



# Oregon

John A. Kitzhaber, M.D., Governor

## Department of Land Conservation and Development

635 Capitol Street NE, Suite 150

Salem, Oregon 97301-2540

Phone: (503) 373-0050

Fax: (503) 378-5518

[www.oregon.gov/LCD](http://www.oregon.gov/LCD)



January 21, 2015

TO: Grants Advisory Committee

FROM: Rob Hallyburton, Community Services Division Manager

RE: Materials for January 29, 2015 meeting

The background materials for our meeting are included in this report or attached. We have provided some explanation and analysis for your information.

### **I. REVIEW OF 2013-15 GRANTS/PROGRAM STATUS**

The following table shows the payment status of the grants, by category, for this biennium.

**Table 1.** 2013-15 Grant Program Payment Summary by Program

Grant Program	Number of Grants	Amount Awarded	Notes
Planning Assistance	93	\$113,000	85 cities and 8 counties accepted
CR Gorge	3	\$240,000	\$120,000 paid; none overdue
Dispute Resolution	1	\$20,000	\$10,000 paid; none overdue
Periodic Review	3	\$108,000	\$51,227 paid; \$18,000 overdue
Technical Assistance	19	\$561,300	\$48,433 paid; \$55,392 overdue
Population forecast	1	\$440,716	\$242,494 paid; none overdue

Additional detail on Periodic Review and Technical Assistance grants is provided in Attachment A.

### **II. STATUS OF THE GRANT FUND**

The Governor's 2015-17 recommended budget has been released. The department's General Fund grant budget is proposed to be \$2,027,115. This is equal to the 2013-15 budget, minus an \$80,000 one-time allotment for the Columbia River Gorge Commission, then adjusted for inflation, and then supplemented with an additional \$500,000. Staff recommends the advisory committee plan for this level of funding until a reason to assume otherwise emerges from the legislature.

### **III. 2015-17 GRANTS ALLOCATION PLAN**

The 2013-15 Grants Allocation Plan is available at [http://www.oregon.gov/LCD/docs/grants/2013-15\\_Grants\\_Allocation\\_Plan.pdf](http://www.oregon.gov/LCD/docs/grants/2013-15_Grants_Allocation_Plan.pdf) for reference.

#### **A. Changing Circumstances**

The Grants Allocation Plan for the current biennium includes five categories or types of grants:

1. Planning Assistance (to small cities and counties)
2. Columbia River Gorge (to counties)
3. Dispute Resolution (to Portland State University)
4. Periodic Review (PR – by application)
5. Technical Assistance (TA – by application)

The allocation plan allots a sum for each of the first three categories, essentially making them the first priority for use of funds. TA gets whatever remains after the first four categories are funded.

The committee will decide whether to adjust these categories and priorities. There are external and internal influences that will affect that decision.

#### **1. Statutory Influences**

**Population Forecasting.** As reported to the committee in September, [HB 2253](#) (2013) requires the Portland State University Population Research Center to coordinate and develop population forecasts for jurisdictions statewide, and for the department to fund the work. Subsection 5 (6) of the bill provides:

The population forecasting program operated by the Portland State University Population Research Center pursuant to section 2 of this 2013 Act is the highest priority for the allocation of grant funding...

In order to comply with this law, the allocation plan needs to incorporate a new priority use of the grant fund. During 2013-2015, the grant to PSU for population forecasting was for \$440,716. The department has received a preliminary, rough estimate from PSU that the request will be larger next biennium. Since this becomes the highest priority use of funds it would be reasonable to create a special category for the population forecast grant.

**Regional Solutions.** Again as we discussed in September, [HB 4015](#) (2014) requires certain state agencies to include considerations when exercising their grant-making authority. The bill states:

In awarding grants, loans or incentive funds for projects undertaken in connection with grant, loan or incentive programs, state agencies listed in section 3 (3)(a)(A) to (E) of this 2014 Act [which includes DLCD] shall, consistent with the programs' enabling legislation, rules and regulations, use regional priorities for community and economic development as described in section 3 of this 2014 Act in the consideration of project funding decisions and base decisions of which projects to undertake upon whether the project will:

- (1) Use regional and community-based problem solving.
- (2) Support regional and community-based means of integrating state and local resources and services.
- (3) Create jobs in relation to the economy and population of the region directly impacted by the project.
- (4) Involve investment of capital in relation to the economy and population of the region directly impacted by the project.
- (5) Have community support, as indicated by the support of the governing body of the local government.
- (6) Have obtained appropriate land use and environmental reviews and authorizations prior to utilization of funds.

This bill primarily affects TA grant priorities. Recognition of this requirement should be included in the award priorities in allocation plan for TA grants. Current regional priorities are provided in Attachment B for your information. The department has considered regional priorities in past grant cycles but the priorities have not been a scoring criterion. This legislation formalizes the relationship and argues for recognition in the allocation plan.

The allocation plan should also include a new section explaining how the grant program as a whole supports regional priorities and considers the elements enumerated in the bill. Department staff will draft that section based on input from the advisory committee.

## **2. Department Initiatives**

***Community Development.*** The department submitted a request for funding of a package called “Regional Solutions Community Development” in its budget request. The department requested five new positions to “engage with local efforts to revitalize communities, seek infrastructure solutions, and build community participation.” Two of those positions were funded (three went to Business Oregon). In its September staff report, the department notified the advisory committee that, if the request got approved, DLCD would propose that the allocation plan include an allotment for community development projects.

The DLCD grant fund has traditionally been used to create and maintain comprehensive land use plans under the statewide land use planning goals. The community development program would expand this focus to include “next steps” such as downtown plans, urban renewal plans, Local Improvement District formulation, design charrettes, and other projects “downstream” of the comprehensive plan. The idea is to assist a community get ready for development once its comprehensive plan is up to date.

The department requests \$150,000 of the grant fund be dedicated for these projects. This proposal would dedicate half of this amount for non-competitive awards. That is, half of the money would go to projects through approval of applications (as TA grants are awarded now) while the other half would be reserved for worthy projects as they arose throughout the biennium. The director would decide how to use these funds on a case-by-case basis according to guidance in the Grants Allocation Plan.

**Natural Hazards Planning.** The September staff report explained another multi-department initiative relating to natural hazards. The department proposed a “Natural Hazards Program” funding package to continue efforts begun in 2011-13 to update the Oregon Natural Hazards Mitigation Plan (NHMP) and develop a new risk assessment methodology to help the state better allocate mitigation resources. The department has the lead role in updating the statewide plan. One important focus of the current Oregon NHMP update is to obtain approval from FEMA for the updated Oregon NHMP as an “enhanced” plan. Having an enhanced plan will make the state eligible for additional federal funding following a presidentially declared disaster. One requirement for enhanced plan status is demonstrating the state’s commitment to natural hazard mitigation, which includes providing funding and technical assistance to local governments.

Local NHMPs must be updated every five years for communities to remain eligible for federal recovery and mitigation assistance following natural disasters. These updates are supported – but not fully funded – by FEMA, and local governments often have difficulty providing the required match from non-federal sources. TA grants could help local governments meet the 25-percent cost-share requirement while leveraging federal dollars. Some communities may not receive or have the resources to accept federal funding, but still desire to develop or update a NHMP. We encourage them to do so to protect the health, safety, and welfare of their residents, and to remain eligible for federal mitigation funding. TA grants would provide the support they need.

In addition, Goal 7 requires cities and counties to incorporate the new hazard risk information into comprehensive plans and development regulations. The department anticipates that DOGAMI will be generating detailed data on landslides during the coming biennium. The department prefers to provide funding to assist in compliance with a goal requirement.

In summary, the department proposes to include natural hazard planning as a priority use of TA grants in order to assist local governments in:

- Obtaining enhanced plan status and with it eligibility for increased federal funding
- Encouraging local governments to engage in natural hazard mitigation planning
- Leveraging federal dollars
- Assisting local governments with satisfying their Goal 7 obligations; and
- Integrating local natural hazard mitigation and comprehensive plans

#### **B. Status of Periodic Review Program**

The cities that are currently in periodic review are mostly finishing their work programs, so the demand for PR grants from these cities in 2015-17 is expected to be low but probably not zero. The department has polled jurisdictions that are eligible for periodic review and found some interest, but it is likely that no jurisdiction will be prepared to begin task completion work until the middle of the biennium at the earliest because a work program would need to be developed first. Work program development is eligible for grant funding, so there could be some demand earlier in the biennium should new cities be brought into periodic review.

Since the budget won’t be final until after the allocation plan should be complete, there will continue to be uncertainty on whether it is advisable from a grants perspective to start additional

cities in the periodic review process. The allocation plan could have two or more scenarios for the level of funding for PR grants to respond to possible budget outcomes.

**C. Size of Planning Assistance Grants**

The amount of Planning Assistance grants (\$1,000 per biennium to cities under 2,500 population and \$3,500 to counties smaller than 15,000 population) has not been changed in years, if ever. The department recommends they stay at the current level for 2015-17. Unless the grants are increased substantially, they still won't be large enough for a local government to complete a significant planning project. The department believes the funds that would go to increasing Planning Assistance grants would have a more beneficial effect going to TA grants, where the larger awards can have a noticeable impact on the local planning program.

**D. Grant Program Priorities**

Based on the foregoing analysis, the department provides the following scenario for discussion purposes.

**1. Grant Program Priorities**

Table 2 shows one possible scheme for 2015-17, with the 2013-15 priorities and funding levels shown for comparison.

**Table 2.** 2013-2015 and 2015-2017 Grant Categories and Budget Comparison

	<b>2013-2015</b>	<b>2015-2017</b>
<b>Grant Budget</b>	<b>\$1,562,635</b>	<b>\$2,027,115</b>
Columbia River Gorge Comm.	80,000	NA
Population Forecast	440,716	600,000*
Planning Assistance	113,000	147,000**
Columbia River Gorge counties	240,000	240,000
Dispute Resolution	20,000	20,000
Community Development	NA	150,000
Periodic Review	108,000	50,000*
Technical Assistance	561,300	820,115*

\* Estimated

\*\* The demand for Planning Assistance grants was down in 2013-15. The level proposed for planning purposes is the highest demand the department has experienced. If every city and county accepted the grant, the total would be \$166,000.

**2. Technical Assistance Priorities**

The 2013-15 allocation plan states:

The committee recommends that technical assistance grants again be focused on the following topics in the listed order of priority. The priorities are for projects that:

1. Promote economic development
2. Advance regulatory streamlining

3. Provide infrastructure financing plans for urbanizing areas
4. Update comprehensive plans and implementing codes to respond to changes in state law
5. Provide coordinated county-wide population projections

The fifth priority could be dropped as the population forecast function has been given to Portland State University (except for the Portland metro region). The department requests adding natural hazards planning as a priority (see “Natural Hazards Planning” in subsection III.A.2, p. 4). Other deletion, insertion, and reordering ideas should be discussed by the advisory committee.

HB 4015 requires the department to “use regional priorities for community and economic development... in the consideration of project funding decisions” (see “Regional Solutions” in subsection III.A.1, pp. 2–3). The current regional priorities are provided in Attachment B. Department staff has marked those that appear to be directly applicable to TA grant priorities (\*) and those that may apply (?). Certain themes that could lead to projects requesting TA grants appear in multiple regions: industrial land availability and readiness, provision of infrastructure, and regulatory streamlining (although local process streamlining is never mentioned specifically) are common. Housing and downtown revitalization are less common but recurring. The level of specificity and amount of explanation of the priorities varies from region to region, so the meaning of certain priorities is not entirely clear from some lists.

A reasonable question for the committee to discuss is whether the current TA priorities parallel the regional priorities closely enough, or should the allocation plan create a more explicit tie between regional priorities and TA grant award decisions. Should planning for workforce or affordable housing or downtown revitalization, or both, be a TA grant priority?

The bill also includes a list of “considerations” for “decisions of which projects to undertake” (p. 3). Most of these considerations do not appear directly relevant to individual award decisions in the TA grant program, and therefore would not translate well to approval criteria. They could be addressed in the allocation plan at a programmatic level (*e.g.*, *all* of the grants use regional or community-based problem solving). One consideration, number 5, regarding support from the local governing body, is specific and has not been strictly practiced by the department. That is, we have accepted grant applications signed by any official from the local government (*e.g.*, planning director, city administrator). Requiring a memo of support from the elected body is encouraged by HB 4015 and is a worthwhile consideration for TA grants.

### **E. Leveraging**

The allocation plan includes this about the part leveraging plays in making grant award decisions.

The committee does not recommend that a local cash or in-kind match be required for individual grants. Typically for a local government to provide a cash match, the match must be budgeted ahead of time which increases the lead time for project planning. Cash matches may also be particularly difficult for small jurisdictions. The required lead time and the uncertainty of grant awards present barriers to participation for some communities and may result in missed

opportunities for the program. Regardless of any hard match requirement, however, a local government must provide in-kind resources for grant administration and must facilitate the local decision-making process.

The department recognizes that matching funds provide a more fully funded project and increase the likelihood that a project will be successfully completed. Matching funds also demonstrate local or regional commitment to a project. Therefore, within the priorities above, greater consideration should be given to projects that offer hard matching funds. All funding sources that will contribute to the successful completion of a project will be considered, including cash and in-kind, local and non-local, and public and private investments.

The committee has previously recommended that the department primarily leverage grant funds at the program level rather than for individual grants. The committee has specifically recommended that DLCD partner with other agencies and programs, such as the Transportation Growth Management Program, the Regional Solutions Teams, and Business Oregon, as the primary approach for leveraging DLCD grant funds. The department will continue to seek opportunities for local, state, and federal investment partnership. Under current budget circumstances, projects that demonstrate regional coordination and cost sharing opportunities will be strongly considered in an effort to maximize the impact of planning grants in Oregon communities.

This section is likely to be amended to recognize the requirements of HB 4075 (see “Regional Solutions” in subsection III.A.1, pp. 2–3). The department does not have any specific recommendations for altering the leveraging policy, but would like the committee to affirm or amend the policy as it sees fit.

#### **IV. CONCLUSION**

The department has not prepared a draft 2015-17 Grants Allocation Plan because it needs committee contributions first. Without a draft, the advisory committee will not be able to make a final recommendation on the plan at the January meeting. Some committee members will be occupied by the upcoming legislative session, making it potentially difficult to schedule another committee meeting in time to complete a recommendation for LCDC to consider during this biennium.

#### **ATTACHMENTS**

- A. 2013-15 Technical Assistance Grant Status
- B. Regional Solutions Regional Priorities

## ATTACHMENT A

### 2013-15 Technical Assistance Grant Status

Grantee	Type	Title	Grant Amount	Payment status
Hermiston	PR	Task 5 - Transportation Task 6 - Goal 5 Natural Resources	\$18,000	Overdue
Pendleton	PR	Transportation System Plan Update	\$10,000	Closed out
Portland	PR	Periodic Review Tasks 3, 4, and 5	\$80,000	On time
Amity	TA	Amity Economic Opportunities Analysis.	\$11,800	Not overdue
Arlington	TA	Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance update	\$14,000	On time
Canyonville	TA	Water Master Plan	\$40,000	Overdue
Coos Bay	TA	Community Development Code Review and Partial Rewrite	\$20,000	Not overdue
Coos County	TA	Land Development Ordinance and Comp Plan updates	\$12,000	Overdue
Hines	TA	Document Digitalization and Update	\$2,000	Not overdue
Hood River	TA	Buildable Lands Inventory and Housing Analysis	\$30,000	Not overdue
Lane County	TA	Goshen Sewer Feasibility Study	\$30,000	Not overdue
LCOG	TA	Integrating the Retooling of the ORWAP in the Land Use Planning and Policy Process.	\$56,500	Overdue
MWVCOG	TA	Donald and Gervais Comprehensive Plan Updates/ Housing and Economic Elements	\$70,000	Not overdue
Port of Portland	TA	Metro Regional Industrial Site Readiness Project	\$5,000	Closed out
Port of The Dalles	TA	Local Wetland Planning Inventory	\$10,000	Not overdue
Sutherlin	TA	Economic Prosperity Initiative	\$40,000	On time
Tigard	TA	Public Infrastructure Finance Plan & Partnership	\$35,000	Not overdue
Tillamook County	TA	Land Use Ordinance and Comprehensive Plan modernization	\$30,000	Overdue
Umatilla County	TA	Highway 395 Corridor Economic Revitalization Toolbox Scoping	\$25,000	Not overdue
West Linn	TA	Economic Opportunities Analysis Goal 9 Compliance	\$35,000	Not overdue
Wheeler County	TA	Goals 3 & 9 - Comprehensive Plan Update	\$5,000	Not overdue
N/A	TA	Multi-County Zoning Code Update Project	\$90,000	On time

“Not overdue” means no task submittal or payment requests are yet due

“On time” means one or more grant payment has been made and none are overdue

“Overdue” means a task submittal/payment request is past the timeframe established in the grant contract

“Closed out” means the grant project is complete and the final payment has been made

# Regional Solutions

Priorities identified by Regional Solutions Advisory Committees  
Updated Oct. 22, 2014

## **North Coast Region (Clatsop, Tillamook and Columbia Counties)**

### Team Mission:

- Promote and sustain healthy communities through retention, diversification and expansion of the economic base. Job creation is paramount with the goal of expanding the region's economic base while being responsible stewards of the region's natural resources.

### Regional Priorities:

- ? • Sustain and grow NW Oregon businesses in areas such as marine based industry, tourism, small manufacturing, forest products, agriculture and aviation.
- Encourage innovation, business incubation and the manufacturing of new product technologies. Assist business start-ups and entrepreneurs. Encourage the creation of quality flex-space.
- \* • Improve the readiness of industrial land by addressing wetlands, transportation access, infrastructure and other impediments on prime industrial land in the region. Work to increase the number of sites that have building-ready status.
- \* • Review, streamline and address regulatory and permitting impediments to economic development.
- \* • Work with rural communities to plan, coordinate, fund and install needed infrastructure.
- Bring regional support to ongoing Oregon Solutions projects.

## **Mid-Valley Region (Marion, Polk and Yamhill Counties)**

- Primary Goal: Become a center for Agri-business innovation and agri-tourism
- Promote regional workforce development opportunities
- Increase business capital for existing and emerging businesses
- Explore passenger and freight rail opportunities
- ? • Expand agri-tourism opportunities which highlight local produce, viticulture/winery operations, and visitor hospitality amenities
- Enhance programs that encourage business retention and expansion
- \* • Engage in local government infrastructure assessments

# Regional Solutions

Priorities identified by Regional Solutions Advisory Committees  
Updated Oct. 22, 2014

## **South Valley (Benton, Lane, Lincoln and Linn Counties)**

*\*priorities are continuing to be evaluated\**

- ? • Housing and Manufactured Housing
- Entrepreneurialism and Southern Willamette research corridor
  - Encourage business incubation, acceleration, manufacturing and new technologies
  - Encourage and support an entrepreneurial culture and ecosystem
  - Access to capital strategy – Develop resident capital and access to capital investment
  - Venture Capital and Commercialization – support mentoring related to capital access and product development, as well as networking opportunities with other innovators. Support both emerging entrepreneurs and established companies.
  - Promote regional workforce readiness
- Improve the readiness of industrial land
  - Addressing uncertainty and permit streamlining on wetlands
  - ? ○ Support rural industrial development opportunities
  - Encourage creation of quality industrial flex-space
  - Increase number of certified industrial sites
  - Support time to market initiatives
- ? • Improve access to markets via improved transportation systems
  - Transportation systems
    - All modes
    - Rapid Rail
    - Transit
    - Air
    - Ports
    - Infrastructure
- Support alternative fuel and energy industry and alternative energy advancement

## **South Coast: Umpqua (Coos, Curry and Douglas Counties)**

- Active Forestry Management on O & C Timber Lands
- Business Retention, Expansion, and Creation
  - Workforce training
  - \* ○ Regulatory streamlining, technical assistance
- Enhance Marine, Rail and Telecommunication infrastructure
- Build on Recreation Economy
- Access to Natural Resources, Support of Natural Resource Economy
- Alternative Energy Development



# Regional Solutions

Priorities identified by Regional Solutions Advisory Committees  
Updated Oct. 22, 2014

## **Southern Region: Rogue Valley (Jackson and Josephine Counties)**

- Active Forestry Management on O & C Timber Lands
- Maintain and Enhance Forest Industry Infrastructure
- Business Retention, Expansion, Creation, and Recruitment
- \* • Regulatory Streamlining
- Water Conservation and Stream Restoration
- Workforce Training
- \* • Downtown Revitalization
- Agricultural Economy
- Recreational Economy
- ? • Community Infrastructure

# Regional Solutions

Priorities identified by Regional Solutions Advisory Committees  
Updated Oct. 22, 2014

## **Metro Region (Multnomah, Washington and Clackamas Counties)**

- **Regulatory Coordination, Streamlining & Continuous Improvement: Proactively coordinate, synchronize and improve the State’s application of regulations and permitting processes to efficiently manage regionally significant projects.**
  - Streamline wetland permitting process in coordination with US Army Corps of Engineers and other related government agencies.
  - Provide regulatory certainty for industrial land and brownfield redevelopment.
  - Deliver efficient and professional services through improved communication and coordination.
- **Infrastructure: Provide resources and technical assistance to modernize the region’s key transportation and infrastructure systems to support livability and to promote traded sector economic growth.**
  - Pursue “shovel ready” certification for the region’s priority industrial lands greater than 25 acres.
  - Prioritize projects that enhance freight mobility and provide access to key industrial areas and intermodal facilities.
  - Work in concert with local government and private sector partners to leverage greater resources for infrastructure investment.
- **Redevelopment: Align state policies and resources to cleanup and reuse brownfields and other potential redevelopment areas to efficiently use existing properties and protect productive farm and forest land and conserve natural resources.**
  - Target and cleanup brownfields in economically deprived neighborhoods.
  - Encourage local hiring to promote workforce development when redevelopment projects are procured and implemented.
  - Coordinate longer term evaluation and prioritization of public and private sites for future clean-up and re-use along key transportation corridors.
- **Economic Development: Improve the regional economy by prioritizing economic development efforts around distinctive industry clusters: 1) software & high technology; 2) advanced manufacturing; 3) clean technology; and 4) athletic & outdoor.**
  - Promote “shovel ready” large industrial land to traded sector investors.
  - Support regional export initiatives to help companies access global markets and grow local jobs.
  - Through increased coordination, leverage workforce programs to increase the effectiveness of existing economic development strategies and initiatives in order to fuel innovation and economic growth.
- \* ● **Regional Planning and Development: Align State policies and resources to maximize development that encourages land efficiency, multi-modal transportation, and balances future employment and housing growth.**
  - Provide technical assistance to promote well planned communities that have a sufficient supply of land, services and infrastructure to embrace a variety of

# Regional Solutions

Priorities identified by Regional Solutions Advisory Committees

Updated Oct. 22, 2014

economic opportunities, develop resilience to natural hazards and support community health.

- Encourage development that makes active transportation safe and convenient.
- Ensure the achievement of equity throughout the region by advancing a truly inclusive and transparent policy agenda for jobs, transportation, education, health and housing for all.

## **North Central Region (Wasco, Hood River and Sherman Counties)**

- ? • Infrastructure focus
  - Waste water
  - Water
  - Telecommunications/broadband
  - Public transportation, access, freight
- Providing support for business clusters
  - Value added agriculture
  - Fermentation sciences (wine, beer, distilling, cider, cheesemaking) (subset of value added agriculture)
  - Technology
  - Arts and culture
  - Health care
  - Renewable energy
  - Tourism and recreation
- Work force training
- \* • Attainable housing
- ? • Availability of industrial land
- \* • Urban area boundaries in the National Scenic Area and need for clarity from Columbia Gorge Commission re: amendments
- \* • Regulatory integration/streamlining

# Regional Solutions

Priorities identified by Regional Solutions Advisory Committees

Updated Oct. 22, 2014

## **Central Region (Jefferson, Crook and Deschutes Counties)**

- Establishment of four year university (OSU Cascades)
- Job retention and growth; respond to emerging opportunities
- \* • Ensure that the region has land and infrastructure available to retain/attract employers
- Water availability
- Sewer infrastructure
- Central Oregon Transit System
- Strengthen regional agriculture
- Improve forest health and increase access to timber resources
- Support for arts and culture
- ? • Housing

## **South Central Region (Klamath and Lake Counties)**

- ? • Infrastructure
  - Water systems
  - Water storage
  - Sewer
  - Natural gas
  - Rail
  - Highways 97 and 140
  - Airports
  - Broadband
  - Active transportation
- Work force training
- \* • Availability and marketability of industrial land
- \* • Downtown revitalization
- Business retention, expansion, and attraction
  - Energy efficiency
  - Food processing/value added agriculture
  - Wood stove change out/improve air quality
  - Aviation
  - Health care
  - Renewable energy
- Improve forest health and access federal timber resources
- Support for entrepreneurship
- Housing rehabilitation/housing for vulnerable populations
- Regulatory integration/streamlining
- Respond to immediate, emerging opportunities



# Regional Solutions

Priorities identified by Regional Solutions Advisory Committees

Updated Oct. 22, 2014

## Greater Eastern Region (Gilliam, Wheeler, Morrow, Umatilla, Grant, Harney and Malheur Counties)

- **Increased Productivity from Federal Forest Lands**
  - Policy and resources to improve forest health and sustain/grow rural economies
  - Develop technology for biomass utilization
- **Skilled Workforce Availability**
  - Increase availability of training/certification programs
  - Increase vocational/career technical education availability
  - Address interstate certification reciprocity issues
  - Address community livability issues
  - Commercial kitchens to support rural entrepreneurship
- \* ● **Avoid/Mitigate Sage Grouse Endangered Species Act Listing**
  - Resources to avoid sage grouse listing or mitigate impacts of listing
- **Water Management and Development**
  - Water storage projects
  - Infrastructure/distribution systems in critical groundwater areas
- **Infrastructure to serve industrial sites**
  - Funding for infrastructure to support Umatilla Chemical Depot redevelopment
  - Preserve rail infrastructure to Pilot Rock
- ? ● **Unmanned Aviation Vehicle Industry**
  - Support efforts to identify a regional test site(s)
- ? ● **Marketable Industrial Land**
  - Funding and technical assistance to ensure a supply of marketable industrial lands
- **Workforce Housing**
  - Create a housing loan fund to assist with market rate rural housing financing
  - Address appraisal (lack of comparables) issues for rural market rate housing financing
  - Funding for housing rehabilitation
- \* ● **Regulatory Technical Assistance**
  - Increase technical assistance to local governments on land use planning and infrastructure upgrades
- **Mining/Metals Extraction**
  - Streamline permitting process
  - Assessment of regional mineral resources
- **FEMA National Flood Insurance Program Changes**
  - Investigate opportunity for local/state insurance pools

# Regional Solutions

Priorities identified by Regional Solutions Advisory Committees

Updated Oct. 22, 2014

## Northeast Region (Union, Baker and Wallowa Counties)

Primary Priorities:

- **Increased Productivity from Federal Forest Lands**
  - Funding for two NEPA teams per forest and additional implementation teams.
  - Accelerated restoration strategy for dry forests.
- **Skilled Workforce Availability**
  - Increase availability of training/certification programs.
  - Increase vocational/career technical education availability (Eastern Promise as a delivery model).
  - Address interstate certification reciprocity issues.
  - Integrate with Coordinated Care Organizations and Early Learning Councils.
- **Available infrastructure to serve industrial sites**
  - Rail spur to Baum Industrial Park.
  - Rail switch at Elkhorn Industrial Park.
  - Sewer/water extension to Joseph Industrial Park.
- \* ● **Marketable Industrial Land**
  - Funding and technical assistance to ensure a supply of marketable industrial lands
- ? ● **Value-Added Natural Resource Utilization**
  - Forest restoration infrastructure
  - Agricultural product processing
  - Mining/metals extraction and processing
- **Support Regional Vertical Integration Opportunities**
  - Wood products
  - RV manufacturing

Secondary Priorities:

- **Regional Business Recruitment Marketing Strategy**
  - Website development
  - Investigate air commerce opportunities
- **USFS 39 Road**
  - Funding for repair and maintenance
- **Entrepreneurial Development**
  - Access to capital
  - Incubator feasibility and operation analysis (Baker and Union counties)
- **Business Succession/Transition to Next Generation**

