



APPROVED MEETING MINUTES  
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ALLIANCE OF LINCOLN COUNTY  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING  
Thursday, June 3, 2021, 3:30 pm  
Zoom Meeting

Members Present: Bailey, Kemp, Smith, Fitzsimmons, Hunt, Cowen, Roy, Ogden, Miranda  
Staff: Schuytema, Bruckart

**Agenda Review:** No changes to the agenda.

**Review and Approval of May 6, 2021, Minutes:** Lewis moved and Roy seconded a motion to approve the May 6, 2021 minutes. The minutes were approved unanimously with Miranda abstaining due to not having attended the previous meeting.

**Welcome New Directors: Karen Gray & Paula Miranda:** Kemp welcomed Gray & Miranda to the Board. Board members and staff made introductions.

**Treasurer's Report:** Smith was absent, Schuytema presented the report. He reported little change since last meeting. He explained that some of the cash reserves will be used, but it was less than expected.

**Discussion: Annual Meeting After-Action:** Schuytema reported that approximately 23 people attended the Annual Meeting event. He voiced general approval of the event, adding that he believes events will be more effective when they are in person again. He mentioned the need for outreach, increasing members and marketing member benefits. Bruckart echoed the need for in-person meetings. Roy added that face to face meetings will offer more opportunity to explain what EDALC does. Kemp reported that the same things had been discussed in an Executive Meeting a few days previous. He suggested that the August Board meeting be face to face, and Miranda offered a Port of Newport facility to hold the meeting. Schuytema asked if digital Board meeting packets would still be acceptable once the Board is meeting in person. Member unanimously agreed that digital packets would still be acceptable.

**Discussion: Officers for 2021-22:** Kemp explained that during a recent executive meeting it had been suggested that current officers retain their positions for the next year to provide continuity, stating that it would also be fine if other Board members would prefer to present alternative nominations instead. (Bailey joined the meeting at this time.) Lewis voiced approval of keeping the current slate of officers. Roy and Cowen concurred. Schuytema added that in the future it would be best practice to change officers regularly, but that retaining the current officer positions was best during these challenging times. Cowen moved to retain the current officers and Fitzsimmons seconded. The motion carried

unanimously.

**Discussion: 2021-22 Proposed Budget:** Kemp explained that EDALC was spending cash reserves and focused on limiting our budget. Schuytema said that he and Smith had met twice on the proposed budget and explained that they had agreed that there should be no vote on the budget at this meeting, just a discussion. He stated that EDALC's long-term financial stability is unknown right now. He said that what he and Smith would recommend to the Board is to work on income targets to make sure that any funding requested of the county is fair and reasonable, and in support of the goal of diversity of funding. Schuytema relayed that Smith was concerned about budgeted expenses being a bit too lean, as the need for travel and networking post-COVID would likely increase. He re-iterated he and Smith's recommendation that the Board look over the currently proposed budget but allow for further development by the executive team and hold the vote until the August Board meeting.

Cowen asked what the timeline and budget aspect of this were for the county, stating that this has been going on for a long time and he is worried that with all the tremendous work that's been done with Paul coming into EDALC that it's very concerning to consider that we might have to shut things down. Bailey responded that this was beyond the control of the Board. Cowen redirected the question to Hunt, asking what the situation looked like from his perspective. Kemp intervened with the suggest that the meeting move to agenda item number nine which was apropos to the question Cowen asked.

**Discussion: Short Term Plan to Demonstrate Value to County Administrator:** Hunt explained that he couldn't give a definitive answer on funding and continue by expressing offense to comments within the strategic plan, specifically verbiage suggesting that County Commissioners had "pushed off" EDALC funding decisions on the County Administrator. He explained that the decision to work with the County Commissioner on how the county does economic development was a consensus decision by the Board of Commissioners. He said that there is money in the economic development fund and that it can be used to support EDALC if that's the decision made by the Board of Commissioners. He added that he didn't know when that decision would be made. He cited the pandemic, wildfires and other difficult issues as reasons for the delay in decision making. Schuytema said that he agreed with the incoming County Administrator being the point person for economic development and that EDALC is looking forward to development a good relationship with the new Administrator. He recognized that the new Administrator would be overwhelmed to start and asked for assistance in getting access to them when reasonable but within EDALC's tight timeline. Hunt agreed that it was an important question and said he understood the concern. He added that without some meaningful support from other sources the funding, if any, from the count would be limited. Schuytema indicated that he understood but added that securing funding from other sources would be difficult without the support of the county. Hunt clarified by saying that he meant that while EDALC was building value for the county, it also had to build value for the municipalities.

Schuytema continued discussion by pointing out that EDALC would probably always depend more on public sector funding, and that while it was important to increase private sector funding, it would be difficult to do so without county support. He offered to delve into the document he sent out about short term budget planning, but Kemp suggested tabling that discussion for a moment, as Hunt had temporarily left the meeting to take a phone call. They agreed to move back to agenda item number eight until Hunt's return.

**Discussion: Executive Director Contract:** Kemp explained that Schuytema's contract expired the next day, June 7<sup>th</sup>, 2021. He said that they had in the budget, for discussion, money to cover Schuytema's contract for the next year and that he would like to see Schuytema continue. Cowen moved to renew the contract

and Roy seconded. Members shared positive feedback and support of Schuytema's work. The motion carried unanimously.

**(Continued) Discussion: Short Term Plan to Demonstrate Value to County Administrator:** Schuytema reviewed the document regarding budgeting and ongoing funding. He agreed again that working with new County Administrator was a good idea, but also acknowledge the frustration with the long process. He said our short-term goal was to prove value in order obtain county funding and diversify funding. He also stated the need for a contract for services with the county and a comprehensive strategic plan. Schuytema discussed the cash reserves available and the budgetary timeline that suggests EDALC could work through March of 2022 without tapping money market reserves. He announced that EDALC is participating in a regional and statewide level with other economic development communities for the first time ever. He summed up the report with the short-term plan for EDALC including further enhanced communication and awareness, focusing on specific impactful tasks, and engaging with the new county administrator.

Lewis asked about the timeline for hiring the county administration. Kemp explained that the initial deadline was May 24<sup>th</sup> but has been extended to June 20<sup>th</sup>. He added that the current administrator's last day is in July, and that getting the new administrator up and running might not happen until August. Lewis stated that she found the report sobering, yet optimistic and extended an offer of support from the board, asking if there was anything that the board could do to help. Schuytema said that there are things the board can do and said that those things would be defined and asked for.

Miranda talked about her previous work in Columbia County, offering to reach back to the people she worked with there to ask about ideas on funding. Other board member acknowledged that they are prepared to help in any way to support efforts to diversify and secure funding.

Kemp asked Fitzsimmons about his view of how EDALC got to its current situation. Fitzsimmons explained that of major importance was the genesis of the telecom push with Ed Parker. He said that he didn't remember how exactly the organization came to reviewing grants but didn't feel it was significant. He added that he had reservations sixteen months ago about hiring an ED while funding was uncertain, and that he was still worried about that. He commended Schuytema for continuing to try to make it work. He then addressed Commissioner Hunt, recognizing Hunt's criticism of EDALC before Schuytema was hired, but adding that great strides had been made since then. He explained that what he heard Hunt say earlier in the meeting is that the Commissioners did not pass off decisions to the new administrator, but that the Commissioners could make some decisions. He concluded that he feels it's time to move forward and addressed Hunt in stating that he wouldn't have said that a year ago, and that it would be nice to stop focusing on just survival.

Kemp brought up that EDALC started as a county driven organization, and that we need to re-up that discussion and find the critical path items for economic development for the county. He stated that moving forward we would need more tangible assets or products that EDALC would deliver to achieve the goals of the county. Paul responded by saying that the reason BRE is so important is because it is relationship and data gathering from the business community and is where you discover the specific needs for economic development in the county. Kemp added that the measure of success would be jobs created, wages increased, etc. Miranda said that if the county is not pro-active the business community becomes stagnant or may even lose business. She said that we really need an organization that is dedicated to this work, referring to Schuytema specifically. Schuytema added that in economic development circles there are other performance measurements beyond job numbers.

Schuytema explained that he and Bruckart would be working on grants and other things in the coming month but would also work at refining the strategic plan to have information ready for the new county administrator. Kemp then suggested an executive committee meeting in lieu of a July board meeting. Schuytema expressed that he would keep the board informed despite there being no meeting in July.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:02 p.m.

**Update on Member Management Efforts:** Bruckart used a PowerPoint presentation to share recent efforts in updating member management, plans for member engagement strategies and what has been done so far. She went over the use of HubSpot to manage member data, changing to an annual membership renewal with online payment option, holding regular member engagement events.

**Executive Director's Report:** Schuytema started with an update on the re-designation of the Lincoln County Enterprise Zone. He reported that meetings had taken place with all current EZ sponsoring and consenting entities, adding that he was hoping to move Newport from being a consenter to a full sponsor, as well as adding the hotel rider. Schuytema also reported that Bruckart had provided all sponsors and consenters with draft resolutions and that he and Bruckart had created an informational sheet to explain the EZ process, which will be used as a marketing piece in the future. He shared that we now have an extra three-square miles that could be added to the Lincoln County Enterprise Zone, and that the state list of properties in Lincoln City was inaccurate but had been updated by the city. Next he explained that an informational meeting with all non-sponsoring taxing bodies had been planned. He finished his report with an explanation of final steps, which would be to complete the formal application with all approved resolutions. There was a short discussion about E-Commerce zones having limited availability. Schuytema added that he would be working on Project Big Catch in the coming week. He finished with a report on where things stand with funding from the county, explaining that all funding decisions would be on hold until the new county administrator was hired. Commissioner Doug Hunt was present and confirmed that this was the case. Schuytema followed up by acknowledging past issues at EDALC, reviewing recent improvements and accomplishments and stating that at some point alternative funding would have to be considered if the county fails to make a decision in a timely manner or decides not to fund EDALC.

**Closing Comments:** Ryslinge offered appreciation for Schuytema's report and work, as well as support for finding alternate funding if necessary. Dahl asked Schuytema about whether or not EDALC applied for the second round of PPP funds. Schuytema answered that we did apply and that EDALC received \$31,000 based on our payroll and expenses. Kemp asked a question on behalf of Smith about the timeline for hiring a county administrator.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.