

A. Opening

1. Call to Order

Chair Travis Stovall called the Gresham Redevelopment Commission (GRDC) meeting to order on Tuesday, November 18, 2025, at 2:32 P.M. via Conference Call +1 253 215 8782, Meeting ID 878 9531 6107 or <https://greshamoregon.zoom.us/j/87895316107>

2. Roll Call

COMMISSION PRESENT: Commission Chair Travis Stovall
Commissioner Kayla Brown
Commissioner Janine Gladfelter
Commissioner Jerry Hinton
Commissioner Cathy Keathley
Commissioner Sue Piazza

COMMISSION ABSENT: Commissioner Eddy Morales

STAFF PRESENT: Eric Schmidt, Gresham City Manager
Ellen Van Riper, Gresham City Attorney
Justin Douglas, GRDC Executive Director
Michael Gonzales, Urban Renewal Project Coordinator
Johntae Ivory, Recording Secretary

B. Open Public Comment - 10 Minutes

1. Instructions to the Public

Written Testimony must be received by 3:00 p.m. on Monday, November 17, 2025, via email to Johntae Ivory, Program Technician, at johntae.ivory@greshamoregon.gov
Oral Testimony: Persons wishing to provide oral testimony must register their request to Johntae Ivory, Program Technician, by calling 503-618-2473 or emailing johntae.ivory@greshamoregon.gov by 3:00 p.m. on November 17, 2025 and include their name, email address, phone number, and subject matter of the oral testimony. Mr. Ivory will send persons who wish to provide oral testimony via Zoom a Zoom link to use to provide the oral testimony.

2. Open Public Testimony

Chair Travis Stovall read the instructions.

Johntae Ivory, Recording Secretary, reported that no citizens signed up to provide oral testimony or submitted written testimony.

C. Consent Agenda - 5 Minutes

Commission actions are taken in one motion on Consent Agenda items; however, Commission members can remove items from the Consent Agenda to be addressed separately.

1. Gresham Redevelopment Commission Meeting Minutes

Move to approve minutes from the Gresham Redevelopment Commission meeting of October 21, 2025.

Motion was made by **Commissioner Hinton** and seconded by **Commissioner Brown**.

APPROVE CONSENT AGENDA ITEMS C-1.

Hearing none, **Chair Stovall** called for the vote. The motions passed as follows:

Commission Chair Travis Stovall	YES
Commissioner Kayla Brown	YES
Commissioner Cathy Keathley	YES
Commissioner Jerry Hinton	YES
Commissioner Sue Piazza	YES
Commissioner Janine Gladfelter	YES
Commissioner Eddy Morales	ABSENT

D. Public Hearing

E. Commission Business – 30 Minutes

1. Storefront Improvement Grant Program

Mr. Gonzales & Mr. Ivory gave the presentation.
PowerPoint presentation Exhibit A

Commissioner Piazza asked why sidewalk repairs were excluded from eligible improvements, noting that lifted sidewalks often caused by required street trees create tripping hazards and potential liability for businesses. She noted that sidewalk repairs can be financially burdensome for small businesses.

Mr. Gonzales explained that sidewalks and ADA improvements had previously been grouped together. Sidewalk repairs are often classified as code violations, which the program typically does not fund. ADA-related modifications, however, were intended to remain eligible.

Mr. Schmidt explained staff are seeking Commission direction on whether sidewalk repairs should be included, and said staff can make those changes.

Commissioner Piazza discussed the distinction between improvements intended to address slum and blight versus structural or operational issues. It was noted that sidewalks could reasonably fall into either category depending on interpretation.

Commissioner Hinton expressed strong support for the program, referring to recent success story involving a preschool redevelopment near the Catalyst Site. He stated that the program has proven effective at reducing slum and blight and improving corridor conditions. He supported including sidewalk repairs as eligible improvements

Commissioner Gladfelter supported adding sidewalk and ADA-related improvements, emphasizing the importance of accessibility and the community benefits of ensuring all residents can safely access businesses.

Commissioner Brown noted a contradiction between “signs and graphics” listed as eligible and “advertising” listed as ineligible. She recommended clarifying the ineligible “advertising” language to specify print materials, promotional collateral, or other non-permanent advertising, so that it is not confusing with permanent signage. She is in support of the program.

Vice Chair Keathley inquired about the source of the \$200,000 allocated to the program and whether other Urban Renewal Area commitments would be impacted.

Mr. Gonzales confirmed the funds are allocated within the Urban Renewal materials and services budget and are not diverted from capital improvement projects or the City's general fund.

Vice Chair Keathley also asked how many businesses could be served and whether the program is one-time or ongoing. She also raised concerns about maintaining code compliance expectations if sidewalk repairs (which can be code-related) are made eligible.

Mr. Gonzales stated:

- The program is budgeted for the current fiscal year.
- Up to 20 businesses may receive the maximum \$10,000 reimbursement, though smaller projects may stretch the total further.
- If successful, staff would recommend renewal in future fiscal years.
- Eligibility area was expanded from 235 to 312 businesses after removing boundary restrictions and including the full URA.
- Recognize the importance of sidewalk safety and the need to revise and to clarify the language.

Chair Stovall noted that similar programs have been implemented successfully multiple times, echoing Commissioner Hinton's comments. He expressed full support for these programs, including investments in sidewalks, highlighting their importance for community benefits, observed improvements, and pedestrian safety.

Mr. Gonzales raised a question regarding guidance and direction on potential tenant displacement. He noted that previous feedback raised concerns that improvements to a business's property could create situations where tenants might be displaced if lease rates were increased. He suggested considering an eligibility requirement that tenants have an active lease of 2–3 years to mitigate this risk.

Several commissioners expressed they were not in favor of adding a requirement for longer-term leases. They noted:

- Lease increases are likely as the corridor improves, independent of grant funding.
- Improved conditions may ultimately benefit tenants and businesses.
- Limiting property owners could discourage needed improvements.
- Market conditions, not the grant program, primarily drive lease rates

1. **Capital Improvement Forecast**

Justin Douglas gave the presentation.
PowerPoint presentation Exhibit A

Commissioner Gladfelter raised questions about the apartment rehabilitation program, emphasizing the need to distinguish between owners neglecting properties for profit and those seeking genuine improvements.

Mr. Douglas highlighted focusing on safety, visibility, and livability for residents, referencing existing property maintenance codes and other standards.

Mr. Schmidt referenced existing property maintenance codes and rental housing inspection programs, suggesting these could guide rehabilitation efforts, particularly emphasizing fire life safety and routine property upkeep. He proposed incorporating standards such as lighting, visibility, and safety measures (SEPTED standards) into urban renewal efforts for apartment complexes in Rockwood.

Commissioner Hinton asked about the available funding.

Mr. Douglas note a potential \$5 million over fiscal years 2026-27, and 2027-28.

Commissioner Hinton expressed support for proposals focused on homeowner repair and improvements that address slum and blight, particularly for individuals unable to maintain their homes due to disability, age, or other challenges. He highlighted the importance of maximizing impact, favoring smaller, targeted interventions over large-scale acquisitions or developments that may not provide immediate returns. He supported programs that raise property values and quality of life for current homeowners while noting the challenges of providing affordable housing in the current market.

Mr. Schmidt offered context regarding staff suggestions for homeowner repair programs, noting the existing Mend a Home and Adapt a Home programs funded through HUD. He highlighted the potential for additional funding to cover mechanical, accessibility, or ADA-related improvements and emphasized exploring short-term and long-term strategies for supporting homeownership. He also raised the possibility of vertical homeownership solutions, such as condominiums, as an option to encourage new housing in areas where single-family infill is expensive.

Chair Stovall emphasized exploring innovative housing solutions, including ADUs, tiny homes, and cottage clusters, to improve affordability and housing options in Rockwood. He highlighted challenges with high land and construction costs, the need for creative approaches to support homeownership, and the importance of leveraging existing resources to encourage reinvestment in current properties. He stressed the value of aesthetic and livability improvements while considering long-term affordability and community benefit.

Commissioner Brown focused on homeowner repair programs and supporting existing housing stock rather than new acquisitions. She emphasized the potential of ADU grants on larger lots to address multi-generational living and increase housing availability. Brown expressed caution about high construction costs and preferred solutions that improve quality of life for current residents, such as apartment rehabilitation and targeted homeowner support, rather than purchasing additional properties.

Commissioner Piazza expressed support for ADU development on larger lots in Rockwood to increase housing options without building new apartments. She emphasized making housing more affordable despite high fees and land costs, and highlighted the importance of improving property values through homeowner repair programs. She also noted concerns about nonprofit-owned land limiting property tax revenue and stressed focusing on practical, feasible solutions for homeownership and apartment rehabilitation.

Mr. Schmidt suggested exploring programs to support ADU development, including reviewing city fees, permits, and system charges. He also mentioned the possibility of allocating funds to assist with ADU design, though not full construction costs. Additionally, he emphasized supporting existing property owners to reinvest in their properties, considering improvements like remodeled kitchens or additional bathrooms, and how such investments could increase property value and benefit the community.

Chair Stovall emphasized the importance of exploring innovative approaches and leveraging city resources to support development while ensuring investments provide long-term value. He supported homeowner repair programs and ADUs as ways to improve quality of life and property values.

Mr. Douglas thanked the Chair and Commissioners, noting the discussion was very helpful and that there is follow-up work to do. He highlighted that construction costs are a real challenge for new projects but suggested that the city, as a public entity, could use tools such as property value discounts or direct investments, like the \$5 million in the CIP, to make projects more feasible. He proposed exploring interest from the development community for vertical homeownership products in the area. He acknowledge the strong demand in Gresham's multifamily market, pointing out that new developments attracted existing families seeking better housing. He emphasized that the main challenge is promoting homeownership versus rental. He concluded that the city will further explore the ADU concept and homeowner repair programs and plans to return in a month or two with additional proposals for consideration.

F. Commission Measures, Proposals and Announcement

G. Adjournment

Hearing no further business, **Chair Stovall** adjourned the meeting at **3:46 p.m.**

Travis Stovall,
Chair

Prepared by:

Johntae Ivory
City Recorder