

East Portland TIF Exploration - Steering Committee Meeting #8

Summary Notes – March 18, 2024

Committee Members: Matina Kauffman, Jessica Arzate, Duncan Hwang, Elsa Natal, Kimberly Branam, Jonath Colon, Christina Ghan, Jeff Renfro, JR Lilly, Sabrina Wilson, Bill Kent

Staff: Camille Trummer, Dana DeKlyen, Roger Gonzalez, Paula Byrd, Jessica Conner, Kiana Ballo, Lisa Abuaf, Shea Flaherty Betin

Guests: Guy Benn, Debbie Aiona, Steph Routh,

Summary Meeting Notes

1. Camille Trummer welcomed the committee members and reviewed the meeting goals and agenda.
2. Staff shared [this presentation](#).
3. Camille reviewed roles and responsibilities for the steering committee and working groups, and how the committees periodically coordinate throughout the TIF exploration process.
4. Camille reviewed the tentative meeting sequence for the steering committee and working groups.
5. Roger Gonzalez presented community engagement updates including current/planned engagement and ongoing partnership needs.
6. Roger Gonzalez provided updates from recent working group discussions on governance structure, and draft district boundaries. Members on both a working group and the steering committee were encouraged to share out regarding updates from the working group conversations.
 - a. In 82nd, there is a lot of back and forth about the donut holes can occur in the boundary to address the acreage cap and the needs of the district. Prioritizing commercial corridors.
 - b. Parkrose-CC group has debated whether to include high assessed value areas to capture value for the district or to utilize acreage to extend into areas that need investment. Discussions around the balance of higher assessed value, lower need areas and higher need, lower assessed value areas.
 - c. In Parkrose-CC, trying to balance different interests and working toward developing boundaries and a path forward.

7. Roger discussed the governance structure feedback from the Steering Committee and working groups and reviewed the potential governance structures and strategies with their associated accountability mechanisms.
8. Camille facilitated a discussion around governance structure including key questions regarding strategic convenings, stakeholder participation, and advisory structures.
 - a. Pre-pandemic there was a hope for an East Portland Action Plan summit, that never came to fruition. This could be a good format for the strategic convening. An annual East Portland Summit where the three bodies take a full day to coordinate and share updates. There are already a lot of meetings happening so focusing it on one immersive, full day event would be helpful.
 - b. *Question:* What is the frequency for the community leadership committee meetings? *Answer:* In Cully, there is a once-a-month meeting during the creation of the five-year action plan, after that it could change once the action plan is ready to be implemented.
 - c. Once a year or once every six months would make sense for the three bodies to convene depending on what is needed to get feedback. Quarterly seems like too much.
 - d. Participation of people outside of the geographic locations is still valuable and it should be open for people to learn about the work. The people who are shaping the work, decision making, and implementing the projects are people that should be tied to the geography of the district.
 - e. In the Parkrose-CC working group, there is talk about engaging groups that have a city or state wide focus not a neighborhood specific focus. There is a struggle of asking for partnership with those organizations with interests much wider than just the neighborhood to support neighborhood specific efforts.
 - f. Public comment periods, open and low barriers ways to give their thoughts or questions or share perspectives.
 - g. The government transition team could be an opportunity to partner with their efforts. Portland Clean Energy Fund is another potential partnership and has community engagement teams. Leveraging existing engagement opportunities that relate to TIF activities and community needs.
 - h. TriMet Station area planning in various districts is another opportunity to collaborate.
 - i. Main challenge is how would these groups be classified in the City of Portland? There's some sort of advisory body restructure. Civic Life is working on transition of neighborhood coalitions to match with districts, and a lot of advisory bodies/steering committees & Boards now are not clear yet on what changes may come with the changing government structure.

- j. Each district needs to work directly with bureaus and the mayor's office.
9. Dana DeKlyen moved into a governance charter discussion focused on scope and membership. What sections of the TIF plans need to be consistent across all three areas?
- a. Consistency across the districts would make sense. It is already challenging to get information out there, it seems like the more consistent and clear the messaging it is, the better. Given that each district has individual needs that should not be ignored but it seems like consistency would be beneficial.
 - b. *Question:* Questions about operating procedures from Cully – there are two elected co-chairs. Is this something that would be consistent with the potential new districts? *Answer:* It could be a chair or co-chair model, that is something that would be up to the individual groups.
 - c. *Question:* Looking at staffing for three separate districts, does each district require a community-based staff person at a CBO? It seems like a lot to do it with only one person for three groups, but it seems expensive to have three separate staff people.
 - d. This will also be important for clarity and accountability between staff assigned to do the work and the committee when there might be conflict.
 - e. *Question:* Where does the relationship between these bodies & the decision-making bodies (Prosper Portland Board & Council, particularly district offices) belong? *Answer:* The ultimate decision-makers are City Council and Prosper Portland Board. Those are the decision-makers responsible for TIF funds and the TIF plan, but the recommending body is a co-created model between the community leadership committee and Prosper Portland staff.
 - f. *Question:* Where in this charter is that accountability written? *Answer:* Section 9, accountability. There is an annual report to council to ensure that the community has a voice at city council and a direct connection to share how they feel things are going.
 - g. Right now, policy, budget, and the official procedures to get those approved go through City Council which needs to get a vote 7/12 to move forward.
 - h. It feels like there is potential with the change of government coming and the Cully charter being written prior to knowing what the change of government would look like, there should be specific language in the new TIF district charters to accommodate the change of government.
 - i. In the last section of the Cully charter, it does specify that if there is a change in City government would trigger a change in the charter.
10. Dana reviewed the scope of work for the community leadership committee members and the membership model from the Cully plan.

- a. *Question:* On the charter on the committee list, it does not mention recently displaced people from Cully. Does that need to be explicit in future TIF plans? Especially with how gentrification is moving and at a faster speed than before. This could be something to include explicitly in the membership.
 - b. *Question:* Is there any mention of renters identified as community members? Is that captured anywhere in the Cully plan? *Answer:* There was not a specific discussion around that when developing the Cully plan but that is a good call out to incorporate the future.
11. Camille encouraged committee members to continue to share feedback and ideas on basecamp. Staff will post a discussion prompt to continue the conversation online.
12. Camille reviewed the next steps, thanked committee members for their participation, and closed the meeting.