

CULLY COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

Meeting Details:

Date: May 27, 2026

Time: 6 pm to 8 pm

Location: munk-ye?lan Saxali

Online: Zoom

Attendees:

Name	Role	Name	Role
Bella Mata	CLC	Kathryn Hartinger	Prosper Portland
Cecelia Lente	CLC	Brian Moore	Prosper Portland
Elizabeth De Jesus Lopez	CLC	Angela Nguyen-Ta	Prosper Portland
Gary Hollands	CLC		
Ginger Rogers	CLC (Co-Chair)		
Jorge Sanchez Bautista	CLC (Co-Chair)		
Julia Tienson	CLC		
Towanda Perry	CLC		
Vena Rainwater	CLC		
Sky Waters	CLC		

Meeting Minutes:

Meeting Commenced at 6:15 pm

1. Roll Call & Icebreaker

Ginger Rogers (CLC Co-Chair) started the meeting and conducted roll call with the icebreaker for each CLC member to respond to.

2. Confirm Meeting Minutes, Announcements

Confirmation of April Meeting Minutes:

CLC approved meeting minutes with consensus and one abstention at 6:20pm.

Announcements

City Staff:

Reminder that the CLC will be shifting to meeting every other month.

MURP students visioning for Five Corners held presentation event at NAYA.

CLC:

Julia Tienson joined Zumba in the park with plans to hold Zumba at Five Corners.

Vena Rainwater attended a carnival.

3. Refresher from Last Time

Jorge Sanchez Bautista (CLC Co-Chair) provided a recap from the previous meeting.

4. Prosper Portland Grant Priority Implementation

Kathryn Hartinger (Prosper Portland) presented on the grant priorities that the CLC discussed last meeting and how to have the priorities meet the requirements to implement.

Jorge asked if the CLG is available once a year. Kathryn confirmed.

Cecelia Lente (CLC) asked if the CLC is needed to provide the criteria/objectives for Prosper Portland to approve the grant applications (PIP/ACT) that come in a rolling basis. Kathryn confirmed.

Question posed by Vena, how can the CLC determine how to engage business owners who are historically unable to access? Kathryn referenced to the current grant criteria.

Brian Moore (Prosper Portland) provided additional context that the grants team's need for clear objectives to review applications. Brian also explained the two separate criteria for grant review: business and business owner.

Vena identified the work that the CLC has put into the criteria and weighing and shared frustration of having to go back through the decisions previously made by the CLC.

Julia asked what it means when the language could not be altered. Kathryn responded.

Cecelia asked if the objectives were to be decided and changed, would it impact on current businesses' ability to access PIP. Brian clarified that once a business receives a PIP grant, they would not be eligible to receive PIP grants after five years to open opportunities for new businesses to support.

Jorge asked if the language criteria could be changed by the next Action Plan. Kathryn confirmed that there would likely be opportunity, and the Board of Commissioners may be open to approving new criteria.

CLC shared concerns with language around industrial/traded sectors.

Ginger asked what CLC's goal is with the presented criteria. Kathryn highlighted that the CLC should be focusing on the items within the red box and what the CLC needs to define.

Vena posed the question to the CLC that if the business owner has experienced displacement or other hardship, does it matter what type of business they have?

The revision shared does not currently align with the CLC's intent. Brian to look into dropping statement after the "Or" in Part A of the Grant Eligibility Criteria with the grants and legal team.

Gary Hollands (CLC) identified that there is a possibility that the grants will be unable to reach all the demographics intended and concerns about creating too many regulations. Is there a possibility to change the phrase "affordable" to "provide living wages". Kathryn responded with

feedback from grant and legal team about the objectivity for what is considered “living wage” and how it can be defined.

Sky asked if the business owner does not get approved, could their business get approved. Brian clarified that for the PIP/ACT grant, part A or C and B.

Jorge checked with the CLC on their thoughts about removing the statement after the “or” in Part A of the criteria. If there is a no, any modification would likely be a no. Staff to bring explanation if there is a no to removing.

CLC has interest in supporting home businesses. Brian responded that the home businesses are not typically eligible for TIF dollars for PIP/ACT as they are for commercial businesses. Jorge noted that the home businesses are unable to be added to the current Action Plan but can be considered for the next Action Plan.

Sky shared three items:

1. Is there a deadline to approve the criteria. Brian confirmed that the funds are paused until the criteria will be approved and will be ready to go once the CLC approved.
2. Sky is comfortable moving with removing the industry piece and wonders if NAYA could look into industrial businesses to see if there is a need for it. Regarding the home-based businesses, is there something that Prosper could look into? Brian responded to the home-based businesses that there are barriers due to zoning/operation and Prosper could look into.
3. Sky is good on the highlighted part in the red box.

Gary asked if the CLG go towards home-based businesses? Brian clarified that it is geared towards non-profits improvements.

Kathryn transitioned the conversation into CLGs. Kathryn added a second criteria for the CLC to consider. CLGs are eligible towards non-

profits. CLC would like time with the information before discussing further at the next meeting.

5. Public Comment

Edy Martinez, NAYA:

1. Lease agreements: there are lease agreements that are month to month to one year lease agreement with no-option to renew.
2. In the process of meeting with community, there are a lot of home-based businesses in the community.

6. Feedback Loop and Next Steps

Jorge closed the meeting with the next steps and next meeting.

Next steps:

1. Brian to request to remove the statement after “or” in Part A of the PIP/ACT grant criteria. Prosper to provide explanation if they are unable to remove.
2. CLC to review the CLG added language.
3. CLC to revisit the grant criteria in June.
4. Request for someone from the Prosper Grant team to join the CLC meeting
5. Check in about current lease language
6. Prosper and PHB commit to language reflects the desire of the CLC and policies, preventing revisiting language after approval.

Meeting cadence: CLC would like to keep the meetings to month-to-month while there are decisions to be made.

Meeting adjourned at 8:05pm