



**City of McMinnville**  
**Planning Department**  
231 NE Fifth Street  
McMinnville, OR 97128  
(503) 434-7311

[www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov](http://www.mcminnvilleoregon.gov)

# MINUTES

---

**February 19, 2020**  
**McMinnville Economic Vitality Leadership Council**  
**Regular Meeting**

**4:00 pm**  
**Community Development Center**  
**McMinnville, Oregon**

**Members Present:** Carson Benner, Kellie Menke, Walt Gowell, Steve Patterson, John Deitz, Deven Paolo, Ellen Brittan, Jodi Christensen, and Ty Rollins

**Members Absent:** Dani Chisholm, Kyle Faulk, Mike Morris, and Nancy Carlton

**Staff Present:** Heather Richards – Planning Director, Scott Cooper, Jeff Knapp, and Tom Schauer

**Others Present** Jeb Bladine, Gerardo Ochoa, Gioia Goodrum, and Heather Miller

---

## 1. Call to Order

Chair Benner called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

## 2. Discussion of Meeting Structure Moving Forward

Jeff Knapp, Executive Director of Visit McMinnville, said the intention of the Council was not only to move the Economic Development Strategic Plan forward but to also achieve legacy projects. They needed to discuss how they would move things forward and function as a group. The Stable Table met monthly which was a group of economic development organizations. That group could report back to this Council. He asked how often the Council would like to meet and how they would like to operate.

Chair Benner asked what the end product would be and how they would measure success.

Planning Director Richards said the Council's focus was to implement the action plan that had already been developed. They had to report once a year back to Council, but the committee was autonomous and could utilize the five different agencies who were working on economic development. There were some performance metrics identified in the strategic plan, but the more detailed performance metrics had not been identified. That could be part of the near term work.

There was discussion regarding how often to meet. There was consensus to meet monthly on the third Wednesday of the month at 3:30 p.m.

Councilor Christensen noted that this was the first time the five agencies were coming together in a coordinated fashion around a strategic plan. This committee had the ability to bring people together and have interagency collaboration. There would need to be coordination of the different boards to make sure everyone was in line with what was happening and meeting the deliverables of their own organizations.

Councilor Brittan thought it would be helpful for each group to explain the portion of their strategic plan specifically devoted to economic development so they could identify the overlap and synergies and leverage points.

Planning Director Richards said that already occurred in the advisory committee work. The strategic plan was based on the overlaps and how they could move these things forward. It was aspirational and set up with potential projects and programs because they didn't want to lock anything in without an evaluation and decision if it was the best way to go. There was an implementation part of the strategic plan where in each strategy they identified who was the potential lead and potential partners.

Chair Benner thought they should know what was already occurring at each of these organizations and where there were barriers or opportunities to work on.

Councilor Patterson suggested getting a report from each agency, one at each meeting, for all members to get caught up.

Councilor Brittan suggested identifying from the plan priority projects and each group could talk about what they were doing for those priorities and how they could collaborate.

Councilor Rollins suggested each organization take 15 minutes at the next meeting and give an update on their efforts towards this plan. They could then do a gap analysis on what was not being focused on and what wasn't being moved forward and how they would achieve those goals.

Chair Benner said each organization could also say what was working and what was not working. They could also discuss the barriers to those goals.

Planning Director Richards said they could frame it in near term and long term goals.

Chair Benner also thought they should discuss the past, and what worked and what didn't and why.

Planning Director Richards thought they should also get a presentation from Linfield, Chemeketa, McMinnville Water & Light, and School District to get the full breadth.

Councilor Brittan thought each agency should say what they thought the top three projects should be.

Mayor Hill suggested they look at the strategic plan and understand the material and how it impacted each of the organizations and then put a working plan together.

Chair Benner thought they should give each organization 10 minutes to explain their projects against the strategies in the plan, their top three, and hurdles or threats they were facing over the next two meetings.

Senior Planner Schauer said in finding out what everyone was doing, they would also be able to see what was not under someone's umbrella and decide where it fit in and doing those projects together. As the priorities were identified, they could align the work plans, budgets, and resources of all the organizations.

Planning Director Richards said the strategies in the plan were based on near term high impact projects and long term high impact projects. Part of the dialogue of the project advisory team was identifying gaps and hurdles and what they needed to do as a community to get past those. That was what generated the strategies.

Chair Benner said for organizations like the School District, they were not going to change their mission. If what they could contribute would help further their mission and these goals, that would be successful. Some organizations could change their mission.

Planning Commission Richards said it was not the intent to have the organizations change their missions. The intention of the group was to be a think tank to how to take it further.

The Council wanted to review the whole plan document.

Chair Benner said next month they would review the plan document, the month after that there would be presentations from the five organizations of the Stable Table, and the month after that would be presentations from the stakeholders.

There was discussion regarding the shareholders involvement in this effort.

Planning Director Richards said the School District had two issues, enrollment was stagnant and that could continue in a downward trend based on housing affordability and the career pathways of students graduating. There was a demographic for the age group of 20-30 that showed they were losing that age group and no one from that age group was migrating in. A solid school district did effect economic development, and a floundering school district also had an effect.

Councilor Gowell thought getting the baseline presentations from all of the participants was important.

Planning Director Richards suggested the Council read through the plan again and highlight questions before the next meeting.

### **3. Review of At-Large Candidates**

Planning Director Richards said staff made a list of people they thought could be impactful for the three at large positions, and Gerardo Ochoa and Robert Banagay had been contacted. They did plan to talk to County Administrator Ken Huffer as well.

There was discussion regarding having someone from the healthcare industry, aviation industry, transportation, and food or beverage processing.

There was consensus to either add a member from one of these industries later or to get presentations from them as needed.

#### **4. Review of Economic Opportunity Analysis and MAC Town 2032 ED Strategic Plan**

Planning Director Richards said the City was underway with an employment needs analysis for the next 20 years. They were working under a strict structure of how the analysis was done. One of the tests for identifying needs was did the City have a strategic plan for economic development and did they have the land supply to support that strategic plan. The advisory committee went through the strategic plan and identified the non-traditional projects outside of what they would do for employment forecasting. She asked if the Council wanted to hear the list and give feedback or if they would rather staff come back with the results.

There was consensus for staff to give a high level overview.

Senior Planner Schauer said cities were required to plan for a 20 year buildable land supply within their Urban Growth Boundaries. There were statewide planning goals, statutes, and administrative rules that had to be followed. A lot of the work for the Economic Opportunity Analysis was done already through the Economic Development Strategic Plan and they could look through the strategies and land needs for the targeted sector industries and forecasted employment. The document also had an analysis on trends, types of sites to plan for, inventory of what they had today, and regional advantages and disadvantages. He explained how they identified the land needs for future businesses and did a supply and demand equation to make sure there was enough acreage for the different types of small and large sites as well as services and attributes needed. They were currently in the needs identification stage and the next step would be to determine how to meet the needs. He explained how the Buildable Lands Inventory was done which evaluated the sites that were already developed or partially developed and what kind of constraints were on the properties that would prevent development. The employment forecast looked at trend data and reviewed what had been done before. They also had to decide what kind of community they wanted to be, a complete community that had homes and jobs, or a retirement community or a bedroom community. They had anticipated that the City would generally continue to be a regional center and that employment growth would be on par with population growth. Right now the population growth was 0.3%.

Planning Director Richards said the population growth was given to the City by the State. They were planning for an additional 12,800 people by 2041. It was a 1.4% growth rate over the next 20 years. The School District was supposed to be using these same numbers because the assumption was the City would experience this much growth. The State updated the number every four years and they would review these plans at that time to make sure they were continuing to plan for the growth. Currently the City was at the slowest annual average growth rate than it had ever been. As land became more constrained and there was less building, when the State updated the population forecasts, it was looking at past trends. In the future they would be assigned a smaller growth ratio. They were planning for only enough land supply for the employment forecast which was based on the population forecast. Presumably it would grow at the same rate. It was not based on opportunity or market.

Councilor Gowell said planning for growth did not mean it would happen and it didn't mean that they couldn't be proactive about growth.

Planning Director Richards said the idea was they should always have a five year buildable land supply within City limits and 20 years within the UGB. It was an expensive and time consuming process and many cities were not keeping up. Right now the growth was occurring in the County instead of the City and that was not where the State intended.

Senior Planner Schauer explained the employment forecast which included employment density factors such as how many average employees per acre for industrial and commercial use as well as looking at sites like the Evergreen Aviation and Space Museum site that did not fit the averages and were outliers that would have special needs to account for. They also had to make sure that they had the right types of sites to accommodate the target industries. The last time the EOA was updated was in 2013 and in the strategic plan there were four goals that were more general and five that focused on specific target sectors. As they updated the 2013 document, they wanted to make sure that they also drew from the strategic plan and meeting the site needs. The project advisory committee's last meeting would be this month. All of the work would be rolled into an urbanization report with housing, employment, and public/institutional land needs.

There was discussion regarding the percentage of land that would not be buildable and how there was a lack of available industrial land in the County and lack of workforce housing in the City.

## **5. Council Member Comments**

None

## **6. Staff Comments**

None

## **7. Adjournment**

Chair Benner adjourned the meeting at 5:36 p.m.