Welcome!

September 20th Work Group Meeting!

Agenda

Section one, all work group members meeting together

1. Welcome and Overview of Today's Desired Outcomes
2. Scenario Development Update
3. How the Key Issues and Recommendations fit into the Project

Section two, mixed workgroups at tables

4. Introduction Around the Tables
5. Explanation of Process
6. Table Dialogs to Connect the Dots
7. Table Reactions to Recommendations
8. Reports from Tables

Reminder: How Fits Into the Project

Reminder: Complete evaluations (turn in as lunch ticket)

Lunch

Business Panel:

Janelle Riley, Syvantis Technologies; Arlene Jones, The Farm at St. Mathias; Miranda Anderson, Essentia Health; Tony Mayer, West Central Telephone Company; Gary Walters, The Fiducia

Desired Outcomes for the Day

- **Understand the flow of the process today and moving forward.**
- **Distribute revised scenario narratives.**
- **Coordinate recommendations across Workgroups.**
- **Learn about business issues and opportunities.**
- **Celebrate!!**

Job of the Work Groups

- **Identify Key Issues to be addressed in each work area.**
- **Identify and gather the information needed to make informed recommendations.**
- **Identify scenarios that you would like to see done by the U of M.**
- **Create a range of recommendations related to each issue**
- **Coordinate recommendations across workgroups**
- **Participate in the full Consortium**

What's Next

Look at flow chart in your packet

- **October 13th, Collage of Sustainability Event**
- **December 13th, Consortium selects preferred scenario.**
- **May 8th, Consortium reviews selected scenario and gives input on related recommendations, policies and strategies.**
- **June 12th, Consortium reviews and gives input on implementation plan.**
- **August 14, Consortium reviews final plan, implementation strategies and celebrates success.**

How the Key Issues and Recommendations fit in the project

- ***Key Issues*** = problems to be addressed
- ***Key Issues*** relate to the current state of the region
- ***Recommendations*** are potential strategies to address the Key Issues

How the Key Issues and Recommendations fit in the project

- A ***preferred future*** scenario chosen by the Consortium in December
- 2012 - Consortium develops a ***plan of action*** to achieve the desired future, which includes ***polices and strategies*** that guide present and future decisions that move toward the desired future.
- The range of recommendations developed by the Workgroups will inform the development of ***polices and strategies***
- The polices and strategies guide present and future decisions that move toward the desired future.

Small Group Instructions

- Two part process
  - Making connections
  - Discuss recommendations
- Each table looks at a part, together we look at the whole.

Numbering Process

- First letter is Work group; **E**conomic, **L**and use, **T**ransportation, **H**ousing.
- Second letter is Key issue under that work group, **A – D** or **E.**
- Number is number of recommendation under that Key issue.
- So, TA1 is **T**ransportation, Key Issue **A**, Recommendation 1.

Instructions

- First part – Making connections
- An example
  - "T" person reads recommendation TA1.
  - H, L, E people listen and look for connections in their recommendations
  - All record "T.A.1" on their sheet next to the recommendation with connections
  - Call out to "T" person the number they are connecting who writes it next to TA1

- First part – Making connections
- An example
  - Recommendation TA1. "**Public Transit** - Focus on low cost and full access to communities to provide service and multiple options for communities and aging population"
  - Connects to EC2 because "dial-a-ride" is mentioned
  - Connects to LC1 because "transit" is mentioned

A Reminder

This part of the process is to help us identify connections, not discuss the merits of the recommendation.

Group Expectations

Hearing Everyone's Voice

1. **Use Go-Around**
2. **Everyone has chance to speak once before someone one speaks twice**
3. **Respect others' contributions**
4. **No side conversations**

Small Group Instructions

- Introduce yourselves
- Start with Transportation
- Work on Highlighted Key Issue Recommendations
- Go beyond that if there is time in the rotation
- We will do one 15 minute rotation per Workgroup area.

Group Expectations

Hearing Everyone's Voice

1. **Use Go-Around**
2. **Everyone has chance to speak once before someone one speaks twice**
3. **Respect others' contributions**
4. **No side conversations**

Instructions

- Part two – Discuss recommendations
- Last 30 minutes
  - Did you find any of the others recommendations particularly surprising or interesting?
  - Which one and Why?

Remember to sign up for the October 13th Collage of Sustainability

December 13th 4-6 pm Full Consortium meeting

Serving; Crow Wing, Cass, Morrison, Todd and Wadena Counties.

Evaluation Results from Work Group 5

Number = 59 of 63 Participants = 94%

On a scale of 1 to 5, how effective was:	*Not Effective*				*Very Effective*
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
Today's workgroup session?	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (10.2%)	35 (59.2%)	18 (30.5%)
The entire 5-session workgroup process? Blank = 2 (3.4%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	15 (25.4%)	32 (54.2%)	10 (17.0%)
Use of the nominal* facilitation process in the workgroup sessions.	0 (0%)	1 (1.7%)	4 (6.8%)	34 (57.6%)	20 (34.0%)
The description of how the five-session workgroup process fits in with the entire 18-month process to develop the region-wide plan.	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (10.2%)	24 (40.7%)	29 (49.2%)

On a scale of 1-5, do you think this session was "time well spent"?

Waste of My Time				**Time Well Spent**
1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**
0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (10.2%)	24 (40.7%)	29 (49.2%)

Evaluation Results from Work Group 5, continued

A question I still have is:
How we expect to be able to plan on a 35 year horizon
Explain "bootstrap" approach – my understanding is this is an impossible concept in the literal sense.
I'm intrigued about the process of end outcome.
None at this time
Implementation process to change/direct systems in the region.
Not sure how we are going to get to the "final recommendation."
Nothing – process is transparent
Are government organizations aware of these meetings and if they are do they have any suggestion IE: DNR.
How much emphasis is given to growing versus attracting business.
How does the low-income sector fit into the various components? They are left out of the priorities.
Jet packs?
What will become of all this work?
How much input will be given before plan is finalized?
When do policy-makers come into play to listen to the recommendations? How and when will implementation occur?
What will happen with recommendations not linked to other teams?
What does commitment to equity mean for the Region V process?
Financing of activities.
Should there be more about nonprofit organizations in the economic development group?? Over ten percent of Minnesota workforce is employed by nonprofits.
Funding will be key – how will this be identified?
How do we implement this sustainable recommendation?
Implementation details.
How will we connect health care, agriculture, and how we go forward.

Evaluation Results from Work Group 5, continued

Something else that I wish to share about this meeting or the workgroup process is:

The nominal process broke down quite often .
I commend you for the manner in which you have gone about collecting and communicating the vast array of ideas that has emanated from these meetings.
I think people got a little off track when finding connections on recommendations.
Just wondering if it would have to take 18 months to do this process? Of if it could be done in a shorter amount of time. Maybe meetings closer together than a month or more apart?
One of the best meetings yet.
Need to balance recommendations of the work groups and ensure they are at the same level (regional).
Some recommendations were strategic while others highly tactical.
Great explanation, very thorough but maybe a little shorter.
We seem to be missing our connectedness to the rest of the world .
None at this time.
Best of the 5 meetings.
Regroup and consolidate housing recommendations.
Development of an entrepreneurial center.
Good job on this.
Twisting of content from goals from one meeting to next. New goals – new focus – seems driven by our land use facilitator.
Very good.
Good way to integrate recommendations. How do define sustainability? Perhaps recommendations could be sorted by topics/impacts – energy, fiscal, natural resources, education, healthy, etc. to look for more linkages.
Thank you for all the coordination. Keep systems thinking as a [word] place?
A lot of important recommendations. Good interaction. Wish more time was spent on how to create/reinforce unique sustainable places in the region.
Good, open, inviting process.
Good discussion – would like to hear from business more – and the job connection.
Seems some recommendations were pre-determined.
This was hard work. There is so much to do and simplify with each section.
We need to week out the impractical.
Encourage you to influence car-pooling in Oct. and Dec. Meetings.
This has been very helpful in guiding our work forward.

Portion of Transportation Workgroup Material Synthesis following Work Group 5 Meeting

HUD Transportation Workgroup

A. Public Transit

How can regional public transit be an alternative to cars for commuters, for both the young and elderly? What opportunities are there for transit partnerships? Where does it make sense to focus on public transit? In what ways might the private sector be involved in this as the need grows?

	L	E	H
1. Focus on low cost full access service for communities and specifically the aging population. (TA1)	LC1, LC3, LA1, LA2, LC2, LB3	EC2, EA1, ED, EB3, EE3	HA4, HA31, HA32, HD4, HD6, HD8, HA1, HA3, HB1, HB4
2. Extend light rail development to reach certain rural areas. (TA2)	LC1, LC3, LA2, LA3	EC2, ED, EE3, EE5	HD4, HA24, HA25, HA3, HA4, HD8
3. Establish connected region-wide public transportation network (TA3)	LB2, LC1, LC3, LA2, LA3, LA1	EA1, ED, EC2, EB3, EC3	HD8, HD4, HA3, HA4, HD8
4. Map out existing public transit routes and increase county wide service in addition to providing additional transit services for regional hubs. (TA4)	LC1, LC3, LB1, LA3, LA2, LA1	ED4, ED, EA1, EC2, EC3, ED1, EE3	HA4, HD10, HD12, HC10, HD18, HD3
5. Identify existing corridors with the most transit use and promote/plan transit oriented development along those corridors. (TA5)	LB2, LA4, LC1, LC3, LB1, LA1, LA2, LA3	ED, EA1, EC2, EC3	HE1, HD3, HC1
6. Increase/create high MPG transportation vehicle incentives – i.e. less hwy taxes, cheaper tabs, and sales tax deduction. (TA6)	LA1, LA2, LC2, LC1	EB4, EE5, EB3, EC2	HD6

Portion of Material Synthesis following Work Group 5 Meeting

Did you find any of the others recommendations particularly surprising or interesting? Which one and why?

- (4) Housing recommendations – have WAY TOO many/lots of recommendations
  1. Re-classify housing into following 5 categories: money, planning, doing, energy efficiency, special housing needs
  2. Rehab, employment, building
  3. Lots of materials/items did no link to housing – min. wage, taxes to goods, K-12 issues, retirement jobs
  4. Could be combining of these strategies – many similar
- (3) Do not have to invent the wheel – improve what exists – across all areas, connecting what already have that is working
  1. Great environment in which to live
  2. Healthy living environment – farm, lake business
  3. Support systems – ED, unique shopping
  4. Hospital/medical availability
  5. Transit – existing roadways, trails, air – etc.
  6. Concern – bus does not run at the time the plane leaves the airport