

Lane Economic Committee Response  
to  
Oregon Economic and Community Development Commission  
2005-07 Statutory Review  
Discussion Document

Q1: Should the Commission recommend consolidating the purpose and economic strategy for the Department and Commission into a single statement or set of statements? Does the proposed “declaration of purpose and economic strategy” above reflect your understanding of the Commission and Department’s role? If not, please recommend an alternative.

*Yes. However, we recommend a clear definition of a “strong investment climate”? The definition impacts the tools & strategies to be used for implementation.*

Q2: Should the Commission recommend establishing a single definition of “small business” for purposes of the Department’s small business programs. What should that definition be?

*Yes. Same as US Small Business Administration / 500 employees.*

Q3: Should the Commission recommend revising the definition of “rural area” to cities of 50,000 or less (in line with the Census Bureau definition)? If not, please outline an alternative recommendation.

*Yes.*

Q4: What other definitional additions, deletions, or revisions should the Commission recommend?

*No input.*

Q5: a) Should the Commission recommend increasing the number of Commissioners? What would be the appropriate number of Commissioners?

*Yes, if necessary to achieve the goals in (b).*

Q5: b) Should the Commission recommend additional experience or training criteria for commission membership? What areas of focus would you recommend?

*Yes. Include additional criteria such as geographical diversity, labor and education representation.*

Q6: Should the Commission recommend eliminating statutory direction to establish certain boards, commission, committees, and other representation groups including: the International

Commission, the Oregon Entrepreneurial Development Loan Fund Advisory Committee, and the Ports Representation Group, instead establishing advisory committees as part of the Commission itself?

*Yes.*

Q7: Should the Commission recommend any substantive changes related to Strategic Reserve Fund statutory authority?

***Maintain or increase pool. This fund can be a critical component of a total package for new and existing employers.***

Q8: a) Should the Commission recommend eliminating the current \$1 million limit on buy-out of superior liens with OBDF monies?

*Yes.*

Q8: b) Should the Commission recommend any other substantive changes to existing Oregon Business Development Fund statutes?

***1) Remove 20% limitation per county. The fund should be available to those counties (such as Lane County) which choose to utilize this tool as a critical piece of overall incentives. 2) Strive to build strong partnerships with local economic development groups, where possible.***

Q9: a) Should the Commission recommend clarifying authority to retrieve up to 50% of the interest earned on the CAP program's loss reserve accounts for administrative purposes? b) Should the Commission recommend any other substantive changes to existing CAP statutes?

*No input.*

Q10: Should the Commission recommend any substantive changes related to the Credit Enhancement Fund statutory authority?

*No input.*

Q11: a) Should the Commission recommend eliminating the statutory requirement for local governments to approve Industrial Development Revenue Bond projects, instead providing for a notification process via administrative rule?

***Uncertain. If this requirement is lifted, then perhaps there should be some overarching principals regarding the prohibition of funding for projects which result in the movement of jobs from one part of Oregon to another.***

Q11: b) Should the Commission recommend any other substantive changes to existing Industrial Development Revenue Bond statutes?

*No input.*

Q12: Should the Commission recommend any substantive changes to existing Entrepreneurial Development Loan Fund statutes?

*Increase to \$70,000.00 to simplify the process for small loan applications. Perhaps tie the amount to future increases in the CPI.*

Q13: What should the Commission recommend with respect to the Department's role related to Small Business Development Centers? Should the Department act in an oversight capacity, as a pass-thru funder with no oversight role, or have no funding or oversight role at all?

*The SBDC's are important community assets. Continue to fund the SBDC & provide some oversight.*

Q14: What should the Commission recommend with respect to the Department's role related to targeted small business assistance? Should the Department continue to provide funds to targeted service providers that focus on women and minority owned businesses, micro-enterprises, and certain rural businesses? Should the Commission recommend any substantive changes to existing Small Business Assistance statutes?

*No input.*

Q15: Should the Commission recommend any substantive changes to the Business Retention Program statutory authority?

*No input.*

Q16: Should the Commission recommend any substantive changes related to existing Enterprise Zone statutes? Should the Commission recommend any substantive changes related to existing Strategic Investment Program statutes? Should the Commission recommend any substantive changes to any other Department administered tax incentive programs or activities?

*No input.*

Q17: Should the Commission recommend establishing a new statutory fund targeted at industry cluster assistance, marketing, workforce training, and sustainability?

*Yes, these efforts have been quite successful in Lane County.*

Q18: Should the Commission recommend eliminating the specific statutory requirement for a China trade office since no other countries are called out this way? Should the Commission recommend any other substantive changes to existing statutory authority related to international programs and activities?

*Yes*

Q19: Should the Commission recommend consolidating the Special Public Works Fund, Water/Wastewater Fund, Brownfields Redevelopment Fund, Oregon Coalition Brownfields Cleanup Fund, Port Revolving Fund, and Port Planning and Marketing Fund into a single infrastructure improvement fund?

*Yes.*

Q20: a) Should the Commission recommend statutory changes to allow the Department to provide loans to eligible entities to refinance outstanding loans for otherwise eligible projects?

*Infrastructure finance is critical but refinance only if terms are unreasonable or the refinance is just the permanent financing. Attempt to leverage rather than compete with private sector finance tools.*

Q20: b) Should the Commission recommend any additional substantive changes to existing Special Public Works Fund statutes?

*No input.*

Q21: Should the Commission recommend any substantive changes to existing Water and Wastewater Fund statutes?

*Eliminate So Ore specific funds.*

Q22: a) Should the Commission recommend eliminating the statutory creation of a stand-alone Ports Division? b) Should the Commission recommend establishing any additional ports related funding or financing programs? c) Should the Commission recommend any other substantive changes to existing ports related statutes?

*No input.*

Q23: Should the Commission recommend any substantive changes to existing Community Development Block Grant statutes?

*Find additional funds and prioritize this fund.*

Q24: Should the Commission recommend any substantive changes to existing statutes related to Certified Industrial Sites?

*No. Support this process.*

Q25: Should the Commission recommend increasing the percent of Brownfields Redevelopment Fund monies that can be awarded to a liable party?

***Yes. Additional tools such as this are necessary to provide further incentives for Brownfield redevelopment.***

Q26: a) Should the Commission recommend additional Brownfield cleanup related tax incentives or programs?

***Yes. Additional tools such as this are necessary to provide further incentives for Brownfield redevelopment.***

Q26: b) Should the Commission recommend establishing a Brownfield “insurance” fund for prospective purchasers of Brownfield properties?

***Yes. Additional tools such as this are necessary to provide further incentives for Brownfield redevelopment.***

Q27: a) Should the Commission recommend consolidating the Regional Investment Fund and Rural Investment Fund programs? If so, what percentage of combined program funds should be dedicated to projects that will benefit rural communities.

***Yes. Dedication of a certain percentage to rural communities should be established as guidelines rather than rules. Funds should be directed to the best projects in a Region.***

Q27: b) Should the Commission recommend any additional substantive changes to either the Regional Investment Program or the Rural Investment Program statutes?

***No input.***

Q28: Should the Commission recommend any substantive changes to existing Arts Commission or Cultural Trust statutes?

***Strive to implement a socially responsible investing policy that is consistent with the economic development mission of State of Oregon.***