

East Portland TIF Exploration – 82<sup>nd</sup> Ave  
Summary Notes – July 17, 2024

Committee Members: Zonnyo Riger, Jacob Loeb, Nick Sauvie, Barb Geyer, Alisa Kajikawa, Valeria McWilliams, Nancy Chapin

Staff: Roger Gonzalez, Kathryn Hartinger, Kiana Ballo, Paula Byrd, Raul Preciado Mendez, Brian Moore, Barry Manning, Dana DeKlyen

Summary Meeting Notes

1. Camille Trummer welcomed committee members and reviewed the meeting goals and agenda.
2. Kathryn Hartinger asked committee members if they would prefer to finish reviewing the plan or begin with the governance charter.
  - a. *Question:* Did anyone work on expanding the goals section as was discussed in the last meeting? *Response:* Yes, there is a lot of new language and is a big part of what needs to be reviewed.
3. Kathryn prompted committee members to review the plan document.
  - a. *Comment:* Need to be specific about the outcomes of the plan.
  - b. *Comment:* This is a broad plan with limited funds, goals need to be specific to how TIF funds are implemented. It is challenging if the goals outlined in the plan are too broad and go beyond the scope of what TIF is able to do.
  - c. *Comment:* This document is the north star of what the district hopes to achieve, and the action plans are the mechanism to accomplish the goals. This plan does not seem like the place to add that level of detail and metrics.
  - d. *Comment:* Language allows for things to be reinterpreted and it feels like there is a push in this group to do action planning in addition to this plan. It feels like some of the measures are stepping into the action planning space and this groups need to allow the community leadership committee to do that work. Some flexibility is good, and this group has to trust that the community leadership committee will do the work. It is hard to trust the future.
  - e. *Comment:* Can add language to outline how action planning will get into this work and how that process will go to strengthen the community's involvement in action planning.
  - f. *Comment:* Still feels possible to have some middle-ground like at the conclusion of the district that there would be more tree canopy or more safe routes to school. Room for more specificity in goals or implementation principles.
  - g. *Comment:* In the desire to have district wide outcomes as the metric for success, there seems to be a tension around the resources TIF has available compared to the need of the district. There is a fairness issue in judging the success of the TIF district, maybe the goals could be framed in the nature of the desired investments.
  - h. *Comment:* When this funding is braided with other funding, it is hard to make a direct link of impact. An accountability for how the goals are impacting priority communities related to goal metrics seems important and needs to be intentional about creating equity.

- i. *Comment:* It is troubling to not have specificity. What are the barriers, who is going to benefit and who is going to be punished? Need to define what this is.
- j. *Comment:* It is a challenge to fully define what barriers are because there could be new barriers that come up in the future that this group cannot anticipate.
- k. *Comment:* Words like barriers and access and displacement and inclusion need to be defined so they are not easily misunderstood.
- l. *Comment:* Like the direction of leaning into the definition section and number definitions so it can be referred to throughout the document. Language can change or be co-opted over time. At the same time, this group could spend years developing the definitions and cannot solve for every future occurrence and be completely inclusive. Define enough for people to see intent.
- m. *Comment:* Within the timeframe available, this is a document that is supposed to be high level and if there is a prescriptive level of detail will be difficult for action plans. Being mindful of the timeline and process.
- n. *Comment:* From a policy perspective, this goes through a lengthy legal review process with city attorneys. There is a way to reference definitions that are used elsewhere in the city without getting into too specific of detail.
- o. *Comment:* This is an important clean up piece and will be important across districts to be consistent. Definitions will need to be consistent with the comprehensive plan as well. The legal review will help tidy this up.
- p. *Comment:* Circling back, respecting the desire to be able to limit specific negative outcomes and find a way to build that into the plan. May be helpful to speak to the investments and the desirable future condition, outlining how investments can catalyze that outcome.
- q. *Comment:* Need to be thoughtful and intentional with solutions to ensure that cost burdens are not passed down to tenants when investing in development.
- r. *Comment:* Feeling uncomfortable without programmatic funds to supplement this work.
- s. *Comment:* There are pieces in the implementation principles and accountability to get at this point. There could be advocacy for language about that added to the ordinance itself to elevate that desire.
- t. *Comment:* In order to ensure a degree of flexibility of homeownership, not all affordable housing should be permanent, deed restricted affordable housing. Preferred is still a flexible word.
- u. *Comment:* There was a robust conversation about the tension between permanent affordability of an area versus wealth building for an individual. Flagging that this current language prioritizes permanent affordability, or it could be made more flexible.
- v. *Comment:* It almost incentivizes quick turn over to build wealth, worry that it is a pull up ladder situation that excludes future generations from benefiting from that opportunity. It could easily be inequitably applied in the market which poses another problem. Inclination to ensure a mixture throughout the district and reaches beyond short term fixes.
- w. Sentiment with working group to keep language as is.

- x. *Comment:* Adapt language to large sites for remediation/redevelopment opportunities, seems too specific to refer to only one site. There could be many more opportunities in the future that this group is not aware of.
  - y. *Comment:* This piece is under the community identified priorities and is not tied to broader eligibility; those broader opportunities are still outlined in the project list.
  - z. *Comment:* Seems important to highlight that site as it aligns with the goals, it does feel oddly specific, but it is an impactful opportunity.
  - aa. *Comment:* Seems inconsistent with the specificity in the rest of the document and could better fit in a future action plan.
  - bb. *Comment:* If there is an item that is specifically called out in existing districts, it can be used to advance development that may or may not be in alignment with the district goals.
  - cc. *Comment:* With that information, remove the specific site call out. Also use undeveloped and underdeveloped language.
4. Camille transitioned the working group to review and discuss the governance charter.
- a. Kathryn reviewed the updates to the governance charter language since the previous meeting.
  - b. *Comment:* 13 people is a small group and if two are reserved for youth that only leaves 11.
  - c. *Comment:* The way it is currently written, it does not hold any spots for youth. The size of the committee has to reflect the charge of the committee. If there was a committee was just providing comments on staff who are doing the work, it would make more sense to have a larger committee. With the co-creation style of work, it is challenging to organize that many people. If committee members are going to be deeply engaged with cocreation, it is more effective to have a smaller group. Outside experts can be brought in at anytime to provide information if there is an expertise not represented on the committee.
  - d. *Comment:* Often Committee members officially or unofficially represent a particular group not just themselves.
  - e. *Comment:* Appreciate the additions regarding resourcing for future community leadership committee.
  - f. *Comment:* Public deserves to know about investment details and financial reports.
  - g. *Comment:* Throughout the draft document, there are references to working with community organizations. There aren't that many community groups and what their agenda is may not align with the committee members. There is no wording in this document that the committee will work with individuals, not just community organizations.
  - h. *Comment:* Certainly, the intention is not to make individuals feel like they cannot participate without being connected to community groups. There is language outlining that this is a public body and so any person serving on the committee is subject to conflict-of-interest protections. There is also language outlining that anyone serving on the committee only represents themselves and is not representative of their organization.
5. Camille reviewed next steps and closed the meeting.