

**GRESHAM REDEVELOPMENT COMMISSION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (GRDCAC)  
NOVEMBER 12, 2025, MEETING MINUTES**

**MEETING LOCATION**

Online meeting via Zoom Conference Call US: +12532158782, Webinar ID 831 0627 2675, or <https://greshamoregon.zoom.us/j/83106272675>.

COMMITTEE PRESENT: Celso Naranjo, Chair  
Ibrahim Moustafa, Vice Chair  
Leslie Garth  
Jack Hollis  
Jennifer McMillan  
Gregory Schroeder

COMMITTEE ABSENT: None

COMMISSION  
LIAISON PRESENT: Commissioner Kayla Brown

STAFF PRESENT: Justin Douglas, Urban Renewal Director  
Michael Gonzales, Urban Renewal Project Coordinator  
Johntae Ivory, Program Technician, Recording Secretary

**A. CALL TO ORDER**

**Chair Naranjo** called the meeting to order at **6:01 P.M.**

**1. ROLL CALL**

**Chair Naranjo** called the roll.

**2. ANNOUNCEMENTS**

**Mr. Ivory** announced that Marissa Clarke is no longer an Advisory Committee member because she has moved from Gresham. He reminded the committee about the end of the year meeting that will be held at the Rockwood Market Hall with dinner before the meeting. He added that he's going to try a buffet style dinner instead of the individual meals like in previous years.

**3. INSTRUCTIONS TO CITIZENS FOR TESTIFYING ON AGENDA AND NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

**Chair Naranjo** read the instructions.

**4. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

**5. STOREFRONT IMPROVEMENT GRANT**

**Michael Gonzales** and **Johntae Ivory** gave the presentation.

**Mr. Moustafa** expressed appreciation for staff's work and said the program appears beneficial for local businesses. He raised concerns about businesses using artificial intelligence (AI)-generated graphics for signage design if awarded funds. He noted sustainability issues associated with AI energy use and the possibility of individuals misrepresenting the cost of design work. He suggested exploring a "no-AI clause," proof-of-designer requirement, or potentially maintaining a list of approved designers. He also suggested pursuing a partnership with Mt. Hood Community College's graphic design program to support local students and ensure quality design work.

**Mr. Ivory** appreciated the feedback and said staff would look into the concerns and potentially follow up for additional insight.

**Mr. Moustafa** offered to help verify graphic work if needed.

**Chair Naranjo** asked whether design services had been included in previous grant programs.

**Mr. Ivory** said he would research past practices.

**Mr. Douglas** noted that GRDC investment must be for capital improvements. He explained that guidelines can be clarified so funding applies only to physical signage, not design services, regardless of whether a business uses a designer or AI.

**Ms. McMillan** asked whether code-related improvements (such as siding or windows) that appear on a violation notice could be eligible for grant funding, given the financial challenges businesses face.

**Mr. Douglas** acknowledged the idea and said staff would consider it further.

**Mr. Hollis** asked whether green space or public-facing improvements such as planters, benches, or similar elements could be eligible. He said such improvements strengthen storefront appearance and align with program goals.

**Chair Naranjo** agreed and suggested that posting before-and-after examples could help applicants see creative options.

**Mr. Hollis** emphasized allowing staff enough flexibility in reviewing applications.

**Mr. Ivory** agreed and said staff would review the suggestion and discuss it with the Commission.

**Mr. Hollis** also asked about the ineligibility of structural and roofing improvements.

**Mr. Ivory** said that this follows similar programs in other cities and is due primarily to cost and administrative complexity.

**Mr. Moustafa** noted that structural issues often fall under landlord responsibility.

**Chair Naranjo** compared this to sidewalk maintenance, explaining the distinction between mandatory code requirements and the program's focus on aesthetic improvements.

**Ms. Garth** raised concerns about the “first-come, first-served” structure, noting that high application volume could overwhelm the process. She suggested evaluating applications in batches to ensure funding goes to the strongest and most viable projects. Chair Naranjo responded that historically the volume of applications has been low but agreed it is important to prepare in case demand increases.

**Mr. Gonzales** noted that a high volume of strong applications would demonstrate program success and could help justify continued funding in future fiscal cycles. He said staff will review applications individually and assess the quality of proposals to ensure a strong return on investment.

**Mr. Moustafa** asked whether scoring system like other city grant programs would be used.

**Mr. Gonzales** confirmed that staff intends to use a consistent evaluation method.

**Mr. Douglas** added that clear grant guidelines help avoid situations in which subjective criteria must be used to select between applicants. He emphasized the importance of early conversations with business owners to clarify expectations and strengthen proposals.

**Mr. Hollis** sought clarification on the “first-come, first-served” approach.

**Mr. Ivory** confirmed that applications will be reviewed in order but not automatically approved; applicants may be passed over if they fail to meet eligibility requirements such as code or tax compliance.

**Mr. Gonzales** presented the expanded boundary map for the program reviewed areas of concentration and explained the rationale behind opening eligibility to additional pockets within the urban renewal area.

**Mr. Ivory** informed the committee that the program guidelines will be presented to the GRDC on Tuesday. He invited members to attend or access the recording afterward.

**Chair Naranjo** thanked staff for incorporating the feedback from past meetings on expanding the boundaries and changing the dollar amount. He believes those are valuable improvements to the program.

## **6. MEETING MINUTES:**

**Chair Naranjo** announced that it's time to approve the minutes of **July 9, 2025**. Members who were not in attendance at the meetings being voted on should abstain from voting on those minutes. Additionally, for each meeting being voted on, a majority of members in attendance at that meeting must be in attendance tonight in order to be able to take a vote on those minutes or the vote will be tabled to the next meeting. Therefore, we will vote on the minutes for each meeting separately.

**JULY 9, 2025, MINUTES**

Motion was made by **Ibrahim Moustafa** and seconded by **Jack Hollis TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF July 9, 2025**, the motion passed as follows:

Leslie Garth	YES
Jennifer McMillian	YES
Celso Naranjo	YES
Ibrahim Moustafa	YES
Jack Hollis	YES
Gregory Schroeder	YES

**7. GOOD TO THE ORDER:**

**Mr. Gonzales** provided updates on GRDC properties:

- Lydia's Site: Asbestos abatement is complete. Demolition is tentatively scheduled for December 8. Police and Fire will use the building for training prior to demolition.
- B188 Project (Portland Opportunities Industrialized Center, POIC): The development team continues value engineering to bring costs closer to target without altering programming or building massing. Updated schematic revisions are expected soon.

**Mr. Gonzales** encouraged members to follow the upcoming GRDC meeting where staff will also review capital improvement priorities for the coming year.

**Chair Naranjo** asked about the historic Lydia's sign.

**Mr. Gonzales** confirmed the intent is for the Historical Society to preserve it.

**B. ADJOURNMENT OF MEETING**

Hearing no further business, **Chair Naranjo** adjourned the meeting at **6:56 P.M.**

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Johntae Ivory

Johntae Ivory  
Recording Secretary