

East Portland TIF Exploration – 82nd Ave
Summary Notes – May 15th 2024

Committee Members: Jacob Loeb, Nick Sauvie, Zachary Lauritzen, Alisa Kajikawa, Barb Geyer, Nancy Chapin, Joshua Pangelinan

Staff: Dana DeKlyen, Roger Gonzalez, Kathryn Hartinger, Paula Byrd, Kiana Ballo, Raul Preciado Mendez, Jessica Conner, Barry Manning, Robert Smith

Summary Meeting Notes

1. Kathryn Hartinger welcomed committee members and reviewed the meeting goals and agenda.
2. Staff shared [this presentation](#).
3. Kathryn discussed the City of Portland housing set aside policy and the minimum percentage for commercial and economic development that was set in the Cully plan. This is something to consider for this group.
4. Kathryn reviewed affordable housing themes for the project list.
 - a. *Question:* Does purchasing hotels for conversion to housing actually work? *Response:* There are some projects that have been done well and other projects not so much. Most conversions for affordable housing are closer to the spectrum for no or extremely low-income folks. Hotel conversions often lack amenities to serve those populations. If it is even something to consider for investment in the district it should be included in the plan.
 - b. *Comment:* Add income levels served by housing subsidized with TIF reflect the income levels and demographics in the neighborhood. Target programs to meet needs of people already existing in the neighborhood.
5. Kathryn reviewed commercial development themes for the project list.
6. Kathryn reviewed arts, culture, and signage themes for the project list.
7. Kathryn reviewed recreational improvement themes for the project list.
8. Kathryn reviewed infrastructure priority themes for the project list.
 - a. *Comment:* The City has a responsibility to build ADA accessible sidewalks, TIF should not be solely responsible for funding those. For bike storage, this is strong for the way bike access is being implemented on 82nd Ave. Secure bike storage is important to encourage people to access the neighborhood via bike.
 - b. *Comment:* Make ADA accessibility related to commercial projects/development.
 - c. *Comment:* PBOT has money for bike racks, there are specifications for those as well.
 - d. *Comment:* Should bike racks/storage be listed in the Economic Development section to help businesses fund bike storage outside of their businesses to attract customers/employees who bike.
 - i. Agreement from other committee members.
 - e. *Comment:* Signage from the greenway to the business district would be helpful as well.
9. Kathryn moved the committee into a conversation around priorities and allocation for funding.
 - a. *Comment:* There is an urge to have more affordable housing and with the examples given, those goals could be accomplished with some flexibility. As a Portland resident, it would be nice if every neighborhood had affordable housing. This area does need more affordable housing.
 - b. *Comment:* The existing districts are generally silent on this. Cully named their percentages with flexibility to a point. This is part of the shifting between old and new TIF models.

- c. *Question:* Can the economic development category be spent on incentivizing for profit housing developers? If they can't quite pencil out a market rate development, can the economic development dollars close that gap? *Response:* Yes.
 - d. *Comment:* Support for setting percentages.
 - e. *Comment:* Need for advocacy around TIF policy.
 - f. *Comment:* There are no other funding mechanisms for geographically based investment without adding a new tax.
 - g. *Comment:* Also need funding for programs and services outside of physical improvements in addition to TIF.
 - h. *Comment:* Set a percentage and set restrictions on what can be funded since infrastructure pressures are so strong.
 - i. *Comment:* Items in infrastructure picture are important for everything else.
 - j. *Comment:* Advocating for higher percentage than 10% for infrastructure.
 - k. *Comment:* The only parameter is 45% across all TIF districts goes to affordable housing.
 - l. *Comment:* Infrastructure costs more than other things. It would be helpful to talk dollars over percentages and look at example projects.
 - m. *Comment:* No percentage on infrastructure because they can be tied to other projects. Don't fund sidewalks for sidewalks sake because that is the city's responsibility and is an act of gentrification. More in line with infrastructure projects tied to economic development projects.
 - n. *Comment:* Can there be minimums and maximums? *Response:* Yes.
 - o. *Comment:* Initial thought was to not have a separate pot for infrastructure, a maximum of 10% could work though.
10. Kathryn reviewed the definition of priority communities that is currently in the plan and prompted the committee to discuss potential changes to the definition.
- a. *Comment:* Include elders.
 - b. *Comment:* Appreciative of broad/vague language to help people feel more included. To disaggregate all groups by race/ethnicity still wouldn't include everyone. Keep it as is.
 - c. *Comment:* The reason this language is here is because these tools were used by middle class white males to support middle class white males. Does it make sense to start there?
 - d. *Comment:* Support for that.
 - e. *Comment:* Include LGBTQ.
11. Kathryn thanked the committee members for their time, reviewed the next steps, and closed the meeting.