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Executive Summary

THE STRATEGY AND ITS DEVELOPMENT

The 2014 – 2019 Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) is a new 5-year plan and is intended to help guide economic development in the 7-county region in eastern Oregon including Gilliam, Morrow, Umatilla, Wheeler, Grant, Harney and Malheur counties. Developing a new economic strategy fulfills GEODC’s requirement as a designated economic development district administered by the federal Economic Development Administration (EDA). The new strategy will make the district more competitive for upcoming EDA grants and potentially other funding sources; it also provides a more comprehensive approach to economic growth in the region and the framework for better inter-agency coordination.

The GEODC District is reportedly the largest EDD in the nation with 7 counties and 39 incorporated cities. One of the challenges to developing a strategy for a district with a large geographic area is the ability to understand the different local area economies and the conditions which affect them. One of the major goals of the strategy has been to understand what is happening on a local, county level and to devise actions to support economic growth.

The new strategic plan adds two new elements not included in previous plans; a list of high priority projects that have potential to impact regional growth and an action plan to help make the district more effective in carrying out its goals.

A collaborative approach was used in developing the strategy; it included an extensive public involvement effort, active participation among stakeholders on the project’s Strategy Committee, engagement with Business Oregon, the State’s economic development agency and the State’s Regional Solutions Team, a group assigned by the Governor’s Office to coordinate and troubleshoot economic development issues in the district. There were over 34 public meetings and 8 strategy committee meetings held in different communities around the region. A survey was distributed to assess community and business issues and there were 147 responses received and tabulated.

There were four primary areas evaluated to help develop the goals and objectives for the strategy: demographic and economic conditions in the district, the region’s strengths and weaknesses, community input and survey responses, and regional projects submitted by communities and organizations engaged in economic development throughout the district.

DEMOGRAPHIC AND ECONOMIC OVERVIEW

Demographic conditions vary greatly across the district, but a snapshot reveals a declining population base, high poverty rate, the need for skills training among the most vulnerable populations and a lack of housing opportunities in most communities. Between 2000 and
2010, there was a population decline in all but two counties, Morrow and Umatilla, while by comparison, the State grew by over 10%. Even after the recession, 2010 to 2013, there was a consistent loss of population in the district, which was most pronounced in Harney, Grant and Wheeler counties. The poverty rate remains high among families and all people in several counties in the district including Malheur, Harney, Grant, and Morrow counties.

Most of the economic growth over the past 5 years has occurred in Morrow and Umatilla counties, largely attributed to the impact of the Port of Morrow.

The Port of Morrow is a key economic development asset in the district and is strategically located with excellent access to markets. The Port’s impact on the district and, in particular, Morrow and Umatilla counties, makes it a primary asset supporting economic growth in the region. The share of direct employment that is considered to be Port-related accounts for 59% of all jobs in Morrow County, up from 36% in 2006. With a strong multi-modal network including roads, rail and air connected to the Port, it has becomes a major distribution hub with the capacity to connect products and services developed in the district to national and international markets.

Strategic improvements to the Port of Morrow have one of the strongest investment returns for economic development in the district.

The Blue Mountain National Forest Lands Management Plan, currently under revision, will direct federal forest management of the 5.5 million acres in the Malheur, Umatilla, Wallowa-Whitman National Forests, and the Snow Mountain District of the Ochoco National Forest, for the next 15 years. The Plan is critical to delivering economic outcomes in the forest products industry in the district, and will have a far-reaching impact on the scale of timber harvest, its economic impact and the sustainability of forest health. Current plan alternatives proposed by the U.S. Forest Service and those of private industry differ greatly. Private industry recommends allowing an annual sawlog timber harvest to 335 million board feet rather than the current Forest Plan’s proposal of 100 million board feet. According to private industry representatives, this additional 225 million board feet / year of sawlog timber harvest above the current proposed Forest Plan gross harvest would contribute an additional 2,585 direct forest sector jobs to the region.

Striking a balance between economic impact and the future health and sustainability of eastside forests is the crux of the issue.

**ECONOMIC RESILIENCY:**
*How the District Performed During and After the Recession*

One of the most important aspects of an economy is its economic resiliency or its capacity to withstand change. The Great Recession, 2007 to 2009, provided an opportunity to assess how the district and its counties performed during this trying time and to determine what actions might be useful to improving the area’s resistance to job loss during a tough economy.

Overall, the district performed better than the State as a whole during the recession, but did not recover as quickly after the recession. Though both the district and State as a whole had the same percentage loss of jobs during and after the recession, the district would benefit by further economic diversification. Diversification would help the district become less vulnerable to changes in the economy, improve its potential for growth and improve wage levels.
As of 2013, the total employment for the district was 52,075 with roughly 75% employed by private industry and 25% by government. The district is significantly more reliant on government for employment than the State as a whole. While government provides a significant source of employment for the district, it did not perform well during and after the recession. In fact, government employment from all sources continued to decline after the recession. Because government is dependent on tax revenues generated from business growth, it lags behind the private sector in recovering from a recession. While government is a significant employer in the district and is an asset to the region, it is not a sector which contributes to diversification and economic resiliency.

One employment sector which helped stabilize the district during the recession was agriculture. During the recession, the agriculture sector had a lower rate of job loss than did State agriculture as a whole. In light of the strength of agriculture in the region, and the food processing industry in particular, investments in value added agriculture should be an important focus of the district’s economic development efforts.

In counties where there is more industry diversification than in others, economic performance during the recession was similar to that of the State as a whole. In 2009, at the height of recession, Umatilla and Morrow counties, where there is the greatest industry diversification among counties in the district, unemployment rates were below the State’s and four years after the recession in 2013, they were very similar to the state as a whole. Efforts to support entrepreneurs and the creation of new and emerging businesses are an important step to developing a more diversified economy.

As an example, one of the bright spots in the regional economy continues to be the food processing industry centered at the Port of Morrow and Boardman, Oregon, but includes Umatilla County and Ontario, Oregon in Malheur County. While manufacturing employment in the district shrank by 3.5% during the recession, the food manufacturing industry continued to grow by 14.8% in Morrow County and 16.4% in Umatilla County.

The strength of the food processing industry in the district is based on the district’s clear competitive advantages including access to agricultural products and an excellent transportation network by way of its road, rail and Ports system. The addition of a newly planned cold storage facility at the Port of Morrow anticipated to begin operations in the spring of 2015 will strengthen the industry’s capacity to store their product and access new and larger markets.

While economic diversification is a key goal for the district, it may be especially important in counties showing multiple indicators of economic decline. During and after the recession, Harney and Grant counties had continued high unemployment rates, a loss in their labor force participation rate, which is that percentage of persons employed or looking for work, and a decline in the size of their labor forces. In Harney and Grant counties, these economic indicators point towards not only a declining job base but also the labor pool needed to fill jobs. It may be that people are leaving counties to seek work elsewhere. Efforts to support diversification such as research, small business support and entrepreneurial development is particularly crucial in these and other counties.

**STRATEGY HIGHLIGHTS**

The strategy seeks to strengthen and build upon the competitive advantages of the region and overcome identified weaknesses and constraints to growth. Some of the strengths that distinguish the region from other areas of the State and country are: an excellent multi-modal
transportation network connected to a major Ports system serving as a major distribution hub, a highly developed agricultural industry of producers, value-added firms, and support services, a new and emerging Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS) industry, a competitive cost of energy, 5.5 million acres of federally managed forests in the Blue Mountain National Forestlands Management Area, and a rich cultural history with untapped recreational and scenic opportunities.

To build on these economic assets, the strategy identifies ways to support the region’s resource-based industries including agriculture. Development of Columbia River water as a source for irrigated agriculture, the formation of new research partnerships among USDA Research Centers in Pendleton and Burns, OSU Agricultural Centers and private firms in the district, the development of new value-added products and services, and the formation of training partnerships between community colleges and private companies are all ways to support the expansion of the agricultural and forest products industries.

One of the newest emerging opportunities in the district is the Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS) industry. In December 2013, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) announced the six national entities approved for commercial testing of unmanned aerial vehicles, which included Pendleton, Warm Springs and Tillamook in Oregon. The City of Pendleton has made steady progress in positioning itself to become a major test area for firms in the industry, and as of October 2014, has obtained several Certificates of Authorization (COA) to operate and test unmanned aerial vehicles at its airport location.

The UAS industry could have a far-reaching impact on economic growth with potential applications that support resource-based industry in the district. Applications in agriculture are already taking place through research at the USDA Columbia Plateau Research Lab in Pendleton with potential applications to other resource based companies.

Actions to support the UAS industry in the district include development of a small business accelerator at Blue Mountain Community College, currently underway. The Eastern Oregon Business Accelerator Facility, a regional project receiving a high ranking by the strategy committee, will provide a facility for entrepreneurial development which could support the emerging UAS industry in Pendleton.

With over 50% of firms in the district with 5 or fewer employees, the environment is ripe for entrepreneurship. One of the regional projects included in the Strategy is to develop the “new natural resources economy” by researching opportunities unique to the district and understanding the barriers confronting entrepreneurs. Working on a local level with potential entrepreneurs, the strategy recommends expanding small business and entrepreneurial support throughout the district in order to encourage new business formation. Some of the areas with potential for growth include value added agricultural products and services, forest based wood products, and tourism.

Developing new opportunities for growth is not the only approach needed to support economic growth in the region. One of the pressing needs in the district is to assist local communities with land use planning and financing for public improvements. Many communities do not have the tax base to maintain or expand needed public infrastructure. If communities throughout the district are the place where growth is to take place, they will need to be able to plan for and manage their own growth. The strategy recommends better understanding the needs of local communities and working collaboratively to address their needs.

IMPLEMENTATION

The real success of the strategy will be in its implementation over time. With a detailed action plan in place that includes both short-term (1 year) and long-term (5 year) steps to implementation, the plan can be used as a tool to encourage collaboration among participating organizations and manage progress. Developing a sense of follow-through and commitment among the district’s regional partners will be critical to the strategy’s implementation.
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HISTORY

Local public officials, business people, bankers and other private citizens worked cooperatively to form the Greater Eastern Oregon Development Corporation (GEODC) as a private non-profit corporation in June 1982. Since 1982, GEODC has administered the Small Business Administration 504 loan program in eight counties in Eastern Oregon.

In 1992, the U.S. Department of Commerce, Economic Development Administration (EDA), designated GEODC as a federal Economic Development District serving the Oregon counties of Gilliam, Grant, Morrow, Umatilla and Wheeler. In 2001, the District was expanded to include Harney and Malheur Counties. As part of the designation process, GEODC assumed responsibility for the EDA Revolving Loan Fund.

GEODC has administered an EDA Revolving Loan Fund since the late 1980s. GEODC enhanced its portfolio of loan products by borrowing over $4 million from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Rural Development, to administer the Intermediary Relending Program. In addition, a number of small Revolving Loan Funds exist, each serving all or a portion of the GEODC region.

In May of 2014, the Greater Eastern Oregon Development Corporation (GEODC) changed its non-profit status from a 501(C) 4 to a 501(C) 3 organization. The new tax status allows GEODC to seek a broader range of funding sources including private foundations and be able to provide tax deductions to the full extent of the law as charitable contributions.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

GEODC works in several ways to improve economic conditions in the region: providing small business loans, administering Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) for public agencies, and conducting economic planning to help coordinate a region wide effort.

GEODC has the largest loan portfolio of any Community Development Corporation (CDC) in the State and works closely with lending institutions in the district to provide gap financing for businesses that would otherwise not be able to obtain full private financing.

Between 2009 and 2013, GEODC’s revolving loan fund programs have helped create 335 new jobs and retain 816. Over the same timeframe, GEODC provided loans in the amount of $8,551,252 and leveraged $15,016,257 in private funds provided by its lending partners.

GEODC administers a regional housing rehabilitation fund and serves as grant administrator for several communities receiving federal block grants for public infrastructure and community
facilities. From 2009 to 2013, it has administered approximately $800,000 in housing rehabilitation funds and $8,567,500 in CDBG funds for public facilities.

VISION STATEMENT

The Vision Statement of GEODC is:

“Bringing economic prosperity to everyone in the Greater Eastern Oregon Development Corporation service region.”

MISSION STATEMENT

Greater Eastern Oregon Development Corporation (GEODC) is a regional economic development membership organization charged with supporting job creation by helping to create, retain and expand businesses in the region. This is accomplished in part by assisting local government to develop human and physical infrastructure to support community, economic and business development.

GEOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

The Greater Eastern Oregon Development Corporation includes seven counties of eastern Oregon: Gilliam, Grant, Harney, Malheur, Morrow, Umatilla and Wheeler. There are 39 incorporated cities within the region.

GEODC is reportedly the geographically largest Economic Development District in the nation.

This vast region borders the states of Washington on the north and Nevada on the south, a distance of about 280 miles. It extends from the central Oregon corridor to the west, to the Idaho border on the east. This is larger than 11 states and would fall between the size of Maine and South Carolina. Table 1 below shows the area of each of the seven counties. Two of these counties, Harney and Malheur, are among the largest in the continental United States.

Table 1: Geographic Area — Greater Eastern Oregon Economic Development District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA</th>
<th>Gilliam County</th>
<th>Grant County</th>
<th>Harney County</th>
<th>Malheur County</th>
<th>Morrow County</th>
<th>Umatilla County</th>
<th>Wheeler County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SQUARE MILES</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td>4,528</td>
<td>10,228</td>
<td>9,926</td>
<td>2,049</td>
<td>3,231</td>
<td>1,713</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Plan Development

PROJECT GUIDELINES

The Greater Eastern Oregon Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) 2014 – 2019 is a 5-year revision to the 2009 strategy and meets the statutory guidelines of the Economic Development Administration (EDA), parts 13 C.F.R 303.6, and 13 C.F.R 303.7. In addition to meeting the existing requirements, this CEDS document was developed using the Comprehensive Economic Development (CEDS) Content Guidelines; Recommendations for Creating Impactful CEDS which are the proposed, new guidelines for CEDS but not yet adopted.

THE PLAN

The primary objective of the CEDS document is to develop an effective strategy and set of actions that will, over time, improve economic conditions in the district. In order to achieve this, the 2014 CEDS plan includes a range of information that was developed and evaluated as a basis for the strategy and its actions. The overall document includes an assessment of the current demographic and economic conditions, key issues, assets and weaknesses supporting and confronting the district, and the perceptions and needs of communities, the public, and private businesses. In order to describe the unique demographic and economic conditions that exist within the large region that comprises the district, information was assembled on the county level first and then aggregated for the district. Demographic analyses included population, poverty rate, educational attainment, and housing trends. Economic analyses included labor force, industry employment, employment change during and after the recession, and wages and income. In addition to the data analyses, a “SWOTS” analysis (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) was performed and an extensive public outreach program developed.

Two new elements added to CEDS 2014 – 2019 are the prioritization of regional projects and an action plan for implementation. The action plan includes a set of short-term (1 year) and long-term (5 year) actions.

One of the unique opportunities that presented itself as a part of this five (5) year update was the chance to look at how the district performed during and after the Great Recession, 2007 to 2009 and from 2010 to 2013. By looking at how employment levels were affected during these timeframes, it was possible to obtain an assessment of economic resiliency in the region.

THE PROCESS

The CEDS 2014 – 2019 process has been a year-long effort to develop a comprehensive but practical strategy to improve economic conditions in the region. A collaborative approach was used in developing the strategy; it included demographic and economic research, an extensive public involvement effort, active participation among stakeholders on the project’s Strategy Committee, and engagement with Business Oregon, the State’s economic development agency and the State’s Regional Solutions Team, a group assigned by the Governor’s Office to coordinate and troubleshoot economic development issues in the district.

Public meetings were held from January through October 2014. There were a total of 34 meetings staged at key points in the process. Public meetings were attended by a wide array
of participants including community residents, businesses, city council members, county commissioners, judges, public officials, and representatives from the Ports, State agencies, economic development organizations, civic organizations, and Chambers of Commerce.

Eight (8) Strategy Committee meetings were held over the same timeframe. The Strategy Committee was made up of 16 members from the public sector and private business from across the district.

Surveys were sent out to a subset of organizations more closely associated with economic development including cities, counties, judges, Ports, and economic development organizations including both non-profits and informal groups. One hundred forty seven (147) surveys were received and tabulated (see Section VII. Public Involvement and Survey Information)

ANTICIPATED OUTCOMES

Some of the desired outcomes of a new economic strategy which have not yet been realized in the district are: better focus and coordination among economic development partners in all parts of the district, awareness of high priority projects, added organizational capacity building and the development of new resources.

Having completed a year-long dialogue with stakeholders, public policy makers and the public about how to improve the economy in the region, there is new awareness of the potential to make things happen by working together. With over 40 regional projects submitted from organizations across the region, people are beginning to focus on what is most important to their area. Having an action plan in place will help place the focus on achieving goals rather than debating what should be done.

COORDINATION WITH THE STATE OF OREGON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES

The Greater Eastern Oregon Development Corporation (GEODC) worked with representatives from Business Oregon and the Regional Solutions Team, a designated group of representatives assigned by the Governor’s Office, in developing the CEDS 2014 – 2019 Plan. A representative from the Regional Solutions Team, acting in the capacity of technical assistance, served as a non-voting member on the Strategy Committee.

GEODC continues to collaborate with the State’s Regional Solutions Team in addressing and assessing relevant issues throughout the district, promoting and executing grant agreements for community facilities, and identifying and prioritizing regional economic development projects for potential funding or implementation through the Governor’s office.

In 2014, Business Oregon began its process of creating the Oregon Business Plan, a new economic development strategy for different parts of the State and conducted a series of regional forums. The Greater Eastern Oregon Development Corporation participated in several forums within the district, providing input and using the forums as a means of assessing the development of its own strategic plan.

As part of the CEDS 2014 – 2019 process, GEODC staff solicited and obtained 41 regional projects which were prioritized by the Strategy Committee and forwarded to the State’s Regional Advisory Council for review and potential funding by the Governor’s Office.

With Business Oregon’s effort to refocus its strategic plan coinciding with the Greater Eastern Oregon Development Corporation’s revision of its CEDS, there was an opportunity for collaboration which resulted in close realignment between the CEDS 2014 -2019 Plan and the State’s new business plan for the region. The State’s effort is grounded in a regional and grassroots approach supported by the Regional Solutions Team’s efforts to troubleshoot and execute projects. Likewise, the State’s efforts have been supported by GEODC’s extensive public outreach process for CEDS 2014 – 2019.

Both Business Oregon and the Regional Solutions Team are committed to working with GEODC to identify projects which have potential for funding and / or implementation.
Between 2010, when the last Census was performed, and July 1, 2013, the district’s population grew by 2,276 persons or 1.7%. Gilliam County had the highest rate of growth, 4.0% adding 74 people while Harney County had the largest decline, losing 162 persons or 2.2% from its population. Umatilla County showed the highest net increase in population, adding 2,002 people or 2.6%.

From 2000 to 2010, all counties in the district lost population except Morrow and Umatilla counties. Umatilla County had the fastest population growth rate of 7.6% and Grant County the greatest decline in population at 6.2%. Grant County had the highest rate of increase in its population over 65 years of age, 32.3%. However, all counties showed an increase in the over 65 population with Malheur having the lowest growth rate of 8.6%. The under 18 years of age population declined in all counties in the district except Umatilla County which grew by 3.1%. The largest decline was in Grant County where the under 18 age group decreased by 30.1%.

One significant conclusion that can be drawn from the changes in the under 18 age group is that family formation is on the decline in all of the counties within the district except Umatilla County. With populations declining in all but Morrow and Umatilla counties where economic growth has been greatest, it may be that the decline in family formation is due to the lack of economic opportunity in the district.

POVERTY RATE

The poverty rate, based on a survey conducted between 2008 and 2012 by the US Census American Community Survey, is a measure of the percentage of persons whose incomes were below the poverty level over the past 12 months.

Malheur County’s poverty rates both for all people and families were the highest in the district and State at 25.0% and 17.8% respectively. In response, Malheur County has formed an association of organizations and the Poverty to Prosperity program which is designed to address the issue by providing early skills training for high school students to prepare them for anticipated job openings. The Poverty to Prosperity Program has accomplished exemplary work in identifying the issues and developing a training program based on sound economic research. The program has received praise from the Governor’s office and is currently seeking a permanent funding source.

One of the most vulnerable populations is families with a single, female head of household and related children under 18. Within the district, the poverty rate for this population group is highest in Harney County at 68.3% and in Malheur County, 56.1%, both considerably higher than the State’s poverty rate of 41.4%. As would be expected, the poverty rate for the under 18 age category is also highest in Malheur and Harney counties.

(See Appendix i.a. District Tables – Poverty Rate – GEODC Counties)

EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

Education levels of the population within the district are similar to those for the State of Oregon for some categories but with less attainment in others.

For example, all counties have a higher percentage of persons with a 9th to 12th grade level and no diploma. Both Malheur and Morrow counties stand out as having twice the percentage of persons with less than a 9th grade education as that of the State as a whole.

In order to meet the workforce training skills needed for existing and future jobs, special attention on improving performance is needed. As a potential model for other counties to use, Malheur County’s Poverty to Prosperity Program takes an innovative approach to providing skills training for high
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For educational levels within the workforce, except for a few categories, achievement levels are more consistent among counties in the district. As would be expected, average attainment levels within the population are lower than within the workforce itself. People that are working have higher levels of achievement; the need for action is within the larger population where educational attainment levels are, in part, holding back people from obtaining a job.

For Less than a high school level in the workforce, it ranges from 6.8% (Wheeler) to 19.0% (Morrow County); High school or equivalent, no college, 23.1% (Umatilla County) to 33.5% (Wheeler County); Some college or Associate degree, 25% (Morrow County) to 34.2% (Gilliam); Bachelor’s degree or advanced degree, 13.8% (Morrow County) to 20.7% (Harney County).

(See Appendix i). Educational Attainment – Population, GEODC Counties and Educational Attainment in the Workforce – GEODC Counties 2011)

HOUSING TRENDS

Workforce housing has been a consistently identified issue in nearly all communities within the district. Shortage of both lower and middle income housing for rental and purchase is a pressing problem resulting in inequities in the housing market which effect economic development in the region. While housing is not a primary driver for economic growth, the lack of it can affect whether a company will consider expansion in an area, and whether individuals and sole business proprietors will consider living in a community.

In 2010, all of the counties had a for-sale housing vacancy rate of below 1.8% and for rental housing, most counties except Gilliam were below 3.3%. In comparison with the State, most counties in the district had lower

Educational attainment by GEODC counties:

- Oregon: 19.0%
- Gilliam: 25.0%
- Grant: 16.0%
- Harney: 14.0%
- Malheur: 12.0%
- Morrow: 10.0%
- Umatilla: 8.0%
- Wheeler: 4.0%

For Associates and Bachelors Degree.
vacancy rates for for-sale units, but only two counties had lower vacancy rates for rental units – Morrow and Wheeler counties. More importantly, the vacancy rates for both rental and for-sale units declined from 2000 to 2010 in nearly all counties.

In Morrow County, a county with considerable job growth in comparison with other counties in the district and the State as a whole, the decline in the vacancy rate for rental units between 2000 and 2010 was significant, 47.4%.

Boardman, Oregon is an example of a city in the district trying to address the issue of providing workforce housing. With continued expansion of companies at the Port of Morrow, Boardman would like to capitalize on this market and add new residents to its community. One of the approaches being taken is the use of gap financing, provided by the Port of Morrow and Tillamook Cheese, to lessen the financial requirements of developers to finance new housing. Thus far, it is not clear whether this incentive is working.

Several key issues cited in a forum on housing conducted in Boardman in February of 2014 include addressing the high cost of infrastructure, gap financing, and overall livability issues. Although the housing issue differs from community to community, most communities are struggling with their ability to provide market rate housing. Depending on the outcome in Boardman, other communities will be able to evaluate their results in an attempt to address their particular situation.

Active monitoring of Boardman as a test case for housing will be important to identifying solutions to this pressing issue.

(See Appendix i.a. Housing Vacancy Rate 2000 – 2010 – GEODC Counties)

### HOUSING VACANCY RATES 2000 – 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RENTAL VACANCY RATE</th>
<th>FOR SALE VACANCY RATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilliam</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrow</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harney</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malheur</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umatilla</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 Census Profiles, Oregon and its Counties. PSU Research Center
The 7-county, Greater Eastern Oregon Development Corporation District is made up of distinct local economies within a large geographic area; its economic activities are primarily resource-based supported by agriculture and forestry. Since the region is a designated economic development district by the federal government, it is important to evaluate it as an economic whole as well as on a local level. Economic performance was evaluated on the county and district levels, and to provide some perspective, comparisons were made to the state as a whole where possible.

As of 2013, the total employment for the district was 52,075 with roughly three-fourths employed by private industry and a one-fourth by government. Government is the largest employment sector in the district providing over 25% of the total employment. The district is more reliant than the State as a whole on government as an employer; by comparison, 16% of State employment is in the government sector. The manufacturing sector has been growing and represents 11.1%, which is slightly higher than the State’s at 10.4%. Much of the recent growth in the manufacturing sector has been due to the food processing industry centered at the Port of Morrow. Retail is a major employer at 11.0%, but does not impact secondary jobs in the district.

As would be expected with the high level of farm commodities in the district, the Agriculture and Forestry sector is a significant non-governmental source of employment. Not considering all sources of agricultural employment such as small farms and single proprietors, the employment is estimated at 10.6%. However, the State Employment Department conducts a separate estimate of agricultural jobs that includes all sources which is estimated at 13.4% for the district. Health Care and Social Assistance is a growing employment sector and employs 10.3%. The Transportation and Warehousing sector supports the distribution of agricultural products and major distribution centers in the region. With a well-developed multi-modal transportation network including road, rail and ports, the sector employs over 2600 and employs 5.0% of total jobs, higher than the State’s average of 2.9%.

The major employment sectors in the district include:

1. Government 25.6%
2. Manufacturing 11.1%
3. Retail Trade 11.0%
4. Agriculture & Forestry 10.6%
5. Health Care and Social Assistance 10.3%

### AGRICULTURE

Agricultural employment including small and large farms, ranches and related agricultural support activities is estimated at 13.4% of total employment for the district or 7640 jobs. Jobs in agriculture represent a significant source of employment for all of the seven counties in the district. Roughly 80% of the jobs in agriculture were found in three counties—Umatilla County (43%), Malheur County (24%) and Morrow County (17%). The remaining 20% of agricultural jobs were in four counties—Harney County (7%), Grant (5%), Gilliam (2%) and Wheeler (2%).

The district has a high value of farm commodities which support its capacity to develop other value added industries in the sector. The highest values of commodities within the district are: cattle, $385 million; wheat, $258 million; potatoes, $115 million, alfalfa, $85.4 million, and onions, $84.5 million. Umatilla county is a major producer of cattle, wheat and potatoes; Malheur, cattle, dry storage onions, alfalfa; Morrow, wheat, potatoes, cattle, and alfalfa; Grant, cattle; Harney, cattle, alfalfa. (OSU Agricultural Research Center)

One of the bright spots in the regional economy continues to be the food processing industry centered at the Port of Morrow and Boardman, Oregon, but includes Umatilla County and Ontario, Oregon in Malheur County. While manufacturing employment in the district shrank by 3.5% during the recession, the food manufacturing industry continued to grow by 14.8% in Morrow County and 16.4% in Umatilla County.

The strength of the food processing industry in the district is based on the district’s clear competitive advantages including access to agricultural products and an excellent transportation network by way of its road, rail and ports system. The addition of a newly planned cold storage facility at the Port of Morrow planned to begin operations in the spring of 2015 will strengthen the industry’s capacity to store their product and access new and larger markets.

The Hermiston area is a good example of an urban area within the district that has shown signs of diversification and growth. Being in the center of the agriculture industry and with excellent access to major freeways, rail and a major port, it has
attracted firms which capitalize on its competitive advantages. Its location to a growing job base at the Port of Morrow, recent siting of the Pioneer Seed, a major company engaged in seed research, and the location of the Walmart Distribution Center, employing 1,300, have helped the City position itself for future growth. In relative terms, Hermiston is seen as a desirable place to live and has captured the bulk of commuters to jobs in the Port District but competes with the Tri-Cities area in its perception as desirable place to live.

(See Appendix iib.: Oregon Agricultural Employment Estimates 2007–2013, Greater Eastern Oregon Counties)

THE FOREST SECTOR

The Forest sector has declined over the past 10 years due to harvest restrictions on federal forest lands, and the impact of the recession. Grant County lost almost 50% of its jobs in forestry and logging between 2006 and 2012. Harney County, also reliant on the industry, has had similar losses. In eastern Oregon, where the federal government owns over 65% of forestlands, the impact on timber harvests has been keen. Employment in logging was cut back by 48% from 2002 to 2012 (U.S. Census Bureau).

The Blue Mountain National Forest Lands Management Plan, currently under revision, will direct federal forest management of the 5.5 million acres in the Malheur, Umatilla, Wallowa-Whitman National Forests, and the Snow Mountain District of the Ochoco National Forest, for a period of 15 years. The Plan is critical to delivering economic outcomes in the forest products industry in the district, and will have a far-reaching impact on the scale of timber harvest, its economic impact and sustainability of forest health.

Current plan alternatives proposed by the U.S. Forest Service and those of private industry differ greatly. Private industry recommends allowing an annual sawlog timber harvest to 335 million board feet rather than the current Forest Plan’s proposal of 100 million board feet.

According to private industry representatives, an additional 225 million board feet/year of sawlog timber harvest above the current proposed Forest Plan gross harvest would contribute an additional 2,585 direct forest sector jobs to the region, and 2,000 indirect and induced jobs to the regional economy. Striking a balance between economic impact and the future health and sustainability of eastside forests is the crux of the issue.

THE PORT OF MORROW

The Port of Morrow, located on the Columbia River, near Boardman is the second largest Port in Oregon, (behind the Port of Portland), and serves as the main point for freight distribution, export and value-added production of agricultural products (grains, root vegetables, cattle, and milk/dairy products) that are primarily grown in Oregon, Washington, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming.

As a key economic development asset within the district, it is strategically located with excellent access to markets. It is estimated that over 7.7 million people reside within a half-day’s driving time including Seattle, Tacoma, Portland, Vancouver, Boise and other regions. Some of the key industries served by the Port include agriculture, lumber, food processing, livestock, transportation, freight distribution, information, advanced communications, energy, waste management, and recreation.

The permanent annual economic impact of the Port of Morrow and the 57 separate Port-related businesses are significant not only for the district but for the State and on an international scale. Based on a 2013 Economic Impact Analysis of the Port of Morrow by the FCS Group, the estimated employment provided by the Port includes 6,850
jobs (3,965 direct jobs, 1,925 indirect, and 960 induced), an annual output of more than $1.6 billion ($1.23B direct, $260M indirect, $111M induced), the generation of local and state tax revenues of over $48 million and annual federal tax revenues of over $66 million.

The Port’s impact on the district and, in particular, Morrow and Umatilla counties makes it a primary asset supporting economic growth in the region. The share of economic output within Morrow and Umatilla counties attributed to Port-related businesses has increased from 15% in 2006 to 22% in 2011. The share of direct employment that is considered to be Port-related accounts for 59% of all jobs in Morrow County, up from 36% in 2006. Strategic improvements in the Port of Morrow have one of the strongest investment returns for economic development growth in the region.

**ECONOMIC RESILIENCY:**

*Employment Change During and After the Recession*

Evaluating how the district and its counties performed during the Great Recession, 2007–2009, provided an opportunity to assess economic resiliency in the region. Employment and industry performance were evaluated during two timeframes; during the recession, 2007 to 2010, and after the recession, 2010 to 2013. Several factors were evaluated including how
the district performed in comparison with the state as a whole, how individual employment sectors performed on the district and county level and what relevant actions should be taken to improve economic resiliency.

Overall, the district performed better than the State as a whole during the recession, but did not recover as quickly after the recession. During the recession, the district lost 3.5% of its total nonfarm employment whereas the State declined at a faster rate, 7.5%. However, following the recession, the district grew at only a 0.3% rate whereas the State rebounded at the faster pace of 4.5%. Over the entire timeframe, 2007 to 2013, both the State and the district had the same rate of job loss of approximately 3%.

The fact that the district lost jobs at a slower rate during the recession but recovered more slowly than did the State after the recession points to the difference in diversification of industries between the district and the State. The State as a whole is far more diversified than the GEODC District. Because the recession impacted a larger range of industries on the State level than the district level, there was a greater loss of jobs during the recession. After the recession, because the State as a whole has a broader range of industries, it recovered more quickly than did the district.

Though both the district and State as a whole had the same percentage loss of jobs during and
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after the recession, the district would benefit by further economic diversification. Diversification would help the district become less vulnerable to changes in the economy, improve its potential for growth and improve wage levels.

Within the district, during the recession, the largest employment losses occurred in Mining, Logging, and Construction, -20.5%, Financial Activities, -12.3%, Information, -11.3%, Trade, Transportation & Utilities, -6.8%, and State Government, 6.0%.

The only sector that grew during the recession within the district was Education and Health Services, which includes ambulatory care services, hospitals, nursing and care facilities, social assistance; it grew by 9.1%.

One employment sector which did not rebound in the district was Government. Government including federal, state, and local, was down 0.5% during the recession and continued to decline by 4.6% after the recession. Because government is dependent on tax revenues generated from business growth, it lags behind the private sector in recovering from a recession. Overall, government is not a sector which contributes to diversification and economic resiliency, although its employment in the district at 13,895 jobs (2013) is significant. Certainly government employment provides many benefits to the region including jobs which support the district’s resource economy include the USDA, OSU Agricultural Extension Service Centers, US Forest Service, and State Forestry Department. 

*(See Appendix I[b. Employment Change During & After the Recession, Greater Eastern Oregon District]*)

**ECONOMIC RESILIENCY:**

**Performance of Agriculture Industry During and After the Recession**

One employment sector which helped to stabilize the district during the recession was the agriculture sector. The agriculture sector is a mature industry in the district and employed 13.4% and provided 7,640 jobs. Relative to total employment, the district lost fewer jobs in agriculture than did the State as a whole during the recession. While the district lost jobs in agriculture during the recession at a 2.7% rate, the State’s agriculture sector declined at a much faster rate of 10.1%.

Although the district lost a smaller percentage of its jobs in agriculture than did the State as a whole, it rebounded nearly as quickly with a 6.7% growth rate compared to the State’s, 7.2%.

---

**AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYMENT — GEODC COUNTIES**

% Change During Recession 2007–2010
The agriculture industry performed comparatively well during the recession; actions which strengthen agricultural production and expand value added products would tend to improve the overall resiliency of the district.

As an example, food processing, a value added agriculture manufacturing sector, was a stabilizing influence in the district during the recession. In Morrow County, jobs in food processing grew by 14.8% while the State as a whole lost 7.5% of its total jobs. After the recession, from 2010 to 2013, the food processing industry in Morrow County did even better, growing at 35.3% compared to the State’s overall recovery rate of 4.5%.

The food processing industry is a growing industry in the region, due to the availability of farm products, access to markets and a well-developed multi-modal transportation network including access to the Ports. With the high value of agricultural products in the region and these assets, the industry is positioned to continue its growth trend.

(See Appendix iib. - Oregon Agricultural Employment Estimates 2007 – 2013, Greater Eastern Oregon Counties)

**ECONOMIC RESILIENCY:**

**Performance of the Counties and Confederated Tribe (CTUIR) During and After the Recession**

In counties where there is more industry diversification than in other counties, economic performance during the recession was similar to that of the State as a whole. In 2009, at the height of recession, Umatilla and Morrow counties, where there is the greatest industry diversification among counties in the district, unemployment rates were 9.9% and 9.3% respectively, both lower than the State’s at 10.7%. Four years after the recession in 2013, Umatilla and Morrow counties had unemployment rates of 8.1% and 7.8%, both similar to that of the State as a whole at 7.7%.

Other counties in the district did not fare as well during the recession. In 2009, Grant and Harney
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Geodc Counties had unemployment rates of 13.4% and 16.1%, both considerably higher than the State’s rate of 11.1%. Four years after the recession in 2013, Grant and Harney counties still had high unemployment rates of 11.8% and 12.3% respectively, both considerably higher than the State’s at 7.7%.

While economic diversification is a key goal for the district, it may be especially important in counties showing a decline in employment both during and after the recession. Both Harney and Grant counties lost jobs during the recession, 2007 – 2010, after the recession, 2010 – 2013 and had a loss of their Labor Force Participation Rates and size of labor pools after the recession.

The Confederated Tribe of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) in Pendleton employed 1600 persons in 2013 representing 5.9% of the total employment for Umatilla County. Its employment was unaffected by the recession; during the recession, employment at CTUIR grew by 18.8%. After the recession, it continued to grow at 15.1%.

LABOR FORCE TRENDS

The Labor Force Participation Rate (LFPR), the percentage of persons employed or looking for work is a key indicator of how active the labor force is within an area. During an economic recession, many workers often get discouraged and stop looking for employment, as a result, the participation rate decreases. The size of the labor force and its change over time is also a means of evaluating the labor market.

If there are new jobs in an area or the prospect of jobs, an increase in the Labor Force Participation Rate could be anticipated. After the recession, 2010 -2013, the State’s LFPR declined by 4.5%. In the GEODC District, the LFPR also declined during the same time. The largest decline in the LFPR was in Gilliam County with a loss of 13.6%. The County also had the largest decline in the size of its labor force with a loss of 14.1% or 173 people. The likely explanation for the change in LFPR and size of labor force in Gilliam County is the end of the employment spurt attributed to wind power construction, which occurred in 2012.

After the recession, 2010–2013, Harney County also demonstrated a significant decline in its Labor Force Participation Rate, 5.1%, and the size of its labor force, 11.7%, a loss of
416 people from its labor pool. The County’s employment peaked in 1999, but has largely fallen off since then. In 2012, the nonfarm job count was down to its lowest since 1984, and in 2013 it reached a lower average of 2090 jobs. Grant County also showed a decline in its Labor Force Participation Rate, by 1.3% and its labor force, 4.5%, losing 157 persons from the labor pool.

In Harney and Grant counties, these economic indicators point towards not only a declining job base but also the labor pool needed to fill jobs. It may be that people are leaving counties to seek work elsewhere although there could be other explanations. Except for Gilliam County, most other counties had a modest decline in their Labor Force Participation Rate and size of labor force in comparison with that of the State as a whole.

Appendix i)b.: Labor Force Participation Rate—Greater Eastern Oregon Counties and Size of Labor Force—Greater Eastern Oregon Counties)

WAGES AND INCOME

Average wages for all counties were below the average for the State. In 2013, the average wage in Oregon was $45,010; the lowest average wage among counties in the district was Wheeler County, $23,530, representing 52.3% of the State average; the highest wage among counties was Morrow, $41,352, representing 92% of the State average.

In 2013, some of the highest paying employment sectors in Morrow County, where the average wage was highest, were: Transportation, Warehousing & Utilities, $80,158; Information, $79,683; Federal Government (Natural Resource & Mining), $60,294; Local Government (Trade, Transportation & Utilities), $52,737; Manufacturing, $44,081; Natural Resources & Mining (primarily agriculture), $37,020.

In Wheeler County, where the average wage was lowest, employment sectors with the lowest wages included: Leisure & Hospitality, $13,178; Retail, $20,104; Education & Health Services, $23,901; Federal government (Trade, Transportation & Utilities), $20,186.

In general, the more economically diversified counties had higher wage rates. One exception to this is Gilliam County, which, in 2013, had an average wage of $36,145 placing it at 80.3% of the State average. Gilliam County’s higher average wage is, in part, due to its relatively
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high paid workforce in its Waste Management and Remediation industry.

In general, the more diversified an economy is, the higher the average wages. Developing a more diversified economic base serves a number of economic development goals, one being the establishment of higher wages and the resulting capacity to sustain family life and support other sectors of the economy.

(See Appendix ib: Median Household Income, Greater Eastern Oregon Counties, and Average Wages 2013, Greater Eastern Oregon Counties and Average Annual Wages–2013 Greater Eastern Oregon District Counties)
GILLIAM COUNTY PROFILE

**POPULATION DENSITY (2013):** 1.59 Persons per square mile

**INCORPORATED CITIES:** Arlington | Condon | Lonerock

**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS:** Port of Arlington, Gilliam County, Ione Community Agriculture Business Organization (ICABO)

**History and General Information:**
Gilliam County was established in 1885 from a portion of Wasco County and was named after Colonel Cornelius Gilliam, a veteran of the Cayuse Indian War. The first county seat was at Alkali, now Arlington. In 1890, voters chose to move the county seat to Condon, known then as “Summit Springs.” A brick courthouse was built in Condon in 1903 but was destroyed by fire in 1954. The present courthouse was built on the same site in 1955.

Gilliam County is in the heart of the Columbia Plateau wheat area. The economy is based mainly on agriculture, with an average farm size of about 4,200 acres. Wheat, barley and beef cattle are the principal crops. Gilliam County produces approximately $19.5 million in sales of Wheat; $11 million in Cattle, and $1.35 million in Barley. The largest individual employers in the county, Chemical Waste Management of the Northwest and Oregon Waste Systems, subsidiaries of Waste Management Inc., are regional waste disposal landfills.

With elevations of over 3,000 feet near Condon, in the south of the county, and 285 feet at Arlington, 38 miles north, the county offers a variety of climates. Hunting, fishing and tourism are secondary industries. Two major rivers, the John Day and Columbia, and Interstate 84 traverse the area east to west. Highway 19 connects the county’s major cities north to south and serves as the gateway to the John Day Valley.

**Points of interest:**
Old Oregon Trail, Arlington Bay and Marina, Lonerock area, Condon historic district, tribal pictographs.

**Population Trends:**
Gilliam County’s population rose by 10 residents in 2011 and the trend continued in 2012, rising by 20. The 2013 population growth was 2.4 percent rising by 45 to total 1,945 and ranked as Oregon’s fastest growing county.

In 2012, the county ranked fifth in Oregon for the share of its population age 65 or older, according to the latest available estimates from Portland State. Births in Gilliam County are typically...
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outnumbered by deaths and net migration has not supported a sustained level of growth.

The population in Gilliam County lost 2.3% of its population between 2000 and 2010. The under 18 age group declined by 20.7% and the 65 years and older population grew by 13.7% over the same timeframe. The Hispanic population grew by 151.4%, 53 persons. The non-Hispanic population lost 5.2%, 97 persons.

(See Appendix ii.a. — Gilliam County Population, Households, Race 2000 – 2010)

Poverty Rate:

Gilliam County’s poverty rate for all people is 12.6% and for families with single, female head of household with children under 18, it is 29.4%. Both rates are among the lowest in the district. However for the 65 and over population, Gilliam County’s poverty rate of 15.5 is the highest in the district.

(See Appendix i.a. Poverty Rate – GEODC Counties)

Educational Attainment:

Gilliam County’s educational attainment levels in the over 25 years of age population are higher than the State’s for high school graduates (31.8% vs. 24.8%), associate’s degree level (10.6% vs. 8.1%), but lower for bachelor’s degree (11.8% vs. 18.5%). For all people in the population, high school level attainment is the same as the State’s at 89%. In the workforce, for those over 29 years of age, 14.7% have college degrees and 34.2% have some college or associate’s degrees. Those with some college or associate’s degrees represent the highest percentage of counties in the district.

(See Appendix i.a. Educational Attainment – Population, GEODC Counties and Educational Attainment in the Workforce – GEODC Counties 2011)

Housing Trends:

Workforce housing has been a consistently identified issue in nearly all communities within the district.

Gilliam County has the highest vacancy rates for both rental and for-sale units. In Gilliam County, the vacancy rate for rental housing in 2010 was 5.2% and for-sale housing was 1.8%, both higher than the State as a whole. Between 2000 and 2010, for Gilliam County, vacancy rates for rental grew by 20.3% while the vacancy rate of for-sale units declined by 71.7%

In 2010, all of the counties had a for-sale housing vacancy rate of below 1.8% and for rental housing, most counties except Gilliam were below 3.3%.

(See Appendix i.a. — Housing Vacancy Rate 2000 – 2010 – GEODC Counties)

Labor Force Trends:

Farm proprietors represent a significant share of Gilliam County’s labor force, with 92 self-employed farm operators according to the 2007 Census of Agriculture. The county’s annual jobless rate typically ranks as one of the State’s lowest and averaged 6.9% for 2013, which was lower than the State’s at 7.7 % and the average for the district at 8.6%. Since 2000, Gilliam has consistently had the lowest unemployment rate among counties in the district.

High self-employment and a sparse population translate to low unemployment rates in Gilliam County and a high labor force participation rate (LFPR) which is that percent of the population either employed or looking for work. Gilliam County had a relatively high labor force participation rate of 65.3% in 2013, second in the district and higher than the State’s.

Oregon’s annual average unemployment rate peaked at 11.1 percent in 2009 and has been subsiding ever since. By contrast, Gilliam County’s 2009 unemployment rate was just 6.8 percent but has risen slightly as wind farm construction projects ended.

Between 2010 and 2013, the Labor Force Participation Rate (LFPR) which is the percentage of the population employed or looking for work, declined in Gilliam County by 13.6%. The actual size of Gilliam County’s labor force also declined over the same timeframe by 14.1%, resulting in a loss of 173 persons.

(See Appendix i.b. — Labor Force Participation Rate — GEODC Counties and Size of Labor Force – GEODC Counties, Unemployment Rate – GEODC Counties 2000 – 2013)
Industry Employment Trends:
Total nonfarm payroll employment in Gilliam County grew rapidly in response to wind farm construction projects, peaking at 945 jobs in 2008. The projects continued well into 2012, although total nonfarm employment fell to 840 jobs, a loss of 105 jobs or 11 percent. For 2013, nonfarm employment declined to 735, a drop of 12.5% from 2012.

GILLIAM COUNTY EMPLOYMENT 2013

As of 2013, the top 5 employment sectors in Gilliam County are: Government (30%), Professional and Business Services (18.0%), Trade Transportation and Facilities (17.0%), Education and Health Services (7.4%) and Construction (6.8%).

Government employment (30%) employs 224 persons, with 198 of those with local government, primarily Public Administration and Education and Health Services. Within total government, State government employs 17 in the County. Professional and Business Services employs 134 of which 113 are employed by Waste Management Inc., the largest employer in the County. Trade Transportation and Facilities, employing 127, includes Wholesale, Retail which employs 46 and Transportation, Warehousing and Facilities employs 70 people. Education and Health Services employs 55 persons, distributed among ambulatory health nursing and residential care, and social assistance services. Construction includes 55 jobs primarily among specialty trade contractors.

Farm proprietors play an important role in the local job picture, supporting nonfarm jobs throughout the county. Nonfarm industries in Gilliam County are led by local government, which represented more than 1-in-4 jobs in 2013 (26.5%). Around 17% of Gilliam County’s jobs were found in trade, transportation and utilities, while professional and business services represented 18%. Taken together, Gilliam County’s top three nonfarm industries represented 485 jobs or about 65%.

EMployment Change During and After Recession:
During the recession, 2007 – 2010, Gilliam County gained 7.8% in its nonfarm employment as compared to the State’s loss of 7.5%. However, after the Recession from 2010 to 2013, Gilliam County lost 17.9% while the State gained 4.5 % in nonfarm employment. Sectors which grew in employment during the Recession but declined after it were: Trade, Transportation and Utilities, Educational and Health Services, and Federal Government.

Agriculture in Gilliam County was a stabilizing force during and after the Recession. During the Recession, jobs in Agriculture including small and large farms and proprietors, increased by 10%; after the Recession, 2010 to 2013, it grew by 45.5 %, 50 jobs, compared to the State’s growth in Agriculture of 7.2%.

Wage and Income Trends:
According to Oregon Employment Department data, the average Gilliam County job paid $36,145 in 2013. That was 80% of the statewide average.

Based on a US Census Survey, Gilliam County’s Median Household Income was $45,833, representing 92% of the State’s at $50,036.
Grant County is situated in a rural, mountainous region of Eastern Oregon.

Grant County was established on October 14, 1864, and named for General Ulysses S. Grant, commander of the Union Army during the Civil War. Earlier in his military career Grant had been stationed at Fort Vancouver and assigned to protect the increasing number of emigrants traveling the Oregon Trail. Grant County is located in eastern Oregon and was created out of Wasco and Umatilla Counties. At that time Grant County was the largest county in the state. Its size was later reduced by the transfer of land to Lake County and the creation of Harney and Wheeler Counties. Grant County shares boundaries with eight counties: Morrow, Umatilla, and Union to the north; Harney to the south; Malheur and Baker to the east; and Crook and Wheeler to the west. It has an area of 4,528 square miles.

The county’s public lands play an important role in the local job picture, both for the government workers who manage the resources and the private-sector employees who work with forest products and other natural resources. Grant County employment in government, logging, and manufacturing is much smaller today than it was a decade or two ago; the most current figures suggest that manufacturing jobs are slowly bouncing back and that the downward slide in government employment may be slowing.

History and General Information:

Grant County was one of only three Oregon counties to lose population between 2012 and 2013. The county’s demographic profile tilts toward the elderly, with only two other counties in Oregon having a greater proportion of senior citizens (ages 65 and over) as of 2012. As a consequence, Grant County registered more deaths than births in recent years.

Between the 2000 and 2010 censuses, the under 18 age category declined 30.1% and the over 65 age category gained 32.3%. The Hispanic population grew by 27%, while all non-Hispanic races lost 6.9% over the same time period.

Population Trends:

The county’s population is trending slowly downward. The 2000 Census counted 7,935 people in Grant County, while the 2010 Census recorded 7,445, a loss of 6.2%. According to estimates from Portland State University’s Population Research Center, Grant County was down to 7,435 people as of July 1, 2013.

Points of Interest:

John Day Fossil Beds National Monument, Veteran’s Memorial, Kam Wah Chung Museum, Joaquin Miller Cabin, Grant County Historical Museum, Sacred Totem Pole, Grant County Historical Mural, Dewitt Museum, Depot Park, Sumpter Valley Railroad, Strawberry Mountain Wilderness and North Fork John Day River Wilderness, Silvies Valley Ranch.
IV. Demographic and Economic Profiles of the Counties

Grant County

(See Appendix ii)c. Grant County Population, Households, Race 2000 – 2010)

Poverty Rate:

Based on the American Community Survey 2008 – 2012, the poverty rate for all persons in Grant County was 15.7%. In comparison, the State’s poverty rate is 15.5%. The highest rate of poverty, as in many counties, was seen among single women house- holders with children under 18 at 49.7%, which is higher than that of the State as a whole at 41.4%.

(See Appendix i)a. District Tables — Poverty Rate — GEODC Counties)

Educational Attainment:

Education levels of the population in Grant County are similar to those for the State of Oregon for some categories but with less attainment in others. The County has a much lower rate of persons with less than a 9th grade education, 2.4% vs. 4.1% for the State. Educational achievement levels for persons completing 9th to 12th grades, high school, some college and Associates degree level were equal to or higher than that of the State. For Bachelor degrees and graduate or professional degrees, Grant County was about half the percentage of the State of Oregon; 10.8% for Bachelor’s degree vs. 18.5% for the State; and 5.8% for Graduate / Professional degrees vs. 10.8% for the State of Oregon.

However in the active workforce, Grant County has higher percentage of workers with a high school level but no college level training at 30%.

Grant County has a higher percentage of Bache- lor’s degree or higher, 17.6% than did the State as a whole at 14.7%.

(See Appendix i)a. Educational Attainment – Population, GEODC Counties and Educational Attainment in the Workforce – GEODC Counties 2011)

Housing:

Workforce housing has been a consistently identified issue in nearly all communities within the district. In 2010, all of the counties had a for-sale housing vacancy rate of below 1.8% and for rental housing, most counties except Gilliam were below 3.3%.

In Grant County, the vacancy rate for rental housing in 2010 was 2.9% and for-sale housing was 1.2%. Between 2000 and 2010, for Grant County, vacancy rates for rental and for-sale units declined by 18% and 6% respectively.

(See Appendix i)a. Housing Vacancy Rate 2000 – 2010 – GEODC Counties)

Labor Force Trends:

Chronically high unemployment has been a fact of life in Grant County. The county’s annual average jobless rate has been above 10 percent every year since 2008. The State’s annual average unemployment rate peaked at 11.1 percent in 2009 but has been subsiding ever since. By contrast, Grant County’s 2009 unemployment rate was 13.4%, and it was still 13.4% in 2012. While the local jobless rate finally began to decline in 2013, this may be due to a smaller number of people in the local labor force seeking jobs.

Between 2010 and 2013, the Labor Force Participation Rate (LFPR) which is the percentage of the population employed or looking for work, declined in Grant Council by 1.3%. The combi- nation of a smaller population plus a falling labor force participation rate led to a workforce that in 2013 was about 5 percent smaller than in 2010.


Industry Employment Trends:

Total nonfarm employment in Grant County was down or, at best, unchanged for eight consec- tive years through 2012. In fact, 2012’s nonfarm job count was Grant County’s lowest in 29 years. Figures for 2013 are only marginally higher.

For 2013, the top 5 employment sectors in Grant County are: Government (41%), Trade, Transpor- tation and Utilities (13.1%), Natural Resources and Mining (9.8%), Leisure and Hospitality (7.5%), and Health and Educational Services (7.3%).

Governmental employment includes 265 federal primarily in Natural Resources, 138 in State and 559 in local government. Within State govern- ment, 82 were in Public Administration; Local Government included 559 employees, of which 361 worked in Education and Health Services.
Private employment within the Health and Educational Services sector employs 169 persons, and represents 7.3% of the total employment.

The manufacturing sector in Grant County lost 18% between 2008 and 2013, but still employs 141 in Wood Products, Fabricated Metals, and Machinery with an average wage of $37,662.

For the agriculture sector, including small and large farms, during the recession, 2007 – 2010, Grant County lost 6.5% of its agricultural employment, but gained 20.7% back after the recession (2010 – 2013), adding an additional 60 jobs. Agricultural showed comparatively smaller losses during the recession and quicker gains after the recession than most other employment sectors.

The largest employment losses during the recession were Manufacturing (-54%), Mining and Logging (-50%), Wholesale Trade (-20%), Federal Government (-20%), and Financial Activities (-18.2%).

Wage and Income Trends:
According to Oregon Employment Department data, the average job in Grant County paid $33,497 in 2013. That was 74 percent of the statewide average. The highest wages were found in Government, $42,481, Finance and Insurance, $35,407, Information, $38,952, Transportation and Warehousing, $57,967, and Manufacturing, $37,662.

According to U.S. Census Bureau data, Grant County’s median household income was $34,337 in 2013. That was 69 percent of the statewide median.

(See Appendix ii)b. Grant County Covered Employment and Wages 2013 – GEODC District and Appendix A i) — Median Household Income – GEODC Counties)
Harney County was created from the southern two-thirds of Grant County on February 25, 1889. It is located in the high desert country in the southeast portion of the state and is the largest county in Oregon, comprising 10,228 square miles. Counties with contiguous borders include Malheur to the east; Lake, Deschutes, and Crook to the west; Grant to the north; and the State of Nevada to the south. The county was named after the lake that lies within its territory, which was named in honor of General William S. Harney, commander of the Department of Oregon of the U.S. Army in 1858-1859.

The cities of Burns and Hines are the County’s primary urban centers. Burns, incorporated in 1889, is the County’s administrative seat. Three industries, cattle raising, sheep raising, and timber, have traditionally provided the county’s economic base. The railroad, which extended into the area in 1883, served as a catalyst to the cattle industry but later contributed to its decline by bringing farmers and sheep men to the area thus creating increased competition for productive land. Harvesting and breeding of wild horses was lucrative for a period. Although Harney County lands were open to homesteading from 1862 to 1934, the federal Bureau of Land Management still owns more than three million acres. Facilitated on the national level by the Carey Act of 1894, arid land in Harney County was donated to the state for irrigation and settlement, but all water development efforts failed. Eventually, land claims under the reclamation legislation were abandoned or nullified. The Malheur National Wildlife Refuge was established in 1908 and expanded in the 1930s and 1940s. The refuge now includes 187,000 acres.

In addition to Malheur and Harney Lakes, other geographic landmarks of the county include the nearly 10,000-ft high Steens Mountain, known for its lava formations at Diamond Craters. Borax has been mined in the Steens area, and uranium has been found on its south side.

Points of interest:

Population Trends:
The county’s population has been trending downward. Recent years have seen some net out-migration, with more people moving out of the county than moving in. Based on the U.S. Census, Harney County’s population decreased by 2.5% between 2000 and 2010. Between 2010 and 2013, Portland State University’s Population Research Center estimated a population decline of 2.2%. The total population as of 2013 was estimated at 7,260.
IV. Demographic and Economic Profiles of the Counties

Harney County's population is primarily concentrated in a small urbanized sector that includes the cities of Burns and Hines with the remainder mostly in the Harney Basin. The county's population was recorded as 2,559 during the 1890 census and rose steadily until the decade of 1930-40, and then resumed an upward curve until the 1980s. The county experienced a net out migration of 15% in the 1980s primarily due to the closure of the lumber mill in Hines.

Among the under 18 years segment between 2000 and 2010 Census dates, there was a 15% loss, but in the 65 and over category a gain of 22.9%. Nearly all races lost population over the same timeframe.

Poverty Rate:

Harney County is second in the district to Malheur County in its percentage of people with incomes below the poverty level, 19.1%, while Malheur County is 25.0%. Harney County has the highest rate of poverty in the district among families with a female head of household with children under 18 and no husband present, 68%.

Educational Attainment:

Education levels of the population in Harney County are similar to those for the State of Oregon for some categories but with less attainment in others. The County has a lower rate of persons with less than a 9th grade education, 2.9% vs. 4.1% for the State. Educational achievement levels for persons completing 9th to 12th grades, high school, and Associates degree level were equal to or higher than that of the State. As is similar for Bachelor degrees and graduate or professional degrees, Harney County had a lower percentage than the State of Oregon; 10.4% for Bachelor's degree vs. 18.5% for the State; and 5.3% for Graduate / Professional degrees vs. 10.8% for the State of Oregon.

For education levels of persons over 29 and in the workforce, Harney County had a higher than average percentage of persons in the district with some college or an Associate's degree and a higher percentage of Bachelor's degrees or higher than the State with 20.7% vs 14.7 % for the State.

Housing Trends:

Workforce housing has been a consistently identified issue in nearly all communities within the district.

In Harney County, the vacancy rate for rental housing in 2010 was 3.3% and for-sale housing was 1.4%. Between 2000 and 2010, for Harney County, vacancy rates for rental and for-sale units declined by 24.4% and 2.6% respectively.

Vacancy rates were slightly higher for rental units and about the same as the average for other counties in the district.

Labor Force Trends:

Challenging labor market conditions plus declining population have led to a shrinking labor force. Year-to-date statistics for 2013 suggest that the size of Harney County’s labor force is at its lowest point since the 1960s.

Between 2010 and 2013, the Labor Force Participation Rate (LFPR), that percentage of the population employed or looking for work, declined in Harney County by 5.1%. The combination of smaller population plus a falling labor force participation rate led to a workforce that in 2013 was 11.7% percent or 416 persons smaller than in 2010.

Industry Employment and Trends:

Agriculture – which, in Harney County, consists mostly of cattle ranching and hay growers – has been a bright spot for the local economy. The industry is seeing increased sales values and sustained employment levels.

However, total nonfarm employment in Harney County peaked in 1999 but has largely fallen off
since then. By 2012, the nonfarm job count was down to its lowest level since 1984, and in 2013, nonfarm employment again inched down to an even lower average of 2090 jobs.

Harney County's industry structure once featured several hundred manufacturing workers producing primarily wood products, but the factory sector today claims no more than 10 jobs. The county's largest job category nowadays is government, but as an employment sector, it has been trending downward.

The top 5 employment sectors in Harney County are: government (45.6%), Trade, Transportation and Utilities (16.2%), Leisure and Hospitality (10.2%), Education and Health Services (8.2%), and Natural Resources and Mining (7.6%).

As of 2013, the government employed 991 with 28% or 618 jobs in local government, 11% or 243 jobs in federal and 6% or 130 jobs in State government. The bulk of jobs in the Trade, Transportation and Utilities sector are in retail (76%), the remainder in Wholesale, Transportation and Warehousing. The Leisure and Hospitality sector employs 222 (10.2%), Education and Health Services employs 166, with 75 jobs in Nursing and Residential Care, 67 jobs in Ambulatory Health Care, and 2 employed in Social Assistance.

The Natural Resources and Mining sector is primarily comprised of agriculture including crop production, animal production, and agricultural and forestry support activities. In 2013, within the employment sector, animal production and primarily cattle ranching account for approximately 57% of the employment (94 jobs), and crop production, 38% (63 jobs).

A stabilizing force during the recession for Harney County was Agriculture including small and large farms. Jobs in agriculture in Harney County grew by 8.2% between 2007 and 2010, helping to stabilize its nonfarm employment loss of 7.5%.

During the recession itself, 2007 – 2010, Harney County lost 9.6% of its nonfarm employment compared to the State's loss of 7.5%. While after the recession, from 2010 to 2013, the State made a recovery of 4.5%, Harney County continued to lose nonfarm jobs at the rate of 7.5%. Similar to Grant County, the slower recovery after the recession is likely due to the State's more diversified economic base, contributing to more expansion across a larger range of employment sectors.

After the recession, from 2010 to 2013, there was very little change in agricultural employment in Harney County, growing by 10 jobs, 1.9%.

Wage and Income Trends:

According to Oregon Employment Department data, the average job in Harney County paid $32,812 in 2013. That was 73 percent of the statewide average.

According to U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey (2008 – 2012) Harney County’s median household income was $39,674, 79%.

Harney County’s industry structure once featured several hundred manufacturing workers producing primarily wood products, but the factory sector today claims no more than 10 jobs. The county’s largest job category nowadays is government, but as an employment sector, it has been trending downward.

The top 5 employment sectors in Harney County are: government (45.6%), Trade, Transportation and Utilities (16.2%), Leisure and Hospitality (10.2%), Education and Health Services (8.2%), and Natural Resources and Mining (7.6%).

As of 2013, the government employed 991 with 28% or 618 jobs in local government, 11% or 243 jobs in federal and 6% or 130 jobs in State government. The bulk of jobs in the Trade, Transportation and Utilities sector are in retail (76%), the remainder in Wholesale, Transportation and Warehousing. The Leisure and Hospitality sector employs 222 (10.2%), Education and Health Services employs 166, with 75 jobs in Nursing and Residential Care, 67 jobs in Ambulatory Health Care, and 2 employed in Social Assistance.

The Natural Resources and Mining sector is primarily comprised of agriculture including crop production, animal production, and agricultural and forestry support activities. In 2013, within the employment sector, animal production and primarily cattle ranching account for approximately 57% of the employment (94 jobs), and crop production, 38% (63 jobs).

A stabilizing force during the recession for Harney County was Agriculture including small and large farms. Jobs in agriculture in Harney County grew by 8.2% between 2007 and 2010, helping to stabilize its nonfarm employment loss of 7.5%.

During the recession itself, 2007 – 2010, Harney County lost 9.6% of its nonfarm employment compared to the State's loss of 7.5%. While after the recession, from 2010 to 2013, the State made a recovery of 4.5%, Harney County continued to lose nonfarm jobs at the rate of 7.5%. Similar to Grant County, the slower recovery after the recession is likely due to the State's more diversified economic base, contributing to more expansion across a larger range of employment sectors.

After the recession, from 2010 to 2013, there was very little change in agricultural employment in Harney County, growing by 10 jobs, 1.9%.

Wage and Income Trends:

According to Oregon Employment Department data, the average job in Harney County paid $32,812 in 2013. That was 73 percent of the statewide average.

According to U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey (2008 – 2012) Harney County’s median household income was $39,674, 79%.
History and General Information:
Malheur County was created in 1887 from Baker County. Malheur County derives its name from the “Riviere au Malheur” or “Unfortunate River” (later changed to “Malheur River”), named by French trappers whose property and furs were stolen from their river encampment.

Malheur County is located in the southeast corner of Oregon. It is bordered by Baker County on the north, the State of Idaho on the east, the State of Nevada on the south, and Harney and Grant Counties on the west. Malheur County is the second largest county in the state with 9,874 square miles. The county seat is Vale.

The county is 94% rangeland, with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) controlling 72% of the land. Irrigated fields in the county’s northeast corner, known as Western Treasure Valley, are the center of intensive and diversified farming. Malheur County’s economy also depends on tourism.

The county’s two largest employers are the Snake River Correctional Institution and Ore-Ida, a potato processor owned by H.J. Heinz. The Snake River Correctional Institution, employing approximately 900 and located in northeastern Malheur County, about five miles (8 km) northwest of the city of Ontario, is a medium security prison in eastern Oregon, and the largest facility in the Oregon Department of Corrections system.

Points of Interest:
- Oregon Trail, Keeney Pass, Owyhee Lake, Succor Creek State Park, Leslie Gulch Canyon, Jordan Craters, grave of trapper John Baptiste Charbonneau, Nyssa Agricultural Museum, Vale Oregon Trail Murals, Jordan Valley Basque Pelota Court, the Four Rivers Cultural Center.

Malheur County is Oregon’s second-largest county, but most residents live in a pocket of land in the northeast corner of the county near the Idaho border. According to estimates from Portland State University’s Population Research Center, Malheur County was back up to 31,440 people as of July 1, 2013. The County had considerable long-term population growth through the 1900s, but trends are more mixed these days.

Between 2000 and 2010, the Census reported a 1% loss in population. The under 18 year-old population lost 8.4% over the decade while the over 65 years age group gained 8.6% over the same timeframe.

While the total population lost 1% between 2000 and 2010, the Hispanic population grew by 21.8%; the non-Hispanic population lost 8.8%.
(See Appendix ii.d. Malheur County Population, Households, Race 2000 – 2010)

Poverty Rate:
Poverty is a serious issue in Malheur County. Based on U.S. Census Bureau statistics, Malheur County’s poverty rate both for all people and families were the highest in the district and State at 25.0% and 17.8% respectively. For families with female head of household with children under 18 and no husband, the poverty rate was 56.1%.
(See Appendix i.a. District Tables — Poverty Rate – GEODC Counties)
**Educational Attainment:**

Education levels in the population in Malheur County are not greatly different than the rest of the counties in the district. For the 25 years and older segment, only 8.2% have a bachelor’s degree compared to the State, 18.5%, but the county has a higher percentage of high school graduates at 30.1% vs. the State, 24.8%.

In the workforce, Malheur County educational attainment levels are similar to other counties in the district.

*(See Appendix i)a. Educational Attainment – Population, GEODC Counties and Educational Attainment in the Workforce – GEODC Counties 2011)*

**Housing Trends:**

Workforce housing has been a consistently identified issue in nearly all communities within the district.

In Malheur County, the vacancy rate for rental housing in 2010 was 2.5% and for-sale housing was 1.2%. The vacancy rates in Malheur County in 2010 for both rental and for-sale housing were similar to those of the State at 2.4% and 1.4% respectively. Between 2000 and 2010, for Malheur County, vacancy rates for rental and for-sale units declined by 16.8% and 6.6% respectively. In 2010, all of the counties had a for-sale housing vacancy rate of below 1.8% and for rental housing, most counties except Gilliam were below 3.3%.

*(See Appendix i)a. Housing Vacancy Rate 2000 – 2010 – GEODC Counties)*

**Labor Force Trends:**

The unemployment rate in Malheur County in 2013 was 8.7%, which was higher than the State’s at 7.7%, but not the highest in the district. Idaho residents hold a substantial share of the jobs in Malheur County. Because of this commuting pattern, the federal government recognizes Idaho’s Payette County plus Oregon’s Malheur County as a single labor market known as the Ontario Micropolitan Statistical Area.

For the period after the recession, 2010 to 2013, Malheur County’s labor force participation rate (LFPR) that part of the population that is either working or seeking work, declined by 2.5% and lost 891 persons. In 2013, the overall labor force participation rate for the County, 61.4%, was similar to that of the State as a whole at 62.0%.

However, between 2010 and 2013, the size of Malheur County’s labor force declined by 6.6%, three times as much as the State’s at 2.2%. In comparison with other counties in the district, Malheur County was about in the middle of counties in terms of its labor force participation rate in 2013 and reduction of its labor force between 2010 and 2013.

*(See Appendix i)b. Labor Force Participation Rate — GEODC Counties and Size of Labor Force – GEODC Counties, Unemployment Rate – GEODC Counties 2000 – 2013)*

**Industry Employment Trends:**

Total nonfarm payroll employment in Malheur County peaked in 2000 and has not risen above that level as of 2013. However, there was a slight increase in employment 2013. Private-sector employment in Malheur County has been improving over the past three years, though public sector jobs are still in decline.

![Malheur County Employment 2013 Chart](chart-url)

Agriculture is a key industry for the area, providing not only hundreds of direct jobs on local farms and ranches but also supporting hundreds more in the county’s manufacturing, wholesale trade, and transportation and warehousing industries. Malheur County has a high level of farm commodities including the highest value of sales (2012) for cattle in the district at $134.4 million, the highest for onions,
$84.5 million, and corn for grain, $30.8 million. Malheur County also has sizable employment in the retail trade sector, with Ontario serving as a retail hub for several surrounding communities, in part due to Oregon’s lack of a state sales tax. In 2013, the Snake River Correctional Institute employed 874 workers with an average wage of nearly $60,000. By industry standards, the Snake River Correctional Institute employs about as many workers as its Manufacturing sector, 897, but with two times its payroll and average wage.

The top 5 employment sectors in Malheur County are: Government (25.8%), Trade, Transportation, and Utilities (23.7%), Education and Health Services (13.5%), Natural Resources and Mining (9.5%) and Manufacturing (7.2%).

Total Government employment was 3,192 in 2013, with Federal employing 216, State, 1,214, and local government, 1,761. Within the State government sector, 958 were employed in Public Administration which is attributable to Corrections Facilities. In Local government, over 1,100 were employed in Education and Health Services and 387 in Public Administration.

The Trade, Transportation, and Utilities sector employs over 23%, including 2,933 jobs, and is made up of Wholesale, Retail and Transportation, Warehousing and Utilities. Wholesale and Transportation, Warehousing and Utilities are heavily driven by farm products. The Retail sector employs 1,825 and comprises over 60% of the Trade, Transportation, and Utilities sector. Wholesale Trade employs 709 which are primarily wholesale merchants of non-durable farm products. Transportation, Warehousing and Utilities employs 399 with 331 of the jobs in warehousing and storage, and truck transportation.

Education and Health Services employing 13.5% employs 1,672 which includes employment in ambulatory health care services, hospitals, nursing and residential care facilities and social assistance.

Natural Resource and Mining which is primarily agriculture and employs 1,173, of which 666 (57%) are employed in crop production, 276 (24%) in agriculture and forestry support activities, and the most of the remainder were employed in Animal Production, roughly 230 (19.6%).

Wage and Income Trends:

According to Oregon Employment Department data, the average job in Malheur County paid $32,077 in 2013. That was only 71 percent of the statewide average.

According to U.S. Census Bureau data, Malheur County’s median household income was $37,191 in 2013. This represents only 74 percent of the statewide median.
History and General Information:
Morrow County, created from Umatilla County in 1885, is located east of the Cascades in north-central Oregon. It was named for J. L. Morrow, an early resident. Morrow County contains more than one million acres of gently rolling plains and broad plateaus. This rich agricultural land can be roughly divided into three occupational zones—increasing amounts of irrigation farming in the north, vast fields of wheat yielding to cattle ranches in the center, and timber products in the south. With the advent of center pivot irrigation technology, Morrow County became one of Oregon’s fastest growing areas in terms of population, personal income, and agricultural and industrial development. The Port of Morrow, second largest in the state in terms of tonnage, serves as a gateway to the Pacific Northwest and Pacific Rim markets.

The major industries in Morrow County includes timber, energy, food processing and a variety of agricultural practices including potatoes, corn, watermelons, grapes, wheat, canola, sheep and cattle. Morrow County ranks third in the State in amount of value added agricultural products sold.

Points of Interest:
Columbia River, Blue Mountains, Umatilla National Forest, Oregon Trail, Blue Mountain Scenic Byway, Morrow County Museum, Port of Morrow, Sage County and the Lewis and Clark Route.

Population Trends:
Morrow County’s resident population totaled 11,425 in 2013, rising by 1.1 percent with a gain of 125 residents. Morrow County exceeded Oregon’s 0.9 percent gain in 2013 and ranked seventh fastest in population growth, which was in the upper third of Oregon counties.

The County’s growth rate since 2000 has been slower than the State as a whole but more recently has been faster in 2011 and 2013. Overall, since 2000, the County’s population grew by 3.9% (+430 residents) as compared to the State’s growth of 14.5%.

Between 2000 and 2010, Morrow County’s population grew by 1.6% with the largest share of growth among the 65 years and older population, 21.6%. The Hispanic population grew the fastest over the same time period, by 30.2%. All non-Hispanic segments of the population lost 7.6%.

In 2012, the county ranked 30th in Oregon for the share of its population age 65 or older, according to the latest available estimates from Portland State. Births in Morrow County typically outnumber deaths by a wide margin, providing its underlying growth, while net migration has not provided a stable contribution, declining from 2010 to 2012.

(See Appendix ii.e. Morrow County Population, Households, Race 2000 – 2010)

Poverty Rate:
The poverty rate in Morrow County was 15.5% in 2012, representing that percentage of all people...
with incomes below poverty level for the past 12 months. It was highest, 35.4%, among families with a single, female householder with children under 18.

(See Appendix i)a. District Tables — Poverty Rate – GEODC Counties)

**Educational Attainment:**

Education levels of the population in Morrow County are competitive with the attainment levels for the State as a whole. For the 25 years and older age group, Morrow County had a higher percentage of the population with less than a 9th grade education than the State, 9.9% vs. 4.1%. However, it has a higher percentage of high school graduates than the State, 33.4% vs. 24.8%, similar Associates level degrees, 7.7% vs. 8.1%, but only 7.9% with a bachelor’s degree compared to the State as a whole, 18.5%.

As to educational attainment levels within the workforce, Morrow County is similar to other counties in the district with regard to attainment levels for high school degrees, some college or Associates level degrees, bachelor’s degrees, but had a higher percentage than other counties in the district of workers with less than a high school degree at 19%.

Overall, including all ages, Morrow County has roughly half the percentage of Bachelor’s degree as the State, 14.8% vs. 29.2%.

(See Appendix i)a. Educational Attainment – Population, GEODC Counties and Educational Attainment in the Workforce – GEODC Counties 2011)

**Housing Trends:**

Workforce housing has been a consistently identified issue in nearly all communities within the district.

In Morrow County, the vacancy rate for rental housing in 2010 was 1.6%, one of the lowest in the district and for-sale housing was 1.2%, about average for the district. These vacancy rates were lower than the State’s which were 2.4% for rental and 1.4% in the for-sale category. This means that Morrow County has less available rental and for-sale units than is average for the State and most of the counties in the district.

Between 2000 and 2010, for Morrow County, vacancy rates for rental and for-sale units declined by 47.4% and 3.7% respectively. This represents a very significant change in rental vacancy rates for Morrow County. (See Table 5 Housing Vacancy Rate 2000 – 2010 – GEODC Counties)

(See Appendix i)a Housing Vacancy Rate 2000 – 2010 – GEODC Counties)

**Labor Force Trends:**

Farm proprietors represent a significant share of Morrow County’s labor force, with 225 self-employed farm operators according to the 2007 Census of Agriculture. The county’s annual jobless rate typically ranked as one of the state’s lowest, averaging 7.8% in 2013. Oregon’s annual average unemployment rate peaked at 11.1% in 2009 and has been subsiding ever since. By contrast, Morrow County’s 2009 unemployment rate was considerably lower, at 9.2 percent and continued to decline to 7.8% and close to Oregon’s at 7.7%.

High self-employment coupled with rapid job growth have helped to keep unemployment rates low in Morrow County while maintaining a relatively high labor force participation rate (LFPR). Morrow County’s labor force participation rate was 61.4% in 2013, close to the State’s at 62.0% and in the middle of counties in the district.

Between 2010 and 2013, the Labor Force Participation Rate (LFPR) which is the percentage of the population employed or looking for work, declined in Morrow County by 2.6%, which was lower than that of the State’s at 4.5%. The size of the labor force declined by 2.8%, 156 persons, over the same timeframe, representing a decline similar to the State’s at 2.2% (See Table 6 Labor Force Participation Rate — GEODC Counties, Table 7 Size of Labor Force – Eastern Oregon Counties, Table 12 Unemployment Rate – GEODC Counties 2000 – 2013)

(See Appendix i)b. Labor Force Participation Rate — GEODC Counties and Size of Labor Force – GEODC Counties, Unemployment Rate – GEODC Counties 2000 – 2013)

**Industry Employment Trends:**

Three years after the recession, in 2013, Morrow County unemployment rate was 7.8%, which was very close to that of the State’s as a whole at 7.7%.
A bright spot in Morrow County’s employment has been the food processing industry located primarily in Boardman and at the Port of Morrow. Food processing was a stabilizing force in the County’s economy during the recession, growing at 14.8% when the State as a whole lost 7.5% of its jobs. After the recession, from 2010 to 2013, the food processing industry in the County did even better, growing at 35.3% compared to the State’s recovery rate of 4.5%. Of the total public and private employment in the county for 2013, the top 5 major employment sectors include: manufacturing (31.3%), natural resources and mining (22.1%) which is largely centered on agricultural support services; Government (17.2%), and Trade, Transportation and Utilities (12.2%). Of the approximately 1500 jobs in manufacturing, over 1300 were in the Food Processing sector located primarily at the Port of Morrow. The Natural Resources and Mining sector employs 1062, nearly all of those jobs in the agricultural industry. Of the 1062 jobs primarily in agriculture, 521 were in crop production; 350 were employed in animal production, and 169 in agricultural support activities. Government at 17.2% of total employment in the County includes federal, state and local government. Local government employs 686 of the total 866 employed by government; state government employs 109 and the Federal government employs 57 persons. Trade, Transportation and Utilities representing 12.2% of the total jobs in the County employs 584 including 284 in Transportation and Warehousing, 183 in Retail, and 117 in Wholesale trade.

**MORROW COUNTY EMPLOYMENT 2013**

- Manufacturing 31.3%
- Natural Resources & Mining 22.1%
- Local, State & Federal Govt. 17.2%
- Trade, Transportation & Utilities 12.2%
- Information 1.5%
- Education & Health Svcs. 3.2%
- Professional and Business Services 4.4%
- Financial Activities 1.5%
- Leisure & Hospitality 3.1%
- Construction 2.7%
- Other 0.9%

**EMPLOYMENT CHANGE DURING AND AFTER RECESSION**

Morrow County’s nonfarm employment fared better than the State as a whole during and after the recession. During the recession itself, 2007 – 2010, Morrow County gained 2.4% of its nonfarm employment compared to the State’s loss of 7.5%. After the recession, from 2010 to 2013, Morrow County did still better than the State with an 11.0% gain compared to the State’s 4.5%.

Jobs in agriculture declined by 4.8% during the recession, 2007 to 2010, but grew by 11.8% after the recession, 2010 to 2013, which was faster than the State’s recovery during the same timeframe of 7.2%.

The food processing industry helped to stabilize job losses in the County during the recession by growing approximately 15%, adding 17 jobs and faster after the recession by 35%, adding 348 jobs between 2010 and 2013.

(See Appendix ii.e. Morrow County Employment Change During and After Recession – GEODC District)

**Wages and Income:**

According to Oregon Employment Department data, the average job in Morrow County which includes private jobs, government and agriculture, paid $41,352, 92% of the statewide average. Between 2008 and 2013, the average pay in Morrow County rose by 16%. The Median Income for Morrow County is $48,452, the highest in the district.

(See Appendix ii.e. Morrow County Covered Employment and Wages 2013 – GEODC District and Appendix iib. Median Household Income – GEODC Counties)
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UMATILLA COUNTY PROFILE

| POPULATION DENSITY (2013): | 24.1 persons per square mile |
| INCORPORATED CITIES: | Adams | Athena | Echo | Helix | Hermiston | Milton-Freewater | Pendleton | Pilot Rock | Stanfield | Ukiah | Umatilla | Weston |
| ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS: | Round-Up Development Corporation (RCDC), Pendleton Economic Development Commission, Port of Umatilla, Confederated Tribe of Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) |

History and General Information:

Umatilla County traces its creation in 1862 to the regional gold rushes, which spawned the river port of Umatilla City and brought stock raisers to the lush grasslands.

Although Lewis and Clark and the Oregon Trail pioneers passed through Umatilla County, it did not bloom until the arrival of the railroad in 1881 and the development of dry land wheat farming. Water in the form of irrigation has been essential to economic diversification and growth, most recently in the Hermiston area, where the desert now yields lush watermelons and other products. Tourism is also increasingly important to Umatilla County where “Let-er-Buck” is heard by Pendleton Round-Up crowds.

Umatilla County is a major producer and exporter of agricultural goods, and has a well-developed food processing industry employing over 1800. The agriculture sector employed approximately 3000 in 2013 with roughly half of those in crop production and the other half in agriculture and forestry support activities.

The region has significant transportation infrastructure, including two interstates highways, extensive rail and barge links. These attributes, as well as a location that allows for single day access to the Portland, Seattle and Boise metro areas, have contributed to the region establishing itself as a major distribution hub. The area has established a concentration of electrical power generation facilities, both traditional as well as wind farms.

Points of Interest:

Pendleton Round-Up, Pendleton Woolen Mills, Old Town Pendleton, County Historical Society, Pendleton Underground, McNary Dam and Recreation Area, Echo Museum and Historic Area, Hat Rock, Battle Mountain and Emigrant Springs State Parks, Weston Historic District, Frazier Farmstead Museum in Milton-Freewater, North Fork Umatilla Wilderness Area, Tollgate-Spout Springs Recreation Area, Courthouse Clock Tower, Stateline Wind Project, Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation’s Wildhorse Casino and Tamastslikt Cultural Center


From 2000 to 2010, the County’s population grew by 5,341 or about 7.6%. Over the same time period, the Hispanic population grew significantly at 59.3% from 11,366 to 18,107 while the non-Hispanic population declined by 2.4%.

Over the same timeframe, the 65 and over age group grew at a higher rate, 11.2 %, and both the median age for men and women rose slightly.

Umatilla County’s resident population totaled 77,895 in 2013, rising 1.0 percent with a gain of 775 residents. Umatilla County’s more recent
growth trend began in 2011 when its population grew by 0.8 percent and continued into 2012, matching the State's annual gain of 0.7 percent.

However, historically Umatilla County's population growth of 10.4% since 2000 places it below Oregon's at 14.5% and in the middle third of Oregon counties. Births in Umatilla County typically outnumber deaths by a wide margin, providing its underlying growth, while net migration has also offered a boost.

(See Appendix ii) if Umatilla County Population, Households, Race 2000 – 2010)

Poverty Rate:
The poverty rate in Umatilla County is 15.5% for all persons roughly in the middle of counties in the district with Malheur County being the highest at 25.0%. For families with a single female head of household with children under 18, typically with a high poverty rate, the county’s rate was 46.6% also roughly in the middle of counties in the district.

(See Appendix i) a. District Tables – Poverty Rate – GEODC Counties)

Educational Attainment:
Education levels of the population in Umatilla County are similar to those for the State of Oregon for some categories but with less attainment in others. The County has a much higher rate of persons with less than a 9th grade education, 7.8% vs. 4.1% for the State.

Educational achievement levels for persons completing 9th to 12th grades, high school, some college and Associates degree level were equal to or higher than that of the State. For Bachelor degrees and graduate or professional degrees, Umatilla County was about half the percentage of the State of Oregon; 9.1% vs. 18.5% for the State. For graduate and profession degrees, the County was considerably lower than the State's average, 5.8% vs. 10.8% for the State of Oregon.

For education levels of persons over 29 and in the workforce, the seven counties in the district are, except for the category “less than a high school level”, very similar. Umatilla County has a second highest rate of persons working with less than a high school diploma in the district at 11.6%

(See Appendix i) a. Educational Attainment – Population, GEODC Counties and Educational Attainment in the Workforce – GEODC Counties 2011)

Housing:
Workforce housing has been a consistently identified issue in nearly all communities within the district. In Umatilla County, the vacancy rate for rental housing in 2010 was 2.7% and for-sale housing was 1.1%. Between 2000 and 2010, for Umatilla County, vacancy rates for rental and for-sale units declined by 6.8% and 28.1% respectively.

In 2010, all of the counties had a for-sale housing vacancy rate of below 1.8% and for rental housing, most counties except Gilliam were below 3.3%. Vacancy rates were slightly higher for rental units and about the same as the average for both rental and for-sale units among other counties in the district. However, between 2000 and 2010, Umatilla County had a significant drop in its for-sale vacancy rate of 28.1%.

(See Appendix i) a. Housing Vacancy Rate 2000 – 2010 – GEODC Counties)

Labor Force Trends:
The county’s annual jobless rate typically is in the upper-third of Oregon counties, averaging 8.4 % in 2012 while ranking 11th. Oregon’s annual average unemployment rate peaked at 11.1 % in 2009 and has been subsiding ever since. By contrast, Umatilla County’s 2009 unemployment rate was considerably lower, at 9.6 % but didn’t improve much until 2012, when it fell to 8.4 %. Umatilla County’s seasonally adjusted unemployment rate improved slightly in 2013, reaching 7.9 % in November, 0.6 percentage point higher than Oregon, while ranking 18th.

As of 2013, Umatilla County’s Labor Force Participation Rate (LFPR), which is that percent of the population either employed or looking for work, was the highest in the district at 69.7% and higher than that of the State’s as a whole, 62.0%. From 2010 to 2013, the LFPR for Umatilla County declined by 2.3% which was a slower decline than that of the State as whole at 4.5%.

Between 2010 and 2013, the actual size of the county’s labor force declined at approximately
the same rate as that of the State, 2.5% vs. the State’s 2.2% loss.

From 2003 to 2013, the national labor force grew by 6% and Oregon’s labor force by 4%. Over the same time period, most of the counties in the district declined in labor force except Umatilla which grew by 1.1% and Gilliam which grew by 0.57%.

(See Appendix i) Labor Force Participation Rate — GEODC Counties and Size of Labor Force – GEODC Counties, Unemployment Rate – GEODC Counties 2000 – 2013)

Industry Employment Trends:
The Umatilla County economy is centered around agriculture, food processing, forest products, tourism, manufacturing, recreation, aggregate production, and power generation.

The top industries in employment in 2013 for Umatilla County were led by Government (23.9%), Manufacturing, (11.1%), Education and Health Service (10.9%), Natural Resources and Mining, (10.0%), and Leisure and Hospitality (8.1%).

Government employed almost 7000 persons in Umatilla County in 2013, with roughly two-thirds of those employed in local government, one-quarter in state government, and 7% in federal government. Over one-half of the 3200 jobs in manufacturing were in the food manufacturing sector and 318 in the wood products sector. The Education and Health Service sector, which is private employment, employed 3196 person, 946 jobs in Ambulatory Care and 938 jobs in Nursing and Residential Care.

![UMATILLA COUNTY EMPLOYMENT 2013](image)

Leisure and Hospitality provided 2376 jobs with a high percentage of those in Accommodation and Food Services.

Farm proprietors are an important part of Umatilla County’s labor force, with 751 self-employed farm operators according to the 2007 Census of Agriculture. According to a special estimate by Employment Department, the 2013 total Agriculture employment in Umatilla County was 3300, the highest among all counties in the district and representing 43% of the total agriculture employment in the district.

(See Appendix ii) Umatilla County Average Annual Employment 2013 – 5 Year Change – GEODC District and Umatilla County Covered Employment and Wages 2013 – GEODC District

**EMPLOYMENT CHANGE DURING AND AFTER RECESSION:**

During the recession, Umatilla County lost jobs at a slower rate than did the State as a whole. Between 2007 and 2010, the County’s nonfarm job base declined by 3.6% whereas the State’s declined by 7.6%. However, after the recession, the County rebounded at a much lower rate compared to the State. Between 2010 and 2013, the County grew by 0.6% and the State as a whole grew at 4.5%.

Employment sectors that fared well during the recession for the County included Food Manufacturing, which grew at 16.4%, Tribal
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employment (CTUIR) which grew by 18.8%, and Educational and Health Services, which grew by 7.9% over the same timeframe.

Sectors which lost the highest percentage of jobs included State government, 14.3%, Information, 19.2%, Financial Activities, 10.9%, and Mining, Logging and Construction, which was primarily construction, 17.1%.

(See Appendix ii)f. Umatilla County Employment Change During and After Recession – GEODC District)

Wage and Income Trends:
In 2013, the average income in Umatilla County, which includes all jobs in the private sector, government, and agricultural jobs, was $35,594, 79% of the statewide average. Between 2008 and 2013, the average pay in Umatilla County rose by 9.8%. The Median Income for Umatilla County is $48,452, just below that of Morrow County at $48,457. Both Counties lead the district in Median Income and represent about 97% of the Statewide Median Income.

(See Appendix ii)f. Umatilla County Covered Employment and Wages 2013 – GEODC District and Appendix i)b. Median Household Income – GEODC Counties)

WHEELER COUNTY PROFILE

POPULATION DENSITY (2013): 1430
INCORPORATED CITIES: Fossil | Mitchell | Spray
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS: Wheeler County Economic Development Organization

History and General Information:
Wheeler County was formed by the Oregon Legislature in 1899 from parts of Grant, Gilliam and Crook Counties and was named for Henry H. Wheeler, who operated the first mail stage line from The Dalles to Canyon City. The new county consisted of 1,656 square miles with an estimated 46 townships, a population of 1,600 and taxable property worth one million dollars.

Wheeler County is as rugged and uneven as any Oregon county, with the terrain varying widely from sagebrush, juniper and rim rock to stands of pine and fir. Portions of two national forests lie within its boundaries with forest lands covering nearly one-third of the county. The area is probably best known as one of the most outstanding depositories of prehistoric fossils on the North American continent.

Points of Interest:
Painted Hills, John Day Fossil Beds, John Day River.

Population Trends:
Wheeler County is located in sunny North Central Oregon; it is the least populated and one of the most beautiful counties in Oregon. Its terrain is rugged and varies from deep river canyons edged in rim rock to high timbered mountains covered with pine and fir. Wheeler County’s population grew for the first time in over a decade, adding 5 residents in 2013 to total 1,430 and ranking 24th with a 0.4 percent gain. Looking back to the 2000 to 2010 Censuses, Wheeler County grew by 1.6% but declined by
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117 residents through 2013, a loss of 7.6 percent, to rank second from the bottom in 35th position.

In 2012, the county ranked 1st in Oregon for the share of its population age 65 or older, according to the latest available estimates from Portland State. Births in Wheeler County are typically outnumbered by deaths and net migration has not supported a sustained level of growth. Its 65 and over population segment grew by 21.5% and its Hispanic population by 30.2% between 2000 and 2010.

(See Appendix ii, Wheeler County Population, Households, Race 2000 – 2010)

**Poverty Rate:**
The poverty rate for all people in Wheeler, 12.0%, is the lowest of the counties in the district and below the State’s, 15.5%. For all families, it is 9.8%. Among families with a female head of household, with children under 18 and no husband, the poverty rate was the highest in the district, 60.9% and well above the State level, 41.4%. For the 65 and over segment, the poverty rate is 8.7% compared to the State’s, 8.0%.

(See Appendix i, District Tables — Poverty Rate – GEODC Counties)

**Educational Attainment:**
Education levels of the population (25 and over) in Wheeler County are similar to those for the State of Oregon for some categories but with less attainment in others. The County has a much lower rate of persons with less than a 9th grade education, 2.2% vs. 4.1% for the State. Educational achievement levels for persons completing 9th to 12th grades (no diploma), 10.6% which is higher than the State’s, 6.8%; high school, 38.9% is higher than the State’s, 24.8%; Associates degree level were lower, 6.6% vs. State’s 8.1%; Bachelor’s degree 9.5% vs. State’s 18.5%; Graduate or Professional degree, 5.4% vs. 10.8%.

For education levels of persons over 29 and in the workforce, the seven counties in the district are, except for the category “less than a high school level”, very similar. For Less than a high school level, it ranges from 6.8% (Wheeler) to 19.0% (Morrow County); High school or equivalent, no college, 23.1% (Umatilla County) to 33.5% (Wheeler County); Some college or Associate degree, 25% (Morrow County) to 34.2% (Gilliam); Bachelor’s degree or advanced degree, 13.8% (Morrow County) to 20.7% (Harney County).

In the workforce, Wheeler County has a higher percentage of Bachelor’s degree or higher, 16.0% vs. 14.7% for the State.

(See Appendix i, Educational Attainment – Population, GEODC Counties and Educational Attainment in the Workforce – GEODC Counties 2011)

**Housing Trends:**
Workforce housing has been a consistently identified issue in nearly all communities within the district.

In Wheeler County, the vacancy rate for rental housing and for-sale units was the lowest in the district, 0.8% for rental and 1.0% for for-sale units. These vacancy rates were lower than the State’s which were 2.4% for rental and 1.4% in the for-sale category.

This means that Wheeler County has less available on a percentage basis for rental and for-sale housing units than is average for the State and in comparison with other counties in the district.

Between 2000 and 2010, for Wheeler County, vacancy rates for rental and for-sale units declined by 26.8% and 55.4% respectively.

(See Appendix i, Housing Vacancy Rate 2000 – 2010 – GEODC Counties)

**Labor Force Trends:**
High self-employment and a sparse population translate to low unemployment rates in Wheeler County although its labor force participation rate (LFPR) was below average. The LFPR is that percent of the population either employed or looking for work. Wheeler County was the only county with an increase in its labor force participation rate (LFPR) between 2010 and 2013. While its LFPR increased, the size of Wheeler County’s labor forced declined in size by 3.8% or 27 persons. In comparison with the State as a whole, the County declined somewhat faster over the same timeframe.
Farm proprietors represent a significant share of Wheeler County’s labor force, with 86 self-employed farm operators according to the 2007 Census of Agriculture. In 2011, the county’s annual jobless rate ranked as one of the state’s lowest, averaging 7.6% in 2012 and ranking fifth.

Oregon’s annual average unemployment rate peaked at 11.1% in 2009 and has been subsiding ever since. By contrast, Wheeler County’s 2009 unemployment rate was much lower, at 9.0% in 2009 but it rose substantially in 2010 to 10.5%. Wheeler County’s unemployment rate improved in 2011, falling to 9.7%, while 2012’s rate of 7.6% represented a one-year drop of 2.1 percent. Seasonally adjusted jobless rates showed improvement in 2013, reaching 7.1% which was lower than the State as a whole at 7.7%.

(See Appendix iib. Labor Force Participation Rate — GEODC Counties and Size of Labor Force — GEODC Counties, Unemployment Rate — GEODC Counties 2000 – 2013)

**Industry Employment Trends:**

Total nonfarm payroll employment in Wheeler County remained relatively stable throughout the recession and recovery, rising by 20 jobs in 2012, above its 2005 total, but declining in 2013 down to 285, a 5.3% loss.

Farm proprietors play an important role in the local job picture, supporting nonfarm jobs throughout the county. Nonfarm industries in Wheeler County are led by local government with 125 jobs in 2012 or about 42 percent of the total. Around 17 percent of Wheeler County’s jobs were found in trade, transportation and utilities, while leisure and hospitality represented about seven percent. Taken together, Wheeler County’s top three nonfarm industries represented 195 jobs or about 66%.

The top employment sectors are: Government (36.8%), Education and Health Services (17.9%), Trade, Warehousing, and Utilities (16.3%), Natural Resources and Mining (15.5%) and Retail (12.1%). In 2013, Government employed 113 with most of the jobs in local government including Education and Health Services, and Public Administration. Education and Health Services in the private sector employed 55 persons. Natural Resources includes agriculture and contributes most of the 48 jobs in animal production with crop production, forestry and logging, and agriculture and support activities providing the remainder of jobs.

(See Appendix iilg. Wheeler County Average Annual Employment 2013 – 5 Year Change – GEODC District and Wheeler County Covered Employment and Wages 2013 – GEODC District)

**EMPLOYMENT CHANGE DURING AND AFTER RECESSION**

During the recession, 2007 to 2010, Wheeler County lost 1.8% of its job base compared to the State’s loss of 7.5% during the same timeframe. After the recession, from 2010 to 2013, the County recovered its loss and grew at the same 1.8%. The State as a whole grew at 4.5% after the recession.

One of the areas that was hardest hit in Wheeler County during the recession was the Leisure and Hospitality sector, which lost 16.7% of its jobs and continued to lose 40% after the recession from 2010 to 2013. The Trade, Transportation and Utilities sector did well after the recession, adding 15 jobs, growing by 40% over the same timeframe.

(See Appendix iilg. Wheeler County Employment Change During and After Recession – GEODC District)
Wage and Income Trends:

According to Oregon Employment Department data, the average job in Wheeler County paid $25,771 in 2013. That was just 57 percent of the statewide average. Wheeler County impressed in 2012, increasing its median household income (U.S. Census Bureau) by $3,573 or 8.5 percent in one year to rank 14th at $45,833. In 2013, Wheeler County’s median household income gap was $4,203 in 2012 or 8.4 percent below Oregon’s $50,036. Wheeler County’s median income was $36,357 and 73% of the State’s.

(See Appendix ii, Wheeler County Covered Employment and Wages 2013 – GEODC District and Appendix i, Median Household Income – GEODC Counties)
Competitive Advantages for Economic Development

Capitalizing on actions which strengthen the competitive advantages of the region is one of the primary goals of the strategy. The assets and opportunities supporting economic growth in the district are diverse and vary depending on geographic area.

There are eight (8) major assets that support economic growth within the region: Transportation Linkages / Location, Natural Resources, Industrial Land, Energy, Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV) Test Site Designation, Education, Small Business Support Services and Amenity Values.

TRANSPORTATION LINKAGES / LOCATION

Access to Multimodal Transportation Network — Interstate Highway System, Rail, Ports and local Airports

The northern region of the district has outstanding transportation infrastructure, including two interstates highways, I-84 and I-82, extensive rail and barge links via the Port of Morrow, Arlington and Umatilla. These attributes, as well as a location that allows for single day access to the Portland, Seattle and Boise metro areas, have contributed to the region establishing itself as a major distribution hub.

Eastern Oregon Regional Airport in Pendleton provides commercial air service to Portland. There are a number of general aviation airports in the district available for public use by pilots including Ontario, Burns, John Day, Hermiston, Boardman, and Enterprise.

Access to Major Markets

I-84 traverses the northern and east-central portion of the district and allows for single day access to the large urban markets in Oregon, Washington and Idaho and a reasonable drive-time to major population centers throughout the Northwest, Northern California, British Columbia, and the Western Mountain States.

The southern region of the district has an extensive State highway network linking communities to major markets via I-5 to the west, and I-84 to the north and east. Highway 395 connects Burns, John Day, Ukiiah to Pendleton and I-84 to the north; Highway 26 links Mitchell, John Day, Prairie City and Vale to Ontario and I-84 to the east and Bend to the west; Highway 20 connects Burns to Bend to the west and Ontario to the east.

The Port System as a Major Hub for Distribution

The district has an extensive multimodal Port system providing an interconnected means of distribution that includes highways, rail, barges and air. There are three Ports on the Columbia River within the district: the Port of Morrow, Port of Arlington and Port of Umatilla.

The Port of Morrow located next to Boardman, Oregon, on the Columbia River, is a major distributor of the region’s and state’s agricultural products with access to major markets both nationally and abroad. As of January 2012, the Port and its 47 tenants employed an estimated 3,965 direct workers in the district and provided a total annual economic output of over $1.6 billion.
Since the port’s establishment in 1959, it has grown to be the second largest port in Oregon, second only to the Port of Portland. The Port of Morrow’s close proximity to two interstate highways, the Union Pacific Railroad main line and the Columbia River has been major factors in the Port’s growth.

**Access to International Markets via the Port system**

The Columbia River port system is one of four primary international trade gateways along the West Coast. Rapidly growing Asian and middle eastern economies are projected to undergo significant increases in demand for trade into and out of most international and regional ports, including the Port of Morrow. Commodity flow forecasts for the region project a doubling of freight volumes along the Columbia River over the next 20 years. This growth equates to an average annual growth rate of 2-3%.

**NATURAL RESOURCES**

**Agriculture**

The GEODC District has a resource-based economy supported primarily by agriculture and forestry. Agriculture is a stable source of employment with high potential for growth in value-added products and services, and among firms which support agricultural activities.

The high value of farm commodities in the district provides potential for development of value added farm products within the manufacturing sector. High value farm commodities in the district include wheat, cattle, hay, potatoes, and corn for grain. Wheat is grown in Umatilla, Morrow, Gilliam, and Malheur counties and range in annual farm value from $147 million in Umatilla County to $19.5 million in Gilliam County. Cattle are raised in all 7 counties with an annual value of $134 million in Malheur County and a low value of $14.7 in Wheeler County. Hay is predominant in most counties with the highest crop value of $31 million in Harney County and a low value of $402,000 in Wheeler County. Other major farm products include potatoes in Morrow and Umatilla counties with $50 and $61 million respectively; the apple crop in Umatilla county accounts for $32 million in farm value, and water melons at $27 million annually.

**Regional Water Development and Restoration**

Irrigated agriculture is one of the primary means of improving productivity of farming in the region. A major concern for the entire region, there are several on-going efforts to develop new sources of water and opportunities to evaluate the potential for others in the region.

Efforts to acquire water rights and a plan to utilize Columbia River water as a primary source of irrigation in the Umatilla Basin are underway. By taking most deep well water users off of groundwater, and maximizing access to the Columbia River, the area can effectively increase its economic output, recover groundwater aquifers, develop resilience to drought and climate change and improve environmental conditions critical to fisheries and cultural needs.
Other opportunities to plan for and develop new sources of water in other areas of the region include cooperation with the Oregon Water Resources Department’s planning program. The State Department of Agriculture is working cooperatively with the Water Resources Department to assess reservation areas in the district for water conservation, development and storage.

**Agricultural Extension Service / USDA Agriculture Research Centers**

In eastern Oregon, the OSU Agricultural Extension Service along with the USDA research centers serve as Centers of Excellence in the agricultural industry and continue to work cooperatively with firms to develop innovative solutions to agriculture’s challenges. Several local firms have used the USDA’s and OSU Extension Service to test their products and develop better processes. There is great potential to improve agricultural practices by capitalizing on research expertise at the USDA – Agricultural Research Service Centers and the Oregon State University Extension Services.

Oregon State University Extension Services are located in all counties in the district. Combined Experiment and Extension Centers are located in Hermiston; Branch Experiment Stations are located in Burns, and Malheur County. The Columbia Plateau Conservation Research Center in Pendleton provides scientific information to improve practices, techniques, and equipment for dry land crop production, and soil and water conservation.

By forming industry clusters and combining the talents of leadership in private industry with the research capabilities of the US Department of Agriculture and Oregon State University, there is great potential to improve processes, develop new products, and share information among firms.

**Forestry**

Currently, the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) implements forest restoration treatments on about 129,000 acres annually in eastern Oregon, or just 1.4 percent of the USFS forestland not restricted from active forest management. According to An Economic Assessment of Forest Restoration on Oregon’s Eastside National Forests, a study prepared for Governor Kitzhaber and Oregon’s legislature in November 2012, doubling the scale and pace of forest health restoration on USFS-managed forests in eastern Oregon to 258,000 acres annually and sustaining this pace over the next 20 years will allow businesses to invest, restoration contractors to hire more workers, and mills to maintain their operations and employees.

Lumber mills on the east side represent an economic development asset that could be expanded depending on the availability of timber. As of November 2013, there were 11 lumber mills in operation in eastern Oregon employing 1,206 and processing 415 million...
board feet of timber (USFS). Of the 11 mills, 3 mills in the district were operating at less than full capacity. Overall, within eastern Oregon, only 4 mills were operating at capacity leaving 7 mills with additional capacity available.

**Blue Mountains National Forests Land Management Plan**

The Forest sector has declined over the past 10 years due to harvest restrictions on federal forest lands, and the impact of the recession. In eastern Oregon, where the federal government owns over 65% of forestlands, the impact on timber harvests has been keen. Employment in logging was cut back by 48% from 2002 to 2012 (U.S. Census Bureau).

The Blue Mountain National Forest Lands Management Plan, currently under revision, will direct federal forest management of the 5.5 million acres in the Malheur, Umatilla, Wallowa-Whitman National Forests, and the Snow Mountain District of the Ochoco National Forest, for a period of 15 years. The Plan is critical to direct economic outcomes in the forest products industry in the district, and will have a far-reaching impact on the scale of timber harvest, its economic impact and sustainability of forest health.

Current plan alternatives proposed by the U.S. Forest Service and those of private industry differ greatly. Private industry recommends allowing timber harvest to 335 million board feet of annual sawlog timber harvest from these national forests -- rather than the current Forest Plan proposal of 100 million board feet of sawlog/year harvest currently permitted.

According to private industry representatives, an additional 225 million board feet/year of sawlog timber harvest above the current proposed Forest Plan gross harvest would contribute an additional 2,585 direct forest sector jobs to the region, and 2,000 indirect and induced jobs to the regional economy timber. Striking a balance between economic impact and the future health and sustainability of eastside forests is the crux of the issue.

Through the work of the Blue Mountain Forest Collaborative in John Day, the effort to increase the pace of federal forest restoration work has already begun. John Day-based Iron Triangle LLC began work on the Malheur National Forest’s ambitious stewardship program for accelerated forest restoration. It will increase its workforce by as much as 20 percent due to a 10-year contract, and, in late 2013, the Malheur National Forest service added about 20 positions in preparation for the work ahead (Blue Mountain Eagle, 11/27/2013).

**Biomass**

Developing markets that use products and byproducts of forest restoration is one way to support expansion of landscape scale forest restoration activities. The use of biomass as a local fuel source for heating of national forests in Oregon are being managed to restore ecological resiliency and provide economic benefit to communities. The Blue Mountain Forest Partners, Harney County Restoration Collaborative, and the Umatilla Collaborative have been instrumental in defining key areas for restoration and logging activity. The work of eastside forest collaborative groups is accelerating landscape scale planning and implementation, creating local jobs, and supporting the development of a local renewable energy sector.

**Forest Collaboratives**

The formation of Forest Collaboratives in Oregon, an organized group of stakeholders has been an effective way to ensure that...
primarily community based facilities has been successfully developed within the district. In addition, the State’s Department of Energy is supporting the industry with grants to assist companies in assessing the feasibility of their projects. The use of biomass holds the potential to support forest restoration, provide a lower cost of heating for some communities, and increase jobs in rural areas of the district. Ochoco Lumber's biomass plant, which sits adjacent to its Malheur Lumber sawmill in John Day, started turning out its first woody bricks and pellets for heating in 2010. The facility added 12 new workers once full production was reached. (Blue Mountain Eagle, 12/29/2010)

Oregon’s Forest Biomass Working Group has identified four market development initiatives that should be pursued and supported at the state level. They include: biomass thermal (on-site heat at commercial and institutional facilities), distributed generation (heat and electricity at existing wood product facilities), existing markets (landscape bark, shavings, bedding, etc.), and emerging markets (biofuels, biochar, cellulosic ethanol, etc.).

**INDUSTRIAL LAND**

The district has a diversity of available land to accommodate a range of uses. This diversity expands regional marketability and offers the flexibility to plan for future uses meeting specific site criteria. The State of Oregon uses the “Oregon Prospector” online database to provide access to an industrial sites and buildings inventory. There are 10 “certified” industrial sites in the district. Certified industrial sites are highly marketable, project-ready industrial sites that are ready for construction within six months or less.

Within the State of Oregon, there are very limited opportunities for large lot industrial development, and the region’s industrial land supply provides a strong competitive advantage. Having a well-developed inventory of sites will support industrial marketing and coordination.

**Enterprise Zones**

Enterprise Zones offer unique investment opportunities for firms constructing new facilities or making improvements to industrial property or personal property. In comparison with Washington and Idaho, the zones provide a distinct advantage which includes a 3-year 100% property tax exemption for qualified investments. Tax exemptions are significant incentives to firms constructing new facilities or investing in expansions or high-value equipment as personal property.

The Depot’s unique redevelopment potential lies in its strategic location with Union Pacific rail mainline access and nearby water port facilities, large parcel sizes unavailable elsewhere in the State, and location at a developing three state energy hub. The Depot’s position at the intersection of two Interstates is also consistent with a quality regionally-serving retail location.
E-Commerce Zones

“Electronic commerce” is defined as engaging predominantly in transactions via the internet or an internet-based computer platform. A significant feature of these designations is that qualifying businesses may receive a credit against the business’s annual state income or corporate excise tax liability. In exchange for locating or expanding in an enterprise zone, businesses receive exemption from local property taxes on new plant and equipment for at least three years (but up to five years) in the standard program. In addition, many zones can offer special incentives for investments in long-term rural facilities or electronic commerce operations.

Rural Renewable Energy Development Zones

Rural Renewable Energy Development (RRED) Zones offer an incentive to encourage investments that harness wind, geothermal, solar, biomass or other unconventional forms of energy in Oregon to generate electricity or produce, distribute or store a variety of biofuels. Currently, there are two investment zones in the region including Harney and Malheur counties. Incentives include a three-to five-year exemption from property taxes on new investments in wind energy farms, biofuel production facilities and other eligible projects in a designated county.

ENERGY

The cost of energy in eastern Oregon is very competitive and lower than in other states around the country. Abundance of hydro-powered energy facilities under public ownership is primarily responsible for lower costs. The cost of power is considered to be lower than that available on the west side including Portland, presenting opportunities for the siting of energy dependent companies within the district.

A potential trend currently taking place in areas where the cost of energy is competitive is the siting of “server farms,” and high-tech firms in need of large scale facilities for information processing. Availability of quality power will improve regional competitiveness over the long-term. This provides an advantage when pursuing users requiring large power sources such as data centers and durable goods manufacturers.

Both the cost of energy in combination with excellent distribution facilities via truck, rail and the Ports system in the district have provided an ideal environment for alternative energy companies to flourish. As an example, Pacific Ethanol, located in Boardman, Oregon, produces 27% of the national demand for ethanol required for use in gasoline.

The State’s policy of incentivizing the development of alternative energy sources provides other opportunities for energy development including biomass, geothermal, solar and wind.

UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLE (UAV) TEST SITE DESIGNATION

In December 2013, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) announced the six national entities approved for commercial testing of unmanned aerial vehicles. Congress asked the FAA to pick the six organizations as part of an initiative to have UAVs flying in the skies with passenger airlines by late 2015. Pendleton, along with Warm Springs, and Tillamook in Oregon were selected as part of a team coordinated by the University of Alaska to begin preparing to meet FAA requirements.

This could mean the development of a significant new industry in the region with the potential for siting new firms interested in developing their products and using the Pendleton Airport to test
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them. The City of Pendleton has been proactive in positioning themselves for the opportunity by hiring consulting firm Peak 3 to help them meet FAA requirements in order to begin operations. As of October 2014, Pendleton has made steady progress and obtained several Certificates of Authorization (COA) to operate and test unmanned aerial vehicles at its airport location.

EDUCATION

The district has two community colleges, a state university, and a K-12 system that have received awards for innovative training in a range of programs. There are two Community Colleges within the district; Blue Mountain Community College in Pendleton with six (6) satellite locations and Treasure Valley Community College in Ontario with four (4) satellite locations. Eastern Oregon University is located in La Grande. The colleges are significant assets supporting the workforce and companies whose primary interest is maintaining the quality of their human resources.

SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

Oregon’s Small Business Development Center Network repeatedly earns national recognition for achieving and meeting the needs of growing businesses. Small Business centers are established at Blue Mountain Community College in Pendleton, Treasure Valley Community College in Ontario and the Wildhorse Business Development Center at the Confederated Tribe of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR). Expansion including entrepreneurial support services and better access to services across the district would serve the high number of small firms in the region.

AMENITY VALUES

Amenity values are what people or firms consider “livability” and are considered when making a decision to locate in a community or area. While livability is subjective, it can include recreational activities, scenic areas, sense of community, retail and shopping, quality of education, or overall attractiveness and community design.

Eastern Oregon has a wealth of recreational and scenic opportunities. However, one of the challenges facing cities and small towns is creating a strong sense of place that attracts people. Vibrant downtowns, well designed streets, parks and other aspects of community design are important elements that have not been fully developed by many of the district’s small communities due to inadequate tax bases and the inability to finance community improvements. Identifying a means to assist communities to plan for and develop needed infrastructure supports economic growth in the region.

» Cultural History, Recreation, Tourism

Eastern Oregon has a rich cultural history and untapped recreational and scenic opportunities. Some of the notable areas and events include the John Day River Territory, one of our nation’s longest free-flowing river systems, the Blue Mountains, two of the Seven Wonders of Oregon — the Wallowa Mountains and the Painted Hills outside John Day. The Eastern Oregon Visitors Association in conjunction with Travel Oregon is expanding its tourism market and developing new opportunities to attract visitors and improve awareness of the quality of life in the region.
Constraints to Economic Development

Constraints to economic development are current conditions which limit or reduce the potential for economic growth. Constraints represent challenges which should be evaluated and addressed, if needed, in order to develop a more competitive business environment.

There are 12 identified constraints to economic growth and expansion: 1) access to capital, 2) lack of entrepreneurial support services, 3) lack of high speed internet services, 4) decline in workforce, 5) educational attainment, 6) restrictions to annual saw log timber harvest, 7) water usage, 8) lack of rental and for-ownership housing, 9) changes to FEMA National Flood Insurance Program, 10) application of Oregon Land Use laws in rural Oregon, 11) inadequate land use planning and regulatory assistance, and 12) insufficient infrastructure in small towns to support growth.

ACCESS TO CAPITAL

Prior to the recession, lending institutions had fewer restrictions tied to business and construction loans and there was more capital available. Access to capital is an identified concern among businesses across the district. Another area of concern is the lack of funding for higher risk ventures in the district. Developing a source of high-risk capital in conjunction with entrepreneurial support will improve the rate of new business formation and expansions.

LACK OF HIGH-SPEED INTERNET SERVICES

The lack of internet services and adequate bandwidth is a considerable constraint to business growth and the attraction of the professional services sector to small towns. Identifying ways for communities to work together to develop a market for services is a challenge that will have a long-term, positive impact if properly addressed.

LACK OF ENTREPRENEURIAL DEVELOPMENT AND SUPPORT SERVICES

Since about 40 percent of the private sector’s new jobs in the U.S. are created by startups; developing an entrepreneurial environment is critical to support new business formation and growth. With a high degree of self-employment and almost 50% of the businesses in the district with less than 5 employees, there is strong potential for job growth through entrepreneurial development. Developing small business incubators and accelerators accessible across the district would support new business formation and industries with high potential for growth. An example of a potential emerging industry in the district is Unmanned Aerial Systems, which would directly benefit from entrepreneurial development and support services.

DECLINE IN WORKFORCE

Over the 10 year period 2003 – 2013, the U.S. and Oregon labor force grew by 6% and 4% respectively, while the district’s labor force declined by 6%. The fact that all of the counties except Umatilla county lost labor force during the 10 year period 2003 – 2013 while Oregon’s and the U.S.’s grew indicates that the region’s economy and employment is less diversified and resilient than that of the State’s and the U.S. as a whole. Eastern Oregon has a much older population than the State as a whole and the baby boomers are beginning to retire, which also might explain the decline in the labor force.
One of the key trends occurring with regard to labor force in the district is a decline in the labor force participation rate (LFPR), the percentage of the population either working or looking for work. Between 2010 and 2013, that period after the Recession, the labor force participation rate declined in all counties except Wheeler.

Actions to improve the skills levels of the district’s workforce to prepare them for anticipated employment opportunities are both important to addressing the issue.

**EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT**

The educational level in the district varies by county but for bachelor’s degree or higher, nearly all of the counties in the district have half the percentage of persons with a bachelor’s degree or higher than the State as a whole. For Associates level and high school degrees, most counties meet or exceed the rate of the State. In general, States with higher educational attainment levels including bachelor’s degree, have higher productivity and wage levels. One of the common concerns among cities and towns, in part, due to the lack of opportunity in the district, is the inability to attract and retain highly skilled workers including technology-based workers.

**RESTRICTIONS TO ANNUAL SAW LOG TIMBER HARVEST**

The Blue Mountain Federal Forest Plan, which will serve as the guide for the future management of natural resources on the Malheur, Umatilla, and Wallowa-Whitman National Forests has been under revision since 1990 with the final version of the plan anticipated to be adopted in late 2015. There are discrepancies between the projected annual saw log timber harvest in the Plan (100 million board feet / year) versus what the Forest industry thinks should be allowed. The Association of Oregon Loggers recommends that 335 million board feet / year should be provided in order to support existing mill capacity and economic growth in the region. It is unclear whether the Federal Forest Service will modify the plan alternative to be more conducive to economic growth but the two assumptions will have very different economic outcomes over the next 15-20 years.

**WATER USAGE**

Water scarcity and cost is a limiting factor for economic development in the region. Water for agricultural use holds both strong potential and limitations for the industry. In general counties within the district including those on the Columbia River do not have the resources to accommodate large-scale water users. Industries requiring large amounts of water are not an appropriate target industry for the region.

**LACK OF RENTAL AND FOR-OWNERSHIP HOUSING**

Shortage of both lower and middle income housing is a pressing problem resulting in inequities in the housing market which can effect economic growth in the region. The consequences of limited housing options include the inability to attract new residents or firms and lost tax revenues and expenditures that otherwise would support community growth. Constraints to building new housing include the cost of infrastructure, differential site development costs, inability to provide housing at a cost that workers can afford, and lack of amenities to attract new residents.

**CHANGES TO FEMA NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM**

FEMA changed its National Flood Insurance program in 2012 and eliminated federal subsidy of Flood Insurance due to catastrophic climatic events placing excessive burden on the federal government to pay for reconstruction. The effect of the change has already been seen in the district where, in some areas, flood insurance has soared making it difficult for individuals and businesses to bear the cost and / or purchase or sell their homes and commercial structures. Due to the high percentage of small businesses in the district, the burden of the new changes will unduly
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Impact the region. Construction of buildings in the flood plain which has occurred regularly in the past has become more difficult due to increased insurance costs. An evaluation of this impact has not been done, but it will be important to assess how the new FEMA rates will affect the district’s inventory of industrial sites and how best to address the financial burden on businesses.

APPLICATION OF OREGON LAND USE LAWS IN RURAL OREGON

Differences between how Oregon’s Land Use Laws are applied in urban vs. rural areas have been an ongoing issue affecting economic development in the district. The application of land use laws affects how easily rural areas of the state can respond to development proposals including economic development opportunities. An evaluation of the specific land use issues in more rural areas should be undertaken to identify potential solutions.

INADEQUATE LAND USE PLANNING AND REGULATORY TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

One of the challenges for rural communities expressed in many outreach meetings and conversations with local officials is the need for land use planning assistance. Many smaller communities do not have planning staff and are unable to update their comprehensive plans and zoning ordinances or process routine land use actions. This is critical because without the ability to update planning documents, communities are unable to plan for the future, and provide marketable industrial or commercial property for economic growth.

In addition to land use planning, there is a need for technical assistance and training to help communities undertake the visioning process to develop long-term goals and strategies. Once communities understand what their future should look like, they are better able to develop priorities and projects that support their vision of it.

INSUFFICIENT INFRASTRUCTURE IN SMALL TOWNS TO SUPPORT GROWTH

The lack of basic infrastructure and the capacity to pay for it is a limiting constraint in small towns within the district. The lack of growth and tax revenues prevent municipalities from making improvements for water, sewer, power, and streets which limit their ability to attract firms, accommodate expansion, or plan for the future.
Community Outreach

Obtaining candid community level input was critical to developing a strategy that addressed the unique needs of different areas of the district.

An open dialogue about community issues was achieved through community meetings and a formal survey. One of the challenges in devising a strategy for a region as large as the GEODC District was to ensure that it addresses the range of issues that disproportionately affect different areas of the region. By holding meetings in four different geographic areas of the district, it was possible to see if there was a fit between the strategic actions proposed and the specific interests of communities across the district.

Overall there were a total of 34 public meetings conducted in three rounds, 8 Strategy Committee meetings, and 147 surveys completed. Public meetings were attended by a wide array of participants including community residents, businesses, city council members, county commissioners, judges, public officials, and representatives of the Ports, State agencies, economic development organizations, civic organizations, and Chambers of Commerce. Surveys were sent out to a subset of organizations more closely associated with economic development including cities, counties, judges, Ports, and economic development organizations which included both non-profits and informal groups.

**ROUND 1 PUBLIC MEETINGS**

Public meetings were held from January through October 2014. The first round of public meetings sought to obtain community input about economic development strengths, weaknesses, important community projects and the needs of business. There were 6 questions asked at all of the public meetings in Round 1. They were: (1) What do you see as assets or strengths supporting economic development in your community?, (2) What do you see as weaknesses or constraints hindering economic development in your community?, (3) What are the most important projects your local community should focus on in the next 5 years to advance economic growth and development?, (4) If you are a business owner, operator or entrepreneur, what do you need to expand or develop your business?, (5) What do you see as assets or strengths supporting economic development in the Region?, (6) What do you see as weaknesses or constraints hindering economic development in the Region?

**ROUND 2 PUBLIC MEETINGS**

The second round of meetings included a discussion of the results from the first round of public meetings, a summary of the survey results to-date and a review of the list of regional economic development projects submitted and their prioritization. The results of Round 1 meetings and the survey responses to date may be found in Appendix ii). Surveys received prior to the 2nd round of public meetings were summarized by county and organization and discussed at the public meetings in addition to the other items mentioned.

**ROUND 3 PUBLIC MEETINGS**

Round three of public meetings included a discussion of the near final-draft of the goals, objectives and action plan. There were no formal recorded responses to the second or third round of meetings. However, points of discussion were
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Community Level Input

noted and specific comments obtained in Round 3 meetings were written down and incorporated into the final draft of the Strategy.

SURVEY RESULTS

In addition to public meetings, a survey was developed to elicit responses to a similar set of questions presented at the public meetings. The advantage of a separate survey over the public meeting as a means of obtaining input is its ability to capture individual responses. One hundred forty seven (147) surveys were filled out online and subsequently tabulated.

The questions that were asked on the survey were: (1) What do you see as assets or strengths supporting economic development in the REGION?, (2) What do you see as weaknesses or constraints hindering economic development in the REGION?, (3) What are the most important issues affecting economic development in the region, and what businesses need for expansion.

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO SURVEY

Survey responses were summarized in two ways, using a quantitative tabulation of responses and a qualitative recording of responses by organization within each county. The survey responses were grouped by likeness and tallied using a percent of total. The tabulated and summary responses can be found in Appendix ii) c) 1. A written summary of survey responses to key questions may be found in Appendix iii) c. The summaries are provided by County, community and organization and include answers to three key questions; top priorities for the next 5 years, most important issues affecting economic development in the region, and what businesses need for expansion.

SURVEY — TABULATED RESPONSES BY COUNTY

Except for Question #4, the 5 questions on the survey are summarized below. The summaries are based on the number and type of responses to each question. Question #4 was not summarized because the number of responses did not fall into convenient categories that could be tabulated. The written summary of responses to Question #4 may be viewed in Appendix ii) c) 3 by County including their communities and organizations.

QUESTION 1: What do you see as assets or strengths supporting economic development in the REGION?

Responses to this question varied by County. There were many responses to this question which can be viewed in the appendix iii) c) 2. The most common response to this question was Access to Transportation (11.7%), followed by: Access to public / commercial lands (7.0%), Natural Resource (6.8%), Communities – People and Leaders (6.6%), Education (6.6%), Tourism/Recreation (5.6%), Agriculture / Value added Agriculture (4.5%), Quality of Life / Culture / Population (4.5%), Business / Service Organization (4.2%), Open Space / Location (4.2%).

In reviewing the most common responses to Question 1, one of the key strength identified was access to transportation. Access to transportation including roads, rail and the Ports and to markets are seen as a competitive advantage for the district. Most of the strengths identified by the survey respondents have been incorporated into the strategic plan for the district with transportation, natural resources, agriculture and tourism being identified as competitive advantages in the region.

QUESTION 2: What do you see as weaknesses or constraints hindering economic development in the REGION?
The most common responses to this question included lack of funding (6.31%) followed by minimal skilled workforce (6.31%), affordable housing (6.06%), location / isolation (5.81%), restrictive land use laws (5.05%), family wage jobs (4.29%), and restricted access to water (4.04%).

Umatilla and Malheur counties had the highest responses to this question and responses were influenced by both areas. Malheur counties cited restrictive land use laws, competing with Idaho, and local regulatory processes as key constraints to economic development in their area. Malheur County cited an unfair advantage that Idaho provides to companies and residents by having less restrictive land use regulations and taxes than Oregon.

Umatilla County mentioned local regulatory processes, lack of funding, skilled workforce, access to water, and lack of amenities as key constraints to economic growth.

**QUESTION 3: What are the most important issues affecting Economic Development in the Region?**

When asked about the most important issues affecting economic development in the region, the greatest response was: lack of skilled workforce (8.02%) followed by housing (6.48%), lack of water rights (5.56%), Local / State / Federal Regulations (4.63%), Infrastructure / Telecommunications (3.40%), and Lack of Funding (3.40%).

The majority of respondents were from Malheur and Umatilla counties and both counties had strong responses to the lack of a skilled workforce as a constraint to economic growth in the region. Morrow County and Umatilla counties responded strongly to the need for housing, in particular, market rate, workforce housing. Malheur County had the strongest response to the concern over local / state / federal regulations as a major constraint to growth in the region, including the Ontario – Idaho border area. Umatilla County referenced the lack of water rights as the key constraint to economic development in the region.

All of these issues were pre-identified in community meetings and discussions among members of the Strategy Committee. Workforce and skills training is a key component of the Strategy and Malheur County has taken its own initiative with its Poverty to Prosperity program to improve skills training for anticipated job openings. Water rights and access to water is also an objective included in the Strategy not only for Umatilla County but the region as a whole. The need for adequate internet infrastructure was within the top 5 issues and was corroborated by members of the Strategy committee citing it as a deterrent to new business expansion and as an amenity needed to attract new residents.

**QUESTION 4: What are the most important projects your local community should be focused on to advance economic growth and development over the next 5 years?**

Responses to this question were not tabulated because the range of responses was too great. The written responses may be seen in Appendix ii) c) 3 by county including their communities and organizations.

**QUESTION 5: If you are a business owner or entrepreneur, what do you need to expand or develop your business?**

Access to capital (19.48%) received the highest response to this question with most responses coming from Umatilla County though all counties had this concern as its most important need for business expansion. Following access to capital were: business retention / expansion programs (15.58%), Marketing (2.99%), Street / façade improvements (9.74%), Help with permitting and regulations (9.09%), website / tech upgrades (8.44%), employee training (8.44%), and business planning / counseling (6.49%).

Access to capital was mentioned not only in the survey but at the later public meetings. As a consequence, it was added to the strategy as a key objective. Regulations at all levels including local, state, and federal was mentioned both in the survey as the second most common response and at several public
meetings including presentations to Chambers of Commerce and Rotary clubs. Marketing and business planning received relatively high responses. The expansion of small business services is a key objective in the strategy with the need to include non-urban areas of the district.
The Strategy including its goals, objectives and action plan were developed through a 10-month planning process that included multiple advisory and community meetings, demographic and economic research and analyses, and participation in a number of economic development forums and meetings sponsored by the State’s economic development team. GEODC participated in events sponsored by Business Oregon, the State’s economic development agency and coordinated with the Regional Solutions Team, a group of individuals from various State agencies assigned by the Governor’s office to trouble shoot and support economic development issues and projects in the region.

There were 11 goals that were developed by the strategy committee and are the basis for the 2014 – 2019 strategy its action plan. The following is a brief overview of the goals and why they were included in the strategy.

**GOAL 1: Stimulate Growth by Capitalizing on the Competitive Advantages of the Region**

Starting with the accepted idea that a region’s economy is based on its natural advantages, the strategy committee thought it made sense to try to build on existing and emerging competitive advantages in the region. Some of these advantages include: a strong agricultural base, an extensive multi-modal transportation network and Port system, the presence of the OSU Agricultural Extension Services and USDA Research Centers, abundant forest resources, access to Columbia River water, a competitive cost of energy, designation as a national test site for unmanned aerial vehicles in Pendleton, and a rich cultural history.

**GOAL 2: Encourage Diversification of Local Economies within the Region to Increase Stability and Resiliency**

Many of the counties lack diversification in the types of firms and industries present. In looking at how different counties responded to the Great Recession 2007 – 2009 and after 2010 – 2013, it was clear that the more diversified the job base, the more resilient areas were and the better they responded to and recovered from the recession.

**GOAL 3: Build an Entrepreneurial Environment across the Region**

The district lacks support for entrepreneurial growth. While there are small business centers, there are no business incubators in place that foster new business formation. With over 50% of firms in the district with 5 or less employees, the conditions are ripe to nurture entrepreneurial growth.

**GOAL 4: Develop an Educational and Training System That Supports Business**

The K-12 and post-secondary education system has developed some very innovative programs to establish early workforce training and skills development. Yet one of the primary weaknesses in the region has been identified as skills training. Doing a better job of tying skills training to future job growth could have a far-reaching impact on the business environment.
GOAL 5: Support Business Retention and Expansion

Making sure existing companies have what they need to maintain or expand their operations is an essential aspect of economic development and should not be overlooked in favor of looking only at potential growth opportunities.

GOAL 6: Attract New Firms to the Region that will serve to Diversify the Economy and Provide Family Wage Jobs

With an array of competitive advantages in the region, identifying target industries and firms that would directly benefit by them should be part of any marketing effort to expand business growth. Wage levels across the district are, in general, lower than the average for the State except in areas where there is considerable economic diversification.

GOAL 7: Increase the District’s Resources for Economic Development Initiatives

The district lacks the resources it needs to support economic development. The district including its non-profit organizations and economic development partners need to do a better job of working together to identify and obtain resources that will help implement high priority projects.

GOAL 8: Promote a Network of Industrial Sites that will Serve the Needs of Existing and Future Firms

Maintaining an active inventory of industrial sites and having access to certified and shovel-ready sites are important aspects of both industrial marketing and supporting the needs of existing businesses.

GOAL 9: Support Rural Communities’ Capacity for Self-Reliance

The lack of basic infrastructure and the capacity to pay for it is a limiting constraint in small towns across the district. Finding ways to support this and other basic needs of the district’s smaller communities is critical to their growth potential.

GOAL 10: Develop a Regional Strategy that Incorporates Viable Projects to Stimulate Jobs and Economic Growth

Developing consensus around important economic development projects in the region is needed to better coordinate efforts and help position projects for funding.

GOAL 11: Develop a Methodology to Evaluate Progress and Ensure Implementation and Viability of the Plan

In order to measure progress, it is important to establish benchmarks and performance measures that provide feedback as to how the district is doing. Feedback can be used to modify goals and actions or set new timeframes for completion.
### COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2014–2019
**GEODC DISTRICT ➤ STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GOAL 1: STIMULATE GROWTH BY CAPITALIZING ON THE COMPETITIVE ADVANTAGES OF THE REGION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Encourage industry clusters to explore opportunities for growth and expansion</td>
<td>1.1.1 Promote and support the formation of industry clusters within developed and emerging industries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.2 Support the development of value added products and services among new and existing natural resource-based firms in the region</td>
<td>1 Year 2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.3 Investigate grant opportunities to support the development of industry clusters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Develop projects which support resource based industries in the region</td>
<td>1.2.1 Encourage research partnerships throughout the region among firms in the agriculture and forest industries, USDA Research Centers and OSU Agricultural Extension Service Centers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.2 Develop training and encourage public-private partnerships between Community colleges and private companies to support natural resource-based industries</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.3 Support and investigate potential water resource development and storage projects throughout the region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.4 Coordinate with Soil and Water Conservation Districts and Watershed Councils to assist in planning for long-term water management to support rural development needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.5 Pursue funding for the Regional Water Development and Restoration Project to access Columbia River water for irrigated agriculture in the Umatilla Basin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.6 Evaluate opportunities for water development and storage at other locations throughout the District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2014–2019
**GEODC DISTRICT ➤ STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2 Develop projects which support resource based industries in the region</strong></td>
<td>1.2.7 Develop public-private partnerships in the region to conduct cooperative planning for development of water resources for agricultural use</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.8 Pursue sources of matching funds to improve eligibility among local planning efforts for Oregon Water Resource Department Program grants for water conservation, reuse and storage.</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.9 Evaluate the potential for development of alternative energy sources in the region</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.10 Evaluate current mining and metals extraction projects as to impact and feasibility and trouble shoot barriers to progress</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.3 Support improvements to and expansion of the District’s Ports as distribution hubs for national and international trade</strong></td>
<td>1.3.1 Investigate funding opportunities to improve distribution capacity at the Ports of Morrow, Umatilla, and Arlington</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3.2 Seek funding for infrastructure improvements and a workforce training facility at the Port of Morrow</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.4 Support development of emerging industries</strong></td>
<td>1.4.1 Develop training at community colleges and other educational institutions to support applications in the Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS) Industry</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4.2 Seek funding for infrastructure and facilities to support the Unmanned Aerial System (UAS) industry development</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4.3 Assist firms to expand or locate in the region that can capitalize on the logistical advantages of multi-modal transportation and distribution facilities in the District</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4.4 Support efforts to develop the Juniper processing industry in the District</td>
<td>![ ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2014–2019
**GEODC DISTRICT  »  STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Year 2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 Support the expansion of Tourism in the region</td>
<td>1.5.1 Support efforts to evaluate and develop Tourism in the region based on local food, agriculture, natural resources, history and archaeology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5.2 Establish and market rural Oregon itineraries to domestic and international tour operators</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6 Develop planning and policy initiatives which support resource based industries</td>
<td>1.6.1 Participate in planning efforts of the Forest Collaboratives in the District to develop consensus on forest restoration projects in the region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6.2 Develop a regional scale project to help mitigate the threat of the potential listing of the Sage Grouse by US Fish &amp; Wildlife in 2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6.3 Promote and support the use of biomass in the District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6.4 Encourage public participation in the Blue Mountains National Forest Lands Management Plan Revision process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6.5 Encourage the revision of the Blue Mountains National Forest Lands Management Plan to maximize a clear economic benefit to the region and sustain long-term ecological health.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GOAL 2: ENCOURAGE DIVERSIFICATION OF LOCAL ECONOMIES WITHIN THE REGION TO INCREASE STABILITY AND RESILIENCY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Year 2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Identify opportunities for new business growth in emerging and diversified industries</td>
<td>2.1.1 Encourage partnerships among business leaders, entrepreneurs and economic development organizations to identify business opportunities that serve to diversify the economic base</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.2 Support research to identify value-added business opportunities and barriers to entrepreneurship in the region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Identify opportunities for new business growth in emerging and diversified industries</td>
<td>2.1.3 Identify resources to support industry clusters and research of emerging industries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Target small business and entrepreneurial support services to firms within emerging and diverse industries</td>
<td>2.2.1 Expand access to entrepreneurial resources in the District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.2 Identify and pursue grant funding to support entrepreneurial development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.3 Target business support resources to firms and entrepreneurs within emerging industries in the District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.4 Develop a financial funding mechanism to finance the need for speculative industrial and commercial buildings in the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Support funding for new start-ups and high-risk ventures in the region</td>
<td>2.3.1 Develop a source of high risk capital to support new business formation in the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Identify and support business opportunities in all areas of the District</td>
<td>2.4.1 Provide forums for communication among counties, cities, agencies to address economic development concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4.2 Conduct research to identify the unique business opportunities in all areas of the region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4.3 Improve access to small business development resources and incubators by clients in all areas of the region</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2014–2019
**GEODC DISTRICT » STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME 1 Year</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME 5 Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.4 Identify and support business opportunities in all areas of the District</strong></td>
<td>2.4.4 Encourage partnerships among business leaders, entrepreneurs and economic development organizations to identify business opportunities and resources to support entrepreneurship and small businesses in rural communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4.5 Concentrate on value-added opportunities in existing natural resource-based industries, recreation, and tourism, while seeking new, compatible industries to develop economic resiliency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4.6 Evaluate the unique opportunities and needs of all communities to support tourism, recreation, community and cultural development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4.7 Modify the Small Business Center Program to make it easier for businesses throughout the District to utilize services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4.8 Encourage cities to develop strategic plans for local economic development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.5 Expand internet capacity within small towns in the region</strong></td>
<td>2.5.1 Conduct an assessment of the need and requirements for high-speed, high-bandwidth internet service in all communities of the District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5.2 Develop a pilot project that can be used as a model for development of internet service in limited access areas in the District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GOAL 3: BUILD AN ENTREPRENEURIAL ENVIRONMENT ACROSS THE REGION**

| 3.1 Develop business incubators that support regional economic development goals | 3.1.1 Develop and utilize business incubators at key locations across the region to improve access and support economic diversification |                  |                  |
|                                                                                   | 3.1.2 Create a coordinated network among small business centers, business incubators, industries and the financial community to maximize distribution of information and resources for entrepreneurs |                  |                  |
### COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2014–2019
**GEODC DISTRICT ➤ STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Develop business incubators that support regional economic development goals</td>
<td>3.1.3 Develop an online website for entrepreneurial and small business support in the region</td>
<td>5 Year 2016-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Identify the unique opportunities and challenges facing entrepreneurs in eastern Oregon's rural economy</td>
<td>3.2.1 Conduct research to identify opportunities for business expansion, new start-ups and challenges to entrepreneurs in rural areas of the region</td>
<td>5 Year 2016-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2.2 Pursue grant funding for The New Natural Resource Economy—a joint UO / OSU study to identify new opportunities for expansion of the natural resource-based economy in eastern Oregon.</td>
<td>5 Year 2016-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Encourage collaboration to provide a comprehensive approach to meeting business development needs in the region</td>
<td>3.3.1 Encourage partnerships among economic development professionals, Small Business Development Centers, Small Business Incubators, Workforce Training organizations and private sector expertise to create localized networks to respond to the range of business development needs</td>
<td>5 Year 2016-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### GOAL 4: DEVELOP AN EDUCATIONAL AND TRAINING SYSTEM THAT SUPPORTS BUSINESS

| 4.1 Develop a highly skilled workforce                                                                 | 4.1.1 Work with businesses, educational institutions, and workforce agencies to determine workforce skills needed to support expanding and potentially new industries in the region | 5 Year 2016-20 |
|                                                                                                        | 4.1.2 Evaluate workforce needs in all areas of the District and provide training to support local growth | 5 Year 2016-20 |
|                                                                                                        | 4.1.3 Sustain funding for specialized training which provides the skilled workforce for new and expanding industries (Ex., Precision Agriculture) | 5 Year 2016-20 |
|                                                                                                        | 4.1.4 Develop funding for training to support Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS) development | 5 Year 2016-20 |
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**COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2014–2019**  
**GEODC DISTRICT » STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1 Develop a highly skilled workforce</strong></td>
<td>4.1.5 Encourage public / private funding partnerships in the development of training centers and curricula to support business needs</td>
<td>1 Year 2015-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.6 Develop and sustain programs that improve training for high school level students in preparation for jobs of the future</td>
<td>5 Year 2016-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.7 Sustain funding for the Eastern Promise Program to improve high school student training at the community college level</td>
<td>1 Year 2015-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.8 Improve access and opportunities for post-secondary education in Frontier areas of the region</td>
<td>5 Year 2016-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.9 Pursue funding for the Poverty to Prosperity Program including a training facility and curriculum programming at Treasure Valley Community College</td>
<td>1 Year 2015-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.10 Pursue funding for specialized company training including the Mechatronics Program under development by Blue Mountain Community College</td>
<td>5 Year 2016-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1.11 Pursue funding for the Port of Morrow Training Facility</td>
<td>5 Year 2016-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.2 Improve educational attainment levels in the District</strong></td>
<td>4.2.1 Support and sustain programs that expand opportunities for high school students to obtain college credit and an Associates degree</td>
<td>1 Year 2015-16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.2 Increase the percentage of individuals in the District who obtain a bachelor’s degree or higher</td>
<td>5 Year 2016-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2.3 Expand technology based training and degree offerings at all levels</td>
<td>5 Year 2016-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.3 Incorporate work ethic skills into educational workforce development</strong></td>
<td>4.3.1 Identify specific skills needed and training opportunities to meet the needs of business</td>
<td>5 Year 2016-20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2014–2019

**GEODC DISTRICT ➤ STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### GOAL 5: SUPPORT BUSINESS RETENTION AND EXPANSION

| 5.1 Assess business needs in the region | 5.1.1 Develop an outreach program targeting industry organizations to assess the current and future needs of businesses |         |
| 5.1.2 Initiate and participate in industry cluster meetings to obtain input from industry leaders as to needs and opportunities for growth |         |
| 5.2 Improve access to capital in the region | 5.2.1 Evaluate business financing needs and expand marketing of loan programs in the District |         |
| 5.3 Expand the Business Support Network to a broader area of the District | 5.3.1 Develop a program to expand Small Business Development Center (SBDC) services to all areas of the region |         |
| 5.3.2 Evaluate and improve marketing of Small Business Center (SBC) services in the region |         |
| 5.3.3 Seek resources to provide and expand Small Business Development Centers (SBDC) |         |
| 5.3.4 Encourage networking and mentoring within private enterprise. |         |
| 5.3.5 Create flexible business support systems capable of responding to a variety of business development needs in the region |         |
| 5.4 Identify opportunities for business expansion in the region | 5.4.1 Provide research and local training to assist firms in accessing new markets for products and services |         |
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#### COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2014–2019

**GEODC DISTRICT » STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Year 2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Identify opportunities for business expansion in the region</td>
<td>5.4.2 Conduct a trade leakage study</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.4.3 Develop export training workshops and expand resources for businesses to expand their export potential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.4.4 Develop resources to conduct market research and improve the potential for businesses to expand their export capacity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| GOAL 6: ATTRACT NEW FIRMS TO THE REGION THAT WILL SERVE TO DIVERSIFY THE ECONOMY AND PROVIDE FAMILY WAGE JOBS |
|--------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| 6.1 Identify and address issues affecting economic development on a regional scale | 6.1.1 Evaluate the need for changes to land use regulations and permitting in the region | | |
| | 6.1.2 Engage legislators and business advocates in discussion of options to change land use regulations and permitting requirements | | |
| 6.2 Promote Eastern Oregon as a place to do business | 6.2.1 Develop a target industries analysis to identify firms with high potential for success in the region | | |
| | 6.2.2 Develop a regional marketing program that includes all sub-regions within the District | | |
| | 6.2.3 Develop a regional marketing budget to support the development of marketing materials and coordinated efforts | | |
| | 6.2.4 Form a regional partnership to recruit firms, respond to industry interest and assist the expansion of existing firms | | |
| | 6.2.5 Recruit firms and support expansion among regionally suitable industries | | |
| | 6.2.6 Develop an online newsletter to inform regional stakeholders and the business community of opportunities, funding, and progress. | | |
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### COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2014–2019

**GEODC DISTRICT ➔ STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2015-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GOAL 7: INCREASE THE DISTRICT’S RESOURCES FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVES

#### 7.1 Develop consensus around important economic development issues and projects in the District

- **7.1.1** Prioritize regional economic development issues and projects

- **7.1.2** Coordinate with the Regional Solutions Advisory Team and Advisory Council to evaluate regional projects for potential State funding

- **7.1.3** Evaluate the suitability of funding criteria and allocation method for State funded projects in the District

#### 7.2 Develop a plan to address economic development issues requiring legislation action

- **7.2.1** Identify and prioritize economic development issues requiring legislative action

- **7.2.2** Develop a course of action to address critical issues through the legislative process

#### 7.3 Improve the receipt of grant funds to support projects in the region

- **7.3.1** Support the completion of planning activities and processes at the local and regional scale to prepare for development of grant proposals

- **7.3.2** Develop a schedule for developing and submitting grant proposals to fund high priority regional projects

- **7.3.3** Coordinate efforts among regional partners to submit grant proposals for key regional projects

- **7.3.4** Develop relationships with potential funding organizations to increase investment in the region

#### 7.4 Improve grant writing capacity among regional partners

- **7.4.1** Develop an online clearinghouse and calendar for grant funding and economic development in the region
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### COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2014–2019

**GEODC DISTRICT  »  STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.4 Improve grant writing capacity among regional partners</td>
<td>7.4.2 Identify / sponsor grant writing training programs to enhance capacity in the District</td>
<td>1 Year 2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.4.3 Evaluate the use of private grant writers to help secure funding for regional economic development projects</td>
<td>5 Year 2016-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GOAL 8: PROMOTE A NETWORK OF INDUSTRIAL SITES THAT WILL SERVE THE NEEDS OF EXISTING AND FUTURE FIRMS

| 8.1 Expand industry awareness of available industrial land | 8.1.1 Develop and maintain an online inventory of industrial sites including available infrastructure, readiness, certifications, and incentives | 1 Year 2015-16 |
| | 8.1.2 Utilize an industrial site inventory as a planning tool to assess future needs | 5 Year 2016-20 |
| | 8.1.3 Encourage redevelopment of the Umatilla Army Depot Site | |
| | 8.1.4 Encourage environmental restoration, redevelopment and marketing of industrial sites with potential to expand site selection opportunities in the District. | |

### GOAL 9: SUPPORT RURAL COMMUNITIES’ CAPACITY FOR SELF-RELIANCE

| 9.1 Assess the needs of local communities within the region | 9.1.1 Develop a public outreach program and business survey to better understand local community needs | 1 Year 2015-16 |
| | 9.1.2 Identify common assets and constraints to economic growth on a local level | 5 Year 2016-20 |

| 9.2 Assist communities to address local economic development constraints and develop opportunities | 9.2.1 Collaborate with stakeholders to address identified local community issues | 1 Year 2015-16 |
| | 9.2.2 Identify land use planning, permitting and technical issues affecting economic development within the region | 5 Year 2016-20 |
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**COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2014–2019**  
**GEODC DISTRICT ➔ STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.2 Assist communities to address local economic development constraints and develop opportunities</td>
<td>9.2.3 Identify a range of potential solutions to address the impact of changes in FEMA’s National Flood Insurance Program on businesses and communities in the region</td>
<td>1 Year 2015-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.2.4 Encourage the development of county emergency response plans to counter potential, unanticipated impacts to local economies</td>
<td>5 Year 2016-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.2.5 Assist communities to overcome the constraints to development of market rate housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.2.6 Develop a list of local community infrastructure / public improvement needs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.2.7 Review and participate in the State's multimodal transportation planning and capital improvement programming for the District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.2.8 Collaborate with regional partners to identify and advocate for multimodal transportation projects which have a potential impact on economic development in the region</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.2.9 Evaluate the benefits of a coordinated public transportation and human services plan(s) to provide for transit among persons with special needs and the lower income workforce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.2.10 Assist communities with obtaining and managing grants for public infrastructure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.2.11 Pursue grant funding to assist communities to develop community-economic development strategic plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.3 Develop resources to assist communities to capitalize on recreational, scenic and cultural opportunities</td>
<td>9.3.1 Identify communities with a need for land use planning, community design, or redevelopment activities in order to capitalize on economic growth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**GEODC ➔ 2014 Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy**
## COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2014–2019
### GEODC DISTRICT  ❯ STRATEGIC ACTION PLAN

### VIII. Strategy Development  ❯ Goals, Objectives and Action Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.3 Develop resources to assist communities to capitalize on recreational, scenic and cultural opportunities</td>
<td>9.3.3 Identify funding sources to support community planning, open space and recreational planning, cultural development, tourism, and redevelopment</td>
<td>1 Year 2015-16 5 Year 2016-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GOAL 10: DEVELOP A REGIONAL STRATEGY THAT INCORPORATES Viable PROJECTS TO STIMULATE JOBS AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

| 10.1 Increase awareness and potential funding of important economic development projects in the region | 10.1.1 Solicit and prioritize regional projects in accordance with the Regional Solutions Project funding process or as needed to support economic development goals | 1 Year 2015-16 5 Year 2016-20 |
| 10.1.2 Review and assess the need for new or revised projects annually | 10.1.3 Collaborate with regional partners and the Regional Solutions Team to seek funding for high priority regional projects |  |

### GOAL 11: DEVELOP A METHODOLOGY TO EVALUATE PROGRESS AND ENSURE IMPLEMENTATION AND VIABILITY OF THE PLAN

| 11.1 Utilize an oversight committee to evaluate progress and ensure implementation of the strategy | 11.1.1 Create a regional oversight committee with representation based on the Economic Development Administration (EDA) Strategy Committee requirements | 1 Year 2015-16 5 Year 2016-20 |
| 11.2 Develop performance measures and benchmarks on annual and 5-year basis to measure performance | 11.2.1 Identify performance measures to assess economic performance as well as qualitative improvements in key areas supporting economic growth in the region |  |
| 11.3 Monitor the progress of strategic objectives and actions and modify implementation plans accordingly | 11.3.1 Evaluate economic development activities and progress against performance measures and benchmarks |  |
| 11.3.2 Report performance on a regular basis to the regional oversight committee and Economic Development Administration (EDA) as required |  |
### OBJECTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>ACTIONS</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.3  Monitor the progress of strategic objectives and actions and modify implementation plans accordingly</td>
<td>11.3.3  Monitor and report progress at regular timeframes and update the 1-Year Implementation Plan and 5-year actions annually to reflect change</td>
<td>1 Year 2015-16 5 Year 2016-20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Projects

As part of the strategic planning process, the Greater Eastern Oregon Development Corporation solicited organizations within the district for projects with potential for a regional economic development impact. The overall objective to developing a list of projects was to build awareness of important projects in the region, support strategic goals and objectives with real-world projects, and help position projects for potential funding.

Projects were ranked in two categories according to a set of criteria approved by the Strategy Committee: Construction and Technical Assistance. The criteria used to rank were: economic impact, potential availability of funding sources, alignment with EDA priorities, support for the project and readiness to proceed.

Over 40 projects were submitted. The top projects in each of the categories were submitted to the Regional Solutions Advisory Council for potential funding consideration by the State of Oregon. In ranking projects, the Strategy Committee recognized that although many of the submitted projects did not meet criteria to place them in the high-priority category, they are important community projects. As a result, the Strategy Committee prioritized all of the projects but chose to show in the report only those projects receiving a high-priority ranking; all other projects were identified as unranked.

### COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY (CEDS) 2014–2019

#### GEODC DISTRICT » REGIONAL PROJECTS PRIORITY LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>SPONSOR</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Construction Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td><strong>Eastern Oregon Business Accelerator Facility</strong></td>
<td>Blue Mountain Community College Small Business Development Center</td>
<td>To provide a shared space and/or technical assistance for growing companies in a variety of industries throughout the region</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td><strong>UAV Facilities, Improvements and Flight Operations Equipment</strong></td>
<td>Eastern Oregon Regional Airport</td>
<td>Improvements to support a UAS test range including buildings, infrastructure, vehicles, facility improvements, and equipment.</td>
<td>$1,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## IX. Regional Projects

### COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY (CEDS) 2014–2019

**GEODC DISTRICT ➤ REGIONAL PROJECTS PRIORITY LIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>SPONSOR</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Career Technical Education Center</td>
<td>Malheur County Poverty to Prosperity</td>
<td>A construction project that would house classrooms and shop facilities to facilitate career technical education instruction for applied health professions, automated systems and business technology.</td>
<td>$2,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Interim UAV/Airport Hanger Facilities</td>
<td>City of Pendleton/Eastern Oregon Regional Airport</td>
<td>Construction of corporate T-hangers on the Eastern Oregon Regional Airport airfield to support anticipated demand from UAS companies, corporate traffic and GA pilots.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Port of Morrow Workforce Training Center</td>
<td>Port of Morrow</td>
<td>To construct a Workforce Training Center for industries located at the Port of Morrow</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Regional Water Development &amp; Restoration Project</td>
<td>Northeast Oregon Water Association</td>
<td>Construction of infrastructure to provide access to Columbia River water to increase irrigated agricultural production in the Columbia Basin</td>
<td>$150,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>I-82/Lamb Rd Interchange Exit Ramp and Road Improvements</td>
<td>Columbia Development Authority</td>
<td>Reconstruction of the I-82 Lamb Road interchange exit ramp to provide new connection to the existing roadway network required as a result of the exit ramp improvement.</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Harney County Incubator/Juniper Processing Facility</td>
<td>Harney County Economic Development</td>
<td>Construct an incubator building in the current industrial park to house a small diameter tree processing plant that would produce marketable materials from small diameter trees from the Malheur National Forest and unidentified private land.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Internet Service Improvement</td>
<td>Gilliam County</td>
<td>Provide access to improved internet access with greater bandwidth.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## IX. Regional Projects

### COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY (CEDS) 2014–2019

#### GEODC DISTRICT » REGIONAL PROJECTS PRIORITY LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>SPONSOR</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked</td>
<td>Frontier Regional 911 system redundant/backup system</td>
<td>Gilliam County</td>
<td>Establish a redundant back up system for emergency communications based on fiber connectivity</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked</td>
<td>Renovation and Expansion of the Mustanger’s Riding Club Facility</td>
<td>Mustanger’s Riding Club</td>
<td>Improvements to the Mustanger’s Arena to expand for the capacity of holding events and rodeos.</td>
<td>$349,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked</td>
<td>Operations Equipment</td>
<td>Rimrock Recycling</td>
<td>Expand recycling capacity by purchasing 30 cardboard collection bins at businesses, (8)-2 cubic yard dump bins and (8)-1 cubic yard dump bins at Rimrock’s collection center.</td>
<td>$58,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked</td>
<td>Arlington Mesa Industrial Park</td>
<td>Port of Arlington</td>
<td>Construction of a new 320-115kV Area Source Substation based on the findings of a System Impact Study to support high-end users</td>
<td>$30,780,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked</td>
<td>Housing Development</td>
<td>Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation</td>
<td>To provide additional housing including multi-unit and single family homes.</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked</td>
<td>Wanapa Industrial Site Infrastructure</td>
<td>Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation</td>
<td>To construct infrastructure at the Wanapa Industrial Site, a 195 acre site adjacent to the Port of Umatilla.</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked</td>
<td>Tribal Education Center</td>
<td>Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation</td>
<td>To construct an education center for the existing tribal education department and the Nixyaawii Charter School.</td>
<td>$7,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IX. Regional Projects

**COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY (CEDS) 2014–2019**  
**GEODC DISTRICT » REGIONAL PROJECTS PRIORITY LIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>SPONSOR</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked</td>
<td>Water and Other Infrastructure</td>
<td>Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation</td>
<td>Construction of a new well and reservoir on the reservation.</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked</td>
<td>Tribal Health Center</td>
<td>Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation</td>
<td>To construct a new health care clinic</td>
<td>$16,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked</td>
<td>Biomass Breakdown Facility</td>
<td>Iron Triangle, LLC</td>
<td>Construction of a biomass breakdown facility and purchase of equipment</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked</td>
<td>Power Supply to John Day Industrial Park</td>
<td>City of John Day</td>
<td>Expand the power supply to John Day Industrial Park including conduits and vaults.</td>
<td>$68,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked</td>
<td>Hydrosphere Center</td>
<td>Milton-Freewater Downtown Alliance</td>
<td>Construction of a facility for exploring the historic, science and artistic aspects of water.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked</td>
<td>Gilliam County Bridge Repair</td>
<td>Gilliam County</td>
<td>Repairs on a bridge that has been permanently shut down and another bridge that is threatened.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked</td>
<td>Echo Wastewater Treatment Facility</td>
<td>City of Echo</td>
<td>Improve water quality and provide expansion to existing wastewater system</td>
<td>$2,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked</td>
<td>Self loader log truck</td>
<td>Todd M. Hueckman contracting</td>
<td>To purchase a self loader log truck to haul salvaged logs from Juniper cutting projects on BLM and private land</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked</td>
<td>Sage Grouse habitat Restoration-Equipment for restoration work</td>
<td>Brandon Baron</td>
<td>Equipment to support restoration work including the purchase of a grinder, live bottom trailers and a loader.</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IX. Regional Projects

#### COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY (CEDS) 2014–2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>SPONSOR</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked</td>
<td><strong>Sage Grouse Habitat Recovery-Harney County</strong></td>
<td>Joseph's Juniper, Inc.</td>
<td>Expansion of existing juniper utilization business in collaboration with logging company prepared to expand into small diameter logging.</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked</td>
<td><strong>Harney County Energy Project</strong></td>
<td>Wisewood, Inc</td>
<td>Replacement of multiple fossil fuel boilers with modern, efficient and clean burning biomass energy systems that will use wood chips from local forests.</td>
<td>$4-5,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked</td>
<td><strong>East Beach Infrastructure Improvements</strong></td>
<td>Port of Morrow</td>
<td>Infrastructure improvements including water, sewer, wastewater, steam, and water and wastewater storage at the East Beach industrial park.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked</td>
<td><strong>Port of Morrow Transportation Improvements</strong></td>
<td>Port of Morrow</td>
<td>Improved access to Interstate 84, rail improvements in East Beach and Terminal 1 Marine improvements.</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked</td>
<td><strong>Infrastructure to Pendleton Industrial Property</strong></td>
<td>City of Pendleton/Eastern Oregon Regional Airport</td>
<td>Extension of water and sewer to 365 acres of M-1 zoned light industrial property.</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|      | **TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECTS** | | | |
| HI | **Wastewater Facilities Master Plan Update/Analysis of Options** | City of John Day | A wastewater facilities Master Plan and update an analysis of options for the cities of John Day and Canyon City | N/A |
| HI | **Planning and development of a Career Technical Education Facility** | Malheur County Poverty to Prosperity Program | Feasibility study to evaluate proposed education programs and develop a master plan to develop for building layout. | N/A |
### Regional Projects

#### COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY (CEDS) 2014–2019

**GEODC DISTRICT » REGIONAL PROJECTS PRIORITY LIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>SPONSOR</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>The New natural Resources Economy Study</td>
<td>University of Oregon and OSU Community Service Center</td>
<td>An economic study to identify ways government and relevant non-profit economic development organizations can support emerging opportunities for small, rural firms in Eastern Oregon.</td>
<td>$143,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Blue Mountain Community College Mechatronics Program Creation</td>
<td>Blue Mountain Community College</td>
<td>Mechatronics/Industrial Maintenance programs to train technicians to troubleshoot, maintain and repair mechanical equipment that is controlled by electrical, electronic and computer systems used in a variety of applications.</td>
<td>$2,764,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Product Development for Eastern Oregon Culinary &amp; Ag Tourism</td>
<td>Eastern Oregon Visitors Association</td>
<td>A multi-phase project for tourism development to update a process that builds on tourists in niche markets particularly in the culinary/ag area.</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>Rural Oregon Packaged Travel Development</td>
<td>Eastern Oregon Visitors Association</td>
<td>Establish and cooperatively market a “Rural Oregon Itinerary” for group and FIT travelers</td>
<td>$34,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked</td>
<td>Highway 11-Land Use Master Plan/Feasibility Study</td>
<td>Milton-Freewater Downtown Alliance</td>
<td>A proposed Land Use Master Plan and Feasibility Study to evaluate the market for business expansion, potential land uses needed and a master plan for the stretch of Highway 11 between Milton-Freewater, Oregon and Walla Walla, WA.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked</td>
<td>Water and Sewer Rate Analysis</td>
<td>City of Hines</td>
<td>A feasibility study for water and sewer rates</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## IX. Regional Projects

### COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY (CEDS) 2014–2019
#### GEODC DISTRICT » REGIONAL PROJECTS PRIORITY LIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>SPONSOR</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unranked</td>
<td><strong>Master Plan and engineering design for a Certified Flood Levee on the Silvies River near Burns, Or</strong></td>
<td>City of Burns</td>
<td>Project minimize the impact of a flood plain designation for Burns, Hines and some county properties.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked</td>
<td><strong>Blue Mountains National Forest Lands Management Plan Revision</strong></td>
<td>Associated Oregon Loggers, Inc.</td>
<td>Revision to the Forest Plan that directs federal forest management of the 5.5 million acres in the Malheur, Umatilla, Wallowa-Whitman National Forests, and the Snow Mountain District of the Ochoco National forest for a period of 15 years (not a project)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked</td>
<td><strong>Vacant Public Building Assessment</strong></td>
<td>Gilliam County</td>
<td>Assess vacant public buildings and diversification for potential rehabilitation and reuse.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked</td>
<td><strong>Morrow County Public Transit/Workforce</strong></td>
<td>Morrow County Citizens</td>
<td>Transportation plans to address the needs of seniors, disabled individuals, veterans and the workforce in the region.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked</td>
<td><strong>Morrow County Incentives for Middle Income or family wage housing</strong></td>
<td>Morrow County Citizens</td>
<td>Assistance in creating more opportunities for middle income and family wage housing.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked</td>
<td><strong>Pendleton Industrial Area Master Plan</strong></td>
<td>City of Pendleton/Eastern Oregon Regional Airport</td>
<td>A Master Plan for the 365 acre light industrial parcel, adjacent to the airport in Pendleton, Or.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### IX. Regional Projects

#### COMPREHENSIVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY (CEDS) 2014–2019

**GEODC DISTRICT ➔ REGIONAL PROJECTS PRIORITY LIST**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
<th>SPONSOR</th>
<th>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>TOTAL COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unranked</td>
<td><strong>Marketing and Tourism Development</strong></td>
<td>Silvies Valley Ranch</td>
<td>Develop a marketing plan to promote tourism in the John Day area including the support of the Silvies Valley Guest Ranch as a destination experience and other activities in the area.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unranked</td>
<td><strong>Silvies Valley Ranch; Development of a guest ranch within Harney/Grant Counties</strong></td>
<td>Silvies Valley Ranch</td>
<td>Development of a guest ranch including 10 cabins and timeshares</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Performance Measures

OVERVIEW

A set of performance measures is critical to evaluating progress made towards meeting the goals and objectives of the Strategy. They include measures both required by EDA (those marked with an asterisk *) and specific measures for each goal.

In addition to the specific measures for each goal listed below, the number of projects or initiatives within the strategy that are evaluated and/or developed, whether performed by the Greater Eastern Oregon Development Corporation or a cooperating organization, will be tracked.

One important measure that will be tracked in the district is the ratio of public to private investment as the dollar amount of private investment per $1 of public investment.

Productivity, roughly equivalent to the amount of coordinated effort in the district, is a more subjective performance measure but is important to evaluating progress. The method to assess productivity will be to obtain the commitment from organizations responsible for implementing any part of the strategy to report on their progress. This will require an acknowledged commitment on behalf of organizations to follow through on action items that are within their sphere of influence.

Developing a sense of follow-through will be discussed among participating organizations and the best method will be utilized. In order to maintain a viable action plan, knowing what progress had been made and what has not will be essential to adjusting future goals and actions. The action plan will be updated annually to reflect progress or changes. New actions may be added, modified or moved between the short-term (1 year) and long-term (5 year) timeframe depending on the outcome of performance measures.

ANNUAL PERFORMANCE MEASURES

GOAL 1: Stimulate Growth by Capitalizing on the Competitive Advantages of the Region

1. Number and type of short-term actions executed and / or developed into projects

GOAL 2: Encourage Diversification of Local Economies within the Region to Increase Stability and Resiliency

1. Number and type of short-term actions executed and / or developed into projects
2. Establishment of partnerships or cooperative efforts carrying out short-term actions
3. Changes in the economic environment of the region*
4. Grant funding proposals developed and grants received

GOAL 3: Build an Entrepreneurial Environment across the Region

1. Development of Business Incubators (short-term)
2. Growth of firms in identified clusters (long-term)
X. Performance Measures

3. Number of spin-off firms (long-term)
4. Number of jobs generated by new firms *
5. Partnerships created to support entrepreneurial activity (short-term)

GOAL 4: Develop an Educational and Training System That Supports Business
1. Partnerships formed between workforce, education, and economic development
2. Improvement in educational attainment levels; lower drop-out rates, increased graduation rates, increase in number of students achieving Associates level credits in High School, increase in number of persons receiving skills training
3. Number and type of short-term actions executed and / or developed into projects

GOAL 5: Support Business Retention and Expansion
1. Number of jobs created and cost / job*
2. Number of jobs retained and cost / job*
3. Change in average annual wages
4. Unemployment level
5. Use of existing small business resources such as business loan programs
6. Number and types of private sector investment in the District*

GOAL 6: Attract New Firms to the Region that will serve to Diversify the Economy and Provide Family Wage Jobs
1. Number of new firms moving into the area
2. Development of a partnership for regional marketing
3. Number and type of short-term actions executed and / or developed into projects

GOAL 7: Increase the District’s Resources for Economic Development Initiatives
1. Number of grant proposals generated / grants received
2. Number and type of short-term actions executed and / or developed into projects
3. Number of regional collaborative projects including those with multiple funding sources

GOAL 8: Promote a Network of Industrial Sites that will serve the Needs of Existing and Future Firms
1. Number and type of short-term actions executed and / or developed into projects

GOAL 9: Support Rural Communities’ Capacity for Self-Reliance
1. Number of grants applied for / generated to address infrastructure needs in small towns
2. Number and type of short-term actions executed and / or developed into projects

GOAL 10: Develop a Regional Strategy that Incorporates Viable Projects to Stimulate Jobs and Economic Growth
1. Number of high priority regional scale projects receiving funding
2. Number and type of short-term actions executed and / or developed into projects
Appendices

### Population - Change and Forecasts 2010 - 2020

**GEODC Counties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gilliam</td>
<td>1,945</td>
<td>1,871</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>1,958</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>7,435</td>
<td>7,445</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>7,414</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
<td>7,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harney</td>
<td>7,260</td>
<td>7,422</td>
<td>-162</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
<td>7,425</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>7,404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malheur</td>
<td>31,440</td>
<td>31,313</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>32,033</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>32,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrow</td>
<td>11,425</td>
<td>11,173</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>11,668</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>12,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umatilla</td>
<td>77,895</td>
<td>75,889</td>
<td>2,006</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>78,887</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>83,359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>1,441</td>
<td>-11</td>
<td>-0.8%</td>
<td>1,407</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
<td>1,378</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Portland State University Population Research Center, Oregon Office of Economic Analysis

### Poverty Rate

**GEODC Counties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oregon</th>
<th>Gilliam</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Harney</th>
<th>Malheur</th>
<th>Morrow</th>
<th>Umatilla</th>
<th>Wheeler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All families</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families with female householder with related children under 18 years, no husband present</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>49.7%</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All people</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 years</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 64 years</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey 2008 - 2012 - Percentage of Families and People whose Income in the Past 12 months is below the poverty level
## Educational Attainment - Population

**GEODC Counties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Oregon</th>
<th>Gilliam</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Harney</th>
<th>Malheur</th>
<th>Morrow</th>
<th>Umatilla</th>
<th>Wheeler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population 25 years and over</td>
<td>2,612,044</td>
<td>1,462</td>
<td>5,516</td>
<td>5,107</td>
<td>20,129</td>
<td>7,083</td>
<td>48,616</td>
<td>1,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th grade</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th grade, no diploma</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate (inc. equivalency)</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>30.1%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate's degree</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional degree</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent high school graduate or higher</td>
<td>89.2%</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
<td>88.8%</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td>79.8%</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent bachelor's degree or higher</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: American Community Survey 2008 - 2012

## Educational Attainment in the Workforce

**GEODC Counties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gilliam</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Harney</th>
<th>Malheur</th>
<th>Morrow</th>
<th>Umatilla</th>
<th>Wheeler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than high school</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school or equivalent, no college</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college or Associate degree</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>26.0%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree or advanced degree</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment not available (29 years or less)</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Oregon Employment Department
Housing Vacancy Rates 2000 - 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEODC District</th>
<th>Rental Vacancy Rate</th>
<th>For Sale Vacancy Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilliam</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrow</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harney</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malheur</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umatilla</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 Census Profiles, Oregon and its Counties. PSU Research Center
## Major Employment Sectors - 2013

**GEODC Counties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greater Easter Oregon District</th>
<th>Jobs</th>
<th>% of All Industries</th>
<th>Oregon % of All Industries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total All Industries</strong></td>
<td>52,075</td>
<td>1,679,377</td>
<td>74.4% 2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Private Industry</td>
<td>38,754</td>
<td>74.4% 2.9%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting</td>
<td>5,494</td>
<td>10.6% 2.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, Quarrying, and Oil and Gas Extraction</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0.3% 0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>0.8% 0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>2.7% 0.3%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>5,803</td>
<td>11.1% 10.4%</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>1,697</td>
<td>3.3% 0.4%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Trade</td>
<td>5,710</td>
<td>11.0% 10.4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>2,601</td>
<td>5.0% 2.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>0.9% 0.3%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Insurance</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>1.7% 0.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate and Rental and Leasing</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>0.6% 0.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>1.5% 0.4%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management of Companies and Enterprises</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>0.4% 0.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin &amp; Support, Waste Mgmt &amp; Remediation Svcs</td>
<td>1,996</td>
<td>3.8% 0.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0.2% 0.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>5,376</td>
<td>10.3% 12.3%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>0.5% 0.1%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and Food Services</td>
<td>3,822</td>
<td>7.3% 1.6%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services (excluding Public Administration)</td>
<td>1,221</td>
<td>2.3% 0.4%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0% 0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Government</strong></td>
<td>13,321</td>
<td>25.6% 16.0%</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>2.5% 1.6%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>3,380</td>
<td>6.5% 4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>8,631</td>
<td>16.6% 10.3%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Or. Dept of Employment
## Oregon Agricultural Employment Estimates 2007 - 2013

### During & After the Recession

#### GEODC Counties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>56840</td>
<td>53340</td>
<td>53030</td>
<td>53580</td>
<td>56140</td>
<td>58980</td>
<td>-10.1%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilliam</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrow</td>
<td>1330</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>1190</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>1310</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>-4.8%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umatilla</td>
<td>3300</td>
<td>3070</td>
<td>3070</td>
<td>2950</td>
<td>3180</td>
<td>3170</td>
<td>-3.2%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>-6.5%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harney</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malheur</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>1760</td>
<td>1790</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>-5.7%</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>7640</td>
<td>7240</td>
<td>7160</td>
<td>7120</td>
<td>7280</td>
<td>7360</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

District as % of Oregon

|        | 13.4% | 13.6% | 13.5% | 13.3% | 13.0% | 12.5% | Na                | Na                |

Source: Employment Dept.

### Unemployment Rate 2000 - 2013

#### GEODC Counties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilliam</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harney</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malheur</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrow</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umatilla</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Recession from Dec 2007 to June 2009

Source: Oregon Employment Dept.
### Non-Agricultural Employment Change 2007 - 2013

#### % Change During & After Recession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEODC District</th>
<th>Recession</th>
<th>Post-Recession</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Nonfarm Employment</td>
<td>1731000</td>
<td>1601700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total nonfarm employment</td>
<td>49605</td>
<td>47885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total private</td>
<td>34970</td>
<td>33330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, logging, and construction</td>
<td>1610</td>
<td>1280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>5780</td>
<td>5580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, transportation, and utilities</td>
<td>11380</td>
<td>10605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>1690</td>
<td>1640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>6020</td>
<td>5660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, warehousing, and utilities</td>
<td>3490</td>
<td>3440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial activities</td>
<td>1630</td>
<td>1430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and business services</td>
<td>3070</td>
<td>3080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational and health services</td>
<td>4745</td>
<td>5175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and hospitality</td>
<td>4210</td>
<td>3945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>1140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>14640</td>
<td>14560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal government</td>
<td>1715</td>
<td>1780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State government</td>
<td>3775</td>
<td>3550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>9180</td>
<td>9230</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Oregon Employment Department

Note: recession dec 2007 to june 2009; high unemployment lasted through 2010
### Labor Force Participation Rate

**% Change 2010 - 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEODC Counties</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Percent change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>-4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilliam</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>-13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harney</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>-5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malheur</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrow</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>-2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umatilla</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>-2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Oregon Employment Department

### Median Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEODC Counties</th>
<th>United States</th>
<th>Oregon</th>
<th>Gilliam</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Harney</th>
<th>Malheur</th>
<th>Morrow</th>
<th>Umatilla</th>
<th>Wheeler</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$53,046</td>
<td>$50,036</td>
<td>$45,833</td>
<td>$34,337</td>
<td>$39,674</td>
<td>$37,191</td>
<td>$48,457</td>
<td>$48,452</td>
<td>$36,357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS) 2008-2012

### Size of Labor Force

**% Change 2010 - 2013**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEODC Counties</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1,968,730</td>
<td>1,924,604</td>
<td>-44,126</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilliam</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>-173</td>
<td>-14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>3,494</td>
<td>3,337</td>
<td>-157</td>
<td>-4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harney</td>
<td>3,545</td>
<td>3,129</td>
<td>-416</td>
<td>-11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malheur</td>
<td>13,489</td>
<td>12,598</td>
<td>-891</td>
<td>-6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrow</td>
<td>5,495</td>
<td>5,339</td>
<td>-156</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umatilla</td>
<td>39,256</td>
<td>38,255</td>
<td>-1,001</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>-27</td>
<td>-3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Oregon Employment Department

### Annual Average Wage 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GEODC Counties</th>
<th>Average Wage</th>
<th>% of State Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>$45,010</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilliam</td>
<td>$36,145</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>$33,497</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harney</td>
<td>$32,812</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malheur</td>
<td>$32,077</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrow</td>
<td>$41,352</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umatilla</td>
<td>$35,594</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler</td>
<td>$23,530</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Or. Employment Dept.
Gilliam County Population, Households, Race 2000-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POPULATION</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>1,871</td>
<td>-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age (years)</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 years</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 64 years</td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>1,103</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Median age (years)</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Median age (years)</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RELATIONSHIP

| Total population               | 1,915   | 1,871   | -44    |
| In households                  | 1,889   | 1,851   | -38    |
| In family households           | 1,578   | 1,437   | -141   |
| In nonfamily households        | 311     | 414     | 103    |

HISPANIC OR LATINO AND RACE

| Total population               | 1,915   | 1,871   | -44    |
| Hispanic or Latino             | 35      | 88      | 53     |
| Not Hispanic or Latino         | 1,880   | 1,783   | -97    |
| White alone                    | 1,839   | 1,725   | -114   |
| Black or African American alone| 3       | 3       | 0      |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 16 | 18 | 2 |
| Asian alone                    | 3       | 3       | 0      |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 0 | 13 | -13 |
| Some Other Race alone          | 1       | 0       | -1     |
| Two or More Races              | 18      | 21      | 3      |

Source: US Census Bureau 2010 Census tabulated by Population Research Center, Portland State University

Gilliam County Annual Average Employment 2013 - 5 Year Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Employment 2013</th>
<th>% Change 2008-2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon - Public &amp; Private Employment</td>
<td>1,679,364</td>
<td>-1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; Private Employment</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>-19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Employment</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>-26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources &amp; Mining</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>330.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Transportation. &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>-17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Activities</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional &amp; Business Services</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>-11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Health Services</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>-20.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure &amp; Hospitality</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Government</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-48.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Oregon Employment Department

Note: (C) - confidential; the employment Dept. restricts data in a sector if there are either too few firms or a single dominant firm which could result in the identity of a company; totals for Businesses and/or Employment may not add up to due to the use of different databases and / or rounding error based on quarterly reporting.
### Gilliam County Covered Employment & Wages 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>GEODC Counties</th>
<th>Businesses</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Average Pay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Statewide</td>
<td></td>
<td>133,539</td>
<td>1,679,363</td>
<td>$45,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; Private Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>$36,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>$37,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources &amp; Mining</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>$26,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop production</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$32,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal production</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing, hunting and trapping</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>$40,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy and civil engineering construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty trade contractors</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$32,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Transportation &amp; Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>$41,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>$18,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle and parts dealers</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building material and garden supply stores</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and beverage stores</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$17,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline stations</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous store retailers</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstore retailers</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Warehousing &amp; Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$55,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing industries, except Internet</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$28,753</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Gilliam County Employment Change During and After Recession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Sector</th>
<th>Recession</th>
<th>Post-Recession</th>
<th>% Change 2007 - 2010</th>
<th>% Change 2010 - 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oregon Nonfarm Employment</strong></td>
<td>1731000</td>
<td>1601700 1673500</td>
<td>-7.5% 4.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total nonfarm employment</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>895 735</td>
<td>7.8% -17.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total private</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>655 495</td>
<td>8.3% -24.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, transportation, and utilities</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>170 130</td>
<td>9.7% -23.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and business services</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140 135</td>
<td>0.0% -3.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational and health services</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75 55</td>
<td>15.4% -26.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and hospitality</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40 45</td>
<td>-33.3% 12.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>240 240</td>
<td>4.3% 0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal government</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15 10</td>
<td>50.0% -33.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State government</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30 20</td>
<td>-14.3% -33.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>195 210</td>
<td>5.4% 7.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Oregon Employment Department
### Grant County Population, Households, Race 2000-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POPULATION</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>7,935</td>
<td>7,445</td>
<td>-490 (-6.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age (years)</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 years</td>
<td>2,045</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>-615 (-30.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 64 years</td>
<td>4,560</td>
<td>4,255</td>
<td>-305 (-6.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>1,760</td>
<td>430 (32.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Median age (years)</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Median age (years)</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HISPANIC OR LATINO AND RACE

| Total population | 7,935 | 7,445 | -490 (-6.2%) |
| Hispanic or Latino | 163 | 207 | 44 (27.0%) |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 7,772 | 7,238 | -534 (-6.9%) |
| White alone | 7,506 | 6,951 | -555 (-7.4%) |
| Black or African American alone | 8 | 11 | 3 (37.5%) |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 124 | 88 | -36 (-29.0%) |
| Asian alone | 15 | 24 | 9 (60.0%) |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 3 | 6 | 3 (100.0%) |
| Some Other Race alone | 6 | 2 | -4 (-66.7%) |
| Two or More Races | 110 | 156 | 46 (41.8%) |

Source: US Census Bureau 2010 Census tabulated by Population Research Center, Portland State University.

### Grant County Annual Average Employment 2013 - 5-Year Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon - Public &amp; Private Employment</td>
<td>1,679,364</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>1,714,781</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; Private Employment</td>
<td>2,325</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2,413</td>
<td>-3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Employment</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>1,393</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources &amp; Mining</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>-53.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>-18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Transportation, &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>-14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-31.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>-10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Activities</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>-23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional &amp; Business Services</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Health Services</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure &amp; Hospitality</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Government</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>1,020</td>
<td>-5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>-11.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Oregon Employment Dept.

Note: Totals for businesses and/or employment may not add up to due to the use of 2 different databases and/or rounding error based on quarterly reporting.
### Grant County Covered Employment & Wages 2013

#### Greater Eastern Oregon District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Businesses</th>
<th>Average Employment</th>
<th>Ave Annual Wages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Statewide</td>
<td>133,539</td>
<td>1,679,363</td>
<td>$45,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; Private Employment</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>2,325</td>
<td>$33,497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Employment</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>$27,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources &amp; Mining</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>$30,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop production</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal production</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry and logging</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and forestry support activities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, except oil and gas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>$23,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of buildings</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>$23,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy and civil engineering construction</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$24,443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty trade contractors</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$24,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>$37,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood product manufacturing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabricated metal product manufacturing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery manufacturing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous manufacturing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Transportation. &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>$28,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>$30,913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant wholesalers, durable goods</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant wholesalers, nondurable goods</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$31,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>$22,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle and parts dealers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>$34,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and home furnishings stores</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics and appliance stores</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building material and garden supply stores</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$29,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and beverage stores</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>$21,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and personal care stores</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$21,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline stations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>$19,634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing and clothing accessories stores</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General merchandise stores</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous store retailers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstore retailers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Warehousing &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>$57,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck transportation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$32,345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal service</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couriers and messengers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>$38,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing industries, except Internet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcasting, except Internet</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Grant County Employment Change During and After Recession

#### Greater Eastern Oregon District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Recession</th>
<th>Post-Recession</th>
<th>% Change 2007 - 2010</th>
<th>% Change 2010 - 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Nonfarm Employment</td>
<td>1731000</td>
<td>1601700</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
<td>-4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total nonfarm employment</td>
<td>2,510</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>-8.4%</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total private</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>-16.3%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining and logging</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-50.0%</td>
<td>133.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>-54.2%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, transportation, and utilities</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>-7.9%</td>
<td>-11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-20.0%</td>
<td>-25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>-3.7%</td>
<td>-11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, warehousing, and utilities</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-16.7%</td>
<td>-15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial activities</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-18.2%</td>
<td>-11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and business services</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational and health services</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and hospitality</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>-10.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-14.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>-7.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal government</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>-10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State government</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>-6.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
<td>-7.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Oregon Employment Department
### Harney County Population, Households, Race 2000-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>POPULATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>7,609</td>
<td>7,422</td>
<td>-187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age (years)</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 years</td>
<td>1,975</td>
<td>1,664</td>
<td>-311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 64 years</td>
<td>4,493</td>
<td>4,356</td>
<td>-137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>1,402</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RELATIONSHIP</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>7,609</td>
<td>7,422</td>
<td>-187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In households</td>
<td>7,440</td>
<td>7,295</td>
<td>-145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In family households</td>
<td>6,293</td>
<td>5,958</td>
<td>-335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In nonfamily households</td>
<td>1,147</td>
<td>1,337</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HISPANIC OR LATINO AND RACE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>7,609</td>
<td>7,422</td>
<td>-187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>7,293</td>
<td>7,128</td>
<td>-165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White alone</td>
<td>6,823</td>
<td>6,648</td>
<td>-175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race alone</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau 2010 Census tabulated by Population Research Center, Portland State University

**Sources:** U.S. Census Bureau, 2010 Census, Summary File 1; 2000 Census, Summary File 1. Tabulated by Population Research Center, Portland State University. [www.pdx.edu/prc](http://www.pdx.edu/prc)
## Harney County Annual Average Employment 2013 - 5 Year Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon - Public &amp; Private Employment</td>
<td>1,679,364</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>1,714,781</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; Private Employment</td>
<td>2,173</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>2,465</td>
<td>-11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Employment</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
<td>1,406</td>
<td>-15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources &amp; Mining</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of buildings</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-73.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy and civil engineering construction</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty trade contractors</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>Na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Transportation. &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>-8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>-26.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>-10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional &amp; Business Services</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Health Services</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>-1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure &amp; Hospitality</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>-11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Non-Classified</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>Na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Government</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>45.6%</td>
<td>1,059</td>
<td>-6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>-1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>-10.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Oregon Employment Department

Note: (C) - confidential; the employment Dept. restricts data in a sector if there are either too few firms or a single dominant firm which could result in the identity of a company; totals for Businesses and/or Employment may not add up due to the use of 2 different databases and/or rounding error based on quarterly reporting. Na - not available due to restricted or lack of data

## Harney County Covered Employment & Wages 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Businesses</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Average Pay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Statewide</td>
<td>133,539</td>
<td>1,679,363</td>
<td>$45,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; Private Employment</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>2,173</td>
<td>$32,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Employment</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>1,182</td>
<td>$25,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources &amp; Mining</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>$25,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop production</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>$29,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal production</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>$21,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry and logging</td>
<td>2 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and forestry support activities</td>
<td>4 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>$31,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of buildings</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$32,363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy and civil engineering construction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>$39,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty trade contractors</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$23,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>2 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food manufacturing</td>
<td>1 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather and allied product manufacturing</td>
<td>1 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Transportation. &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>$31,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$34,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant wholesalers, durable goods</td>
<td>3 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant wholesalers, nondurable goods</td>
<td>2 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic markets and agents and brokers</td>
<td>2 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>$25,183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle and parts dealers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>$33,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and home furnishings stores</td>
<td>1 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building material and garden supply stores</td>
<td>2 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and beverage stores</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>$24,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and personal care stores</td>
<td>1 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline stations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>$16,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing and clothing accessories stores</td>
<td>1 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting goods, hobby, book and music stores</td>
<td>1 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General merchandise stores</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$20,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstore retailers</td>
<td>1 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Warehousing &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>$58,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>2 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck transportation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$40,416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support activities for transportation</td>
<td>2 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal service</td>
<td>1 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couriers and messengers</td>
<td>2 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>$40,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing industries, except Internet</td>
<td>1 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td>3 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Activities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>$28,509</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Harney County Employment Change During and After Recession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Sector</th>
<th>Recession</th>
<th>Post-Recession</th>
<th>% Change 2007 - 2010</th>
<th>% Change 2010 - 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Nonfarm Employment</td>
<td>1731000</td>
<td>1601700</td>
<td>1673500</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total nonfarm employment</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,260</td>
<td>2,090</td>
<td>-9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total private</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>-20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, logging, and construction</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, transportation, and utilities</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>-3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, warehousing, and utilities</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial activities</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and business services</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational and health services</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and hospitality</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>-8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,130</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal government</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State government</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Oregon Employment Department
### Malheur County Population, Households, Race 2000-2010

#### POPULATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SEX AND AGE</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median age (years)</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 years</td>
<td>8,734</td>
<td>8,004</td>
<td>-730 (-8.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 64 years</td>
<td>18,560</td>
<td>18,615</td>
<td>55 (0.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>4,321</td>
<td>4,694</td>
<td>373 (8.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Median age (years)</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Median age (years)</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### RELATIONSHIP

| Total population | 31,615 | 31,313 | -302 (-1.0%) |
| In households | 28,294 | 27,962 | -332 (-1.2%) |
| In family households | 24,789 | 23,975 | -814 (-3.3%) |
| In nonfamily households | 3,505 | 3,987 | 482 (13.8%) |

#### HISPANIC OR LATINO AND RACE

| Total population | 31,615 | 31,313 | -302 (-1.0%) |
| Hispanic or Latino | 8,099 | 9,867 | 1,768 (21.8%) |
| Not Hispanic or Latino | 23,516 | 21,446 | -2,070 (-8.8%) |
| White alone | 21,752 | 19,906 | -1,846 (-8.5%) |
| Black or African American alone | 369 | 331 | -38 (-10.3%) |
| American Indian and Alaska Native alone | 273 | 235 | -38 (-13.9%) |
| Asian alone | 608 | 511 | -97 (-16.0%) |
| Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone | 18 | 12 | -6 (-33.3%) |
| Some Other Race alone | 37 | 21 | -16 (-43.2%) |
| Two or More Races | 459 | 430 | -29 (-6.3%) |

Source: US Census Bureau 2010 Census tabulated by Population Research Center, Portland State University.

---

### Malheur County Annual Average Employment 2013 - 5 Year Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon - Public &amp; Private Employment</td>
<td>1,675,364</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>1,714,781</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; Private Employment</td>
<td>12,393</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>12,931</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Employment</td>
<td>9,202</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>9,458</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources &amp; Mining</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>-7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>Na</td>
<td>Na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>1,036</td>
<td>-13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Transportation, &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>2,933</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>3,027</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1,829</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>1,969</td>
<td>-7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Warehousing &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Activities</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>-10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional &amp; Business Services</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>132.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Health Services</td>
<td>1,672</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>1,534</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>-9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Government</td>
<td>3,192</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>3,474</td>
<td>-8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>-11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>1,252</td>
<td>-3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>1,761</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>1,977</td>
<td>-10.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Oregon Employment Department

Note: (C) - confidential; the employment Dept. restricts data in a sector if there are either too few firms or a single dominant firm which could result in the identity of a company. Na - not available due to restricted or lack of data; totals for Businesses and/or Employment may not add up to due to the use of 2 different databases and/or rounding error based on quarterly reporting.
Malheur County Covered Employment & Wages 2013
Greater Eastern Oregon District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Businesses</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Average Pay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Oregon Statewide</strong></td>
<td>133,539</td>
<td>1,679,363</td>
<td>$45,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; Private Employment</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>12,393</td>
<td>$32,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Employment</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>9,202</td>
<td>$28,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources &amp; Mining</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>$25,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop production</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>$25,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal production</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and forestry support activities</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>$18,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, except oil and gas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>$31,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of buildings</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>$31,678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy and civil engineering construction</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>$33,833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty trade contractors</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>$30,876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>897</td>
<td>$29,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food manufacturing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beverage and tobacco product manufacturing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood product manufacturing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and related support activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastics and rubber products manufacturing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmetallic mineral product manufacturing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>$26,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabricated metal product manufacturing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>$27,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery manufacturing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>$28,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous manufacturing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$17,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Transportation &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>2,933</td>
<td>$29,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>$33,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant wholesalers, durable goods</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>$37,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant wholesalers, nondurable goods</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>$32,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic markets and agents and brokers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$54,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1,825</td>
<td>$25,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle and parts dealers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>$38,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and home furnishings stores</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$25,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics and appliance stores</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building material and garden supply stores</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>$24,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and beverage stores</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>$20,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and personal care stores</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>$30,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline stations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>$20,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing and clothing accessories stores</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>$14,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting goods, hobby, book and music stores</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>$15,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General merchandise stores</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>$24,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous store retailers</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>$17,517</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Malheur County Employment Change During and After Recession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Sector</th>
<th>Recessions</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>% Change 2007 - 2010</th>
<th>% Change 2010 - 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Nonfarm Employment</td>
<td>1731000</td>
<td>1601700</td>
<td>1673500</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total nonfarm employment</td>
<td>11,990</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>11,610</td>
<td>-3.3%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total private</td>
<td>8,540</td>
<td>8,020</td>
<td>8,240</td>
<td>-6.1%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, logging, and construction</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>-27.8%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>-16.1%</td>
<td>-3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, transportation, and utilities</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>2,950</td>
<td>-7.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>-11.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, warehousing, and utilities</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>-10.5%</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial activities</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>-18.6%</td>
<td>-5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and business services</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational and health services</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,630</td>
<td>1,690</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and hospitality</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>-5.2%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>-6.5%</td>
<td>-3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>3,450</td>
<td>3,580</td>
<td>3,360</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>-6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal government</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State government</td>
<td>1,120</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>1,230</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>-3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td>1,910</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>-8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Oregon Employment Department
## Morrow County Population, Households, Race 2000-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POPULATION</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>10,995</td>
<td>11,173</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age (years)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 years</td>
<td>3,385</td>
<td>3,190</td>
<td>-195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 64 years</td>
<td>6,441</td>
<td>6,562</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>1,421</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Median age (years)</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Median age (years)</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIONSHIP</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>10,995</td>
<td>11,173</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In households</td>
<td>10,955</td>
<td>11,150</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In family households</td>
<td>9,883</td>
<td>9,915</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In nonfamily households</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HISPANIC OR LATINO AND RACE</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>10,995</td>
<td>11,173</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>2,686</td>
<td>3,497</td>
<td>811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>8,399</td>
<td>7,676</td>
<td>-633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White alone</td>
<td>7,911</td>
<td>7,218</td>
<td>-693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race alone</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Morrow County Annual Average Employment 2013 - 5 Year Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon - Public &amp; Private Employment</td>
<td>1,679,364</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,714,782</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; Private Employment</td>
<td>4,805</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>4,220</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources &amp; Mining</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>163.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Transportation &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>-20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>-4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Warehousing &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>-7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>268.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Activities</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional &amp; Business Services</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>Na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Health Services</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>Na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure &amp; Hospitality</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>-17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Government</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>-4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Morrow County Covered Employment & Wages 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Businesses</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Average Pay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Statewide</td>
<td>133,539</td>
<td>1,679,363</td>
<td>$45,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; Private Employment</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>4,805</td>
<td>$41,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Employment</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>3,978</td>
<td>$41,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources &amp; Mining</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>$37,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop production</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>$40,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal production</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>$36,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry and logging</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and forestry support activities</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>$28,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, except oil and gas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$33,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>$51,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of buildings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy and civil engineering construction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty trade contractors</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>$28,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>$44,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food manufacturing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>$43,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood product manufacturing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical manufacturing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmetallic mineral product manufacturing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabricated metal product manufacturing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery manufacturing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Transportation &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>$55,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>$50,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant wholesalers, durable goods</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant wholesalers, nondurable goods</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>$49,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic markets and agents and brokers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>$21,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle and parts dealers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$44,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building material and garden supply stores</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and beverage stores</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and personal care stores</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline stations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing and clothing accessories stores</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General merchandise stores</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous store retailers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstore retailers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$35,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Warehousing &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>$80,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck transportation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>$36,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit and ground passenger transportation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehousing and storage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$79,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing industries, except internet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data processing, hosting and related services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Activities</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$34,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Insurance</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>$38,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit intermediation and related activities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance carriers and related activities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Morrow County Employment Change During and After Recession

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Sector</th>
<th>Recession</th>
<th>Post-Recession</th>
<th>% Change 2007 - 2010</th>
<th>% Change 2010 - 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Nonfarm Employment</td>
<td>1731000</td>
<td>1601700</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total nonfarm employment</td>
<td>3,290</td>
<td>3,740</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total private</td>
<td>2,380</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining and logging</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food manufacturing</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, transportation, and utilities</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>-16.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>-45.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, warehousing, and utilities</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>-8.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>250.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial activities</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and business services</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational and health services</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and hospitality</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>-21.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-16.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal government</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State government</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>-14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Oregon Employment Department
### Morrow County Population, Households, Race 2000-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POPULATION</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>10,995</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>11,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median age (years)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 years</td>
<td>3,385</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>3,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 64 years</td>
<td>6,441</td>
<td>58.6%</td>
<td>6,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>1,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Median age (years)</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Median age (years)</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HISPANIC OR LATINO AND RACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total population</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Nonfamily households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>10,995</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>2,686</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>8,309</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White alone</td>
<td>7,911</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race alone</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: US Census Bureau 2010 Census tabulated by Population Research Center, Portland State University

---

### Morrow County Annual Average Employment 2013 - 5 Year Change

#### GEODC District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon - Public &amp; Private Employment</td>
<td>1,679,364</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1,714,781</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; Private Employment</td>
<td>4,805</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>4,220</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Employment</td>
<td>3,978</td>
<td>82.8%</td>
<td>3,354</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources &amp; Mining</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>163.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Transportation, &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>-20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>-49.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>-4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Warehousing &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>-7.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>268.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Activities</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional &amp; Business Services</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>Na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Health Services</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>Na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure &amp; Hospitality</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>-17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Government</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>-4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>-3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Oregon Employment Department

Note: [C] - confidential; the employment Dept. restricts data in a sector if there are either too few firms or a single dominant firm which could result in the identity of a company. Na - not available due to restricted or lack of data; (c) - no employment in that year; totals for Businesses and/or Employment may not add up due to the use of different databases and/or rounding error based on quarterly reporting.
### Morrow County Covered Employment & Wages 2013

**GEODC District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Businesses</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Average Pay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Statewide</td>
<td>133,539</td>
<td>1,679,363</td>
<td>$45,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; Private Employment</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>4,805</td>
<td>$41,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Employment</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>3,978</td>
<td>$41,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources &amp; Mining</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>$37,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop production</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>$40,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal production</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>$36,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry and logging</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and forestry support activities</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>$28,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining, except oil and gas</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$33,266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>$51,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of buildings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy and civil engineering construction</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty trade contractors</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>$28,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,504</td>
<td>$44,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food manufacturing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,335</td>
<td>$43,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood product manufacturing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical manufacturing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmetallic mineral product manufacturing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabricated metal product manufacturing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery manufacturing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Transportation &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>$55,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>$50,463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant wholesalers, durable goods</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merchant wholesalers, nondurable goods</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>$49,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic markets and agents and brokers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>$21,498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle and parts dealers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$44,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building material and garden supply stores</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and beverage stores</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and personal care stores</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline stations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing and clothing accessories stores</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General merchandise stores</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous store retailers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstore retailers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$35,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Warehousing &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>$80,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck transportation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>$36,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit and ground passenger transportation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehousing and storage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>$79,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing industries, except Internet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data processing, hosting and related services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Activities</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>$34,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance &amp; Insurance</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>$38,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit intermediation and related activities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance carriers and related activities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Morrow County Employment Change During and After Recession

**GEODC District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Sector</th>
<th>Recession</th>
<th>Post-Recession</th>
<th>% Change 2007 - 2010</th>
<th>% Change 2010 - 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Nonfarm Employment</td>
<td>1731000</td>
<td>1601700</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total nonfarm employment</td>
<td>3,290</td>
<td>3,370</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total private</td>
<td>1,380</td>
<td>2,440</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining and logging</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>1,280</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food manufacturing</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, transportation, and utilities</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>-16.7%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>-45.0%</td>
<td>-9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, warehousing, and utilities</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>-8.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>250.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial activities</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and business services</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational and health services</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and hospitality</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>-21.1%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-16.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>-5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal government</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State government</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>-14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>-2.7%</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Oregon Employment Department
### Wheeler County Population, Household, Races 2000 - 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POPULATION</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>1,547</td>
<td>1,441</td>
<td>-106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 18 years</td>
<td>351 (22.7%)</td>
<td>259 (18.0%)</td>
<td>-92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 64 years</td>
<td>836 (54.0%)</td>
<td>762 (52.9%)</td>
<td>-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 years and over</td>
<td>360 (23.3%)</td>
<td>420 (29.1%)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Median</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Median</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELATIONSHIP</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>1,547</td>
<td>1,441</td>
<td>-106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In households</td>
<td>1,516</td>
<td>1,416</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In family households</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>1,139</td>
<td>-131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In nonfamily households</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HISPANIC OR LATINO AND RACE</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>1,547</td>
<td>1,441</td>
<td>-106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race alone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wheeler County Annual Average Employment 2013 - 5 Year Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon - Public &amp; Private Employment</td>
<td>1,679,364</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>1,714,781</td>
<td>-2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; Private Employment</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Employment</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources &amp; Mining</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>118.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Transportation. &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>48.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Warehousing &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Activities</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional &amp; Business Services</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Health Services</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure &amp; Hospitality</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total All Government</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>-2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Transportation. &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>-4.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tabulated by Population Research Center, Portland State University.

Note: (C) - confidential; the employment Dept. restricts data in a sector if there are either too few firms or a single dominant firm which could result in the identity of a company. Na - not available due to restricted or lack of data; (-) - no employment in that year; totals for businesses and/or employment may not add up due to the use of 2 different databases and / or rounding error based on quarterly reporting.
### Wheeler County Covered Employment & Wages 2013

#### GEODC District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Businesses</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Average Pay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public &amp; Private Employment</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>$25,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Employment</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>$33,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources &amp; Mining</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$30,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop production</td>
<td>2 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal production</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$22,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry and logging</td>
<td>1 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and forestry support activities</td>
<td>1 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>1 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Transportation &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>$23,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>8 (c)</td>
<td>37 (c)</td>
<td>$20,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor vehicle and parts dealers</td>
<td>1 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building material and garden supply stores</td>
<td>1 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and beverage stores</td>
<td>1 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline stations</td>
<td>2 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting goods, hobby, book and music stores</td>
<td>1 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonstore retailers</td>
<td>2 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation, Warehousing &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>1 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>1 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional &amp; Business Services</td>
<td>1 (c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Health Services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>$23,901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure &amp; Hospitality</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$13,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$10,847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Government</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>$29,618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$33,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Transportation &amp; Utilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$20,186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$11,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>$30,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Health Services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$32,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$28,157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Oregon Employment Department

Note: (c) - confidential; the employment Dept. restricts data in a sector if there are either too few firms or a single dominant firm which could result in the identity of a company; (c) - no employment in that year

---

### Wheeler County Employment Change During and After Recession

#### GEODC District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Sector</th>
<th>Recession</th>
<th>Post-Recession</th>
<th>% Change 2007 - 2010</th>
<th>% Change 2010 - 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Nonfarm Employment</td>
<td>1731000</td>
<td>1601700</td>
<td>-7.5%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total nonfarm employment</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>-1.8%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total private</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, transportation, and utilities</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and hospitality</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-16.7%</td>
<td>-40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>-16.7%</td>
<td>-40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal government</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State government</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>-4.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Oregon Employment Department
Who is GEODC?

Greater Eastern Oregon Development Corporation
- Non-profit Economic Development Organization

Economic Development District
- Federally designated by US Dept. of Commerce, Economic Development Administration
- One of 11 Economic Development Districts in Oregon
- Serving Gilliam, Morrow, Umatilla, Wheeler, Grant, Harney and Malheur Counties
- 33,000 square miles (nearly 1/3 of the State of Oregon)

What is CEDS?

Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy

- A Demographic and Economic Analysis of the Region
  - What is the Region?
  - Portrait of the economic conditions of the Region in 2014
  - Key strengths and challenges for economic development
  - Opportunities for growth and economic development in the region

- Strategies for creating sustainable and resilient economic growth in the Region

- Local projects important for each community

- Projects that address regional economic issues; and which are prioritized for implementation and funding

Map of GEODC District
Who Should Participate in CEDS?
- Local Community Residents
- Businesses
- Economic Development Organizations
- Civic Organizations
- Chambers of Commerce
- City Council Members
- County Commissioners
- Anyone with an interest in the economic outcome of the region

Why is it Important to Participate?
- Shed light on community issues and concerns
- Position community projects for potential funding
- Weigh in on regional economic development needs and issues
- Participate in crafting strategies to address economic conditions
- Help prioritize regional projects for implementation and eligibility for state and federal funding
- Ensure CEDS is a grass-roots citizen-driven effort
- The CEDS plan guides economic development efforts in Eastern Oregon for the next five years

What are the Opportunities to Participate?
- Contribute ideas in a CEDS Community Outreach Meeting
- Fill out a Survey – On Line or paper
  - Provide suggestions for local Community Projects
- Solicit and submit ideas for REGIONAL projects
- Attend 2nd Round of Outreach Meetings to discuss regional priority projects

Opportunities to Participate continued
- Review and comment on-line:
  - Goals and Objectives
  - Criteria for Prioritizing Projects
  - Elements of CEDS plan
  - Final DRAFT of CEDS
- Provide input via Regional Partners in your area.
  - Who are the Regional Partners?
  - How are Regional Partners involved in the CEDS process?
Local Economic Development Issues

- What do you see as assets or strengths supporting economic development in your *community*?

- What do you see as weaknesses or constraints hindering economic development in your *community*?

Local Economic Development

- What are the *most important projects* your local community should focus on in the next 5 years to advance economic growth and development?

- If you are a business owner, operator or entrepreneur, what do you need to expand or develop your business?

Regional Economic Development Issues

Discussion of Local Economic Development Issues
Regional Economic Development Issues

- What do you see as assets or strengths supporting economic development in the Region?

- What do you see as weaknesses or constraints hindering economic development in the Region?

Regional Economic Development

- What are the most important economic development issues in the Region?

- What are the highest priority projects needed to address economic conditions in the Region?

ANY QUESTIONS?

Contact:
Greater Eastern Oregon Development Corporation (GEODC)

Phil Nachbar, Project Lead 541-612-7117
Judy Moore 541-612-7142
Christine Nelson 541-612-7090
Office phone: 541-276-6745

Website: www.geodc.net/ (Go to 2014 CEDS)
For Survey: www.geodc.net/ceds/2014-survey
**COMMUNITY MEETING: Assets & Strengths**

**ARLINGTON MEETING**
- Freeway access – I-84
- “Wheat, Wind, Waste”!
- Chemical Waste Disposal is an innovative company, employs 80 person
- Port of Arlington
- Rail yard and active rail spur
- East End – Willowcreek District
- Wheat Lab
- Charter school
- Climate
- Affordable
- Wind surfing

**COMMUNITY MEETING: Assets & Strengths**

**CONDON MEETING**
- Chamber of Commerce
- Port of Arlington
- Condon as the County Seat of Government
- State Airport
- Fairgrounds
- Summit Springs Assisted Living
- Offices for Farming Industry
- Main St Façade Program
- Gilliam Historical Museum
- Oregon Dept. of Aviation Airport
- Small Private farms
- Newspaper distributed to 3 counties
- Theater / Hotel
- Homes to Famous People – Linus Pauling

**SURVEY RESULTS: Assets & Strengths**

**Gilliam County**
- Underdeveloped natural resources-wind, solar, minerals, water
- Little congestion
- Transportation
- Can do attitude

**Port of Arlington**
- Abundant industrial lands available
- Good transportation infrastructure-barge, rail, interstate
- Enormous power availability
- Large untapped water resource – Columbia River
- Rural workforce is creative and hardworking
SURVEY RESULTS: Assets & Strengths

Economic Development groups
- Gilliam County
- Port of Arlington
- Industrial Land / property available throughout Gilliam County
- Pioneer Community Development corporation
- John Day River / Cottonwood Canyon State Park
- Windmill/landfill revenue
- Port possibilities-growth
- Industrial park: both City of Arlington and Gilliam County’s Shutler Station
- Water, land and rail transportation possibilities

City of Condon
- Less expensive cost of living - rent/utilities
- Medical clinic & dental services
- Nice Main Street/Community Pride
- Amenities - movie theatre/pharmacy/pool/track/grocery stores

City of Lonerock
- Wind Farms
- Arlington Landfill

Education (1)
- Growing focus on tourism and investment from Travel Oregon
- Main Street project improved our buildings and demonstrates we are a community committed to our town

Natural Resources group (1)
- Untapped natural resources
- Strong agricultural industry
- Centrally located with easy access to large metropolitan areas
- Improving infrastructure
- Business-friendly county court

SURVEY RESULTS: Assets & Strengths

Businesses (3)
- Abundant Natural Resources & Energy
- attractive main street
- Work Ethic
- Port region
- Low Crime
- Wind industry
- Lower Living Costs
- Active collaboration on issues like tourism development, etc.
- People and organizations including City and County
- Main Street
- Pool, rodeo grounds, golf and other recreation
- Senior services

Residents (1)
- Rural Lifestyle
- Federal Timber Land
- Federal Grazing Land
- Landfills
- Port Districts

Assets & Strengths: Reoccurring Themes throughout Region

- Available Land
- Transportation / Access to Markets
- Quality of Education
- Low-Cost Utilities
- Recreational Opportunities
- Tourism
- Airports
- Climate
SURVEY RESULTS: Challenges

**Gilliam County**
- Government over-regulation
- Trained workforce
- Remoteness from some markets

**Port of Arlington**
- Limit development of new irrigation water supply
- Limited resources for infrastructure improvements
- Lack of quality housing – rental and residential housing units
- Ambiguous interpretations of environmental regulations and permit processes

SURVEY RESULTS: Challenges

**Economic Development groups**
- Broadband (internet upload speeds)
- Housing (rental, apartments, new, rehab old housing stock)
- Lack of job opportunities
- Distance
- Water
- People not willing to work together
- North County/South County attitude towards each other
- Condon School District failing to meet needs (low enrollment)- not willing to merge services with Arlington School
- Arlington School (low enrollment) unable to merge with Condon
- Not willing to expand and work together- always trying to sabotage entrepreneurs

COMMUNITY MEETING: Challenges

**Condon Meeting**
- Lack of Market Strength
- Internet – not well distributed: ESD provides most of ISP in town. It is a constraint to growth. Professionals working remotely won’t consider Condon without better internet access and bandwidth.
- No overnight mail
- High commute rate of workers. EX. Wind farms – many workers commuted to Condon.

**Arlington Meeting**
- Appropriate housing
- No apartments for rent
- Jobs for spouses
- Lack of irrigation systems – water issue
- Highway 19 to US 26
SURVEY RESULTS: Challenges

**Businesses (3)**
- Communications Infrastructure (Lack of cell service and high-speed internet in many communities)/ Internet (2)
- Lack of housing (2)
- Lack of some basic services
- Not enough qualified economic development professionals
- Remote Location
- Transportation
- Communities lacking basic amenities (grocery stores, gas stations, etc.)
- Skilled Workforce
- Lack of hospitality services
- Distance from main traffic flow i.e. Freeway
- Lack of employment

**Residents (1)**
- Environmental Constraints
- Restrictions on timber harvest
- Restrictions on grazing on federal lands
- Endangered species act

Survey Results: Regional Issues

**Economic Development groups**
- Lack of grant funds
- Support for start-up businesses – counseling, business plan, mentoring
- People
- Location

**Port of Arlington**
- Irrigation Water

**City of Condon**
- Transportation
- Infrastructure – enough water?
- Internet access and speed

Challenges: Reoccurring Themes throughout Region

- Housing Availability
- Access to Water
- Government Regulations
- High Commute Rate
- Lack of Services / Amenities
- Educational Facilities
- Access to Markets

Survey Results: Regional Issues

**Education**
- We need stronger, more stable funding for schools. If our schools are weak, we won’t be able to attract workers with families
- Lots of times you can find work for one member of a family, but it is very difficult to find work for both a husband and wife

**Natural Resources groups**
- Lack of jobs
- Lack of large scale employers
- Lack of tax base
- High school graduates leave town and never come back
- Average age is going up as young people leave for urban jobs
Regional Issues continued

**Businesses (3)**
- Infrastructure -- High-Speed Internet
- Compressed tax base
- Amenities
- Sustainable living wage
- Educated and well-trained Workforce
- Aging communities
- Lack of new families
- Lack of new industry
- Internet
- Schools
- Housing
- Transportation
- Lack of employment

**COMMUNITY MEETINGS: Project Priorities**

**Arlington Meeting**
- Arlington “Mesa” – airport industrial park
- Recruitment of businesses to Arlington
- Shutler Station Rail
- Food Campus

**Condon Meeting**
- Infrastructure – water / sewer (provided by $3 million grant from Wind fund)
- School Facilities – decreasing enrollment
- Internet Technology upgrade
- Brewery start up idea

**Survey Results: Priority Local Projects**

**Gilliam County**
- Columbia River dock for on and off loading materials
- Building infrastructure at industrial sites
- Funding for local schools
- Coordinating with community colleges for workforce developments
- Affordable housing

**Port of Arlington**
- New 230K-115Kv Substation for Arlington Industrial Park
- Expanded services for Arlington Marina
- Construction of new intermodal facilities
- Development of new value-added facilities
- Upgrading internet speeds to households and businesses

**City of Condon**
- Infrastructure upgrades/fixes
- Business retention – keep what we’ve got
- Attracting new businesses – young families

**Survey Results: Priority Local Projects**

**City of Lonerock**
- New reservoir
- Replace bridge on County road located at Lonerock

**Economic Development groups**
- Fiber available- better upload capacity for citizens
- Business recruitment
- Stronger school system
- Growth/expansion of sustainable employment
- Positive committee members who can see growth
- Local services: ambulance and medical services

**Education**
- Commitment to right-size the facilities (especially schools) to meet current enrollment, this will free up funds for operating

**Natural Resource Groups**
- Bring large employers into the county
- Retain young people into the community
- Modernize infrastructure
Survey Results: Priority Local Projects

**Businesses** (3)
- Need to expand high-speed internet beyond city limits/Internet (2)
- Housing (2)
- Our schools
- Need to focus on how to make it easier for graduates to return home (work remotely or start new businesses...internet)
- Need to support the John Day River Territory in its efforts to promote tourism in the region
- Infrastructure to sustain growth
- Need to focus on retaining and strengthening established businesses
- Need to partner with school districts to develop programs that enable students to stay and find employment in local industries
- Lack of employment

**Residents** (1)
- Continue development of Mesa Airport Industrial Site in Arlington
- Beautify the city
- Work with property owners to clean up and rehabilitate vacant buildings
- More Open-Door policy encouraging new businesses
- Develop Water Park in Lagoon, Skate Park, Public Meeting facility for weddings, etc.

Small Business Needs

- Website/Tech Upgrades (6)
  - I work in Condon but my employment is based in Bend. I can only maintain this arrangement with strong internet infrastructure.
  - Strong cell phone and data service is another key to maintaining my ability to work remotely.
- Access to Capital (5)
- Marketing (4)
- Business Planning/Counseling (2)
- Local government business retention/expansion programs (2)
- Networking with similar businesses and industry associations (2)
- City needs to relax their ordinances to bring businesses in and to allow alternative housing
- Community members have had meetings to discuss giving our community a more cohesive look but has never done anything with it.
- Employee Training
- Help with Licenses/Permits/Regulations

Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy: Goals & Objectives

**Vision:** To create a thriving, diversified, and sustainable regional economy that is resilient to economic change.

1. **Stimulate growth by capitalizing on the competitive advantages of the region.**
2. **Encourage diversification of the regional economy to increase stability and resiliency.**
3. **Build an entrepreneurial business environment across the region.**
4. **Develop an educational system that supports business.**

Goals & Objectives continued

5. **Promote a regional network of industrial sites** that will serve the needs of existing and future firms.
6. **Support rural communities’ capacity for self-reliance.**
7. **Develop a regional strategy** that incorporates sound economic planning principles and includes viable projects to stimulate job development and economic growth.
8. **Develop a methodology** to evaluate progress and ensure viability of the plan.
Project Prioritization Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Impact</td>
<td>Projects impacting a larger portion of the Region rather than a single community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Impact</td>
<td>Projects demonstrating or with potential for job growth / Projects demonstrating job retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Availability of Funding Sources</td>
<td>Projects with a higher degree of local match funding / Projects with other potential funding sources committed or identified / Projects that qualify for EDA funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment with EDA Priorities</td>
<td>Project serves/improves Economic Distressed and Underserved Communities / Project demonstrates Collaborative Regional Innovation / Project demonstrates Public / Private Partnerships and/or National Strategic Partnerships / Project demonstrates Environmentally Sustainable Development / Project demonstrates Global Competitiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Project</td>
<td>Projects demonstrating support including letters of support, commitment, funding, actions by public entities such as City Councils, County Commissions in support of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness to Proceed</td>
<td>Projects that are ready to start immediately</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regional Construction Project Priorities

**MID-HIGH PRIORITY (2)**
- Harney County Incubator/ Juniper Processing Facility
  - Sage Grouse Habitat Recovery – additional equipment to expand capacity
  - Sage Grouse habitat restoration – Equipment for restoration work
  - Self loader log truck for use on Juniper cutting projects on BLM and private land
  - Harney Community Energy Project
- Expand and connect Fiber from City of Arlington to City of Condon

**HIGH PRIORITY (7)**
- Eastern Oregon Business Accelerator Facility
- Pendleton UAV Facilities Improvements and Flight Operations Equip.
  - Interim UAV / Airport Hanger Facilities - Pendleton
- Umatilla Basin Water Storage & Infrastructure
- Malheur County Poverty to Prosperity Career Technical Education Center
- Port of Morrow Workforce Training Center
- Interstate 82/Lamb Road Interchange: Straightening of the access road into the Umatilla Chemical Depot

**REGIONAL CONSTRUCTION (5)**
- Silvies Valley Ranch: Guest ranch within Harney / Grant counties
- Power Supply to John Day Industrial Park (State-Certified)
- Wastewater treatment facility for the cities of John Day and Canyon City
- "Hydrosphere Center" - Milton Freewater
- Gilliam County Bridge Repair

**MEDIUM PRIORITY (3)**
- Infrastructure (Water & Sewer) to Pendleton Industrial land (365 acres)
- Port of Morrow East Beach infrastructure improvements
- Port of Morrow Transportation Improvements - including improved access to Interstate 84, Rail improvements in East Beach and Terminal 1 Marine improvements
Regional Technical Assistance Project Priorities

HIGH PRIORITY (3)
- City of John Day Wastewater Facilities Master Plan Update/Analysis
- The New Natural Resources Economy: An Economic Study to Identify Emerging Opportunities for Small, Rural Firms in Eastern Oregon
- Malheur County Poverty to Prosperity Planning and Development of the Career Technical Education Center

MEDIUM PRIORITY (2)
- Morrow County Public Transit / Workforce
- Pendleton Industrial Area Master Plan (365 acres)

LOW PRIORITY (3)
- Morrow County Incentives for Middle income or family wage housing
- Marketing and Tourism Development - Frontier Counties (John Day)
- Vacant Public Building Assessment - Condon & Condon School District

Potential Additional Project/Issue Category
REGION-WIDE LOCAL ISSUES
- Potable water systems improvements
- Waste water treatment facilities
- Access to high-speed telecommunications
- City and county road infrastructure improvements
- Utilities extended to industrial land to develop certified industrial sites

How would you prioritize these projects?
Grant County CEDS Community Comments

COMMUNITY MEETING: Assets & Strengths

John Day Meeting
• Car Show
• Historic Downtown
• Tourism
• Logging
• Resilient community/people
• Unique History
• Recreation-hiking, biking

SURVEY RESULTS: Assets & Strengths

Grant County
• Access to natural Resources
• Thriving agricultural environment
• Accelerated restoration in the national forests of the Blue Mountains
• Certified industrial sites
• Quality of life

City of John Day
• State certified Industrial park – available industrial lands
• Grant County Regional Airport
• Blue Mountain Hospital
• Climate
• Proximity to outdoor recreation

City of Monument
• Agriculture
• Forestry
• Livestock

SURVEY RESULTS: Assets & Strengths

Economic Development groups (2)
• Large timber base
• Established agricultural base
• Diverse recreational opportunities
• Eager employment base
• Supportive communities
• Lifestyle
• Natural resources
• Key transportation hubs
Assets & Strengths: Reoccurring Themes throughout Region

- Available Land
- Transportation / Access to Markets
- Quality of Education
- Low-Cost Utilities
- Recreational Opportunities
- Tourism
- Airports
- Climate

SURVEY RESULTS: Challenges

Grant County
- Dwindling population
- Regulations that don’t address the difference between metropolitan areas and rural areas
- Lack of trained/skilled workforce
- Dwindling tax revenues
- Aging infrastructure

City of John Day
- Weak political structure
- Aging infrastructure (i.e. wastewater treatment plant, fire station)
- Weak transportation system
- Available work force (substance abuse problem)
- Negative attitude of community – fear of change, not wanting to pay for services

City of Monument
- Jobs

COMMUNITY MEETING: Challenges

John Day Meeting
- Jobs
- Remote location, accessibility

SURVEY RESULTS: Challenges

Economic Development groups (2)
- Limited infrastructure for marketing timber products
- Limited market for green-non-saw biomass
- Stretched financial resources to develop additional infrastructure
- Need for retraining workforce
- Inadequate infrastructure in some areas
- Insufficient labor pool – inadequate skills, substance abuse
- Lack of unity of purpose among countless groups at work on this
Challenges: Reoccurring Themes throughout Region

- Housing Availability
- Access to Water
- Government Regulations
- High Commute Rate
- Lack of Services / Amenities
- Educational Facilities
- Access to Markets

Survey Results: Regional Issues

Grant County
- Water management and development infrastructure
- Skilled workforce availability
- Regulatory technical assistance
- Sage Grouse endangered species listing
- Workforce housing

City of John Day
- Loss of funding for cities, counties and schools
- Loss of availability to use natural resources
- Lack of employment opportunities
- Drugs and alcohol; criminal activities
- Need to upgrade aging infrastructure

City of Monument
- Jobs
- Housing

Community Meetings: Regional Issues

John Day Meeting
- Diversified Ag
  - Organic Farming
- Value Added Ag
  - Beef & food processing
- Marketing Multiple Counties
- Timber Harvest
- Infrastructure
- Emergency Services for small cities

Survey Results: Regional Issues

Economic Development groups (2)
- Improving forest health on national forest
- Development of products and markets for biomass
- State and federal regulations which slow or stifle development
- Labor pool
- Working capital
- Global economy
- Shifting consumer demands related to ag products
COMMUNITY MEETINGS: Project Priorities

John Day Meeting
- Developing Entrepreneurship
- Local Firehouse
- Marketing – Customer Service cross promoting

Survey Results: Priority Local Projects

Grant County
- Researching and developing markets for woody biomass
- Researching and developing community heat sources
- Researching and developing combined heat projects
- Educating and marketing Oregon’s transformational health care program
- Updating aging infrastructure

City of John Day
- Creating new jobs – getting new industries at the industrial park
- Secure funding for new wastewater treatment facility and new fire station
- Improve city streets and sidewalk facilities
- Encourage all age groups to participate as community leaders

City of Monument
- Jobs

Survey Results: Priority Local Projects – Economic Development groups (2)

- Expansion of timber manufacturing infrastructure
- Assistance in accelerated restoration of national forests
- Assistance in recruitment of alternative industrial base
- Expansion of value-added agriculture
- Development of recreational opportunities
- Working capital – devise loan bank
- Labor training/recruitment – teach possibilities
- Training / support for entrepreneurs – teach business basics
- Marketing for regional tourism

Small Business Needs

- Local government business retention/expansion programs
- Help with Licenses/Permits/Regulations
- Access to Capital
- Marketing
- Business Planning/Counseling
- Networking with similar businesses and industry associations
Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy: Goals & Objectives

Vision: To create a thriving, diversified, and sustainable regional economy that is resilient to economic change.

1. Stimulate growth by capitalizing on the competitive advantages of the region.
2. Encourage diversification of the regional economy to increase stability and resiliency.
3. Build an entrepreneurial business environment across the region.
4. Develop an educational system that supports

Goals & Objectives continued

5. Promote a regional network of industrial sites that will serve the needs of existing and future firms.
7. Develop a regional strategy that incorporates sound economic planning principles and includes viable projects to stimulate job development and economic growth.
8. Develop a methodology to evaluate progress and ensure viability of the plan.

Project Prioritization Criteria

Regional Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projects impacting a larger portion of the Region rather than a single community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects demonstrating or with potential for job growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects demonstrating job retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects enhancing economic diversification, business expansion or economic growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects demonstrating improvement to economic conditions, regional/community conditions, or improves standard of living</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Economic Impact

| Projects with a higher degree of local match funding |
| Projects with other potential funding sources committed or identified |
| Projects that qualify for EDA funding |

Potential Availability of Funding Sources

| Project serves/Improves Economic Distressed and Underserved Communities |
| Project demonstrates Collaborative Regional Innovation |
| Project demonstrates Public/Private Partnerships and/or National Strategic Partnerships |
| Project demonstrates Environmentally Sustainable Development |
| Project demonstrates Global Competitiveness |

Alignment with EDA Priorities

| Projects demonstrating support including letters of support, commitment, funding, actions by public entities such as City Councils, County Commissions in support of the project. |

Readiness to Proceed

| Projects that are ready to start immediately |

Potential Additional Project/Issue Category

REGION-WIDE LOCAL ISSUES

- Potable water systems improvements
- Waste water treatment facilities
- Access to high-speed telecommunications
- City and county road infrastructure improvements
- Utilities extended to industrial land to develop certified industrial sites
Regional Projects - Construction
High Priority

- Eastern Oregon Business Accelerator Facility
- UAV Facilities, Improvements and Flight Operations Equipment Pendleton
- Malheur County Poverty to Prosperity: Career Technical Education Center
- Interim UAV / Airport Hanger Facilities - Pendleton
- Port of Morrow Workforce Training Center
- Regional Water Development and Restoration Project
- I-82 / Lamb Road Interchange Exit Ramp and Road Improvements to Umatilla Army Dept

Regional Projects – Construction
Medium / High Priority

- To expand and connect Fiber from City of Arlington to City of Condon
- Self loader log truck for use on Juniper cutting projects on BLM and private land
- Sage Grouse habitat restoration – Equipment for restoration work
- Sage Grouse Habitat Recovery – Harney County
- Harney Community Energy Project
- Internet Service Improvements – Gilliam County

Regional Projects – Construction
Medium Priority

- Port of Morrow East Beach infrastructure improvements
- Port of Morrow Transportation Improvements - including improved access to Interstate 84, Rail improvements in East Beach and Terminal 1 Marine improvements
- Infrastructure (Water & Sewer) to Pendleton Industrial Property (365 acres)
- Renovation and Expansion of the Mustanger Riding Club’s Grounds

Regional Projects – Construction
Low Priority

- Power Supply to John Day Industrial Park (State-Certified)
- Wastewater treatment facility for the City of John Day and the Town of Canyon City
- "Hydrosphere Center" - Milton Freewater
- Gilliam County Bridge Repair
- Silvies Valley Ranch: Development of a guest ranch within Harney / Grant counties
- Frontier Regional 911 system redundant / backup system.
Appendices ➤ ii(b)2. Round 2 — Summary of Public Meetings in Round 1 ➤ Grant County

**Regional Projects – Construction**

**Low Priority**
- Operations Equipment – Rimrock Recycling (non-profit Corp) – Burns, OR.
- Arlington Mesa Industrial Park – Area Source Substation (Electric Power) Improvements
- CTUIR - Housing Development
- Tribal Education Center (CTUIR)
- Water and Other Infrastructure (CTUIR)
- Tribal Health Center (CTUIR)

**Regional Project – Technical Assistance**

**– High Priority**
- Product Development for Eastern Oregon Culinary & Ag Tourism
- Rural Oregon Packaged Travel Development

**Regional Projects – Technical Assistance**

**– High Priority**
- City of John Day Wasterwater Facilities Master Plan Update / Analysis of Options
- Malheur County Poverty to Prosperity Program - Planning and development of the Career Technical Education Center
- The New Natural Resources Economy : An Economic Study to Identify Emerging Opportunities for Small, Rural Firms in Eastern Oregon ( University of Oregon and OSU joint project)
- Blue Mountain Community College Mechatronics (Modern Industrial Maintenance) Program Creation

**Regional Projects – Technical Assistance**

**– Medium Priority**
- Morrow County Public Transit / Workforce
- Pendleton Industrial Area Master Plan (365 acres)
- Highway 11 - Land Use Master Plan / Feasibility Study (between Walla Walla, Wa and Milton- Freewater, OR
- Master Plan and engineering design for a Certified Flood Levee on the Silvies River around Burns OR.
Regional Projects – Technical Assistance – Low Priority

- Morrow County Incentives for Middle income or family wage housing
- Marketing and Tourism Development - Frontier Counties (John Day)
- Water & Sewer Rate Analysis – City of Hines

HOW WOULD YOU PRIORITIZE THESE PROJECTS?
Harney County CEDS Community Comments

COMMUNITY MEETING: Assets & Strengths

- Clean Air/Water/Land
- Environmental Clean - Organic
- Knowledge base for animal and land

SURVEY RESULTS: Assets & Strengths

Harney County
- Wide Open Spaces, lots of land, save communities

Harney County Economic Development
- Available and affordable large industrial buildings
- Value added agriculture base
- Available commercial & industrial land
- Supportive local governments
- Silvies Valley Ranch

City of Burns
- Inexpensive labor
- Inexpensive housing
- Two highways with reasonable traffic count
- Economic Development zones
- Commitment from the community

City of Hines
- Available industrial zone properties
- Available work force
- Enterprise zone status
- Quality of life
- Natural resources
SURVEY RESULTS: Assets & Strengths

**Businesses/Residents** (3)
- Rail
- Freeway
- Commercial airport
- Port
- Labor pool
- Public Lands
- Dark skies
- Open Space
- Forests
- Rangeland
- Eco-Tourism
- Malheur bird refuge
- Historical buildings as well as now gone town sights
- Wide open places: wilderness!
- Historical/important native culture

SURVEY RESULTS: Challenges

**Harney County**
- TOO Much regulation at the federal, state & local level
- Distance from markets, lack of access to higher education, scheduled air service, rail service and the interstate freeway system

**County Economic Development**
- No rail service
- Challenges by environmental groups
- Unskilled work force
- Proximity to scheduled air service
- Geographic location

COMMUNITY MEETING: Challenges

- Transportation/Shipping/Time & Cost
  - No Air
  - No Interstate
  - No Rail
- No University

Assets & Strengths: Reoccurring Themes throughout Region

- Available Land
- Transportation / Access to Markets
- Quality of Education
- Low-Cost Utilities
- Recreational Opportunities
- Tourism
- Airports
- Climate
### SURVEY RESULTS: Challenges

**City of Burns**
- Location
- Flood plain issues
- Lack of industry
- Lack of growth in the community

**City of Hines**
- No major transportation systems
- No start-up funding
- Aging infrastructure
- Some restriction on water development (irrigation pivots)
- High-tech skilled personnel

**Natural Resources groups**
- Regulatory issues – federal and state

### Challenges: Reoccurring Themes throughout Region

- Housing Availability
- Access to Water
- Government Regulations
- High Commute Rate
- Lack of Services / Amenities
- Educational Facilities
- Access to Markets

---

### SURVEY RESULTS: Challenges

**Businesses/Residents (3)**
- Lack of rail
- Lack of freeway
- Lack of commercial airport
- Lack of Port
- Lack of labor pool
- Anti-government attitude
- Not valuing existing assets
- Extractive mentality (letting profits go to too few at great cost to the many)
- Not weighing cost of new projects to local tax and rate-payers
- Applying for grants for new infrastructure taxpayers can’t afford
- Regional interior water drainage
- Lack of effective *conversation* practice on private and public lands
- Over allocation of water rights; historical
- Non-cooperation by local residents with planning
- Very poor response to all matter of waste containment and recycling

### Survey Results: Regional Issues

**Harney County**
- Workforce in our communities
- Ability of an expanding business to get timely decisions from regulators. Business needs a speedy way through the many processes

**County Economic Development**
- Listing of the Sage Grouse as an endangered species
- Oregon Natural Desert Association
- No dedicated and sustainable timber supply
- Transportation
- Skilled work force

**City of Burns**
- Lack of industry
- Location
- Lack of growth
- Lack of state support
- Flood plain issues
Survey Results: Regional Issues

City of Hines
- No major transportation systems
- No start-up funding
- Aging infrastructure
- Some restriction on water development (irrigation pivots)
- High-tech skilled personnel

Businesses (3)
- Lack of rail
- Lack of freeway
- Lack of commercial airport
- Lack of port
- Lack of labor pool
- Budget cuts to federal agencies
- Lack of LEED for new and remodeled buildings
- Lack of school funding
- Loss of trains
- Lack of recognition of the role government plays in economic development
- Consumer waste stream management
- Lodging and services in smaller towns

Survey Results: Priority Local Projects

Harney County
- Securing access to juniper and infrastructure to process it
- Performing arts center
- Food processing plant
- All above are prioritized as most important due to the fact we will move from one to the next as they are able to move ahead.

County Economic Development
- Continued recruitment of Pacific Natural Foods
- Completion of the Silvies Valley Ranch Eco-Resort
- Modernization of school buildings
- Continued downtown re-development
- Formation of an “Angel Investment Group”

Community Meetings: Project Priorities

Harney County Projects
- Planning Documents
  - Steens Mt Resort Plans
  - Sage Grouse Plans
  - Sustain existing businesses

Survey Results: Priority Local Projects

City of Burns
- Flood plain designation
- Industry development
- Marketing
- Networking
- State Support

City of Hines
- Infrastructure replacement (both utilities and streets)
- Recruitment of small to medium sized tech companies
- Training locally to enhance skills of unemployed
- Funding for small business start-up
- Rural community-specific funding

Natural Resource Groups
- Retaining current infrastructure
Survey Results: Priority Local Projects

**Businesses/Residents (3)**
- USDA RBEG Program
- Industrial Certification
- Proactive Marketing Program
- Employee Retraining Programs
- Federal, State and local incentives
- Logging
- Ranching
- Juniper products
- Refurbish/restore 5 day week for schools
- Protect open spaces in town

**Small Business Needs**
- Access to Capital (4)
- Marketing (3)
- Website/Tech Upgrades (3)
- Local government business retention/expansion programs (3)
- Street/Façade Improvements (2)
- Employee training (2)
- Help with Licenses/Permits/Regulations

Project Prioritization Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Impact</th>
<th>Projects impacting a larger portion of the Region rather than a single community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Impact</td>
<td>Projects demonstrating or with potential for job growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects demonstrating job retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects enhancing economic diversification, business expansion or economic growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects demonstrating improvement to economic conditions, regional/community conditions, or improves standard of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Availability of Funding Sources</td>
<td>Projects with a higher degree of local match funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects with other potential funding sources committed or identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects that qualify for EDA funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment with EDA Priorities</td>
<td>Project serves/Improves Economic Distressed and Underserved Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project demonstrates Collaborative Regional Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project demonstrates Public/Private Partnerships and/or National Strategic Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project demonstrates Environmentally Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project demonstrates Global Competitiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Project</td>
<td>Projects demonstrating support including letters of support, commitment, funding, actions by public entities such as City Councils, County Commissions in support of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness to Proceed</td>
<td>Projects that are ready to start immediately</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regional Construction Project Priorities

**HIGH PRIORITY (7)**
- Eastern Oregon Business Accelerator Facility
- Pendleton UAV Facilities Improvements and Flight Operations Equip.
  - Interim UAV / Airport Hanger Facilities - Pendleton
- Umatilla Basin Water Storage & Infrastructure
- Malheur County Poverty to Prosperity Career Technical Education Center
- Port of Morrow Workforce Training Center
- Interstate 82/Lamb Road Interchange: Straightening of the access road into the Umatilla Army Depot
### Regional Construction Project Priorities

#### MID-HIGH PRIORITY (2)
- Harney County Incubator/ Juniper Processing Facility
  - Sage Grouse Habitat Recovery – additional equipment to expand capacity
  - Sage Grouse habitat restoration – Equipment for restoration work
  - Self loader log truck for use on Juniper cutting projects on BLM and private land
  - Harney Community Energy Project
- Expand and connect Fiber from City of Arlington to City of Condon

#### MEDIUM PRIORITY (3)
- Infrastructure (Water & Sewer) to Pendleton Industrial land (365 acres)
- Port of Morrow East Beach infrastructure improvements
- Port of Morrow Transportation Improvements - including improved access to Interstate 84, Rail improvements in East Beach and Terminal 1 Marine improvements

#### LOW PRIORITY CONSTRUCTION (5)
- Silvies Valley Ranch: Guest ranch within Harney / Grant counties
- Power Supply to John Day Industrial Park (State-Certified)
- Wastewater treatment facility for the cities of John Day and Canyon City
- "Hydrosphere Center" - Milton Freewater
- Gilliam County Bridge Repair

### Regional Technical Assistance Project Priorities

#### HIGH PRIORITY (3)
- City of John Day Wastewater Facilities Master Plan Update/Analysis
- The New Natural Resources Economy : An Economic Study to Identify Emerging Opportunities for Small, Rural Firms in Eastern Oregon
- Malheur County Poverty to Prosperity Planning and Development of the Career Technical Education Center

#### MEDIUM PRIORITY (2)
- Morrow County Public Transit / Workforce
- Pendleton Industrial Area Master Plan (365 acres)

#### LOW PRIORITY (3)
- Morrow County Incentives for Middle income or family wage housing
- Marketing and Tourism Development - Frontier Counties (John Day)
- Vacant Public Building Assessment - Condon & Condon School District

### Potential Additional Project/Issue Category

#### REGION-WIDE LOCAL ISSUES
- Potable water systems improvements
- Waste water treatment facilities
- Access to high speed telecommunications
- City and county road infrastructure improvements
- Utilities to industrial land
HOW WOULD YOU PRIORITIZE THESE PROJECTS?
Malheur County CEDS

Community Comments

COMMUNITY MEETING: Assets & Strengths

Ontario Meeting
- Tax Incentives
- Cliff Bentz-Land use issues
- TVCC
- Regional Retail Hub
- Transit System
- Snake River Coalition-SREDA
- Access to Multi Modal transportation
- Local news paper
- Airport
- Certified Land 75 acres ready industrial
- Quality of Life-Water/Clean air
- Recreational opportunities
- Cheap Energy
- Labor force training opportunities

Vale Meeting
- City murals

SURVEY RESULTS: Assets & Strengths

Malheur County
- Land: lots of it
- Good location on highways, freeway and rail
- Government incentives

City of Nyssa
- Proximity to I-84, major airport in Boise and Ontario
- Quality of life
- Recreation opportunities
- Workforce
- Available land

City of Adrian
- Meeting with all jurisdictions
- Updates

Economic Development groups (4)
- Location: Union Pacific Mainline (2)
- Location: Interstate 84 (2)
- Community Collaboration/ Good cooperation between cities (2)
- Location: centrally located in the Treasure Valley with a regional population of 29,000
- Industrial hub for food processing with major company names (Heinz, ORE-IDA, etc.)
- Port of entry for the State of Oregon
- Ethnically diverse
- Very active EDAs: SREDA and Malheur EDA
- Identified lands ready
- Workforce training through TVCC and P2P Career Center
- Land and Buildings – have sites with freeway/rail/highway access
- City and county governments are pro-business and willing to make it happen
- State is very supportive
- Utilities: cheap power and next to NW Williams Gas pipeline and lots of fiber
- Very small communities working together
- Willingness to travel long distances to represent our region(s)
- Dedicated and hard working local, state and federal legislators
SURVEY RESULTS: Assets & Strengths

Community Groups (2)
- TVCC (2)
- SREDA (2)
- Many talented and caring adults and youth who are willing to work toward economic development
- High schools collaborating with each other
- Business and non-profit support and awareness that we need economic development opportunities
- Large amounts of land available
- Access to roads and railway and airport

Businesses (2)
- No sales tax
- Available property
- Community college, training options
- Trainable work force – willing to work for lower wages
- Willingness for communities to come together
- Quality healthcare available locally
- TVCC

SURVEY RESULTS: Assets & Strengths

TVCC (2)
- Strong leadership from education and business and industry coming together
- Strong support from local community to bring county out of poverty
- New economic development consulting firm
- Snake River Economic Development Association (SREDA)
- Excellent schools and community college
- Work force
- Access to rail/highway and airports
- Available industrial land
- Supportive community

Ontario School District
- People with strong work ethic
- People who are willing to take risks to try new...

SURVEY RESULTS: Assets & Strengths

Education
- Malheur County ESD (6)
- Good schools
- TVCC
- Children
- Natural resources
- Infrastructure
- Local businesses
- Work force availability and desire for folks to work
- Community support (2)
- Education community support
- Business support for trained individuals
- Agency and business collaboration
- Commitment and desire of people within the area
- Support of Representative Cliff Bentz (2)
- Support of the Malheur County Poverty to Prosperity Committee
- Good school including a good community college
- Area for potential growth
- Access to I-84
- Large pool of employees from the Treasure Valley
- Good access to transportation (highways and railroad)
- Community college
- Hospital

Assets & Strengths: Reoccurring Themes throughout Region

- Available Land
- Transportation / Access to Markets
- Quality of Education
- Low-Cost Utilities
- Recreational Opportunities
- Tourism
- Airports
- Climate
COMMUNITY MEETING: Challenges

Ontario Meeting
• Different State/Federal Regulations regarding environmental impacts
• Land Use as applied to growth in Idaho affecting Malheur County.

Vale Meeting
• Economy based on Agriculture; not diversified
  – Agriculture is dependent on access to water
  – In drought years (reservoir currently looks like end of summer, not beginning), agricultural economy suffers
• When ag suffers, access to capital suffers (bankers are focused on/dependent on agricultural based economy)
• Old and insufficient infrastructure (includes water, wastewater, roads, essential utilities)
• Access to high speed internet and phone is limited (max. 3 miles from Vale City Hall); otherwise it is dial-up or satellite
• Empty storefronts

SURVEY RESULTS: Challenges

Malheur County
• Land use planning issues
• Competing with the Idaho side. Land availability, time constraints for development, etc.
• Smooth working relationship between developers and City of Ontario
• Inspection fees are higher in Oregon
• System development charges in Ontario

City of Nyssa
• DLCD constraints
• One size does not fit all
• A business can open in 90 days in Idaho, where it takes 3 years in Oregon because of regulations

City of Adrian
• Not enough progress moving area projects along quickly
• Not enough funding for area projects
• Too many restrictions for qualification for funding

SURVEY RESULTS: Challenges

Economic Development groups (4)
• Highest poverty in Oregon(2)
• Need for more infrastructure/ Need infrastructure to available sites (2)
• Regulations- city and state/ Regulation-land use (2)
• Lack of trained workforce/ lack of funding
• Program funding for workforce training through P2P & TVCC
• Lack of workforce development programs
• Location next to Idaho
• Construction development fees (as compared to Idaho)
• Street/ façade improvements
• Technology not up to reasonable standards
• Need everyone to think globally and not just city/neighborhood size!
• Extreme rural areas and small population, huge land mass
• Many state legislative regulations strangle our local efforts and tie-up in red tape for sometimes years
• Finances are always a problem for cities, towns and county
• Being a border community (Idaho) where there is much growth on the other side
• Small towns afraid of losing their identity and older residents wanting things to stay the same

Businesses (2)
• Local government
• State government
• Lacking industry/production business
• Disparity in state laws causing uneven growth (retail in Oregon/ housing in Idaho)
• Ontario resources spread too thin- need to focus on a few key issues
• Development fees on new business
• Land use restrictions

Community Organizations (2)
• Poor elementary to high school educational achievement
• Teen pregnancy
• Low Latino population engagement
• Oregon land laws
• Poverty
• We lack manufacturing
• High drop-out rate from high school youth
• Lack of training for youth to obtain skills to compete for jobs
• There is a philosophy that working a minimum wage job is ok because many youth were raised this way
• We lack the “right” type of land to put together an enticing package for potential manufacturers
SURVEY RESULTS: Challenges

Education

TVCC (2)
- Land use laws
- Lack of good family wage jobs/employment opportunity (2)
- Lack of skilled workforce
- Not enough business and industry
- Stagnant population
- Lack of educated workforce for available jobs
- Lack of funding

Ontario School District
- Minimum wage is higher in Oregon than Idaho which is ten minutes away
- Corporate tax laws in Oregon

Community Meetings: Regional Issues

Ontario Meeting
- Rail Access
- Common Ag/Ranching interests
- Ports
- Available land
- Special interest groups interfering with land use
- Poverty
- Water issues

Challenges: Reoccurring Themes throughout Region

- Housing Availability
- Access to Water
- Government Regulations
- High Commute Rate
- Lack of Services / Amenities
- Educational Facilities
- Access to Markets

SURVEY RESULTS: Challenges

Education

Malheur County ESD (6)
- Land use red tape / restrictive land use laws / restrictions on development / tighter restrictions on everything vs. across the river in Idaho (5)
- General poverty / high poverty / local poverty levels (3)
- Money / resources, particularly start up to maintain programs (2)
- Property tax
- State regulations
- A lack of viable jobs
- A lack of progressive leadership
- Training programs that are local and accessible
- Apathy due to economic situation in Malheur county and surrounding area
- Time / too many community and organizational meetings already
- Location
- Qualified government
- Lack of community involvement
- Lack of educational opportunities
- Local financial backing
- Infrastructure
Survey Results: Regional Issues

Malheur County
- Choking land use regulations
- Minimum wage vs. Idaho
- Property tax perceptions vs. Idaho
- All forms of social, welfare programs are more conducive to growth in that area in OR vs. ID
- Mining laws. No mine has been permitted since inception of DOGAMI. What are we paying for the last approx. 40 years.

City of Nyssa
- Economy
- Trained workers
- DLCD Restraints
- Proximity to Idaho
- Land that is shovel ready

City of Adrian
- Funding
- Restrictions

Survey Results: Regional Issues

Economic Development groups (4)
- High poverty rates (2)
- Lack of workforce development programs (2)
- Access to capital for businesses (2)
- Regulations
- Land use planning-state is trying to assist has hindered development in the past
- Getting the word out of what we have here and to market to our targeted industries
- Water shortage drought conditions affect farming and that affects the rest of the economy
- We need business development and job creation
- Often the image of our area is downgraded because of lack of some family-oriented facilities
- Need for more consolidation of city/county government areas

Businesses (2)
- Industry not coming here due to government/ local restraints
- Poverty, low paying employment rates
- Environmental restraints
- Access to transportation of goods
- Development fees imposed on new business- Ontario
- Land use restrictions
- Business retention

Regional Issues continued

Community Organizations (2)
- Job availability
- Practical training and job training for youth
- Low academic achievement and engagement by students
- Distance from the western side of the state
- Poverty
- Land use issues
- Need for a trained workforce
- Unintended consequences from legislative issues in Salem
- Collaboration among community partners- need to keep them strong
- City Council has little support from the general public, which creates issues

Education
- Malheur County ESD (6)
  - It is easy to develop across the river due to Oregon restrictions vs. Idaho
  - Higher property taxes vs. across the river in Idaho
  - Greater housing market in Idaho
  - Funding/ short and long-term funding (2)
  - Qualified employees
  - Education
  - Land use laws hurt our region
  - Poverty- uneducated people
  - Sustained political and economic support
  - Long term “buy-in” from agencies and organizations
  - Jobs and wages
  - Restrictive land use laws
  - General poverty of the area
  - Isolation from the political center of Oregon
Regional Issues continued

Education

TVCC (2)
- Need to create more jobs
- Need more educated workforce
- Community has come together around the full Malheur County – Poverty to Prosperity initiative
- Malheur County is ready to step up and take control of its destiny
- Training for family wage jobs
- Development of more industrial land
- Supporting local business and industry
- Adequate funding for schools
- Community working together for positive change

Ontario School District
- Businesses that need skilled labor and unable to find people locally
- Many times people don’t want to live in rural Oregon communities
- Demographics- large Hispanic population- large number of people living in our community that are families of prisoners of SRCI

CommUNITY MEETINGS: Project Priorities

Ontario Meeting
- Poverty to Prosperity (P2P)
- Swimming Pool
- Hometown Competiveness
- 4 Rivers Healthy Community

Vale Meeting
- Upgrade infrastructure to support growth: both new residents and tourism
- Additional water storage facilities to capitalize on plentiful rainfall years to hold water in reserve for

Survey Results: Priority Local Projects

Malheur County
- Need more average and above average wage jobs
- More available housing subdivisions
- More rural housing opportunities
- Help on installing expensive infrastructure to spur industrial development
- More local control of land planning issues

City of Nyssa
- Extending water and sewer lines to new industrial lands recently brought into the UGB
- Completing a designated truck route through town from 1st Street to Commercial and extending to Beck’s Road
- Completion of the collector street Locust Avenue
- Sewer line upgrades
- Build ADA Emergency Services facility

City of Adrian
- Upgrading the sewer system
- Completing the water project drill well and transmission lines
- Completing the water project looping lines and new meters
- Upgrading the sewer lagoons to be in compliance
- New office building and meeting hall

Survey Results: Priority Local Projects

Economic Development groups (4)
- Malheur County: P2P Career and Technical Education Center (6)
  - Poverty to Prosperity Project (involves 5 areas of development)
  - Getting the P2P Career Center past the pilot project stage for our workforce
  - Community college development for job training in the trades
  - Keep the local community college thriving so they can keep helping business

- Community infrastructure (water, sewer, telecommunications, roads, etc.) (8)
  - Ontario, Nyssa & Vale infrastructure needs to available industrial lands
  - Road improvement for economic development projects
  - Assistance with water issues
  - Maintenance of deteriorating county roads
  - Get better cell phone/ internet technology to Vale

- Agricultural preservation including cattle
  - Support Vale and Ontario airport projects
Survey Results: Priority Local Projects

Businesses (2)
- Malheur County Poverty to Prosperity
- Finding use for mall
- Additional phases to school upgrades in Ontario
- Reopening the pool in Ontario
- Bringing in industry
- Pursuing industrial companies
- Environmental issues addressed based on facts, science
- Farming: producing needed crops
- Access to transportation of goods

Community Organizations (4)
- Poverty to Prosperity must continue to be a focus - expansion is needed
- Fair housing and housing issues must be faced, housing stock is old and must be rehabilitated
- SREDA must continue to be supported to attract business to our area
- The community must support its high schools and continue to improve the educational structures
- There must be a community attraction that could include a community center, a beautification project or other enhancements
- Focus on getting kids to progress in school ready and on time each year
- Boys & Girls Club to help keep kids in school and on track to graduate
- Developing strong Latino outreach efforts to engage families
- Creating a CTE program

Survey Results: Priority Local Projects

Education
Malheur ESD (6)
- Malheur County Poverty to Prosperity Technical Education Center (5)
- City of Ontario infrastructure
- More buildable lots for homes and businesses
- Bringing in and keeping good people within the community
- Keeping and supporting good schools
- Maintaining a good community college
- Supporting local businesses
- Skilled/ trained workforce specific to local needs
- School to work programs
- College credit/ certificate programs for high school students
- Involvement of all educational entities in the area to promote post school outcomes for local kids
- Recreational opportunities for youth
- Eastern Oregon Early learning Center

Ontario School District
- Training skilled laborers
- Supporting families through training and holding them accountable to teach their children
- Supporting schools

TVCC (2)
- Creating a Career and Technical Trade School – part of Poverty to Prosperity Initiative
- Creating more job opportunities
- To develop a strategic plan for the City of Ontario
- Poverty to Prosperity: Malheur County CTE Center
- Youth
- High school completion rates
- Hunger/homelessness
- Health care

Survey Results: Priority Local Projects

Small Business Needs
- Local government business retention/expansion programs (7)
- Help with Licenses/Permits/Regulations (6)
- Educated/Skilled Workforce/ Employee training (6)
  - Community college development with high schools job training facilities
- Access to Capital (4)
- Marketing (4)
- Website/ tech upgrades (4)
  - Access to high speed internet
    - Information
    - Networking
    - Marketing
    - Selling products on-line
- Street/façade improvements (3)
- Business Planning/Counseling (2)
- We just need to get our infrastructure projects completed with financial assistance
- Consolidation and cooperation of cities, counties and schools. Help smaller rural areas that cooperation does not lose identity
- I am an agriculturalist - we need local, state and federal government to pay more attention to our needs. We have a road we need to access our farm that was upgraded through a grant. We can no longer use this road due to the so called improvement
Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy: Goals & Objectives

Vision: To create a thriving, diversified, and sustainable regional economy that is resilient to economic change.

1. Stimulate growth by capitalizing on the competitive advantages of the region.

2. Encourage diversification of the regional economy to increase stability and resiliency.

3. Build an entrepreneurial business environment across the region.

4. Develop an educational system that supports business.

5. Promote a regional network of industrial sites that will serve the needs of existing and future firms.


7. Develop a regional strategy that incorporates sound economic planning principles and includes viable projects to stimulate job development and economic growth.

8. Develop a methodology to evaluate progress and ensure viability of the plan.

Project Prioritization Criteria

Regional Impact
- Projects impacting a larger portion of the Region rather than a single community

Economic Impact
- Projects demonstrating or with potential for job growth
- Projects demonstrating job retention
- Projects enhancing economic diversification, business expansion or economic growth
- Projects demonstrating improvement to economic conditions, regional/community conditions, or improves standard of living

Potential Availability of Funding Sources
- Projects with a higher degree of local match funding
- Projects with other potential funding sources committed or identified
- Projects that qualify for EDA funding

Alignment with EDA Priorities
- Project serves/Improves Economic Distressed and Underserved Communities
- Project demonstrates Collaborative Regional Innovation
- Project demonstrates Public/Private Partnerships and/or National Strategic Partnerships
- Project demonstrates Environmentally Sustainable Development
- Project demonstrates Global Competitiveness

Support for Project
- Projects demonstrating support including letters of support, commitment, funding, actions by public entities such as City Councils, County Commissions in support of the project

Readiness to Proceed
- Projects that are ready to start immediately

Regional Construction Project Priorities

HIGH PRIORITY (6)
- Eastern Oregon Business Accelerator Facility
- Pendleton UAV Facilities Improvements and Flight Operations Equip.
  - Interim UAV / Airport Hanger Facilities - Pendleton
- Umatilla Basin Water Storage & Infrastructure
- Malheur County Poverty to Prosperity Career Technical Education Center
- Port of Morrow Workforce Training Center
- Interstate 82/Lamb Road Interchange: Straightening of the access road into the Umatilla Chemical Depot
Regional Construction Project Priorities

**MID-HIGH PRIORITY (2)**
- Harney County Incubator/ Juniper Processing Facility
  - Sage Grouse Habitat Recovery – additional equipment to expand capacity
  - Sage Grouse habitat restoration – Equipment for restoration work
  - Self loader log truck for use on Juniper cutting projects on BLM and private land
  - Harney Community Energy Project
- Expand and connect Fiber from City of Arlington to City of Condon

**REGION-WIDE LOCAL ISSUES**
- Potable water systems improvements
- Waste water treatment facilities
- Access to high-speed telecommunications
- City and county road infrastructure improvements
- Utilities extended to industrial land to develop certified industrial sites

Regional Technical Assistance Project Priorities

**HIGH PRIORITY (3)**
- City of John Day Wastewater Facilities Master Plan Update/Analysis
- The New Natural Resources Economy: An Economic Study to Identify Emerging Opportunities for Small, Rural Firms in Eastern Oregon
- Malheur County Poverty to Prosperity Planning and Development of the Career Technical Education Center

**MEDIUM PRIORITY (2)**
- Morrow County Public Transit / Workforce
- Pendleton Industrial Area Master Plan (365 acres)

**LOW PRIORITY (3)**
- Morrow County Incentives for Middle income or family wage housing
- Marketing and Tourism Development - Frontier Counties (John Day)
- Vacant Public Building Assessment - Condon & Condon School District

Potential Additional Project/Issue Category

**REGION-WIDE LOCAL ISSUES**
- Potable water systems improvements
- Waste water treatment facilities
- Access to high-speed telecommunications
- City and county road infrastructure improvements
- Utilities extended to industrial land to develop certified industrial sites
HOW WOULD YOU PRIORITIZE THESE PROJECTS?
Morrow County CEDS
Community Comments

SURVEY RESULTS: Assets & Strengths

Morrow County
• Water from Columbia River
• Transportation via barge, rail, federal highway
• Availability of industrial zoned land
• Agricultural product for processing
• Affordable power

County Economic Development
• Regional transportation networks (I-84/I-82/UPRR/Columbia River)
• Strong Port of Morrow support

Economic Development groups (2)
• Port of Morrow growth and expansion
• SAGE Center – tourist attraction
• Boardman Community Development Association
• Lower cost of commercial land and utilities
• Strong agricultural base
• Many transportation options – trucking, rail, barge
• Lower cost of living – housing, utilities, taxes
• Established, active Port District with experienced management

COMMUNITY MEETING: Assets & Strengths

HEPPNER MEETING
• Infrastructure

BOARDMAN MEETING
• Good transportation – port, highways etc.
• Steam power – cost of utilities is low and available
• Location – access to markets
• Recreation – water activities

SURVEY RESULTS: Assets & Strengths

City of Heppner
• Place where people want to live
• Safe communities
• Excellent highly rated schools
• Recreational opportunities
• Clean air - no traffic

City of Boardman
• Port of Morrow
• Urban Renewal
• Enterprise Zone
• Transportation location – rail, barge, freeway
• Access to reasonably priced utilities

City of Irrigon
• Jobs – strong livable wage jobs
• Transportation
• Housing – fair and equitable
• Lower taxation
SURVEY RESULTS: Assets & Strengths

Natural Resource groups (1)
- Clean air/water
- Open space
- Strong agricultural community

Businesses (2)
- Natural resource based economy
- Engage population
- Decent city infrastructure
- There is more cooperative alliances than there used to be
- Similar traits/needs across the region
- Water
- Electric rates
- Waste water treatment
- Railroad access
- Interstate access

COMMUNITY MEETING: Challenges

Boardman Meeting
- Lack of water for agriculture
- Permitting processes related to marina and transportation improvements
- Low rate of civic involvement resulting in lack of attractiveness to residents
- Public transportation
- Smaller pool of higher educated workers
- Lack of single-family housing
- Lack of local services

Heppner Meeting
- FEMA

Assets & Strengths: Reoccurring Themes throughout Region

- Available Land
- Transportation / Access to Markets
- Quality of Education
- Low-Cost Utilities
- Recreational Opportunities
- Tourism
- Airports
- Climate

SURVEY RESULTS: Challenges

Morrow County
- Water from Columbia River
- Work force housing (not low-income)
- Over-regulation by state and federal governments
- Federal payment in lieu of taxes

County Economic Development
- Family wage and middle income housing

Economic Development groups (2)
- Water from Columbia River — without it growth will be stifled
- Small labor force/lack of skilled labor
- Limited education opportunities for apprentice/vocational training
- Minimal housing inventories
- Low amount of commercial/retail
- No downtown
- Undesirable school district
- Very little community participation
- Too large of a cultural divide with Hispanic community
- Very little recreation opportunities
SURVEY RESULTS: Challenges

**City of Heppner**
- Lack of multiple job choices
- Lack of rentals
- Isolated
- No shopping/entertainment
- No restaurants

**City of Boardman**
- Housing
- Skilled work force for the job opportunities
- Need more water out of the Columbia River
- Lack of amenities

**City of Irrigon**
- Over-pricing/Building Consultant/Engineers for infrastructure development
- Jobs – fair and strong livable wages
- High taxes and fiscal overburden to community members
- High development fees/costs
- Housing

SURVEY RESULTS: Challenges

**Natural Resource groups**
- Distance to major transportation (highway-rail)
- Access to high speed systems
- Weed infestations

**Businesses (2)**
- Transportation options in remote areas
- Regulations and policies that hinder growth and limit options
- We get a lot of lip service from Salem, but in practice the Willamette Valley is all that really matters
- Aging demographics
- Shrinking schools
- Water rights to develop more land for crops for food

Challenges: Reoccurring Themes throughout Region

- Housing Availability
- Access to Water
- Government Regulations
- High Commute Rate
- Lack of Services / Amenities
- Educational Facilities
- Access to Markets

Survey Results: Regional Issues

**Morrow County**
- Good work force

**Economic Development groups**
- Lack of housing for potential employees
- Small existing labor pool
- Difficulty attracting families from urban to rural areas
- Workforce training availability in local areas
- Water
- Not enough housing for all the jobs here
- Not much community involvement

**City of Heppner**
- Far from interstate/lack of intermodal transportation
- Housing
- Not known in other areas
- Floodways/ FEMA
Survey Results: Regional Issues

City of Boardman
- Training for employees
- Workforce housing
- Lack of amenities

City of Irrigon
- Providing higher end development housing
- Transportation – Travel – location to things
- Broader employment opportunities, not just Ag or warehouses
- Growth of crime/ Lack of enforcement issues
- Communities having to borrow and creating greater obstacles for sustainability

Natural Resources groups
- Lack of jobs
- Lack of housing
- High number of jobless-low income population on public assistance

Survey Results: Regional Issues

Businesses
- Infrastructure
- Government regulation
- Taxation
- Lack of workforce
- Training
- Public transportation
- Housing - entry level starter homes and apartments
- Services for business- supplies, technical

COMMUNITY MEETINGS: Project Priorities

Heppner Meeting
- Infrastructure
- Wastewater- Ione, Lexington
- Park-Heppner
- DEQ Water Reservoir – Heppner
- Housing – Senior & other – Boardman
- Rec Center – Boardman
- Education – Workforce development – Boardman

Boardman Meeting
- Cultural arts centers – cultural opportunities
- Tech training
- Workforce training including tech and other

Survey Results: Priority Local Projects

Morrow County
- Develop better water system from Columbia River
- Keep power cost low for industry
- Training for local workforce
- Able to ship product to Asian markets

County Economic Development
- I-82/Lamb Road interchange; straightening road into Umatilla Chemical Depot
- POM connect Oregon rail expansion and cold storage project; improvements to POM I-84 interchange
- Workforce housing (family wage or middle income)
- Transportation Improvements/Public transportation

Economic Development groups (2)
- Housing development
- Commercial/retail development
- Community recreation center/ indoor recreation/fitness center (2)
- School support for more class offerings/ improved marketing, etc.
- Street/ walking path connectivity and landscaping/beautification
- More amenities such as salons, shopping, dining, etc.
Survey Results: Priority Local Projects

City of Heppner
- Becoming known
- Advertising our lifestyle
- Solving the floodway development problem
- Continuing to upgrade our community infrastructure
- Supporting opportunities

City of Boardman
- Workforce housing
- Workforce training

City of Irrigon
- Improved road system
- Finalize waste water system conversion
- Framed housing development – higher end structures

Survey Results: Priority Local Projects

Natural Resource groups
- Private property natural resource improvements
- Weed control on public and private land
- Improve water quality of Willow Creek Reservoir
- Improve stream bank conditions in the county

Businesses
- Housing

Small Business Needs

- Access to capital (3)
- Employee training (2)
- Networking with similar businesses and industry associations (2)
- Street/Façade improvements (2)
- Website/Tech upgrades (2)
- Marketing (2)
- Skilled labor
- Training for basic skills and higher tech positions
- Local government business retention/expansion programs
- Legislative change for water from Columbia River for region

Project Prioritization Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Impact</td>
<td>Projects impacting a larger portion of the Region rather than a single community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Impact</td>
<td>Projects demonstrating or with potential for job growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects demonstrating job retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects enhancing economic diversification, business expansion or economic growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects demonstrating improvement to economic conditions, regional/community conditions, or improves standard of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Availability of Funding Sources</td>
<td>Projects with a higher degree of local match funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects with other potential funding sources committed or identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects that qualify for EDA funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment with EDA Priorities</td>
<td>Project serves/improves Economic Distressed and Underserved Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project demonstrates Collaborative Regional Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project demonstrates Public/Private Partnerships and/or National Strategic Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project demonstrates Environmentally Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project demonstrates Global Competitiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Project</td>
<td>Projects demonstrating support including letters of support, commitment, funding, actions by public entities such as City Councils, County Commissions in support of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness to Proceed</td>
<td>Projects that are ready to start immediately</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regional Construction Project Priorities

**HIGH PRIORITY (7)**
- Eastern Oregon Business Accelerator Facility
- Pendleton UAV Facilities Improvements and Flight Operations Equip.
  - Interim UAV / Airport Hanger Facilities - Pendleton
- Umatilla Basin Water Storage & Infrastructure
- Malheur County Poverty to Prosperity Career Technical Education Center
- Port of Morrow Workforce Training Center
- Interstate 82/Lamb Road Interchange: Straightening of the access road into the Umatilla Chemical Depot
- Port of Morrow Connect Oregon rail expansion and cold storage improvements to the Port of Morrow Interchange

**MID-HIGH PRIORITY (2)**
- Harney County Incubator/ Juniper Processing Facility
  - Sage Grouse Habitat Recovery – additional equipment to expand capacity
  - Sage Grouse habitat restoration – Equipment for restoration work
  - Self loader log truck for use on Juniper cutting projects on BLM and private land
  - Harney Community Energy Project
  - Expand and connect Fiber from City of Arlington to City of Condon

**MEDIUM PRIORITY (3)**
- Infrastructure (Water & Sewer) to Pendleton Industrial land (365 acres)
- Port of Morrow East Beach infrastructure improvements
- Port of Morrow Transportation Improvements - including improved access to Interstate 84, Rail improvements in East Beach and Terminal 1 Marine improvements

**LOW PRIORITY CONSTRUCTION (5)**
- Silvies Valley Ranch: Guest ranch within Harney / Grant counties
- Power Supply to John Day Industrial Park (State-Certified)
- Wastewater treatment facility for the cities of John Day and Canyon City
- "Hydrosphere Center" - Milton Freewater
- Gilliam County Bridge Repair

Regional Technical Assistance Project Priorities

**HIGH PRIORITY (3)**
- City of John Day Wastewater Facilities Master Plan Update/Analysis
- The New Natural Resources Economy : An Economic Study to Identify Emerging Opportunities for Small, Rural Firms in Eastern Oregon
- Malheur County Poverty to Prosperity Planning and Development of the Career Technical Education Center

**MEDIUM PRIORITY (2)**
- Morrow County Public Transit / Workforce
- Pendleton Industrial Area Master Plan (365 acres)

**LOW PRIORITY (3)**
- Morrow County Incentives for Middle income or family wage housing
- Marketing and Tourism Development - Frontier Counties (John Day)
- Vacant Public Building Assessment - Condon & Condon School District
**Potential Additional Project/Issue Category**

**REGION-WIDE LOCAL ISSUES**
- Water systems improvements
- Waste water facilities
- Utilities (power, water, sewer, telecommunications) to industrial land
- Power to irrigated farm land
- Access to fiber
- County road infrastructure improvements

**HOW WOULD YOU PRIORITIZE THESE PROJECTS?**
Umatilla County & CTUIR CEDS Community Comments

COMMUNITY MEETING: Assets & Strengths

CTUIR meeting
- Tax Incentive in the Industrial Park
- Casino
- Governing Body
- Workforce develop programs
- Vocational Rehab
- Location-transportation infrastructure
- Business Park
- Museum
- Business Support Services
- Schools
- UAV Test Site
- Health Clinic
- Utilities-Power/Energy
- Free Transit to area cities
- Small Business Center

Pendleton Chamber meeting
- Rich Western Heritage
- Regional Airport
- Near 3 highways
- Land Available at Airport
- Low Cost Utilities
- New Medical Development/Hospital
- Hub for small cities surrounding Pendleton
- Support for School District/Facilities/Improvement
- Affordable Workforce
- Fastest Internet
- Community College Partnerships
- Unmanned Aerial Vehicles Test Site
- Supportive community Gov’t

Round-up City Meeting
- Industrial Park & Airport
- Land ready for development
- Supportive City Government
- Coyote Business Park
- Blue Mountain Community College
- I-84 / I-82 access
- Community-oriented town
- Low crime, good public schools
- Educational facility upgrades
- Affordable city
- New Hospital
- Wildhorse Casino & Resort
- Tourism (and potential)
- Round Up Rodeo Event
- Urban Renewal Program
- Professional “Hub” for NE

Hermiston Meeting
- Transportation access – rail, highway, port
- Access to power
- Access to Regional source of water – Columbia river
- Climate
- Excellent k-12 school system
- Positive outlook /capacity to collaborate

SURVEY RESULTS: Assets & Strengths

Umatilla County
- Available infrastructure
- 2 interstate national freeways
- Columbia River for boat transportation
- Railroad switching area
- Regional airport
- Sparser population for industries that want open space
- Good educational system for special training needs

CTUIR
- Availability of developable land
- I-84 Interstate, state highways, ports, airports and regional transit facilitating moving freight and workforce
- University and community college system
- Unmanned aerial systems opportunities
- Entrepreneurial environment
SURVEY RESULTS: Assets & Strengths

City of Pendleton
- Confederated Tribes
- Port of Morrow
- UAS designation
- Central location in Pacific Northwest
- Open Spaces
- Agriculture and food processing
- Abundant and affordable industrial land and utilities
- Central location with excellent rail, river, road and air access
- Port of Morrow and CTUIR
- Tourism/ outdoor recreation potential

City of Pilot Rock
- 450 acres of industrial property, with rail spur, in the enterprise zone
- Regional airport and Port of Umatilla
- High pressure gas main
- Power substation with capacity of 10 more megawatts
- 3,000 gallon/minute water resource. Water system capable of doubling for domestic only.

City of Umatilla
- Good Transportation
- Good utility rates
- Reasonable land values

City of Hermiston
- Available agricultural land
- Availability of forest products
- Transportation infrastructure (freeway, rail, marine)

City of Stanfield
- Growing population
- Good schools
- Good access to interstate highways and rail infrastructure
- Government and community leaders eager to help attract development

City of Echo
- History – Oregon Trail, Agriculture, Historic buildings, etc.
- Transportation System/Hub
- Location near Columbia River, Tri-cities, Mountains, etc.
- Agricultural diversity, technology, growing season
- Wind/Weather

SURVEY RESULTS: Assets & Strengths

Pendleton Chamber
- Transportation
- Recreational opportunities
- Weather/climate
- Name and/or brand recognition

Hermiston Chamber (2)
- Willingness of all residents to work together
- Great city
- Excellent schools
- Responsible county government
- Good state representation
- Agriculture
- Industry
- Land availability
- Schools/Education
- Location

Umatilla Chamber
- GEODC

SURVEY RESULTS: Assets & Strengths

Business Community
- Outdoor activities
- Hospitality
- Historical locations/tourism
- Drones
- Close to transportation links
- Tourism (2)
- Large area of real estate available for growth
- BMCC
- Outdoor activities
- Social services
- Natural resources
- Agriculture and associated agribusiness
- Strong support system for agriculture
- Good understanding about regional agriculture
- Food processing manufacturers and processors in the region
- High educational levels of many agribusiness professionals and they are well connected and respected
- Water resources
- Climate
- OSU Extension
- NRCS programs
- Builds a strong community through economic diversity
- Community is aligned on its goals and objectives
- Strong support for GEODC and Regional Solutions, even though at times participation is low
- Great leadership in GEODC and Regional Solutions
SURVEY RESULTS: Assets & Strengths

Business Community continued
• Creative thinkers with great ideas
• Spirit of collaboration for area development
• Transportation/infrastructure availability
• Natural resources
• Agriculture
• Aggressive approach to growth (Hermiston/Port of Morrow)
• Strong school systems
• Availability of land parcels
• Agricultural land production; energy production
• Forest land production
• Market access by river, port, rail, freeway, airport, utility, internet
• Reasonable cost of living; rural quality of life
• Manufacturing and distribution of food, wood, energy, other
• Growth in local communities
• More business
• More employment
• More diversity
• Diversity
• Drive to grow
• Ability to adapt to future needs

Assets & Strengths: Reoccurring Themes throughout Region

• Available Land
• Transportation / Access to Markets
• Quality of Education
• Low-Cost Utilities
• Recreational Opportunities
• Tourism
• Airports
• Climate

COMMUNITY MEETING: Challenges

CTUIR meeting
• Housing
• Trust Land/Fractured Property
• Skill Sets in the Workforce

Pendleton Chamber meeting
• Lack of Workforce Housing-Middle Income
• Retail Shopping
• Empty Storefronts in downtown
• Lack of Childcare-Specific to Infant & Toddler Care
• Lack of Understanding on how important tourism is to Pendleton
• Need more dining options-vegetarians, vegans, restricted diets
• Restrictive Gov’t Regs
• Declining School Enrollment

Round-up City meeting
• Lack of Workforce Housing-Middle Income
• Retail Shopping
• Empty Storefronts in downtown
• Lack of Childcare-Specific to Infant & Toddler Care
• Lack of Understanding on how important tourism is to Pendleton
• Need more dining options-vegetarians, vegans, restricted diets
• Restrictive Gov’t Regs
• Declining School Enrollment

Hermiston Meeting
• Government regulations pertaining to business
• Access to water (both asset and constraint)
• Capacity to recruit professional workforce
• Lack of services & amenities to retain workers
SURVEY RESULTS: Challenges

Umatilla County
- Lack of affordable housing
- Scarcity of family wage jobs
- Restrictive land use laws without local control
- Limited availability of irrigation from Columbia River water system

CTUIR
- Skilled Workforce
- Small populations spread over large land base
- Infrastructure needs
- Workforce housing
- Redevelopment

SURVEY RESULTS: Challenges

City of Umatilla
- Political infighting
- Poverty
- Isolation

City of Hermiston
- Lack of irrigation water for agriculture
- Restrictions on harvesting forest products

City of Stanfield
- Poor job training resources
- Poor reputation for anything other than agriculture
- Most cities are small, and all lack funding for economic development

City of Echo
- Lack of water
- Money
- Federal and state regulatory agencies: DEQ/ODFW in particular
- Limited affordable housing especially mid-priced 3 or 4 bedroom

SURVEY RESULTS: Challenges

City of Pendleton
- Cost of transportation
- Dwindling ability to use natural resources
- Rigid land use regulation
- Relatively small, unskilled work force
- Companies only interested in cheap labor and $$ incentives
- Poor curb appeal of all the cities along I-84
- Lack of shopping and eateries/ difficulty adjusting to rural lifestyle
- Distances from suppliers

Pendleton Chamber
- Housing
- High paying jobs
- Lack of a car dealership
- Lack of infrastructure
- Lack of funding

Hermiston Chamber (2)
- The burden of federal and state regulations
- Unfunded mandates that increase cost and create delays
- The lack of use of natural resources
- Access to more water from the Columbia River
- Regulatory processes

Umatilla Chamber
**SURVEY RESULTS: Challenges**

**Business Community**
- Decrease of employment related to dry land wheat farming
- Lack of entrepreneurship
- Property owner investment apathy
- Lack of local tax incentives for real property investment
- Federal limits shrink national forest management and timber
- Federal and state limits stifle water use from Columbia River
- Federal and state limits stifle energy/utility production and transport
- Workforce shortage – worker exodus from rural communities
- Government limits stifling business and employment status
- Well trained workforce
- The local community college needs to provide more technical degrees, and action plans to show the community value
- Umatilla, Echo, Stanfield seem to not be very progressive/active in economic development
- Adequate water/sewer systems
- Housing shortage
- Rental shortage
- Government regulation (water, land use etc.)
- Infrastructure road blocks
- Skilled labor shortage
- Missing “large city” appeal (entertainment, restaurants, etc.)
- Area appeal (housing, area business layout, etc.)
- Some state agencies are not business-friendly
- Lack of coordination on what priorities should be for the region
- Implementation strategies that are disjointed
- Negative cumulative impacts of rules and regulations slowing or stopping the process
- Lack of authority to implement regional plans
- Lack of stable economy in industries other than natural resources and agriculture
- Unbalanced support for minority groups in incentive programs
- White youth cannot compete with these programs
- Lack of awareness in the local education system for economic future of students
- Lack of qualified labor pool
- Lack of diversity in new business
- Lack of 4-year college/ university
- Lack of educating the public about need for economic development
- Lack of support for existing businesses
- Workforce
- Housing
- Jobs
- Commerce

**Community Meetings: Regional Issues**

**CTUIR meeting**
- Port Facilities/Shipping
- Renewable Energy
- Idaho Power B2H transmission line
- Water/Wastewater Improvements
- Diversified Agriculture
- Timber/Fed Forestland
- Redevelopment of Umatilla Depot property
- Access to water/irigation
- Balancing water access with natural Resource Preservation

**ASSETS:**
- Tourism
- Trucking Industry
- I-84 Multi-Modal

**WEAKNESS:**
- Lack of Coordination with other Economic Development Organizations & Marketing
- Marketing Capacity
- Workforce/Skills
- Finance for Community Infrastructure
- Business Networking

**REGIONAL PROJECTS:**
- Networking Economic Development Organizations across the region/including tribes
- Funding

**Challenges: Reoccurring Themes throughout Region**

- Housing Availability
- Access to Water
- Government Regulations
- High Commute Rate
- Lack of Services / Amenities
- Educational Facilities
- Access to Markets
Survey Results: Regional Issues

Umatilla County
- Volatility of Business Oregon programs affected by the Legislature: constantly changing
- Entry areas of region might have a positive attraction for lack of sales tax
- Cooperative collaboration between/among all entities’ needs in the region
- Streamlined, proactive, friendlier relationships with federal agencies dealing with economic development in the region

CTUIR
- Availability of additional infrastructure
- Skilled workforce
- Workforce housing
- Redevelopment of Umatilla Army Depot

Survey Results: Regional Issues

City of Pendleton
- Land use
- Cost of transportation
- Dwindling ability to use natural resources
- UAS designation
- Access to Columbia River water
- Oregon’s perception of being unfriendly to business
- Workforce training and work force housing
- UAS Test Range (based out of Pendleton)
- Lack of regional cooperation/coordination

Survey Results: Regional Issues

City of Umatilla
- Umatilla Chemical Depot Reuse Planning
- Water rights

City of Hermiston
- Lack of irrigation water
- Forest product restrictions

City of Stanfield
- Funding for infrastructure
- Lack of marketing
- Difficulty in attracting private developers and investors

City of Echo
- Water, lack thereof
- Money for infrastructure and housing development
- Trying to get regulatory agencies to understand differences between western and eastern Oregon and realize rules should not be one size fits all
- Referring to above: conflicting agency requirements have made it almost impossible to make affordable upgrades to our wastewater system

Survey Results: Regional Issues

Pendleton Chamber
- Housing
- Decent paying jobs
- Minimally skilled work force
- Infrastructure

Hermiston Chamber (2)
- Water, Water, Water
- Access to water
- Investors
- Regulatory processes
- Industry diversity- need more tech related industry
- Finding qualified workers

Umatilla Chamber
Survey Results: Regional Issues

**Business Community**
- Growth of population
- Some state agencies are not business-friendly
- Lack of coordination on what priorities should be for the region
- Implementation strategies that are disjointed
- Negative cumulative impacts of rules and regulations slowing or stopping the process
- Lack of authority to implement regional plans
- Water usage
- Shortage of skilled labor
- Urban/area renewal
- Affordable housing
- A younger education generation of workers has not come back
- Infrastructure to support technology

Survey Results: Regional Issues

**Business Community**
- Broken federal forest policy
- Punitive federal and state water policy
- Bad federal/state environmental limits on water, air, transport, utility
- Government limits on port, rail, highway, airport, utility, internet
- Lacking employment opportunities in rural communities
- Aging generation of business and property owners
- Access to natural resources
- UAV development
- Information technology (both +/- depending on location)
- Housing (2)
- Infrastructure
- Economic support
- Labor pool
- Ignorance
- Workforce

COMMUNITY MEETINGS: Local Project Priorities

**CTUIR meeting**
- Business Parks/Coyote Creek & Wanapa
- Housing
- Education Center
- Wellness Center

**Pendleton Chamber meeting**
- UAV Industry
- Water Storage
- Year-Round Tourism
- Housing for Workers (workforce)
- Improve Infrastructure; roads, water, sewer, airport, industrial land
- City/Count/State Gov’t-Better coordination to address housing issues/needs
- Expanded Convention Center

**Round-up City meeting**
- Housing development
- UAV industry development
- Privatize Airport hill
- Infrastructure – Barnhart Rd.
- Expand local tourism events
- River corridor development

**Hermiston Meeting**
- Recruitment of firms to achieve higher employment and wages
- Revitalize downtown core
- Develop a college presence
- Access to water for irrigation
Survey Results: Priority Local Projects

Umatilla County
1. Expansion of Value-added agriculture
2. Return of more local control of land use laws
3. Establishment and expansion of the unmanned aerial vehicle industry
4. Expansion of retail wine industry
5. Return to sustainable forest industry activities (logging, replanting, mills, export)
6. Commercial development activity possible at the decommissioned Army Depot in West Umatilla County when deeded to the County.

CTUIR
1. Workforce Housing
2. Wanapa Industrial site Infrastructure
3. Tribal Education Center
4. Tribal Health Center
5. Overall infrastructure development

City of Pendleton
- Developing UAV industry
- Infrastructure to industrial lands
- Access to federal timber
- Expanding tourism
- Access to Columbia River water
- Local business expansion
- Unmanned Aerial Systems/ Pendleton UAS Range
- Tourism
- Creating more shovel ready industrial land for sale
- Work force housing and training

City of Pilot Rock

Survey Results: Priority Local Projects

City of Hermiston
- Gaining access to additional irrigation water
- Building infrastructure to deliver additional irrigation water
- Extending redundant potable water service to the Cook industrial site
- Upgrading wastewater delivery capacity to southern industrial area of town
- Fully developing educational programming at the new Eastern Oregon Higher Education Center

City of Stanfield
- Attracting development to I-84/US 395 Interchange in Stanfield
- Redevelopment and revitalization of Stanfield Main Street
- Increase acreage of industrial zoned lands with access to utilities

City of Echo
- Waste water improvements
- Housing – need 3-4 bedrooms
- Continued development of Downtown, art, etc. to attract visitors and investors
- Funding to assist entrepreneurs develop railroad and other light industrial/tourist commercial properties
- River: protect town from flooding/erosion damage/river access

Survey Results: Priority Local Projects

City of Umatilla
- Old Town Site agreement with CTUIR
- Port Zoning conflict resolution
- Downtown Revitalization
- Columbia River water right opportunities

Pendleton Chamber
- UAV/UAS technology
- Airport region development
- Vendors and suppliers for local businesses/industry

Hermiston Chamber (2)
- Ag and agribusiness development
- Technology and technical infrastructure
- Matching education to the needs of current and incoming businesses
- Reasonable power cost for the future
- Downtown revitalization, infrastructure and attracting new business
- Eastern Oregon Trade and Event Center
- Beautification/Signage/Lighting/Expanding trails
- E-commerce zone
- Educational opportunities that provide industry with the qualified work skills they need

Umatilla Chamber
- Assistance for undercapitalized businesses
### Survey Results: Priority Local Projects

**Business Community**
- Blue Mountain National Forest Plan
- Columbia River water development
- Regulatory relief on ports, highway, airport utility, internet
- Community college distance education to rural areas
- K-12 vocational/technical trade education improvement
- Technical education to support the future jobs
- Drivers to bring younger generations back to the community
- CROC Center
- Development of larger shopping stores (Target, Shopko, etc.)
- Attract larger groups and corporations to settle in the area
- Build a sizable convention center
- New/expanded training programs at BMCC
- UAV research industry
- New development and improved tax assessed values
- Build out of cutting edge communication networks
- Housing
- Jobs

### Small Business Needs

- Access to capital (7)
- Street/façade improvements (4)
- Local government business retention/expansion programs (4)
- Marketing (4)
- Business planning/consulting (3)
- Employee training (3)
- Access to more timber, water, energy
- Regulatory relief on environmental limits
- Workforce that has employment security
- Business friendly state agencies
- State agencies that must consider the effects on the economy before enacting rules and regulations
- Parking for Handicap Downtown
- Dependable Drug-free Workforce
- Lower Minimum Wage/Workers Comp
- Incentives to get people back to work

### Potential Additional Project/Issue Category

**REGION-WIDE LOCAL ISSUES**
- Potable water systems improvements
- Waste water treatment facilities
- Access to high-speed telecommunications
- City and county road infrastructure improvements
- Utilities extended to industrial land to develop certified industrial sites
Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy: Goals & Objectives

Vision: To create a thriving, diversified, and sustainable regional economy that is resilient to economic change.

1. Stimulate growth by capitalizing on the competitive advantages of the region.

2. Encourage diversification of the regional economy to increase stability and resiliency.

3. Build an entrepreneurial business environment across the region.

4. Develop an educational system that supports

Goals & Objectives continued

5. Promote a regional network of industrial sites that will serve the needs of existing and future firms.


7. Develop a regional strategy that incorporates sound economic planning principles and includes viable projects to stimulate job development and economic growth.

8. Develop a methodology to evaluate progress and ensure viability of the plan.

Project Prioritization Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Impact</th>
<th>Projects impacting a larger portion of the Region rather than a single community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Impact</td>
<td>Projects demonstrating or with potential for job growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects demonstrating job retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects enhancing economic diversification, business expansion or economic growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects demonstrating improvement to economic conditions, regional/community conditions, or improves standard of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Availability of Funding Sources</td>
<td>Projects with a higher degree of local match funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects with other potential funding sources committed or identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects that qualify for EDA funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alignment with EDA Priorities</td>
<td>Project serves/Improves Economic Distressed and Underserved Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project demonstrates Collaborative Regional Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project demonstrates Public / Private Partnerships and/or National Strategic Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project demonstrates Environmentally Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project demonstrates Global Competitiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for Project</td>
<td>Projects demonstrating support including letters of support, commitment, funding, actions by public entities such as City Councils, County Commissions in support of the project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness to Proceed</td>
<td>Projects that are ready to start immediately</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regional Construction Project Priorities

**HIGH PRIORITY (6)**

- Eastern Oregon Business Accelerator Facility
- Pendleton UAV Facilities Improvements and Flight Operations Equip.
  - Interim UAV / Airport Hanger Facilities - Pendleton
- Umatilla Basin Water Storage & Infrastructure
- Malheur County Poverty to Prosperity Career Technical Education Center
- Port of Morrow Workforce Training Center
- Interstate 82/Lamb Road Interchange: Straightening of the access road into the Umatilla Chemical Depot
**Regional Construction Project Priorities**

**MID-HIGH PRIORITY (2)**

- Harney County Incubator/ Juniper Processing Facility
  - Sage Grouse Habitat Recovery – additional equipment to expand capacity
  - Sage Grouse habitat restoration – Equipment for restoration work
  - Self loader log truck for use on Juniper cutting projects on BLM and private land
  - Harney Community Energy Project

- Expand and connect Fiber from City of Arlington to City of Condon

**REGIONAL CONSTRUCTION PROJECT PRIORITIES**

**MID-HIGH PRIORITY (2)**

- Harney County Incubator/ Juniper Processing Facility
  - Sage Grouse Habitat Recovery – additional equipment to expand capacity
  - Sage Grouse habitat restoration – Equipment for restoration work
  - Self loader log truck for use on Juniper cutting projects on BLM and private land
  - Harney Community Energy Project

- Expand and connect Fiber from City of Arlington to City of Condon

**REGIONAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROJECT PRIORITIES**

**HIGH PRIORITY (3)**

- City of John Day Wastewater Facilities Master Plan Update/Analysis
- The New Natural Resources Economy: An Economic Study to Identify Emerging Opportunities for Small, Rural Firms in Eastern Oregon
- Malheur County Poverty to Prosperity Planning and Development of the Career Technical Education Center

**MEDIUM PRIORITY (2)**

- Morrow County Public Transit / Workforce
- Pendleton Industrial Area Master Plan (365 acres)

**LOW PRIORITY (3)**

- Morrow County Incentives for Middle income or family wage housing
- Marketing and Tourism Development - Frontier Counties (John Day)

**HOW WOULD YOU PRIORITIZE THESE PROJECTS?**

**HIGH PRIORITY (3)**

- City of John Day Wastewater Facilities Master Plan Update/Analysis
- The New Natural Resources Economy: An Economic Study to Identify Emerging Opportunities for Small, Rural Firms in Eastern Oregon
- Malheur County Poverty to Prosperity Planning and Development of the Career Technical Education Center

**MEDIUM PRIORITY (2)**

- Morrow County Public Transit / Workforce
- Pendleton Industrial Area Master Plan (365 acres)

**LOW PRIORITY (3)**

- Morrow County Incentives for Middle income or family wage housing
- Marketing and Tourism Development - Frontier Counties (John Day)
Wheeler County - May 15

Assets / Strengths
- 7 Wonders – Tourism – Painted Hills
- Fossil bed / resources – open to public
- JD River
- Juniper (as wood products resource)
- Hwy 26, 19 - access to tourism areas
- John Day River Territory
- Regional Tourism – branding (ability to)
- Collective knowledge & skills of community – lifeskills / homesteading (self-reliance)
- Small towns, back in time, simplicity – as attractive place to live
- Quality of life – quiet, no light pollution, stability of
- Sense of community
- Internet / cellular in some parts of the county
- “Art community waiting to happen”
- Artists, musicians, writers with regional & national reputation
- Strong sense of community for growing families
- Lots of people who have stayed or come back to area
- “Wheeler county wave” – friendly folks
- Young people returning to community
- Entrepreneurial spirit
- Gym / fitness

Constraints / Weaknesses
- Distances between communities
- Number of people in workforce
- Lack of community infrastructure
- High median age – 58
- Lack of housing / rentals
- Condition of housing
- Downside to “gentrification”
- Fear of what change will bring
- Land use regulations pertaining to EFU (inability to subdivide land for residential use) – mentioned at end of meeting

Top projects next 5 years
- Year-round employment (as a goal)
- Juniper Mill expansion
- Telecom Infrastructure – supports entrepreneurial growth
- Industrial Park (Fossil) – infrastructure development
- Residential Development
- Aquaponic Farming (entrepreneurial idea suggested)
- Land use regulations test area (mentioned towards end of meeting)
2014 Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) Survey

The Greater Eastern Oregon Development Corporation (GEODC) is developing a new Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy for the region and would like your input. The REGION includes the following counties: Gilliam, Morrow, Umatilla, Wheeler, Grant, Harney and Malheur. Information obtained from this survey will be included in our Strategy and help provide direction for those working for economic growth in the region.

Name:________________________  Phone#:________________  Email:__________________

Who do you represent? (check one)
County Government ( )  Social Services Agency ( )  Business ( )
City Government ( )  Business Organization ( )  Resident ( )
Unincorporated Town ( )  Community Organization ( )  Other: __________________

Name of Organization:___________________________________________________________
Located in which County:________________________________________________________

1. What do you see as assets or strengths supporting economic development in the REGION?
   a.
   b.
   c.
   d.
   e.

2. What do you see as weaknesses or constraints hindering economic development in the REGION?
   a.
   b.
   c.
   d.
   e.

Issues Affecting Economic Development in the REGION (8)

- We need stronger, more stable funding for schools. If our schools are week, we won’t be able to attract workers with families.
- Lots of times you can find work for one member of a family, but it is very difficult to find work for both a husband and a wife.
- Existing businesses
- Lack of existing workforce
- Community attitude
- Irrigation Water
- Transportation
- Infrastructure
- Internet access and speed
- Lack of grant funds
- Support for start-up businesses—counseling, business plan, mentoring
- People
- Location
- Lack of jobs
- Lack of large scale employers
- Lack of tax base
- Retaining our youth
- Aging population

Needs to expand or develop your business (5)

- Help with Licenses/Permits/Regulations
- Access to Capital (2)
- Marketing
- Business Planning/Counseling
- Access to Capital
- Local Government Business Retention/Expansion Programs (3)
- Marketing
- Website/Tech Upgrades (2)
- I work in Condon, but my employment is based in Bend. I can only maintain this arrangement with strong internet infrastructure.
- Strong cell phone and data service is another key to maintaining my ability to work remotely.
## Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) 2014 - 2019
### Greater Eastern Oregon Counties
### Survey Responses

**Question 1: What do you see as assets or strengths supporting economic development in the REGION?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Gilliam</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Harney</th>
<th>Malheur</th>
<th>Morrow</th>
<th>Umatilla</th>
<th>Wheeler</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Transportation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to public/commercial land</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communities-People and Leaders</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism/recreation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture/value added ag</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Life/Culture/Population</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses/Service Organizations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Spaces/Location</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of living</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive Govt./Incentives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration-Schools/Agencies/other cities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ports</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable housing/industrial bldg./land</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beauty/Climate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible County Govt./State Rep</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety/Healthy Community</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entreprenuer/UAS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development Zone</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community pride</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax funding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tribal government</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) 2014 - 2019**

**Greater Eastern Oregon Counties**

**Survey Responses**

**Question 1: What do you see as assets or strengths supporting economic development in the REGION?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Gilliam</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Harney</th>
<th>Malheur</th>
<th>Morrow</th>
<th>Umatilla</th>
<th>Wheeler</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historical sites</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturers and other industries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silvies Valley Ranch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise Zone</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital switch investment for Tri-Co. region</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Ag focus with new enterprise initiative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rangelands</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 2: What do you see as weaknesses or constraints hindering economic development in the REGION?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Gilliam</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Harney</th>
<th>Malheur</th>
<th>Morrow</th>
<th>Umatilla</th>
<th>Wheeler</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure including telecommunications</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.0758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/state/fed regulatory process &amp;/or fees</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.0732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.0682</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of funding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal skilled/trained workforce</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/isolation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrictive land use laws</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.05%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family wage jobs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Amenities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.04%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack and cost of transportation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.54%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressiveness of boards &amp; committees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of job training resources</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.78%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of community involvement/attitude</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.53%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competing with Idaho</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.53%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of communication, coordination, vision</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes (revenue, laws, incentives)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of new industries (incentives)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.02%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.77%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited access to support &amp;/or services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cities lacking curb appeal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of growth/retain high wage earners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political structure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to capital</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of or &quot;use&quot; of universities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of marketable industrial/commercial land</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurs taking risk</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of ability to use natural resources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood plain issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited market for biomass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>396</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 3: What are the most important issues affecting Economic Development in the Region?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Gilliam</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Harney</th>
<th>Malheur</th>
<th>Morrow</th>
<th>Umatilla</th>
<th>Wheeler</th>
<th>Other Jurisdictions</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of skilled workforce</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6.48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of water/water rights</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local/State/Fed regulations or process (new businesses, land use)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure/telecommunication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of funding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB/ wages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation/Isolation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to working capital</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty attracting private developers &amp; investors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proximity with Idaho</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access/Ability to use natural resources</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.83%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for start up businesses/industries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High/lack of incentives</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land use planning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulty attracting private developers &amp; investors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAS designation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community attitude/little involvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of employment opportunities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining youth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aging population</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of funding &amp; diversity (more tech related industry)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation &amp; growth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable political and economic support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative collaboration among all entities needs in the region</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scars/Ability to use natural resources</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.93%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of wireless/broadband communication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sage Grouse endangered species act</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood plain</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of more industrial land</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing the area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory agencies need to understand differences west vs. east and realize rules shouldn’t be one size fits all</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Chemical Depot Reuse Planning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon’s perception of being unfriendly to businesses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited ability for young workers to get jobs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health care resources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning laws and regulations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) 2014 - 2019

Greater Eastern Oregon Counties

### Survey Responses

**Question 3: What are the most important issues affecting Economic Development in the Region?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Gilliam</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Harney</th>
<th>Malheur</th>
<th>Morrow</th>
<th>Umatilla</th>
<th>Wheeler</th>
<th>Other Jurisdictions</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The resources for business development are few</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing businesses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of tax base</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shifting consumer demands related to ag products</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving forest health</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of products and markets for biomass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of availability to use natural resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber industry 10 yr plan has filtered down to outside communities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory technical assistance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Natural Desert Association</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No dedicated and sustainable timber supply</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely decisions from regulators for expanding businesses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of state report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restriction on water development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget cuts at federal level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of LEED for new/remodeled buildings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of recognition of the role Govt plays in Economic Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lodging and services in smaller towns</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of interest in rethinking use of resources, continued focus on ineffective crop production</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No local markets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective state and local govt controls regarding mining and materials extraction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business development/job creation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unappealing look of buildings/area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for consolidation of city/county govt areas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental restraints</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business retention</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics of population</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long term buy in from agencies and organizations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintended consequences from legislative issues in Salem</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration among community partners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council has little support from the general public</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled &amp; job training for youth</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land that is shovel ready</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 3: What are the most important issues affecting Economic Development in the Region?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Gilliam</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Harney</th>
<th>Malheur</th>
<th>Morrow</th>
<th>Umatilla</th>
<th>Wheeler</th>
<th>Other Jurisdictions</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mining laws, inception of DOGAMI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of amenities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide high end dev housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not know in other areas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small labor pool</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest product restrictions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volatility of business Oregon programs affected by legislature-constantly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better areas of region might have a positive attraction for lack of sales</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamlined, proactive, friendlier relationships with federal agencies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of transportation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of industrial/commercial property</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limits on taxing ability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reluctance to try new things from far away</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure to strive for excellence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited voice in state affairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterproductive fiscal conservation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of progressiveness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All talk little action</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited focus by region to expand beyond current activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expensive housing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved transportation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un-capitalised businesses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable living</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food distribution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental concerns relating to coal transport</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced state investment in rural workforce development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businesses with low academic expectations to keep costs down</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to retain high wage earners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No destination identity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enterprise</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information technology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban/area renewal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No sales tax</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seasonal nature of tourism supporting businesses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of new industry around existing natural resources</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Question 3: What are the most important issues affecting Economic Development in the Region?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Gilliam</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Harney</th>
<th>Malheur</th>
<th>Morrow</th>
<th>Umatilla</th>
<th>Wheeler</th>
<th>Other Jurisdictions</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership transitions in local organizations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of new agricultural based enterprise (farmer)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism development of lodging, services and local amenities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of additional infrastructure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken federal forest policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penetrate federal/state water policy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bed fed/state environmental limits on water, air, transport, utility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost limits on port, rail, highway, airport, utility, internet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 18 10 28 71 32 110 15 20 324

### Question 5: If you are a business owner or entrepreneur, what do you need to expand or develop your business?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Gilliam</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Harney</th>
<th>Malheur</th>
<th>Morrow</th>
<th>Umatilla</th>
<th>Wheeler</th>
<th>Other Jurisdictions</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>% of total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to capital</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19.48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Govt. Business retention/expansion programs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.99%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street/Facade improvements</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help with licenses/permits/regulations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABC/tech upgrades</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee training</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business planning/counseling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networking with similar businesses and industry associates</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.09%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finances management</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife conservation enhancement and support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of “green” markets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislative change for water from Columbia for region</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and post-secondary career ed/workforce training</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business friendly state agencies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State agencies that must consider the effects on the economy before enacting rules and regs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need the county to rezone low quality IRU land to light industrial need to the Freeway</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to more timber</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory relief on environ. limits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce that has employment security</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 12 9 23 32 15 47 3 13 154
Top Priorities in the next 5 years (9)

**Gilliam County**
1. Columbia River dock for on and off loading materials
2. Building infrastructure at industrial sites
3. Funding for local schools
4. Coordinating with community colleges for workforce developments
5. Affordable housing
6. Fiber availability; better upload capacity for citizens
7. Business recruitment
8. Stronger school system

**City of Condon**
1. Infrastructure upgrades/fixes
2. Business retention-keep what we've got
3. Attracting new businesses-young families

**City of Lonerock**
1. New reservoir
2. Replace bridge on county road located at Lonerock

**Port of Arlington**
1. New 230Kv-115Kv Substation for Arlington Mesa Industrial Park
2. Expanded services for Arlington Marina
3. Construction of new intermodal facilities
4. Development of new value added facilities
5. Upgrading internet speeds to households and businesses

**Other Organizations:**

**Gilliam Soil and Water Conservation District:**
1. Bringing large employers into the community
2. Retain young people in the community
3. Modernize infrastructure

**North Gilliam Health District**
1. Community attitude – we need to WANT to grow
2. Courting new businesses
3. Community facilities and housing to support growth
4. Promoting small start-ups
5. Intra-city partnerships

**Educational**
1. Commitment to right sizing the facilities (especially schools) to meet current enrollment, this will free up funds for operating.

Issues Affecting Economic Development in the REGION (8)
- We need stronger, more stable funding for schools. If our schools are week, we won’t be able to attract workers with families.
- Lots of times you can find work for one member of a family, but it is very difficult to find work for both a husband and a wife.
- Existing businesses
- Lack of existing workforce
- Community attitude
- Irrigation Water
- Transportation
- Infrastructure
- Internet access and speed
- Lack of grant funds
- Support for start-up businesses-counseling, business plan, mentoring
- People
- Location
- Lack of jobs
- Lack of large scale employers
- Lack of tax base
- Retaining our youth
- Aging population

Needs to expand or develop your business (5)
- Help with Licenses/Permits/Regulations
- Access to Capital (2)
- Marketing
- Business Planning/Counseling
- Access to Capital
- Local Government Business Retention/Expansion Programs (3)
- Marketing
- Website/Tech Upgrades (2)
- I work in Condon, but my employment is based in Bend. I can only maintain this arrangement with strong internet infrastructure.
- Strong cell phone and data service is another key to maintaining my ability to work remotely.
Top Priorities in the next 5 years (8)

Grant County:
1. Researching and developing markets for wood by biomass (2)
2. Researching and developing community heat sources
3. Researching and developing combined heat projects
4. Education and marketing Oregon’s transformational health care program
5. Updating aging infrastructure
6. Outdoor recreation
7. Tourism
8. Forest restoration

City of Monument
1. Wastewater project USDA grant award
2. Update City water system, Awarded water technical grant for research
3. Road improvement/applied for ODOT grant
4. Capital improvement and technical assistance/upgrades to City Hall

City of John Day
1. Creating new jobs-getting new industries at the industrial park
2. Secure funding for new wastewater treatment facility and new fire station
3. Improve City streets and sidewalk facilities
4. Encourage all age groups to participate as community leaders
5. Attract new business especially to the downtown area

Other Organizations:
G.R.E.A.T., Corp:
1. Expansion of timber manufacturing infrastructure
2. Assistance in accelerated restoration of national forests
3. Assistance in recruitment of alternative industrial base
4. Expansion of value-added agriculture
5. Development of recreational opportunities

Grant County Economic Council:
1. Working capital-devise loan bank
2. Labor training/recruitment-teach possibilities
3. Training/support for entrepreneurs-teach business basics
4. Marketing for regional tourism

North Fork John Day Watershed Council:
1. Re-establish a sawmill or other manufacturing plant
2. Identify viable markets for low quality/size wood
3. Diversify farm/ranching operations
4. Improve transportation options

Issues Affecting Economic Development in the REGION (8)
- Schools
- Transportation
- Work force (3)
- Housing (3)
- Working capital (2)
- Global Economy
- Shifting consumer demands related to ag products
- Improving forest health or national forest
- Development of products and markets for biomass
- State & Federal regulations which slow or stifle development
- High taxes
- Remote location (3)
- Lack of funding for government entities
- Loss of availability to use natural resources
- Lack of employment opportunities
- Drugs & alcohol; criminal activities
- Need to upgrade aging infrastructure
- Timber industry 10yr plan has not filtered down to outside communities
- Lack of rail, port and interstate services
- Lack of wireless and broadband communication services
- Water management and development infrastructure
- Regulatory technical assistance
- Sage Grouse endangered species act listing

Needs to expand or develop your business (3)
- Access to Capital
- Help with Licenses/Permits/Regulations (2)
- Business Planning/Counseling (2)
- Marketing (2)
- Networking with similar businesses and industry associations
- Local government business retention/expansion programs
Top Priorities in the next 5 years (8)

Harney County:
1. Continued recruitment of Pacific Natural Foods
2. Completion of the Silvies Valley Ranch Eco-Resort
3. Modernization of School Buildings
4. Continued Downtown Re-development
5. Formation of an "Angel Investment Group"
6. Securing access to juniper and infrastructures to process it
7. Performing arts center
8. Food processing plant

City of Burns:
1. Flood plain designation
2. Industry development
3. Marketing
4. Networking
5. State support

City of Hines:
1. Infrastructure replacement (both utilities and streets)
2. Recruitment of small to medium sized tech companies
3. Training locally to enhance skills of unemployed
4. Funding for small business start up
5. Rural community-specific funding

Other Organizations:
Harney Soil & Water Conservation District
1. Retaining current infrastructure

Business and Private Sector:
1. USDA RBEG Program
2. Industrial Certification
3. Proactive Marketing Program
4. Employee Retraining Programs
5. Federal, State and Local Incentives
6. Logging
7. Ranching
8. Juniper products
9. Refurbish/restore 5 day week for schools
10. Protect open spaces in town
11. Energizing local merchants
12. Improvement of wayside viewpoints of interest and roads.
13. Comprehensive regional development of all inclusive waste management and control and enforcement.
14. Comprehensive development of reginal water supplies and control.
15. Wildlife support and sustainability.

Issues Affecting Economic Development in the REGION (8)

- Listing of the Sage Grouse as an endangered species
- Oregon Natural Desert Association
- No dedicated and sustainable timber supply
- No major transportation systems (3)
- Skilled work force (2)
- Workforce in our communities
- Ability of an expanding business to get timely decisions from regulators.
  Business needs a speedy way through the many processes.
- Lack of industry
- Location
- Flood plain issues
- Lack of growth
- Lack of State support
- No start-up funding
- Aging Infrastructure
- Some restriction on water development
- High tech skilled personnel
- Budget cuts at the federal level
- Lack of LEED for new and remodeled buildings
- Lack of school funding
- Loss of trains
- Lack of recognition of the role government plays in economic development
- Consumer waste stream management
- Lodging and services in smaller towns
- Lack of interest in rethinking use of resources, continued focus on ineffective crop production.
- No local markets. All produce continues to be trucked in from out of region.
- Ineffective State and local government controls regarding mining and materials extraction.

Needs to expand or develop your business (7)

- Local government business retention/expansion programs (4)
- Access to Capital (5)
- Waste management
- Wildlife conservation enhancement and support
- Development of “green” markets
- Street/façade improvements (2)
- Website/Tech upgrades (3)
- Employee training (2)
- Marketing (3)
- Help with Licenses/Permits/Regulations
Top Priorities in the next 5 years (23)

Malheur County:
1. Need more average and above wage jobs.
2. More available housing subdivisions.
3. More rural housing opportunities
4. Help on installing expensive infrastructure to spur industrial development
5. More local control of land planning issues.
6. Career Technical Education Center, Poverty to Prosperity
7. Community Infrastructure (water, sewer, etc.)

City of Ontario:
1. Workforce training
2. Port District
3. Infrastructure to industrial sites

City of Vale:
1. Trained Workforce
2. Available Land
3. Infrastructure to Industrial Sites

City of Adrian:
1. Upgrading the sewer system
2. Completing the water project drill well and transmission lines
3. Completing the water project looping lines and new meters
4. Upgrading the sewer lagoons to be in compliance
5. New office building and meeting hall

City of Nyssa:
1. Extending water and sewer lines to new Industrial lands recently brought into the UGB
2. Completing a designated truck route through town from 1st street to Commercial and extending to Beck’s Rd.
3. Completion of the collector street Locust Avenue.
4. Sewer line upgrades
5. Build ADA Emergency Services Facility.

Other Organizations:
Snake River Economic Development Alliance:
1. Ontario, Nyssa, & Vale infrastructure needs to available industrial lands.
2. Getting the Career Technical Education Center past the pilot project state for our workforce.
3. Keep the local community college thriving so they can keep helping business
4. Support Vale and Ontario airport projects
5. Road improvement for economic development projects.

Malheur County Poverty to Prosperity:
1. Career and Technical Education Center
2. Community Infrastructure

Boys & Girls Club of Western Treasure Valley:
1. Focus on getting kids to progress in school ready and on time each year.
2. Boys & Girls Club to help keep kids in school and on track to graduate.
3. Developing strong Latino outreach efforts to engage families.
4. Creating a CTE program.

Community in Action:
1. Expansion of the Career and Technical Education Center, Poverty to Prosperity Initiative.
2. Creating more job opportunities
3. To develop a strategic plan for the City of Ontario.
4. Youth
5. High School Completion Rates
6. Hunger/Homelessness
7. Health Care
8. City of Ontario Infrastructure
9. More buildable lots for homes and businesses
10. Bringing in and keeping good people within the community
11. Keeping and supporting good schools
12. Maintaining good community college
13. Supporting local businesses
14. School to work programs
15. College credit/certificate programs for High School students
16. Involvement of all educational entities in the area to promote post school outcomes for local kids
17. Recreational opportunities for kids
18. Eastern Oregon Early Learning center
19. Trained skilled labors
20. Supporting families through training and holding them accountable to teach their children

Education:
1. Creating a Career & Technical Trade School-Part of Poverty to Prosperity Initiative.(8)
2. Creating more job opportunities
3. To develop a strategic plan for the City of Ontario.
4. Youth
5. High School Completion Rates
6. Hunger/Homelessness
7. Health Care
8. City of Ontario Infrastructure
9. More buildable lots for homes and businesses
10. Bringing in and keeping good people within the community
11. Keeping and supporting good schools
12. Maintaining good community college
13. Supporting local businesses
14. School to work programs
15. College credit/certificate programs for High School students
16. Involvement of all educational entities in the area to promote post school outcomes for local kids
17. Recreational opportunities for kids
18. Eastern Oregon Early Learning center
19. Trained skilled labors
20. Supporting families through training and holding them accountable to teach their children
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- Community working together for positive change
- Malheur County is ready to step-up and take control of its destiny
- Unintended consequences from legislative issues in Salem
- Collaboration among community partners-need to keep them strong
- City Council has little support from the general public, which creates issues.
- Practical & job training for youth
- Low academic achievement and engagement of students
- Regulations (2)
- Access to Capital (2)
- Land use planning (2)
- Getting the word out of what we have and to market to our targeted industries
- Water shortage-drought conditions affect the farming and that affects the rest of the economy
- Lack of workforce development programs
- Economy
- Proximity to Idaho
- Land that is shovel ready
- Minimum wages vs. Idaho
- All forms of social, welfare programs are more conducive to growth in that area in Oregon vs. Idaho
- Mining laws. No mine has been permitted since inception of DOGAMI. What are we paying for the last approx. 40 years.

Needs to expand or develop your business (13)

- Street/Façade Improvements (3)
- Marketing (4)
- Website/Tech Upgrades (3)
- Local government business retention/expansion programs (7)
- Help with licenses/permits/regulations (5)
- Employee training (4)
- Business planning/Consulting (2)
- Access to Capital (4)
- Completed infrastructure projects
  - I am an agriculturist-We need local, state, & federal government to pay more attention to our needs. We have a road we need to access our farm that was upgraded through a grant. We can no longer use this road due to so called improvement.

Business/Resident:
1. Malheur County Poverty to Prosperity, CTE (2)
2. Finding use for mall
3. Additional phases to school upgrades in Ontario
4. Reopening the pool in Ontario
5. Bringing in industries
6. Pursuing industrial companies
7. Environmental issues addressed based on facts, science
8. Farming-Producing needed crops
9. Access to transportation of goods
10. Infrastructure
11. Get better cell phone/internet technology to Vale
12. Agriculture preservation including cattle
13. Community College Development for job training in the trades
14. Assistance with water issues
15. Maintenance of deteriorating county roads

Issues Affecting Economic Development in the REGION (22)

- Business development and job creation
- Often the image of our area is downgraded because of lack of some family oriented facilities
- Need for more consolidation of city/county government areas
- Industry not coming here due to government/local restraints
- Poverty, low paying employment rates (6)
- Environmental restraints
- Access to transportation of goods
- Development fees imposed on new business-Ontario
- Land use restrictions/laws (6)
- Business retention
- Businesses need skilled labor (6)
- Many times people don’t want to live in rural Oregon communities
- Demographics-large Hispanic population-large number of people living in our community that are families of prisoners of SRCI
- It’s easy to develop across the river due to Oregon restrictions vs Idaho
- Higher property taxes vs. across the river in Idaho (2)
- Greater housing market in Idaho
- Funding (4)
- Education (4)
- Sustained political and economic support
- Long term “buy in” from agencies and organizations
- Jobs and wages (3)
- Isolation from political center of Oregon (2)
- Development of more industrial land (2)
- Supporting local business and industry
### Top Priorities in the next 5 years (10)

**Morrow County:**
1. Develop a better water system from Columbia River
2. Keep power cost low for industry
3. Training for local workforce
4. Able to ship product to Asian markets

**City of Boardman**
1. Housing
2. Workforce Training

**City of Irrigon**
1. Improved road system
2. Finalize WW system conversion
3. Framed Housing Development-higher end structures
4. Reduction of fiscal overhead/debt to our community
5. Increased employment opportunities

**City of Heppner**
1. Becoming known
2. Advertising our lifestyle
3. Solving the floodway development problem
4. Continuing to upgrade our community infrastructure
5. Supporting opportunities

**City of Lexington**
1. Back up water source and reservoir

**Other Organizations:**

**Morrow County Citizens Economic Development Task Force**
1. I-84/Lamb Rd Interchange
2. POM connect Oregon rail expansion and cold storage project
3. Improvements to the POM I-84 Interchange
4. Workforce Housing
5. Transportation improvements/Public transportation

**Boardman Community Development Association**
1. Housing Development
2. Commercial/Retail Development
3. Community Recreation Center
4. School Support for more class offerings/improved marking, etc.

**Boardman Chamber**
1. Indoor recreation/fitness center
2. More amenities such as salons, shopping, dining, etc.

**Morrow Soil & Conservation District**
1. Private property natural resource improvements
2. Week control on public & private property
3. Improve water quality of Will Creek Reservoir
4. Improve stream bank conditions in the county

**Private Business (1)**
1. Housing
2. Training
3. Services for employees, families, business

---

**Issues Affecting Economic Development in the REGION (10)**

- Not enough water (2)
- Good workforce
- Training for workforce (3)
- Workforce housing (6)
- Lack of amenities
- Provide higher end development housing
- Transportation-travel-location to things (2)
- Broader employment opportunities, not just AG or warehouses
- Growth of crime/lack of enforcement issues
- Communities having to borrow and creating greater obstacles for sustainability
- Not known in other areas
- Floodways/fema
- Small existing labor pool
- Difficulty attracting families from urban to rural areas
- Not much community involvement
- Lack of jobs
- High number of jobless-low income population on public assistance (2)
- Water rights to develop more land for crops for food
- Taxes and lack of incentives (2)
- Infrastructure
- Government regulation
### Needs to expand or develop your business (5)

- Employee training (2)
- Access to capital (3)
- Legislative change for water from Columbia for region
- Street/Façade improvements (3)
- Local government business retention/expansion programs
- Website/Tech upgrades
- Marketing (2)
- Networking with similar businesses and industry associations (2)

### Top Priorities in the next 5 years

#### Umatilla County:
1. Expansion of value added agriculture
2. Return of more local control of land use laws
3. Establishment and expansion of the unmanned aerial vehicle industry
4. Expansion of retail wine industry
5. Return to sustainable forest industry activities (logging, replanting, mills, export)

#### City of Hermiston:
1. Gaining access to additional irrigation water
2. Building infrastructure to deliver additional irrigation water
3. Extending redundant potable water service to the Cook Industrial Site
4. Upgrading wastewater delivery capacity to southern industrial area of town.
5. Fully developing educational programming at the new Eastern Oregon Higher Education Center

#### City of Stanfield:
1. Attracting development to I-84/US395 Interchange in Stanfield.
2. Redevelopment and revitalization of Stanfield Main Street.
3. Increase acreage of industrial zoned lands with access to utilities.

#### City of Echo:
1. Wastewater improvements
2. Housing need 3-4 bedrooms
3. Continued development of downtown, art, etc., to attract visitors and investors
4. Funding to assist entrepreneurs develop railroad and other light industrial/tourist commercial properties.
5. Protect town from flooding/erosion damage/river access

#### City of Umatilla:
1. Old town site agreement with CTUIR
2. Port zoning conflict resolution
3. Downtown revitalization
4. Columbia River Water Right opportunities

#### City of Pendleton:
1. Develop UAV industry (2)
2. Infrastructure to industrial lands (2)
3. Access to federal timber
4. Expanding tourism (2)
5. Access to Columbia water.
6. Local business expansion
7. Workforce housing and training
City of Pilot Rock:
1. Infrastructure
2. Maintaining rail service

City of Milton-Freewater:
1. Keep the economic development moving forward after sunset of URA
2. Retention of local businesses
3. Job creation
4. Protection of, and improvement of utility infrastructure
5. Eradicate blight
6. Fight ODOT when they have a dumb idea
7. Identify and adopt good ideas from across the US
8. Be a leader, not a follower
9. Do the Impossible

City of Athena:
1. Water project
2. Business growth
3. Swimming pool

City of Adams:
1. Public works shop-new construction
2. Street infrastructure
3. Water system improvements-New Well
4. Park and Ballpark improvements
5. City Hall restoration-outside of building

City of Helix:
1. Upgrades to street infrastructure
2. City beautification
3. Park enhancement
4. Encourage additional businesses
5. Flood management

Other Organizations:

Pendleton Chamber of Commerce
1. UAV/UAS Technology
2. Airport Region Development
3. Vendors & Suppliers for local business/industry

Hermiston Chamber of Commerce
1. Ag and agribusiness development
2. Technology and technical infrastructure
3. Matching education to the needs of current and incoming businesses
4. Reasonable power cost for the future

5. Downtown revitalization, infrastructure and attracting new business
6. Eastern Oregon Trade and Event Center
7. Beautification/Signage/Lighting/Expanding trails
8. E-Commerce Zone
9. Education opportunities that provide industry with the qualified work skills they need.

Umatilla Chamber of Commerce:
1. Assistance for undercapitalized businesses

Milton-Freewater Chamber of Commerce/Community Economic Development:
1. Bring in more businesses to our downtown.
2. Have activities that draw people to shop locally.
3. Continue with the projects outlined by Milton-Freewater Downtown Alliance.

Umatilla County Soil & Water Conservation District:
1. Water Development
2. Alternative Cropping-Multi Cropping
3. Unmanned Aerial programs
4. Food processing
5. Port developments

Community Organization:
1. Social and education development of those living in poverty
2. Healthy activities for youth and teens (extreme sports park, ect.)
3. Affordable housing
4. Affordable and accessible child care
5. Targeted job training

Social Services Agency:

CAPECO:
1. Rehabilitation of housing stock
2. Affordable housing development
3. Family wage jobs

Education:
1. Marketing industrial shovel ready land
2. Customized workforce training
3. Access to affordable water & energy
4. Development of infrastructure for support of technology industries including UAV, software.
5. Access more Columbia River water for agricultural expansion.
6. Clear the hurdles to coal transport and gas pipelines through Oregon
7. Mandate the settlement of the Port of Portland labor unrest and start restoring shipping carriers to lower costs for ag export.
8. Re-fund regional economic development funds administered by professional managers like GEODC.
9. Airport industrial area infrastructure
10. Funding for incumbent worker skills training (e.g. EWTF)
11. Land use exceptions for industrial, commercial and residential development
12. Funding of post-secondary technology workforce training
13. Promotion of city and region to industrial site candidates
14. Increase funding to the schools
15. Fund water development and use
16. Value education as an economic driver
17. Capitalize upon hospitality/tourism opportunities
18. Invent new business establishment
19. Create long-term housing plan
20. Eastern Oregon Trade and Event Center completion
21. Development of Camp Umatilla (NG Base on former Chem Depot)
22. Expansion of higher education opportunities

Private and Business Sector:

Businesses:
1. UAV (2)
2. Technical education to support the future jobs
3. Drivers to bring younger generations back to the community
4. Better marketing program on the final recommendations to drive the political agenda
5. Engage political representatives to get them on board with the recommendations
6. Seek commitment from the governor's office for support of the solutions.
7. Housing
8. Jobs
9. Expanding BMCC
10. Bringing green businesses to Pendleton
11. Full spectrum support to help business owners develop upper levels of buildings.
12. Support small and diverse housing projects/not large complexes
13. Education
14. new development and improved tax assessed values
15. Build out of cutting edge communication networks
16. Attract larger groups and corporations to settle in the area
17. Build a sizable convention center
18. CROC Center
19. Development of larger shopping stores (Target, Shopko, etc.)
20. Hermiston; develop the full use of the regional water supply system
21. Echo; Needs to develop the land south of the freeway and add a motel
22. All Counties; need to welcome the wind industry by having an effects tax

Residents:
1. Re-write zoning laws/regulations to fit our needs on the East side of the state.
2. Umatilla Old Town site (which is being worked on)
3. Building owners not taking pride in fixing up their buildings
4. We need a Costco in our area
5. We need a Winco also
6. Good restaurants

Issues Affecting Economic Development in the REGION (36)
- Lack of water (10)
- Forest product restrictions
- Volatility of business Oregon programs affected by legislature-constantly changing
- Entry areas of region might have a positive attraction for lack of sales taxes
- Cooperative collaboration among all entities needs in the region (3)
- Streamlined, proactive, friendlier relationships with federal agencies dealing with economic development in the region
- Funding for infrastructure and housing development (3)
- Lack of marketing
- Difficulty in attracting private developers and investors (4)
- Trying to get regulatory agencies to understand differences between west and east and realize rules should not be 1 size fits all (2)
- Umatilla Chemical Depot Reuse Planning
- Water rights
- Land use (2)
- Cost of transportation
- Access/Ability to use natural resources (3)
- UAS Designation (3)
- Oregon's perception of being unfriendly to business (2)
- Workforce training and workforce housing
- Access to capital (4)
- Lack of industrial/commercial property
- Limits on taxing ability
- Reluctance to try new things from far away
- Failure to strive for excellence
- Limited voice in State affairs
- Counterproductive fiscal conservatism
- State regulations
- Lack of progressiveness
- All talk little action
- Lack of family wage jobs (2)
- Limited ability for young workers to get jobs (2)
- Limited focus by region to expand beyond current activities
- Expensive housing
- Housing (8)
Skilled workforce (9)  
Infrastructure for businesses (4)  
Improved transportation infrastructure  
Lack of incentives  
Regulatory processes (2)  
Industry diversity—need more tech related industry  
Un-capitalized businesses  
Affordable living  
Food distribution  
Childcare  
Education  
Location  
Environmental concerns, relating to coal transport  
Industrial development  
Mental health care resources (2)  
Reduced state investment in rural workforce development  
Out-migration of talented youth (2)  
Businesses with low academic expectations to keep costs down  
Inability to retain high wage earners  
No destination identity  
Growth of population  
Economic support  
Ignorance  
Aging generation of business and property owners  
Information technology  
Urban/area renewal  
Zoning laws and regulations  
No sales tax

Needs to expand or develop your business (16)

Business planning/counseling (3)  
Access to capital (10)  
Marketing (7)  
Employee training (5)  
Local government business retention/expansion programs (7)  
Website/Tech upgrades (2)  
Street/Façade improvements (4)  
Networking with similar businesses and industry associations  
Help with Licenses/Permits/Regulations (4)  
Fund post-secondary career education and workforce training  
Business friendly state agencies  
State agencies that must consider the effects on the economy before enacting rules and regulations  
Need the county to rezone low quality EFU land to light industrial need to the freeway

Other Jurisdictions Top Priorities in the next 5 years (5)

Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR):
1. Workforce housing
2. Wanapa Industrial Site Infrastructure
3. Tribal Education Center
4. Tribal Health Center
5. Overall Infrastructure Development

Burns Paiute Tribe:
1. Develop a business plan
2. Re-open casino
3. Start 8a or llc for other businesses

Statewide Agencies:

Oregon Employment Department:
1. Development of housing, particularly in Morrow County.
2. Short term training designed to prepare workers for high tech manufacturing jobs.

Associated Oregon Loggers, Inc:
1. Blue Mountain National Forest Plan
2. Columbia River water development
3. Regulatory relief on ports, rail, highway, airport, utility, internet.
4. Community college distance education to rural areas
5. K-12 vocation-technical trade education improvement.

Walla Walla Basin Watershed Council:
1. Water infrastructure
2. Community Attractiveness

Issues Affecting Economic Development in the REGION (6)

Stagnant population growth  
Aging population  
Lack of political influence/support (2)  
The resources for business development are few  
Employment (2)  
Training workforce (2)  
Opportunities for new businesses  
Availability of additional infrastructure  
Workforce housing  
Redevelopment of Umatilla Army Depot
- Unmanned aerial systems opportunities
- Limited diversity of industry
- Limited water availability
- Broken federal forest policy
- Punitive federal & state water policy
- Bad fed/state environmental limits on water, air, transport, utility
- Government limits on port, rail, highway, airport, utility, internet

**Needs to expand or develop your business (4)**

- Access to capital (3)
- Website/Tech upgrades (2)
- Street/Façade improvements (2)
- Business planning/counseling
- Local government business retention/expansion programs
- Help with Licenses/Permits/Regulations
- Access to more timber, water, energy
- Regulatory relief on environmental limits
- Workforce that has employment security
### CEDS 2014

**Greater Eastern Oregon Development Corporation**

#### Strategy Committee & Public Meetings Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy Committee Meetings Dates</th>
<th><strong>CEDS - 1st Round Public Meetings</strong></th>
<th>Date</th>
<th><strong>CEDS - 2nd Round Public Meetings</strong></th>
<th>Date</th>
<th><strong>CEDS - 3rd Round Public Meetings</strong></th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25-Mar</td>
<td>M-F Community Dev Partners</td>
<td>27-Feb</td>
<td>M-F Community Dev Partners</td>
<td>26-Jun</td>
<td>John Day</td>
<td>8-Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Apr</td>
<td>Ontario Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>3-Mar</td>
<td>Ontario Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>21-Jul</td>
<td>Vale</td>
<td>20-Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29-May</td>
<td>Morrow County Citizens Ec Dev Taskforce</td>
<td>4-Mar</td>
<td>Morrow County Citizens Ec Dev Taskforce</td>
<td>1-Jul</td>
<td>Boardman</td>
<td>21-Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-Jul</td>
<td>Roundup City Dev Corp</td>
<td>17-Mar</td>
<td>Roundup City Dev Corp</td>
<td>15-Jul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Sep</td>
<td>Hermiston Rotary</td>
<td>27-Mar</td>
<td>Hermiston Rotary</td>
<td>24-Jul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-Oct</td>
<td>Arlington Chamber</td>
<td>31-Mar</td>
<td>Arlington Chamber</td>
<td>30-Jun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-Nov</td>
<td>Burns</td>
<td>2-Apr</td>
<td>Burns</td>
<td>2-Jul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Day</td>
<td>3-Apr</td>
<td>Condon</td>
<td>16-Jul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Condon</td>
<td>8-Apr</td>
<td>Ontario Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>21-Jul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pendleion Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>16-Apr</td>
<td>Vale Chamber</td>
<td>22-Jul</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vale Chamber</td>
<td>22-Apr</td>
<td>Boardman Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>21-May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Strategy Committee Meetings Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CEDS - 1st Round Public Meetings</strong></th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boardman Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>21-May</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CEDS - 2nd Round Public Meetings</strong></th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ione Community &amp; Agri Business Org. (ICABO)</td>
<td>12-Jun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CEDS - 3rd Round Public Meetings</strong></th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant County/Mt Vernon Economic Dev Group - Wheeler Cnty / Spray</td>
<td>31-Jul</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CEDS - 3rd Round Public Meetings</strong></th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boardman Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>22-Jul</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Greater Eastern Oregon District

**Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy 2014**

**Regional Projects Prioritization Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prioritization Criteria</th>
<th>Higher Priority will be Given to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Impact</strong></td>
<td>Projects impacting a larger portion of the Region rather than a single community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Impact</strong></td>
<td>Projects demonstrating or with potential for job growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects demonstrating job retention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects enhancing economic diversification, business expansion or economic growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects demonstrating improvement to economic conditions, regional/community conditions, or improves standard of living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Availability of Funding Sources</strong></td>
<td>Projects with a higher degree of local match funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project with other potential funding sources committed or identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Projects that qualify for EDA funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Alignment with EDA Priorities</strong></td>
<td>Project serves/improves Economic Distressed and Underserved Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project demonstrates Collaborative Regional Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project demonstrates Public / Private Partnerships and/or National Strategic Partnerships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project demonstrates Environmentally Sustainable Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project demonstrates Global Competitiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Readiness to Proceed</strong></td>
<td>Projects that are ready to start immediately</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Regional Partners - CEDS 2014 - 2019

**Greater Eastern Oregon Development Corporation District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morrow</td>
<td>Morrow County Citizens Economic Development Task Force</td>
<td>Carla Mclane</td>
<td>541-922-4624</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cmclane@co.morrow.or.us">cmclane@co.morrow.or.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willow Creek Valley Economic Development Group (WCVEDG)</td>
<td>Sheryll Bates</td>
<td>541-676-5536</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heppner Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Sheryll Bates</td>
<td>541-676-5536</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boardman Chamber</td>
<td>Diane Wolf</td>
<td>541-481-3014</td>
<td><a href="mailto:diane@boardmanchamber.org">diane@boardmanchamber.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ione Community and Agricultural Business Organization</td>
<td>Russell Seewald</td>
<td>541-422-7466</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rseewald@beobank.com">rseewald@beobank.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irrigon Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Phylis Danielson</td>
<td>541-922-3857</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pdanielson@live.com">pdanielson@live.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant</td>
<td>GREAT</td>
<td>King Williams</td>
<td>541-575-0547</td>
<td><a href="mailto:king.kinginc@gmail.com">king.kinginc@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grant County Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Sharon Mogg</td>
<td>541-575-0547</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gcadmin@gcoregonlive.com">gcadmin@gcoregonlive.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grant County Economic Development</td>
<td>Sally Bartlett</td>
<td>541-575-1555</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gced@centurytel.net">gced@centurytel.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grant County Economic Council</td>
<td>Les Zaitz</td>
<td>541-421-3031</td>
<td><a href="mailto:leszaitz@gmail.com">leszaitz@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler</td>
<td>Wheeler County Economic Development</td>
<td>Commissioner Anne Mitchell</td>
<td>541-763-2370</td>
<td><a href="mailto:amitchell@co.wheeler.or.us">amitchell@co.wheeler.or.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OPLI/ Mitchell</td>
<td>Bonnie Lofton</td>
<td>541-462-3263 after 4:30 p.m.</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bonnie.g.lofton@gmail.com">bonnie.g.lofton@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilliam</td>
<td>Gilliam County</td>
<td>Michelle Colby</td>
<td>541-384-3767</td>
<td><a href="mailto:michelle.colby@co.gilliam.or.us">michelle.colby@co.gilliam.or.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arlington Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Regional Partners - CEDS 2014 - 2019

**Greater Eastern Oregon Development Corporation District**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Representative</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Malheur</td>
<td>Malheur County Economic Development</td>
<td>Greg Smith</td>
<td>866-989-8012</td>
<td><a href="mailto:malheurcountyedc@gmail.com">malheurcountyedc@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Snake River</td>
<td>Kit Kamo</td>
<td>208-230-5214</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kkamo@tvcc.cc">kkamo@tvcc.cc</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treasure Valley CC/Small Business</td>
<td>Andrea Testi</td>
<td>541-881-5761</td>
<td><a href="mailto:atesti@tvcc.cc">atesti@tvcc.cc</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ontario Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>John Breidenback</td>
<td>541-889-8012/208</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ceo@ontariochamber.com">ceo@ontariochamber.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nyssa Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vale Chamber of Co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harney</td>
<td>Harney County Chamber</td>
<td>Chelsea Harrison</td>
<td>541-573-2636</td>
<td><a href="mailto:director@harneycounty.com">director@harneycounty.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Harney County Economic Development Group</td>
<td>Randy Fulton</td>
<td>541-589-3994</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ranful71@yahoo.com">ranful71@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umatilla</td>
<td>City of Pendleton</td>
<td>Steve Chrisman</td>
<td>541-276-7754</td>
<td><a href="mailto:steve.chrisman@ci.pendleton.or.us">steve.chrisman@ci.pendleton.or.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Round up City Economic Development</td>
<td>Mike Short</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mshort@beobank.com">mshort@beobank.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pendleton Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Gail Nelson/Adrienne Lapp</td>
<td><a href="mailto:info@pendletonchamber.org">info@pendletonchamber.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City of Milton Freewater Economic</td>
<td>Mike Watkins</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mike.watkins@milton-freewater-or.gov">mike.watkins@milton-freewater-or.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Cheryl York</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mffndfrog@mfchamber.org">mffndfrog@mfchamber.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Milton-Freewater Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Umatilla Chamber of Commerce</td>
<td>Karen Hutchinson-Talaski</td>
<td><a href="mailto:karen@umatillachamber.net">karen@umatillachamber.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Umatilla County Economic Development</td>
<td>Hulette Johnson</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hjohnson@umatillacounty.net">hjohnson@umatillacounty.net</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Port of Umatilla</td>
<td>Kim Puzey</td>
<td>541-922-3224</td>
<td>kimpuzey@uscinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTUIR</td>
<td>Business Development Services</td>
<td>Kathleen Flanagan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kathleen.flanagan@wildhorseresort.com">kathleen.flanagan@wildhorseresort.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nixyaawaini Chamber</td>
<td>Dana Quaempts</td>
<td>541-966-8336</td>
<td><a href="mailto:DanaQuaempts@ctuir.org">DanaQuaempts@ctuir.org</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Private Sector Representatives (51% or >)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob Levy</td>
<td>L &amp; L Farms</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Docsavage</td>
<td>Ochoco Lumber / Malheur Lumber co</td>
<td>Regional Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rex Storm</td>
<td>Assoc of Oregon Loggers Inc</td>
<td>Forest Policy Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan McDonald</td>
<td>Wtechlink</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shane Clayson</td>
<td>Pioneer Hybrid Seed</td>
<td>Dir R&amp;D</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadye Drury</td>
<td>Seven Hills - Grape Growers</td>
<td>Viticulturist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Kazele</td>
<td>Watermill Winery</td>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sloan Kimball</td>
<td>Pendleton Grain Growers (PGG)</td>
<td>Corp. Financial Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kara Wilson</td>
<td>John Day River Territory / Wilson Family Ranch</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Representatives of Other Economic Interests (49% or <)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Public Sector</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Grasty</td>
<td>Harney County</td>
<td>Judge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Houk</td>
<td>City of Pendleton</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike McLoughlan</td>
<td>City of Vale</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cam Preus</td>
<td>Blue Mountain Community College</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Mitchell</td>
<td>Port of Arlington</td>
<td>Economic Dev Dir</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Morgan</td>
<td>City of Hermiston</td>
<td>Asst City Manager</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Seamans</td>
<td>Confederated Tribe Umatilla Indian Reserv.</td>
<td>Economic Planner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Fairley</td>
<td>Governor’s Office - Regional Coordinator</td>
<td>Non-Voting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Occupation of Member</th>
<th>Phone Numbers</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sally Bartlett</td>
<td>Economic Development Coordinator</td>
<td>541-575-1555 Phone</td>
<td>230 E. Main, John Day, OR 97845</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sally.bartlett@geodc.com">sally.bartlett@geodc.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>Grant County Economic Coordinator</td>
<td>541-575-1559 Fax</td>
<td>224 S Broadway, Burns, OR 97720</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sbuentener@burns.or.us">sbuentener@burns.or.us</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant County</td>
<td>Development Department</td>
<td></td>
<td>PO Box 65, Prairie City, OR 97639</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Bailey</td>
<td>CEO/President</td>
<td>541-676-9125 Phone</td>
<td>530 E. Main PO Box 656 Prairie City 97869-Home Preferred</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-President</td>
<td>Bank of Eastern Oregon</td>
<td>541-676-5501 Fax</td>
<td>541-573-8387 Fax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>PO Box 39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Runnels</td>
<td>Owner-Figaro’s Pizza</td>
<td>541-573-5500 Phone</td>
<td>541-573-5300 Phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary-Treasurer</td>
<td>Harney County Commissioner</td>
<td>216 SE 4th Street</td>
<td>216 SE 4th Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harney County</td>
<td>1100 N Diamond</td>
<td></td>
<td>Heppner, OR 97836</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge Terry Tallman</td>
<td>Morrow County Judge</td>
<td>541-676-5251 Phone</td>
<td>541-676-5251 Phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrow County</td>
<td>PO Box 788</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pendleton, OR 97801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne C. Mitchell</td>
<td>Owner-John Day Territory Ent., LLC</td>
<td>541-763-2912 Phone</td>
<td>541-763-2912 Phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler County</td>
<td>Wheeler County Commissioner</td>
<td>541-256-0551 Cell</td>
<td>Fossil, OR 97830</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holette Johnson</td>
<td>Economic Development Director</td>
<td>541-763-2026 Phone</td>
<td>541-763-2026 Phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umatilla County</td>
<td>Commissioner</td>
<td>541-256-0551 Cell</td>
<td>541-256-0551 Cell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge Dan Joyce</td>
<td>Malheur County Judge</td>
<td>541-473-5124</td>
<td>251 “B” Street West #5 Vale, OR 97148</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malheur County</td>
<td>City Manager</td>
<td>541-473-5168</td>
<td>541-473-5168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peggy Gray</td>
<td>City Manager</td>
<td>541-575-0509 Phone</td>
<td>541-575-0509 Phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Cities</td>
<td>City of John Day</td>
<td>541-575-3668 Fax</td>
<td>541-575-3668 Fax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor Dale Thompson</td>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>541-384-2711 Phone</td>
<td>541-384-2711 Phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilliam Cities</td>
<td>City of Condon</td>
<td>541-384-2700 Fax</td>
<td>541-384-2700 Fax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robb Corbett</td>
<td>City Manager</td>
<td>541-966-0201 Phone</td>
<td>541-966-0201 Phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Pendleton</td>
<td>City of Pendleton</td>
<td>541-966-0213 Fax</td>
<td>541-966-0213 Fax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Morgan</td>
<td>Admin. Assistant City of Hermiston</td>
<td></td>
<td>500 SW Dorson St. Pendleton, OR 97801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hermiston</td>
<td>180 NE 2nd</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hermiston, OR 97838</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Cutsforth</td>
<td>City Manager</td>
<td>541-676-9618 Phone</td>
<td>541-676-9618 Phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrow Cities</td>
<td>City of Hermiston</td>
<td>541-676-9601 Fax</td>
<td>541-676-9601 Fax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO Box 756</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>541-676-9601 Fax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heppner, OR 97836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>541-676-9601 Fax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Greater Eastern Oregon Development Corporation
2014 Board of Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Board Member</th>
<th>Occupation of Member</th>
<th>Phone Numbers</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dauna Wensenk</td>
<td>City Clerk</td>
<td>541-573-5255 Phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harney Cities</td>
<td>City of Burns</td>
<td>541-573-5622 Fax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>PO Box 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Hill</td>
<td>City Manager</td>
<td>541-938-8242 Phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Milton-Freewater</td>
<td>City of Milton-Freewater</td>
<td>541-938-8224 Fax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor</td>
<td>PO Box 542</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pilot Rock, OR 97868</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Tovey</td>
<td>Finance Officer</td>
<td>541-276-3875 Phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla</td>
<td>Umatilla Indian Reservation</td>
<td>541-454-0144 Fax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Mitchell</td>
<td>Port Manager</td>
<td>541-276-3262 Fax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of Arlington</td>
<td>Economic Development Officer</td>
<td>541-454-0144 Fax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Manager</td>
<td>City of Heppner</td>
<td>541-676-9650 Phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen Hendricks</td>
<td>Controller</td>
<td>541-481-6786 Phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of Morrow</td>
<td>541-481-2679 Fax</td>
<td></td>
<td>541-481-2679 Fax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of Arlington</td>
<td>Port of Arlington</td>
<td>541-573-2323 Fax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Manager</td>
<td>541-938-8242 Phone</td>
<td></td>
<td>541-938-8242 Phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Puzey</td>
<td>Port of Umatilla</td>
<td>541-938-8242 Phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of Umatilla</td>
<td>541-938-8242 Phone</td>
<td></td>
<td>541-938-8242 Phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald Eppenbach</td>
<td>Retired City Manager</td>
<td>541-367-3360 Phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>541-364-0026 Fax</td>
<td></td>
<td>541-364-0026 Fax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy Hamby</td>
<td>Vice President</td>
<td>541-476-1706 Fax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Manager</td>
<td>541-276-4111 Phone</td>
<td></td>
<td>541-276-4111 Phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna Kinnaman</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>541-276-3390 Phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umatilla Tribes</td>
<td>Port of Umatilla</td>
<td>541-573-2323 Fax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of Heppner</td>
<td>Umatilla Indian Reservation</td>
<td>541-454-0144 Fax</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheryll Bates</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>541-676-5536 Phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port of Umatilla</td>
<td>Port of Umatilla</td>
<td>541-276-3390 Phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Seams</td>
<td>Economic Planner</td>
<td>541-429-7479 Phone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At Large</td>
<td>541-429-7479 Phone</td>
<td></td>
<td>541-429-7479 Phone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>