

East Portland TIF Exploration – Parkrose-Columbia Corridor  
Summary Notes – July 23, 2024

Committee Members: Colleen Johnson, Corky Collier, Lin Felton, Danell Norby, Michael Lopes-Serrao, Alando Simpson, Annette Stanhope, Bill Kent, Dave Ganslein, JR Lilly

Staff: Camille Trummer, Roger Gonzalez, Kathryn Hartinger, Dana DeKlyen, Kiana Ballo, Paula Byrd, Raul Preciado Mendez, Lisa Abuaf, Shea Flaherty Betin, Bill Cunningham, Brian Moore

Guest: Sharie Lewis, Parkrose School District

Summary Meeting Notes

1. Camille Trummer welcomed committee members and reviewed the meeting goals and agenda.
2. Camille presented the items for discussion including the following scenarios to go to a committee vote:
  - a. Option 1 – Move forward with a TIF district this year, and if a majority voted for this option, the following boundary scenarios would be considered in a second vote:
    - i. Maintain the present boundary, which includes Argay Terrace, and move forward with a TIF district this year (subject to board and council approval).
    - ii. Remove all areas east of 122<sup>nd</sup> (industrial and Argay Terrace) and move forward with a TIF district this year (subject to board and council approval).
    - iii. Remove the residential portions of Argay Terrace (while maintaining the industrial areas) and move forward with a TIF district this year (subject to board and council approval).
  - b. Option 2 – Request for additional time (12 months or so) for TIF exploration and provide an update to our board and council.
3. Camille reviewed the two-step voting process, reviewed the working group members' roles, and opened the floor for final questions and comments. Each working group member was allowed time to share and asked to disclose if they could personally benefit financially from a TIF district based on a committee member's request. Any working group member that was not present in the meeting would have the ability to vote until 10 AM the following day.
  - a. Danell Norby asked what the process is if the working group asks for more time. She noted as a resident of Parkrose her vote will come out of hope rather than out of fear. She acknowledged her role as Portland Housing Bureau employee and reiterated that she has been participating as a Parkrose resident.
  - b. Lisa Abuaf responded that the process would be going to council with an update versus an action. 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. Future council support for this effort was not guaranteed.
  - c. Roger Gonzalez added that there is a risk in that it is uncertain whether other taxing jurisdictions would forego additional funds in another round of TIF exploration.
  - d. Colleen Johnson commented that the Argay Terrace Neighborhood Association voted to ask for more time and that there is a risk of going against that vote by further

legitimizing people's view that the City does not listen to them. People are concerned about their neighborhood.

- e. Camille asked Colleen to verify the representation of the people who voted at the neighborhood association.
- f. Colleen responded that it was a fairly representative group of the neighborhood with a wide variety of ages and races.
- g. Roger clarified that the working group is making the determination today, not the Portland Housing Bureau and not Prosper Portland. Additionally, he shared that community engagement has been a significant part of this process, and the team had heard from immigrant communities, low-income residents, renters, BIPOC residents, youth, and houseless residents who highlighted the urgent need to generate the resources to support vulnerable communities.
- h. Lin Felton asked why boundary scenarios removing Argay Terrace are being considered and expressed curiosity around where that had been an active conversation. She had further curiosity around the working group vote being open to 10 members when certain members had not participated in meetings from the start of the process. She questioned that person's standing as a voting member of the work group.
- i. Lisa responded that those boundary options were in response to the Argay Terrace's vote for more time and hearing from others that they would still like to see some version of a TIF district in the area.
- j. Roger added that the intention was to provide options for the working group to consider, noting that there is a working group member who has not participated until June who is with the group today. He noted it did not seem fair to not raise that as well.
- k. Camille discussed that there are no clear rules to define participation and there are different ways that various working group members have participated including office hours, written and verbal communication.
- l. Lin stated that this is a community led process and including options that remove Argay Terrace have not been heard as an active part of the conversation.
- m. Roger added that there have been many residents that have voiced support for a TIF district. What has been shared are several options for the working group to consider, as committed from the project team.
- n. Annette Stanhope asked folks who attended the Argay Terrace Neighborhood Association meeting to speak to what more time was needed for, what needed to be resolved?
- o. Lin replied that more clarity for what TIF would mean for Argay Terrace residents and people felt that they could not process it in a short amount of time.
- p. Michael Lopes-Serrao stated that the TIF district would not be detrimental to the Parkrose School District and could benefit the community. He noted the dialogue really increased after the Argay Terrace Neighborhood Association meeting, and it was tense. He expressed that when you ask for a public vote with more than 50 people, it would be tough for someone to express a differing opinion. Michael acknowledged TIF is a confusing tool, and it takes time to understand the implications of TIF. He further noted the neighborhood meeting served loud voices and did not provide meaningful dialogue, with harsh comments directed at City employees which were hard to digest. He

expressed understanding the way this neighborhood has been treated historically seems to be the dominating force in that conversation and that waiting can lead to more confusion while the need for the resources is immediate.

- q. Alando Simpson indicated that this group is getting tied up on technicalities over the potential positive impact that a TIF district could have on benefiting future generations. There are forces that do not want changes to happen, and it comes from privilege and whiteness. He encouraged Prosper staff and working group members to be positive through this process because those loud voices are coming from a place of fear and scarcity of unaddressed trauma. He shared that some were trying to prevent prosperity and progress because of fear. He raised a question and concern around how the neighborhood just found out about this process when it has been going on for almost eight months.
- r. Paula Byrd responded that since community engagement started, Parkrose had the largest turn out and that it was not that they are just finding out, they are just now getting involved because it is getting to the critical point of the vote. She stated Prosper Portland had been reaching out to neighborhood associations well before the last month. She offered that whether people in the Working Group or Steering Committee are talking to their neighbors about this process is unknown but was their responsibility to share information with their communities.
- s. Alando mentioned in order to stop a project you start talking about more time and delays. In this instance, if this group looks to delay that sounds like this group does not want to utilize public resources to invest in the community.
- t. Camille added that the working group member's role is to serve as an ambassador for this work and spread the word about TIF exploration.
- u. Lin stated that all of the working group members want the best deal possible for all members of the community. She emphasized this is a potential 30-year agreement with Prosper Portland and the Portland Housing Bureau and a need more time vote is not stopping this potential agreement for the community, but the need for more time is a way to build a better agreement that the community will be grounded in.
- v. Corky Collier discussed that this conversation is rooted in other frustrations and the working group is here to vote on moving forward of the TIF district concept. He shared that staff have done a great job of answering questions, addressing committee needs, and laying out what it can look like. He suggested enthusiastically moving forward with a TIF district and the conversation will continue to play out with action plans.
- w. Michael asked if delay inherently had risk to potentially establishing a TIF district.
- x. Lisa responded it is safe to say yes – there is a risk in the City and County's appetite to take this up in the future and there is a risk that the new council may not be interested in another exploration process.
- y. Alando mentioned that the neighborhood association meeting conversation demonized certain businesses and individuals. Since his business started operations in Parkrose in 2019, there has been a community enhancement grant program that has put \$350,000 in the hands of the community as a result of the COR facility in Parkrose. There is a plethora of things that this business has done in collaboration with the community and

TIF dollars could greatly expand that opportunity. This is a big opportunity to build a sustainable ecosystem that encompasses all tiers of sustainability.

- z. Colleen stated that it is unfortunate that asking for more time has been equated with demonizing individuals and abandoning the next generation. She emphasized that requesting more time was a legitimate option.
  - aa. Annette expressed understanding the discomfort with saying yes to a plan that is broad. Thinking back to the process of how the Historic Parkrose Neighborhood Prosperity Network was created and how that area has grown over time, there is a now grocery store and improved storefronts, and there are lessons learned. When that mini-TIF district was established, another year's time to draft the plan would not have substantially helped change anything.
  - bb. Lin asked what benefits people may experience from the TIF funding. What does benefit mean.
  - cc. JR Lilly commented that the district needs to move forward. If there is a pause there is no identified funding for engagement. The money that is being used now was set aside by the Mayor last year. This is one step in the process, City Council is the one who has the final decision. If this group agrees to move forward today, there is still a long process with opportunities to engage. This conversation has been going on for several years and not everything is perfect about it. It is the right move for this neighborhood, and it is what is going to give the community a competitive edge.
4. Camille prompted working group members to vote on either Option 1 – proceeding with a TIF district going to Board and Council on the current timeline or Option 2 – request for additional time (12 months or so) for TIF exploration and provide an update to the Prosper Portland Board and City Council.
    - a. Members voted in the following manner:
      - i. Colleen Johnson voted to request more time.
      - ii. Danell Norby voted to proceed with a TIF district this year.
      - iii. Lin Felton voted to request more time.
      - iv. Michael Lopes-Serraio voted to proceed with a TIF district this year.
      - v. Corky Collier voted to proceed with a TIF district this year.
      - vi. JR Lilly voted to proceed with a TIF district this year.
      - vii. Annette Stanhope voted to proceed with a TIF district this year.
      - viii. Dave Ganslein voted to request more time.
      - ix. Bill Kent voted to proceed with a TIF district this year.
    - b. Of nine working group members present, six voted to proceed and three voted for more time. Sharie Lewis and Alando Simpson did not vote as they were represented by other working group members who participated in the vote.
  5. Camille presented the boundary scenarios for working group members to vote on:
    - a. Maintain the present boundary, which includes Argay Terrace, and move forward with a TIF district this year (subject to board and council approval).
    - b. Remove all areas east of 122<sup>nd</sup> (industrial and Argay Terrace) and move forward with a TIF district this year (subject to board and council approval).

- c. Remove the residential portions of Argay Terrace (while maintaining the industrial areas) and move forward with a TIF district this year (subject to board and council approval).
6. Roger shared maps for each scenario and discussed the acreage and details of each scenario. Any future amendments to a TIF district would require a legislative process and is limited to an additional 20% of the original acreage.
7. Lisa acknowledged that options b and c do not include the Argay Terrace residential area to allow continued neighborhood conversation so if there was community support after a potential TIF district was established, that area could be amended into the district.
8. Camille opened the floor to limited discussion.
  - a. Bill Kent asked for clarity regarding the purpose of voting on scenarios. He noted one small group should not determine what happens for all residents and businesses in the district and stated the industrial area should not be cut out.
  - b. Camille stated the last vote was to proceed now or later, this vote is for a potential boundary. She reminded the working group that they had not set a final boundary, and the different scenarios are responsive to community feedback. Whatever scenario receives the majority vote will move forward.
  - c. Colleen asked about the other districts voting on governance and draft plans.
  - d. Roger responded that that was the last vote and that the conversation last week was to identify any remaining issues to finalize those documents. Moving forward today is moving forward with the package of the plan and governance charter that this group has been working on. He noted other working groups had already established a boundary and that this group needs a boundary to produce and finalize the plan and report documents.
  - e. Corky voiced support for option a and acknowledged the reason to have the other options is to be responsive to Argay Terrace.
  - f. Colleen stated that the neighborhood association has not discussed these possibilities and deferred to Lin as an Argay Terrace Neighborhood Association board member.
  - g. Camille responded that options b and c allow for more time for Argay Terrace to decide to be included in the district or not.
  - h. Lin stated she could not vote on scenarios that have not been discussed with the community. As a representative of the community in this community process, what the community arrived at was more time to examine the deal on the table.
  - i. Camille asked for clarification from Lin, the Argay Terrace neighborhood association asked for more time and options b and c allow for more time for Argay Terrace to decide if they should be included in the district or not. The neighborhood association area could be amended into the district.
  - j. Lisa responded that there could be language in the plan and communications to council that outlined the need to continue conversation with Argay Terrace for potential amendment without that neighborhood deciding for other neighborhoods whether or not to be in a district.
  - k. Lin stated that Argay Terrace neighborhood association did not say they wanted to be in or out of the deal, they wanted more time to discuss the deal.



circulated to the city attorney's office for review. If there are substantive issues, please flag those ASAP.

- c. *Question:* The other two TIF groups are voting on the plan and charter? *Response:* Part of the dilemma is that this group did not have a boundary. If the working group feels strongly that there is a need for a formal vote for the report, plan and governance charter with findings and existing conditions we can circulate that for review and an electronic vote.
  - d. *Comment:* The vote tomorrow is the same go, no go, or pause that this group had today. The vote for the other districts tomorrow is on the plan and governance charter. They are voting to go, no go, or pause based on the two documents that everyone has had access to for weeks.
  - e. *Comment:* This group has gone through the plan and charter line by line in the last two meetings.
12. Lin requested that any of the working group and steering committee members state if they would benefit monetarily from the TIF district.
- a. Danell asked if it counts as a benefit, as a homeowner, if property value increased.
  - b. Camille asked what benefit monetarily means.
  - c. Danell discussed that property value could go up, but that is uncertain.
  - d. Bill asked how can people know if they will benefit if no projects have been selected.
  - e. Lin stated that this is a transparency question.
  - f. Danell stated that as a homeowner it is possible property value could go up.
  - g. Michael stated no direct benefit but potential benefit for the school district and opportunities for students.
  - h. Colleen stated that property value could go down or up based on what was selected.
  - i. JR stated he does not anticipate any personal conflict of interest but there are benefits to the community and for people's voices to be heard outside of personal monetary benefits. This is another tool to accomplish community benefits without additional costs.
  - j. Annette stated it is uncertain if she would qualify for any homeowner benefit programs within the TIF district.
  - k. Bill asked if it was whether people wanted to talk about how TIF was going to benefit the community not whether individuals would benefit.
  - l. Dave stated that he would not benefit from TIF funding.
  - m. Corky stated he does not own property or a business in the area, so he would not personally benefit, but he works in a non-profit whose members could potentially see some benefit in the future.
  - n. Alando stated for the record that there is no guarantee that any member will receive any benefit.
  - o. Bill stated that there needs to be further information to answer the question.
13. Camille closed the meeting.