

# MINUTES

## Lane Economic Committee

Lane Council of Governments – 4<sup>th</sup> Floor Large Conference Room  
99 E. Broadway, Suite 400 – Eugene

November 17, 2003 – 11:30 A.M.

**PRESENT:** John Tamulonis, Chair; DeAnn Cherbas, Anna Morrison, Glenda Poling, Jim Ramseyer, Robert Scoggin, Charles Spencer, Mike Sullivan, Lynnette Wikstrom-Smith, members; Jay Bozievich, Deb Schmidt, Kari Westlund, *ex officio* members; Mike Galvin, Joshua Greene, Darrell Hames, Howard Schesser, Tim Black, alternate members.

Steve Dignam, Milo Mecham (LCOG); Peter Thurston (Lane County).

**ABSENT:** Chuck Forster, Scarlet Lee, Hal Reed, members;

**GUESTS:** Randy Derrick, Drew Foster, Don Hampton, Phillip Hudspeth.

In the absence of the Chair and Vice Chair, Mr. Scoggin called the meeting of the Lane Economic Committee (LEC) to order at 11:35 a.m. He invited those who were present to introduce themselves.

Mr. Scoggin determined there were no requests to change the agenda. He also determined there were no requests to present Public Comment.

### 1. Comments of the Staff and Chair

Mr. Dignam discussed his accrued benefits for having completed five years as an employee of Lane Council of Governments. He described, circulated, and offered copies of a report on Sustainable Economic Development prepared by Bob Doppelt.

Mr. Tamulonis joined the meeting and assumed the chair at 11:40 a.m. He observed that bridge re-construction created traffic congestion in the Glenwood area.

### 2. Approval of Minutes

*Mr. Scoggin moved, seconded by Ms. Wikstrom-Smith to accept the minutes of the October 20, 3002, meeting. The motion was adopted unanimously, 12:0.*

### **3. LEC 2004 Work Plan and Strategies**

Mr. Dignam referred to a document entitled “Lane Economic Committee Strategy Development Based on LCOG Board Goal Setting Session and Subsequent LCOG Board Discussion” distributed with the agenda of the meeting. He invited members to provide suggestions for additions or changes to the LEC strategies and work plan it included.

Ms. Morrison said it appeared that the proposed work plan was a listing of activities in which the committee and staff were already engaged. She asked for an explanation of the suggestion that there were “other economic advisory councils” in which it would be appropriate for LEC and staff to participate.

Mr. Dignam replied that it was true that the work plan attempted to reduce to writing the activities in which there was already involvement, but that several new elements had been added. He said he believed coordination of economic development was an important LEC role and that it was positive for committee representatives and/or staff to establish connections with other groups with such interests. He said he did not believe there was redundancy in economic development funding goals of various agencies, but that specific projects supported by them could inappropriately duplicate efforts.

Ms. Westlund said she believed there were a number of economic development programs that had inherent conflicts of interest and that it was positive for LEC to seek a presence with their governing bodies. She suggested that there would be value in having an LEC representative on the Lane County Economic Development Standing Committee.

Ms. Poling said she agreed that seeking coordination of economic development efforts was important. She suggested that competition between various programs was inevitable, such as relocation of a business from one area to another.

Mr. Sullivan suggested that confusion in the proposed work plan could be avoided by separating LEC, staff, and LCOG efforts. He said doing so could indicate that there was a role for the LEC beyond that carried out by staff.

Mr. Spencer said he agreed that it would be helpful to provide additional detail in the work plan. He said networking among economic development interests was beneficial to all. He suggested that it would be helpful to identify an LEC liaison to each group with such interests.

Mr. Dignam said he agreed that it was a challenge for the LEC to eliminate redundancy among economic development efforts. He said the multi-agency membership of LCOG made it a viable tool for encouraging such a goal.

Members continued to discuss issues related to the proposed work plan – economic development in unincorporated areas of the county, the Oregon “Needs and Issues” inventory, the purpose of the strategy discussion, and current economic development activities in various locations.

Mr. Tamulonis determined there appeared to be agreement for staff to re-work the proposed work plan and report to the LCOG Board of Directors and continue the discussion of it at the December LEC meeting.

#### **4. Membership Nominations**

Mr. Dignam referred to an LEC membership information list distributed with the agenda of the meeting. He noted that it identified recent resignations and expiration of the terms of four members. He reported that a number of applications for appointment as members had been received from a recent newspaper notice of the vacancies. He suggested that an *ad hoc* subcommittee be formed to evaluate the applications and make a report to the LEC for it to develop recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners for appointment.

Mr. Scoggin, Ms. Poling, and Ms. Morrison volunteered to serve on the subcommittee.

#### **5. Vision for Lane County Job Creation**

Mr. Tamulonis referred to a draft memorandum from the LEC to the Lane County Economic Development Standing Committee containing feedback on a proposed document entitled “A Vision for Lane County Job Creation – 2003 to 2010” distributed with the agenda of the meeting. He reviewed information it contained regarding the importance of “high impact proposals” in job creation, and factors for use in evaluating competing projects.

Mr. Dignam distributed printed copies of e-mail communications from John Sullivan, Kari Westlund, and Charles Spence regarding the proposed document.

Ms. Morrison said she questioned the value of technical assistance and capacity building as an economic development project.

Mr. Thurston said the suggestions regarding proposal evaluation criteria contained in the draft memorandum would be helpful to the Standing Committee. He invited members to discuss what would be an appropriate standard for the number of jobs created or retained in a funded project.

Members discussed the Oregon recommended standard of one job for every \$5,000 provided and how setting such a ratio could eliminate good proposals. There appeared to be agreement that a broader perspective on such a requirement would be desirable.

Mr. Tamulonis stated that the report to the Economic Development Standing Committee would continue to be discussed at the December LEC meeting.

## **6. Cascades West Economic Development District Strategy**

Mr. Foster described the concerns of the Cascades West Economic Development District regarding the limitation of economic development funds available from the state and its directive to concentrate on job creation. He said it would be important for the LEC to not lose a “long-range view” of economic development in the face of the limitations. He invited members to participate in the discussion.

Mr. Dignam said it appeared that the Regional Investment Board would adopt short-term strategies to encourage job creation, but that he believed it was important to not lose track of the value of long-term investment programs encouraging technical assistance.

Mr. Tamulonis stated that discussion of the issue would continue at the December meeting of the LEC. He asked Mr. Dignam to prepare a communication on the issues involved.

## **7. Regional Investment Board Update**

Mr. Mecham distributed copies of a document entitled “2003-2005 Regional and Rural Investment Programs” and reviewed information it contained about the categories of activities to be considered by the Benton, Lane, Lincoln, and Linn Regional Investment Board (BL<sup>3</sup>) – Business Development, Site Development, Workforce Development, and Capacity Development.

Mr. Mecham referred to his Memorandum dated November 10 distributed with the agenda of the meeting in which he described the revised strategy of the BL<sup>3</sup> for distributing Oregon State Lottery support for the current biennium. He said the strategy was intended to create 300 new jobs in the four county area and leverage at least \$5 of matching funds for each \$1 of investment.

Mr. Mecham said the Regional Investment Board intended to create an Opportunity Fund and reviewed its focus, goals, and preferences as described in his memorandum. He explained that the deadline for comments on the proposed strategy was December 21 and encouraged members to make them at the BL<sup>3</sup> internet website, [www.bl3rib.org](http://www.bl3rib.org).

Members discussed elements of the strategy, the availability of economic resources, and the disposition of funds not fully expended.

The meeting adjourned at 1:05 p.m.

*(Recorded by Dan Lindstrom)*

LCOG: L:\ECODEVO\LEC\MINUTES\LEC031117.DOC  
Last Saved: November 20, 2003