

CITY OF CORVALLIS
COUNCIL WORK SESSION



AGENDA

June 14, 2010
7:00 pm

Madison Avenue Meeting Room
500 SW Madison Avenue

COUNCIL ACTION

- I. ROLL CALL
- II. UNFINISHED BUSINESS
 - A. Mayor/Council/Manager Quarterly Meeting
 - 1. Councilor Discussion (issues/topics not identified)
 - 2. Deliberations, Compensating Benefits, and the Application of Applicable Criteria
 - 3. FY 2011-2012 Budget (budget big picture, next year's budget planning, revenue enhancement, expense reduction, living within our means)
 - 4. Economic Development White Paper
 - 5. Relationships Using Self-Evaluation Tools
 - 6. Other
- III. ADJOURNMENT

For the hearing impaired, a sign language interpreter can be provided with 48 hours' notice prior to the meeting. Please call 766-6901 or TTD/TDD telephone 766-6477 to arrange for such service.

A LARGE PRINT AGENDA CAN BE AVAILABLE BY CALLING 766-6901

A Community That Honors Diversity

- C. Announcement of Appointments to Arts and Culture Commission (Amacher, Davidson, Kingstad, Segel, van Develder, Zielke, Butcher, Flowerday, Moon, Daniels)
- D. Schedule a public hearing for May 17, 2010 to consider land use applications expiration extension
- E. Approval of an Airport lease assignment (Gerding)
- F. Approval of 2010 Planning Commission and Historic Resources Commission vacancies and proposed interview schedules
- G. Acknowledgment of Comcast rate filing

The motion passed unanimously.

III. ITEMS REMOVED FROM CONSENT AGENDA – None.

IV. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- A. Adoption of Findings of Fact and Order relating to an appeal of a Land Development Hearings Board decision (VIO09-00648 – Phones Plus, Inc.)

Declarations of Ex Parte Contacts Since Public Hearing – None.

Declarations of Site Visits Since Public Hearing – None.

Councilors Hamby and Brown, respectively, moved and seconded to adopt the draft Formal Findings and Conclusions from the April 15, 2010, memorandum from the Community Development Director to the Mayor and City Council, in support of the City Council's decision to deny the appeal, thereby affirming the decision of the Land Development Hearings Board to uphold the Director's interpretation of Land Development Code provisions related to variable message signs. The motion passed unanimously.

Mayor Tomlinson announced that any participant not satisfied with the Council's decision may appeal to the State Land Use Board of Appeals within 21 days of the date of the Council's decision.

Compensating benefit

- B. Adoption of Findings of Fact and Order relating to an appeal of a Land Development Hearings Board decision (LDO09-00016 – Smith)

Councilor Brauner stated that he was absent from the Council's public hearing and had not reviewed the minutes or audio recording of the meeting. Therefore, he would abstain from the Council's decision today.

Declarations of Ex Parte Contacts Since Public Hearing – None.

Declarations of Site Visits Since Public Hearing – None.

Councilors Daniels and Hamby, respectively, moved and seconded to adopt the draft Formal Findings and Conclusions from the April 14, 2010, memorandum from the Community Development Director to the Mayor and City Council, in support of the City Council's decision to approve the appeal and approve 2215 NW 16th Street Major Lot Development Option application.

Councilor Brown noted from the public hearing that the fence would be seven feet high with a trellis at least one foot high, so the solid portion of the fence would be six feet high. The Formal Findings, on pages 7 and 8, describe the proposed fence as being eight feet high. He asked that the discrepancy be clarified.



Councilor Brown referenced the issue of compensating benefits. According to the Formal Findings (page 12), "the modified fence design will allow one of the two windows on the south facade of the home to view the street and sidewalk along NW Maple Avenue." He would like to add to this compensating benefit, "The south facade on the residence was originally a windowless wall with no view of the outside. The current owner added two new, egress windows, which greatly increased the view of pedestrians and automobile traffic on NW Maple Avenue and of the intersection with NW 16th Street. Because of the actions of the owner, public safety has been enhanced."

Community Development Director Gibb acknowledged that the fence height should be stated on page 7 of the Formal Findings as seven feet. On page 9 of the Formal Findings, paragraph 17 refers to the proposed fence, which was revised by the Council's decision to a fence seven feet high, including a one-foot trellis at the top.

City Manager Nelson concurred that paragraph 17 referenced the proposed fence, but the Council's approval is stated on page 7 of the Formal Findings, with the correction Councilor Brown requested.

Councilors Brown and Daniels, respectively, moved and seconded to amend the Formal Findings, page 7, paragraph 11, to specify a seven-foot-tall fence, rather than an eight-foot-tall fence.

In response to Councilor Hamby's inquiry, Councilor Brown confirmed that the overall fence height would be limited to seven feet, including the trellis.

The motion passed eight to zero, with Councilor Brauner abstaining.

Councilors Brown and O'Brien, respectively, moved and seconded to amend the Formal Findings, on page 12, paragraph 3, second bullet, to add "The south facade on the residence was originally a windowless wall with no view of the outside. The current owner added two new, egress windows, which greatly increased the view of pedestrians and automobile traffic on NW Maple Avenue and of the intersection with NW 16th Street. Because of the actions of the owner, public safety has been enhanced."

Councilor Raymond thanked Councilor Brown for specifying a compensating benefit.

The motion passed eight to zero, with Councilor Brauner abstaining.

*** MEMORANDUM ***

JUNE 8, 2010

TO: MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL
FROM: JON S. NELSON, CITY MANAGER 
SUBJECT: JUNE 14, 2010 WORK SESSION DISCUSSION ON FY 2011-12 BUDGET

Background information that may be helpful to your discussion follows.

Relevant Timelines

- * 2009-10 preliminary audit information and resulting revenue and expenditure projections available in September
- * November 2010 and May 2011 election time lines are attached

Major work efforts involving City Council/City staff for the balance of 2010

- | | |
|--|---|
| * LDC packages | * Elections and orientation |
| * Airport Industrial Park | * Econ Development policy: review & metrics |
| * Downtown Parking | * TMDL |
| * S. Corvallis planned development removal | * Labor/Management committee discussions |
| * SIF | * Budget 10/11 & 11/12 |
| * Enterprise Zone expansion | |

FY 2011-12 Budget - Next Steps

June Work Session

- Initial City Council discussion, including gauging interest in revenue alternatives (in addition to SIF)

September Work Session

- Review revised projections
- Determine reduction methodology (services to be considered, board and commissions involvement)

November work session

- Review reduction methodology outcomes
- Discuss next steps

c: Department Directors

CITY OPERATING LEVY TIMELINE

NOVEMBER 2, 2010 ELECTION

DRAFT

| <u>Date</u> | <u>Event</u> |
|--------------------|--|
| June 23 | CAO or Finance submits draft Ballot Title to Administrative Services Committee |
| July 6 | City Council approves Ballot Title |
| July 12 | Assistant to City Manager/City Recorder publishes "Notice of Receipt of Ballot Title" |
| July 12 - 27 | Forward Explanatory Statement and any other public outreach materials to State Elections Division for advocacy review |
| July 20 | Deadline to file dissatisfaction with Circuit Court |
| July 21 - 28 ? | Circuit Court holds hearing and decides on ballot title if appealed |
| August 2 | City Council adopts resolution scheduling an election on November 2, 2010 sending levy to a vote of the people, and directing the Assistant to City Manager/City Recorder to publish notice of municipal election (probably need to have public comments at this meeting?) |
| August 4 | Administrative Services Committee reviews/approves Voters' Pamphlet (Explanatory Statement) |
| August 16 | City Council considers/approves Explanatory Statement |
| September 2 | Last day for ACM/CR to file Notice of Measure and Explanatory Statement with Benton County Elections |
| September 24 | Explanatory Statement published in " <i>the City</i> " |
| Mid-October | Ballots in mailboxes |
| October 16 and 23 | ACM/CR publishes "Notice of Municipal Election" and post in four locations |
| November 2 | Election |
| December 6 | ACM/CR prepares Abstract of Votes and Canvass of Votes to City Council |

CITY OPERATING LEVY TIMELINE

MAY 17, 2011 ELECTION

DRAFT

Jon,
Using current
Standard Comte
Schedule —
K

| <u>Date</u> | <u>Event</u> |
|--------------------|--|
| January 5 | CAO or Finance submits draft Ballot Title to Administrative Services Committee |
| January 18 | City Council approves Ballot Title |
| January 24 | Assistant to City Manager/City Recorder publishes "Notice of Receipt of Ballot Title" |
| February 2 | Deadline to file dissatisfaction with Circuit Court |
| February 2 - 16 | Forward Explanatory Statement and any other public outreach materials to State Elections Division for advocacy review |
| February 7-11? | Circuit Court holds hearing and decides on ballot title if appealed |
| February 22 | City Council adopts resolution scheduling an election on May 17, 2011 sending levy to a vote of the people, and directing the Assistant to City Manager/City Recorder to publish notice of municipal election (probably need to have public comments at this meeting?) |
| February 23 | Administrative Services Committee reviews/approves Voters' Pamphlet (Explanatory Statement) |
| March 7 | City Council considers/approves Explanatory Statement |
| March 17 | Last day for ACM/CR to file Notice of Measure and Explanatory Statement with Benton County Elections |
| April 29 | Explanatory Statement published in "the City" |
| Mid-April | Ballots in mailboxes |
| April 30 and May 7 | ACM/CR publishes "Notice of Municipal Election" and post in four locations |
| May 17 | Election |
| June 6 | ACM/CR prepares Abstract of Votes and Canvass of Votes to City Council |

RECEIVED

[Type text]

MAY 28 2010

April 29, 2010

CITY MANAGERS
OFFICE

To: Budget Commission Chair, Jacque Schreck

From: Parks, Natural Areas and Recreation Board Chair, Jennifer de-Vries

Memo: Parks and Recreation Budget Reductions

On April 1st and 15th, the Parks, Natural Areas and Recreation Advisory Board (PNARB) convened to discuss the \$2.4 million shortfall in property taxes that must be balanced through Departmental reductions for FY 10-11. After discussion with Nancy Brewer, department staff, and board members we ask that the following recommendations be considered. We strongly believe that a long term, multi-faceted approach, needs to be the focus of budget commission and city council action. We feel the short term recommendation, though necessary, is short-sighted if it is the only action that will be taken to address the budget shortfall. With this concept in mind we offer the following:

Immediate considerations

The PNARB reluctantly endorses the staff proposal that reduces the Parks and Recreation budget of \$420,600 with a supplemental budget reduction of \$73,520. We are extremely concerned that these reductions will only serve as a stop gap and will have a devastating impact if similar or additional reductions will need to be made for FY 11-12. The immediate impact will have major consequences to service levels and ability to provide programs that the community has come to expect from the Parks and Recreation Department. Of the supplemental budget reduction, we are particularly concerned about removing the Youth Volunteer Corps and the Youth Parks Corps, programs with both short term benefits to city services and the youth and long term benefits for the youth participating. We are concerned as well, regarding FTE reductions proposed which affect permanent staff.

Additionally, there is concern that the methodology chosen to "share" reductions across departments, may be an unrealistic approach given that some departments have limitations that others do not which will likely place a higher burden on departments such as Parks and Recreation to deal with the brunt of the reductions. That being said, the compounding effects of addressing this year's reduction and next year's anticipated reduction will mean major cuts in programs and services that will drastically impact the community. Other considerations must be addressed:

- Review support levels of partners that also receive funding. Partner support should be reduced at levels at least equivalent to reductions in department funding levels.
- Review the recently approved Community and Department enhancement requests adopted over the last four years and the recent Sustainability Initiative proposals. Potentially postpone action and/or review the process for future consideration to ensure current budgetary needs are addressed first.
 - Additional note: Change name of enhancement requests to something more accurate like, add-back request or additional budget request, since many of these requests are developed to return to previous service levels which were cut or to address increase in service demands
- Review Capital Improvement Program and potentially postpone projects.
- Review and change the current policy that uses the mean of comparators of other cities for salaries. Consider using Oregon and/or Federal cost of living (COLA) factors instead.

[Type text]

- Review and change the current cost recovery methodology that Parks and Recreation must use to allow more flexibility to generate revenue

Intermediate considerations

- Implement greater cross-department planning and staffing decisions to ensure the greatest leveraging of resources for the entire community
- Facilitate cross-commission sessions to develop comprehensive business plan for the city
- Encourage and support advocacy groups to support potential long-term financial strategies such as a levy or a special district
- Consider using a third party firm to address the financial and political feasibility to pass a levy or special district
- Review current reserve policy and see if that needs to be addressed to ensure long term financial stability
- Invest in developing Corvallis as tourist destination to generate additional revenue streams.

Long term solutions

- Implement long term strategies based on results from third party findings and support from advocacy groups
- Develop on-going public review of business plan and impacts to community
- Consider re-establishing the Core Service Committee disbanded by the City Council in the fall of 2007. Charge that committee with developing a 5-year long-term financial plan that suggests ways to provide stable, reliable funding for City services now dependent primarily on property taxes.

We appreciate the difficult task you have before you and encourage open dialog throughout the process. Our goal is to be well informed and help create long term solutions while minimizing immediate impact to services and programs. We are committed to being advocates for the Parks and Recreation Department and the well being of the Corvallis community.

To: City Council
From: Dan Brown

June 10, 2010

Subject: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

I've been allocated five to ten minutes at the June 14 work session to discuss the topic of Economic Development. Hopefully in preparation for the meeting, Councilors will be able to review the white paper, *Corvallis City Government and Local Economic Development*, especially the Executive Summary. Here is a skeleton of my discussion.

Proposals:

1. The City Council would take a leadership role by providing policy direction for the community by taking a more active stance. This would involve development of: goals, strategy, and budget.

Goals - Prioritize City Goals and Community Goals

For example: Increase family-wage jobs in Corvallis

Strategy - Commission a Strategic Plan to be prepared by ED professionals

Emphasis on the plan, not process for creating it

Budget - Set level of investment for influencing our economic future

To be determined - depends on goals and available resources

2. The City Council would direct City Staff to take a more active role in implementing the strategy.

Administration - Staff would administer ED budget and activities

Metrics - Indicators, baselines, and benchmarks to measure progress toward goals

RFP Process - Request for Proposals channel activities to be performed by agents

Justification:

Corvallis is in the middle of an economic transition which was precipitated by national, regional and local events. In particular, government data show that local employment and wages have suffered for more than a decade. These concerns are reflected in the public's concern about economic issues expressed on the *Corvallis Citizen Attitude Survey*.

The long-term (5-10 years) economic sustainability of the community can be improved by strategically rebuilding the local economic engine in order to increase both property tax revenues as well as the incomes of Corvallis workers and families.

*** * * MEMORANDUM * * ***

JUNE 8, 2010

TO: MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL

FROM: KATHY LOUIE, ASSISTANT TO CITY MANAGER/CITY RECORDER

SUBJECT: SELF-EVALUATION FORMS



A total of seven self-evaluation forms was received and tabulated. Attached is a compilation of the responses for your June 14 quarterly work session discussion.

c: City Manager Nelson

Attachment

CORVALLIS CITY COUNCIL
Self-Evaluation
June 14, 2010

Self-Evaluation
General Practices
(Updated January 2007)

| | 1 | 1.5 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 3 | 06/14 | 09/14/09 |
|--|------------|-----|------------------|-----|-------------|----------------|----------------|
| How are we doing on <i>General Practices</i>? | Low | | Mid-range | | High | Average | Average |
| 1. Thinking and acting strategically | 2 | | 4 | 1 | | 1.79 | 2.00 |
| 2. Understanding and demonstrating the elements of teams and teamwork | | 1 | 5 | 1 | | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| 3. Mastering "small group" decision-making | | | 4 | 3 | | 2.21 | 2.11 |
| 4. Clearly defined roles and relationships | | | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2.29 | 2.15 |
| 5. Council/staff partnership | 1 | | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2.07 | 2.35 |
| 6. Systematic evaluation of policy implementation | 1 | | 4 | 2 | | 2.00 | 2.10 |
| 7. Allocation of Council time and energy | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | | 1.93 | 2.00 |
| 8. Clear rules and procedures for Council meetings | | | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2.50 | 2.45 |
| 9. Response to the public's concerns and evaluation of Council performance | | 2 | 3 | 2 | | 2.00 | 2.15 |
| 10. Continuous personal learning and leadership development | 1 | | 4 | 1 | 1 | 2.07 | 2.40 |

Additional Comments:

- 1. We seem to have lost a long-term perspective in our work; endlessly debating minor issues.
- 9. We sometimes do not give feedback to citizen requests; they do not know where the Council stands on a matter.
- This is a hard time for citizens, a hard time for the city and a hard time for the mayor and council. There are opportunities afforded by this adversity if we can avoid expending much capital on the trifling or absurd. We have two choices; accept conditions as they exist or accept the responsibility for changing them. I encourage the latter.
- 1. I have learned from experience that I must not ask for clarification, but say "I have a question for staff that I would like answered." Otherwise it will be misinterpreted.
- 2. I have learned that asking certain in depth questions are taken to be offensive and will not be answered.

**Self-Evaluation
Specific Practices
(Updated January 2007)**

| | 1 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.5 | 3 | 06/14 | 09/14/09 |
|--|------------|-----|------------------|-----|-------------|----------------|----------------|
| How are we doing on <i>Specific Practices</i>? | Low | | Mid-range | | High | Average | Average |
| 1. Effective chartering of committees and acceptance of committee work | | 1 | 4 | 2 | | 2.07 | 2.20 |
| 2. Prioritizing goals and initiatives and avoiding over-commitment | | 1 | 5 | | 1 | 2.07 | 2.30 |
| 3. Educating ourselves about issues | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1.93 | 2.20 |
| 4. Limiting amount of time spent on “small-picture” activities | 2 | | 4 | | 1 | 1.86 | 1.95 |
| 5. Regular evaluation of our effectiveness as a Council | | | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2.21 | 2.35 |
| 6. Celebrating success – our own and that of others | | | 6 | 1 | | 2.07 | 2.15 |

Additional Comments:

- 3. Are we fully informed about community issues?
- 4. Are we so intent on our own agendas that we lose sight of the big picture and strategic direction?
- I'd like to see us review our city structure/processes for developing and bringing forth fees/taxes ideas – maybe other areas as well.

**Self-Evaluation
Code of Conduct
(Revised February 2009)**

| | 1 | 1.5 | 2 | 2.5 | 3 | 06/14 | 09/14/09 |
|---|------------|-----|------------------|-----|-------------|----------------|----------------|
| How are we doing on <i>Code of Conduct</i>? | Low | | Mid-range | | High | Average | Average |
| 1. Show consideration; avoid judgmental language | | 2 | 5 | | | 1.86 | 2.20 |
| 2. Strive as a team to keep opposition from moving into conflict | | 1 | 4 | 2 | | 2.07 | 2.40 |
| 3. State your opinion; explain reasoning and intent (succinctly); respect the decisions of the body | | | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2.29 | 2.20 |
| 4. Focus on understanding interests | | | 5 | 2 | | 2.14 | 2.20 |
| 5. Be concise and respectful while focusing on issue | | | 5 | 2 | | 2.14 | 2.20 |
| 6. Assume best intentions as you seek common ground | | | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2.21 | 2.40 |
| 7. Be honest, reliable, and accountable | | | 5 | | 2 | 2.29 | 2.55 |
| 8. Prepare adequately for meetings | | 2 | 3 | 2 | | 2.00 | 2.35 |

Additional Comments:

- I'm a bit concerned about language used in reference to some of our citizens.
- We might benefit from finding more means for councilor to get clarity about issues of interest to them. Sometimes we spend longer times at council giving clarifying information than I would prefer.

TO: Mayor, Councilors, City Manager 10
FROM: Trish Daniels
SUBJECT: June 14, 2010 Council Work Session
Item #3—FY 2011-2012 Budget

Before beginning a budget discussion, it seems to me we ought to think carefully about how we want to spend our limited time and resources as a council during the final six months of our term. Do we want to devote most of that time developing long-term, big-picture recommendations for a council or councils that are under no obligation to implement such recommendations? Do we want to work on nothing but budget issues for the remainder of the term? Do we want to spend the time trying to guess what our constituents want, or don't want, or will support? Do we want to set up the next council to rush into yet another unsuccessful attempt to ask voters for more revenue?

My opinion is that we still have work to do in other areas, completing things we've started and following through on our goals we set when our term began. Therefore, I suggest that we consider the following courses of action regarding our budget questions.

1. Ask our citizens what they want. Hire an Oregon firm experienced in working with local governments, to conduct intensive, targeted polling of our voting population to ascertain what city programs community members most strongly support, and at what level. We need to know whether there is or is not support for a potential future levy, and where the support (if any) lies—who will be the strongest advocates for city programs and work to sustain them. Several such firms have given workshops over the years at LOC conferences, and their track records are generally positive. Fall
2. Form a Financial SWAT team: 5-7 current and former budget commissioners (already familiar with city finances, budget issues, and working with staff) for the purpose of making recommendations about the budget big picture in particular, but also about the shorter term if they wish to. Such a financially and politically experienced group would provide two clear benefits:
 - Because they would focus only on budgetary matters, they could save us considerable time and effort in developing expert near-term advice, with regard to budgetary decisions we still must make in the months remaining in our term, and
 - Because of their Budget Commission background, they would be able to provide continuity into next council term and long-term strategic guidance to future councils.
3. Avoid taking actions that may jeopardize support for possible levy or other taxes, fees, or means of increasing revenues.
4. Ask city employees if they wish to participate, or make a proposal that could result in significant expenditure reductions (such as a COLA moratorium, wage freeze,

reduced schedules, or furloughs, for example). They may choose not to, but they ought to be asked if they want to do so.

5. Face the fact that cuts next year will be necessary. Given the legal deadlines and requirements that must be met to put a measure on the ballot, it is close to impossible to adequately prepare for a levy request before next spring at the earliest. Additionally, I have heard from both friends and constituents the opinion that before they will support a levy, they need to believe we're making the same kinds of sacrifices they and their employers are already making. I recognize that this is anecdotal information, but since Ward 2 has a long record of strong support for city measures, the fact that its voters are expressing such sentiment is of serious concern. The draconian measures we're facing for next budget cycle will be unable to avoid highly visible changes to our operations and the levels of service we will be able to provide.
6. Evaluate the SWAT team recommendations, the polling results, and the strength and will of advocacy groups (for a political campaign). Estimate the amount of time it will take for each of these actions to be completed. Then, if all signs appear positive, work with supporters and advocates to build a levy proposal that accomplishes what the community says it wants.
7. Make a realistic estimate of the amount of time required to prepare for and execute a successful campaign. (**NOTE:** this does not mean what we would like to see in order to avoid further cuts. It means how long the people doing the actual work believe it will take them.) Work with the supporters and advocates to put the levy request on the ballot as soon as is realistically possible.
8. Work with other jurisdictions about their funding requirements and the timing of these revenue measures. The County will need to re-authorize its public safety levy, the school district its local option levy, and the County may opt for a jail bond measure.

As a veteran of many local political campaigns, including managing 10 successful city and county races, my very rough estimate of a timeline is:

July-December 2010: items 1-4 and 8
January-February 2011: items 5 and 6
February-August 2011: items 6 and 7.

This would indicate that a levy could go on the ballot in Sept. or November 2011.

6-14-10
Don Brown

CORVALLIS CITY GOVERNMENT AND LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT*

When I was a young-un - came to Corvallis in 1974

Joined School of Business and Technology / Agricultural Business Major
The Great Pumpkin departed - Beaver Football Team had 25 losing seasons
Corvallis had OSU, forest products, and agricultural processing
Hospital was on Harrison and 29th and Clinic was near senior center
Timberhill development just getting started and Albertsons was the north center
Gables was the restaurant, Mazzis, the Valley, Nearly Normals, were the others
Tower (McMenamins) and new Nendells for drinks

Olden days, I witnessed

1978 (HP)
1980s (forest products & ag processing recession)
1997 (peak employment & wages)

Fun Facts for a Data Head

Local economy is more cyclical than state or nation
Even OSU enrollment peals and declines
Corvallis is very different from the rest of Benton County.
Average income Corvallis is much, much lower than in the rest of Benton Co.
Median income in Linn County is higher than in Benton County.

Target Audience is the City Council, the City's Elected Policy-Making Body

Economic Development Service in the City Attitude Survey
Council Goal for 2009-10

Outmoded *Comprehensive Plan* Assumptions

"Recent growth in high-tech manufacturing, especially at Hewlett-Packard has led to relocation and local creation of numerous high-tech related enterprises."

"Benton County's low unemployment rate has made it difficult for many Corvallis employers to locate qualified, skilled workers for available jobs."

"Large parcels of general industrial land are key elements in the industrial land market that serve as magnets for development."

***Economic Development** = the addition of new economic activity. Includes replacement.

Philosophy for Elected Policy-Making Body

| | |
|----------------|--|
| Passive | Active: Goals, Strategies, Investment |
|----------------|--|

Policy-Level Goals

| | |
|---|--|
| Community Goals: Economic Vitality | City Goals: Fund City Services |
| 1. Stability | 1. Stability of Funding - Balanced Budgets |
| 2. Jobs | 2. City Property Tax (but No Income Tax) |
| 3. Capital Investment | 3. City Infrastructure |
| 4. Sales Revenue | 4. No Sales Tax |

Policy-Level Strategies

| | |
|--|---|
| 1. Existing Companies (Retain) | 2. New Companies (Create / Recruit) |
| 3. Targeting / Diversification | 4. Targeting / Synergy |
| 5. City of Corvallis Alone | 6. Partnership(s): Benton, COG, etc. |
| 7. No Investment in ED | 8. Big Investment (i.e. \$1 mil annually) |

Implementation by City staff

After Council establishes **Goals and Strategy**

Metrics of Success

- For Example, **Jobs:**
- # new jobs, wages, benefits
- Corvallis, Benton County, etc.
- Impact on City property taxes
- Sectors: public, not-for-profit, private, traded-sector, retail
- Unemployment
- Attitudes about Employment

In-House or Out-Placed (**RFP Process**)