappled with. They had a good pool of applicants but agreed the membership of City staff is problematic.

Ana said the candidate Mia's status as an employee is a great advantage though she understands the perception issues.

Micah noted the candidates could be judged solely on their community connections and not on their professional background.

Van said there are several principles to choose from. The board is a public advisory body and who PUB represents is important. She advised members to look at their guiding principles.

Brian asked what data the City and the Board have about how people feel about the PUB.

Colleen said they have seen the public will come to meetings to speak about filtration and corrosion control. There is a distrust of the utilities and the focus is Water. PUB's purpose is to increase community oversight of the utilities.

Carol said that on the topic of public perception, PUB was founded after a ballot measure to defeat the move to private control of the utilities. The Blue Ribbon Commission's goal was to try to bring peace. She said she understands the political issues that inform the decision but also sees the benefits of including this individual on the Board.

Rob said his employment status at Water caused there to be a stipulation that there will be one ex-officio representative from Water and two from BES.

Colleen said the ordinance says one representative will be from Water and two from BES; bracketed is one will be from a represented group. The union member has a vote and this is related to how BACs work.

Carol said there three advisory committees were dissolved because of PUB: the PURB and Water and BES's BACs.

Ted referenced PUB's origin. The body was formed in reaction to discussions on mismanagement of public resources. The Anderson lawsuit was part of an attempt to privatize the utilities.

Micah said he agrees with Colleen about maintaining public perception.

Rob noted some candidates may not be employees of the City of Portland but other municipalities with potential conflict.

Colleen said her issue was mainly on potential conflicts.

Rob said he didn't want to be the leading discussion and would not vote.

Amy said she investigated other advisory commissions and boards. There are different blends; several boards and commissions are all public and have no staff. Others are bureau advisory committees with council guidelines. There are standards around bureau advisory committees, sometimes code stipulates membership is half community and half staff. PUB is between the two models.

Ted noted the potential for many different conflicts of interest.

Amy noted it is key to know how to deal with conflicts if they come up. For example, Dory in her former role at DEQ had potential conflicts. The board needs to establish how to deal with circumstances on a case by case basis. As an applicant, declaring or speaking about potential conflicts is confusing because people may not understand the decisions being made yet. If there is a conflict it is possible to discuss the conflict when it arises and move forward appropriately.

Colleen said there likely is no legal conflict of city staff on the board. The issue is mainly one of perception and how that might impact trust and integrity.

Ted noted that regarding public perception, research in April or May 2017 showed that the public does not know there are two different utility bureaus. Ted noted he brought a copy of the research.

Amy reminded the board that there are three three-year openings and one one-year opening.

Rob said he would like to see a member filling a term of one year, he would like to see them be able to be reappointed to a two-year term.

Amy said if someone is appointed to a partial term they can be reappointed to two full terms.

Allan asked if it is required that they reinterview to be reappointed.

Amy said that code does not clearly define the process for appointments, but that there are guidelines for interviews to be done.

Van asked if the board must fill all four slots.

Colleen noted the challenge to have a quorum if not all positions filled. They would still need six members to form a quorum.

Dan asked if the committee spoke about the different term options.

Amy said everyone who interviewed said they were interested in three-year terms.

Rob noted the current quorum is six but that the definition of their quorum is 50% plus one so even with just ten members we would still need a quorum of six.

Allan said during his involvement in PUB the board has always maintained a collection of skills.

Amy referred the memo that shows the current skill set and demographics and the subcommittee did consider the range of skills in making their recommendation.

Rob said in his review of the candidates, if the City employee was not approved, Karen Williams would be nominated for approval. He noted they both have heavily technical backgrounds, but their skill sets are different. One of the candidates is an asset manager and one is a hydrologist.

Van suggested members not focus on the individuals.

Amy said the code does not define limits to those principles. She noted the subcommittee had to work with individuals given the existing code.

Dory said although focusing on values was a valid objective, when reviewing candidates and interviewing it would be difficult to gauge two candidates with principles not already established.

Heidi requested the board address this problem and come to a decision on the proportion of City staff on the board. For this recruitment, the focus was on the candidates' professional backgrounds and who the board would most benefit from and who would most improve outcomes. Though she was concerned about the ratio of City staff nearing 50%, without a policy conflict she favored the original recommendations.

Brian suggested the Board unpack the 40%; most of these members are not voting members. One is not employee of the two bureaus.

Amy said it will be important to clarify the conflict of interest issues.

Dory noted all members come from privileged positions. They have levels of expertise that are uncommon. The public perception is that they bring a high level of information to the board while being detached and distant from true community needs.

Ana said when interviewing the candidates, they were thinking about their connections to the community. The community should see themselves represented by the board.

Colleen said perception is an important factor. If the board is to conduct successful public engagement in the coming years, they must have public trust.

Amy suggested the board consider the two candidates who were scored highest.

Colleen motioned to recommend applicants Kaliska Day and Gabriela Saldaña-López for two of the three-year terms.

- Micah seconded the motion.
- There was no public comment.
- All aye.

Colleen motioned to recommend Karen Spencer for a three-year term.

- Rob seconded the motion.
- There was no public comment.
- All aye.

Allan said the remaining term is for one year.

Heidi motioned to recommend Mia for one-year term.

- Dory seconded the motion.
- There was no public comment.

- Allan asked who was in favor of recommending Mia Sabanovic for the one-year term.
- Three said ayes.
- Four were opposed.
- Rob abstained.
- The motion failed.

Heidi motioned to not appoint the one-year vacancy and to leave it vacant for the next round of applications.

- Dory seconded.
  - Dory said she sees a benefit to waiting until there is clarity on the City staff ratio.
  - Micah suggested an amendment to allow a vote once the charter has been solidified.
    - Colleen asked if this motion proposes another recruitment in September when the bylaws are updated.
    - Heidi said no, it was not intended to open another recruitment. The motion is to wait until an appropriate time when there would be a three-year term available.
    - Colleen asked what the rationale is.
    - Heidi said it was to find candidates the board supports.
    - Van asked if Council would be able to fill the vacant position if they only recommend three members.
    - Amy said yes.
    - Rob said the only appropriate reason to not fill the position is a lack of qualified candidates. Beyond that, he considers it an obligation to fill every vacancy.
    - Dory said the reason we are taking this action is important. It is not because of a lack of candidates. She said a lack of clarity created these two vacancies.
    - Rob said whoever is appointed would likely to reapply in one year and they can reevaluate the situation in one year.
    - Carol asked if the amendment was seconded.
    - Micah said no.
  - Ted asked about the asterisks on the alternate voting.
  - Heidi said she didn't have an alternate. Her opinion changed after the first review period.
  - Dory said one of the candidates would bring an immense level of knowledge and be able to answer questions on water health.
  - Rob referenced the subcommittee notes.
  - Amy said the recommendation was not a personal vote; it is based on the majority. Two or three candidates were in the next tier and people were struggling based on specific knowledge and skills while trying to evaluate the best fit. Ultimately there was a decision to choose an alternate.
  - Rob asked if there were candidates who were not qualified or not recommended.
  - Amy said yes.
  - Rob said if there were qualified candidates they should not leave a vacancy.

- Colleen said there is a motion and a second to leave the vacancy until the expiration of the term.
- The motion was abandoned and not finalized.

Rob motioned to vote on not making a recommendation on the one-year term.

- Dory seconded.
- Two members were in favor.
- The majority opposed. The motion failed.

The board discussed the candidates.

Rob motioned to recommend Karen Williams for the one-year term.

- Ted seconded.
- There was no public comment.
- Rob noted he is represented by AFSME; this union represents DEQ as well; Rob knows who Karen Williams is.
- Ted said he thinks this is the best idea. The only other option is recommending the previously approved new candidates and asking Council to decide on the remaining vacancy.
- Colleen suggested they vote on the motion (to recommend Karen Williams to a one-year term).
  - Five in favor
  - Three opposed.
  - Motion passed.

**IX. BES Strategic Plan, Dawn Uchiyama, Maiya Delgoda, and Becky Tilson, Bureau of Environmental Services**

Dawn said they would provide an update on the ten-year strategic plan; they presented an overview at a past meeting and would give more detail now.

She introduced her colleagues Maiya Delgoda and Becky Tilson.

The ground work for the strategic plan was laid with a 20-question survey. They had a 75% response rate. The employees articulated changes needed at the bureau. They knew they needed to consider how decisions were made and had to double throughput of Capital Improvement Projects (CIPs). They launched CIP prep which led to the transition team's work. This work is focused on project delivery. The bureau realized they needed to look upstream; this promoted them to look at the whole organization. They have reoriented the bureau to the overall strategy.

The first priority is performance metrics. Data management is the second priority. Equity, diversity, and inclusion is next. They have hired two people focused on equity. Workforce development and culture is the next priority.

She referenced a slide on the implementation overview.

Dawn spoke about the priorities in the plan. Maiya will speak about performance measures and results-based accountability. They want a high performing organization with a strong customer orientation. There are metrics related to equity; there is a process develop these metrics.

Data management is focused on optimizing governance and data security. An IT governance group has been formed and is looking at strategies.

Equity and inclusion information was detailed and Dawn referenced three goal areas on slide 7. This is the basis for workforce development. Alice has done a survey and is looking at the results.

Colleen asked what Dawn meant by bureau culture.

Dawn said the culture was influenced by engineering services and the delivery of CIP. The effort now is to respect that history but expand to ownership. They are working toward shared ownership across all priorities. The bureau's employees are good at working hard and having heavy workloads. Not enough attention has been paid to employee's needs in the workforce, such as support in advancing their careers and providing the training they need. This is an opportunity to look at what their workforce needs. The expectations are changing. They need to create an inclusive work environment. They are taking actions to provide resources to employees.

Dawn referenced slide 8 on their survey. This survey also had a high response rate of 62%. Many survey respondents provided responses that were connected to the priorities in the strategic plan. They noted the need for more robust career development and training and improved performance reviews and equity.

Becky is leading the transition team and has activated 10% of this work.

A strong focus is communication and engagement. The team focuses on brainstorming, holds office hours, and proactively communicates with employees. There is an employee newsletter. External communications have been limited. PUB is the first circle outside of the bureau. This summer they will be developing community engagement. They are working with Water, PBOT, and Parks.

The strategic plan is meant to measure progress and adjust the bureau's priorities.

Maiya said she came to BES last year as a change and communications manager. She will be providing an update about the strategic plan.

Performance measures will be implemented in phases. They are in phase two. In phase one they researched what other cities did. Results-based accountability includes the best-known practices. Lessons have been learned from the enhanced process. Phase two is the functional descriptions of the measures. This is the most granular level and they are building performance measures on these outputs to address how they performed. Phase two also includes collecting performance measures from 75+ functions. There are 300 primary functions.

Colleen asked for an example of functions.

Maiya said for example with impervious areas, the goal is to have fewer hard surfaces so there is less going into the collection system. They measure number of gallons.

They also ask the question who is impacted, if they are providing services equitably, and how they compare with other agencies.

Phase three will include looking at the new budget process and having a process to define community indicators or community outcome measures.

Phase four's goal is to improve equity.

Phase five is improving services. They will identify gaps and opportunities to be more innovative.

They engage PUB and Council throughout the process.

Heidi asked about the timeline.

Maiya said they are in phase two now. Phase five will take place next fiscal year. They are targeting the end of June 2020.

Colleen said PUB has been concerned about needing information on performance measures for the next budget.

Heidi asked if the plan will be implemented in this budget process.

Maiya said some will be implemented this budget year and the process is iterative; it will be improved over time.

Ted asked if it was possible to engage PUB in stage 3. He asked if PUB will be able to weigh in on performance measures as well. He asked if Colleen had alluded to PUB being involved in performance measure development.

Colleen said yes, she would like to review and has input in development.

Ted said PUB should be more involved in the process and progress and not just hear about decisions that have already been made.

Colleen said being able to provide their input sooner would be better.

Maiya said the bureau does want to engage with PUB and will have performance measures to review in phase three in October.

Becky said she has worked at the bureau for six and half years. She is a project manager for the transition team. There are six focus areas and encompass most of the bureau to look at the entire business process. The focus is on three types of improvement; each team focuses on all three. They collect feedback and provide recommendation. There are six different focus teams.

There has been robust stakeholder engagement. They are gleaning the expertise of stakeholders. It is an iterative process.

Change implantation is focused in the project management office. It was staffed by two people. There have been interviews to hire additional staff to launch the PMO. The industry standard is to have a PMO. They could stop there; the PMO will address the unmet maintenance needs. There is a need to look upstream to learn what leads into project delivery. The next round of implementation is in September.

They are working on reinforcing change with training and development.

Slide 15 shows some risks in the planning process. Orange shows different ways to deliver on solutions. They need to think about the CIP in context and with other bureaus.

Becky said if PUB wanted to provide feedback they would welcome it.

Dory said it was an ambitious plan. She asked how they would support onboarding of project managers.

Becky said two people launched the PMO. Because the PMO is new they are building something.

Brian asked how they will encourage workforce development.

Dory noted the specific education of PMI certified project management. This is not the purest form of project management. She asked about workload and if they were asking project manager to produce deliverables they were not familiar with.

Becky said there are separate functions of design engineers and project managers. The office could become a center of excellence for project managers in other parts of the bureau. She agreed it was an ambitious plan; they are trying to set up the organization to solve challenges down the line.

Ana made a comment related to Dory's comment on the PMO hiring certified PMI specialized trainer, scheduler. The outreach has been internal and there is an effort to look at talent within bureaus. Hopefully there will be a supportive environment.

Ted commented on the limited external communications to date. He heard increased communications efforts are coming this summer. There is a lot for the general public to absorb; he wondered about the list of external stakeholders.

Dawn said she was interested in looking at suggestion for public stakeholders. She acknowledged the bureau is not connected enough to the community. They need to increase accountability and transparency. They have assembled a group of people committed to building to stronger commutations and are holding focus groups on community engagement. They are dedicated to public involvement in the watershed. They are taking feedback from a stakeholder group.

Becky recognized the need to coordinate internally with community groups and union reps.

Ted said community partners can help translate and provide case studies that will illustrate how the plan will affect bureau operations. It would be useful to meet with community groups now and not go to community when the plan is already solidified.

Dory agreed and said it would be good to hold listening sessions with communities or partner organizations that represent districts. She advised the bureau to go to the listening session with the ability to explain why these goals benefit the bureau. She recommended partnering with an organization like Prosper Portland which frequently interacts in this way.

Ana added the Office of Equity and Human Rights.

Dawn said they would be back in fall to share progress. Maiya will return to share performance metrics and will seek help formulating the measures. They will have an update on workforce and culture goals. When they come back, Dawn said she wanted to discuss community engagement work. They need insight on how to talk to the public and what to say. She wanted the community to have an opportunity to share their priorities.

**X. Administrative Code Review, Rachele Altman**

Amy introduced the BES administrative review and referenced the fact sheet.

Rachele introduced herself. She is a policy analyst at BES working on transparency in the code and rules related to the administrative review process. There are over 30 administrative rules in title 17 to implement code. There are changes on the transparency related what is reviewable and what is not. There are also changes related to what it is possible to use staff time for. The comment period is open until June 21, 2019. The hearing is scheduling for next Tuesday, June 11.

Micah asked if they were conducting outreach and soliciting comments. He suggested sending a communication to people who had previously applied for and administrative review.

Rachele said no and noted the hearing is advertised on the website homepage, Oregonian, the Daily journal of Commerce and the City news page. They don't hold lists of people who have applied for an administrative review. She agreed a communication would be good for bigger changes. When they engage in substantive changes it would be good to do more targeted outreach.

Rob said he is looking for something more substantive in the changes. The changes seem to memorialize what's happening and is not restrictive of current policies. The changes include updates and gender-neutral language changes. It appeared there were no substantive rule changes.

Rachele said yes.

Ana asked if they considered using other publications, for example Skanner which is a publication more well-read by diverse communities.

Colleen asked if there would be anyone adversely affected by the changes.

Rachele said some rules previously had no associated deadline. There will be a deadline per the proposed changes; for any deadline changes the timeline is at least as generous or more generous.

Brian asked for examples of different settings to understand the audiences affected.

Rachele said an example is in regulated industries that are issued permits or must pay charges for enforcement actions. An example of an affected project is converting a nonconforming sewer to conforming. Systems development charges could result in a request for a review. If a customer thinks there is an error and we agree, it is not a good use of our time to conduct a review; it would be better to correct the mistake.

Colleen repeated that public comments are due by June 21, 2019.

#### **XI. PUB General Updates, Amy Archer-Masters**

Amy said with Mike leaving the Board, there is a need for members to participate in upcoming Administrative Review Committees on June 11, July 9, and August 13.

- Dory said she could go July 9.
- Amy said she would contact other members to fill June 11.

There are several subcommittee meetings and minutes and Amy did not hear feedback. The minutes need to be accepted.

- Heidi and Dory said they did not create records while participating in the subcommittee.
- Rob motioned to accept the minutes as written. Heidi seconded the motion. The minutes were accepted.

Amy discussed the outcome of the subcommittee workplan and schedule. There are two key decisions. She asked if members agreed to hold three-hour Tuesday meetings. She also asked if the second Thursday meeting should be subcommittee meeting. Amy is looking for June date for the fieldtrip to Mt. Tabor. The trip will inform PUB before budget season starts. The July 18 subcommittee meeting will be on community engagement. It will include discussions and information from bureau staff who are engagement experts. August's meeting does not have a firm topic. A possibility is water efficiency. September's meeting is on lead. Ted and Heidi are planning this meeting.

Amy repeated her question on the meeting time and asked if the PUB agreed to meet for three hours from 4:00pm to 7:00pm.

Members decided to meet 3:30pm to 6:30pm.

Ana mentioned the BES performance measures could be a topic for a subcommittee.

Micah added bylaw reform, City staff, and PUB membership.

--DRAFT--

Rob entered his draft of the bilingual premium pay support letter into the record and said he would like to submit it to PUB for their edits. He said he would like to send this to Council so we could close it off the PUB workplan.

Amy said she would combine edits to Rob's document and have something to decide on at the next meeting.

Amy said the July 2<sup>nd</sup> meeting would include swearing in for new members, voting on the co-chair, and a contractor's presentation on the comprehensive rate review.

Amy asked for a quorum check and said she would do another this week.

The meeting adjourned at 6:58