

East Portland TIF Exploration: 82nd Ave

Meeting #5 Notes – March 6th, 2024

Attendees: Jacob Loeb, Nick Sauvie, Alisa Kajikawa, Joshua Pangelinan, Zachary Lauritzen, Barb Geier, Duncan Hwang, Jamal Dar, Nancy Chapin, Sara Fischer

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

Notes:

1. Camille Trummer welcomed committee members and reviewed the meeting goals and agenda.
2. Staff shared this presentation.
3. Camille provided a reminder for roles and responsibilities for Working Group members and Steering Committee members, and how the two groups coordinate and support each other's work throughout this process.
4. Camille reviewed the timeline and next steps.
5. Kathryn Hartinger reviewed the philosophy of inclusion/exclusion for the boundary discussion.
 - a. *Comment:* It is not Rocky Butte specifically; the point is to exclude areas of single-family zones with high ownership and low renting. If there are other areas that fit that description, those areas can be scraped out to add acreage.
 - b. *Comment:* Agree to free up room for fingers and padding West of 82nd Ave.
 - c. *Question:* What was the reasoning to include Parks properties? *Answer:* There was back and forth on this. In the end, there was a pitch for including parks. There could be picking and choosing which parks should be included based on where projects could happen.
 - d. *Comment:* Question including parks because they are gentrifying investments and substitutes funds that the Parks Bureau should be funding. Prioritizing lower income areas in the district which need most investment.
 - e. *Comment:* Including parks is important to provide low-income communities that need those spaces. There needs to be greater access to parks. One example if you look at 82nd by Glisan, that soccer field is small, but the land is big. It is too busy to get a space to play, youth are lining up to play. There needs to be more available space for parks for healthy communities.
 - f. *Comment:* For example - Harrison Park could use some work
 - g. *Comment:* It would be great to address the lack of investment in parks East of 82nd. Even investing in low-income areas can be gentrifying. Parks are a lifeline for the youth growing up in these areas.
 - h. *Comment:* The Park Bureau needs to be spending equitably money in East Portland.
 - i. *Comment:* Technical expertise on the Parks question – in the Old Town TIF district the skate park was pushed onto the Parks budget list as the next park to be developed in Downtown after Darcel Park is finished. This was accomplished by leveraging TIF

resources not in the park but in the community by supporting predevelopment funds around the area and supporting the Old Town Community Association.

- j. *Question:* Is Columbia Christian school included because it is private? *Answer:* Generally, yes, it should come out but there has been a question around if they are selling that property. Staff will reach out to them around that.
 - k. *Comment:* Even if they keep it, they have affordable housing on the property. Excluding them could lose an opportunity to take advantage of what they already have going on.
 - l. *Comment:* Since a TIF district will be here for decades, just because someone isn't selling now doesn't mean they won't sell in the next 10-20 years so we should take a longer horizon view.
 - m. *Comment:* There is a lot of individual plots for the Columbia Christian so that could be carefully cut out.
6. Kathryn shared an updated map based on previous committee conversations and discussed the revisions that were made since the previous discussion. This is not a final map, there is room for changes and this discussion is for what the map should look like when it goes out for community feedback.
- a. *Question:* Where does Parkrose TIF district fit with this? *Answer:* They meet on 82nd just above Fremont.
 - b. *Comment:* This map is an improvement over the last one. The boundary is still tight to the west if 82nd particularly where there is multifamily zoning on Holgate. More of that area should be included. The land next to the freeway is marginal and that could be a tradeoff.
 - c. *Comment:* Last time there were differing opinions on the area around the freeway.
 - d. *Comment:* Another place could be the single-family zone around Rocky Butte.
 - e. *Comment:* The area by the freeway is an important area to invest in because it is a lower income, higher need area. It is highly residential. That should be kept in the district.
 - f. *Comment:* In support of padding 82nd Ave. In terms of where to cut back, the area to the south of Multnomah University seems to be fairly established and successful. Leaving Glisan but doing a little donut to get that space back.
 - g. *Comment:* Regarding Corridors classification in Comp Plan: Glisan, Stark, Division and Woodstock are classified as "Neighborhood" corridors. Powell and Foster (and Sandy) are classified as "Civic" corridors.
 - h. *Question:* The goal of having denser neighborhoods that are walkable, are we taking out the opportunity to have housing for all beyond the main roads?
 - i. *Comment:* Thinking of economies of scale for affordable housing developers, generally the residential infill is more like fourplexes or townhomes or a two-and-two. What is still available and is being taken advantage of is the homebuyer opportunity limited tax exemptions. With or without TIF district, those options are still available.
 - j. It sounds like there are some modifications that need to be made. With those proposed changes, are we good to bring this map to the public?
 - k. *Comment:* I might prefer to chop the area around Rocky Butte over Glisan.
 - l. *Comment:* Vestel could be carved out of it is included in this map.

- m. *Comment:* Typically, all public schools are zoned for residential in the context of the neighborhood they are in. There has been a move toward zoning them to institutional zones.
 - n. *Comment:* Vestel has a popular community garden and is used as a park and playground for many people which is accessed off the greenway. People want to invest in the gardening space and community use space around the school.
 - o. *Comment:* The reason why Vestel is in is because of the zoning type and there were several high-density projects around it. It had to be included otherwise it is a very strange cut-out.
 - p. *Comment:* The only reasoning for cutting off Rocky Butte area is because of the name of the TIF district, defending taking out an area closer to 82nd is a harder defense over somewhere further out.
 - q. *Comment:* Keep the yellow portion south of Burnside that is going to be carved out (south of Multnomah University). They have a little more space for denser housing if folks sell their property.
 - r. *Question:* Do you mean south of Glisan?
 - s. *Comment:* Yeah, the yellow goes from Glisan to south of Burnside. Carve out the yellow from Glisan to Burnside and keep Burnside south.
 - t. *Comment:* Include some of the R2.5 within a few blocks of 82nd for higher density housing.
 - u. *Comment:* Areas of R5 on the Eastern edge of Rocky butte area, area of R5 south of Multnomah University are the areas to cut to capture more space West of 82nd Ave.
 - v. *Comment:* The DMV is cut out of this map. Is that a potential opportunity site?
 - w. Is anyone uncomfortable with these changes?
7. Kathryn transitioned to a discussion around governance structure and reviewed the decision-making model for TIF district governance and major questions that came up in the Cully TIF District Exploration process. This is important context when considering what the governance charter could look like for potential new TIF districts.
8. Kathryn reviewed highlights from the Cully Governance Charter. This is not a legally required document for a TIF plan, but it is an addition to the plan to provide clarity and insurance that the community's needs are met.
9. Kathryn reviewed highlights from the Steering Committee's recent conversation around governance structure and prompted the committee to discuss governance considerations.
- a. *Comment:* Leaning toward keeping districts separate. There could be benefits from overarching oversight especially when looking at breaking through bureaucracy if there is autonomy between the individual districts.
 - b. *Question:* If there was an overarching body, would there be cocreation with writing the charter? *Answer:* There could be a draft coming out of the steering committee, the draft would go to each district governing body to customize as needed. The roles and responsibilities would need to be the same throughout the three groups, but the plans could be different for each district but there would need to be agreement between the three groups on what the overarching body would look like.

- c. *Comment:* Agreement around local committees that come together on a regular basis to strategize. Each district has different goals and needs so it would be challenging for one body to handle that.
 - d. *Question:* Can we specify what happens in the convening of the groups to get at what an overarching body could achieve?
 - e. *Comment:* There was an audit for the Lents URA and the major critique was that it did not look at overarching goals. That is one reason why it is valuable to have an overarching committee to look at the big picture outcomes.
 - f. *Comment:* There will be some metrics in the district and action plans, that type of reporting could happen separately or together.
 - g. *Comment:* It would be awesome and important to have guiding principles that are agreed upon where representatives from each district could convene around.
 - h. *Comment:* The more local something is, the more focused it is. Versus having a global view of what is happening because of these projects.
 - i. *Comment:* 82nd is interesting because of the new City government this area is in District 1 and 3, the other TIF exploration areas are all in District 1. There could be political benefits from an overarching structure between districts when you think about the government restructuring.
 - j. *Comment:* Talking about mechanics and maps, there is a missing piece of why this should happen or not. Just to note there is a need for a higher-level philosophy of what this is trying to accomplish.
 - k. *Comment:* It would be great for committee members to share what they are hearing from their communities about TIF exploration. It is important to know what the community is thinking and if they have reservations.
 - l. *Comment:* Right now, people don't know what this is, and they are trying to wrap their heads around it. There will be more community feedback once open houses get started. There are two open houses in April. In the Black community, there is a negative connotation around TIF and a feeling that it is not worth engaging with.
 - m. *Comment:* It's a good idea for this group to go through our own reservations
10. Kathryn reviewed the next steps and closed the meeting.