

BOOK **160** PAGE **2249**
MINUTES

Eugene City Council--Lane County Board of Commissioners
McNutt Room--City Hall

December 1, 1997
5:30 p.m.

COUNCILORS PRESENT: Pat Farr, Nancy Nathanson, Tim Laue, Scott Meisner, Bobby Lee,
Betty Taylor, Laurie Swanson Gribskov, Ken Tollenaar.

**COMMISSIONERS
PRESENT:** Steve Cornacchia, Elli Dumdi, Bobby Green.

I. CALL TO ORDER/INTRODUCTIONS

Mayor James D. Torrey called the meeting of the City Council to order. Board Vice President Steve Cornacchia called the meeting of the Lane Board of County Commissioners to order.

**II. JOINT WORK SESSION/ACTION: RESOLUTION CONCERNING ENTERPRISE
ZONE COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS**

Denny Braud, Eugene Planning and Development Department, provided an overview of the item, discussing the background behind the proposed criteria developed by the Enterprise Zone Committee, which included Mr. Tollenaar, Ms. Dumdi, Mr. Meisner, Mr. Green, Craig Smith of School District 4J and Gerald Thenell of Shelton-Turnbull Printers. He noted that Mr. Smith was present.

Mr. Braud reviewed the seven criteria and the rankings and weight assigned to each criteria by the committee.

Responding to a question from Ms. Nathanson, Mr. Meisner clarified that the committee would reconvene when there was a predetermined amount of funds available, and at that time the committee would issue a competitive Request for Proposals.

Mr. Braud reviewed an example of how a company might score points under the proposed point system.

Ms. Nathanson asked if expansion outside the zone boundaries would be calculated into the point total.

Mr. Braud clarified that the investment must occur within the existing enterprise zone boundaries. Ms.

Dumdi asked about the impact of expanding onto a brownfield site outside the zone. Mr. Braud clarified that the State statutes limit future benefits within the boundaries of the zone. The brownfield site would have to be located within the zone.

Ms. Taylor questioned the inclusion of low- and moderate-income on the list of persons with barriers to employment. Mr. Meisner clarified that the list came from the Department of Labor and was a statistically based list. Ms. Taylor asked if the list could be changed.

Mr. Farr observed that all the employment and training referral agencies referred to in the criteria were all public bodies. He asked if the committee excluded for profit training agencies. Mr. Braud said that

expensive to redevelop. Ms. Nathanson feared a company could receive points for expanding in an inefficient way at its existing site.

Mr. Torrey thought the criteria was questionable because it was not employment related.

Mr. Cornacchia asked who would determine if expansion was efficient. Ms. Nathanson said she would be inclined to reassign the point for simply expansion to the second point in the criteria related to redevelopment of brownfield and existing industrial sites.

Mr. Meisner believed that the criteria implied intensification of development and created an incentive for nonsprawl.

Responding to a question from Mr. Tollenaar, Mr. Smith said that the Enterprise Zone Department Advisory Committee did not produce an analysis regarding the best use of land, but had focused on job creation when discussing the criteria.

Mr. Torrey noted that the board would not take action on the public benefit scoring system because not all commissioners were present.

Res. No. 4548—A resolution adopting public benefit scoring system applicable to the West Eugene Enterprise Zone.

Ms. Swanson Gribkov moved, seconded by Mr. Farr, to adopt resolution 4548.

Mr. Tollenaar said that any plant expansion on an existing site would be given one point. He concurred with Ms. Nathanson that the element of the criteria could be eliminated and its points reassigned.

Ms. Dumdi saw no need to delete the element of the criteria, urging it be retained as an incentive.

Mr. Farr indicated his opposition to the motion because he did not think that the City should be attempting to recapture any moneys from the companies in the zone.

Mr. Cornacchia referred to the percentage of the contribution intended for education and asked why the committee was forcing the education contribution to go to training while not mandating any purpose for the money to be realized by the City and County. Mr. Meisner reminded Mr. Cornacchia of the ordinance approved by the County and City, which established the distribution formula.

City Attorney Glenn Klein said that the resolution could be altered to change the distribution formula. However, the elected officials could not change the criteria.

Mr. Green was not interested in having further discussion of changing the distribution.

Mr. Meisner said that the resolution was not specific to job training but rather called out programs "which enhance the ability of residents to gain quality employment." He said that basic education was

the key to meeting that goal. He said that the resolution did not preclude schools from offering other proposals. He further pointed out that the distribution formula did not restrict the use of the funds to job training only.

Mr. Torrey believed that the proposed resolution contained language broad enough to address Mr. Cornacchia's concerns. He said that either the City or County could reallocate their portion if they choose.

Responding to a question from Mr. Cornacchia, Mr. Torrey envisioned that an elementary school in Mohawk could apply for funding to support a teacher as the resolution was written. Mr. Meisner did not anticipate that there would be sufficient funds collected to support such an expenditure.

Mr. Meisner moved, seconded by Mr. Laue, to amend the motion by striking the phrase "which enhance the ability of Lane County residents to receive an education" from the notes on the distribution of the public benefit criteria. Roll call; the amendment to the motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Mr. Tollenaar moved, seconded by Mr. Laue, to amend the motion by inserting "\$10,000" in the blank space in the notes on the distribution of the public benefit criteria. Roll call; the amendment to the motion passed unanimously, 8:0.

Roll call; the main motion passed, 7:1 Mr. Farr voting no.

The meeting adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

(Recorded by Kimberly Young)

r:cc53001.127