

PROCESSES USED TO SELECT TOP TEN PROJECTS

Baker-Morrow Region

The “Top 10” were discussed at the September public meeting and then decided upon at the November 5th BMRP public meeting. At the November 5th meeting, Baker and Morrow County representatives divided into two groups to discuss the infrastructure projects. Each group selected a “top 10”. From there, each project was discussed and questions were answered by the Partnership and those in attendance at the meeting. The group then selected the top 10 for Baker-Morrow Regional Partnership.

Benton-Lane-Lincoln-Linn Region

The BL3 Regional Investment Board asked each of the four counties to assist them by reviewing the high priority projects list and identifying the top economic development infrastructure projects within their county.

- Benton County created a consensus recommendation from City Administrators/Managers for the consideration of the Board of County Commissioners, who identified three priorities.
- Lane Economic Development Committee (appointed by the Lane County Board of Commissioners) provided review and recommendation of four Lane County projects.
- Lincoln County Board of Commissioners identified three projects on a split vote.
- Linn County Board of Commissioners, with qualifications, identified a short list of three projects through a split vote.

The Board reviewed the list of thirteen projects presented by the Counties and approved the full list for submittal to OECDD. The Board Chair directed Board staff to review the list and reduce it to the required ten projects.

Central Oregon Region

(Crook, Deschutes and Jefferson Counties)

The prioritization was an agenda item for the November 29th Board meeting. Elected officials and several senior administrative staff attended from all three counties. Two chambers of commerce, finance, retail, and franchise utilities are member of the Board and represented the private sector. Economic Development for Central Oregon and OECDD staff were also in attendance. Board staff made a short PowerPoint presentation that included the full list of 95 "high" priority projects. The presentation included the guidelines that were included in the Frequently Asked Questions (September 2007) item 10), with some verbal emphasis on infrastructure, readiness, the need for new capitalization, and potential regional benefits. Several days prior to the meeting, Board staff had contacted county and city managers/administrators for any possible preliminary prioritization by jurisdiction. This was a very helpful step not only for ranking but for obtaining additional details about projects. Participants then broke into 3 smaller groups by county to come back with the 3 - 5 highest priorities. When full meeting reassembled, the results of the breakouts were shared. A proposal to submit 15 projects was submitted and approved by Chair, and then subsequently increased to 20 projects. Board staff reiterated the instructions were to list ten and convinced the Chair to rank the 20 by first 10, next 5 and second next 5, to allow for distinction and quick follow-up "if/when it gets sent back." The Board

identified the top 10, some consideration given to number of projects reflecting the relative size of counties (geography, population, and metros). Turned out Deschutes -5, Crook -3, Jefferson -2.

Coos-Curry-Douglas Region

To determine the projects to be included in the Top 10 list, the Board invited all project sponsors with projects that were determined to be high priority to attend the meeting in case there were any questions about their projects. Each sponsor that had multiple projects was asked to prioritize their projects. Only their top one would be considered for the list (unless the impact of more than one of their projects was significant to the region). The board discussed how many projects each subcommittee (individual counties in the region) would bring back to the full board. After discussion it was agreed that each county would pick five projects to bring back to the full board. The full board would then discuss those projects and pick five.

The individual counties committees met along with the attending project sponsors for that region. They briefly discussed all of the projects on the list and asked the attending project sponsors if they had any questions about the project. After initial review they went through the list two more times and discussed projects. By the third time those projects that were most important were apparent to all involved in the discussion. They were also able to help some sponsors who had important projects that required smaller amounts (and the project needed to be completed before Feb 2008) with ideas and assistance for funding.

The main Board resumed the meeting and all 15 projects were placed on large sheets where everyone could see them and ask questions about them. After discussion, it was decided to take the top 3 projects from each County. Then one member recommended a project on the list for the 10th spot (not even from their respective county). The final project list was approved by the Board.

Jackson-Josephine Region

An email was sent to all the Board members on Thursday (a week before the Board's November meeting 11/14/07) detailing the Infrastructure Inventory projects which were given the "high" priority rating from the state. In order to expedite the process, it was discussed and agreed to at the previous meeting that a voting matrix and list of voting criteria in Excel document for the Board members' reference would be e-mailed at the same time to all Board members. Of those 40 projects, the Board would review and agree on the November meeting (11/14/07) as to which of the projects are considered the top 10 projects for regional economic impact. The Board members would then give the appropriate score of 1 to 15 with 15 being the highest score to these projects and e-mail them back immediately to the staff a day before 11/14/07. The staff compiled the scores to have a draft rating of the top projects for the final Board members' review on 11/14/07 Board meeting to decide the regional top 10 projects.

Lower John Day Region

(Gilliam, Sherman, and Wasco Counties)

At the special meeting of the Lower John Day Development Partnership on November 29 2007, the Board selected the Top 10 Infrastructure Inventory projects. These were the projects that, in the opinion of the Board, would result in the most economic benefit to the region. Several steps led up to the development of this final list. Briefly, the process involved:

1. Each County had been asked to use the High Priority List to further prioritize their County's projects. Rationale: The Counties are most familiar with their own projects, project sponsors, their relative importance, projected timelines and feasibility.

2. Each County held a Public Hearing to compile and adopt ten projects on the Infrastructure Inventory. At the hearing, each County Court selected 10 high priority projects for their respective counties. The method ranged from informal discussion with participating entities to a formal prioritization process at a County Court session. Rationale: The LJDDP is a consortium of counties. Each county's representatives are very aware of the economic situation in their county, have the means to easily communicate with local sponsors, and can most accurately judge which projects would be of most economic benefit. By each county selecting their top several projects, it decreased the pool to be discussed at the Board meeting.
3. The High Priority Projects and Active Projects reports were sent to and there were copies on hand for members of the LJDDP Board along with the published criteria for the Top 10. Rationale: Members of the Board had information on all projects and were aware of which were ranked "high" and therefore eligible for the Top 10.
4. At the November 29 meeting, each County presented a list of their four highest priority projects. Each County's priority list of projects was discussed in turn, including a discussion of the projects' alignment with the criteria, definitions (e.g., immediate job creation), regional impact, etc. Rationale: Board members gained awareness of the projects brought forth by all three counties. They discussed the degree to which projects did, or did not, meet the criteria and their impact on the regional economy.
5. Three projects from each County were chosen with the 10th project being sited in Wheeler County and having the greatest regional impact. Rationale: The Board took a County approach to determining the Top 10 projects, selecting those that would have the greatest impact on regional economic development, within each County and for the region as a whole

Mid-Willamette Valley Region

(Marion, Polk, and Yamhill Counties)

Nomination forms and an explanatory memo outlining major criteria were first sent to every local government in the region. Everyone had about three weeks to respond. Board staff also followed up with phone calls or meetings with the largest cities with the most potential for regionally significant projects, reviewed last year's EDA project list (CEDs), and talked with the OECD Business Development Officer. Then, after receiving nomination forms (and phone calls to clarify details in some cases) staff assembled all the nominated projects, applied the criteria on a spreadsheet and prepared a staff recommendation to the entire Board. All of the nominated projects were presented to the Board as well as the staff recommendation. The Board reviewed and discussed the nominees at their

November 1st public meeting and then made a final decision to identify 10 projects as High Impact Projects.

Mt. Hood Economic Alliance

(Clackamas, Hood River, and Wasco Counties)

The High Priority list was printed and considered by the Regional Board and each County. Each County developed a list and held a public hearing for its list. Each County brought the highest of its high priority projects to the regular Board meeting in order to narrow the list to ten projects for the region. Wasco and Hood River Counties had four projects each. Clackamas County had 6 projects (2 urban and 4 rural). The Board decided to focus projects in rural areas and where would be the

biggest economic development impact. Three were chosen from Wasco and Hood River and four rural projects were chosen from Clackamas, for a total of ten.

Multnomah-Washington Region

In September 2007, following OECDD's meeting on developing the database, the Multnomah-Washington Regional Investment Board hired a technical consultant to conduct outreach to all of the public entities in the two counties, initially using the lists provided by the department. A mailing was sent to all names listed, followed up by personal phone calls and email communications as available. A total of 72 different entities were contacted; 12 of which never responded after repeated efforts over a two-month time frame. Thirty-six of the 72 entities did not enter any projects into the database because they did not see a need for OECDD Community Infrastructure funding and/or their projects were already funded through their rate base.

On November 14, 2007, the Multnomah-Washington Regional Investment Board held a public meeting to select the top 10 Infrastructure Projects for the region, and sent out invitations to all 72 entities. Attendees included Multnomah County, Washington County, cities of Banks, Beaverton and Gresham, and Metro. The Regional Investment Board chose to follow its Six-Year Plan areas of focus—rural and distressed areas—when deciding on the top 10 Infrastructure Projects and selected the top project named by the cities of Banks, Beaverton, Cornelius, Forest Grove, Gresham, and North Plains, East Multnomah County, and Multnomah County Bridges.

Northeast Economic Alliance

(Umatilla, Union, and Wallowa Counties)

All cities, special districts, counties and many other interested organizations were invited to enter projects in the infrastructure inventory. The state system then prioritized the projects as high, medium or low priority projects.

The Northeast Oregon Alliance board met on November 20 to select the top 10 infrastructure projects for the region. Notice for the meeting was sent to the distribution list staff maintains for the Northeast Oregon Alliance board meetings – primarily board members, state employees, and the press. A quorum of the board, including county and most city representatives, attended the board meeting. Two guests participated in the prioritization discussion – one Housing and Community Development staff member and one regional economic development representative.

The high priority project lists were distributed to board members. The board members and interested parties met in sub-groups by county to discuss the high priority projects for their counties and bring forth 3-5 projects for consideration by the entire board. The county sub-groups discussed the merits, needs and impact of the various high priority projects in order to bring forth their list for consideration by the entire board. In most cases, board members knew about the projects personally, in some instances, staff provided project details to the board. For final consideration, Wallowa County board members proposed 3 projects, Umatilla County board members proposed 4 projects and Union County board members proposed 5 projects.

The counties then presented information about their top priority projects. They talked about the local and regional impacts of the projects. In many cases, the projects proposed were basic infrastructure projects that would have a significant impact on the local community, but not on the region. After discussing the projects, the board members came to consensus and voted on the top projects. They made a decision to adopt 3 projects per county and one project with a regional

impact.

Northwest Oregon Economic Alliance

(Clatsop, Columbia, and Tillamook Counties)

At the November 19 joint meeting, Columbia-Pacific Economic Development District and Northwest Oregon Economic Alliance Boards, as well as representatives from Columbia Co Commission, Tillamook County government, USDA Rural Development, City of Clatskanie, a reporter from the Clatskanie Chief, OECDD, Senator Betsy Johnson, City of Cannon Beach, Oregon Employment Dept., City of Cornelius, Columbia 911, and the Scappoose Public Library, reviewed the state-generated High Priority List. The boards decided that, for purposes of the immediate reporting, each county would select its top 3 projects and get them to Mary McArthur within the next week. Subsequently, each county's NOEA appointees met to list their top 3 priority projects, which were then sent to the County Commissions as a recommendation. Each County approved its top 3 projects.

South Central Oregon Region

(Klamath and Lake Counties)

The prioritization was an agenda item for the November 26, SCORIB meeting, and was publicized as a Public Hearing. All County Commissioners on both Boards and the City of Klamath Falls Council members were specifically notified and invited to participate in the prioritization and attend the SCORIB meeting. Representatives from Klamath and Lake County Commissioners, Crescent-Gilchrist Community Action Team, SCOEDD, and OECDD attended the meeting. RIB staff presented a list of 22 "high" priority projects. A proposal was made by a RIB member to include 3 projects from Lake County and 7 from Klamath County, with some informal reference to population bases, the City of Klamath Falls, and leaving slots for smaller communities. That proposal for composition of the "Ten" was agreed to. Five general criteria were provided by staff and used as guidance: immediacy, short-term job creation/retention projects, contribution to future economic development, critical needs among the smaller rural communities, and to best portray funding assistance required in the next 3 years to the legislature. The virtues of each project in the context of these criteria were briefly presented as they were selected for the Top-Ten list. One project suggested was withdrawn after the absence of essential ownership/operation agreements was disclosed. The importance of funding for essential community facilities in rural areas, as being comparable to infrastructure for short and long economic development, was also discussed as needing more recognition by the State.

Southeast Regional Alliance

(Grant, Harney, and Malheur Counties)

At the regular meeting of the Southeast Regional Alliance on November 26, 2007, the Board selected the Top 10 Infrastructure Inventory projects. These were the projects that, in the opinion of the Board, would result in the most economic benefit to the region. Several steps led up to the development of this final list. Briefly, the process involved:

1. All entities that had entered more than one project on the Inventory were asked to prioritize their own projects. Rationale: The sponsors are most familiar with their own projects, their relative importance, projected timelines and feasibility.
2. The High Priority Projects and Active Projects reports were sent to members of the SRA Board along with the published criteria for the Top 10. Rationale: Members of the Board will have

information on all projects and be aware of which were ranked “high” and therefore eligible for the Top 10.

3. Each county delegation was asked to select the top 5 to 10 projects from their respective counties. The method varied in each county ranging from informal discussion with participating entities to a formal prioritization process at a County Court session. Rationale: The SRA is a consortium of counties. Each county’s representatives are very aware of the economic situation in their county, have the means to easily communicate with local sponsors, and can most accurately judge which projects would be of most economic benefit. By each county selecting their top several projects, it decreased the pool to be discussed at the regional Board meeting.
4. At the November 26 meeting, each county listed their selected projects followed by discussion of the projects’ alignment with the criteria, definitions (e.g., immediate job creation), regional impact, etc. Rationale: Board members gained awareness of the projects brought forth by all three counties. They discussed the degree to which projects did, or did not, meet the criteria and their impact on the regional economy.
5. Final selections were made with 1 project from Harney County, 3 from Grant and 6 from Malheur. Rationale: The Board took a regional approach to determining the Top 10 projects, selecting those that would have the greatest impact on regional economic development, without regard to the projects’ location within the region.