



CITY OF  
**PORTLAND, OREGON**  
 PORTLAND HOUSING BUREAU

Nick Fish, Commissioner  
 Margaret Van Vliet, Director  
 421 SW 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 500  
 Portland OR 97204  
 (503) 823-2375  
 Fax (503) 823-2387  
[www.portlandonline.com/PHB](http://www.portlandonline.com/PHB)

**TIF Affordable Housing Set-Aside Policy Review  
 PUBLIC HEARING  
 August 2, 2011 – Portland Housing Bureau  
 PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Name/Representing	Comments
<b>Brad Perkins</b> Perkins Realty	Mr. Perkins expressed concern regarding the steep drop-off in TIF funding over the next few years. There is a need to engage in good discussion to think about new zones, new URAs, or other economic opportunity areas for resource development and revitalization. Home values are going down, and it has been a challenge. It's time to think outside the box, think about changing zones. One example is the Sullivan Gulch Corridor Trail – this is a good economic zone coming up. We need to start thinking about TIF in other ways, make the funds go farther.
<b>Patrick Gortmaker</b> Old Town China Town Neighborhood Assoc.	In 2005, during a review of Old Town China Town, housing was mostly at 50% MFI and below. The district wanted a better mix of incomes to increase the overall MFI of the area; especially wanted to look at 80% MFI and above, as well as homeownership opportunities. This hasn't happened yet in OTCT. There has been good reinvestment in preservation and serving those most in need (such as Bud Clark Commons), but there is still a need to increase the MFI. Mr. Gortmaker expressed concern that the Recommendations as written would not help the problem. OTCT is unique in that there is a great need for mixed income housing, as well as student housing (for Oregon College of Oriental Medicine & University of Oregon). We should take advantage to increase housing diversity.
<b>John Miller</b> Oregon Opportunity Network	Mr. Miller participated on the sub-committee that developed the Recommendations. Oregon ON expresses support to make the 30% a <i>minimum</i> rather than a goal or maximum. Oregon ON also supports a by-district policy, rather than city-wide. Regarding the income guidelines, the hope is that PHB will use the guidelines to prioritize 0-30% MFI units. Mr. Miller applauded the city for its work on this policy.
<b>Debbie Aiona</b> League of Women Voters	Ms. Aiona submitted a written copy of her testimony – it is inserted at the end of this document.

<p><b>Justin Buri</b> Community Alliance of Tenants</p>	<p>Community Alliance of Tenants supports a 30% minimum, and supports the policy by district, rather than citywide. CAT also acknowledges the risk of concentrations of poverty, so it's important to keep incomes mixed in URAs. Don't concentrate specific types of development in one place, but do try to spread out more 0-30% MFI units. PHB should take care when growing boundaries or changing URAs to make sure there aren't pockets of revitalization while ignoring other areas in the URA. Districts need mutual benefits throughout the URAs.</p>
<p><b>Jonathan Trutt</b> NW Housing Alternatives</p>	<p>Mr. Trutt thanked the City for its work so far, and echoed comments made by Mr. Miller from Oregon ON. NW Housing Alternatives also supports making the 30% a <i>minimum</i>, and supports a district-by-district policy. Mr. Trutt also noted that he would support unit counts as goals for 0-30%MFI; it makes it more concrete. Regarding the "TIF Cliff" of declining resources, the goal should be to match efficiency and affordability, be mindful of other types of resources, their restrictions, and how to best leverage funds to minimize the hard cost of building. Make the money go farther.</p>
<p><b>David Fuks</b> Cedar Sinai Park</p>	<p>Mr. Fuks agrees that the 30% as a minimum makes good sense. Leadership for preservation is going to be very important as resources decline and buildings age. Agencies are struggling, including the Oregon Housing &amp; Community Services since the federal government has moved some of its previous roles to Washington. Leadership will need to step up into those roles. Cedar Sinai is looking at three buildings in downtown, with the goal of preservation. But there is much-needed subsidy to complete renovations. Cedar Sinai is also working on a model to use to help seniors age in place, help people with mental illness remain in their communities. TIF could be a vital resource to make this happen.</p>
<p><b>Deborah Turner</b> Portland Community Reinvestment Initiatives, Inc.</p>	<p>PCRI would like to go on record to support that the 30% should be a <i>minimum</i>. There is so much gentrification already in URAs, we need to protect the individuals in their communities. PCRI also supports the percentage per URA, rather than city-wide.</p>

For more information on the TIF Set-Aside policy and the review process and draft recommendations, please visit [www.portlandonline.com/phb/tif](http://www.portlandonline.com/phb/tif). Questions and comments can be directed to David Sheern, Program Coordinator, at [david.sheern@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:david.sheern@portlandoregon.gov) or (503) 823-4103. Written comments can also be mailed to Portland Housing Bureau, 421 SW 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Suite 500, Portland, OR 97204.

Comments can also be submitted online by visiting [www.portlandonline.com/phb/index.cfm?c=54691](http://www.portlandonline.com/phb/index.cfm?c=54691).

*Written comments submitted by Debbie Aiona, League of Women Voters:*



**The League of Women Voters of Portland**

310 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 520  
Portland, OR 97204

(503) 228-1675  
info@lwvpdx.org

**Draft TIF Setaside Policy  
Portland Housing Bureau Advisory Committee Meeting  
August 2, 2011**

The League has a long history of involvement in both urban renewal and affordable housing and actively participated in the setaside policy discussions that took place in 2006. At that time we were alarmed that much needed low-income housing was losing out to other high-profile projects, particularly in the North Macadam Urban Renewal Area.

State statute requires urban renewal plans and Tax Increment Financing (TIF) expenditures to comply with the city's Comprehensive Plan. According to the plan, housing in urban renewal areas should be affordable to income ranges reflective of the city as a whole. The setaside resources are not sufficient to meet that standard, but they do insure that a credible effort is made in each district.

The draft recommendations under consideration maintain the commitment to the 30 percent setaside and recommend continued annual reporting utilizing the established Income Guidelines. The League encourages your endorsement of this approach, although we would prefer to see "minimum" restored to the language. The Income Guidelines direct development of housing for a range of incomes consistent with the citywide profile. You should also consider adding unit targets at each level of affordability in order to increase accountability.

In light of the fact that demand far outstrips supply for units affordable to households earning below 30 percent of median family income, we urge you to include a statement in the policy identifying development of those units as a priority. They are the most challenging to develop and the most needed.

The draft recommends retaining URA-specific spending targets. By retaining the specific targets and creating housing for those most in need within each district, families and individuals of all incomes will have the opportunity to benefit from the increased attention and public investment that takes place within the boundaries of an urban renewal area.

Some have suggested that setaside resources be spent on student and middle-income "workforce" housing. TIF funds typically are combined with money from other sources that limit access to students. In light of the scarcity of low-income housing funds, the city must invest in a way that maximizes the use of outside resources. Instead of seeking setaside dollars, PDC may want to consider allocating economic development funds to student housing. Furthermore, we acknowledge the desire for middle-income households to have more housing options, particularly in the Central City. Given the tremendous need among the lowest income families and workers for safe and decent housing we believe meeting their needs should come first.