

East Portland TIF Exploration: Parkrose-Columbia Corridor

Meeting #4 Notes – February 20th, 2024

Attendees: Dave Ganslein, Corky Collier, JR Lilly, Lin Felton, Annette Stanhope, Michael Lopes Serrao

Staff: Camille Trummer, Roger Gonzalez, Kathryn Hartinger, Dana DeKlyen, Paula Byrd, Kiana Ballo, David Sheern, Shea Flaherty Betin, Danell Norby, Brian Moore

Notes:

1. Camille Trummer welcomed committee members and reviewed the meeting goals and agenda.
2. Staff shared [this presentation](#).
3. Roger Gonzalez reviewed the East Portland TIF Exploration timeline specifically looking at the plan for community engagement in the coming months.
4. Roger outlined the anticipated engagement activities including developing TIF 101 materials (presentation slide deck and leave behind hand out), 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 Community Leader Luncheon is scheduled for March 1st 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.
5. Roger continued that this is only the beginning of community engagement, if a TIF district is created then there will be 20-30 years of relationship building to ensure that the district serves the community and achieves their priorities throughout its life cycle. A reminder that the community leadership committee will support TIF district governance and implementation throughout the process.
 - a. *Question:* How are faith-based organizations engaged in this process? *Answer:* If you have any connections with those organizations, please let us know and we will do outreach to them as well. It would be great to invite them and begin a conversation with those organizations.
 - b. *Comment:* Recommend an equity lens to identify who would be impacted/benefitting from TIF. Certain communities will be most impacted, and they need to be engaged in the process. This will help with transparency.
6. Roger checked in with the committee regarding the asset map that was created in the last working group meeting. Does this still feel accurate? Is there anything missing?
 - a. *Question:* There are a few assets with value that is currently much lower than it will be in the future once they are developed, how does that work? If a large plot of land is developed, what obligations are there for the developer? *Answer:* If there is an undeveloped property that is developed (e.g., Rossi Farms), the growth in value would

be captured and reinvested into the district. There is a conservative calculation that creates the estimate for revenue generated but any development that occurs comes back to the tax increment. Once you hit 20% of maximum indebtedness the funds go back to the other taxing jurisdictions as well. There is a maximum number set in the TIF district plan when it is created. Affordable housing is not taxed, which is one of the ways to keep it affordable, which is true whether you have a TIF district or not.

- b. *Comment:* Be conscious of the various mobile homes, manufactured homes, and multifamily homes. Those should be included as an asset and should be a part of this conversation.
7. Roger prompted the committee to think about the philosophy of inclusion/exclusion for what ends up in the TIF district boundaries.
8. Roger continued that after review of the current acreage within the exploration area, we are over by about 100 acres and will need to cut from the existing boundaries and reviewed the potential subtractions/additions from the previous working group discussion. The slough piece that was discussed as an addition in the last conversation adds about 167 acres, adding level brewing would add eight acres, adding some of the multifamily housing adds 38 acres. If you take out some pieces like the railroad right of way (~30 acres), I-205 right of way (~30 acres) or public facilities (~100 acres), that will help get the acreage down to where it needs to be. This is information for the discussion.
9. Roger highlighted that access to Linfield was discussed in the last meeting, and that there is a critical linkage on 148th that coincides with the multifamily housing east of 148th. This addition could provide potential to improve the bike/pedestrian infrastructure to facilitate access to the college without adding acreage.
10. Roger reviewed the philosophies of inclusion/exclusion from the 82nd Ave exploration area as an example of how decision-making is going in other groups in terms of how to prioritize areas to be included in the district. Philosophy will be important to determine what is included and why. This will matter when the TIF plan is being developed, what areas have potential for TIF funded projects? What needs to be included and why?
 - a. *Comment:* The multifamily addition area discussed last week is all condominiums so it is unclear how much opportunity there is to invest in that area and does not seem like it should be prioritized over other areas.
 - b. *Question:* As the boundary is now, if there is a partial trail in the boundary can you spend only on the areas of the trail that are inside the boundary? *Response:* Yes, only spending of TIF funds within the boundary is allowed. These funds could be paired with funds from PBOT or other partners that could help coordinate funds for developments outside of the boundary.
 - c. *Comment:* There is the pedestrian path in the slough, but there is also the multimodal greenway along the levy that has never been developed but has some momentum now. The interest in is around creating greater greenspace and climate resilience and public health outcomes for the community by creating easy access to green space and exercise.
 - d. *Comment:* The Inverness Jail would be pulled out of the potential expansion area.
 - e. *Comment:* There are two very different types of zones basically industrial or residential. They have different purposes and taxation. Why are we including industrial areas in this

TIF? If we are using industrial areas to fund TIF then the TIF funds will need to benefit the industrial area, and tax increment from the residential area should benefit the residents. The greenway could be a good resource and mutually beneficial for residents and employees/employers in the area. *Response:* Implementation principles will guide future decision making and can help ensure that this is carried out. The project team would like to partner with the CCBA to engage employers in the slough.

- f. *Question:* Do you have any examples of implementation principles for Cully TIF? When might implementation principles need to be outlined? *Response:* Implementations principles from Cully TIF District Plan were shared with committee members. This is a case of the Steering Committee and Working Group. The Steering Committee provided an initial list of implementation principles for the Working Groups to then refine. This is a great opportunity to add guidelines for how investments can be made and ensure shared benefits.
- g. *Comment:* In terms of monetary value, the assessed value showed that the industrial area keeps the cost low to keep industrial businesses from leaving and would not be generating as much value for the TIF district.
- h. *Question:* How do we facilitate resources to see the employers and employment opportunities that people want to see? *Response:* The City would love to partner with WG members or organizations to engage them.
- i. *Question:* Is there a climate resilience piece here? Some of these employers have impacts on the health of the residential areas. Does this create an opportunity for them to improve their outcomes? *Response:* The goal is finding a balance between stabilization and growth. Industrial jobs are accessible jobs. In terms of climate, historically TIF in other districts has played a tangential role in paying into supports for employers in the district to receive resources to provide efficiencies, reduced waste, and sustainability initiatives. Many employers are engaged in clean industry work and PCEF work. This is all woven together, but it needs to be woven intentionally if this is a priority.
- j. *Comment:* The previous question assumes that the industrial areas do have harmful health impacts on residents, this should be confirmed/researched before it is included as a priority.
- k. *Comment:* One thing is that there are three properties (Wheatley School 14030 NE Sacramento St. Portland, OR 97230, Knott Creek School 11456 NE Knott St Portland, OR 97220, Helensview School 8678 NE Sumner St. Portland, OR 97220) that the Parkrose School District rents out. Ultimately, in the coming years the school board will be in conversation about what to do with those properties. The funds from renting out those properties are income for the school district. With the large developments coming soon, there will be growth necessary for the school district to accommodate more kids and residents. The school district boundaries are also outdated.
- l. *Question:* Curiosity around Linfield and what it looks like if that was included in the district? Universities are powerful economic engines which is a strong positive to the community with a lot of potential. If it was included, are there benefits to them that would assure that the university stays in the area? If it is not included, are there pros

and cons? *Response:* A conversation with Linfield would be helpful in answering this question and seeing what they think.

- m. *Question:* If this district is at the acreage cap and if Linfield is an economic engine that should be included, where would you pull acreage away from? *Response:* If it is a potential economic engine for the area, should we at least have the conversation about it while sacrificing single family homes?
 - n. *Comment:* There seems to be a clear base area and then there are a couple of questions around areas to add. This is not necessarily a linear process. When the conversation gets to project list, that could inform the potential boundaries. If this seems area good enough for now, then it can be revisited once the project list is established, and everyone is clear on what needs to be prioritized.
 - o. *Comment:* That makes sense. What do we want to do and what tool (eg. boundaries) do we need to get there? It is okay to release where things are at to the public, folks often feel like they are looped in too late, and this could be a great opportunity to get feedback earlier rather than later.
 - p. *Comment:* Important to emphasize that this is proposed, and that the community has the ability to make changes.
 - q. *Comment:* There is some heartburn around the Linfield area.
11. Working Group members in attendance tentatively approved using the current exploration area (minus railroad right of way, minus I-205 right of way, minus some public properties) to begin engaging the public and bringing feedback on the boundary back to the WG.
12. Camille reviewed the next steps and discussion topics for the upcoming meeting.
- a. *Comment:* Flagging the language that the lawyers had issues with during the Cully TIF district exploration process. It would be helpful to learn more about that situation as this process moves forward.
 - b. *Question:* Think about if/when you want to do any in-person meetings for this group. Let staff know if this is something of interest. Staff will continue to check in on this as well.