

## East Portland TIF Exploration: 82<sup>nd</sup> Ave

### Meeting #4 Notes – February 21st, 2024

Attendees: Joshue Pangelinan, Zonnyo Riger, Jacob Loeb, Nick Sauvie, Alisa Kajikawa, Zachary Lauritzen, Nancy Chapin, Barbara Geier, Jamal Dar, Valeria Vidal

Staff: Camille Trummer, Roger Gonzalez, Kathryn Hartinger, Dana DeKlyen, Paula Byrd, Kiana Ballo, Jessica Conner, Brian Moore, Robert Smith

#### Notes:

1. Camille Trummer welcomed committee members and reviewed the meeting goals and agenda.
2. Staff shared [this presentation](#).
3. Kathryn Hartinger provided an overview of the TIF Exploration Timeline highlighting the public engagement opportunities in the coming months.
4. Paula Byrd discussed community engagement activities including developing TIF 101 materials (presentation slide deck and leave behind hand out, will be translated in other languages once it is finalized in English), outreach to increase awareness (information in newsletters, sharing with networks, canvassing), healing sessions to unpack harms of urban renewal and gathering feedback, direct surveys/polls to capture priorities/investment types/project lists/identify gaps, short video on TIF exploration, partner organization hosted forum/focus group to review draft information and gathering feedback, presentations to groups, and public open houses. The survey lives on the Rosewood Initiative website if anyone wants to take the survey or share it with your networks. The Community Leader Luncheon is scheduled for March 1<sup>st</sup> which is bringing together the groups identified in working group conversations to increase awareness around the TIF exploration process, community engagement, and potential partnership opportunities. If you know of any religious institutions that should be included in a faith-based organization open house, please let us know.
5. Kathryn continued that if there are any organizations that working group members are affiliated with, please talk to them about this process, let them know about office hours, and help us get on agendas/get coffee/get connected.
6. Kathryn added that this relationship building is critical for the long haul to ensure the community priorities are upheld throughout the process. This is a 20–30-year relationship building process so even if folks are busy now, it will be great to get to know them and connect with them sooner rather than later. A reminder that the community leadership committee will support TIF district governance and implementation throughout the process.
7. Kathryn provided a high-level asset and opportunity map based on the previous working group conversation. Are the assets and opportunities falling within the boundary? What is missing? This map is an important snapshot of what the working group was thinking about when developing the draft district boundaries.
  - a. *Comment:* There are 1.34 acres property behind AYCO that we would like to include. AYCO will be planning to develop for Mental health/ Housing development.

- b. *Comment:* 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue business association is not on this map. *Question:* Do they have a physical space to put on this map? *Response:* No but they are an asset.
8. Kathryn reminded the committee of the original boundaries based on guidance from the steering committee and discussed the inclusion/exclusion conversation from the last meeting to reduce the boundary to achieve the acreage goals. Last time, the committee discussed adding the commercial corridor from Holgate South and including a Stark finger while potentially shortening fingers to 10 blocks, removing higher value SF properties near Rocky Butte and between Glisan & Burnside, removing schools and existing parks, and maybe removing the Ellington property. Are there any strong feelings about these and if so, why?
- a. *Comment:* How much acreage to remove? *Answer:* 328 acres from the original boundary.
  - b. *Question:* Is it correct that the city is taking ownership of 82<sup>nd</sup>? Is the money coming in applying to all 82<sup>nd</sup>? *Response:* the money is specifically for transportation investments along the corridor and extends past the city/county line. This is specific for transportation investments, but TIF funds could be complimentary to those investments.
  - c. *Comment:* The 185 million can only be sent on the Portland side right of way.
  - d. *Question:* The crosshatch area got added to the south? *Answer:* That was part of the discussion last time, it sounded like the corridor in that area was the most important section to include out of that area given the limited acreage.
  - e. *Comment:* It would be great to see more land in the south area and more residential land to the west with potential for mixed-use housing. Any added residential that is close to 82<sup>nd</sup> will strengthen the commercial corridor there. Take away the stuff that backs onto the freeway.
  - f. *Comment:* The cuts must be ruthless at this point. The area in the south is part of the active Lents district. The area next to the freeway needs to be included because it needs the most help. The boundary going up to the highway hits some important areas that should be included.
  - g. *Question:* If this was not an acreage issue, would you have opposition? *Comment:* If acreage was not an issue, then the whole area should be in.
  - h. *Comment:* Could be more mixed-use south of Woodstock too.
  - i. *Comment:* Nothing west of 82<sup>nd</sup> is part of Lents from Flavel south. So, would going 2-5 blocks west starting at Flavel be something to think about?
  - j. *Comment:* The land along the freeway is a border vacuum. It would be a challenge to find any transformative development along the freeway. Another thing, how does this district interact with the other potential districts?
  - k. *Comment:* There are caps for each district to stay within. All potential districts are trying to narrow their boundaries to fit in the acreage cap as well. If you make a district too small, it cannot be supportive or transformative.
  - l. *Comment:* The Brentwood-Darlington NA Area is important to support. Fumes from the freeway are not healthy.
  - m. *Comment:* The neighborhood area by 205 has housing density, there is a pathway that is somewhat of a boundary between the single family and multifamily areas on the

eastern side. There is a good opportunity for better density, walkability, and connections even though it is adjacent to the freeway.

- n. *Comment:* They are working to close out the Lents district by the end of the year to provide room for this district.
- o. *Comment:* Adding 3 blocks west of 82nd from Powell south is approximate 300 acres.
- p. *Comment:* The Stark finger would be great to have more investment there, but other communities have more need. *Response:* It was originally out for that reason, but this came up in the last working group. The reasoning for adding it is because it would help address the 15-minute neighborhood goal and can help utilize the high property values in the area to support other areas.
- q. *Comment:* There are some good development opportunities for vacant properties in the Stark finger area. It can contribute a great deal to the success of the area since it is already tracking in the right direction, it is a good catalyst point.
- r. *Comment:* School areas and parks, the needs for those parks should be reconsidered. Support for housing development and inclusiveness.
- s. *Comment:* What is the cost of keeping the Rocky Butte area in or out? *Response:* Balancing the high value areas to generate value with areas the need assistance. The technical math aspect is more nuanced, going in with a scalpel to pick and choose a set of 10 properties here are there will have marginal impacts at best for both acreage and AV. Even the exercise of trying to identify what is a high value home in terms of definition is not clear, to be able to pick and choose on that basis is challenging. The point about the tension between AV and revenue generation and the need for a neighborhood, this is a challenge to keep in mind for both commercial and residential. It is important to think about the overall fabric of the community throughout the district, how are things being stitched together and laid out.
- t. *Comment:* It is very difficult to do anything on a school site, school properties are being cut out of most districts unless the school is looking to change use or sell certain properties. The parks piece discussed previously that existing parks should be funded by Portland Parks but incorporating new parks could be funded with TIF. This philosophy is important to discuss. If there is available acreage, should it be included?
- u. *Comment:* Parks is struggling for maintenance funding, but they have funding for new parks. Can TIF fund maintenance and upgrades? *Answer:* Upgrades or physical development can be funded with TIF.
- v. *Comment:* Leaving them in if there's acreage sounds good.
- w. *Comment:* The only way that TIF funds can be used on a school site is if what is being funded can be accessed by everybody so historically schools do not use TIF funds for projects. Also, some parks can be left in, and some can be out.
- x. *Comment:* Might have to be assessed park by park. Glenhaven park by McDaniel high school (near Dharma Rain) is newer and seems to be in great shape. Support funding for older park facilities like Montavilla Community Center.
- y. *Comment:* Use funds for enriching existing parks, in addition to constructing new parks/facilities. But also put a poison pill though and say that if our AV is too low, parks should be considered on the chopping block.

- z. *Comment:* Essential to have access to parks, see if there are any barriers for at least the East side of 82<sup>nd</sup> where there will be a lot of development.
- aa. *Comment:* It sounds like the group agrees to leave schools out and keep parks in if possible.
- bb. *Question:* In this revised map, the PCC campus has been removed but that means if PCC wanted to do some sort of programming partnership with the community around workforce training it would be excluded. This is also in the heart of the district; can you all confirm that you are comfortable excluding that site?
- cc. *Comment:* PCC has been developed and there is not a lot of unused land, a partnership availability policy could be interesting to explore. There must be a collaborative discussion for what the relationship or partnership could be.
- dd. *Comment:* PCC has quite a bit of acreage, workforce training doesn't necessarily have to happen on the campus, it could happen at other locations if this is something that is included in the project list.
- ee. *Comment:* A workforce training program would not be eligible for TIF because it is programmatic but if PCC were to pursue the development of a building to house a workforce training district that would be eligible. If PCC is excluded from the boundary but they develop in the district that would be eligible.
- ff. *Comment:* APANO is working with PCC and Our Just Future on affordable housing on SE PCC campus, so TIF would be great...although TIF funds would probably come too late.
- gg. *Comment:* Greenspace is critical to this project. It would be worth going through park by park to decide what to include. Some parks could use funding even if there is an acreage issue.
- hh. *Question:* Can a park be cut into different parts? There is not enough acreage to go around especially when talking about expanding in the South, acreage is not allowed.  
*Answer:* It must be the full parcel; they cannot be divided. Acreage will be close, and this is only a draft boundary still, there will be room for more input and discussion.
- ii. *Comment:* Housing is more important than greenspace, but it hurts to say that.
- jj. *Comment:* Agree even though it hurts. Prioritize housing. PCC should be included, there is a big difference between elementary schools and higher education institutions. Long term there will always be needs so to would be great to keep that open in the future.
- kk. *Comment:* Agree to prioritize housing and focus investment along the corridor.
- ll. *Comment:* There are large parks that could be easy to exclude but there are some small parks that could use assistance.
- mm. *Comment:* PHB supports the direction that this working group decides to go in. In thinking about the balancing of priorities, the Ellington is only 10 acres itself so there could be some trimming around there. There has been an analysis of what is needed to keep that site going, the buildings have reached the end of their life cycle and need to be replaced. There is an open RFP process to engage a consultant for a formal analysis, there could be some rezoning and adding units to that site. The Bureau has a new director, and she is passionate about creating a whole community within large sites like this based on the Vienna housing model. There is a lot there and it could be a tough conversation, but PHB is committed to the redevelopment of this site.

- nn. *Question:* What is the cost for the need for the Ellington? What percentage of potential revenue would that site pull from the rest of the district? *Answer:* If the site moved forward in the district, this is something that the potential TIF district advisory committee would help to flush out. TIF is a small portion of the capital stack for these kinds of projects, maybe 10's of millions.
- oo. *Comment:* Great for Ellington to serve the community but it is not serving the 82nd avenue community.
- pp. *Comment:* It would be great to redevelop that area but 82<sup>nd</sup> is not the correct funding mechanism for that. Including this place feels like it does not align with the vision/value for this district.
- qq. *Comment:* This project is exciting and should be supported but overall, it would be better to extend along 82<sup>nd</sup> to the west instead of giving acreage to this project. The line is so tight to 82<sup>nd</sup> Ave on the west it is a bit concerning.
- rr. *Comment:* This is a difficult decision, PHB is committed to this project no matter what. This is a touch conversation with hard policy choices that need to be made. Along Halsey, it is sprinkled with commercial development which would support the whole district. The 10-acre site that is the Ellington with new zoning would add mixed use and increasing residential density with a larger portion of family size units that can feed into everything around it. There are some ways to trim some of that acreage if it was to be included. It could be cut down to 45-50 acres.
- ss. *Comment:* The transit and pedestrian oriented 82<sup>nd</sup> is central to this district and when you are excluding land that is close to 82<sup>nd</sup> to have this appendage far out of the district is a concern.
- tt. *Comment:* The Ellington has a market and a community there. It seems like the areas closer to 82<sup>nd</sup> need more help.
- uu. *Comment:* From a real estate perspective, you have developed businesses, commercial tenants and it isn't clear what percentage of people are actually property owners. In real estate, property owners generally benefit. Some people are bound to lose their business if owners sell or develop. The Ellington seems far away from 82<sup>nd</sup> to include in this district.
- vv. *Comment:* It is important to highlight that stakeholders who are property owners both commercial and residential need to be engaged with an anti-displacement conversation.
- ww. *Comment:* Adding the Rocky Butte area back is another 100 acres which leaves about 100 acres for PCC/parks potentially. Total acreage for parks is more than what would be available, some parks will have to stay out even without adding anything along 82<sup>nd</sup> to the South. If Halsey is removed, or leaned out how do we treat it? All combined if we do that and don't add any parks, there will still only be about 75 acres to add to the Southern stretch. What specifically on the southern stretch needs to be added?
- xx. *Comment:* Fingers to 10 blocks west of 82nd, taking out schools except for PCC, keeping parks and seeing where we are?
- yy. *Comment:* Approach to add multifamily
9. Camille stated that this conversation will continue on basecamp and staff will adjust the next meeting agenda if this needs more time.