

MINUTES

Lane Economic Committee

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

October 15, 2007 – 11:30 A.M.

PRESENT: Rob Scoggin, Chair; Leah Carter (for Jenny Ulum), DeAnn Cherbas, Chuck Forster, Mike Galvin, Glenda Poling, John Sullivan, John Tamulonis, *members*; Deb Schmidt, *ex officio member*; Lawrence Brice, Lou Christian, Ric Ingham, Howard Schesser, *alternate members*.

Steve Dignam, Milo Mecham (LCOG); Mike McKenzie-Bahr (Lane County); Louise Birk, Bob Warren (Oregon Economic & Community Development Department).

ABSENT: Tim Black, Mike Blommé, Jay Bozievich, Denny Braud, Bill Fleenor, Ellen Teninty, Jenny Ulum, Lynnette Wikstrom, *members*; Jim Ramseyer, Kari Westlund, *ex officio members*;

GUESTS: Chuck Spies, Diane Wiley, Gordon Zimmerman

Mr. Scoggin called the meeting of the Lane Council of Governments (LCOG) Lane Economic Committee (LEC) to order at 11:30 a.m. He invited those who were present to introduce themselves. He determined there was no one present wishing to make a public comment and said he had none to make himself.

1. Staff Comments

Mr. Dignam reported that he had acquired the 80 pint western chapeau he was wearing during a recent trip to Texas. He read documentation which supported his decision to wear it indoors, in the presence of women, and to hide the increasingly thin pilus covering his cerebellum.

Mr. Dignam reported that the terms of four members would expire in December 2007 – DeAnn Cherbas, Rob Scoggin, John Sullivan, and Ellen Teninty. He said they were eligible to be reappointed. He said the availability of applications to fill the positions would be publicly posted. He explained that, in the past, a subcommittee had been formed to make recommendations of persons to be appointed to fill the positions, which would be reviewed by the LEC and submitted to the LCOG Board of Directors. Mr. Tamulonis and Ms. Poling volunteered to serve on such a subcommittee that would meet before the next LEC meeting.

Mr. Dignam noted that Lane County Commissioner Bill Fleenor continued to be unable to attend meetings of the LEC as the assigned representative of the Board of County Commissioners. He said it was his intention to request that an alternate who could attend be identified.

2. Meeting Minutes

Mr. Tamulonis moved, seconded by Mr. Sullivan, to accept the minutes of the July 30, 2007, meeting. The motion was adopted unanimously, 8:0.

3. Infrastructure Inventory

Mr. Dignam reported that the Oregon Legislature had directed that the Economic and Community Development Department gather information on Oregon's needed infrastructure improvements through the Regional Investment Boards (RIB). He reviewed previous efforts by the LEC to create a priority listing of such projects through a Needs and Issues listing process. He said it was his impression that the State process would be comparatively simple and limited to input requested on a website data bank. He referred to his October 3 letter which described categories of submissions and how data was to be entered. He explained that a report was to be made to the Legislature by February 1, the deadline for submission of projects was November 15, and the time for review and prioritization of submissions from Lane County by the LEC very limited.

Mr. Mecham explained that the Lane Board of County Commissioners had agreed to have the Benton, Lane, Lincoln and Linn (BL³) RIB conduct the inventory, as required for the State to provide the available funding.

Mr. Warren explained that the Legislature had not been able to reach consensus regarding funding of RIB efforts and had settled on the Infrastructure Inventory process to identify a list of existing needs. He said the Legislature had directed that the Inventory should coincide with existing Oregon Economic Development Goals.

Mr. Galvin reported that the BL³ RIB would meet before the day was over and discuss the matter. He said he did not believe any final decisions about the process or strategies for its use had been made. He said he believed funding for the projects identified in the Infrastructure Inventory process was questionable, especially within the previous RIB priority of job creation.

Members and Mr. Dignam asked questions, as follows:

- Will the Infrastructure Inventory rank submitted projects? (*Dignam*) The submissions will be self-ranked into high priority, medium priority, and low priority and the RIBs are directed to identify the top ten projects in each region. It is likely that the BL³ RIB will allow each county to choose its two top projects. (*Galvin*)
- If LCOG is asked to do the work, would it be responsible for identifying the top two projects in Lane County? (*Dignam*) That is the only way that it could be done. (*Galvin*)
- What criteria will be used for recommending projects? (*Zimmerman*) A previously identified list of criteria could be used – readiness, impact, etc. (*Dignam*)

Louise Birk, Oregon Economic & Community Development Department staff responsible for the Infrastructure Inventory process, joined the meeting.

- Will funding be provided only for projects identified on the Inventory? (*Tamulonis*) The Inventory will answer that question. (*Birk*)

- Should counties submit all infrastructure projects? (*Scoggins*) Everything except big road projects with federal funding. Prioritization will be determined by RIBs. (*Birk*)
- With the potential of hundreds of projects being submitted from each county, will not the process become unmanageable? Is the LEC to participate in identifying Lane County priority projects? (*Sullivan*) It is the responsibility of the RIB to choose the top ten priorities for each region. (*Birk*)
- How will the Infrastructure Inventory differ from the previous Needs and Inventory listing? (*Spies*) The Inventory will be more narrowly focused on infrastructure needs. (*Birk*)

Mr. Tamulonis suggested that the most difficult aspect of the Infrastructure Inventory process would be to ensure that all eligible agencies submit their priorities. He said Lane County BL³ RIB representatives should be informed of local priority rankings of projects submitted. He noted that Mr. Galvin, Don Hampton, Faye Stewart represented Lane County on the BL³ RIB and that there was a vacancy in its delegation.

Members discussed the process – the difficulty of being able to identify and prioritize projects before deadlines, the influence of the priorities established in the Lane County Needs and Issues process, how to encourage small cities to update previous submissions, the logical coordination role of LCOG in the process, and technical issues related to on-line submission of projects.

Mr. Scoggins determined there was consensus to form an LEC subcommittee to prepare suggestions for prioritization of Lane County submissions to the Infrastructure Inventory Process. Mr. Brice, Ms. Cherbas, Ms. Poling, Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Tamulonis, and Ms. Carter volunteered to serve on the subcommittee.

Members continued to discuss the Infrastructure Inventory process – the applicability of ranking criteria used in previous Needs and Issues processes, project priority categories identified by the State, use of Community Development Block Grant applications, how to encourage participation from agencies that have not previously done so, and the importance of securing funding for staff work on the Inventory.

Mr. Scoggins announced that the next LEC meeting was scheduled for November 19.

The meeting adjourned at 12:50 p.m.

(Recorded by Dan Lindstrom)

*LCOG: L:\ECODEVO\LEC\MINUTES\LEC071015.DOC
Last Saved: October 22, 2007*