

Portland City Council Agenda  
Written Testimony - Item 927/913

|   | Agenda Item | Name or Organization                             | Position             | Comments  | Attachment | Created           |
|---|-------------|--|----------------------|---|------------|-------------------|
| 1 | 913         | Colleen Johnson, Argay Terrace resident          |                      |   | Yes        | 10/18/24 4:03 PM  |
| 2 | 913         | Keija Lee, Argay Resident                        | Support with changes | I am generally in support of the Urban Renewal Plan for the Sumner-Parkrose-Argay-Columbia Corridor district because this area of Portland is in desperate need of investment into housing and local businesses that are NOT industrial in nature. That said, I have two major concerns. The first is that this district includes industrial AND residential land use, which is different than other Urban Renewal Districts. There is a sentence in the plan that reads, "...for the projects that clearly benefit one land use over the others, balance them according to the percentage of TIF income from that land use." (page 8) I am concerned that the trend of favoring industrial development in our area will continue, which is not as beneficial to our community as housing and small businesses. A perfect example of this is the Prologis logistical center that is currently being built across the street from Parkrose High School. The vast majority of our residents felt this development was detrimental to our community and we were not listened to. How can we trust that projects paid for with TIF will not follow suit? My second concern is that this plan will direct funds away from Parkrose School District. Our school district is fragile because of its small size and cannot sustain funding loss. We have a levy on the ballot this year just to maintain status quo because state funding is not enough to keep class sizes manageable while maintaining elective and sports programs that our low income students desperately need. We have been told there is an equalizer formula that the state will use to maintain funding for the district while about 20% of property tax funds are being directed away to the TIF plan. This requires trust that the state will follow through on its word. However, politics and school funding change regularly. One of the only sustainable sources of funding we have for our school district that is not dependent on politics is in the form of property taxes. Parkrose School District already took a massive property tax hit from measure 5 back in 1990 and the school district has never been able to recover. How do we know FOR SURE that the state will adequately fund the school district for the next 30 years for the duration of the TIF plan? | No         | 10/21/24 1:02 PM  |
| 3 | 911         | Multnomah County Chair Jessica Vega Pederson     | Support              | Please see the attached letter from Multnomah County Chair Vega Pederson on behalf of herself, Commissioner Jesse Beason and Commissioner Lori Stegmann responding to the six proposed Tax Increment Financing districts (agenda items 911-916). Also included is a memo submitted by Chair Vega Pederson on behalf of the County Department of Community Services regarding the six proposed districts.  | Yes        | 10/21/24 3:44 PM  |
| 4 | 913         | Tim Batog  | Support              | I am a resident of the Sumner Neighborhood and I support the TIF  | No         | 10/22/24 12:49 PM |
| 5 | 913         | Anonymous  | Oppose               | I strongly oppose agenda item 913. As a homeowner and resident of the Argay-Parkrose neighborhood, I am very concerned with attempts to locate low income housing in our already stretched area. Our neighborhood is the rare pocket of well-cared for homes in the area surrounding 122nd Ave. With homelessness unchecked and rampant in our surrounding area, we are already not receiving support or attention from police and others meant to enforce laws to keep our persons and property safe. Now you are pushing to add to our burden by locating vast numbers of low income housing units to our area. We are not a dumping ground for Portland's problems. Please do not add to our issues in this area.  | No         | 10/22/24 1:19 PM  |
| 6 | 910         | Multnomah County Commissioner Julia Brim-Edwards | Support              | Agenda items 910, 912-916   | Yes        | 10/22/24 1:32 PM  |
| 7 | 913         | Earl & Sharon Mershon                            | Oppose               | I am concerned about the effect of the proposed Tax Increment Financing (TIF) on our Parkrose Schools. There is a Parkrose School District levy on the November ballot to maintain teachers and classroom support staff over the next five years. Voter approval of this levy is not assured.<br><br>We live in the Argay Terrace neighborhood. Why is part of the Argay neighborhood, south of Fremont Street, excluded from the proposed Parkrose TIF district? It seems we should be "all inside" or "all outside" the proposed TIF district.  | No         | 10/22/24 3:18 PM  |

To: The City Council  
From: Colleen Johnson, Argay Terrace Resident  
Re: SPACC TIF  
Date: October 18, 2024

I would like to state up front that I am not opposed to Tax Increment Financing in general. I have been involved with the establishment and implementation of an Urban Renewal District in the past. I understand how they work and that they can bring benefits to a community or neighborhood. However, they are not a panacea and they can result in unintended consequences that can be harmful to an area. What I do object to in the SPACC TIF is how the process played out and how it is now being presented. I have three main points I'd like to make.

1. Short time line for Argay Terrace

Discussions in both Parkrose and the Columbia Corridor indicate a path towards the current SPACC TIF date back over 10 years.

- The July 2012 *Mid-County Memo* details the fledgling NPI (mini-urban renewal district) for Parkrose and the subsequent Parkrose Community Plan, published in June 2022, suggests moving forward with a full-blown TIF district. In this Plan, land in Argay Terrace was identified as a possible affordable housing site.
- The Columbia Corridor Association was established in 1986 at the same time as the Airport URA, at the time the City's second largest TIF district. That URA included the industrial area within Argay Terrace. In 2010 and again in 2015 the City Council reduced the size of the district "so as to create additional capacity to...create a TIF district in the city." (Prosper Portland). Much of the area removed from the Airport URA is now included in SPACC, most notably the industrial area in the Argay Terrace neighborhood.

While it appears that both Parkrose and Columbia Corridor have been in various stages of discussion about Urban Renewal for over 10 years, Argay Terrace was not involved in those discussions. As mentioned above, this is in spite of the fact that the Parkrose Community Plan suggests land in Argay Terrace as a possible affordable housing site and the neighborhood sits literally across the street from the industrial area originally included in the Airport URA.

Prosper staff told the Planning Commission on September 24 that many people in SPACC argued that the TIF process had taken too long. For those people in on the discussions for over 10 years, that is undoubtedly true. Unfortunately, since Argay Terrace was left out of these conversations, again in spite of its centrality to the area, the timeline was both short and rushed. The Argay Terrace Neighborhood Association first learned about a potential TIF involving the neighborhood last fall. The first Working Group meeting was in January of this year and the final vote from that group was in July, for a total of thirteen meetings over seven months.

To me, the inclusion of Argay Terrace into the SPACC TIF seems opportunistic. The seeds of the SPACC district lie in the NPI for Historic Parkrose and the Airport URA, but it then pulls in Argay Terrace residential for property tax revenue and, perhaps most importantly, the largest vacant land inventory in Portland. Quite frankly, the process felt performative and the outcome a foregone conclusion.

2. Stifling of legitimate concerns about industrial pollution

- “Modeling from a diesel study by Portland State University has shown the area experiences high pollution levels...an area home to many low-income residents, immigrants and people of color hemmed in by two freeways and an industrial zone.” (Oregonian June 25, 2024)
- “A new diesel emissions study from the Department of Environmental Quality and Portland State University show current modeled levels of diesel particulate matter in Argay Terrace are 350% above the Oregon Ambient Benchmark Concentration, the level above which the state has determined exposure causes excess risk of cancer.” (Multnomah County News, November 2, 2022)

As Prosper staff mentioned in the Planning Commission meeting of September 24, SPACC is unique in that both industrial and residential zones are included. Indeed, in Argay Terrace those two very different land uses lie literally across the street from each other, and therein lies a problem. In a neighborhood that is already challenged by high pollution levels, an increase in industrial production, that is not adequately regulated by the City, threatens to make environmental conditions even worse and calls into question the City’s real commitment to environmental justice given the demographics of the area.

While there is laudable language in the SPACC TIF District Plan (Section 4.I) regarding environmental stewardship, it is at time vague and unclear as to its meaning. Portland’s past decisions and oversight of pollution standards in this area, as exemplified by the above bullet points, does not inspire confidence. The tension between industrial and residential land uses exists and the resulting concerns are legitimate subjects to explore. Unfortunately, when questions about the spillover effects of industrial expansion were voiced at the last Working Group meeting, it was implied that those questions and concerns were coming from ‘white privilege’, racist in nature and aligned with white supremacy. Objections to such characterizations were met with an email from Prosper staff that ‘everyone has their own truth.’ The rejection and dismissal of reasonable concerns only further calls into question whether residential concerns about pollution will even be heard much less acted upon.

3. Economic Development

As I listened to the presentations of the Eastside TIFs by Prosper staff to the Prosper Board and the Planning Commission, the majority of the questions were related to the set-aside for affordable housing. That emphasis makes sense given Portland’s existing housing issues. What surprised me, however, was the virtual lack of questions and

discussions surrounding economic development issues and how Prosper envisions tackling them and, more specifically, how successful are they likely to be.

As an economist, I understand that it is impossible to fully predict job creation and economic growth 30 years into the future, but as the economic development department for Portland, I would expect Prosper to be able to make some educated guesses. Another Eastside TIF District provides some interesting statistics. The City Auditor released a report on the Lents Urban Renewal in 2020, 20 years into the Plan. While the Mayor and Prosper's Executive Director quibbled with some of the methodological decisions used in the report, in the area of Jobs and Income, the report suggested some concerns. The report shows that jobs increased 36% over the 20-year period, wages fell 4%, income fell 24%, and the poverty rate increased 7%. Given that one of the vision statements in the SPACC TIF District Plan states, "Residents will have access to meaningful, middle- and high-wage employment..." (p. 7), the numbers from Lents are cautionary. Clearly you can generate jobs and any job creation is good, even low-wage jobs because they provide experience and access to job ladders. But, the benefits and opportunities of employment can be limited for workers in low-wage jobs. Certainly one question that would be interesting is in what sector does Prosper envision the job growth coming from and what sorts of jobs are those likely to be?

Looking at the SPACC District map, I would guess that much of the job creation is expected to come from the industrial area, if for no other reason than this area has been on Prosper's radar screen since 1986 when this area was included in the newly created Airport URA. If I'm correct, and I suspect I am, then the residents in Argay Terrace deserve a plan that will hold those job creators accountable for any and all spillover effects of that industrial expansion. And no, I do not believe the present plan does that. The residents of Argay Terrace should not have to choose between jobs and a clean environment.

Interestingly, the Auditor's Report also shows that "Gentrification accelerated in Lents" between 2010 and 2016.

At the July 23, 2024 final meeting of the SPACC Working Group, the representatives for Argay Terrace asked for more time to gather more information and study the pros and cons of a complex Urban Renewal area in our neighborhood. Given that we were only 7 months into the discussion of a \$300m/30-year contract with Prosper, that seemed like a small ask. It also seemed like a reasonable and responsible request given the potential for industrial expansion, the need to clearly understand the potential environmental impacts on the area, and to ensure that there are appropriate and stringent regulations in place to protect residents. Unfortunately, that additional time was denied as was the chance to fully inform the residents of Argay Terrace and encourage them to become more fully invested in this process.



## Department of Community Services Transportation & Land Use Planning Divisions

---

### MEMO

**TO:** Jessica Vega Pederson, Multnomah County Chair

**FROM:** Marge Bradway, Department of Community Services Director  
Megan Gibb, Land Use Planning Director  
Jessica Berry, Transportation Deputy Director

**Cc:** Christian Elkin, Chief Budget Officer  
Allison Boyd, Transportation Planning Manager  
Eve Nilenders, Transportation Planning Specialist

**DATE:** October 18, 2024

**SUBJECT:** DCS Feedback on Tax Increment Financing (TIF) Districts and Proposed Projects

---

### Summary

The Department of Community Services' Transportation and Land Use Planning staff reviewed the proposed Tax Increment Financing (TIF) districts and projects that were presented to the Board on September 17, 2024. Below, staff outline Department policy feedback on the TIF districts, areas and projects.

Overall, Land Use Planning and Transportation divisions support the investments in affordable housing which are planned for most of the TIF district areas. Some general comments regarding the proposal, follow:

- Staff supports investments in the right-of-way and public realm: e.g. streetscape improvements, parks, green infrastructure, improved sidewalks, walkability, connectivity and access to transit. All of these are consistent with several DCS policies such as mobility and access, community health and safety, housing affordability, equity, and Tribal sovereignty.
- In the Central City areas, the County has significant transportation infrastructure and costs associated with operating and maintaining three movable bridges over the Willamette River and the associated viaducts. These are a significant financial burden on Multnomah County and staff would like to understand how the TIF districts could positively or negatively impact the County's financial investment in these bridges.



## Department of Community Services Transportation & Land Use Planning Divisions

---

### East Portland TIF Districts

There are three East Portland TIF districts that overlap with Transportation Division work. None of these locations have County land use authority or transportation infrastructure; however, Transportation Division staff work within all three areas. DCS supports investment in affordable and missing middle housing in these areas with residential components.

#### 82nd Avenue

- **Position:** Multnomah County supports the investment priorities in this area which are consistent with Department values around mobility and access, community health and safety, equity and housing affordability.
- Multnomah County is on public record supporting investments for safety and transit on the 82nd Avenue project both in the Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT).
- **Nexus:** Multnomah County has a seat, currently held by Commissioner Brim-Edwards, on the 82nd Avenue Transit Project Steering Committee, convened by Metro and TriMet. The County voted in support of the preliminary Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA). Staff attend technical committees and support the Commissioner in her role on the steering committee.
- **Support:** Investments in safety, transit, transit-oriented development and affordable housing on and around 82nd Avenue.

#### East 205

- **Position:** Multnomah County supports investment prioritizing generational wealth for first-time BIPOC homeowners and improved walkability, connectivity and transit access, with a focus on sidewalks.
- **Nexus:** The issues facing the East 205 district are similar to issues facing the rest of Urban East Multnomah County. Transportation staff work with Centennial school district and with City of Portland staff to provide safe routes to school programs and support the City's Safe Streets For All grant work on 122nd Avenue.
- **Support:** Investments in transportation on 122nd Avenue and Safe Routes to School in this TIF district.

#### Sumner-Parkrose-Argay-Columbia Corridor

- **Position:** Multnomah County supports the 10-15% TIF that will be invested in streets, utilities, green infrastructure improvements, connectivity and accessibility, public recreation, safety, health and resilience investments.
- **Nexus:** Multnomah County provides transit service in this area and sees a need for greater investment in safe transportation infrastructure that will enable people to more safely access jobs.
- [ACCESS](#), a County-operated job- and community-connector shuttle, provides a last-mile connection to jobs along the Alderwood-Cornfoot-Columbia Corridor. It operates out of Parkrose-Sumner Transit Center in the Sumner-Parkrose-Argay-Columbia Corridor TIF area.



## Department of Community Services Transportation & Land Use Planning Divisions

---

- ACCESS serves NE 105th Avenue where there are three stop pairs along 105th. TriMet Line 87, which is soon to become a frequent-service route, also serves these stops.
- This portion of 105th lacks sidewalks north of Killingsworth until the intersection with NE Alderwood. Because 105th is within a freight district, the lack of sidewalks creates conflicts between freight vehicles and pedestrians (transit users).
- In this area, NE 105th would be a good candidate for improvements at transit stops (landing pads, sidewalk infill, pedestrian-scale lighting) and other transit amenities.
- ACCESS also serves NE Prescott, which lacks sidewalks on the south side of the street. TriMet Line 73 (a frequent-service route) also serves NE Prescott. This area would benefit from sidewalk infill, ADA-compliant infrastructure and pedestrian-scale lighting.
- Most of the neighborhood adjacent to Parkrose Transit Center (south of the TC) also largely lacks sidewalks, making safe access to transit (the MAX, TriMet and C-TRAN bus lines and ACCESS shuttle) challenging.
- **Support:** Investments in green infrastructure, transit and access to transit on NE 105th, NE Prescott, and near the Parkrose Transit Center.

### Central City TIF District

The Central City TIF District has three areas, two of which overlap directly with County transportation infrastructure and services.

#### Central Eastside Corridor

- **Position:** Multnomah County supports the investment priorities in this area, especially residential development like affordable housing units, in collaboration with key community stakeholders including Tribal and Indigenous partners. This is consistent with Department policies for housing affordability and Tribal sovereignty.
- **Nexus:** Multnomah County also owns and maintains three large moveable bridges and their viaducts within this TIF area - the Hawthorne Bridge (including Hawthorne and Madison Viaducts), the Morrison Bridge (including Morrison and Belmont Viaducts) and the Burnside Bridge (including Burnside viaduct). These are large, expensive infrastructure investments for the County. It would be useful to understand how the existence of the TIF districts impacts these County resources.
- **Support:** Investments in affordable housing and transportation projects that support or leverage our bridge investments, especially the Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge project.

#### Lloyd Holladay

- **Position:** Multnomah County supports the investment priorities in this area, especially with a focus on economic development and housing. They are consistent with Department values around mobility and access, community health and safety, equity and housing affordability.
- Multnomah County is on record in regional committee meetings in support of the Albina Vision project and alignment between the Albina Vision Plan, Portland's Comprehensive Plan and investments in the Lloyd Center. While this TIF district does not directly overlay with the Albina Vision area, Portland Prosper should coordinate and leverage investments with Albina Vision.



## Department of Community Services Transportation & Land Use Planning Divisions

---

### Westside

- Position: Multnomah County supports the investment in infrastructure, utilities, public realm, road extensions, parking infrastructure, utility upgrades, investment in parks and open spaces, streetscape improvements and signage in this area. Multnomah County is also supportive of seismic upgrades in historic districts as noted on slide 23, this language is not included as a bullet point in the letter dated August 29, 2024, however, it is consistent with the Transportation Division's policy on resilience.
- Nexus: The County maintains four Willamette River bridges that provide direct access to/from this district; Broadway, Burnside, Morrison, and Hawthorne bridges. As noted above, these are large, expensive infrastructure investments for the County. It would be useful to understand how the existence of the TIF districts impacts these County resources.
- **Support:** Transportation investments that support or leverage County investments in the Willamette River bridges.





## Department of Community Services Transportation & Land Use Planning Divisions

---

### APPENDIX A - For Reference

#### Land Use and Transportation Division Policy Frameworks

##### Land Use Policy Framework (DRAFT)

- CLIMATE AND RESILIENCE: Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and increase community resilience to the impacts of climate change through land use practices.
- COMMUNITY HEALTH AND SAFETY: Promote overall health of community members, reduce exposure to health risk factors and mitigate natural hazards through land use practices.
- EQUITY: Promote racial, social, and economic justice through equitable access to land use processes and equitable impacts of land use plans and policies.
- HOUSING AFFORDABILITY: Promote housing opportunities and affordability through land use plans and processes.
- PROTECTION OF NATURAL RESOURCES: Protect natural resources and air, water and land quality for present and future generations.
- PROTECTION OF AGRICULTURAL AND FORESTRY RESOURCES: Conserve agricultural and forestry land and support rural business development that complements farming and forestry.
- CUSTOMER SERVICE AND ACCOUNTABILITY: Provide excellent customer service and accountability in land use planning. Provide equitable public access to land use information, engage affected stakeholders in land use processes and provide predictable permitting pathways.

##### Transportation Policy Framework

- MOBILITY AND ACCESS: Provide transportation options for people to access destinations and critical services.
- COMMUNITY HEALTH AND SAFETY: Provide a transportation system that promotes community health and safety.
- CLIMATE: Reduce greenhouse gas emissions and increase community and environmental resilience to the impacts of climate change.
- EQUITY: Promote racial, social and economic justice through equitable transportation access, impacts, burdens and benefits.
- TRIBAL SOVEREIGNTY: Respect and integrate the rights of federally recognized tribes into County policies, practices and procedures.
- RESILIENCE: Provide a transportation system that supports equitable community preparation for, mitigation of, and recovery from the impacts of natural disasters.
- ASSET STEWARDSHIP: Manage county transportation assets to earn and uphold public trust.

October 18, 2024

Delivered via email

Dear Members of Portland City Council:

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the six proposed Tax Increment Financing (TIF) Districts that will be considered by City Council. We thank staff from Prosper Portland for their briefing to the Multnomah County Board of Commissioners on September 17th, and for the individual briefings they have provided to each of our offices.

Multnomah County is supportive of the proposed new TIF Districts, and we appreciate the opportunity to highlight the significant impacts that the foregone revenue will have on County services and uplift key values and priorities of our Board when considering the cost-benefit analysis of these new districts.

Prosper Portland projections show the foregone revenue for Multnomah County to be \$48.9 million per year at its peak, and \$816 million over 30 - 35 years for all six proposed districts. To put one year in context, that is the equivalent of:

- 89.6% of the District Attorney's FY 2025 Adopted Budget
- The same as the cost of operating the dorms in the Multnomah County Detention Center (MCDC) - 448 jail beds (FY 2025 Adopted Budget)
- 98% of the costs of providing 1,385 emergency shelter for adults in the County's Safety Off the Streets - Adult Shelter program (FY 2025 Adopted Budget)

Multnomah County's core values of accountability, social and environmental justice, inclusively leading with race, equity and inclusion, and safety and well-being are guiding principles for the County.

In addition to the impacts to our County's revenue and budget, there are several key values based in these principles that we ask that you prioritize and center when considering the establishment of new TIF districts:

1. **Recognizing Harms:** First, we recognize the harms that have resulted from historic Urban Renewal Areas, which were substantially similar to the TIF funding mechanism. In areas such as North and Northeast Portland, which historically were home to large communities of Black and African American households, investments tied to Urban Renewal led to gentrification and the displacement of many households from their historic neighborhoods. As new TIF districts are established, it is critical that policymakers learn from the historic harms done by Urban Renewal districts, incorporate lessons of [how rising property values can lead to displacement](#) without adequate mitigation strategies in place, and center the voices of communities that have historically been impacted and who would be impacted by rising housing costs and gentrification.

2. **Acknowledging inequities in our property tax system:** Many of the promises the City made to east Portland communities when annexing them decades ago became much harder to fulfill after the passage of Measure 5 and Measure 50, which drastically curtailed revenue to support infrastructure. In fact, the County, City, and jurisdictions across Oregon face mounting infrastructure challenges because of the inequities in our property tax system. TIF districts are an important tool, but they cannot replace the structural reform that could address the multi-generational impacts of public disinvestment driven by the State's property tax policy.
3. **Increasing housing supply:** We strongly support the use of TIF funds for the expansion of affordable housing, housing preservation, affordable infill/middle-density housing, and homeownership opportunities in alignment with regional and local housing production plans; and prior to final approval ask the City to share those plans, with the TIF-supported housing included, with our Board. In the City of Portland's most recent [Housing Needs Analysis](#), the City found that Portland needs to support the development of 120,560 new units of housing by 2045, and our Board supports the development of a range of housing options that provide access to affordable rents, reduce homelessness by increasing housing stock, prevent more people from becoming homeless by keeping existing units affordable, and expand homeownership opportunities to build wealth.
4. **Leveraging existing revenue sources:** We believe investments from these new TIF Districts should be focused to leverage additional sources of funding for key community priorities, including addressing our homelessness crisis, economic opportunity and living-wage jobs, workforce development, expanding access to high-quality preschool, and investing in community-based strategies to mitigate the impacts of the climate crisis. We believe that projects funded by these TIF districts should seek to braid funding - where feasible - with projects funded by revenue sources including Metro's Supportive Housing Services program, local and regional housing bonds, Multnomah County's Preschool for All program, and the City of Portland's Portland Clean Energy Community Benefits Fund.
5. **Supporting our business community:** We support the use of TIF districts to support small and local businesses and entrepreneurship across Portland, especially in areas such as east Portland where previous urban renewal areas fell short of delivering the economic opportunity they promised. We believe that these investments should contribute to the revitalization of Portland's central city, and support our ongoing work to understand how post-pandemic work and travel habits have changed our city and re-envision our downtown and east Portland areas to adjust for anticipated long-term shifts and trends in consumer, residential and workforce trends.

In addition to these core values, we support several potential projects and project categories that our Board believes would be beneficial to the safety, development, and expansion of economic opportunities in Portland.

1. **Expanding critical infrastructure:** We support the use of TIF funds to expand critical infrastructure in areas of Portland that lack these resources, such as areas of Northeast and Portland east of 82nd Ave. Of particular importance are investments to protect pedestrians and bicyclists, ADA accessibility, and increase street lighting. In the [Bureau of Transportation's 2023 Deadly Traffic Crashes Report](#), it was
-

found that the rate of traffic deaths in east Portland was two-thirds greater than the rest of the City, that 77 percent of traffic fatalities occurred in low-light conditions, and that there has been a “dramatic increase” in the number of pedestrians who died in traffic fatalities compared to the three years prior. Investments in sidewalks, protected bicycle lanes, and street lighting, particularly on high-crash corridors, will have a significant chance of preventing future traffic fatalities.

- a. Multnomah County continues to support investments for safety and transit on the 82nd Avenue project at Metro’s Joint Policy Advisory Committee on Transportation (JPACT), and supports utilizing TIF resources to increase investments in safety, transit, and affordable housing on and around 82nd Avenue.
  - b. Multnomah County has worked with the City of Portland and the Centennial School District to provide safe routes to schools and support the City’s Safe Streets for All grant-funded efforts on 122nd Avenue, and supports utilizing TIF resources to leverage those investments to enhance street safety east of I-205.
2. **Increase access to recreational and green spaces:** We believe that TIF districts should fund investments to expand access to recreational opportunities and green spaces, particularly in areas with low tree canopy coverage. During the 2021 Heat Dome event, Multnomah County saw 69 County residents die from heat-related illnesses. Areas of our community with low tree canopy coverage, such as in east Portland, have been found to be up to ten degrees warmer than those with adequate tree canopy coverage, creating heat islands; those areas with greater concentrations of heat islands are disproportionately home to low income residents who may lack access to air conditioning. In our region, we have measured a 17 degree difference between the hottest and coolest neighborhoods. That can be the difference between life and death in a heat emergency.
3. **Capitalize on Portland’s unique advantages:** We are supportive of new investments to activate areas of the central city and establish new areas with robust housing, commercial, and tourism-focused resources, amenities and services. We also believe that TIF investments should be used to capitalize on Portland’s unique advantages, such as our robust restaurant and dining community and access to outdoor spaces. To that end, we support the proposed development of the OMSI District in southeast Portland, the exploration of new ways to enhance Tom McCall Waterfront Park and city parks in East Portland, alignment of TIF investments with the economic opportunities presented as an epicenter for sports and sport design, and the establishment of the James Beard Public Market.

Lastly, we make two specific requests to Prosper Portland as they move forward with implementing these new TIF Districts:

1. **Regular updates:** First, we request that Prosper Portland provide our Board with annual, written updates on the status of TIF investments, projects under consideration and development, including the housing pipeline by geographical area and its alignment with regional and local housing production plans, the anticipated and actual amounts of foregone revenue, and the benefits our community receives from TIF investments.
-

2. **Involvement in committees:** Second, we request that Prosper Portland add County representatives as participants in the six district-specific, community-led committees that develop project lists and set funding priorities as ex officio, non-voting members. Recognizing the importance of centering community voices on these committees, we believe that County representatives can provide valuable input on these proposed investments and hope to be able to participate in a collaborative manner.
3. **Understanding impacts on County infrastructure:** Finally, in the central city areas, the County has significant transportation infrastructure and costs associated with operating and maintaining three movable bridges over the Willamette River and the associated viaducts. These are a significant financial burden on Multnomah County and staff would like to understand how the TIF districts could positively or negatively impact the County's financial investment in these bridges. We would request that Prosper Portland staff arrange time to meet with County Transportation staff to discuss this matter further.

Please don't hesitate to reach out with questions or thoughts on this feedback. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input and we look forward to next steps.

Sincerely,



Jessica Vega Pederson  
Multnomah County Chair



Jesse Beason  
Multnomah County Commissioner, District 2



Lori Stegmann  
Multnomah County Commissioner, District 4

---

Dear Mayor Wheeler, Commissioners Ryan, Rubio, Gonzalez, and Mapps,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the six proposed Tax Increment Financing (TIF) Districts that will be considered by Portland City Council.

Thank you to the staff of Prosper Portland for their briefing to the Multnomah County Board of Commissioners. As a Commissioner with proposed new TIF Districts in my East Portland Commission District, I am supportive of the proposed new TIF Districts. I know that many District 3 residents, community leaders, and local business representatives have participated in the process of developing the proposed districts and the identified investments in the Districts. I am supportive of many of the proposed investments and want to highlight some priorities below:

- increasing housing production in alignment with regional and local housing production plans;
- additional funding for key economic development community priorities, including employment and economic empowerment opportunities connected to living-wage jobs, and workforce development;
- revitalizing local businesses and entrepreneurship in the City's local business districts;
- investing in critical infrastructure in areas of Portland that lack these resources, such as areas of East Portland which have historically not benefited from the City's infrastructure investments. Sidewalks, safer roads, better lighting, protected bike lanes, and safe routes to school are all needed investments, especially along the 82nd, 122nd, and other major transportation corridors within the TIF Districts;
- expanding access to recreational opportunities and green spaces, particularly in areas with low tree canopy coverage which result in heat islands during extreme weather events; and
- activating areas of downtown/central city and East Portland with robust housing, commercial, and tourism-focused resources, amenities and services, including investments in the proposed development of the OMSI District, further enhancements in our riverfronts and city parks in East Portland, alignment with the economic opportunities as an epicenter for sports and design, and the establishment of a Public Market.

Also, I support adding County representatives as participants in the district-specific, community-led committees that develop project lists and set funding priorities. **I agree with this recommendation only if it includes the requirement that the County representative to a TIF Committee be the District Commissioner who has the majority of a TIF district in their District.**

Thank you again for the briefing and the opportunity to comment on your plans.

Regards,



Julia Brim-Edwards  
Multnomah County Commissioner, District 3

| Agenda Item | Name or Organization                                  | Position | Comments   | Attachment | Created          |
|-------------|---|----------|--|------------|------------------|
| 8<br>913    | Annette Stanhope                                      | Support  | <p>Dear City Council Members,</p> <p>I am writing today to express my support for the creation of the SPACC (Sumner Parkrose Argay Community Corridor) Tax Increment Financing (TIF) District. I am glad I was able to participate in the working group for SPACC alongside others who care deeply about improving the overall prosperity of this area. I believe that this TIF district presents a valuable opportunity to stabilize our community and build this long-term prosperity. However, it is crucial that the implementation of the TIF district is done with transparency, accountability, and a focus on the community's priorities.</p> <p>The SPACC TIF District has the potential to provide a critical tool for stabilizing our community, especially in areas that have long suffered from disinvestment. By dedicating funds to affordable housing, economic development, and infrastructure, we can ensure that current residents and businesses are not displaced by gentrification, but instead, are uplifted by these improvements. And stabilization is not just about preventing displacement—it is about creating an environment where residents and small businesses can thrive and participate in the growth of their neighborhoods. This includes implementing a broad spectrum of housing options so that residents are not cost-burdened by their housing and can have more options to build equity in a path forward to home ownership. Also, when residents are not cost-burdened by their housing, they can participate more fully in their neighborhood economy. This TIF district must center on protecting these stakeholders, ensuring that the economic benefits are distributed equitably across the community.</p> <p>A key priority should be the establishment and strengthening of the Community Leadership Committee (CLC). The allocation of 25% of the administrative funds to Prosper Portland should be directly tied to the CLC's efforts to ensure that community voices are at the forefront of all decisions. It is essential that the CLC represents the diversity of this TIF district, including long-standing residents, small business owners, and community organizations. The success of this TIF district depends on the active and meaningful involvement of these leaders. This ensures that the investments align with the real needs and desires of the community, rather than external forces or interests.</p> <p>It is vital that the CLC hold Prosper Portland accountable to the commitments made in the working group discussions. The community has clearly outlined its priorities—affordable housing, equitable economic development, and responsible use of funds in industrial areas. Prosper Portland must honor these priorities, ensuring that every dollar spent aligns with the community-driven vision for the SPACC TIF District. Regular reporting, transparency, and open communication with the CLC and the public are non-negotiable to ensure that these commitments are being fulfilled.</p> <p>Lastly, I want to address the importance of safeguarding against the misuse of funds in industrial lands. The SPACC TIF District includes areas that have historically been prone to environmental harm and exploitation. It is imperative that the funds designated for industrial lands are used responsibly, ensuring that any developments do not lead to further harm or displacement. We must have strong oversight to prevent the abuse of these funds for projects that benefit large corporations at the expense of local communities. Instead, these funds should be used to create sustainable jobs, improve environmental conditions, and promote equitable growth within these areas.</p> <p>The SPACC TIF District represents a transformative opportunity for our community, but only if it is implemented with the values of equity, accountability, and community-driven leadership. I urge you to support the creation of the Space TIF District, with these critical considerations in mind. Thank you for taking the time to consider my written testimony.</p> | No         | 10/22/24 3:52 PM |
| 9<br>911    | Laura Bower   | Support  | <p>I strongly support the TIF items currently before the Portland city council (agenda items 911-913) and also encourage the city to maintain (or increase!) the 45% affordable housing set-aside in all new TIFs. According to the city's Housing Needs Analysis, Portland needs 63,000 new homes for low and moderate income residents over the next 10 years. We are facing a dire affordable housing shortfall and now is not the time to shift scarce resources away from housing! Affordable homeownership is a key anti-displacement strategy, and the city needs to prioritize it.</p>   | No         | 10/22/24 4:18 PM |
| 10<br>911   | Sarah Radcliffe, Habitat for Humanity Portland Region | Support  | This testimony applies to Items 911, 912, 913, and 917   | Yes        | 10/22/24 5:03 PM |



October 22, 2024

RE: Agenda Items 911, 912, 913, 917

Dear Mayor Wheeler and City Commissioners,

My name is Sarah Radcliffe and I am the Director of Government Relations for Habitat for Humanity Portland Region ("Habitat").

First, thank you to the staff and leadership who led a thoughtful and robust process to engage with communities and to incorporate those on-the-ground perspectives into the new TIF plans. Consistent with that input, it's imperative that the new TIF districts prioritize housing for households who are struggling to maintain a foothold and who have been closed out of homeownership. Especially in East Portland, an anti-displacement strategy must include adequate TIF funds for affordable housing, including new homeownership opportunities.

***Early investments in Affordable Housing, and specifically Homeownership, help to stabilize communities and insulate against displacement, which has historically been fueled by non-housing TIF investments.***

We trust that City Council shares our strong objections to the urban renewal strategies of the past; it was a vehicle to strip families, disproportionately Black households and other households of color, of their most critical asset; homes were bulldozed, and communities displaced. Those harms live on today; Portland faces a vast gulf between Black and White homeownership rates and on a national level, homeownership disparities have not improved since passage of the Fair Housing Act in 1968. Moving forward, TIF dollars should address that harmful history by investing in BIPOC homeownership and stabilizing housing for communities of color.

Stakeholder engagement during the East Portland TIF exploration established homeownership as a strong priority for local communities. Residents know that there is no better protection against displacement than a 30-year fixed affordable mortgage. To that end, we appreciate that homeownership is called out as a priority in all three plans.

***More, not less, affordable housing funds are needed.***

Portland communities continue to face a housing crisis, but local funding for affordable housing development has dried up. The Portland Housing Bond and Metro Regional Housing Bond have been fully allocated, with no plans to seek a new bond in the foreseeable future. Meanwhile, Portland needs



63,000 new homes for households below 80% AMI by 2035 according to the City's Housing Needs Analysis. These homes will simply not be built without public funding.

I am here today to reiterate a request that you have heard from Habitat and a strong coalition of other housing and homeownership organizations. We are proposing that the new East Portland TIFs:

- a. **Preserve or increase TIF funds for affordable housing;**
- b. **Dedicate a minimum of 20% of the total TIF funding to investments in affordable homeownership.**  
We appreciate that Item 917 promises more clarity going forward around how TIF housing dollars are allocated (homeownership, home repair, affordable rental development, capital expenses for homeless services, etc). At the same time, we encourage Council to take action now to ensure a modest commitment to homeownership.
- c. **Require that the housing set-aside requirement be spent within each new TIF** (vs. an aggregate city-wide target). We've been informed that the new plans are intended to require TIF-specific housing set-asides. If that's the case, Council should make a record of its intent.)

Thank you for your consideration and your service.

Sarah Radcliffe, Director of Government Relations  
Habitat for Humanity Portland Region

**Commented [SR1]:** @Erika Kennel and @Steve Messinetti how's this?

**Commented [EK2R1]:** good, but bold the key statement

**Commented [SR3R1]:** I had a long conversation with Helmi this morning too. Basically, she wants all the housing \$ she can get, but feels that requesting a increased (or decreased) % now would be a bait + switch because the whole TIF creation process was premised on the 45%.

|    | Agenda Item | Name or Organization   | Position | Comments  | Attachment | Created           |
|----|-------------|--|----------|---|------------|-------------------|
| 11 | 913         | Nicole Lu  | Support  | <p>As a resident and homeowner in the Sumner neighborhood, I am writing to express my strong support for the proposed TIF district in East Portland. For far too long, our community has faced underinvestment, leaving vital infrastructure and services lacking. This proposal represents an essential opportunity to address these issues by directing resources to where they are most needed.</p> <p>I believe the TIF district is a smart and sustainable way to reinvest our tax dollars into projects that will enhance our neighborhood’s quality of life. My greatest hope is that this initiative will prioritize the construction of new affordable housing, attracting families, children, and a more diverse population to strengthen our community. With increased investment, East Portland can finally experience the growth and revitalization it deserves.</p> <p>I urge you to support the creation of this TIF district and help make this positive change a reality for our neighborhood.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>Sincerely,<br/>Nicole Lu<br/>Sumner Neighborhood Resident</p>   | No         | 10/22/24 8:35 PM  |
| 12 | 913         | Dylan  | Support  | The SPACC TIF district offers our neighborhood a great opportunity to fund small businesses, neighborhood improvements, and add housing, written with intention to prioritize equity, keeping residents in their homes, and building up our community. As a Sumner resident, I support moving ahead with this TIF.  | No         | 10/22/24 8:41 PM  |
| 13 | 913         | William Mohring, Mohring Realty Group and Habitat for Humanity                                     | Support  | I urge the City Council to approve this urban renewal plan. We need to prioritize housing, with a special focus on affordable homeownership. Achieving true equity, opportunity, and stability in our community requires dedicated funds for homeownership.   | No         | 10/23/24 11:55 AM |
| 14 | 909         | Nicole Knudsen   |          | Items 909-916   | Yes        | 10/23/24 4:15 PM  |
| 15 | 927         | Lillian Erwin, Argay Terrace Neighborhood Association  | Oppose   | The Argay Neighborhood has asked for more time. In addition, the citizens of this neighborhood want to know how this will benefit us over the proposed period. We are not listened to time after time. How is this a government that listens to the people rather than plodding ahead without providing additional time as requested.   | No         | 10/29/24 12:28 PM |
| 16 | 927         | Dolores Livesay  | Oppose   | I do not think this will benefit my neighborhood. We had asked for more time but it seems like you want to rush this to a vote. We'll I've read the agenda and I don't like.  | No         | 10/29/24 12:31 PM |
| 17 | 927         | Colleen Johnson, Argay Terrace resident  |          |   | Yes        | 10/29/24 1:47 PM  |
| 18 | 927         | Argay resident—my only comment (not leaving multiple comments)                                     | Oppose   | Please let the new city council vote on this. We have asked for more time—please honor this request. Your response proves whether or not you care about true democracy. I am also concerned about the economic impact—who is paying for this?. Too many voices clamoring for “more, more”—at cost to someone else. Too much burden to working and retired tax-payers.   | No         | 10/29/24 3:09 PM  |
| 19 | 927         | Katie Beymer Nguyen - 4th Gen. Parkrose Resident - Argay Terrace Neighborhood Resident & Volunteer | Oppose   | <p>Thank you, City Council, for your willingness to ask further questions about the SPACC TIF. While the options for "Support" or "Oppose" did not include "Need More Time," I believe this is a crucial topic for discussion during #927. There is no urgency to adopt this plan within this calendar year. The community has clearly expressed the need for more time to ensure that TIF funds are allocated thoughtfully and effectively.</p> <p>The current plan lacks clarity and seems overly flexible, giving Prosper Portland and the Portland Housing Bureau the latitude to use these funds largely at their discretion. It's essential that we take the necessary time to ensure responsible management of these resources. TIF money was allocated for the benefit of the community, yet it feels as though there is already an agenda to direct these funds toward large projects that Portland Housing and Prosper Portland have in mind.</p> <p>Please give the residents &amp; community members of the SPACC TIF more time for discussion. Allow the community to be an integral part of the conversation. Thank you for your consideration, and thank you for being a voice that advocates for our community.</p> | Yes        | 10/29/24 3:45 PM  |



Testimony to the Portland City Council  
Provided by Yasmin Ibarra  
Political Director  
SEIU Local 49

Re: Support for the City's Urban Renewal Plans (Agenda items #909-916)

October 23, 2024

Mayor Wheeler and Commissioners,

My name is Yasmin Ibarra and I am the Political Director of the Service Employees International Union, Local 49. SEIU Local 49 is a union of nearly 14,000 essential healthcare and property service workers, including the City's subcontracted janitors, security officers, and laundry workers, as well as the officers who provide security services for the Clean & Safe downtown essential services district.

Local 49 also represents thousands of janitors and security officers who work throughout the metro area every day to clean and secure Portland's commercial office buildings. Our members have firsthand experience of the changes Portland has undergone in recent years and share the City and business community's interest in using a variety of tools to reinvigorate Portland's neighborhoods and commercial districts.

The proposed Urban Renewal Plans are one such tool that we are in support of using, as SEIU Local 49 members continue to look for ways to actively partner with City agencies and business leaders as engaged stakeholders working to reimagine what Portland can be.

When the City invests or creates tax incentives such as the new Tax Increment Financing zones, additional tools such as community benefit agreements can be an important way to ensure public dollars are used to achieve the most expansive public good. Prioritizing the use of union contractors can also amplify the benefits of public investment, as responsible union contractors provide living wages, affordable benefits, and important on-the-job working protections that help to ensure workers and their families are not left behind.<sup>1</sup>

We hope the City will continue to prioritize economic tools and public investment in good jobs that can provide benefits to those at *all* economic levels of our community. As the City implements these Urban Renewal Zones, we look forward to finding more ways to partner in the work of restoring our region's economy.

Thank you.

Yasmin Ibarra  
Political Director  
Service Employees International Union, Local 49

---

<sup>1</sup> For a recent example of an expansive public benefit resulting from contracting, the Federal Bureau of Economic Analysis estimates that every dollar earned by a union janitor and security officer in the Portland metro area generates a return investment of \$1.59-\$1.73 for the community. Using this metric, SEIU Local 49 estimates our 2024 Master Janitorial and Security contract settlements will result in an economic impact of \$33 million dollars over the life of the four-year agreements. (Bureau of Economic Analysis, Regional Input-Output Modeling System multiplier available at <https://apps.bea.gov/regional/rims/rimsii/home.aspx>)

1-800-955-3352  
MAIN OFFICE

503-238-6692  
FAX

3536 SE 26<sup>TH</sup> AVE  
PORTLAND, OR 97202

@SEIU49  
TWITTER

SEIU LOCAL 49  
FACEBOOK

WWW.SEIU49.ORG

TO: City Council  
FROM: Colleen Johnson, Argay Terrace  
DATE: October 29, 2024

After listening to the testimony and discussion of the three potential Eastside Tax Increment Financing Districts at the City Council meeting on October 23, one could be forgiven for thinking that TIF stood for Tax Increment Financing for affordable housing (or TIFah). While half of the revenue from TIFs is supposed to be dedicated to economic development, there was hardly a question nor any thoughtful discussion of that piece. Commissioner Mapps did ask how Prosper worked to increase homeownership, rather than rental units, among Blacks given its central role in generational wealth. Unfortunately, Prosper failed to provide a satisfactory answer. The link between homeownership and the economy is pretty clear. As KOIN reported in March 2024,

*[T]he needed income for a typical home in Portland has soared. In 2024, Portlanders need to earn \$161,624 to afford a typical home, according to Zillow. The median income in Portland is around \$96,137 with monthly mortgage payments at \$3,374.*

An annual salary of \$161,624 requires an hourly wage of \$78.00 for 40 hours per week, 52 weeks per year, with no overtime.

So the obvious question, the other side of the housing coin, is what sorts of jobs does Prosper anticipate being created, in what sectors, and at what wage range? In Lents, according to the City Auditor's report (February 2020), while the number of jobs increased in that TIF District, the rate of homeownership decreased, wages fell, income fell, and poverty rose. Is it realistic to assume that these Eastside TIFs will generate \$160,600/year jobs that will then allow people to buy homes, even with help from the affordable housing portion of the TIF? If such help is forthcoming, what exactly is it and how will it solve the yawning gap between income and homeownership that occurred in the Lents TIF District?

Where is the discussion of the how and what of economic development in the TIF Districts? How will economic development occur and what will it look like? Why isn't anyone asking those very important questions? In the SPACC TIF proposal, I think the answer is that the discussion has already taken place and decisions already made. Unfortunately, much of it has taken place outside of public meetings. For example, the Working Group for the proposed SPACC TIF district met for 7 months, but those meetings were not open to the public.

For at least the last two years, the City has been engaged in economic development plans to pursue a Clean Industry hub in the Columbia Corridor, much of which lies across the street from Argay Terrace. Advance Portland, the City Economic and Industrial Development Plan, was passed by the Council on April 26, 2023 and directed the City to explore the creation of Eastside TIF districts; formalize a clean energy partnership; and establish an advisory committee.

The Advisory Committee for Advance Portland consists 34 members representing business and industry, construction, education, tourism, utilities, Metro, Port of Portland, and organizations focused on BIPOC populations among others. What's striking is that there is not a single person

who was appointed to represent those neighborhoods adjacent to the industrial land targeted for the proposed Clean Industry Hub, in particular Argay Terrace.

Between September 2023 and September 2024, there were 5 meetings of the Advisory Board for Advance Portland, none of which were open to the public. In the PowerPoint presentation for the September 10, 2024, it states that one of the Proposed Priorities for FY 2024-25 under Business Retention & Innovation is: Launch Clean Industry Initiative.

We have a City that has been developing a strategy for a Clean Industry Hub in the Columbia Corridor for well over two years and this week the City will consider approving a TIF District in NE Portland (SPACC) that would generate revenue of approximately \$300 million, 45% for economic development. In their 2024/25 budget, Prosper Portland invested in helping industry partners to deploy innovative green products and services. Obviously an admirable goal, but once again industry was represented on the Budget Committee but the people who live across the street and are most impacted by the Columbia Corridor Industrial Zone were not. In addition to those pots of money, there is an Enterprise Zone for the industrial area in the Columbia Corridor that “allows industrial...firms making substantial new capital investments an exemption of 100% of real property taxes attributable to the new investment(s) for a five-year period.” (PDC)

The City has a plan, they have the land, and they will soon have the money. The only problem is that those residents who are most likely to be affected have been excluded. Throughout the entire seven months (Jan-July 2024) during which the SPACC Working Group was meeting, the the Advance Portland Advisory Committee was also meeting and strategizing to initiate a Clean Industry Hub across the street from Argay Terrace. Why was there not a robust discussion of this in the SPACC Working Group? Why wasn't it front and center in any discussion of economic development? While I would like to understand better the potential benefits of a Danish-style Clean Industry Hub, what I find most disturbing about this entire process is the lack of trust and respect Prosper Portland has shown for the residents of Argay Terrace.

One of the main critiques of the TIF process is lack of transparency. The decision-making and budget processes tend to be opaque, receiving less public scrutiny than other municipal processes. Unfortunately, the City of Portland is a prime example of that criticism.

10-29-2024

RE: SPACC TIF (Sumner/Parkrose/Argay/Columbia Corridor)

Dear Mayor Wheeler and City Commissioners,

My name is Katie Beymer Nguyen, and I am a fourth-generation resident of Parkrose, with my children now being fifth-generation. My family has lived in Parkrose since the early 1900's and have built many of Portland's historical buildings. I am writing to express my deep concerns regarding the allocation and management of Tax Increment Financing (TIF) funds in our community and to advocate for postponing the upcoming vote to allow for more thorough community discussion and planning.

### **Lack of Transparency and Community Engagement**

I dedicated significant time to understanding the potential benefits of TIF for our community, yet it has become clear that the SPACC TIF primarily focuses on high-density apartments. Community meetings, which were meant to facilitate dialogue, instead felt like mere formalities. Many insights and concerns raised by residents went largely unaddressed, leading to a growing sense of frustration among community members.

The political intricacies surrounding TIF districts are troubling. During TIF meetings, basic community questions were met with vague responses from Prosper Portland and the Portland Housing Bureau. This lack of transparency raises serious concerns about the motivations behind these initiatives and whether they genuinely prioritize community needs.

### **Financial Implications and Affordable Housing Concerns**

#### **1. TIF Funding & Representation:**

The financial structure of TIF funding is concerning. Proposed administrative costs could reach up to \$100 million for a single TIF district—an astonishing figure. Our community felt that 15% was excessive, only to later learn that the actual deduction could be as high as 25%. This misallocation of funds undermines the very purpose of TIF, which is supposed to stimulate local growth and benefit the community.

At multiple TIF meetings, we sought clarity on the reasons behind the selection of our area and the management of funds. Our inquiries regarding the workgroup's selection process, potential conflicts of interest, arms-length agreements, and discrepancies in administrative costs went unanswered. These issues are not trivial; they warrant comprehensive and transparent responses.

We have become aware that several members of the workgroup have a vested interest in these funds and may be pursuing future projects that require TIF support. This raises potential conflicts of interest that undermine trust in the entire process.

## 2. Overbuilding 'Affordable Housing' in our Area.

Additionally, the promise of affordable home ownership has not materialized. After attending multiple TIF meetings, it is evident that the current plan lacks transparency and depth, often using vague terms like "affordable housing" to obscure its true implications. Many residents were unaware of the finalized Parkrose Plan until recently, raising concerns about its funding and alignment with community needs. It appears that the focus is shifting toward multifamily housing without adequate community input or consideration for homeownership opportunities. This approach may enhance nonprofit wealth while neglecting individual and generational wealth-building in our community.

Since the Parkrose planning meetings began, residents have expressed strong opposition to any further multifamily housing developments in the area, which already has a high percentage of such units. Additional high-density growth would not contribute positively to our community's quality of life.

During the city council meeting, when several commissioners and the mayor briefly addressed this topic, Portland Housing provided a cursory overview of how funds should be used regarding affordable home ownership. However, we must ask: is this truly the best use of homeownership funds? We recognize that our beautiful farmland will inevitably be converted to housing, but why can't that development be of high quality, promoting individual wealth creation?

Our community needs single-family housing development. This type of development fosters generational wealth for Portlanders and allows them to plant their roots here. Unfortunately, ownership funds are often channeled into nonprofits that provide superficial renovations rather than genuine building efforts. For example, a friend of mine recently faced a high loan through Hacienda CDC for minimal home improvements that should have cost significantly less had she been able to choose her own contractor. They more than doubled her expenses, and as a disabled single mother, she will need to repay those funds in full once she sells her home. If these funds were properly audited, a contractor could have fixed her leaky roof and windows for a fraction of the cost.

## **Safety & Quality of Life for Residents**

### 3. Impact on Tax Revenue:

The transformation of business owners and government entities into nonprofits through TIF has detrimental effects on our tax rolls. Properties acquired through TIF are often taken off the tax rolls, resulting in higher taxes for residents in an area that already has a lower Area Median Income (AMI). This inequity is unsustainable and undermines the financial stability of our community. Why should nonprofits, funded by TIF, be exempt from contributing fairly to our tax base?

We are aware of current examples of properties that have been recently purchased or developed under this system. We worry that future developments will not represent the best use of funds. Parkrose needs its fair share of commercial tax revenue, especially given our community's high demands for police, fire, schools, and other essential services. We recently lost our East Precinct, and if there were more time in the planning process, we could advocate for a community precinct to enhance safety.

#### 4. Deteriorating Neighborhood Quality & Environmental Impacts:

High-density housing often leads to increased traffic, strain on local infrastructure, and diminished quality of life for existing residents. Our community is not equipped to handle such rapid changes without careful planning. We need to prioritize thoughtful development that enhances, rather than disrupts, our neighborhoods.

Argay already has a significant amount of industrial area; the northern half of our neighborhood is entirely industrial. This wasn't always the case; this area was once filled with beautiful homes that bordered our Columbia River and sloughs. Over the years, we have seen development in our area that could have been much better planned if more time and input had been allowed.

Most recently, we learned significant lessons from the Kmart site (NE 122nd and NE Sandy Blvd.). The community urged the council for representation, but our requests were ignored. The Prologis warehouse has now become a massive commercial building in our area, where we could have had a facility that benefited our neighbors and the children of our community. An amazing community center and grocery shopping area were among the visions of the neighbors, but our voices were lost to political maneuvering.

Environmental impacts are also not adequately accounted for. Many environmental and traffic studies that were once mandatory now seem to be treated as negotiable. We need advocacy prior to planning to protect our water resources. Argay Terrace and the surrounding neighborhoods are home to the Columbia River slough, currently bordered by industrial businesses. TIF could be a significant tool to protect our water and soil from industrial encroachment, yet this concern was another topic overlooked by Prosper Portland.

### **Community Vision and the Need for Time**

#### 5. Inadequate Decision-Making Time:

The rushed nature of this decision-making process leaves our community without sufficient information to make informed choices. After watching the TIF council meeting, it was evident that Prosper Portland and the Portland Housing Bureau were reluctant to amend their plans significantly, despite the community's clear request for more time and transparency.

The preservation of our farmland is paramount. High-density zoning should not come at the expense of our community's quality of life. Our residents deserve a say in the future of our neighborhoods, not merely as a formality but as a genuine partnership in shaping our collective future.

#### 6. The Importance of Local History and Identity:



Parkrose and Argay Terrace have rich histories that contribute to the character of our city and diversity. Our neighborhoods were once vibrant centers for families and businesses. As we consider new developments, we must ensure they respect and preserve the historical identity that makes our community unique.

Other TIF districts that have been built in the past, in hindsight, could have been approached more thoughtfully. Who is auditing these plans? Do community members have a say in changes as plans are developed?

#### 7. A Call for Genuine Community Involvement:

We seek a genuine opportunity for community involvement in shaping our neighborhood's future. Our residents want to actively participate in the planning process, ensuring that developments align with our needs and values. This requires more time for collaboration and input from diverse community voices. Prosper Portland and Portland Housing bureau did not give our neighborhood time or consideration to address some of the concerns of the community. This process over the summer was completely rushed. I had given my contact information at each community meeting, and I was never contacted about any of my questions. I heard this from other community members. It seems that they only help the meetings as a formality to their agenda and plans.

In conclusion, I implore you to *please consider postponing the vote*. Allow us the necessary time to engage in meaningful dialogue, ensuring that the TIF plan reflects the true needs and desires of our community. We seek a collaborative approach that honors our voices and fosters a thriving Parkrose/Argay community. I want my children and other children in the community to grow up in a healthy environment they can be proud to call home and want to raise the next generations here – *at home*.

In just a few months, we will have new representatives. In district 1, we will have multiple representatives. After talking to some of the candidates running for our district, it sounds like they would love to address the SPACC TIF. I think they genuinely want to help neighbors and community members take a closer look at this plan to ensure that there is time allowed for true community involvement. Once the SPACC TIF passes, the community meetings will only be formality.

Thank you for your attention to these pressing concerns. Please give SPACC TIF more time!

Sincerely,

Katie Beymer Nguyen

|    | Agenda Item | Name or Organization | Position             | Comments   | Attachment | Created           |
|----|-------------|----------------------|----------------------|--|------------|-------------------|
| 20 | 927         | Anonymous            | Oppose               | I'm a resident in Argay and am incredibly concerned that the industrial owners and corporate executives will use their connections across various Portland based committee boards to pass regulation that pushes out the thousands of residents who rely on East Portland for our own community. Businesses do not have skin in the game and have proven that profits matter more than ANY impact they have on the community they do business in. Until residents have EQUAL say and power, myself and numerous neighbors I've spoken with will continue to oppose this measure.   | No         | 10/29/24 7:46 PM  |
| 21 | 927         | Anonymous            | Oppose               | <p>Dear Council Members,</p> <p>I am writing to express my deep concerns about the proposed TIF district. The hurried timeline and the absence of public input are troubling. Moreover, it is unclear how the next council will manage this district, especially considering the short notice.</p> <p>The plans for affordable housing are unclear, and the potential impact on our schools remains unknown. Additionally, the district includes both industrial and residential areas, raising concerns about community health and environmental sustainability. Historically, past investments have prioritized the profits of industry over the long-term well-being of our community.</p> <p>I strongly urge you to reconsider this TIF district and prioritize community input and transparency. We need a plan that benefits our community as a whole, not just developers.</p>  | No         | 10/29/24 8:03 PM  |
| 22 | 927         | Amy Honeyman         | Support with changes | <p>As a resident of The Argay Terrace Neighborhood I urge you to save our neighborhood from more disasters like the Pro Logis sight at 122nd next to the High School.</p> <p>As you plan the new developments please consider saving the character of our little community and offer single family homes and townhomes with a path to homeownership rather than just dense low income apartments that will crumble within 10 years.</p> <p>Please help us with a grocery store and small businesses that do not include the the unlicensed "Massage Parlor" that only brings violence and noise to our neighborhood.</p> <p>This area has so much potential right on the edge of The Gorge.</p> <p>I know historically East county is just a place to shove the unwanted troubles from the more expensive central neighborhoods but we work hard to care for our corner of the city and I urge you to take care with it. You're supposed to be the leaders so please be thoughtful and careful and work for the common hood of the whole community rather than just the pockets certain developers and non profits.</p> <p>We deserve clean air and water and a livable community the same as the rest of Portland.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Amy Honeyman</p>            | No         | 10/29/24 9:28 PM  |
| 23 | 927         | Anonymous            | Oppose               | <p>Prior to voting, please ask Prosper Portland if they plan to implement The Parkrose Plan and the City of Roses Expansion plan prior to voting. They acted like they knew nothing about these plans when the community asked about them directly, multiple times at multiple meetings.</p> <p>This summer the person that was in charge of the Parkrose Plan sat quietly at the large Argay meeting and didn't say a word. The neighborhood didn't know they were in the room until after the meeting it was brought to my attention. With \$310M, money would likely go to fund both of these plans. If so, that would be a lot of money that wouldn't be going to the community for the items neighbors had asked for.</p> <p>Also neighbors from Parkrose/Argay/Sumner neighborhoods pointed out the conflict of interest that several of the voting members on the workgroup had. Ex: Parkrose Representative work for Historic Parkrose. City of Roses had two Representatives on the workgroup. They obviously voted yes. Which was a disappointment, when the neighbors were asking for more time.</p> <p>There may be other hidden agenda items not brought up in front of neighbors. I think neighbors deserve a straight answer before this is voted in.</p> | No         | 10/29/24 11:35 PM |

Portland City Council Meeting  
Wednesday, October 23, 2024 - 2:00 p.m.  
Verbal Testimony

|   | Agenda Item | Name            |
|---|-------------|-----------------|
| 1 | 913         | Corky Collier   |
| 2 | 913         | Alando Simpson  |
| 3 | 913         | Dr Paula Macfie |
| 4 | 913         | Colleen Johnson |
| 5 | 913         | Lily Burnett    |
| 6 | 913         | Candice Jimenez |
| 7 | 913         | Cassie Cohen    |
| 8 | 913         | Lynn Felton     |