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New Central City URA and Economic Development Strategy

• Creation of new Central City URA is critical to successful implementation of Economic Development Strategy

• Urban core innovation and Central City job creation are key thrusts of the Economic Development Strategy

• Core Action Items of the Strategy reside in proposed Central City URA and are TIF-eligible
Economic Development Strategy: Central City Themes

Sustainability/Built Environment
  • Oregon Sustainability Center/Living Building
  • Eco-Districts

Higher Education Partnerships
  • PSU Economic Development Framework Plan

Job Creation
  • Catalytic redevelopment sites viewed as employment sites
  • Business recruitment tool
Evaluation Committee

- 25 members appointed by Mayor Adams
- Formed in May, 2009
- Anticipate recommendation by February, 2010
- Making recommendations on:
  - Whether or not to create a new district
  - Boundaries
  - Maximum Indebtedness
  - Goals and Project Priorities
Central City Study Areas

- Northwest
- Goose Hollow
- North of Market
- South of Market
Tax Increment Nodes A through G: Concentrations of potential development
Criteria for Geography Presentations

- Job creation
- Range of housing
- Livability
- Sustainability
- Leverage of and/or impact to current assets and adjacent amenities
- Impact of development on adjacent areas
- Financial impact
- Community perception
WESTSIDE STUDY AREA DIAGNOSTICS
Where are we now?

- In May 2009, we developed the financial characteristics of the area and outlined development potential.

- Today, we provide an objective snapshot of the socio-economic characteristics of the area’s residents and users.
Overview

- **Challenges**
  - Low household income
  - Jobs do not match skills of residents
  - Recent growth trends are insufficient to reach Metro population and employment goals
  - Lack of green space within the study area
  - Low appeal to families with children
  - High crime rates

- **Opportunities**
  - Great educational facilities
  - Great transportation infrastructure
  - Highest concentration of jobs in the state
  - Access to parks, social services, grocery stores, and other services/amenities

ECONorthwest
Economics • Finance • Planning
Study Area Snapshot

Percent of City Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>5%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>15%</th>
<th>20%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Area</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed Value</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Who Lives in the Study Area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total residents</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>535,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth to school age</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College age</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working age</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Population Trends and Projections

Study Area and City Population Trends
1990 – 2030

Source: 1990 and 2000 data points are US Census data; 2008 population is estimated by Claritas, Inc., and is based on the Census American Community Survey. The 2010 trend estimates were calculated by ECONorthwest, using Metro TAZ population projections estimated for the MetroScope model. ECO calculated the growth rates using the TAZs that most closely conform to the boundaries of the study area and City.
Population Density, 2005 and 2030
Population Density, 2005 and 2030
## Study Area Households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total households</td>
<td>8,600</td>
<td>235,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average size</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Family</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Over half of all rental units in study area are classified as affordable
- Almost 90% of rental units in study area are one-bedroom or less
- From 2005 to 2008, housing in the study area has shifted towards higher-income ownership units
Economic Need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Income</th>
<th>Study Area</th>
<th>City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$25,000</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $100,000</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$100,000</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The study area has more than twice the percentage of low-income households compared to the City.
- It has one-third the percentage of households earning more than $100,000 per year.
- Low-income households headed by college students contribute to this income discrepancy.
Study Area Employment

Residents

- 8,500 in labor force
- 7,500 employed
- 10% unemployment (2008)

Day Users

- 84,000 employees
- 19% of City employment
- Top employers:
  - Government
  - Finance, Insurance & Real Estate

Employment Trends

2000-2005: -0.8% per year
2005-2030: 1.0% per year
Employment by Sector

- **FIRE, Prof. Svcs, Info.**
  - Residents: 22%
  - Day Users: 24%
  - Total: 41%

- **Health, Ed, Public Admin**
  - Residents: 22%
  - Day Users: 25%
  - Total: 47%

- **Retail, Hotels, Food Svcs.**
  - Residents: 11%
  - Day Users: 27%
  - Total: 38%

- **All Other**
  - Residents: 27%
  - Day Users: 22%
  - Total: 49%

Sources: ECONorthwest
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Education

Residents

- 220 students are enrolled in K-12 schools
- 2,300 students are enrolled in post-secondary programs

Day Users

- Lincoln High School
  - 84% capture rate
  - 89% graduation rate
  - 92% meet reading benchmark
  - 85% meet math benchmark

- Portland State University
  - 27,000 students
  - National reputation in sustainability and a growing research presence
Core Services

- A “20-minute neighborhood”
  - Virtually the entire population is within walking distance of:
    - Transit
    - Parks
    - Grocery Stores and other retail services
  - Transit connects residents to health, education, and cultural services
6,200 crimes reported in 2008 (8% of total crime in the City)

Crime rate per capita is three times the City average

Total reported crimes in the study area decreased 21% from 2004 to 2008, including a 36% decline in Part I crimes (violent crimes and theft).
Conclusions and Questions

- The area's assets are numerous (transit, parks, schools, jobs, retail)
- Residents are an eclectic bunch (students, professionals, working poor). They have mixed success in taking advantage of those assets
- Metro assumes we could have many more residents in next two decades, which raises questions. For example:
  - How would varying degrees of public intervention shape the rate of growth?
  - How would varying degrees of public intervention shape the profile of the 2030 population?
Recommendations

- Capitalize on existing assets (transportation, education, etc.)
- Attract more economically diverse residents
- Build amenities that are family friendly
- Match resident job skills with business needs
- Continue programs to reduce crime rates
QUESTIONS & DISCUSSION
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