

CFED - Vermont – June 16, 2008 9:00am - 3:00pm
Room 10, The Vermont Statehouse
115 State Street, Montpelier

MEETING NOTES

Attending: Bill Botzow, Staige Davis, Sam Matthews, Will Patten, Kevin Dorn, Jay Kenlan, David Mount, Mary Niebling, Hinda Miller
Absent: Mary Lintermann, Fred Kenney, Dan Kurzman
Resigned: Barbara Grimes
(There are now two vacancies on the Commission)

Minutes from the May

- Approved as submitted.

Chair's Rpt.

TY to Glenn for his support work for the Commission.

Vermont Business Roundtable – Jay reported that he was asked to present on CFED to the Vermont Business Roundtable. He reviewed the CFED charge, mission and activities and indicated that there was a good discussion.

Vermont Association of Planning and Development Agencies) VAPDA – (presentation by Jay with Dave Mount, Sam Matthews and Kevin Dorn in attendance)

-Jay presented an overview of CFED. Highlights of the discussion included:

- growth centers as a factor in economic development – pros and cons
 - can be an effective tool but current law not realizing the benefits
 - requested recommendations for a fix in legislation
- growth centers should be the intersection of many of the key issues the CFED is hearing about, permitting, infrastructure investment, and economic

development

- while it varies from region to region, not enough dialogue with DED or RDC's
- RPC's no longer have a grant requirement to do a joint plan with RDC's, but RDC's are Required to do a plan with RPC's. Need to fix this.

Other: discussion of transit issues has risen to the top with VPRDA and in the public outreach since we began (noted as well in the Council on the Future of VT outreach sessions); focus on need for expansion of public transit and need for transit nodes (e.g., park and rides)

Need to keep discussion open with other groups (Futures and RPC's) as well as RDC's

SCG role

-Jay and Bill to help renegotiate the contract with SCG to include finishing the public outreach work and supporting the Commission through the fall in its work on goals and benchmarks and drafting the report to the legislature.

Finance

(see attachment I for report)

As of June 1, The Snelling Center had expended \$115,000 of its \$140,000 contract. This included \$41,000 of the first phase of the public engagement process.

While a budget has yet to be developed the combination of the remaining funding and the new legislative allocation should comfortably take CFED through its activities and a report to the legislature and administration in January.

The Snelling Center will provide a budget and activity proposal.

Legislature and Budget

-Appropriations Bill and H.885 have both been signed

-CFED was provided clear direction for the next year in H.885 and \$50K was allocated to CFED in the Appropriations bill.

Public Outreach Process – review and evaluation

COMMENTS

Process – afternoon

- start at noon; better transition time for conversation
- prioritization (get across the need CFED has to develop priorities)
- competitiveness – better understanding of why are you here rather than elsewhere
- more on -how do you measure your success and failure
- more on - what is necessary for you to be successful

Process-Evening

- Need a series of questions for prompting discussion in the evening
- Prologue – Set of common talking points for a 10 minute presentation.
- Set up opening – not useful with talking points; still need introductions to welcome people
- direction for chair to keep those who dominate the conversation in the evening to limits
 - when faced with a problem; ask back what would you do to change it, what policy, what investment
- evening population is not general public necessarily – some expansion of afternoon; some people with very specific agendas
- difficulty of prioritization – how to get the public involved in making choices
- legislators there in WRJ and Burl; good – outreach for others
- make sure everyone has a chance to speak if they make the effort to come out
- want to understand more about competitive issues (why are they on one side of the river or another)
-
- Do an open space exercise at some point in the issue

- what is most important to you
- how to help set priorities
- How to make the evening more productive and robust for public and CFED

- * work with Heidi for a proposal for Springfield
- how does the CFED work with competing goals

Compilation of all the results

- how do we get to goals; and how do we set up measures to make wise decisions to get through to a solution
- draft work should go back out to everyone – how to re-engage people work with what the commission works with; general comment and prioritization through tools

Follow-up

- how to get continuing input.
- for public this might be their chance to get to know CFED, their ideas might come later

CFED mission

- has not changed since Act 184
- H.885 gives a set of short term CFED outputs for setting goals and crafting benchmarks
- H.885 gives a FY09 direction, not a replacement
- Key need for how we measure success and failure (against what goals; what is economic development?)

Moving forward

- Review previous definition, vision and goals
- Incorporate new data
- how does new data inform what CFED has drafted?
- Focus on the key goals that are measureable
- Review benchmarks
- Get input on benchmarks from economists

Next Meeting

- Circulate the previously developed definition, goals and vision (on website)
- Exercise question: Take the big set of goals that were developed in January and February; incorporate the new input from the public outreach effort, and look at how you would narrow the list and get it down to a manageable level
- Select your top six goals and send them to Glenn. This will be the basis for the agenda.
- Meet on July 15th before the public session (10-11:30 at Vermont College) with priority lists

Goals and Benchmarks Discussion

- Not all states have created a specific “innovation” index or focused set of goals and benchmarks
- Maine and Oregon are “form” examples – not content examples

- Vermont needs to find its approach and focus
- OR is very focused and actionable.
- NC has a good format as well- and a good system for regular measurement
- ME appears to have set unattainable goals – can set up for failure

Steve Klein / JFO attended and discussed moving ahead the benchmarking task

- How can benchmarking be meaningful?
- Role of JFO in supporting carrying out H885;

- Both Carr and Kavet have seen H885 and understand the intent
- JFO will cover Kavet's time and assign some staff
- CFED needs to work out how Carr's time will be allocated with the Administration.
(ACCD contracts for VEGI measures; Fin and Mgt for rev and budget rpt)

- JFO sees this as an iterative process to use staff and economists to comment and craft and send drafts and ideas back and forth

- Goals; CFED may give a variety of possible benchmarks, or ID what is important to measure
- Formative work should be with CFED – economists and JFO staff should respond.

- Ex. 2010 deadline for ubiquitous coverage by cell and broadband
 - goals and benchmarks need to be flexible to adapt to new technologies; and specific in what needs to be accomplished

- Need a backboard to evaluate against; need to determine what is actionable and measurable

- Make sure that CFED benchmarks are in line with other initiatives, e.g., telecom and 2010.
 - as much as CFEDs goals are overlapping with specific initiatives draw them in
 - telecom, housing, education

- Benchmarking in the past – where they tend to fall apart is that they are not used moving forward
 - Ownership is a real problem; CFED is unique in the ongoing nature of its work and the urgency of its work – need to create a shared ownership model with the related groups and depts.

- The legislature's frustration has been with outside groups measuring VT inconsistently – need for internal process that speaks to what Vermont needs to plan forward
 - Some measures are very political (e.g., tax burden) but specific
 - How to measure competitiveness; who do we measure ourselves against?

- Find out what is already out there and can be used (JFO, Carr, Kavet); what are the options
- Benchmarks – coordinated and consistent and tracked would make a significant contribution

Added Value from CFED work

- *Cohesion – in measures
- *Visibility – of measures and tracking
- *Continuity and preservation – goals and tracking goes beyond the 2-yr election cycle- what is the structure for carrying on

LUNCH

Meeting on goals/benchmarks in fall

The decision was to meet for two days in late September or early October (Glenn will send out a meeting planner to organize the best dates) in a retreat like environment to review and discuss and come up with clear goals and draft benchmarks.

Jay to send out process proposal and facilitator information for review

Budgeting and working plan for FY08 - Brainstorm

Be bold – get attention and bring people to the discussion

Need to create the operators manual as well as the thing.

Need focus – fewer, more strategic recommendations

- tied to key opportunities and based on unique strategic advantages

Build a business case around each one –

- why is this a good goal – the benefit will be “x”

- * Outcome is a vehicle, an instrument, not just a report
- * pick way forward (see what other states are doing to keep it alive)
- * Vermont's strategic advantages
- * Clear outcomes
- * Make it visible – attach it to the data and information base used to measure

Discussion on the learning from the regional meetings so far

- Snelling Center will have an initial findings draft for review
- Focus on regional issues and unique aspects identified in the six regions visited to date
- What are the high level issues that are surfacing so far?
 - There are lots of important things, but what will be the process of winnowing

Need to bring a focus to the goals and then to the strategies
-IMPORTANT to keep in mind that this process is only 50% complete and the CFED does not want to prejudice its conclusions without full inquiry into the next six

Activities and schedule (July – December and beyond)

- July and August -would be focused on the regional meetings without formal CFED Meetings (July 15th – short goals meeting)
- September/Oct -two meeting days – either back to back retreat or two separate days with assignment in between
-SCG report out on regional process
-compare process outcomes to previous goals by CFED
-revise and narrow goals; discussion possible benchmark approaches
-Finalize what to send to economists for review and to apply benchmarks
-Communication out to all participants
- Oct – Nov - process for taking goals and summary back to the regions
- December- Jan. - one or two meetings before session to review report on benchmarks
- report from economists due by Dec. 15
- January 09 -Submit report to legislature
- Feb-Mar 09 - process for taking it all back to the regions and all participants
- review of agenda for FY10 and budget request to legislature
- June 09 - Annual Plan for FY10; review legislation

Announcements and other issues

- Entrepreneurs Group (Mary, Sam attended second gathering)
-very diverse group; looking at support infrastructure for entrepreneurship in VT
-lot of goals for entrepreneurial Education, even K-12; policy event; raise visibility

ADJOURN

ATTACHMENT I: SCG Expenditures to date (DRAFT)

Invoice	total	SCG time-general support for CFED	SCG time - outreach	SCG exp - general	SCG exp – outreach (some exp paid direct by ACCD)	CFED exp for meetings and other pd by SCG
6/29/2007	4800	4800				
7/31/2007	14280	14280				
9/17/2007	11100	11100				
9/17/2007	1132.47			377.54		754.93
10/15/2007	7440	7440				
10/15/2008	1598.84			313.12		1285.72
11/21/2007	8040	8040				
12/21/2008	8491.67	6840		250.76		1400.91
2/4/2008	9186.79	7920	240	159.28		867.51
4/11/2008	14160	7560	6600			
4/11/2008	324.72			51	273.72	
5/6/2008	20571.83	4800	11133.75		4638.08	
5/6/2008	1392.25					1392.25
6/2/2008	12793.92	2400	8523.75		1870.17	
		75180	26497.5	1151.7	6781.97	5701.32
	115312.49					

Public Outreach budget and expenditures

Consultant public outreach -JAN	Jan est. budget	Apr rev budget	Expended 6/1	Remaining
Staffing-planning	12000	9600	6600	3000
Staffing-outreach	6000	8400	4700	3700
Staffing - prep meetings	3600	9000	4500	4500
Staffing- events	21600	24000	14598	9402
Staffing -compile results	2400	7200	2700	4500
Staffing - report	4800	9600	0	9600
Mileage & Misc	2350	4800	1241	3559
Facilities & Food	3600	4800	5063	<263>
Displays / handouts	1200	800	479	321
Publicity	1000	400	0	400
Recording	1200	1800	1201	599
	59750	80400	41082	39318

Original Contract = \$140,000;

Expansion proposed by ACCD to cover direct CFED exp = + \$35,000

Funds from FY09 for completion of outreach, reporting and benchmarking thru Sept. = \$20,000

New contract total = \$195,000

Expenditure to date = \$115,312

Anticipated additional expenditures for completing outreach = \$ 39,318
\$154,630

Allowance for CFED general support and operations (SCG time and exp) = \$ 40,370

Common definitions

CFED Planning terms (DRAFT) 6-5-08

VISION / PURPOSE

A state that describes how the world will be different improved or changed, if the goals are met and a successful economic development plan is implemented.

Goals Goals are outcome statements that frame what the state is working to accomplish

The process of setting goals needs to be strategic because it involves choosing how best to respond to the circumstances of a dynamic and sometimes hostile environment. The choices emphasize specific priorities, making decisions about ends and means. This must be transparent – stating the specific goals and the prioritization method that made that the best choice. Goals must emerge from a process of building broad based commitment, and once stated must be part of an ongoing process to maintain and then increase that commitment.

Strategies Strategies are broad, overall priorities or directions adopted by the state. They are choices about how to best work to meet the goals.

Objectives Precise, measureable, time-phased results that support the achievement of the goals; these can be program specific; a set of specific objectives provides the basis for an annual plan.

Benchmarks A measurement of progress toward a goal based on data that is generally accepted as reliable and accurate. Data should be readily available.

The planning process for economic development:

Is strategic;
Views the future as unpredictable;
Views planning as a continuous process;
Considers a range of possible futures;
Strategies are developed based on a current assessment of what the environment is;
Sets priorities;
Has a reliable evaluation process to check on progress and allow for feedback to changing strategies as needed, but in a predictable manner based on new assessment;