

# MINUTES

## Lane Economic Committee

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

November 20, 2006 – 11:30 A.M.

**PRESENT:** John Tamulonis, Chair; Mike Blommé, DeAnn Cherbas, Anna Morrison, Glenda Poling, Jim Ramseyer, Rob Scoggin, Ellen Teninty, Jenny Ulum, members; Deb Schmidt, *ex officio* members; Mike Galvin (for Hal Reed), Robin Onaclea (for Chuck Forster), alternate members.

Steve Dignam, Milo Mecham (LCOG); Mike McKenzie-Bahr (Lane County).

**ABSENT:** Tim Black, Denny Braud, Chuck Forster, Hal Reed, John Sullivan, Lynnette Wikstrom, members; Jay Bozievich, Philip Hudspeth, Kari Westlund, *ex officio* members.

**GUESTS:** Julia Daniels, Heather Edwards, Dave Oatman, Kristin Stahlman, Diane Wiley.

Mr. Tamulonis called the meeting of the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) Lane Economic Committee (LEC) to order at 11:35 a.m. He invited those who were present to introduce themselves. He determined there was no one present wishing to make a Public Comment.

### 1. Comments from the Chair and Staff

Mr. Tamulonis reported that Springfield was in the process of establishing an agreement with the Apex Investment Group to serve as Master Developer of the 45-acre Glenwood Riverfront Re-development Project.

Ms Poling reported that Lane Metro Partnership was involved in recruitment of an unusually large number of potential economic development projects in Lane County. She said they ranged “from good, to great, to hot.”

Mr. Dignam reported that the LCOG Business Loan Program, with the collaboration of the Oregon Economic & Community Development Department and local commercial lenders, had recently closed arrangements for a 20-year, 6.22 percent loan to Flappin’ Flags, a Eugene business that claims its Pirate Head line of collectables is the largest in the industry. He did not say “skullduggery” was involved, but he could have.



### 2. Approval of Minutes

*Mr. Scoggin moved, seconded by Ms. Cherbas, to accept the minutes of the October 16, 2006, meeting. The motion was adopted unanimously, 11:0.*

### **3. Committee Membership**

Mr. Dignam reported that the terms of five LEC members would expire in January – Tim Black, Anna Morrison, Glenda Poling, Jim Ramseyer, and John Sullivan – and the position of Philip Hudspeth was vacant because he had moved from the area. He explained that the availability of the positions had been published and the deadline to apply for appointment had passed. He said a number of applications had been received and that he believed most of those currently holding the positions were seeking reappointment.

Mr. Dignam invited members to serve on a Nominating Committee. Ms. Poling, Mr. Ramseyer, Mr. Scoggin, and Ms. Teninty volunteered.

Mr. Tamulonis said he did not believe LEC Chairpersonship was intended to be service in perpetuity. He requested that the Nominating Committee present a candidate for the office. He suggested that a non-government representative be proposed.

### **4. Economic Development Strategic Investment Program – Video Lottery**

Mr. Dignam referred to a document entitled “Lane County Economic Development Projects – Review and Comment by the Lane Economic Committee.” He reviewed background information it contained and explained that the LEC subcommittee recommended separation of project applications into three categories ranked according to their impact on economic and community development and other measures.

Lane County Community and Economic Development Coordinator Mike McKenzie-Bahr reported that the Board of County Commissioners would review LEC allocation recommendations along with those of its Economic Development Standing Committee in the distribution of \$200,000 in Video Lottery funds available in 2006. He said an additional \$460,000 in reserve funds could also be available for allocation and that an unexpected 30 percent increase in video lottery funds received by the State could be distributed also.

Mr. Scoggin described the intention of the LEC subcommittee in creating categories – “A” List of projects that “stood apart” from the rest; “B” List of projects that were “attractive and important”; and “C” List of project applications that did not meet the economic evaluation criteria of the program. He said projects within each List were not given priority rankings.

In response to a question from Ms. Ulum, Mr. McKenzie-Bahr explained that the LEC could make recommendations that would utilize all of the available funds, including Reserves, but that the final decision about allocations remained with the Board of County Commissioners. He said exhausting all funds would eliminate support for any new projects, such as those reported to be in various stages of development by the Lane Metro Partnership.

Ms. Morrison reported that the Board of County Commissioners had previously decided to hold some video lottery funds in reserve to enable the funding of critical opportunities.

Mr. McKenzie-Bahr distributed copies of a document entitled “VID Lot Projects – Projects by Cost” and reviewed the recommendations of the Economic Development Standing Committee it contained. He explained the point system used to rank the projects. He said there was essential agreement between the recommendations and those of the LEC subcommittee, but that the Standing Committee had reduced funding proposals from the levels requested.

Members discussed various projects, recommendation possibilities, and the projects having received previous funding through the Economic Development Strategic Investment Program.

***Ms. Ulum moved, seconded by Mr. Ramseyer, to recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that it allocate 75 percent of requests for funding of projects included in the “A” and “B” Lists proposed by the LEC subcommittee.***

Members evaluated various projects, discussed alternate funding recommendations, and considered the impacts of the allocation of all or a portion of the available funds.

***Ms. Ulum and Mr. Ramseyer withdrew their motion.***

Members continued to discuss recommendation possibilities.

***Ms. Ulum moved, seconded by Mr. Ramseyer, to report to the Board of County Commissioners that projects included in the “A” and “B” Lists, as proposed by the LEC subcommittee, met criteria of the Economic Development Strategic Investment Program; and to recommend that they be funded “with flexibility” to enable retention of reserve funds in the program that would be available for allocation at a later time.***

Members discussed the motion.

Mr. McKenzie-Bahr reported that an “appeal” of allocation decisions would be possible.

***The motion was adopted unanimously, 11:0.***

***Mr. Galvin moved, seconded by Mr. Scoggin, to report to the Board of County Commissioners that projects included in the “C” List, as proposed by the LEC subcommittee, did not meet the evaluation criteria of the Economic Development Strategic Investment Program and should not be considered for funding at this time. The motion was adopted unanimously, 10:0:1, with Ms. Poling abstaining from voting.***

Members discussed potential changes in future LEC consideration of Strategic Investment Program recommendations – more fully developed criteria for subcommittee clearly applied, use of a matrix for comparison of project proposals, creation of a “quantitative approach” to rankings, and allowing elimination of projects not meeting criteria.

## **5. Economic Development Planning Coordination**

Mr. Dignam reported that, as requested at the October LEC meeting, he had met with staff of the Lane Economic Standing Committee and Metro Partnership to discuss issues related to coordination of economic development planning in Lane County. He said little progress had been made regarding recommendations of a report to the LCOG Board of Directors intended to increase the coordination. He said he had asked LCOG staff Milo Mecham to develop provisionary options for consideration.

Mr. Mecham suggested that the value of LEC in economic development planning could be increased by expansion of the value of the Needs and Issues Inventory process. He recommended consideration of developing “One-Stop-Meeting” processes to make available funding more accessible, using available expertise and staffing to assist communities in preparation of funding applications, and generally increasing involvement of Committee members.

Members discussed previous experience with such processes, limitations and opportunities for them, and the value they would provide.

Mr. Scoggin requested that discussion of coordination of economic development planning continue at the next LEC meeting.

Mr. Tamulonis announced that, to avoid a federal holiday, the next LEC meeting would be rescheduled from January 15 to January 22, 2007.

The meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

*(Recorded by Dan Lindstrom)*

*LCOG: L:\ECODEVO\LEC\MINUTES\LEC061120.DOC  
Last Saved: November 30, 2006*