



May 15, 2025 Labor and Workforce Development Committee Agenda

City Hall, Council Chambers, 2nd Floor – 1221 SW Fourth Avenue, Portland, OR 97204

In accordance with Portland City Code and state law, City Council holds hybrid public meetings, which provide for both virtual and in-person participation. Councilors may elect to attend remotely by video and teleconference, or in-person. The City makes several avenues available for the public to listen to and watch the broadcast of this meeting, including the [City's YouTube Channel](#), the [Open Signal website](#), and Xfinity Channel 30 and 330.

Questions may be directed to councilclerk@portlandoregon.gov

Thursday, May 15, 2025 12:00 pm

Session Status: Adjourned

Committee in Attendance:

Councilor Sameer Kanal

Councilor Steve Novick

Councilor Mitch Green, Vice Chair

Councilor Jamie Dunphy

Councilor Loretta Smith, Chair

Councilor Smith presided.

Officers in attendance: Rebecca Dobert, Acting Council Clerk

Committee adjourned at 1:22 p.m.

Minutes Approval

1

[February 27-April 24, 2025 Labor and Workforce Development Committee minutes](#)

Council action: Approved

Motion to adopt minutes for committee meetings held since February: Moved by Dunphy and seconded by Green. (Aye (5): Kanal, Novick, Green, Dunphy, Smith)

Regular Agenda

2

[Workforce development aspects of the Prosper Portland section of the City Budget](#) (Presentation)

Document number: 2025-202

Introduced by: Councilor Loretta Smith

City department: Prosper Portland

Time requested: 1 hour

Council action: Placed on File

Portland City Council, Labor and Workforce Development Committee

May 15, 2025 - 12:00 p.m.

Speaker List

Name	Title	Document Number
Loretta Smith	Councilor, Committee Chair	
Rebecca Dobert	Acting Council Clerk	
Sameer Kanal	Councilor	
Steve Novick	Councilor	
Mitch Green	Councilor, Vice Chair	
Jamie Dunphy	Councilor	
Ashley Hernandez	Council Coordinator	
Andrew Fitzpatrick	Interim Director of Economic Development, Prosper Portland	2025-202
Amy Fleck-Rosete	Program Manager, Prosper Portland	2025-202
Robert Smith	Entrepreneurship &Community Economic Development Manger, Prosper Portland	2025-202
Patrick Gihring	Project ManagerChief Program Officer, Worksystems, Inc.	2025-202

Portland City Council Committee Meeting Closed Caption File

May 15, 2025 – 12:00 p.m.

This file was produced through the closed captioning process for the televised city Council broadcast and should not be considered a verbatim transcript. The official vote counts, motions, and names of speakers are included in the official minutes.

Speaker: Good afternoon, everybody, and welcome to our hearing of the labor and workforce development committee. I am your chair, councilor loretta smith, joined by our vice chair, councilor mitch green. To my to my left, councilors jamie dunphy, steve novick and sameer canal are seated up here with us as well. And good afternoon. We're also joined by ashley hernandez from council operations. Thank you, ashley and Keelan mcclymont from the council clerk's office. Keelan, could you please call the roll, please?

Speaker: Good afternoon. Canal here. Novick here. Green here.

Speaker: Dunphy here.

Speaker: Smith, here.

Speaker: Keelan. Today it's a different person. I don't know their name.

Speaker: Keelan. Is not here today. Can I get your your full name?

Speaker: I'm deputy council clerk, rebecca daubert.

Speaker: Thank you. Rebecca. I appreciate I had to look over there and say, okay.

Speaker: No worries. Scripts are changing.

Speaker: Yes. Thank you so much. Could you please read the first agenda item?

Speaker: Absolutely. Item one, February 27th through April 24th, 2025. Labor and workforce development committee minutes.

Speaker: We have been asked to approve minutes for each of our committee meetings this this last year. That is a total of five sets of minutes. Unless there are any objections, I believe we can consider and vote on all sets of minutes. Should I read the dates of the minutes?

Speaker: I will just read a quick statement about the minutes from the clerk's office committee meeting minutes include the disposition agenda, which documents the actions committees take on each agenda item. The minutes also include the closed caption file, a speaker list, and audio files in mp3 format for each meeting. Minutes will be presented for approval once a month for the previous months meetings, except with the exception of today, where we have the February through April 20th 25 minutes and then they can be voted on unanimous consent.

Speaker: Okay, so I believe we're required to confirm that we have read and we understood each of these sets of minutes. Is that correct? Could I please have a motion to adopt all five sets of minutes for our committee meetings held since February.

Speaker: So moved second.

Speaker: Thank you, councilor dunphy. Thank you, councilor green. Is there any discussion on the minutes? No discussion here. No need for further discussion. We will call the vote. Could you please call the vote? Rebecca?

Speaker: Canal. Yes.

Speaker: Novick a green. Yes.

Speaker: Dunphy a smith, i. And the minutes are approved.

Speaker: The vote carried.

Speaker: The vote carries are minutes are approved.

Speaker: That's okay. Thank you. Our next presentation is going to be on the workforce development aspects of prosper Portland in the city of Portland's

mayor's budget. This presentation will focus on prosper Portland's workforce development programs. The designated speakers may be joined by their colleagues from work systems as well. And mr. Fitzpatrick, hi. Could you could you all come up?

Speaker: I'll read the agenda item before they start. Agenda item two workforce development aspects of the prosper Portland section of the city budget.

Speaker: While we are setting in, I have some information to share with my colleagues. Yesterday, it came to our attention that there are multiple versions of the mayor's proposed budget in circulation. We may have been relying on different versions of the budget when discussing budget details. When the mayor released his budget on may 5th, me and my staff immediately began downloading electronic copies. A few days later, a spiral bound hard copy of the budget was disseminated by the mayor's office to members of the council, and sometime in the past week, a new version of the electronic document that was uploaded to the city's website. Yesterday. Some staff found some discrepancies between the initial release document and the now updated document, and among those issues were formatting errors that make certain line items in illegible, and the versions differ in length by at least 12 pages. So this situation presents significant questions and concerns. So I felt it necessary to raise these concerns in our committee meeting today for the sake of transparency. If there's some issues around different numbers, because we're all looking in different reference books. We don't know what caused this to happen, but we should still recognize the impacts. And we should remember that councilors will be held accountable for the budget that we vote on, and we need to make sure which version is the correct version. So I urge my colleagues to join me in requesting clarity from the mayor's office, including publication of a final, revised budget document that resolves any clerical or

formatting inconsistencies among the previous versions. So I would suggest that prosper go in, look at the two versions to make sure that your particular budget items have not been changed in any kind of way to make sure that those jive with your your your spreadsheets. Additionally, we may we may wish to engage in some rigorous after action reviews to identify any lingering problems. In the end, we need to provide Portlanders with a clear idea of what our balanced budget looks like. So I will let you all begin your presentation. I just wanted to make sure that I noted that in the beginning.

Speaker: Thank you, chair smith.

Speaker: And I guess what I'm saying, I do understand if the numbers are not what I think it is, because there's some issues with the numbers.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: You're welcome.

Speaker: Good afternoon, chair smith, vice chair, green, members of the labor and workforce development committee, really appreciate the invitation and the opportunity to appear before you today and testify before this committee. My name is andrew fitzpatrick, and I'm the interim economic development director at prosper Portland, our interim executive director, shay flaherty, who you saw last night, would like to be here but sends his regrets as he is currently participating in final interviews for the hiring of our new permanent executive director of prosper Portland. I'm joined here on the dais by robert smith, prosper Portland's entrepreneurship and community economic development manager amy fleck rossetti, a project manager at prosper Portland who is responsible for managing some of our key workforce development contracts. And we are waiting for patrick deering, who we expect to appear as well. He's the chief program officer at our partner, work systems inc. I know that we may also have dca, morrissey from the

city, John Jordan from Prosper, and several other city and work systems team members here in the gallery who are really here to represent a lot of the work and answer technical questions as needed. In the second hour of our time here. Can we go to the next slide, please? Together we will present to you an overview of Prosper Portland's workforce development programs and investments, the respective budgets for each of these programs, and the anticipated impacts due to the FY 2026 budget reductions that have been proposed. As noted here, we are responsible for administering four workforce programs for low to moderate income Portlanders. Our economic opportunity program, or EOP, which is focused on the adult population, Next Gen focused on youth. Our community workforce navigator program, which is district based, and our community opportunities and enhancements program, or COEP. We will dive deeper into each of these programs momentarily. If you go to the next slide, please. As you know, Prosper's central goal is to drive inclusive economic growth for the city of Portland. Workforce development is an absolutely critical tool to our agency because in order for growth to be inclusive, we must simultaneously provide Portlanders with equitable opportunities to build the knowledge, skills and abilities needed to connect, compete, and benefit from our economic growth. Advanced Portland our city's five year economic development strategy and Portland's guiding framework for all of our work, states that one of our city's four primary objectives is connecting Portlanders to high quality jobs and future ready sectors. To accomplish this, we leverage Prosper Portland's industry expertise and investments, employer relationships, and business community networks to partner with Work Systems, Inc. To implement job training programs that can feed into career pathways in growing industries in our city. I want to emphasize that we could not do this work as effectively as we do without the close partnership we have with Work Systems, so I

want to recognize their tremendous value for our community and appreciate them for being with us today. Before we hear directly from them, I will next turn over. The next turn this over to amy, who will provide you with some additional information about the workforce development programs that we offer and the impact that they are now having in our community. Amy. Thank you.

Speaker: Good afternoon. Councilors. As andrew mentioned, my name is amy crosetti. I use she her pronouns and I manage three of our workforce development programs, which includes next gen, the economic opportunity program, and the community workforce navigator program, while my colleague darren jordan, who is here today, manages the community opportunities and enhancements program, which has workforce development, which has a workforce development component focused on supporting individuals connecting to careers in the construction trades. This slide shows workforce partners that support program service delivery. For our four workforce development programs. We will that we are discussing today. Prosper Portland contracts with work systems to administer the next gen and economic opportunity program and the community opportunities and enhancements program. Our partnership and investment in next gen and the economic opportunity program with work systems allows those programs to leverage key federal workforce innovation act funds, as well as other state resources, work system staff. Managed service provider contracts offer ongoing training and one on one support to coaches, provide fiscal and billing assistance, and handle data management and reporting requirements. Next slide please. Both the economic opportunity and next gen programs offer long term career coaching and individual case management to assist participants with career exploration, training, access, work experience and job placement. The economic opportunity program serves Portland residents ages 18 and older who face barriers to

employment, are low income, and would like to find job opportunities, work systems contracts with erco southeast works are just future trash for peace and central city concern to deliver to deliver these services to the community. The economic opportunity program consists of two phases. During the in program phase, participants receive enrollment assistance, needs assessments, career mapping, skills training, job readiness support services, and job search help in the follow up phase. Once employed, participants have regular check ins with their coaches which help them retain employment and advance within their roles to find better job opportunities. Participants can stay in the program for up to three years, including about one year in the follow up phase for the next gen program, which targets youth aged 16 to 24 who are low income, out of school or at risk of dropping out work systems. Contracts with erco, Portland youth builders, new avenues for youth, Portland community college and poic to deliver these services. The program includes three stages. During the preparatory phase, coaches support participants with a range of services including career plan offering, work readiness training, career exploration support services, and access to mentoring or counseling if needed. In the training phase, participants ready to work and training can access scholarships for industry specific training. During the placement and retention phase, coaches assist with job searches. Post-secondary preparation until the participants achieve their career goals. Similar to eop, participants typically engage for up to three years, with one year in post placement support. These programs are currently funded through a mix of general fund, community development block grants, enterprise zone funds, and leverage resources from work systems. Next slide please. This slide shows the outcomes for the adult program for fiscal year 2324. Last year, the program served 686 participants. Over 40% identified as women and 57% identified as people of color. 87% of the

participants entered the program with incomes at or below 30% of the median family income, and over 80% of the participants gained employment overall. Those who completed the program experienced an average wage increase of 16% compared to their starting wage. Next slide please. This slide outlines the outcomes for the youth program for the last fiscal year. The next gen program assisted 491 participants, with 72% identifying as people of color and 49% identifying as women. 78% of the participants entered the program with incomes at or below 30% of the median family income, and out of those who participated, 90 completed the program and 78 secured employment or continued their education at post-secondary institutions. Next slide please. Our next program is the community workforce navigator program, which is managed by prosper Portland and closely coordinated with Portland's neighborhood prosperity districts. Launched in 2015, this program aims to connect job seekers with low barrier services available in their community. Funding for the program comes from a combination of general fund, community development block grants, enterprise zone funds, and enterprise zone funds. Prosper Portland currently partners with rosewood initiative division, midway alliance, Portland community college, and urban league. Unlike the youth and adult career coaching programs, the navigator program offers a lighter touch support. Their services include conducting individual needs assessments to identify suitable job opportunities based on experience and training. They provide assistance with resume writing, interview practice, and connecting to job openings, as well as referrals to other programs or providers for those who need help accessing services such as rent assistance, training or other resources. Next slide please, and our outcomes for the community navigator program for fiscal year 2324. 78% identified as people of color, 82% entered the program at incomes at 30% of the median family income, and 77 participants secured employment. And

I'm pleased to report that the program has surpassed last year's goal, with outcomes this fiscal year to date, over 500 individuals have been served and 147 have successfully secured employment. Next up, I'll pass it over to Robert to provide an overview of the community opportunities and enhancements program.

Speaker: Thank you Amy. Good afternoon. Councilors. My name is Robert Smith. I use he/him pronouns and I manage the entrepreneurship and community economic development team at Prosper. Today I'll be providing an overview of the community opportunity and enhancements program, or coop or coep as it's known. I know coop has come up at the at this committee and at the full council, so I wanted to take a moment to provide some additional background. A majority of the program is funded through 1% set aside of hard construction costs of capital improvement projects. The goal of coep is to increase equity in public contracting, broadening opportunities when it comes to workforce, to the workforce, delivering on city infrastructure projects and those who bid on and are awarded city construction contracts. The timeline that you see here provides a little bit of history on the program. In 2020, Prosper Portland and the city entered into an IGA for program development and service delivery. Council adopted coep into code, and administrative rules were established. Around the same time, a petition was filed requesting the validation of contributions by the water bureau and BTS, and to ensure that they were being used for the provision of delivery of those services. Because of the pending legal process, coep was only able to utilize contributions from two of three pilot projects. Initially, that would be the Portland building, the 10th and Yamhill Smart Park, and then the third was the Washington Park Reservoir, which was on hold because of legal proceedings. After moving through the legal process, there was a formal, formal ratepayer decision that resulted in the release of those additional dollars, and it was linked to a list of commonly used trades,

specifically those trades that were associated with both water and sewer projects. The iga was amended to reflect that updated eligibility requirements, and then the corresponding service delivery contracts that we had with partners reflected this as well. And where we stand today, we have we are currently in the first year of a two year extension that was provided by a fifth amendment to the original iga, which provides funding through 2026. And this period is referenced in the iga as kind of phase one or the pilot period.

Speaker: Mr. Smith, I have a question. I think coep is good and great at what they do, but I'm concerned because I've gotten so many phone calls about the 8.5 million that prosper received and that it's not going back into the subcontractors to help them with technical assistance. And so I'm trying to figure out one. Did we get the 8.5 million? Did prosper put the 8.5 million in back into the system. And I'll tell you who I'm I'm referring to because morris rahming from o'neil electric is concerned that he is not getting the proper 1% back on that project. And can you tell me what happened with that?

Speaker: Yeah, I think this particular concept is something that's come up throughout the history of the program, and that is the difference between the intent and building a pipeline for delivering on future projects versus projects specific supports. It's a conversation that we have had over the years. And I think there's been some confusion honestly around it and what the intent is. Looking back at code, it talks about business technical assistance in kind of that pipeline development approach. And I think that's the distinction with the service delivery that we do via work systems and other community partners is around building that pipeline, preparing the pipeline for the future and the forward looking capital improvement project schedule.

Speaker: I know that that was the concern because there was a deal before this. I think the issue is many of these small subs and contractors, they want the money for the project that's happening right now, not the future projects. And so I'm trying to figure out there was like \$225,000 that was allotted for this next fiscal year. And I want to know how we can work out because there is a misunderstanding somewhere, and we need to figure that out before we vote on this budget. And I need to figure out how we can make them whole, because they're disagreeing with what what you are saying. I know prosper right now wants to move forward and then going forward, they want to spend the 1%, but you got to go back and spend the 1% on what happened in 24, 25. And I think that that is where the discrepancy is.

Speaker: Thanks, chair. If I may add, I think our feeling is that we're operating in compliance, in alignment with the ordinance that was in that timeline just shown, and then the subsequent iga and then the amendments between the city of Portland and prosper Portland in those iga documents as well. And that's split really between the technical assistance that's going into building the capacity of firms, of businesses in the industry, and then the workforce development investments that are implemented with a number of different partners that am y mentioned. So that's what we believe is the status quo in terms of delivering that money into the community to build the pipeline that robert mentioned.

Speaker: If you're trying to build a pipeline, wouldn't you? I don't even understand how it got this far that this was not settled in our community partners who are who are general contractors and subcontractors that they're not feeling that we're we're we're operating at a level playing field right now. And that level playing field, they see the money, they know where the money was, was allocated, but no one on their team. So can you tell me why is it that that o'Neill electric is not being made

whole? Because you feel like there's an iga that that is pending that says something different? Because I don't understand the discrepancy right now.

Speaker: I'm only saying that we've been operating the program in what we believe is in accordance with the iga that we have with the city. I'm not sure of the specific details of that one company, but we're delivering technical assistance to a number of different firms and then to workforce participants in the training programs.

Speaker: So can.

Speaker: We.

Speaker: So can we offline, because I know a couple of our councilors here, they've been contacted as well. And we're all very confused about what's going on and what's not going on. Because if there's money that's left over in this particular pot of money that can help with that technical assistance, that is that they felt that they were they they're deserving of. We need to figure out how to make them whole.

Speaker: Absolutely. We want to do everything we can to help in alignment with the law. So we'd be happy to work with you on that.

Speaker: Okay. Perfect. Thank you.

Speaker: Do you want to finish.

Speaker: The green?

Speaker: Thank you, madam chair. Just to follow up and i'll i'll be brief because I think the councilor, the chair raised most of the concerns that I had, but I had I had received a letter from the executive director of the professional business development group. That's that echoed a lot of what I just heard and said, you know, this this is sort of resulted in some of these firms no longer staying in business. Some of these firms are under the regional workforce equity agreement. And so I guess my ask to prosper Portland would be could you just could you

provide this committee a sort of a written analysis on your interpretation of compliance with the code? So that way it's I think we can operate on a clear basis of what we feel like. The boundaries are there and figure out how to move forward. That's that'd be my request.

Speaker: Absolutely. We prepared a memo to try to answer some of those questions for the dca's office, and we'll be happy to share that with you as well.

Speaker: I'd be grateful for that.

Speaker: Thank you, thank you.

Speaker: To both me and.

Speaker: Councilor green.

Speaker: Absolutely.

Speaker: And we'll get it out to the committee.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you. Okay, mr. Smith, go ahead and go forward.

Speaker: Thank you, chair smith, on this slide, it highlights the two methods by which the program is funded. The activity rate applies 1% to hard costs of water and sewer. And what was known as omb's facility capital improvement projects. Over 500,000 other bureau projects, like those by Portland parks and pbob, use a fixed rate methodology, and that was a backward look on historical contract values. On the workforce side, funding is then used to administer the program as part of work systems community construction training program. Clients on the contractor side receive technical assistance and advising to assist in getting cobid certified or more effectively, bid on and hopefully be awarded city contracts. Clients going through the contractor side also have access to services that are available via the inclusive business resource network. This is a breakdown of the valued organizations we partner with in this work, including work systems. Who is here

with us today? Again, coepp focuses on both developing the workforce to deliver on city infrastructure projects, as well as the contractors bidding on that work as our regional workforce development board, work systems brings together additional funding and resources, delivering services via a network of community based partners. And here you can kind of see what the split. So in our iga, what the split of investment on the workforce side relative to the business technical assistance. The network of partners you saw in the previous slide provide an array of services such as outreach and recruitment services, career coaching, pre-apprenticeship training and placement, and registered apprenticeship and connection to resources and community that ensure continuation and skilled trade apprenticeships. Those would be such things as rental assistance, child care and transportation. Here on this slide, we see some reporting from our most recent full fiscal year. You can see the demographic breakdown breakdown which helps reinforce the importance of doing this work in partnership with organizations that are well established with community community connections and build trust. 289 participants received outreach services, 103 participants completed pre-apprenticeship training, which is a completion rate of 80%. Of those that were enrolled, and in the apprenticeship wage an average wage of just over \$28. In reviewing year to date reporting for this fiscal year. As of April, the program is exceeding annual goals in outreach registrations for pre-apprenticeship completions of pre-apprenticeship training and participants starting registered apprenticeship programs. Next, we'll look at the budget comparison, the overall budget comparison and workforce development from fiscal year this fiscal year to next. As you can see, there's a blend of sources the city general fund, cdbg enterprise zone that leverage additional investment and matching dollars through our partnership with work systems. What you see here represents service delivery contracts, and there are additional training dollars and

resources that participants can access by being a part of the program. I know that cdbg, cdbg came up at yesterday's work session, so I wanted to talk a little bit about how that's used in this programing and some of the limitations of those funds. Prosper Portland administers the cdbg funds for economic development initiatives. On behalf of the city of Portland. We receive about a quarter of the city's overall allocation for these purposes. Cdbg funds, as most of you probably know, are very restricted in the way that they can be used, including an admin cap of 15%. With the funds that we receive, we are not able to charge admin against these dollars, making having flexible funds like the city's general fund so important. Reductions to general fund not only reduce that in these bar charts, but it also jeopardizes the ability for us to utilize cdbg in the overall programing. So reductions have a bit of a ripple effect into the workforce work systems investment as well. Not being able to include cdbg would have kind of exponential impacts on those leveraged dollars. And where we are right now with the proposed general fund cut, we are dangerously close to that threshold of not being able to access cdbg in support of workforce development initiatives. And I know that patrick is going to speak a little bit more to that as well. Next slide. Here is the total proposed workforce development budget for 2526. It's kind of in aggregate across funding sources from the previous slide. We are currently looking at a proposed reduction of 200,000 in general fund. And we are estimating that that will have an impact of about a 6% decrease in the leverage matching funds from work systems. So that accounts for that difference that you saw in the previous slide, between 7.7 million and 7.4 million. We also just received an update on our cdbg allocation and are looking at a thankfully, a very minimal reduction of less than 1%. And yet this is still federal funding, which continues to come with a level of uncertainty in this climate. And then with the funding, we have an additional year of funding authorized through

the most recent amendment, which will carry us through the 2526 year. However, we are anticipating a significant drop in funding availability moving forward beyond the next fiscal year. I think even with the challenges that we face budgetarily, we're grateful that we're still able to deliver services to our most vulnerable population populations, including those that are justice involved immigrants, refugees and low income individuals, and that we're able to do this work through strong partnerships. And with that, i'll pass it off to patrick.

Speaker: Thanks, robert. Thanks, chair smith and counselors for hearing us. I'm going to speak about the impacts of the reduction in budget on the next gen and eop programs that amy and robert mentioned. The most direct impact of the loss of city funds is 45 less people served through this program, 45 less Portlanders. Now, what I want to emphasize here is we use an approach that we call braided funding and integrated services, and that means bringing more resources and more services to the table, to serve more Portlanders and to create more successful programs. When you add the additional resources we're bringing to the table, the reductions climb to 112 fewer people served due to the loss of the city programs. City funding, which reduced the numbers by 45. So there's an additional 67 people that work systems is paying for. One of the ways we do that is a federal matching grant called the snap 5050 program. In this budget year, we have \$480,000 in federal department of agriculture program budgeted for match using the city general and using the cdbg funding. So when those funding sources decline, there's an opportunity cost of losing that federal match. And as our partners and prosper and service providers know, we're being affected at every level by federal funding cuts already. So this is one of the areas we have control of and being able to preserve federal investments, which serve more Portlanders.

Speaker: Can you excuse.

Speaker: Me for a second? Could you go a little bit deeper into that 5050 match? So is that dollar for dollar or is it 2 to 1 or 3 to 1?

Speaker: It's not exactly that simple, but I can tell you roughly it matches \$0.50 on the dollar. So if we have \$100,000 contract to make it simple, we put it out in the community. Over the course of the year, we'll generate 50,000. The reason it's not that simple is that we just put that 50,000 back in the following years. Let's say the city funds 100,000. We're starting with 150 and they match against that too. So the next year we're at a matching 75,000 against that base and we put it in. So it's compounding over time. It's a multi-million dollar program at this point.

Speaker: So where are we in that match ecosystem.

Speaker: Where are we.

Speaker: Are we're in the 50,000 to 75,000 or the 100 and.

Speaker: 480,000 against. The city's investment is being matched this year. So that's the match generated.

Speaker: 240, right.

Speaker: No, no, no. That's the match we're bringing into the community 480 400. And that's off of nearly \$1 million of city general and cdbg.

Speaker: Okay, okay. I'm just trying to figure this out. I knew that we were getting snap, but I didn't know the breakdown of it. Are you all clear about how this is how the feds are? Interjecting this? The which funds are they matched at the same rate?

Speaker: No. The snap 5050 funds only match nonfederal and cdbg. So the city general and cdbg are matchable, but other federal funds like we aren't matched. So we do place we owe it into this program, but we can't match that.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: So as an example, erco presented at the last full City Council meeting and their financial person said, I think it's about 100 and \$170,000 they're getting in

their grant. It's a half \$1 million across all of the eop programs. And that's federal match. That's not the base we're matching against. That's what we're bringing from the federal government into the community. So the more city general and the more cdbg pulled away, the less federal match we're getting from this program.

Speaker: Perfect.

Speaker: So as you mentioned, there's wioa funds that are being lost to in this picture. We go to the next slide. One of the things that we want to emphasize to, and that robert spoke to, is the relationship between the cdbg and the general fund. Cdbg admin cap has been reached before it reaches work systems and before it reaches the community providers. There are a couple of kinds of critical costs that cdbg can't pay for. Once that cap has been reached, management costs which everyone incurs, including cbo's administrative costs, which everyone incurs, including cbo's, and the cost of doing business in June because the city has to have it all build out in order to prepare the invoice for the federal government, and so costs can't be charged to cdbg in June. So after this month, all of our providers will depend exclusively on city general fund and can't spend any cdbg. So this 1/12 of the year, they're operating only on the city funds. So that dynamic means that there's an enabling aspect of the city funds, which allow for us to deploy the cdbg funding. So you have both the snap 5050 and the cdbg in some ways, being unlocked by these investments. The ratio of that, if you include the one month, a year that there's no cdbg, of course, providers can't stall or have a gap in services for a month. So you take that and the management and admin costs. It's about one city dollar unlocking about \$3 in cdbg so that there's a multiplier of loss at the point we hit the threshold where it becomes impossible to run a program without city funds, allowing us to spend the cdbg funds.

Speaker: So that that extra 750,000 that that the mayor's budget added into summerworks, will that get the 3 to 1 match?

Speaker: The summer works would not be deployed in the same contract group as the eop and the nextgen. So that's great to have, but it doesn't mitigate that. We couldn't use it to pay, for.

Speaker: Example.

Speaker: On that side. Okay, okay, I got it.

Speaker: There's some approach of integrated services. That's part of our role, coordinating the different pieces of services that are complements to workforce development that are at risk to, I want to mention some high value services we provide and don't charge to the city. We leverage it through our system. But scholarships, paid internships, the cost of childcare and the cost of housing. So for very low income people with young children, there's no going into a three month occupational training program or construction program if you have to pay for childcare because you can't pay for childcare. So for us to have that high ticket item available enables people in poverty with young children and can be helpful in addressing the intergenerational poverty, the poverty trap that occurs because people in poverty can't pay for childcare. So childcare and housing is another one of those examples. We sometimes have people living in the back of a pickup truck, or trying to camp on a college campus, community college campus. In our program, it's very hard to be successful in that kind of circumstance. We provide rent assistance to people who are going into occupational training, where they can be driving a recycling truck for the city, for example. And after they get through that training, they can pay for their own housing through income from their new career. So we put the housing support while they're going through a training program for a middle income job. And that way we're addressing housing through employment in

this program. Those are leveraged, not directly paid for through this grant. One more thing I want to mention is the industry connections that work systems bring. Those benefit the participants in this program, the Portlanders being served, but also some of the goals of the city. One of the ways that one of the new areas we're standing up is a behavioral health training program. That's addiction recovery programing. We find that many people who've overcome homelessness and addiction want to give back by helping other people through the recovery process, so we're training for those careers, and it's a good match, but also serves the city's objectives in trying to increase the service level for addiction treatment and recovery. Another example is early learning. And as you know, Multnomah County has set a program to universalize preschool by 2030 and has attached the wages within the industry to requirements to bring them up to living wage by 2030. So it's generating thousands of jobs for low income people and for us to link those careers to this program, make sure that Portland residents are part of that uplift of low income Portlanders. It's driven through the preschool for all grant that we pay for internships right now. For example, they run around \$12,000 a piece, and nearly half of people. We didn't expect this, but half of people placed that were placing in preschool for all child care centers are being permanently hired and starting a new career at the childcare center. So all stuff in the area of industry connections and services that we're leveraging in and which will be affected by reductions. Final thing is that the overall economic impact, if you look at the success rate, the earnings of program participants, and you take that 112 people that wouldn't be served through this program, you see it on an impact of \$3.8 million estimated in lost wages or wages not realized because of the gap in services. Thank you.

Speaker: That concludes our presentation. Happy to take your questions.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Thank you for the presentation. And thank you for kind of separating that so that we could I didn't realize that we had this many. Workforce opportunities and training programs before today. I'm going to open this up. Councilor dunphy.

Speaker: Thank you. Chair. As I said yesterday, I think that the breadth of work that you all are doing, trying to support our community in different ways and using different pots of money to leverage it, is really great. I have a problem with this presentation, though. I have said I've sort of criticized this system in the past, that under the old system of government, we would say, okay, parks department, go take an 8% cut and come back to us and tell us what that would look like. And they say, fine, we're going to close all the pools, and City Council is never going to close all the pools. So obviously that's a bad faith argument that I've seen over and over. And this feels like we received mayoral guidance to show what an 8% cut would look like. A budget committee came through, made hard decisions, and then came to us, tasked you all with coming to us to say, look at all the horrible outcomes. They're going to come from this. But there are other scenarios. We City Council's funding does not specify the amount of dollars that are spent in each area. Right. Ours is based off of what the bureau proposes. And so there are situations where, as you were saying, like the one of those projects, you know, we're risking the 3 to 1 or the \$3 that every \$1 comes in. But whoever made this proposal could have said we would fully fund that and take deeper cuts elsewhere. I appreciate the overview of the projects that you all are doing in the good work, but but it doesn't feel like we have the whole story here. And I continue to be concerned about the fact that we are having to react to this with no ability to control it on the other side. So thank you all.

Speaker: May I respond, councilor dunphy, please? I appreciate your remarks. There were a number of other business lines that we can share with you as well. That did take cuts on the prosper Portland side that were outside of the workforce development program. And so looking at all those scenarios, our objective was to try to mitigate impact on the community as much as we can. And this decision about the 112 individuals, people in Portland that wouldn't be receiving the services was not one that we or that our community budget committee or that our board took lightly at all. And it's not something that we relish doing.

Speaker: Councilor green.

Speaker: Thank you, madam chair. Similar comments to councilor dunphy's, although i'll approach it from a slightly different angle. The city's general funds are unrestricted cash that would flow into prosper Portland's general fund. The strategic investment funds are also unrestricted cash that can flow into prosper Portland's general fund. So each dollar is the same in terms of its impact and support, enabling work. For all of the things that you've described, we can have a discussion and an argument and a debate about the opportunity costs of the different dollars. But the point is, if you're going to present, say, this cut is going to result in disabling or reducing capacity, that's disingenuous, because the choice that prosper Portland is making is to say, we're going to use the strategic investment fund for different types of things that may or may not be. That may have different merits. And the arguments that I made yesterday in the comments I made yesterday, pursuant to that whole discussion, were that this is about prioritization. So I just wanted to put that in the record. Feel free to take any response to that if the chair allows it.

Speaker: If I may respond just super briefly, I appreciate that comment. Councilor green. For us, we don't see the strategic investment fund and ongoing general fund

dollars as being the same. The strategic investment fund is a finite source of money that is not necessarily going to replenish itself over time. So it will be spent down quickly. Ongoing general fund is the kind of certainty that the programs need to continue to grow and serve the community over time, and that's where we'd like to see the city's resources flow so that those benefits reach the community.

Speaker: And I understand that, and I but it's also true that when we cut deeply into the city's budget and lay off a number of staff and cut programs, that also undermines our capability to serve this broader community. And so, yes, there is a finite fund there. But the fund came originally from city dollars. It came originally from municipal dollars. Okay. Every dollar that prosper Portland has today originated with public money. And so we are ramping up some new districts. They don't have the resources right now. We understand that. But we have to make choices in a condition of scarcity. So this is just the spirit of my comments. I heard you guys loud and clear yesterday, so I just wanted to lay that out there. Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor green. I wanted to do a finer point of that. We were talking about the strategic investment fund yesterday, but I noticed I think it was in 2023 and 2024, we only had like \$3 million in there. Is your finance person here.

Speaker: So yeah. What happened chair, is that a number of expiring tif districts disperse with their assets. And that pushed up the balance in the fund. But that because we don't have a number of other tif districts that are also expiring in the near future, that number is not going to continue to grow at the same rate that it has grown at. And so my point in saying that it's a finite resource is that it will be totally, if we try to use it to backfill general fund at the rate that we have general fund now, it will be spent through in two years, and then we'd essentially just be programming tif resources. And what we've heard from the community is that the

community is really supportive of economic development programs that can be offered citywide in ways that mitigate some of the displacement or other unintended consequences of tif spending.

Speaker: Right. But what's the average amount that's been in the sif fund?

Speaker: Because it's something that's been newly created over the last few years. I don't I don't have that number in front of me.

Speaker: So that's my point.

Speaker: It has you're right that it has grown.

Speaker: So that's.

Speaker: My point exactly. You guys have never really had this account. It started in 2023. So it's not as if it has been a, a fund that you have been used to having. And so in my opinion, if that money was with the old general fund dollars, then it is something that we have the ability to direct.

Speaker: Councilor that's something that we're looking at carefully in terms of the legal ability to direct those funds. I think we had some conversation about that last night briefly, but we do want to get clarification to you. And we also want to get kind of a larger sort of response on the sif piece, in particular, because it has been such a topic of conversation, and it's obviously carries a high degree of magnitude of importance to us in the community.

Speaker: And I agree, but I just wanted to piggyback on what councilor green was talking about in terms of being disingenuous. This is a new program that was started, and it probably got started a little bit with some arpa money as well. So this is not have been a staple of your of your whole ecosystem. So we're still in the stages of let's see where where else we want to put those dollars.

Speaker: And we're happy to give you the projections of what it would be in the future and what exactly it has been over the last couple of years. So that you have

that picture. I'm just making the point that it won't be recurring, ongoing, general fund in nature. It won't have that level of stability or consistency that the economic development programs we implement have.

Speaker: Thank you. Thank you.

Speaker: Do we have any other comments? Let's see here. Councilor novick.

Speaker: Thank you, madam chair. I was adding up the number of people served and the different categories, and I got 1928. My question is, if you had to use the president's phrasing, the biggest, most beautiful workforce development program you could have, how many people would you want to be able to serve? Do we think that there's a grand total of 4000 people in the city that would benefit being part of a workforce development program, in which case we're halfway there? Or do we think there's 40,000, in which case we're 5% of the way there?

Speaker: There's always more need than the funds that we currently have. But I don't know if you have a figure just kind of based on unemployment rates.

Speaker: Where councilor, I didn't I didn't expect that kind of question. So it's a welcomed question. I think there are two facets of that, you know, what is the level of need, but also what is the manageable kind of growth the program can responsibly implement. So I'm a fan of I'm a fan of incremental growth. I think that's the most judicious way to spend resources. The need already is higher than the level of resources, but we're constrained by our capacity to grow these programs.

Speaker: I would just add, if I may, that we're targeting these in the most kind of vulnerable populations in the city to remove barriers for people who have been underserved in the past. So it's not just that a number is a number is a number. I mean, we're really trying to focus the resources to where barriers have been highest for people.

Speaker: Well, of course, but I'm curious how many people facing those barriers would you like to be able to serve. And really my question is, are we trying to drain the pacific with a teaspoon, or are we, you know, I mean, are we doing a large percentage of what we'd like to do? It's kind of like I had a question the other day about the level of earthquake insurance we have. We have \$75 million worth of earthquake insurance. My question was, well, if we're going to lose \$75 billion worth of assets, how far does that get us? And I kind of have the similar question here.

Speaker: It's just a finger in the wind. But, you know, I think increase of a third of the program capacity feels like it would be ideal. The number of people in poverty is not the same thing as the amount of people that are ready and want to go into a workforce development program. So unemployment data doesn't show us that the waiting list for programs are what show us, you know who wants to and is ready to, who's in poverty, who's homeless, who's reentering the community, who's immigrated here. That that share is always larger than the people that want to go into a new career and need help doing that. But, you know, just from the waitlist and what we can see on the ground, I'd say a growth of a third would be an ideal place to be, rather than a place of reducing services.

Speaker: That's helpful, but I assume the people on the waitlist are those who have heard of these programs to begin with. Is it possible there's another 30,000 people that haven't heard of them? They be on the waitlist if they were had.

Speaker: That is possible. We do pretty good outreach, and the word of mouth dynamic is strong over the years. You know, it's like a community members telling community members. But it's very possible that if we had stronger outreach ability, we'd see more people. I'm just it's just kind of finger in the wind based on, you

know, what, the different kinds of services. Who wants to get in, how many we can serve out of that total. We could do more.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor novick. Just as a point of reference, I was on the workforce board on work systems workforce board. But I do know this, and I'm going to go back from ages of 16 to 24. There are about 24,000 kids. And patrick, you correct me if I'm wrong. There are about 24 to 28,000 kids who, from the age of 16 to 24, that they're not working and who don't have a job, and we don't know what they're doing or how to connect with them. They have dropped off and we know they've dropped off from where they were, and we have to figure out a way to connect with them. So i, I think that we can do more. I think that, you know, with with more, we can do more if given that mandate. We do have a lot of folks that we need to figure out what they're going to be our next homeless, next generation of homeless folks.

Speaker: Absolutely. Councilor I was speaking only about the eop and the next gen programs and not about summer works.

Speaker: Yeah.

Speaker: And councilor kanal.

Speaker: Thank you, madam chair. Returning to the strategic investment fund conversation, I agree with councilor chair smith that there's a interesting it's hard to say that this is required for long term stability for something that's only been around a couple of years, that that doesn't sit well. I'm looking here and no one's sorry.

Speaker: Sorry, I wasn't implying that it is. I was kind of replying that the general fund is the stable source for these programs, that sif is more of a one time thing in and of itself. And so if you try to backfill with it temporarily, it doesn't go on. Thank you. It doesn't have any ongoing relevance.

Speaker: Yeah. And I'm seeing here that back in 2223 it brought in about \$800,000. That went up to about 2.3 million in 2324. This is non transfer revenue. Just to clarify about 3.6 million and proposed would bring in about 3.3 million. Nobody is suggesting what draining this whole thing in a year or anything like that. I think the maximum we're talking about is one third of it, if I understand correctly, in that ballpark. So it seems to me that the opportunity cost here is about \$1.1 million in fOregone revenue between the fees, charges and all the different things that are listed out here, I need to enumerate them for doing that, as well as sort of draining the, the, the principal to some degree. And that's that's a fair thing to assess and look at in contrast to what we're talking about potentially gaining here. And it's not about potentially gaining by use of this money and prosper only, but it's partially what we would spend in the rest of the city budget with the dollars that would otherwise be spent, general fund dollars going to prosper. I think that's a fair thing for us to weigh. I recognize that because of the sort of separation of the prosper budget and the fact that we have to discuss them separately, that that's going to make it a little more complicated. And I recognize that that each agency, each part of the city is going to. Defend their own work. And that's good. I think it's a really important that we have leadership here who believes in the work they do, and we clearly do at prosper, and I really appreciate that. But that's I just think a thing that's worth looking into here is, is this sort of non-numerical drainage of a portion of the principal, a numerical, roughly \$1.1 million in fOregone investment revenue from the fund itself at the maximum level, and certainly it may not end up being as much as is proposed in this amendment. But that, to me, is a cost worth considering. I'm not committing to anything specific at this moment in terms of a dollar amount, but I am really fascinated by fascinating is the wrong word. I'm interested in pursuing this sort of from a conceptual perspective to understand it better, and I'm grateful

that a couple of my colleagues have brought this forward, because it is it is hard to say that we should we should lean into something that is I mean, if it's if it's not something that's been around forever is the intention that it is around forever, actually that that that's a question I want to make sure that we get on the record. Is your intention that this fund remain an ongoing, long term portion of the mix of funding?

Speaker: It is a part of our agency's financial sustainability plan. So it is meant to be a resource that would have more sustainability for us so that we're less reliant on general fund resources over time, and then also deal with the fact that there's a cliff sort of valley that a lot of the resources that we might otherwise have with more districts that are matured, aren't there right now. I would just note, you know, there's multiple different areas of opportunity costs by not having the sif, like we talked about some of the business loans to have elana and some of the affordable housing loans or that have been invested in mississippi shortstack project for mass timber. Those wouldn't be possible without sif. And then I would just offer the zero, you know, the compromise of the general fund would eventually make the office of small business, the inclusive business resource network, our traded sector work all not possible. So it would be defunding our citywide economic development programs.

Speaker: I'm going to let my colleagues speak to that part, but thank you.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor duffy.

Speaker: Thank you, madam chair. There's a couple things I heard in there I just want to respond to, and then I want to move on from the sif conversation completely. But just just for clarity, just folks on the record, the sif dollars, the strategic investment fund at prosper is based off of the financial stability plan, and

it's based off of expiring tif districts and the sale of public properties. For example, the sale of heavy industrial land in the central east side.

Speaker: Income, income from former tif districts. Yeah.

Speaker: So those are all all public dollars that were sort of money from heaven, right? Like money that was unaccounted for. Unbudgeted for exists in a in a pot. And there was a good problem to have it prosper in which they said, what do we do with this money? And we said, we're going to turn it into a strategic investment fund. This is my second tour of city hall. When I left, we were looking at the tif cliff. It wasn't the tif valley, it was the idea that we were not going to have tif districts that prosper was moving to a new business model, and that new business model required prosper to retain ownership of land, where underneath the developments of these projects and would receive ongoing funds to support themselves financially and in that circumstance, having a strategic investment fund was the a portion of the need for how the bureau the agency continues to operate. I came back and there were six new tif districts, and 25% of all tif districts are exclusively earmarked for administrative costs, and the vast majority of that is pretty well split between prosper Portland and the housing bureau. And so over the next 30 years, there are billions of dollars. Now coming to this, this agency. And I'm not convinced that our continued annual grant to the to an outside government body in the form of our general fund should be referred to as, first of all, as stable income. It is a grant. If we are not getting to direct, then that is, you know, any more than the federal government gets to direct. But we also have to say up front what these dollars are for and what they're not for. And I as as councilor smith was saying earlier, we are putting a lot of grant dollars into a different a different body and not able to say that anything about the outcomes. So I just I want to be clear that, like the financial stability of this agency has been moving for the last decade, and it's

not. We're in a crisis and we have to look at every cushion, couch cushion. So that's my biggest point. I would like to go back to one of the slides that you had earlier, talking about leveraging federal dollars and the way that you all are as an outside agency, able to leverage city dollars into federal opportunities and other grant funds. Can you tell me a little bit about some of the opportunities that were unique in this, in that prosper being the more flexible, agile body than sort of the city machinery can be? Can you talk about how that played into our ability to get these grants and how they were applied rather than other municipal economic development agencies?

Speaker: Is this in reference to the cdbg?

Speaker: It was. I wrote down the word federal grants, and I don't know which text, which slide it was on. It was not this one, not this one. It was a pie chart. Yeah, I think it was.

Speaker: Okay. This is a slightly different representation. But prosper Portland, as the city's economic development agency, is granted the allocation of approximately 25% of cdbg for economic development initiatives. And so that goes both into our workforce development programming as well as our small business supports. And with that, that the importance, you know, again, is of the flexible funding with the general fund to be able to charge admin against that and bring that, bring that investment into those programs. And those programs are also income restricted. So they're very focused on some of the most vulnerable parts of our, our, our population with I think it's 0 to 50%. Ami is the target demographic there.

Speaker: Just so I just so I understand that what that would look like is that the city of Portland's general fund is technically paying for a disproportionate amount of staff time at prosper, but the benefit is that you get to leverage these cdgb grants

and get more out of those. And you don't have to spend as much of that pot as admin. Is that what you're saying?

Speaker: Well, I think it's a it's an investment into the system and the capacity that we've built over the years in partnership with work systems, with the city of Portland, to build capacity in community and subject matter expertise. We know that those partnerships, how important they are in delivering the work. And I think, you know, for us, when it comes to the cdbg piece of it, it's not just prosper staffing, it's an investment in service delivery across the system. And so that is inclusive of work systems. That's inclusive of our community partners. And it takes people to deliver on this. And these are high intense kind of touches with community, with vulnerable populations that can be multiyear in nature. And so it's not just the prosper piece of it. It's the investment in the system and the community.

Speaker: Thank you.

Speaker: Councilor green.

Speaker: Thank you, madam chair. And I'm not going to hammer too much more on the conversation. I think I think we've talked about that at length here. Councilor dunphy kind of made the points that I would have responded to councilor kanal with. I just wanted to address the point about the financial. Sort of the long run financial viability plan. And if I'm going to share my screen for a second, if that's possible. Yeah, I'm just going to do it here. There it is. See, it's probably small. Okay. This is page 18 of prosper Portland's proposed budget for this upcoming fiscal year. This shows out this shows sort of the it looks like a five year forecast, including the current operating year of the of the budget sources for prosper Portland's operating budget. And you see that the investment returns from the sif are expected to take up a larger share of the operating budget. And that comes straight from the financial sustainability plan. And in the appendix of that plan, I think the

guidance is the expectations to earn 7% between 5 and 8% on average to grow those levels. Now, I'll note that if you don't make your loans and earn that rate of return, you won't get those levels. And so if you're going to do so the tension here is like, are we subsidizing these investments? And if so, you won't have the rate of return that you're expecting. Are you are you trying to do market rate investments. That's that that that is an interesting question that deserves a kind of a broader piece. But, you know, it was said that. This would hold on, I'm not done that this would sort of replace general fund allocations over time. What you see in the bar chart is that the general fund allocation looks like it's expected to be pretty stable. And so you've got a growth in the operating budget over time, of which we ought to continue to come to the table and make that hole. So and then the green bar here is the terminating or sunseting districts. And that would be true if we hold the line on these districts that would be terminating. But I know that I've already been lobbied on potentially raising the debt limit in some TIF districts and also voting to renew and expand them. And so if those are the choices that we're being asked to make, then we're going to see that those green numbers change as well. So I wanted to lay that all out there as I understand it. And Mr. Fitzpatrick, please go ahead.

Speaker: Appreciate it. Councilor. And I agree that we are in a crisis and we're not trying to be insensitive to that fiscal reality that we know you all are grappling with. I would just respond in part, that the 5 to 8% is a fairly low sought after rate of return. It's it is low because the nature of the loans that were underwriting for the community, a lot of the small businesses and the affordable housing projects, this is gap financing for them. This these are risks that traditional commercial lenders banks would not be taking. So that's the point of the very low rate of return to sustain the fund, so that it can then be a revolving resource in nature for small

businesses and housing, affordable housing and low income housing that we want to invest in.

Speaker: And I hear you on that. You know, I'm actually on the record of thinking revolving loan funds are a good model. I just testified for a state bill, 684 and the house that tries to create that for housing production. I think it's going to pass. I hope it's going to pass. So that then becomes a source to do the very thing that prosper Portland is trying to do right now with this fund. I don't think it's a expenditure. And this is the last point i'll make before I yield the floor. Is that the maiden old town loan was 3% at 15 years to a entity with no financial history, unsecured collateral, and I think 182%, maybe 187% loan to value ratio. So just just laying that out there and i'll, i'll yield to the floor.

Speaker: Councilor green. So what were you saying? It's I mean, because I think I know what you're saying, but could you explain that further in terms of who gets the money? Because for me, will everyone get that same kind of sweet deal? Basically.

Speaker: Based upon the reporting that I've read on this issue, the decision was made based upon a recommendation by the old town community association board, of which multiple members of that board are principals to this project. And i'll just leave it at that.

Speaker: Okay? Okay.

Speaker: I just want to be a little clearer. So question, mr. Fitzpatrick, does prosper Portland align its workforce development programs or any other business efforts with the tif districts? And we were told that tif couldn't pay for certain business development or workforce opportunities because it's they have already identified what the funding is for. And what I'm trying to find out is and I asked the question of donnie, why don't we use some of those tif resources to pay for the business

capital and technical assistance in the tif areas that it serves? And so I guess that's what my question was. Do you all take out money for or do you use the general fund for that and the other cdbg monies to actually pay for business development and business workforce?

Speaker: Thanks for the question, chair. We largely think about tif resources as being so-called sticks and bricks, so they tend to be harder construction infrastructure costs. So they can't always be eligible uses for things like service delivery. So our workforce development programs are generally all citywide programs, with some exceptions that are a little bit more district based, like some of the workforce navigator community program investments that amy described. Those are delivered by specific neighborhood, business or sorry, neighborhood prosperity network districts. But in general, all of our workforce development programs are available citywide, and they're.

Speaker: Not tied to districts.

Speaker: But you've just decided this scope of work is how you're going to use tif.

Speaker: Could we pay for them with could we pay for them with tif? Yes. In those districts? Yes. I don't believe so. But I'd have to confirm for you that we cannot.

Speaker: Can you check into that for me, please?

Speaker: I can thank you.

Speaker: Councilor kanal.

Speaker: Just just checking. Clarifying on a previous comment that I got a little confused by, you mentioned that there were fewer or not expecting there to be as many resources available in future years due to sunseting tif districts. What are the expectations around the sun setting of central eastside, lents town center, interstate corridor and willamette industrial? Are those is there something I'm

missing here? That. Yeah. Where's where? Why would that not be an increase to the to the fund over time?

Speaker: I think I don't have the answer. Thank you for the question. I don't have the specific answer for you, but I think if we provided some kind of a forecast that has estimates for returning resources over the out years, we'd be happy to get that to you either today or tomorrow.

Speaker: Sure. So would I be accurate in saying that the sort of qualitative summary of that is there would be resources, just not as many as not not as much as expected.

Speaker: I don't know what the growth rate would be relative to what it has been over the last couple of years.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: But that's a fair question. And we're happy to get get that back to you.

Speaker: Thanks.

Speaker: And I just I just want to I want to kind of wrap this up as well too, because I learned yesterday that there was about \$30 million that was given back to the general fund and unused tif resources to mayor wilson in his current 2526 budget. Is that what your sense is to.

Speaker: The vast majority of expired tif district, the new like property tax revenue goes back to the city, the county and the schools.

Speaker: Okay, okay.

Speaker: That's well, I was told that we got back in the neighborhood of \$30 million. I don't know if you knew.

Speaker: I'm sorry. I don't have that figure off the top of my head, but I'm happy to get back to you to confirm.

Speaker: Perfect, perfect.

Speaker: And so for 20 fiscal year 2425, how much went into the cif?

Speaker: I don't have the figures in front of me right now. I was really prepping more for like the workforce conversation, but I can I'm happy to get back to you on that.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: And my staffer, joel corcoran, raise your hand, joel, with a beautiful purple shirt on. Thank you. Thank you all for coming today. And thank you for expressing how important and critical these workforce dollars are. And just as a note, you all did see the additional workforce dollars that I was going to increase back for next generation. I put an amendment in to, to bring back 600 so we can get those 112 workforce. Experiences back. And I also added another million to support the summer works program. And so we would be up to approximately \$2 million in summer experiences. The struggle is real for underserved kids who need opportunities to have an opportunity. And I think local government is a place that they can get that opportunity. We two months ago, we had 852 vacant ftes, and many of those were for ftes that were considered hard to fill spots, you know, from police to pbot to engineers to water bts. And the goal that I see in my vision as the chair of the labor and workforce development is to be able to match up young people and have a pipeline of folks who are coming through the city of Portland, who are getting the experience and getting the opportunity to see what a career would look like. We're going to have a silver tsunami of baby boomers retiring in the next 5 to 10 years, and we have to figure out how do we replace ourselves in in that figure. And if we're not training folks and we're eliminating workforce opportunities, we're missing our mark. And as long as I am the chair of this, we're going to make sure that we level the playing field, not take out any resources to help, particularly those underserved communities, because that's where the most

growth is going to come from, to be able to fill local government. Not only are we going to be looking for it, Multnomah County is clackamas county, Washington county, everyone is going to be looking for that worker. And I want the city of Portland to be the government, the local government of choice. And it's because we started at a younger age in there. They're trusting us, and they're giving us opportunities to see what it means to work for the city of Portland. There's such a wide variety of opportunities, and so I know that it works. I worked with it many years at at Multnomah County. And while I was with senator biden's office, I was in charge of their intern program. So I've always been involved with trying to give young people an experience so that they can be able to take care of themselves. And anybody up here would know about the cedar program, other than my old staffer, but that cedar program, I you said that before. Steve councilor novick had a cedar summer employment opportunity like I did. And so we are people of a certain age, and so we understand what it means to get a good paying job over the summer, because more affluent, the studies show that more affluent kids and young people, their parents, afford them opportunity to get those experiences early. And they have relationships with people who could actually give them opportunities. So this is our opportunity to have a open door to making sure that all of our young people who want to work in city government, that they get a chance to have those opportunities. And that is my word on this. And if you all have any other ideas on ways in which we can do that better, I'm open to that as well. Does anyone have any closing remarks? Councilor dunphy councilor kanal, councilor green? Well, it looks like I am going to gavel out. Thank you all for coming.