

CFED - Vermont -- October 10, 2007 9am - 4:00pm
- Woodbury College, Montpelier, VT-
Final - As approved 11-11-07

Meeting Minutes
[to do for next meeting in color]

Members Present: Barbara Grimes, Will Patten, Mary Niebling, Bill Botzow, Hinda Miller, Dan Kurzman, Kevin Dorn, Hope Crifo, David Mount, Mary Lintermann (11a-4p) and Staige Davis (by phone - 11a-noon).

Absent: Fred Kenney

This meeting was taped by ORCA and a DVD record of the meeting is available from CFED.

Opening and basic business

9:20 - Opening and Welcome by Rep. Bill Botzow (Acting Meeting Chair)

-Requested permission from the Commission to act as Chair for the meeting in the absence of an appointed Chair (unanimous assent).

- Basic business

- Membership changes

There are now two vacancies waiting for appointments by the Governor. After last meeting Carl Spangler announced his resignation due to work commitments that would take him out of the country regularly. The opening created by the resignation of Dawn Terrill in August has not been filled. A new Chair (also a gubernatorial appointment) has not been designated.

The Commission decided that the appointment of a Vice-chair once the new official chair is appointed would be beneficial to create a leadership team and have a back-up.

The Commission also discussed the renewal of a committee structure starting with a finance committee so that there is a more regular check in and understanding of the resources available.

-Review of Minutes from September 10.

Approved unanimously as submitted (moved: Miller; second: Niebling)

Request for future draft minutes to be submitted as soon as possible after the meeting in the future.

Goals of the Meeting

1. Agreement on an initial draft of a vision statement
2. A CFED Plan outline and directional areas of agreement established
3. A letter report to the legislature - outline and agreement to produce
4. A work plan for moving CFED ahead over the next 9 months

Acceptance of agenda and meeting goals. - Unanimous - (moved: Mount; second: Patten)

Vision Statement Discussion

VISION STATEMENT DRAFT (SEE ATTACHED)

The Snelling Center presented a one page vision statement for the Commission's consideration and a one page set of definitions on Economic Development. The statements were derived from earlier work of the Commission (December 06; Summer survey; meeting discussions) and the SCG attempted to derive an initial draft as a working paper for the Commission.

Comments and discussion:

(MN) - Need to focus attention on the beneficiaries and actors of economic development activity - people.

(HM) - The vision should acknowledge Vermont's strengths. We need to make the statement about Vermont, not just about what successful economic development is - generic to any state.

-The vision should hone in on localism - production of food, energy, etc., for local consumption; and we should value local enterprise and markets (internal market production) as much as export market production.

-Universal health care is an essential ingredient in successful economic development.

- We should call for more than efficient transportation, we need real public transportation and transportation hubs.

-

(WP) - The customers for ED services and activities are the people of Vermont, not businesses.

- The outcome should be healthy communities.

- Many business dollars are now going to supporting people's needs, employee needs; in many ways replacing the functions of the state to ensure that people have health care, child care, flex time, etc.

(BG) - We need to get our ideas out but should assign a small team to do the next draft.

(MN) - "Rural" needs a focus and strong mention.

(BG) - Mention of wages: above what average - Vermont is below the national average now; need a different metric than rising up to national average.

- Housing needs a key mention. It is certainly not affordable for many in Chittenden county, even those earning competitive wages above the "living wage". Having good affordable living situations for people is key to attracting and retaining.

(HM) - Health care and affordable housing need to be called out as specifics. The vision should be about specifics - not soft.

(Charlie Smith) - If we are successful in Healthcare, childcare, affordable housing, etc., do we know that these initiatives directly lead to success in economic development?

(KD) - A focus just on Healthcare, childcare, affordable housing, etc. does not directly lead to success in economic development. Economic development is about people, eventually, but we need to keep the focus on creating successful opportunities for creating jobs. Businesses create jobs. We need to focus on other costs that are impacting the success of business such as worker's comp and electric energy rates.

(DM) - Health care is a national issue, not a state issue.

- Need to focus on factors facing businesses here, diminishing growth and ability to prosper.

(WP) - Need to support businesses in their key issues:

Healthcare, workers comp, energy costs, property taxes

(KD) -The vision should offer us a 90,000 foot view. Goals, programs and activities are what we employ to address more specifics. Our strategies are about how we achieve the vision of what we want. Hard to universal health care in a vision statement as it is not a goal of economic development, it can be presented as a strategy to support businesses.

(HM) - We should be able to speak to the cost factors for businesses arising from key areas such as health care. Can't we create the right language on the vision level?

(KD) - ?Such as: Vermont as a competitive economic environment - where significant cost factors for business are comparable to other regions.

(BB) - Need to keep the focus on the vision statement. The first sentence of the draft should not be conditional ("If"). Need to keep it positive, future oriented and declarative.

- As we read it we need to think "If we replace Vermont with the name of any other state, would it still work?" (avoid being too generic). Our statement should be one unique as possible to Vermont contrasting us to other states.

(Charlie Smith) - I believe the Commission wants to keep this a short statement, not a laundry list, and one that many different economic actors (the farmer, the local home builder, the multinational CEO, the arts organization, the college, the hospital, the new entrepreneur, etc.) can see themselves or their interests reflected in and respected.

(BB) - Needs to be a declaration of the ethos of the Vermont economy. We need to state the END in an open, but not too open a way.

(WP) - I would feel better if we switched the primary and tertiary categories listed in the definition of economic development so that the tertiary goals are primary.

(HC) - It is essential to mention the creation of wealth through workforce development activities.

- We should look at the balance between what is needed to attract good workers and what is needed to retain good workers.

- People need to have access to the service and tools to be educated to innovate and be entrepreneurial.

(HM) - We need to make decisions on where to put resources in economic development; how to prioritize; need clarity and a definition.

- Along with entrepreneurial skills and support we also need seed capital.

(MN) - We have to start thinking of the activities of Economic Development more as a 3-D picture than a hierarchical listing or chart.

(BB) - We need to create a new statement from this discussion so we can bring it back for more work and comment, not a final version.

(WP) - The public would respond well to the idea that health care is considered part of the economic development infrastructure.

DECISION: Take input and re-craft a new vision statement for further discussion in November.

Will Patten and Dave Mount will work with the Snelling Center to produce a new version.

The new draft will be generated quickly and sent around for comment by email.

Comments will be assembled and a possible second re-write will be done by the next meeting.

VISION STATEMENT -DEFINITIONS OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT - DRAFT (SEE ATTACHED)

There is no single or comprehensive definition of what is meant by "economic development" in the charge to the commission or other state documents reviewed. Attempting to establish a definition was deemed an important step by the SCG in advancing the Commission's conversations and ability to establish a vision, identify activities and set priorities. The definition was presented and activities related to economic development were organized as "primary" "secondary" and "tertiary" (see attached for explanation).

Comments and discussion:

(WP) - If communities are our greatest asset for economic development, and the infrastructure that supports them, then should not investments in community infrastructure, currently labeled "tertiary" really be primary?

(Charlie Smith) -The definition was organized to try and provide a way of sorting activities and strategies so that we do not have to name the whole state budget as an "economic development" budget.

(HM) - Support of higher education should be a primary activity.

(HC) - Is economic development only those activities directed at businesses and employers?

(Charlie Smith) - For us to get a handle on this, we need to bring a sorting scheme together so that we can bring appropriate focus to the work. The importance will be on how we make the connections between different layers of activities and how we define those connections.

(KD) - Need to draw a line around what we call economic development.

(BG) - need to bring in federal monies somehow. They are too big to ignore (CDBG, EDA)

-strike the primary, secondary, tertiary levels and come up with a new scheme to organize and create distinctions so that a prioritization exercise is possible.

CFED's outline of goals and outline of the VEPC Plan. How do we merge them?

The background for this discussion was provided by the Snelling Center. The Commission had decided in September to use the VEPC 2002 plan update as a departure point for structuring a new plan going forward. The Commission had developed six key planning points and these were presented side-by side with the outline of the VEPC plan. [SEE ATTACHED} The idea is to use this to generate ideas and create a new outline for a future plan that CFED would own. The goal is to understand better what the key components of a future 5-year economic development plan will be and then design the rest of the work of CFED around getting to that. Having a plan outline will also allow the Commission to better organize past and future materials that are gathered, including public input so that the final plan and reports will be more easily generated. The idea of the outline is also that it will provide for the better design of a creative and organized process for stakeholder and public dialogue and participation and input.

(BG) Where does public participation fit in? Do we consider any of the process to date public participation?

(BB) The commission did a lot of early listening. We need to be able to organize our ideas in a format that allows for creative public input.

(Charlie Smith) - Do you want to ask the public for their "hopes and dreams" or ask them to respond to and engage with more developed thinking that offers them a framework that can still be shaped and directed?

(HM) The plan and approach needs to be succinct and connected to future funding for ongoing work. The plan needs to explain public engagement.

Initial Plan Outline:

1) **VISION:** Distill a positive and realistic vision for how Vermont's economy can grow, improve, change, and support broad-based, sustainable economic prosperity and quality of life in the global economy (If Vermont's economy is healthy and growing Vermont will look like ____);

2) **GOALS:** Set specific economic development goals with directional benchmarks; a measurement process with reporting and evaluation processes built in. Identify and focus intensively on the top strategic leverage points (sectors of current or future comparative advantage) where the investment of the limited public resources can make the greatest difference in achieving the vision for strategic economic development;

3) **STRENGTHS / AREAS OF COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE:** Identify Vermont's strengths and existing sectors of "comparative advantage", where in Vermont is already well-positioned with respect to the vision and goals;

4) **ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK:** Have a strategic overview of contiguous activities (connected and related to economic development, but not strictly ED) that have an impact on Vermont communities. (e.g., transportation investments, broadband, Building Bright Futures).

5) **KEY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT POLICY AREAS:** Recommend public policies to guide, encourage, and reduce barriers to progress towards the vision.

6) **KEY RECOMMENDATIONS ON SPECIFIC PROGRAMS AND ACTIVITIES**

Getting to public engagement:

The plan should be a formative and emergent document that affords the public a number of appropriate opportunities to weigh in at strategic points in its development.

CFED should be able to develop more fully developed sections including a draft vision, an outline of strengths and areas of competitive advantage, and an overview of the framework of contiguous activities. One level of public engagement should be set up to float these sections. With this input the Commission can be looking at the specific strategic leverage points, refine goals, and develop both policy areas and specific program and activity recommendations.

October Letter Report to Legislature and Directional Areas of Agreement

The Commission needs to submit a letter report to the legislature in the next few weeks. It has been delayed now due to the lack of a Chair.

(HM) Are there recommendations we can make to the legislature now?

Areas to possibly incorporate:

- Incentives: Need for a study on how to account for incentives on both the expense and income sides of the balance sheet.
- VEGI incentives are capped annually and have a 5 year window before sunseting - no need for immediate action.
- Green Economy - outcomes of August meeting; branding; focus

Are there other directional items to add?

The October Letter Report Outline

- Brief history of the Commission and its work, as well as its organizational challenges and successes (attachment with listing of all groups and individuals (and their topics) who have contributed to the Commission and spoken before it; listing of reports gathered and reviewed, activities undertaken)
- An outline of the 5 year plan development process
 - grounding efforts in the past work of the VEPC planning process
 - a projection of how this might be used by the legislature
 - why will this be useful in legislative deliberations
 - understand the nature of the state's \$35M leverage in the ED budget
 - vision, goals, benchmarks
 - connection to broader state activity that impacts Economic Development
(workforce development, Next Generation funding, affordable housing, telecommunications...)

- Schedule of activity areas for furthering the work: plan development; public engagement; research; final products
- Overview of the Commission's work once a 5-year plan has been recommended
- Request to come before the appropriate committees of jurisdiction in January/March for reporting out and discussion

DECISION: With the Snelling Center, Bill Botzow, Mary Lintermann and Hinda Miller will write the letter. Hinda and Bill will sign the letter on behalf of the Commission.

Lunch and Panel discussion with BYOBiz Program at Champlain College

<http://www.champlain.edu/byobiz/>

Champlain College's BYOBiz program is a unique opportunity for you as a student entrepreneur to bring the business you've started -- or the business you're thinking about starting -- to college with you.

-Robert Bloch, Program Director

The Commission received an invitation to meet at Champlain College and have a direct session with students in the program in the spring.

[Commissioners present after Lunch:

Barbara Grimes, Will Patten, Mary Niebling, Bill Botzow, Dan Kurzman, Kevin Dorn, David Mount, Mary Lintermann

Discussion: Review of VEPC plan components from 2002 as initial framework on which to build

Deferred this discussion until November. Send out again as a work document for Commissioners to work on and facilitate discussion on items at next meeting.

Building the work plan

Public engagement

Suggestion that as part of the public engagement work CFED should look to other recent and current processes that brought in public input and participation to key questions that overlap with CFED's agenda. These might include, Building Bright Futures, VCRD's rural energy economy, the E-State/Broadband Council, the Next Generation Commission, VTrans Long Range Strategic Planning Process, the Creative Economy Conference, DPS Vermont Energy Future Deliberative Polling Process and the new VCRD process on the Future of Vermont.

The Snelling Center will compile and organize the findings relevant to CFED, and summarize the public input.

While the Commission has heard from a number of stakeholder groups, businesses and some individuals, a full public engagement process needs to be built into its next steps. The Commission needs to determine what framework is appropriate to bring out to what publics to offer them the best chance to constructively engage with the process and provide comments and feedback to enrich the deliberative process of the commission.

The Commission agreed that there should be multiple portals for public comment. The website is currently static - information posted for people to retrieve. There is a comment form. The website offers an opportunity for more interaction. The Snelling Center suggested considering a combination of E-surveys and blogging or posting opportunities to receive direct feedback on concept pieces (such as the Vision statement and definitions)

The web site is currently housed at:

www.snellingcenter.org/cfed

Taking the Snelling Center's initial concept of 12 meetings around the state, utilizing the RDC division of the state (see attached concept), the Commission discussed the potential of getting out to the public with a process similar to what was organized for the legislature in their 2005 health care reform public process. This would involve connection with regional partners in the 12 areas to help organize, promote and run the programs for the Commission under the facilitation of the Snelling Center. Doing 12 outreach efforts would also allow the Commission to draw input from around the state in a comprehensive way. It was initially suggested that the Commission do an initial process of six geographically diverse meetings, digest it and take new material out to the public in a second round. After discussion the Commission decided it was best to compress the process, do the outreach as a full block, and link meetings to simplify logistics for staffing and participation of Commissioners. To do 12 meetings the Commission will need to split into sub groups to make sure there is a core presence at each meeting.

To start the process the Commission needs to have a clear idea of what questions it wants to ask, what information and frameworks will help the public to prepare and focus input, and how this input can be compiled and brought back to the Commission so it most fully informs the process.

(BB) The process needs to be simple but elegant. It does not need to be complex, or as full as the health care events, but very focused.

The Snelling Center should develop a fuller proposal and budget for such an effort.

Process Outline:

- Initial outreach to secure partners and their participation
- Set schedule, and build in early evaluation of process so necessary changes can be made
- Promotion
- Conduct events
- Tape event for airing on cable access - coordinate airing schedule with follow-up outreach to regions
- Create an open web forum for attendees at each event to continue to comment during a specific period
- Have tools available so attendees can pass them on to others who could not attend
- Engage local press and other outlets to pass on information and connection to ways to comment
- Have specific closing dates for input from each regional effort
- Compile materials from each region; aggregate materials statewide
- Have a response mechanism so that everyone who participated hears directly back from the Commission - what was heard; with an option to comment further on that compilation
- Conclude with summary and analysis of public input

Starting Point:

March 4 Town meeting - Use as an opportunity to promote (announcement and survey?) and engage all legislators as they return to their districts during town meeting break.

Between Town meeting and the scheduled March 17 Commission meeting, run the first 3-4 programs, so that all Commissioners can participate in one outreach effort and the process can be evaluated. Between March 17 and April 21 (the next Commission meeting) attempt to complete the process of meetings.

Process

How to make it doable, provide guidance without restricting input, collect data and organize it so that it is useful to the Commission? How to target participants to get diversity and keep the process open? Should this be coordinated at all with VCRD's project and outreach on "The Future of Vermont"?

Questions for the public - they need to be open-ended enough for people to freely comment and feel heard, but focused on the work as the Commission is defining it. Should be available in multiple venues (meetings, web, etc.).

For November the Snelling Center will provide a plan and budget for the Public Engagement process.

Mary N and Mary L will serve as a sub group to do a preliminary review and comment on the process prior to it being submitted to the Commission for the November meeting.

CFED Operations and Work plan for the next 9 months

Budget:

Request updated expense report from ACCD.

Re-institute a finance committee work group to monitor

Get budgets for the public engagement process.

Research:

The legislation laid out six areas of research for CFED to consider along side their deliberations.

(1) The cost effectiveness of targeted business incentive grants as a tool of state economic development work

(2) The cost effectiveness of non-monetary business aid such as permit and regulatory assistance or other assistance and increased development of infrastructure.

(3) Whether targeting incentives to regions of a state with high unemployment, low wages, or other indications of need for economic development and job creation work to better advance long term economic development goals.

(4) The role and importance of tax policies in state economic development efforts. What tax policies tend to place businesses at a competitive disadvantage and how best to address these policies and mitigate their effects.

(5) The types of postsecondary institution expansion of development which would attract research and technology firms.

(6) The advantages and disadvantages of privatizing all or a portion of economic development functions of a state. Examples from other states.

Questions 1-4 are on incentives

-What is the experience businesses have had?

-Ask Fred and Kevin to respond as a starting point?

Question 5 is a good question to throw to UVM for an initial response.

Question 6 is low priority and can best be served by a lit review initially.

SCG will advance the research; look at the literature; contact the New England Public Policy Center (Boston Fed) <http://www.bos.frb.org/economic/neppc> to see what assistance they might offer.

Meetings:

January - Monday the 7th - we will look at one or more key presentations for this meeting.

February - Monday the 4th - meeting will focus on the public engagement process

Revisit the 9-4 full day meeting schedule

Notes on possible topics for future meeting sessions:

1. Understanding tax incentives

Review of current Vermont programs

Summary of critiques of current programs and approaches

Discussion among members: What is the efficacy of tax credit and / or cash incentives for business “creation, attraction, expansion, and retention”? Should incentives be more targeted? Can accountability be ensured?

2. Presentation on: “the Unified Economic Development Budget”.

Discussion among members: DED and partner priorities; typology of economic development expenditures; allocation of primary ED resources; program performance indicators.

3. Presentation on: “social infrastructure and economic development areas - drawing linkages - understanding connections in state government”; these could include Building Bright Futures, VTrans Long Range Plan, the E-State Initiative; Catamount Health (and health care reform); reauthorization of Reach-Up, VHCB (as pivot position for affordable housing).

Discussion among members: What is the appropriate linkage between the CFED economic development plan and these other, related initiatives? How deeply should the CFED plan reach into secondary and tertiary ED areas?

4. Discussion with large employers with an out-of-state corporate decision making body. These tend to be companies with a large economic footprint who can be found in almost all regions of the state. Their primary emphasis is on "value-adding" "dollar importing" scopes. E.g., in Chittenden County: IBM, IDX-GE Health Care, General Dynamics; in Franklin Co.: Energizer, Mylan, An Derringer, CJ Van Houten; in other areas of the state Ethan Allen, Omya, etc.

Discussion among members: As many of these companies are attached to structures that are significant global players what does Vermont have to offer to assist in meeting their competitive needs (e.g., broadband/high speed internet connectedness of our state, our education curriculums and the training, education and reeducation of our working age population.

5. Discussion with the larger nonprofit employers: Health care and Higher Education.

6. Discussion with next generation businesses - new businesses established by 20 and 30-something entrepreneurs.

7. Discussion with new and emerging niches: e.g., software developers, artisan agricultural products.

8. Discussion with established / traditional key sectors: e.g., tourism, dairy, forestry/timber/pulp/chips.

9. Other

Evaluation

*Get minutes out earlier

*If members agree to homework, do it

*Start meetings on time or change time

*Don't repeat business from one meeting to the next

* Schedule in breaks so that members can interact informally as well as formally

At 4pm the meeting was adjourned. (moved: Lintermann; second: Niebling)

DRAFT - TOWARD DEFINITIONS AND A VISION STATEMENT - 10-9-07

Vision for the Future of Economic Development in Vermont

If Vermont's strategic economic development plan is successful over the next 10 years, Vermont will have proven itself to be resilient in the turbulence of the global economy. The state's strategic employers will continue to be competitive in their industries, and the economy will be increasingly diverse, as small businesses and entrepreneurs flourish. Vermont entrepreneurship will be distinguished by innovation and creative talent, often with ideas spawned in our institutions of higher learning and energized by the research capabilities at the University of Vermont and the rich network of public and private colleges and universities.. With the competitive edge provided by innovation and creativity, these small businesses will prosper, develop the talents of their employees, and attract and retain employees with above average wages and benefits. Moreover, Vermont will have burnished its image as a 'green state', by intentionally developing a sector of companies that sell green products and services into the national and world market, and by inspiring a 'green' ethic throughout the state.

Along with career opportunities, Vermont's ability to retain and attract talented young people is directly related to quality of life. At the same time the state will leverage the rich resource of its growing population of older workers creating opportunities for second careers and workplace practices that create productive workplaces for workers of all ages. Vermont will be an e-state, with broadband communication available in all communities. The state will have strategically addressed the deterioration of roads and bridges and will support an efficient transportation system; and we will have continued to cultivate the social (affordable housing, healthcare, childcare, etc.) and cultural (historic sites, performance venues, parks, etc.) infrastructures. These same attributes will attract tourists, conventions, and college students, and serve to strengthen Vermont's appeal to visitors.

The good health of communities throughout Vermont will be supported by the strengthening trends of local economies, including local farm and forest industries , arts, and small business ventures.

The strategic activities of the state that support and enhance economic development will be clearly articulated, highly adaptable and nimble, and able to demonstrate direct correlation between activities, investments and desired outcomes.

In addition to being viewed as a good place to live, Vermont will have a solid reputation as a place to innovate, learn and invest. Vermont will have a steady stream of creative and innovative businesses and organizations seeking to grow or locate in the state, drawn by its many positive assets and the clustering of highly skilled and enterprising workers.

Economic Development

Economic development is the development of economic wealth in Vermont for the well-being of its inhabitants. Policies that promote economic development seek to improve the economic well-being and quality of life for the community through specific activities directed at employers, businesses and business activity that can be directly correlated to creating and/or retaining jobs and supporting or growing economic wealth and the tax base.

Economic development activities can be seen as Primary, Secondary and Tertiary:

Primary economic development activities are those Vermont expenditure and tax programs for which the primary purpose is to promote economic growth in Vermont, facilitate the prosperity of an industry sector, a specific employer, or a community or region of the state, create or retain jobs, or to develop workforce skills to meet the needs of employers. Primary activities are limited to those for which critical funding is supplied through a State of Vermont appropriation, rather than a Federal or private grant, and the activities are carried out by state employees or contractors or grantees of the state.

Above and beyond the obvious economic development programs, primary activities might, for example, include the Vermont Hi-Tech Program, which is tailored to meet the needs of specific client companies, and the E-State Commission which will support both individual and business communications in rural Vermont.

Secondary economic development activities are those expenditures and tax programs where the primary purposes do not include promoting economic growth, but which have a secondary effect of benefiting employers. For example, the primary purpose of the Reach Up program is to assist people to move from welfare to work. In so doing, the program has a likely benefit to employers.

Tertiary economic development activities are large public expenditures to build and maintain infrastructure. This can include transportation infrastructure (roads, bridges, rail, etc.) and social infrastructure (preschools, K-12 education, health coverage, affordable housing, etc.)

CFED OUTLINE OF PLANNING (9-10-07)

- 1) Distill a positive and realistic vision for how Vermont's economy can grow, improve, change, and support broad-based, sustainable economic prosperity and quality of life in the global economy (If Vermont's economy is healthy and growing Vermont will look like ____);
- 2) Identify Vermont's existing sectors of "comparative advantage", where in Vermont is already well-positioned with respect to the vision;
- 3) Identify and focus intensively on the top strategic leverage points (sectors of current or future comparative advantage) where the investment of the limited public resources can make the greatest difference in achieving the vision for strategic economic development;
- 4) Recommend public policies to guide, encourage, and reduce barriers to progress towards the vision.
- 5) Have a strategic overview of contiguous activities (connected and related to economic development, but not strictly ED) that have an impact on Vermont communities. (e.g., transportation investments, broadband, Building Bright Futures).
- 6) Set specific economic development goals with directional benchmarks; a measurement process with reporting and evaluation processes built in.

VEPC 2002

A PLAN FOR A DECADE OF PROGRESS

Actions For Vermont's Economy

1. ECONOMIC GOALS/OBJECTIVES FOR VERMONT

2. VERMONT STRENGTHS

Vermont has many economic attributes that can be utilized and built upon to create and maintain a competitive economy

3. ECONOMIC VISION FOR VERMONT

Developing and updating a ten-year economic plan for Vermont is an ongoing process. Critical to that process is a vision for change.

4. KEY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT POLICY AREAS

5. SUMMARY OF KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

A. *Infrastructure Investments for a "High-Performance" Economy*

Facilitate the development of essential basic infrastructure to aid in the movement of people, products, and information to support the creation and retention of quality job opportunities:

B. *Knowledge-Based Investments for the Future*

Develop and maintain an adequately trained workforce to support business development and retention consistent with the state's orientation toward competing in high value-added or knowledge-based markets.

C. *Build a Climate of Innovation for Entrepreneurs*

Encourage increased entrepreneurial activity in Vermont and facilitate a supportive environment for innovation.

CFED Public Engagement Plan (DRAFT) October 2007 - June 2008

Decision points:

1. Summit as part of public engagement or as summary or do twice? Or do at all?
2. How much to do in 2007 and how much in 2008?
3. Public outreach meetings as full commission or sub groups; as a fall project or a fall spring project?
4. How much separation of outreach between stakeholders and general public?

Public Engagement and Outreach

The Commission is charged to conduct *a planning process that is open and inclusive, with Broad based public engagement ensuring participation that is demographically and geographically representative of the state and includes input from a wide range of perspectives, expertise and interests, including the general assembly, state agencies and the administration, regional and local planning and development organizations, municipalities, the private sector, and business organizations, including owners, knowledgeable in the areas of economic interest such as agriculture, social and human services, energy, education, child care, environmental issues, science and technology, arts and culture, transportation, telecommunications, housing, workforce development, and tourism and recreation.*

Work through the RDC's using their regional breakdown to conduct a thorough state wide public engagement process. Two processes, one in the fall and one in the spring would be designed to cover the whole state, and ask two sets of questions and present the evolving version of the planning guidelines and plan elements for comments and discussions.

DRAFT - General Public Outreach Effort - CFED

Work with the RDC's to set up meetings, with specific invitations to local employers, workforce development entities, United Ways, Community Partnerships, Business leaders, RPCs, etc.

1. Introduction to CFED
2. Sm. Grp. Discussion of what is needed for an effective infrastructure of economic development; assets and barriers locally; priority initiatives.
3. Lrg. Grp. Feedback and comment.

We are proposing that the focus of this outreach look at what can be identified as successful infrastructure for economic development; where are the areas of greatest leverage that might guide investment and policy development. How do we create conditions for success? The concept of "infrastructure" came up repeatedly during our discussions with each Commissioner as a key concern; along with transportation and communications, it specifically includes social infrastructure issues such as child care, affordable housing, etc. Having a focus is critical to the success of an outreach effort.

As much as possible the outreach would be initiated by the local sponsoring groups. Efforts would be made to encourage cooperation among several types of entities that work on primary as well as secondary "infrastructure" for economic development.

The focus would be on bringing together a critical mass of key groups and their representatives to work together on the "infrastructure question." While the general public can attend, it would not be targeted to them. A wide

range of invitations would be sent out with an opportunity to contribute ideas through the web if they could not attend. A follow-up press release would report on the local meeting and encourage further ideas through web based tools.

Once the schedule is established locally, the Commission would organize itself for members to attend as many of the sessions as possible with the goal of having three commissioners at each of the 12 session. Whether 12 events are overly ambitious has yet to be tested but it would be a way to thoroughly blanket the state.

Addison County RDC - Middlebury

Bennington County Industrial Corp - Bennington

Brattleboro Dev. Credit Corp. - Brattleboro

Central Vermont RDC - Montpelier

Franklin County Industrial Dev. Corp. - St. Albans

Greater Burlington Industrial Corp. - Burlington

Green Mountain Economic Development Corp-WRJct.

Lake Champlain Islands Chamber - No. Hero

Lamoille Economic Dev. Corp. - Morrisville

Northeastern Vermont Dev. Assoc. - St. Johnsbury

Rutland Economic Development Corp. - Rutland

Springfield Regional Dev. Corp - Springfield