

DRAFT Meeting Notes
EDC Subcommittee on 3-5 Year Strategic Economic Development Implementation Plan

April 28,2008

Roll Call/Call to Order

Excused-Richard Slone

Present: Vicky Selkowe, Susan Gleason, Ed Clarke,

Also present: Matthew Mikolajewski, Manager, Office of Business Resources, Peggy Yessa, Office of Business Resources, Mario Mendoza, Mayor's Office Liaison

Call to order at 5:00pm

1. #09033: 3-5 Year Strategic Economic Development Implementation Plan

Chairperson Gleason explained the four items she would like to cover at the meeting:

- 1) How to approach specific edits within the plan?
- 2) Does the plan reflect the EDC's desired goals and vision?
- 3) What else does the EDC want our consultant, Tom Ticknor, to do to complete his contract?
- 4) Discuss having a joint EDC and Common Council meeting.

Ms. Yessa showed the subcommittee a mock-up of an alternate layout of the plan. She noted the page layout would allow for pictures or text on the page adjacent to the actual text of the plan.

Mr. Clarke would also like the EDC to rank suggested budget items. He suggested the plan have:

- A section with clean, crisp goals and vision, and separation between strategies and the goals
- A separate section with structures and systems within the Department of Planning and Community and Economic Development
- An acknowledgement that basic sector job creation is the focus of this effort, but that . . .

A new section on economic development issues that were brought up in the public sessions, but that are not fully addressed in the current plan, such as entrepreneurism and entry level job creation. This section would serve as the base of future economic development planning activities, once the strategies outlined in the current plan have been implemented. In other words, that this was the first step in which we;

1. Clarified our vision and goals.
2. Put necessary systems in place.
3. Completed some of the "low hanging" fruit with acknowledgement that there is a list of additional items we would like to complete in the future.

Ms. Selkowe agreed that a section on goals is needed and it needs crisp vision language.

Mr. Mikolajewski proposed at the May 7 EDC meeting the EDC could further discuss their vision and goals.

Mr. Clarke wants to be sure the plan does not pit basic sector jobs against non-basic sector job creation or small versus big business development. Ms. Gleason mentioned other terms such as primary/secondary economy and import/export economy as other terms that could be used.

Ms. Gleason would like to see the charts, including the ED map located within the appendix.

Ms Gleason noted there is not a consistent level of detail in Section 2, especially pages 19, 20 and 25.

Mr. Clarke suggested not mixing what is already being completed by the City with new initiatives. Keep the items that are in progress with the section on what the City is currently doing well.

Mr. Clarke asked for clarification on the \$50,000 cost/benefit analysis proposal in the toolkit section. Mr. Mikolajewski explained that these funds might be used to purchase cost benefit analysis software or hire a consultant to develop a system. Mr. Clarke explained that the Workforce Development Board already has this software.

Ms. Selkove noted the toolkit does not explain what the proposed project fund would do nor does it explain the proposed change in CDBG fund use.

Ms. Gleason suggested Mr. Ticknor should work on the Toolkit section to be more specific about what other cities do/“best practices” and who to contact in other cities for additional research.

Ms. Selkove stressed the importance of the written recommendations matching what is in the tables.

Mr. Mikolajewski suggested staff could develop a recommendations “template” to standardize all of the recommendations.

Mr. Clarke questioned using number of jobs created as a measure of success in the plan. He suggested a more realistic, proactive method be used to measure progress. He mentioned many things the City currently does are benchmarked in the “Madison Measures “ document. Staff was asked for a copy of “Madison Measures” for the entire EDC to review. He further suggested staff could set outcome measures that would be more attainable. An example was provided of visiting a specific number and type of businesses each year.

Ms. Selkove questioned the meaning of the chart of employment by sector. What conclusions can be drawn from the chart, for instance the growth in the retail sector employment is 163%, why? She also noted earlier drafts of the plan had public/private sector partnerships as weak in peer cities. What conclusions are the readers to draw from the table?

Mr. Mikolajewski explained that some cities fund a public/private partnership instead of having internal economic development staff.

Mr. Clarke suggested the public/private chart on page 60 might be something Mr. Ticknor could refine.

Ms. Gleason asked about the “hot buttons” in this report for the Council? When should the Council and the Mayor see the revised version?

Mr. Mendoza said that the Mayor has supported the economic development plan and is already suggesting funding new project managers in the 2009 budget.

Ms. Gleason suggested asking the entire EDC about when to hold a joint Council and EDC meeting and to show the EDC the recommendation template.

Ms. Selkove would like a brief section in the plan on the work Mr. Ticknor did developing the plan. She noted that the information from the numerous interviews he conducted is not anywhere in the draft plan. She does not want his notes from individual interviews, but would like to know overall themes or topics that emerged.

Mr. Mikolajewski noted that there has already been staff response to immediate concerns raised in the interviews.

Mr. Mikolajewski requested the Subcommittee to confirm that the following items would be requested of Mr. Ticknor:

- A summary of his interviews, especially highlighting points not included in the plan.
- Key vignettes of conversations or narratives of programs or projects that he mentioned in the public sessions.
- More information on the toolkit recommendations. Specifically, the rationale behind the toolkit recommendations and examples of how other communities use their economic development tools (with emphasis on TIF).

Staff will complete the reformatting of the document.

The Subcommittee discussed the following strategy to proceed with completion of the plan. First at its May 7th meeting, the EDC will be asked to do the following:

- Review and provide recommendations to staff regarding the revised design of the document
- Review and discuss a revised vision and goals section.
- Review and discuss a mock-up template for the recommendations section.
- Review and discuss a more thorough explanation of the work completed by Tom Ticknor.
- Approve the remaining tasks for Tom Ticknor, as noted above.

Pending concurrence of the above items on May 7th by the EDC staff will be directed to reformat/edit the document and direct Tom Ticknor to complete his work throughout the month of May. A reformatted/revised plan will then be presented to the EDC at their June 4th meeting and/or at a joint EDC/Council work session during the month of June. Pending the work completed on the plan in June, a final version of the plan will be approved by the EDC at their July 2nd meeting. The EDC will then present the Plan to the Common Council.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 pm.