East Portland TIF Exploration - Steering Committee Meeting 7

Summary Notes – February 26, 2024

Committee Members: Duncan Hwang, Nick Sauvie, Lee Po Cha, Jeff Renfro, Annette Mattson, Bill Kent, Kimberly Branam, Christina Ghan, ShaToyia Bentley, Sabrina Wilson, JR Lilly

Staff: Dana DeKlyen, Roger Gonzalez, Kathryn Hartinger, Paula Byrd, Jessica Conner, Kiana Ballo, Chabre Vickers, Shea Faherty Betin, Lisa Abuaf, Angela Rico, Brian Moore

Guests: Jamie Dunphie, David Linn, Steph Routh, Elsa Natal, Annette Pronk (attending on behalf of Matina Kaufman)

Summary Meeting Notes

1. Roger Gonzalez welcomed the committee members and opened the meeting.
2. Staff shared [this presentation](#).
3. Kathryn Hartinger reviewed the meeting agenda and meeting goals.
4. Kathryn highlighted the East Portland TIF exploration timeline including upcoming engagement opportunities.
5. Kathryn checked in with steering committee members about how the basecamp platform has been working for folks.
6. Paula Byrd discussed upcoming engagement activities.
7. Kathryn added that the Community Leaders meeting is to gauge the organization's ability/willingness to participate in this process and begin relationship building.
8. Kathryn covered the survey topics including knowledge/experience with TIF, support of the tool, opportunities/concerns, basic demographics, etc.
9. Dana DeKlyen continued that this is the beginning of 20-30 years of relationship building. If TIF districts are established, there will be people that may not have time right now to engage but may be interested in the future. This is just the beginning of the conversations with these communities and organizations. The next iteration of the community board is the community leadership committee that will oversee implementation and oversight of the TIF district.
10. Dana provided updates from the working group conversations and how feedback from working groups have informed the next steps in the TIF exploration process. The draft district boundaries are almost ready to go to the public, these are about 90% of final with room for adjustment based on feedback from the community.
    a. *Question*: Does the steering committee have a role in looking at the district boundaries coming out of the working group discussions? *Answer*: The idea is that once the working groups feel comfortable with the boundaries, then it will

go to the steering committee for review. There will be some back and forth between the groups, and then there will be potential edits based on community feedback. Just to note, the working groups have been working with information based on conversations from the steering committee when developing the boundaries. All this information is on basecamp so staff will flag when there are items/updates for review.

b. *Comment*: In Parkrose-Columbia Corridor, the working groups boundary that was drawn initially was well received by the working group and the group started looking at potential projects for a future TIF district. As the conversation with the community begins, there is a roadmap to communicate about what has been discussed.

c. *Comment*: In the working groups, there have been asset and opportunity mapping activities which has turned into people thinking about existing conditions and what things could look like in the future. This is on the mural board if anyone wants to review notes from that conversation. This is all on the same mural board that has been used in various meetings throughout the process, so the evolution of the conversation is well documented there.

d. *Comment*: The East 205 group has really focused on families living in the area and looking at where Black/Indigenous/youth/senior residents are living. It is good to hear from other working groups and community members about their thoughts on what the working groups have discussed.

e. *Comment*: In 82nd there has been a focus on the commercial fingers extended off the 82nd corridor and discussions around how far south to extend the district to ensure equal service.

f. *Comment*: The 82nd district should go down to the City limits and include more area directly adjacent to the corridor.

g. *Comment*: The more conversation around what is missing and what should be included is important and now is the time to get into these discussions.

h. *Comment*: The 82nd Ave working group conversation covered what areas are low income and could benefit from TIF investments.

i. *Comment*: Basecamp serves a great purpose for information and day-to-day conversation, but it is very busy. When the steering committee reconvenes, it would be great to get an executive summary of the working group conversations to get everyone up to speed.

j. *Comment*: For 82nd Working Group, one thing that is different is how much public investment is already planned for the area with the transportation improvements on the corridor and special attention to the potentially complimentary investments in the area will be critical.

11. Dana highlighted essential elements from the Cully Governance Charter which is the added piece of legally required documents to ensure that community had a co-creation model that ensures the direction of implementation and accountability is solidified in

the approval process along with the TIF plan. Now there are three potential districts thinking about their specific areas, there is opportunity for discussions around how the groups are integrated or distinguished beyond just Cully's structure for the cocreation model. What needs to be added, shifted, or discussed?

12. Dana reviewed the roles and responsibilities between the committee, City staff, and City Council/Prosper Portland Board. The decision makers are still the City Council/Prosper Portland board but the recommendations that are put forward for approval are developed by the committee and City staff. The governance charter is a way of minimizing the surprise and tension where the community/community leadership committee is not expecting what comes from the city or when the city is not expecting what is coming from the community. This provides more certainty to the community. This is the start of the conversation for the new TIF district plans recognizing that the Cully district is still in its infancy and has not had time to see how this process plays out.

13. Roger prompted the committee to discuss guiding questions around governance structure for the potential new TIF districts. Does it make sense to have an "East Portland" advisory body with area subcommittees rather than several separate advisory boards? What would roles and responsibilities look like? East Portland is much larger than Cully. Is there a way to engage more people in governance?
    a. *Comment*: It would be good to have some sort of overarching committee. Depending on where you come from and where you live there is a sense of uncertainty around the needs of the different areas. An overarching structure could help get people on the same page. Metro just finished a participatory budget for the parks bond with the community and local jurisdictions which received positive feedback from the participants and seems like a great model to replicate. Apparently 1,700 people voted for the top 15 projects they wanted to see funded.
    b. *Comment*: Many of Prosper Portland investments happen on a rolling basis, let's think about how to adopt this structure used for one-time investments with a bond that could happen for rolling programs.
    c. *Comment*: Participatory budget works best when there are clear parameters for budget. For responsive grants or rapid repair for example, it could be putting out a dollar amount for people to vote on how to invest.
    d. *Question*: What is the difference between subcommittees and the advisory body? What is the difference between their decision-making ability? There needs to be clear channels, communication, and accountability for the community. Broadly, East Portland is big, diverse, and unique. It seems like there is nuance in each district so if this governance advisory body with subcommittees, how would decision-making flow?
    e. *Comment*: There are communication challenges and if there is a broad East Portland body in addition to local bodies there are roles and responsibilities that

need to be clearly outlined. This process needs to be broad and hyper local and diverse.

f. *Question*: What would it look like if there were three separate advisory bodies?

g. *Comment*: One idea could be regular convening of the three groups to discuss the investments, strategies, and plans for each TIF district. If there are singular groups for each district, it looks much more like the Cully model.

h. *Comment*: It needs to be clear on what an "advisory body" role would be using the IAP Spectrum of Public Participation. There is a scale of 5 from inform, consult, involve, collaborate, and empower. An advisory body should not make financial decisions, it only advises. If there is one East Portland body, it is unclear what the decision-making ability is. Who has authority? Collaboration and coordination are important.

i. *Comment*: There is a risk of people coming in and altering recommendations if there is a super structure.

j. *Comment*: The three areas get different types of investments; some get more attention than others when it comes to investments outside of Prosper or any government entities. If there is one body for all three districts, subcommittees are necessary to represent the individual needs and experiences of each district. Maybe subcommittees could set the tone for what the advisory body should be. There will need to be a clear structure. And if there is an advisory board, it is unclear whether their recommendations are implemented.

k. *Comment*: An important role for the advisory body is to set population level outcomes like increase BIPOC business owners or increase homeownership and then it should be clear that the projects are achieving those goals. One advisory committee is more cohesive.

l. *Comment*: It sounds like the three separate advisory bodies convene around strategy instead of three separate subcommittees. It is an eco-system. Performance, indicators and tracking performance are part of the action plans. Who is writing the action plans?

m. *Question*: In the structure the whole City Council is the final decider. Isn't there a way to carve it out so just the city council that represents East Portland participates in decision making?

n. *Comment*: The N/NE Community Development Initiative Action Plan offers an example of how to track outcomes with the N/NE Leadership Committee and the public.

o. *Comment*: If Cully is one district and they have one advisory body, why would there be one advisory body for 3 separate districts generating their own money. Working strategically with the other districts in East Portland and supporting each other's work would still be important.

p. *Comment*: It sounds like there is value in separate bodies coming together in conversation on a regular basis.

14. Roger continued the committee discussion around longevity of the community leadership governance structure. If districts are formed, how do we ensure we're always "training a bench" of future advisory board members? How do we keep this body "vibrant and empowered" for the long term? How can this body support ongoing and long-term engagement so that opportunities for funding continue to reach those who need them most?

    a. *Comment*: Part of the work of the community staff person is to ensure that the community is engaged and informed. The role and extent of community staffing for potential new districts should be discussed as well.

    b. *Comment*: A lot will be learned from Cully in the next year or so.

    c. *Comment*: In talking about engagement with partners, staff has been clear that this is the start of 20-30 years of relationship building.

    d. *Question*: Who does the Cully advisory body report to? Prosper? Commissioner in charge? *Answer*: As a co-created body, the advisory body speaks to council. There are different types of decisions happening over time, in some cases it is in a cocreation model going to council/board or it is a tweak for recommendations to Prosper or Portland Housing Bureau. The accountability model specifically says the advisory committee reports to Council.

    e. *Comment*: Included in the co-creation model and in the governance charter is the committee, Prosper Portland, and Portland Housing Bureau.

    f. *Question*: Are Cully advisory body meetings open to the public? *Answer*: Yes.

    g. *Question:* Do folks have any questions about general governance and how Cully is working? What tools do folks want to explore?

    h. *Comment*: Community members are not as eager to sign up for advisory bodies when there is no accountability to the community. When there is a clear charge for the advisory body from council, it seems to work well. The success of the group will depend on who is involved and there needs to be accountability measures for the advisory body.

    i. *Comment*: Folks want ownership, and ownership of the decision-making. Ultimately this is one of the biggest issues that came up out of Cully TIF exploration. It is not necessarily a handshake agreement, but the final decision maker is council. The Cully TIF governance charter represents the edge of where this has been taken in the past.

    j. *Comment*: The action plan should be shared as well. These give 5 years of consistent investments that are approved by the council and with the governance charter it gives clarity on where investments go. With the Old Town Community Association, one of their observations with their small business grant is that the association asked to extend the eligibility of the small business grant to go toward nonprofits as well. Or in N/NE leadership committee there are monthly conversations about resource allocation for loans and grants, and TIF resource allocation between Prosper and Portland Housing Bureau. This shows

how investments are being implemented and if they are successful. Working with the committee helps facilitate changes when they need to occur.

k. *Comment*: There seems to be hunger for ownership and decision making, conceivable the three recommending bodies come together to impress upon council. Short of the legal authority to make that decision, what would give you confidence in the governance charter and decision-making process?

l. *Comment*: The Cully charter is strong on accountability for the agencies like Prosper Portland and Portland Housing Bureau, it is less so for Council. Those conversations went to the political power of shaming them. Is there political power in having unity between the three districts?

m. *Question*: Would it be helpful to outline 2-3 governance models and how decision-making would flow in different scenarios? *Response*: yes.

15. Roger reviewed the next steps and closed the meeting.