

East Portland TIF Exploration – Parkrose-Columbia Corridor
Summary Notes – May 21st, 2024

Committee Members: JR Lilly, Lin Felton, Dave Ganslein, Bill Cunningham, Bill Kent, Corky Collier, Annette Stanhope, Danell Norby

Staff: Dana DeKlyen, Roger Gonzalez, Kiana Ballo, David Sheern, Paula Byrd

Summary Meeting Notes

1. Roger Gonzalez welcomed committee members and reviewed the meeting goals and agenda.
2. Staff shared this presentation.
 - a. *Comment:* Prosper Portland Chief Financial Officer to meet with Parkrose School District about impacts of TIF on school funding.
 - b. *Comment:* No working group meetings in June instead there will be time to draft and review, meetings resume in July with meetings adjusted for 4th of July holiday.
 - c. *Comment:* Concern around timeline going into summer months and ability to get feedback from community.
 - d. *Comment:* Continued opportunities for community engagement/feedback through summer before going to council including the legislative process – public hearing at the Prosper Portland Board meeting and public hearing at City Council meeting (possibly public testimony at the Planning and Sustainability Commission meetings).
3. Roger 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. Roger reviewed affordable housing themes for the project list.
 - a. *Question:* What percentage of AMI qualify for the affordable housing programs?
Response: For rentals, it is for individuals who make 0-60% AMI, for homeownership support it goes up to 100% AMI.
 - b. *Question:* Are there any right to return policies that could be implemented for people who have been displaced from the neighborhood?
Response: There is language for priority for displaced individuals.
5. Roger reviewed commercial development themes for the project list.
 - a. *Question:* Why isn't there anything listed under opportunistic land acquisition for this section?
Response: If there is something specific you want to see, let us know. This list was pulled from the mural board conversation and there is room to add/change.
 - b. *Comment:* Vacant lot at 112th and Sandy, corner lot zoned for mixed use commercial. Owner is willing to sell.
 - c. *Comment:* Opportunities similar to Mercado for TIF funds. Business incubator spaces, opportunities to better utilize large lots.
 - d. *Comment:* Need to be specific for what the goal is with this list – supporting middle wage jobs and who those jobs are available to. Community solar could be any low energy carbon supply is another example. Language is important here.
 - e. *Comment:* Potential impacts on residential community with industrial business development, need to be clear about what industry support should look like. With the

Montgomery Park area plan, they are building an industrial barrier into code. How does something like that fall into this plan?

- f. *Comment:* The buffer between residential and industrial is important. It should be up to the neighborhood to decide what works. Great thing to do to reflect what is valuable to the neighborhood. Suggest looking at data to help guide decision making.
 - g. *Comment:* Concern that other neighborhoods will push industry to Parkrose.
 - h. *Comment:* Land supply for industrial is a problem throughout the city.
 - i. *Comment:* Industrial land is included in the district and there is no real opportunity to expand the supply of industrial land. If there is conversion from industrial land to non-industrial land, then exclude that area from TIF so TIF cannot fund those conversions.
 - j. *Comment:* Not trying to eat into industrial land, support industrial land, employment access, and create a mitigation for the residential areas near industrial lands so economic opportunities and residential opportunities can coexist.
 - k. *Comment:* There is something here for the project team to outline in the plan around industrial/employment/residential balancing act.
6. Roger reviewed arts, culture, and signage themes for the project list.
 7. Roger reviewed recreational improvement themes for the project list.
 - a. *Comment:* Stress local parks that are walkable, not regional parks that you have to drive to.
 - b. *Comment:* Trees, pocket parks, access to outdoor event space/community gathering space, outdoor patios for restaurants.
 - c. *Comment:* Support for idea around open spaces close to businesses to create a strong environment.
 - d. *Comment:* Creating plazas and third places in business areas.
 - e. *Comment:* Areas along Sandy and industrial areas, off of bike paths, Parkrose Transit Center for opportunities for open space/recreation.
 8. Roger reviewed infrastructure priority themes for the project list.
 - a. *Comment:* Along Sandy safety improvements, connect the seams of the community that are disconnected by high use roads. There must be other pots of money for this as well but even then, this area is not getting prioritized for those funds.
 - b. *Comment:* Improvements there would also be great for any Rossi Farm development.
 - c. *Comment:* Recommend looking at 122nd Ave plan to see what is being covered there, maybe TIF could help fill gaps in that project.
 - d. *Comment:* Curious around how the plan could address the main corridors that are increasingly becoming thoroughfares for expanding population in Clark County. It is a different traffic pattern because of that huge magnet of activity. This is not going to diminish.
 - e. *Question:* Opportunity to name specific streets/issues, how much does this group want to fund traffic calming improvements with TIF?
 - f. *Comment:* Hesitation to do this – safety improvements are expensive and are not necessarily economic development improvements. This could blow apart any community building. On the other hand, money should not be needlessly used that doesn't contribute to creating a whole community.

- g. *Comment:* Not to subsidize PBOT/ODOT projects. Storefront improvements have been beneficial. Would like to see different types of parking structures that allow people to park and walk around the business areas and neighborhoods. Need sidewalk support.
 - h. *Comment:* Suggestion for additional time discussing street use. Be careful around demonizing commuters from Washington, they are creating income tax for our communities. We need to be careful about what we do to our neighbors.
9. Roger moved the committee into a conversation around priorities and allocation for funding.
- a. *Comment:* Support for Cully model insulating economic development funds with the 10% flexibility seems well balanced.
 - b. *Comment:* Need for more commercial investment over affordable housing investment. With the Rossi development, people are going to be upset with more affordable housing impacts in a neighborhood with a lot of existing below market rate housing. Suggesting as much as allowable economic development as possible.
 - c. *Comment:* Also, opportunity to limit infrastructure investment within economic development funds. Housing that is not within the regulated affordable housing is within the economic development funds. How much flexibility is needed?
 - d. *Comment:* Advocate for some flexibility since this is a long period of time for investment. Noting with an 80% AMI is market rate right now in a lot of places. Supportive for some cap on infrastructure investment because it is expensive and there is no shortage of infrastructure needs.
 - e. *Comment:* Infrastructure means a lot of different things and so does affordable housing. Is there a way to prioritize families in this? Businesses in the industrial areas need infrastructure, even getting better internet access. If you make the right investments in infrastructure, then private development will be incentivized.
 - f. *Comment:* Cully went with infrastructure when connected with priority projects. This helps to manage the infrastructure investment by limiting the scale of investment without other priority projects.
 - g. *Question and Comment:* How do we spur additional investment, no matter where it comes from? TIF funds should accelerate additional investment and development.
 - h. *Question:* What sort of infrastructure pieces are helpful to spur private investment?
Response: North Macadam TIF district is an example of this.
 - i. *Question:* Could we state a cap but allow exceptions to exceed the cap if the infrastructure is tied to a project in A through D? *Response:* Project team can draft language that gets to the level of flexibility and priorities folks are talking about here.
 - j. *Question:* Rossi-Argay development will need road and utility infrastructure, would TIF funds be used for this? *Response:* Potentially, depending on what this group lands on for the plan. There is opportunity for return on investment, but it would take up a significant portion of TIF funds.
 - k. *Comment:* Without assuming that everyone wants to leave downtown, with the industrial land opportunities, what are the types of businesses that would be most interested in coming to this neighborhood?
 - l. *Question:* What is the experience dealing with developers? Where are the private developer dollars who are investing in this neighborhood coming from? *Response:* This

is something to look into. Noting the amount of private investment relative to public investment is really high based on recent EcoNW study on recent TIF districts.

10. Roger reviewed the definition of priority communities that is currently in the plan and prompted the committee to discuss potential changes to the definition on basecamp.
 - a. *Question:* Is there a definition for low income? *Response:* This has not been outlined but is something that could be included.
 - b. *Comment:* Not seeing current residents on this list. Current residents should be a priority.
11. Roger thanked the committee members for their time, reviewed the next steps, and closed the meeting.