

East Portland TIF Exploration – 82<sup>nd</sup> Ave  
Summary Notes – July 24, 2024

Committee Members: Zonnyo Riger, Jacob Loeb, Nancy Chapin, Barb Geyer, Nick Sauvie, Duncan Hwang, Alisa Kajikawa, Joshua Pangelinan, Valeria McWilliams, Jamal Dar

Staff: Kathryn Hartinger, Camille Trummer, Paula Byrd, Raul Preciado Mendez, Dana DeKlyen, Brian Moore, Kiana Ballo, Robert Smith

### Summary Meeting Notes

1. Camille Trummer welcomed committee members and reviewed the meeting goals and agenda.
2. Camille reviewed the voting process for working groups to decide whether or not to move forward with the legislative process for the current package of district boundaries, plan, and governance charter. The other options are to stop or to request more time. Any working group member not present in this meeting are able to vote via email until 10 am tomorrow.
  - a. Kathryn Hartinger added that there are potential risks with asking for a pause. It is uncertain how the remaining jurisdictions would feel about foregoing additional funds in another round of TIF district exploration. Prosper would look to this group to guide what the next phase of engagement looks like and would need to seek additional funding to support any additional engagement. With a whole new city commission, future council support for this effort is not guaranteed.
3. Camille opened the discussion for working group members to provide final comments or raise any questions or concerns.
  - a. Alisa Kajikawa asked why the vote needs to happen today.
  - b. Kathryn responded that today's vote is to put a plan into the legislative process that takes about three months. Legal review of the documents needs to occur before the Prosper Portland board process begins in August. Prosper Portland Board will vote at the end of August, then go to Planning Commission, and then to City Council at the end of October. Then there is a 30-day appeal window before it can be recorded with the county. This timeline has been pushed just about as far as it can be pushed. The super notice also goes out 45 days before the first city council hearing which is a postcard with TIF information that is sent to every address in the city. There are also many opportunities at public hearings to continue engagement and provide comments.
  - c. Jacob Loeb asked to what degree the document get changed with corrections and typos.
  - d. Kathryn replied that there is a Prosper and City legal team review mostly for legal aspects. It is on staff to review any revisions and ensure there are not any substantive changes to the documents. If there are things that need to be changed later, it can be fixed and it will all come back to staff to ensure it is reflective of this committee's work.
  - e. Jacob asked about a segment about prioritizing undoing previous harms. If that is still in the plan and if it was removed, when or why?
  - f. Kathryn replied that it is under implementation principal O.
  - g. Alisa asked about revenue share. What is the timeline for that and what would be needed for this working group to advocate for revenue share if this district is approved?

- h. Kathryn responded that there is a revenue share process that starts at a certain percentage of maximum indebtedness. This would be a negotiation between the County and the City about whether or not the County is open to this. When the miniature TIF districts (Neighborhood Prosperity Networks) were established the county agreed to revenue share to support programming. This would be much larger but there could certainly be negotiated. This would be several years out.
- i. Robert Smith discussed that when the Neighborhood Prosperity Networks were launched there was an intergovernmental agreement with the county and there was a need for additional funds needed for non-TIF eligible expenses.
- j. Dana DeKlyen added that the goal of the community economic development project was to get a million dollars into the community which is why it was negotiation at the conception of the micro TIF district. Since these are traditional size TIF districts, it would make more sense to have those negotiations closer to the inflection point.
- k. Zonnyo Riger asked about the timeline for if this district was to move forward.
- l. Camille replied that there needs to be approval by City Council for the district to be established. From approval this group will help select members for a community leadership committee which will then begin the action planning process.
- m. Kathryn added that if this is approved the first funds will begin accumulating on July 1, 2025 and it takes a while to get to a place where there is an educated committee to help make decisions and in the beginning there is not a huge rush to get dollars out the door. This allows time to do committee recruitment and develop criteria for selection, as well as continued community engagement and outreach. In Cully, there was a selection committee with the working group members who were not looking to apply to the community leadership committee and instead helped select the applicants for the community leadership committee. It took almost a year to have a committee selected and through the appointment process. The first couple months with the committee has been working on bylaws and education around TIF.
- n. Nick Sauvie asked what the role is of the steering committee. Concerns around integration of the plans between the three districts. Not all of the steering committee members have read all of the plans and they should work together.
- o. Camille replied that there is overlap between the districts but there are distinctions to meet specific community needs based on the feedback from community and the working groups. It is not an expectation of the working group members to look at other districts.
- p. Nick stated that there are community groups that have proposals and questioned how those proposals will be considered. One example is there are people who are interested in the set aside and that it will not be aggregate across the districts.
- q. Camille replied there is still ample opportunity for engagement and specificity happens in the action plans.
- r. Kathryn added that the concern around the housing set aside policy is safe guarded with the percentage minimums for economic development and for affordable housing. The other piece around the housing set aside is that it is the work of the action plan and the community leadership committee.
- s. Nick stated that housing was continually neglected in the plan.

- t. Kathryn responded that the 45% set aside for housing is set in the plan.
  - u. Nick stated that the percentages within the 45% set aside are not set.
  - v. Kathryn responded that this would happen within the action planning process and anyone looking to bring those interests to the table should be engaged in the action planning process. Please connect staff with anyone looking to engage with that process.
  - w. Alisa asked when the district plan goes through reviews and if the working group will be able to see any edits.
  - x. Kathryn replied that the final documents will be posted a week before the Prosper Portland board and there will be an opportunity to make changes there if there is anything that the working group needs to flag.
4. Kathryn transitioned the committee to cast their vote to move forward, not move forward, or request more time.
- i. Duncan Hwang voted to proceed.
  - ii. Nancy Chapin voted to proceed.
  - iii. Valeria McWilliams voted to proceed. Looking to amend the map in the future to cover the dip on the East side of Lents Park up to foster if there is availability to utilize additional acreage. Important to be consistent with coverage East of 92<sup>nd</sup>.
  - iv. Nick Sauvie voted to request more time.
  - v. Joshua Pangelinan voted to proceed.
  - vi. Zonnyo Riger voted to proceed.
  - vii. Alisa Kajikawa voted to proceed.
  - viii. Jacob Loeb voted to proceed.
  - ix. Barb Geyer voted to request more time.
  - x. Jamal Dar voted to proceed.
- b. Of ten working group members present, eight voted to proceed, and two voted to request more time.
- c. Three working group members not present will be asked to vote via email before 10 am tomorrow. Two votes to proceed; one did not respond to the request for a vote, so will be counted as abstain/did not vote.
5. Kathryn reviewed the next steps and will be in touch with important dates and opportunities to engage.
- a. Nick asked when the next steering committee meeting is scheduled.
  - b. Kathryn replied that the steering committee does not have another meeting scheduled.
  - c. Nick stated that it would be important for steering committee members to review and provide feedback on the plans.
  - d. Kathryn responded that the steering committee has had access to all district plans on basecamp and has had the opportunity to review and provide comments alongside the working groups.
  - e. Jacob asked about expanding the district, when would that opportunity occur, and would the working group help shape the boundary.
  - f. Kathryn stated that all three districts voted to proceed. It is possible to amend a district up to 20% and the area Valeria mentioned is about 5% of the district. In the current process, it will be hard to change the boundary with the legal documents and findings

related to the established boundary. Once it is adopted, there is an opportunity to pick up small sections through a minor amendment process.

6. Kathryn thanked committee members for their time and effort with this process.