

Central City TIF Exploration
Business Retention/Recruitment Subcommittee Meeting #3

Microsoft Teams Meeting
February 5th, 2024, 8:30 – 10:00 am

Meeting Summary:

Kimberly Branam welcomed the committee and reviewed the meeting agenda.

Equity Framework:

Sarah Harpole reviewed the social equity framework for the committee to consider when thinking about the implementation of TIF and refining the project list. Key considerations include disproportionate impacts, shared benefits, accessibility, economic opportunity and wealth creation, and accountability. Kimberly added that both the Portland Housing Bureau and Prosper Portland have equity frameworks with targets to ensure that minority owned businesses benefit from these projects. It is also important to think generally about who benefits from these projects.

Project List & Map:

Sarah discussed the project list and geographic priorities map which synthesizes information and feedback from all three subcommittees. Sarah noted that the project list is intentionally broad to allow for flexibility across the life of a new district and is intended to serve as a menu of investment opportunities. Specific geographic and/or project input is important to keep in mind as we look at boundary scenarios for different geographic areas. Kimberly asked the subcommittee whether there is anything missing from this map?

- *Question:* Do these diamonds refer to specific projects that have been identified? *Answer:* Most of them are general highlights of what we heard the area will need, but some are specific such as the USPS site preparation.
- *Question:* It looks like the downtown area has the most colors, how does this future planning tie into projects that are already well studied? *Answer:* OMSI for example has an approved master plan but they do not have full funding, and there are tens of millions of dollars necessary to unlock that plan. There is a subcommittee focused specifically on the large-scale opportunity sites and you can see their input reflected in this project list. We will need to have conversations about sequencing and timing of projects as we look at cash flow with the TIF districts and the established master plans.

Project Prioritization:

Kimberly asked the committee about their top priorities in the early years of new districts (2025 – 2030)?

- Idea of separate buckets, one for placemaking and one for attracting/retaining businesses. Housing as a separate bucket as well.
- Placemaking will help with business recruitment, creating a downtown that people want to come to is important.

- Quality should be another layer. We have a history of doing things that don't stand the test of time and are trendier, we need to make sure the investments are well considered for the long game, and well designed.
- Not all placemaking needs to be equal, different neighborhoods have different needs based on who is interacting with those places.
- Maintaining flexibility for future projects but opening with a big signature project. Redoing the waterfront park downtown to launch with the TIF investments for example.
- There is a way to do placemaking and partnership building that is different than has been done in the past. In a way that is culturally specific, contemporary, and innovative. The OMSI plan is working closely with the Center for Tribal Nations for example.

Implementation & Oversight:

Sarah reviewed the range of examples for governance models for TIF district plans. These are some things that will be consistent across all plans but there are different models for engagement and oversight. Thinking about what the right model is for the different geographies. Kimberly continued that there are pros and cons for every model, for example, some models are more efficient and opportunistic, some are more collaborative and consultative but are more resource intensive. From an expectation standpoint, there are different dynamics for each of them.

Kimberly asked the committee: who are the key stakeholders that should be engaged in future budget planning and implementation oversight, and what is the appropriate governance model?

- *Question:* given your experience with the three different models and the scope of these districts, what would you suggest as a model that makes the most sense? *Answer:* A lot of it comes down to trust and how much trust people have in government and government processes to be responsive to community needs. For example, in East Portland there is a very low level of trust because of gentrification and displacement with the history of urban renewal not accounting for the needs of the existing community. Historically downtown partners are more comfortable engaging with government processes, but we want to hear from you. In the beginning of a district, models with greater collaboration make more sense and trust and relationships build, and then you can lean more toward the left model as priorities are well established.
- It seems like there is consensus of what needs to be done downtown and we won't want to get in our own way. We need to execute and be timely, particularly downtown. The people that would be engaged would be different for business recruitment and retention versus placemaking so maybe there could be separate committees.
- In the Central Eastside, there are development projects where we know what needs to be done and who specifically need to be at the table to avoid complication. Placemaking for Central Eastside is about safe walking corridors and that doubles as business recruitment/retention. We do need to engage the community and get feedback from employers and employees. Perhaps the Central Eastside needs a little bit of both.
- Maybe there could be a two-speed approach with a launch committee to get things going for the big splash in the beginning with a separate more deliberate process that will have a longer timeline.
- Thinking about ratepayers in the Business Districts, they are paying a lot and need to be engaged.

- Each TIF district has a unique plan and requirements. There are organizations that have capacity and history that need to be consulted throughout the process, but also balancing the voices that are influencing the TIF district projects.
- Beyond the formal seats on the committee, there are many ways to structure community involvement.
- *Question:* If AVT elects to not be a part of the TIF district, do you feel that the cocreation model is appropriate for other plans? *Answer:* There is value. For example, in Cully the plan has a menu of projects that can be funded with TIF dollars, and the five-year action plans specify what projects will be funded. Even if AVT doesn't go forward with a TIF district, the cocreation model is still relevant and valuable for other geographies.

With business retention and recruitment, many of those activities are confidential and need to be agile in response. What does partnership and engagement look like with that in mind?

- Creating the atmosphere that the tenant wants to be in whether that is within the four walls or in the general surrounding area.
- The range of things that can be done to recruit and retain can range from small improvements to large scale projects like Vestas, there are limited but real examples where sizable but real investments are confidential and responsive. Making sure that there are opportunity funds that can be used for a specific purpose.

Closing & Next Steps:

Kimberly reviewed the next steps and timeline. Staff will have district scenarios and initial financial modeling available for review and input at the March Steering Committee Meeting.

Business Recruitment & Retention Sub-Committee Attendance

Name	Affiliation	Present
Committee Members		
Jeff Renfro	Multnomah County	y
Dana White	Portland Public Schools	
Kimberly Branam	Prosper Portland	y
Monique Claiborne	Greater Portland Inc	y
Andrew Fitzpatrick	Office of Mayor Wheeler	y
Peter Andrews	Melvin Mark	y
Justin Hobson	Miller Nash	
Lauren Peng	CBRE	
Jason Chupp	Swinerton	
Sydney Mead	Portland Metro Chamber	
Nicole Davison Leon	Hispanic Chamber	y
Jessie Burke	Old Town Community Association	
Carolyne Holcomb	Central Eastside Industrial Council	y
Jessica Curtis	Brookfield Properties / Pioneer Place	y
Marc Brune	PAE Engineers	y
Angel Medina	Republica	
Brian Ferriso	Portland Art Museum / Travel Portland Board	y
Brad Cloepfil	Allied Works	y
Staff		
Shea Flaherty Betin	Prosper Portland	y
Andrea Gall	Prosper Portland	y
Joe Mollusky	Prosper Portland	y
Lisa Abuaf	Prosper Portland	
Sandra Wood	BPS	
Sarah Figliozi	PBOT	y
Kristin Hull	PBOT	
Rachael Hoy	BPS	y
Sarah Harpole	Prosper Portland	y
Kiana Ballo	Prosper Portland	y