

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

**Committee Chair** Amelia Salvador called the Gresham Redevelopment Commission Budget Committee (GRDCBC) meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. on the 11<sup>th</sup> day of May 2021 via Conference Call +1 253 215 8782 or +1 669 900 6833, Webinar ID 990 5319 4321 or <https://greshamoregon.zoom.us/j/99053194321>.

**Ms. Monohon** called the roll.

COMMITTEE PRESENT: Amelia Salvador, Chair  
Dimitrios Zourkos, Vice Chair  
Christopher Bentley  
Commissioner Dina DiNucci  
Paul Drechsler  
Commissioner Janine Gladfelter  
Ryan Johnson  
Commissioner Vincent Jones-Dixon  
Commission Vice Chair Eddy Morales (arrived at 6:04 p.m. after roll call)  
Commissioner Mario Palmero (arrived at 6:08 p.m. after roll call)  
Commission Chair Travis Stovall

COMMITTEE ABSENT: Helen Kidane  
Commissioner Sue Piazza

STAFF PRESENT: Emily Bower, Gresham Redevelopment Commission Executive Director  
David Clyne, City Manager Pro Tem  
Sharron Monohon, Budget and Finance Director  
Elizabeth McCann, Budget Manager  
Tahni Fagerberg, Senior Financial Analyst  
Katie Cook-Popenuk, Budget Analyst Trainee  
Kevin McConnell, City Attorney  
Eric Schmidt, Assistant City Manager  
Amy Evans, Program Technician  
Cecille Turley, Program Technician and Recording Secretary

**1. AGENDA REVIEW, GROUND RULES, AND MEETING PROTOCOLS**

**Chair Salvador** called upon Ms. Monohon to go over the agenda, ground rules and meeting protocols for the Zoom meeting.

**Sharron Monohon**, Budget and Finance Director, asked the committee to use the mute button whenever possible and use the raise hand feature or physically raise their hands when they have questions. She said it is important when votes are taken that we are counting to the correct number that must be achieved at this meeting. She then went read the agenda item topics of the meeting in the order they appear on the agenda.

**Chair Salvador** asked if there were any questions about the information Ms. Monohon presented.

There were no questions.

**2. ELECTION OF GRESHAM REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION BUDGET COMMITTEE OFFICERS**

**Chair Salvador** called for nominations for Chair.

**Commissioner Vincent Jones-Dixon** nominated Chris Bentley.

**Chair Salvador** called for additional nominations.

There were none.

**Chair Salvador** called for the vote.

The election of Chris Bentley to serve as Chair passed as follows:

|      |  |          |   |
|------|--|----------|---|
| YES: | Christopher Bentley<br>Commissioner Dina DiNucci<br>Paul Drechsler<br>Commissioner Janine Gladfelter<br>Ryan Johnson<br>Commissioner Vincent Jones-Dixon<br>Commissioner Eddy Morales<br>Commissioner Mario Palmero<br>Amelia Salvador<br>Commissioner Travis Stovall<br>Dimitrios Zourkos | NO:      | None                                    |
|      |  | ABSENT:  | Helen Kidane<br>Commissioner Sue Piazza |
|      |  | ABSTAIN: | None                                    |
|      |  | RECUSE:  | None                                    |

**Chair Bentley** called for nominations for Vice Chair

**Commissioner Janine Gladfelter** nominated Paul Drechsler.

**Chair Bentley** called for additional nominations.

**Commissioner Jones-Dixon** nominated Helen Kidane and said he knows Ms. Kidane is not here but he knows she is passionate about Rockwood. Does Ms. Kidane have to be present to be nominated?

**Ms. Monohon** said she believes it would be appropriate to nominate someone who is present.

**Chair Bentley** said he concurred with Ms. Monohon since the business of this committee is based on tonight's work. He asked Commissioner Jones-Dixon if he wanted to remove his nomination.

**Commissioner Jones-Dixon** said he would like to remove his nomination.

**Chair Bentley** called for additional nominations for Vice Chair.

There were none.

**Chair Bentley** called for the vote.

The election of Paul Drechsler to serve as Vice Chair passed as follows:

**GRESHAM REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES  
MAY 11, 2021 – PAGE 3 OF 12**

---

YES: Christopher Bentley  
Commissioner Dina DiNucci  
Paul Drechsler  
Commissioner Janine Gladfelter  
Ryan Johnson  
Commissioner Eddy Morales  
Commissioner Mario Palmero  
Amelia Salvador  
Commissioner Travis Stovall  
Dimitrios Zourkos

NO: Commissioner Vincent Jones-Dixon  
ABSENT: Helen Kidane  
Commissioner Sue Piazza  
ABSTAIN: None  
RECUSE: None

**Commissioner Jones-Dixon** made a point of clarification. He said he would be supportive of Mr. Drechsler being Vice Chair, but he believes Mr. Drechsler is Chair of the Planning Commission, so he would like to see someone else in that role and he suggests either Mr. Johnson or Mr. Zourkos.

**Chair Bentley** said the parliamentary procedure is that there was a vote and the ayes have it, so Mr. Chair Drechsler is elected Vice Chair. However, that is something to consider for next year.

**3. INSTRUCTIONS FOR INDIVIDUALS SIGNED UP FOR PUBLIC TESTIMONY**

**Chair Bentley** read the instructions.

**4. GRESHAM REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES**

**Chair Bentley** said the next order of business is to approve the minutes of May 12, 2020. Please raise your hand if you would like to provide any corrections to the minutes.

Seeing none, **Chair Bentley** called for a motion to approve the minutes.

Motion was made by Commission Chair Travis Stovall and seconded by Commissioner Janine Gladfelter **TO APPROVE MINUTES FROM THE GRESHAM REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETING OF MAY 12, 2020.**

**Chair Bentley** called for discussion on the motion.

Hearing none, **Chair Bentley** called for the vote.

The motion passed as follows:

YES: Christopher Bentley  
Commissioner Dina DiNucci  
Paul Drechsler  
Commissioner Janine Gladfelter  
Ryan Johnson  
Commissioner Vincent Jones-Dixon  
Commissioner Eddy Morales  
Commissioner Mario Palmero  
Amelia Salvador  
Commissioner Travis Stovall  
Dimitrios Zourkos

NO: None  
ABSENT: Helen Kidane  
Commissioner Sue Piazza  
ABSTAIN: None  
RECUSE: None

**5. PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 2021/22 BUDGET AND BUDGET MESSAGE**

**Emily Bower**, Executive Director of the Gresham Redevelopment Commission (GRDC), presented the Proposed Fiscal Year 2021/22 Budget and Budget Message (PowerPoint presentation attached as Exhibit A.)

**6. COMMUNITY COMMENT ON PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 2021/22 BUDGET**

**Ms. Monohon** reported that no one signed up to testify or submitted written testimony.

**7. COMMITTEE DISCUSSION ON PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 2021/22 BUDGET**

**Vice Chair Paul Drechsler** commented that at the recent GRDC Advisory Committee (GRDCAC) meeting there was discussion about the future plans of the GRDC and for other properties. He is a little concerned to hear Ms. Bower say we aren't projecting much in terms of permits or developments in the area. We see large shortages of housing and real estate prices are doing well and the urban renewal district, as stated on line one, is a public funding mechanism for capital improvement programs to stimulate private investment, create jobs and revitalize the community and yet we're saying we're not seeing that stimulus, revitalization, and interest in development or seeing the budget increase. This is a once in a generational opportunity for Rockwood to see that redevelopment and to have that focus, so why aren't we seeing that stimulus to private investment and that return that we're supposed to be developing? What are we seeing in terms of the forecast?

**Ms. Bower** explained that the recession put the district back quite a ways in regards to improving the assessed value. There were significant years lost to gain assessed value during that timeframe, which gave us a late start in doing capital improvement projects. When the Downtown Rockwood project started, the years were doing well, not exceptionally well, but they were doing better than they had been, which provided opportunity to invest those dollars into that project. There's been some delays in finishing the project, but with that there are other extraneous circumstances that have impacted the construction flow and timing, in addition to entering the pandemic and then what does that look like post-pandemic. She thinks we will see some significant growth, but it just might not be as large a percentage as we had hoped for had we had those earlier years from 2008 to 2012 to help build additional capacity to do more projects and to help move more development opportunities.

**Ms. Monohon** added that the impact of the great recession hit at what should have been the prime earning years of the urban renewal area (URA). That impact has lingered and has been significant for the URA overall. Specifically, with where we are right now, the question is how much earnings potential is there between now and what is slated as the end of the urban renewal district. There is a very limited short-time window of what can factor into the financial forecast at this point. We are currently part way into calendar year 2021, which means the tax revenues that we will see for fiscal year 2021/22 are predominantly based on what has already occurred. We really have one more new year worth of construction that may play into that 2022/23 fiscal year, so for something to have an impact within that short timeframe is limited. While there has been a lot of benefit from the district, it is not necessarily going to all fit within an ability to create that borrowing capacity for the district as it currently stands.

**Vice Chair Drechsler** said we've heard great recession for a long time but we're talking about future permits and the stimulated activity that we're saying we're not seeing as a response to urban renewal, so he wants to make sure we're having that conversation of what is going to stimulate and have that urban renewal effect. We hope for more, not less. For the benefit of those who weren't at the last

GRDCAC meeting, his overall concern is the focus on nonprofits, not to say that they aren't of tremendous value, but they aren't paying property taxes. There is need to be thinking of our community spaces and broadways, as well, and that we want places for people to go on dates and to open businesses and want to be in that area for different reasons and not just the specialized services that serve just a specific demographic, but the broader community. A lot of the celebrated successes relate to nonprofit work but as an urban renewal district, we hope to see private investment, jobs, and a thriving economy and community for more than just the nonprofits. That's his only concern as we look at the budget.

**Ms. Bower** replied that Vice Chair Drechsler brought up some critical points that need to be reviewed as we move into our discussions around the future of the district, whether it's just a sunset in 2023 or if it is to have another life after 2023 and how that plays into that role as far as stimulating revitalization and market ready development. She thinks we have always tried to strike a balance around supporting much needed resources and services that are being asked for by the community while also creating a vibrant, active space and maximizing the land use and planning opportunities. That is at the forefront of her mind and her staff as we move forward into future discussions around the Downtown Rockwood site, as well as extending the district.

**Commissioner Jones-Dixon** said regarding Vice Chair Drechsler's point of focusing on nonprofits, he thinks it's a balance. One thing Ms. Bower mentioned, and her predecessor Josh Fuhrer mentioned years ago as far as for us to be ahead of gentrification and all these other things, is that we need to focus on the community that's there. With urban renewal, we have a responsibility to do that, and he loves that we have that focus as far as building up the capacity of the nonprofits because that will lead to other things within our community. We've been talking to people from the Portland Trail Blazers and other larger organizations that would like to come in and plug in support in a creative and authentic way to communities that have been marginalized and he would encourage us to think outside the box as it pertains to making that happen.

**Commission Vice Chair Eddy Morales** said he is proud of the work that the GRDC has done in Rockwood. There's an industrial part of the work and for a while we have been talking about the Catalyst Site because it's exciting, and with that project we'll have one of the nicer restaurants with LaVilla and the chiropractor there and the market rate and affordable housing. It's a good mix. Some of the work we're doing investing in nonprofits are anti-displacement strategies. It's about how to take care of the community that's already there, while also investing in beautification and drawing more individuals. To that point, where in the budget is the programming for community outreach and engagement work to some of the nonprofits and organizations in Rockwood and for celebrations, sponsorships, and other things?

**Ms. Bower** explained that community engagement funding has been in the operational budget for about four years since we received the Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Health (REACH) grant. Those budgeted dollars are focused on building capacity and providing sponsorships and support for emerging Black and Indigenous People of Color (BIPOC) organizations looking to ground themselves in the Rockwood-West Gresham area. There's also a separate budget in the Urban Renewal Capital Improvement Program (CIP) for engagement related to projects.

**Ms. Monohon** added that the budget for the bulk of what Ms. Bower just described is in the line items in the Urban Renewal Support Fund on the City side of the budget. What we have here is the GRDC side of the budget and the GRDC sending funds over to the City budget, and there is not that level of detail in the GRDC budget.

**Commission Vice Chair Morales** asked, how much is budgeted for community engagement?

**Ms. Monohon** explained that there are a variety of things that are addressed within some of the CIP projects for outreach. In the Urban Renewal Support Fund (operating budget) there is \$22,000 in the Promotion line item and a \$10,000 line item for Contributions and City Match, which are separate from the grant program that urban renewal has the potential to implement. She doesn't have all the details of how Ms. Bower will use those dollars, but there are several line items within that operating budget that are contributing towards those kinds of activities.

**Ms. Salvador** commented that if she understands Vice Chair Drechsler's point, the downtown Rockwood area is prime real estate and the urban renewal district's purpose is to revitalize and support that; however, coming from a post-COVID situation, commercial real estate has been suffering quite a bit – most definitely in the office and storefront sectors, and businesses are closing. That said, she thinks Vice Chair Drechsler has tried to express that we don't want to waste that valuable property in the heart of the URA and capitalizing on its visibility and location. When she was growing up, Rockwood was the hub of storefronts and to bring it back to that level is going to take quite some time. We want to continue to support all the nonprofits but it's a symbiotic balance, which we all know and understand. What concerns her is she doesn't want to see the buildings and properties in Rockwood turn into a situation like the Multnomah County Courthouse, which is not being utilized to its fullest capacity and full intent as a courthouse halfway point so we don't have to go all the way to downtown Portland to the county courthouse. That was wasteful and whether it was underbudgeted or not, that should have been accounted for with the build. We don't want to run into that type of issue as we develop Downtown Rockwood and the area. We want to be sure all the spaces will be utilized according to their intended purpose. Regarding the Urban Renewal Capital Fund on page 23, there's an allocation of \$515,00 for the Sunrise Site and \$956,219 for the Rockwood Urban Plaza. What is the intent of those funds?

**Ms. Bower** replied that the allocation for the Sunrise Site, which is comprised of the Asia Kitchen and Sunrise Center properties, is to be used at the discretion of the GRDC. Those funds are for significant maintenance and repair costs and soft costs related to predevelopment and preparing the site for potential acquisition. It's not a significant amount of money if we look at moving towards a feasibility study, an appraisal, an environmental impact study, etc. We will bring additional questions to the GRDC on May 18<sup>th</sup>, based on some of the conversations at last month's GRDCAC meeting, and we will get GRDC guidance on that and then go back to the GRDCAC. Regarding the Rockwood Urban Plaza, much of that funding is related to the System Development Charge (SDC) credits allocated to the site. We will be using those credits to fund the construction of the plaza.

**Ms. Monohon** explained that the SDC credits are not urban renewal funds, so they are not drawn off GRDC revenue. Those are parks SDC credits because that is part of the parks SDC methodology. We must reflect those credits tied to the park project as part of the City's budget in the Urban Renewal CIP fund.

**Commissioner Mario Palmero** asked, do the SDC funds come from Rockwood or a department of the City?

**Ms. Monohon** explained that the parks SDC methodology is on a citywide basis, meaning the original structure of the City. There's a separate parks SDC for Pleasant Valley and for Springwater, but for the City collectively, it's not specific to the Rockwood area but to the main geographic area of the City.

**Ms. Bower** noted that the parks SDC methodology has a list of identified parks in different geographic areas across the City and the Rockwood Urban Plaza fulfills one of those funded projects within their methodology, which allows for those SDC credits to be transferred to that particular use in the CIP.

**Commissioner Palmero** asked, are we sure that the outreach budget for future years will have enough funding moving forward? He wants to make sure that we support the Sunrise Site project and attempt to continue to get the community's feedback and voice in the process moving forward.

**Ms. Bower** said there are outreach and engagement dollars allocated for the strategy and engagement related to the Sunrise Site.

**Chair Bentley** said he knows there was a call for bids for potential investments and private interest in the properties in the URA. Was more consideration given to nonprofits versus private enterprise or were the bids considered equally? Obviously, if there isn't that interest in the properties, then it's better to have some tenant in place than to have a vacant building. Since tax revenues have been down, what opportunities do we have to either extend or restructure the redevelopment opportunities, so that we can still take advantage of that possible revenue structure?

**Ms. Bower** answered that she is not aware of an instance where we have not selected a for-profit partner in developing a particular site. Oftentimes, the site goes through a determination of what the uses will be, based on conversations with engagement, and then we work to seek out tenants that fit that particular use. She thinks there is interest in sites across the URA by for-profit developers, particularly around the Downtown Rockwood site. There are a lot of conversations happening, but the GRDC has never chosen one over the other without creating some form of criteria to meet the needs of the GRDC or community. Regarding opportunities to extend or restructure redevelopment opportunities, at the June 8<sup>th</sup> City Council meeting, we will launch the first work session discussion regarding the district to understand what makes it unique and the statutes that determine the way tax increment financing (TIF) can be used. In that session, we will also hear a little bit of the history of where we were and where we've progressed as a district. The two following sessions will dive into the opportunities and the paths we could take should the GRDC sunset the district, extend the district for a certain length of time, or expand it into other geographic areas within the City. There are several paths to explore with both with the GRDCAC and GRDC. We don't know yet the full impact of the pandemic and because the forecast is only to 2023, we know there will be some residual impact on forecasting beyond 2023. This is not as black and white as the great recession was with property taxes and homeownership and the residential piece pivoting. This is more impactful on businesses, so what does that do to commercial real estate? It's a long-term discussion over the next few months to figure out the right road map for the district.

**Commission Acting Chair Dina DiNucci** said regarding the Rockwood Capital Improvement Fund and Professional & Technical Services, she sees City Contractual Services and City Construction Services. How will City Construction Services be used?

**Ms. Monohon** explained that both of those are funds that the GRDC is sending to the City on its behalf for the City to implement the GRDC's programs. The difference is that City Contractual Services is going to the operating budget and City Construction Services is going to the urban renewal CIP to be used for the listed urban renewal projects.

**Commission Acting Chair DiNucci** asked, when it's part of the CIP fund, is it based on specific construction-related costs for the various CIP projects?

**Ms. Monohon** said yes, it is going to the urban renewal-funded share of those specific projects identified on that list.

**Commission Acting Chair DiNucci** asked, are City Contractual Services and City Construction Services both billed at a certain percentage or are they figured in different ways like actual costs?

**Ms. Monohon** responded that City Contractual Services funds the operating budget on the City side to fund the urban renewal staff and their outreach efforts, consultant services, grant program should they implement one, and their share of the City's internal services charges to cover where they are drawing off of City support staff and support functions, such as building space, information technology support, budget and accounting support, legal support, etc. Those amounts are trued up at the end of the year based on actual expenditures. Same on the capital side. It is specific expenditures that go towards those urban renewal projects, with a small internal overhead charge applied to that, but again, those are actual expenses that are occurring there.

**Commission Acting Chair DiNucci** asked, is that just straight actual expenses that are billed back to urban renewal based the City's charges for those services?

**Ms. Monohon** said correct.

**Commission Acting Chair DiNucci** asked, does urban renewal ever charge back to the City for any of its services? She remembers when we first were doing outreach to the small businesses related to COVID relief and urban renewal was pretty involved in that because a lot of the BIPOC businesses were impacted.

**Ms. Monohon** replied that if urban renewal staff was actively working on implementing those small business contracts that we did through the CARES fund and charged their time under that, which off the top of her head she does not know, the City would have reimbursed urban renewal for their time.

**Ms. Bower** added that there was never a request on behalf of urban renewal staff to charge back its time to the City for that outreach. Urban renewal's philosophy has been to support the City related to outreach to the BIPOC community and small businesses. It is embedded in the work that we do, and the list serve and the contacts we have, so it wasn't any additional work other than hours and time to help coordinate some of that outreach.

**Commission Acting Chair DiNucci** asked, does this budget go through the same process as the City budget as far as being audited annually?

**Ms. Monohon** said yes. As part of the City audit it is reviewed and the financial reporting is handled separately from the City's financial reporting.

**Vice Chair Drechsler** clarified that he one hundred percent agrees with Commissioner Jones-Dixon and Commissioner Morales that the nonprofits are fantastic and doing amazing stuff, and we have shown a huge dedication to the nonprofits like Human Solutions, Boys and Girls Club, Latino Network, and the nonprofits in Building A. He just doesn't want it to be either or, and as Commissioner DiNucci knows more than he with the Rockwood Business Coalition and thinking of Rockwood as a vital commercial center and vibrant community, he wants to make sure it's part of the conversation and that we don't lose sight of the opportunity of urban renewal to bring private investment into the community that will feed into the future. He wants to see more cranes moving, quality houses being built, businesses thriving, and a lot of that development is what will help give us the funds for the other stuff we want like parks, sidewalks, utilities, safe pathways to school, and all those amenities and priorities we really care about. He wants to continue to be a voice for the Rockwood business community even though he's no longer on the board of the Rockwood Business Coalition. There are businesses there that want to see more businesses and that 18-hour activity and safety and thrive that's part of a healthy community. We want people after work to go down to Rockwood and get some ice cream or coffee and think of Rockwood in that way too. That's what he wants to see in those corridors, especially right off the MAX. There is so much need. He wants to make sure that we have the long-term vision.



**Commission Acting Chair DiNucci** commented that what Vice Chair Drechsler said makes perfect sense. That balance does makes sense, and she appreciates his comment.

**Chair Bentley** called for further discussion.

There was no further discussion.

#### **8. MOTION TO APPROVE PROPOSED FISCAL YEAR 2021/22 BUDGET**

**Chair Bentley** called for a motion to approve the proposed fiscal year 2021/22 budget.

Motion was made by Commission Vice Chair Eddy Morales and seconded by Commission Chair Travis Stovall **TO APPROVE THE PROPOSED BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021/22 IN THE AGGREGATE AMOUNT OF \$28,229,500 AND APPROVE URBAN RENEWAL PROPERTY TAX REVENUE AT 100 PERCENT OF DIVISION OF TAX AVAILABLE.**

**Chair Bentley** called for discussion on the motion.

**Commission Chair Travis Stovall** commented that he watched urban renewal get started many years ago and it's incredible to see the outcome. He remembers when the GRDC bought the old Fred Meyer site with the notion of seeing the area enhanced and really coming to fruition. Being this far into this incredible process is encouraging and he's super excited about the opportunity to continue the great work and have Ms. Bower in her role and focusing her sharp and intelligent perspectives moving forward. He thinks this budget captures our next steps and he looks to bring the additional vision over the next year as we look at what we can do over the next couple of years and hopefully beyond as we look at potentially extending this opportunity of urban renewal.

**Commission Vice Chair Morales** asked, are there funds in the budget for storefront improvements in Rockwood?

**Ms. Bower** said we have about \$500,000 as a placeholder in the operating budget for grants to be identified as the GRDC chooses. There's some opportunity with our new assistant city manager structure and the inter-collaboration between departments to think about how the work of the Mt. Hood Community College Small Business Development Center can augment, leverage, and support the work of urban renewal. More of those conversations will happen and she believes that staff from the Community Development and Livability Department, which urban renewal is now under, will be coming to Council with recommendations for how they might roll out those opportunities.

**Commission Vice Chair Morales** commented that it might be a great thing to bring in Eric Schmidt and our urban planning staff to figure out the look and feel we're going for in Rockwood and how to help the businesses in the shopping strips make those improvements. Council gave policy direction to think about more outside dining, so could some of those grant dollars be used to provide grants to some of the businesses to do that kind of work? He thinks that will get to some of what Vice Chair Drechsler is talking about as far as creating a place and environment where we'll want to go and have ice cream.

**Ms. Bower** replied that we look forward to having those conversations. She thinks Eric Schmidt will be providing guidance on what that roadmap would look like, so we can be more coordinated across the City and really optimize and leverage the dollars coming from both the urban renewal district and additional funding and support from the small business development center. We look forward to that and working with our community-based organizations that have cultural competency around technical

business services to try to bring them into the conversation because there's a lot of innovation happening right now with our wraparound services related to small businesses.

**Commission Vice Chair Morales** said downtown Gresham has a unique look that's historic and quaint and Civic has its own look and feel. Rockwood merits that same kind of attention. He and Commissioner Jones-Dixon talk and vision about how Rockwood is a renaissance for a lot of communities that have been displaced and then reimagining what a vibrant BIPOC community looks like with culture and art.

**Chair Bentley** said when he joined this committee, it was through his service on the GRDCAC as a representative from the old Natural Resources and Sustainability Committee, so he's all in favor of adding more trees because trees are great.

**Ms. Salvador** said to add to Commissioner Morales' comment about the storefront improvements, there is a national main street grant program and there may be opportunity for the City to tap into that program, which she thinks will help revitalize. The City of Sandy may have used that program to design a facade that is very cohesive within the whole business district.

**Vice Chair Drechsler** said regarding Commissioner Morales' comments that he one hundred percent supports that idea and loves the idea of a vision and the community feel. There's a model for it and we don't have to reinvent the wheel entirely. We have used a storefront improvement program with matching funds and other things to help those businesses or property owners do improvements and aesthetic upgrades, which benefits the community in all sorts of ways. He noticed, however, that after Commissioner Morales made that suggestion that somehow we immediately went to the topic of wraparound services to non-storefront businesses, and those are two very different things. A physical improvement has a different community impact than the stimulus of wraparound services for startup businesses. They definitely have value, but he thinks Commissioner Morales was talking about an actual storefront improvement or outside dining or other opportunities to get that community feel. Otherwise, he supports the motion on the board.

**Ms. Bower** responded that coming out of the pandemic we will need to really understand the needs and wants of the businesses that are struggling or have been disproportionately impacted by the pandemic. There's a lot of layers of impact to these businesses, so the technical services or culturally competent services will help us better understand what their needs are to get to the next level beyond just surviving day to day or month to month. What we don't want to do is put funding like a storefront grant into businesses that may not be well prepared or well situated for long-term sustainability, so it's a little bit of partnering those two together to really make sure that the investment has some long-term viability to them stabilizing in their situation. It wouldn't be an either or, it would be a complimentary partnership.

**Vice Chair Drechsler** said he understands Ms. Bower's point, but he thinks it makes it more complicated than it needs to be. He thinks it's us creating a vision for the community and those that apply create an actual physical improvement that benefits the entire community, the perception, and other businesses, Using the limited funds to do analysis, studies, and other things to understand their viability and other needs wouldn't be within the scope or ability of such a small program. He thinks we would have to assume that those applying have that long-term vision in mind to make that investment in the community and we would see the immediate benefit to the community because those would be controlled physical improvements. If this was a 20-year program with large budgets, that may be a different approach, but he believes that the suggestion was small in that is there a way to do that kind of improvement. Take the scope out of helping them gets some outdoor dining or those that are looking to apply to find a way to do it, and just help them do it.

**GRESHAM REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES  
MAY 11, 2021 – PAGE 11 OF 12**

---

**Chair Bentley** said it seems like we could do both, but we're not going to just throw money out there. We're going to do some evaluation of the request, so there will be some checks built in.

**Chair Bentley** called for additional comments on the motion.

Hearing none, **Chair Bentley** called for the vote.

The motion passed as follows

|      |  |          |   |
|------|--|----------|---|
| YES: | Christopher Bentley<br>Commissioner Dina DiNucci<br>Paul Drechsler<br>Commissioner Janine Gladfelter<br>Ryan Johnson<br>Commissioner Vincent Jones-Dixon<br>Commissioner Eddy Morales<br>Commissioner Mario Palmero<br>Amelia Salvador<br>Commissioner Travis Stovall<br>Dimitrios Zourkos | NO:      | None                                    |
|      |  | ABSENT:  | Helen Kidane<br>Commissioner Sue Piazza |
|      |  | ABSTAIN: | None                                    |
|      |  | RECUSE:  | None                                    |

**B. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING**

**Chair Bentley** said the final business is to adjourn this meeting. Is there a motion to adjourn the meeting?

Motion was made by Commission Chair Travis Stovall and seconded by Ryan Johnson **TO ADJOURN THE FISCAL YEAR 2021/22 GRESHAM REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETING.**

**Chair Bentley** called for discussion on the motion.

Hearing none, **Chair Bentley** called for the vote.

The motion passed as follows:

|      |  |          |   |
|------|--|----------|---|
| YES: | Christopher Bentley<br>Commissioner Dina DiNucci<br>Paul Drechsler<br>Commissioner Janine Gladfelter<br>Ryan Johnson<br>Commissioner Vincent Jones-Dixon<br>Commissioner Eddy Morales<br>Commissioner Mario Palmero<br>Amelia Salvador<br>Commissioner Travis Stovall<br>Dimitrios Zourkos | NO:      | None                                    |
|      |  | ABSENT:  | Helen Kidane<br>Commissioner Sue Piazza |
|      |  | ABSTAIN: | None                                    |
|      |  | RECUSE:  | None                                    |

The meeting adjourned at 7:28 p.m.

/s/ CHRISTOPHER BENTLEY  
CHAIR

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Cecille Turley  
Recording Secretary