

MINUTES

Lane Economic Committee

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

July 19, 2004 – 11:30 A.M.

PRESENT: John Tamulonis, Chair; Tim Black, Mike Blommé, DeAnn Cherbas, Glenda Poling, Rob Scoggin, John Sullivan, members; Jay Bozievich, Philip Hudspeth, Deb Schmidt, *ex officio* members; Randy Derrick, Mike Galvin, Joshua Greene, Robin Onaclea, alternate members.

Steve Dignam, Carol Heinkel (LCOG).

ABSENT: Chuck Forster, Anna Morrison, Jim Ramseyer, Hal Reed, Charles Spencer, Mike Sullivan, Mitch Wilkinson, Lynnette Wikstrom, members; Kari Westlund, *ex officio* member;

Because of the (barely) late arrival of Mr. Tamulonis, Ms. Poling called the meeting of the Lane Economic Committee (LEC) to order at 11:35 a.m. She invited those who were present to introduce themselves. Mr. Tamulonis joined the meeting at 11:40 a.m. He determined there were no requests to change the agenda or to make public comment.

1. Comments from the Chair and Staff

Mr. Tamulonis expressed to the State of Oregon for reconstructing the I-5 Franklin Avenue Bridge to enable his on-time arrival at LEC meetings.

Mr. Dignam described practical consequences of inadequate coverage.

2. Approval of Minutes

Mr. Scoggin moved, seconded by Ms. Poling, to accept the minutes of the June 21, 2004, LEC meeting. The motion was adopted unanimously, 11:0.

3. Needs and Issues Process Change Recommendations

Mr. Sullivan referred to a July 7 memorandum from the 2004 Needs and Issues Subcommittee and summarized its recommendations for improving the annual ranking process, as follows:

- Continue to consider only the five highest self-ranked projects from any applicant.
- Information about all proposed project should be reported to LEC members.
- Increase the involvement of LEC members in developing ranking recommendations.
- Expand the ranking scale to 1-5 to better identify potential differences between projects.

- Incorporate information from the State regarding potential funding for projects.
- Initially review and rank projects from local governments, unincorporated areas, individuals, and nonprofit organizations separately.
- Increase involvement of local elected officials.
- Identify and give additional weight to the impact of community infrastructure projects.

Members discussed the recommendations. There appeared to be agreement (1) that feedback from elected officials or small city staff on potential rankings be attempted before being submitted for approval by the LEC; (2) that more adequate time be provided for the ranking process; and (3) that ranking of projects be initially evaluated by related type and/or geographic area.

Mr. Greene moved, seconded by Ms. Poling, to approve the recommendations of the subcommittee and to submit them, along with the additional suggestions agreed upon, to the Oregon Economic & Community Development Department. The motion was adopted unanimously, 11:0.

4. Economic Development Agency Profiles

Mr. Bozievich reported that an *ad hoc* subcommittee had reviewed development of a directory of economic development programs available in Lane County. Mr. Dignam said the project had been previously discussed by the LEC as a way to ensure availability of information about services and to identify potential duplications of effort. He reviewed a model studied by the subcommittee prepared for the State of Alaska and suggested that duplicating it locally would require initial and ongoing support.

Mr. Bozievich reported that subcommittee members had discussed how a statewide directory could miss important resources locally available, but could provide information about important state and federal resources. He said whether there were LCOG resources to provide support for the project had not been investigated. He also said members had discussed various ways of categorizing the data and the value of providing it as an interactive Internet resource.

Members discussed the report. Mr. Black volunteered to investigate opportunities for support of directory preparation as a University of Oregon student project. Mr. Greene suggested that computer software could be developed enabling self-updating by agencies. Mr. Dignam said resources available for government and for business projects operated differently and that the support of the Lane Community College (LCC) Business Development Center and Lane Metro Partnership could prove helpful. Ms. Cherbas emphasized the value of single-page agency service descriptions and of keeping included data current.

Mr. Tamulonis determined there was consensus to ask staff to further investigate development of a directory of Lane County economic development agencies, coordinating the effort with the Business Development Center, Lane Metro Partnership, and OECDD.

5. Region 2050

LCOG Staff Carol Heinkel referred to her July 13 memorandum and a document entitled “Alternative Regional Growth Scenarios – Concepts and Evaluation” distributed with the agenda of the meeting. She explained that Region 2050 was a collaborative effort to improve and sustain quality of life in the Southern Willamette Valley. She said it would produce a Regional Growth Management Strategy to be submitted to local governments and state agencies for endorsement. She reviewed alternative regional growth scenarios developed by the Region 2050 Regional Policy Advisory Board (RPAB) and Regional Technical Advisory Committee (RTAC) – Compact Urban Growth, Satellite Community Growth, and Rural Growth.

Members discussed the purpose, goals, processes, and expected outcomes of the Region 2050 project. Responding to a request of Ms. Heinkel, they ranked how well the scenarios met its criteria and objectives in comparison to similar ranking by the RPAB and RTAC, as follows:

Criteria	Compact Urban Growth		Satellite Communities		Rural Growth	
	<i>LEC</i>	<i>RPAB/RTAC</i>	<i>LEC</i>	<i>RPAB/RTAC</i>	<i>LEC</i>	<i>RPAB/RTAC</i>
Promote a diverse regional economy	High	Medium	High/ Medium	High	Medium/ High	Medium
Provide access to goods and services throughout the region	High/Medium/ Low	Low	Medium/ High	High	High/ Medium	Low
Provide access to family-wage jobs throughout the region	Medium	Medium	High/ Medium	High	Medium/ Low	Low
Recognize the unique advantages of each community	Medium	Low	Medium/ High	High	High	Low
Increase employment densities	High/Medium	High	Medium	High	Low/ Medium	High
Promote redevelopment of brownfields and other sites and facilitate redevelopment projects	Low	High	Medium/ High	Medium	High	Low

Members discussed reasons for the rankings and gave personal evaluations of the Region 2050 process. Ms. Heinkel stated that she would collate the feedback and return to a future LEC meeting for additional discussion.

Mr. Tamulonis announced there would be no LEC meeting in August.

The meeting adjourned at 1:05 p.m.

(Recorded by Dan Lindstrom)

LCOG: L:\ECODEVO\LEC\MINUTES\LEC040719.DOC
Last Saved: July 22, 2004