

Region 8 Prosperity Committee

Meeting Agenda

MEETING DATE: MEETING TIME: MEETING LOCATION: March 3, 2016 2:30 pm W.K. Kellogg Airport 15551 South Airport Rd, Battle Creek, MI 49015

- 1. Call to Order
- 2. Introductions
- 3. Action: Approval of the Agenda
- 4. Action: Approval of the Minutes
- 5. <u>Citizen Comments</u>
- 6. Education Session: Transportation Funding
- 7. Discussion: Regional Initiatives
 - a. Updates on state projects with RPI involvement
- 8. Discussion: Financial Report and 2016 Budget
 - a. Review monthly state and revised 2016 Budget
- 9. Action/Discussion: Funding to Local Partners
 - a. Review revised framework for funding to local partners
- 10. Discussion: Strategic Planning
 - a. Setting a long-term vision
 - b. Movement to tier 2
- 11. Committee Member Comments
- 12. Action: Adjournment

Next Meeting: April 7, 2016 at The W.E. Upjohn Institute, Kalamazoo, MI 49007

February 4, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Committee Members Present: Dennis Berkebile, Jill Bland, Corey Carolla, Therese Cody, Barbara Craig, Ben Damerow, Michael Evans, Grant Fletcher, Bridgette Jones, Ken Jones, Pat Karr, Jason Latham, David Reid, Richard Remus, Jon Start, Rachel Wade

Committee Members Absent: Luann Harden, Kenneth High, Lynn Johnson, Jan Karazim, Shelley Klug, Deb Miller, Juanita Miller, Ron Reid, Barbara Rose,

Also Present: Lee Adams, John Egelhaaf, Rebecca Harvey

Call to Order

Berkebile called the meeting to order at 2:30 p.m.

Introduction of Members

Introductions of Committee members and guests were made.

Approval of Agenda

Motion by Carolla, **supported** by Remus, to approve the agenda as presented. The motion **carried unanimously.**

Approval of Minutes

Motion by Karr, **supported** by Carolla to approve the January 7, 2016 minutes as presented. The motion **carried unanimously.**

Citizen Comments

No citizen comment was offered.

February 4, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Education Session: Broadband

Dan Manning of Connect Michigan presented an educational program on 'The Broadband Imperative'. With the use of a power point presentation and handouts, Manning addressed the following: an overview of Connect Michigan; the broadband challenge (broadband's impact on communities, broadband availability in SW MI); the Connected Community Program; and, broadband and the RPI Goals/Opportunities. He explained that Connect Michigan works to link providers with willing populations/scenarios.

Through an extensive question/answer period following the presentation, the following was noted:

- Adoption rates in Michigan are estimated to be 78% (72% in U.S.); difficult to determine unless local surveys are initiated.
- Rural and lake areas are generally problematic; difficult to get providers to respond.
- A diverse approach is required to service problem areas.
- Some federal dollars are available to respond to difficult gap areas.
- Limits on available bandwidths represent a likely future problem.
- A broadband service study was conducted for Region 3 (3 counties); results of study will be provided.
- A service study costs approximately \$7000 per county; such a study was identified as an RPI goal in the 2015 Plan.

Committee members agreed the session was very informative. It was noted that members would review/prioritize the education session topic list developed at the January 7, 2016 Committee meeting and provide feedback to staff for selection of the March meeting session topic.

Financial Report

Egelhaaf referenced the RPI Income/Expense Report noting that a single report has been developed that identifies the income received, direct/indirect expenses and carryover funds from 2014 and 2015 and the 2016 income/expenses to date.

He then referenced the RPI Project Funding Schedule 2015-2016 that has been generated to reflect the grant awards and expended/unexpended grant dollars for the six project grants awarded in 2015.

February 4, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Egelhaaf stated that a third financial report is being developed that will reflect the RPI budget and expenses for the year. He noted that such report will be used and provided monthly to the Committee starting in March.

Regional Initiatives

Reid: reported on new facility in Branch County; 800 employees expected; will be recruiting from universities statewide; will offer training sessions.

Bland: distributed '269' magazine publication; developed as a mechanism for bridging the communication gap in the Region.

Jones: reported on Bronco Force Initiative; initiated to take the supply chain program outward facing; working with 14 different companies along US-131 corridor; want to expand program to include other universities and to move laterally along the I-94 corridor; goal is to retain students and retain the graduating talent.

Standish: reported on Kalamazoo County Ready Fours – a nonprofit program serving 4 year olds of families of need; fosters high-quality support (reference to Great Start Readiness Program)

Bland: reported on regional agricultural summit scheduled for March 23; 26 companies have signed up to be 'buyers'; invites are out to potential providers.

Latham: MDOT to begin update of the State Long Range Plan; the Plan is updated every 5 years and sets forth a 25-year horizon; contains a 5-year fiscally-constrained project list; will include new elements such as 'placemaking' projects and regional prosperity initiatives based on changing polices in Michigan.

Damerow: reported on Career Quest Southwest scheduled for February 11/12; designed to allow 8th and 9th graders to interface with employers/companies; will include a community open house.

Adams: in response to Committee request - reported on the efforts/achievements of the Statewide Prosperity Regions since 2014; referenced 'Report on Regional Prosperity Efforts in MI'; summarized the RPI dollars received to date and the goals/strategies developed for each Region.

February 4, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Committee Policies

Adams referenced the draft General Operational Policies for the Region 8 Prosperity Committee. He noted that the draft policies had been revised (shown in red) per the Committee's review at the January 7, 2016 meeting.

Motion by Start, **supported** by Remus to approve the General Operational Policies for the Region 8 Prosperity Committee as revised. The motion **carried unanimously.**

Review of FY 2016 Grant Application Response

Egelhaaf reported that the Region has received a response from the State on the recently submitted 2016 RPI Grant Application. He referenced the January 22, 2016 response letter, noting that the grant request has been 'approved for an amount totaling \$115,000.' Egelhaaf added that the letter acknowledges that 'when coupled with the remaining dollars from previous year grants, this should still afford the Region \$228,000 to spend in this fiscal year.'

Adams stated that the grant awarded was less than that requested, but that no Region had received their full grant request. He further noted that the Tier 2 transition funding was not made available in this year's funding cycle.

Egelhaaf/Adams stated that we will need to refocus our efforts for 2016 to efficiently use the funds available. Charts were displayed that listed the 2016 work program elements developed by the Committee in the grant application: Facilitation; Project Selection Process; Dashboard; Deepen Regional Knowledge; Links with Region 8 Efforts – *inventory/gap analysis of regional collaboration;* RPI Tier 2 Exploration; Linking with adjacent RPIs for a 'super-regional' project. Committee members were asked to prioritize the work elements through the placement of stickers on the charts.

Egelhaaf noted that the rankings will be compiled by staff and presented to the Executive Committee to be used in the development of a program budget for 2016. He stated that the prioritized work program and program budget will be presented at the March meeting.

February 4, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Funding to Local Partners

Adams referenced the revised 'Invitation to Submit Proposal for Funding' and provided an overview of the revisions/improvements made to the letter. He noted that the RFPs are scheduled to go out on February 11, 2016.

Committee members suggested that the 2016 program budget should be responsive to the quality of the project proposals received.

Committee Member Comments

Evans questioned if the role of the RPI will be changing. Specifically, will State dollars be focused on Tier 2 Regions in the future . . . or are State dollars going to be dwindling overall.

No additional Committee member comments were offered.

Adjournment

There being no further items for consideration, the meeting was adjourned at 4:27 p.m.

Next Meeting: March 3, 2016 at 2:30 p.m. – Lawrence, Michigan

2016 Financial Report Regional Prosperity Initiative - Region 8

Line Items	Current Month	Year to Date 2/24/2016	2016 Budget	2016 Grant Award	2015 Obligated#	2014-2015 Roll Over *
REVENUE						
RPI Grants			\$192,968.00	\$115,000.00		\$192,968.00
Total Revenue			\$307,968.00	\$115,000.00		\$192,968.00

EXPENSE

Staffing

SWMPC	\$ 1,514.24	\$ 2,021.00	\$27,103.28	\$10,290.32	\$16,812.96
SMPC		\$ 17,337.00	\$35,794.00	\$13,595.63	\$22,198.37
Rebecca Harvey			\$8,400.00	\$3,189.23	\$5,210.77

Meeting Expenses

Travel Meals Lodging		\$ 723.00	\$300.00	\$113.90	\$186.10
Telephone		\$ 5.00	\$75.00	\$28.48	\$46.52
Printing		\$ -	\$1,000.00	\$379.67	\$620.33
Supplies & Materials	\$ 3.82	\$ 4.00	\$200.00	\$75.93	\$124.07
Room Rental	\$ 922.31	\$ 922.00	\$5,076.00		\$5,076.00
RPI Committee			\$12,000.00	\$4,556.09	\$7,443.91
Reimbursement					

Contractual Serv. - 2015

Projects

Comm. Develop 2015¥			(\$27,750)	\$10,535.93	(\$40,000)	\$17,214.07
Education 2015¥	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 2,500.00	(\$17,500)	\$6,650.00	(\$37,500)	\$10,850.00
Infrastructure 2015¥			(\$35,000)	\$13,300.00	(\$40,000)	\$21,700.00
RPI Strategies						

Contractual Serv. - 2016

Projects	\$103,947.72	\$38,017.46	\$65,930.26
Dashboard	\$2,000.00	\$759.34	\$1,240.66

Other

Total Expense	\$4,940.37	\$23,512.00	\$227,718.00	\$115,000.00	\$192,968.00
Statewide Plan			\$2,300.00	\$2,300.00	
Plan			\$2,022.00		
Econ Dev Blue Print + 10 yr				\$767.00	\$1,255.00
Regional Studies			\$7,500.00	\$2,847.55	\$4,652.45
Tier Two			\$20,000.00	\$7,593.47	\$12,406.53

Total Remaining Encumbered	(\$77,750.00)	(\$77,750.00)	(\$80,250.00)			
Expense						
Total Expense	\$4,940.37	\$23,512.00	\$307,968.00	\$115,000.00	(\$117,500)	\$192,968.00

* "2014-2015 Roll Over" as of January 31, 2016

"2015 Obligated" reflects total amounts committed to projects

¥ Project expenses reflect remaining expense as of January 31, 2016

RPI Project Funding Schedule 2015-2016

		Community [Devel	opment		Educat	ion		Infrastructure				
	Sprou	out Urban Farms Inc		Upjohn Institute		Kalamazoo Literacy Council		KLC (Portage ESL)		St. Joseph County, MI		City of Galesburg	
Installment One - Upon													
Execution	\$	11,250.00	\$	3,750.00	\$	12,500.00	\$	7,500.00	\$	5,000.00	\$	12,500.00	
	Pd. 1	2/10/15 Ck. 6269	Pd.	1/7/16 Ck. 6322		Pd. 12/10/15	Ck. 62	270	Pd. 1	12/10/15 Ck. 6271			
Installment Two - After													
12/15/15							\$	2,500.00					
Installment Two - After													
2/1/16	\$	5,500.00	\$	3,750.00	\$	6,250.00							
Installment Two - After													
3/1/16									\$	5,000.00	\$	6,250.00	
Installment Three - After													
4/15/16							\$	2,500.00					
Installment Three - After													
5/2/16	\$	5,750.00	\$	3,750.00	\$	6,250.00							
Installment Three - After													
7/1/16									\$	5,000.00	\$	6,250.00	
Installment Four - 6/1/16							\$	2,500.00					
Installment Four - After													
8/1/16			\$	3,750.00									
Installment Four - Before													
11/30/16	Progr	ess Report	Prog	ress Report	Progr	ess Report			Prog	ress Report	Prog	ress Report	

2016 RPI Project Selection

Three Options Suggested by the Executive Committee...

- 1. Follow the same RFP process as we did in 2015.
 - Distribute RFPs to the contacts within the three focus areas (Community Development, Education, and Infrastructure).
 - Subcommittees for focus areas evaluate the proposals and recommend the top scoring projects for Prosperity Committee approval.
- 2. Follow a flexible RFP process where we solicit proposals across the three focus areas.
 - Within the RFP we clearly state that we are also looking for projects that transcend a single focus area; that significant additional scoring will be given to projects that do so.
 - Subcommittees would then evaluate the proposals using as close to a uniform, objective scoring system as we can design.
 - The Prosperity committee then evaluates the top scoring projects and considers the prospect of selecting only one or two transcendent projects or a series of projects that focus on single focus areas.
- 3. Design a project that will focus on yielding a single regional flagship project.
 - The Region 8 Prosperity Committee has supported projects on a limited basis. The Committee has the opportunity to impact the region through the creation of a regionally significant project.
 - The Committee would develop the scope of work and timeline for the project.
 - The Committee would then solicit proposals from contractors who intend to carry out the work related to the project.

Examples of projects that might represent a single region-wide impact could include the following:

Broadband

Dan Manning from Connect Michigan provided the Prosperity Committee a "state of the region for broadband" presentation in February. Based on his presentation action is available to the RPI to identify gaps in our regional broadband coverage and explore tactics to fill those gaps. http://www.connectmi.org/get-involved

Connecting Education, Business, and Community Development to Enhance Talent

The region would, in many ways, increase the competitive value of area businesses through the retention and development of the local workforce while attracting talented workers from outside the region. Other regions in the state have developed coordinated efforts to align resources around talent in their region; most notably, leaders in the West Michigan Region created the Talent 2025 initiative (http://talent2025.org/). The Region 8 Prosperity Committee has the opportunity to combine RPI funding with local funding and expertise to create a unique effort designed to retain and develop the current and future workforce while attracting talent to the region. Furthermore, the project would help to convene partners from the many systems working to attract, develop, and retain students and workers in the region. If successful, this project will convene and leverage the outstanding existing resources and programs in the region to develop a strong singular focus designed to more strongly connect and enhance the transitions between the talent pipeline and businesses in the region.

Public Transportation Service Uniformly Oriented toward Client/User

A high functioning public transit system represents a bridge between employer needs for a reliable workforce and the rider's need for affordable, predictable, respectful transportation provision. MDOT has just begun to look at gaps in transit service between service areas. Their study is a step in the right direction but is merely scratching the surface of a much greater need. It is possible that coordination between transit service providers is achievable. What changes in could be implemented that might create better linkages between service providers? And what changes could be implemented that might allow providers to better fit the needs of business? There are Incentives to Help Employers and their Employees Access alternative modes of Commuting to work: http://www.nctr.usf.edu/programs/clearinghouse/commutebenefits/

Rail (Freight, Passenger)

The network for rail in southwest Michigan represents a significant opportunity to move people and freight in a more effective and efficient way than it currently does. What are the needs of business and passengers (both existing and potential) in southwest Michigan? What changes can be made to better match the need to the service provided? Some resources from MDOT on Passenger and Freight Rail: Passenger Rail In the Chicago-Kalamazoo Corridor: http://www.michigan.gov/mdot/0,4616,7-151-11056-254087--,00.html The MDOT Freight Economic Development Program: http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mdot/FEDP_Summary_2014_476623_7.pdf

Regional Food System

Agriculture is an essential piece of the economy in southwest Michigan. Our ability to grow a wide variety of non-citrus fruit, vegetables, and commodity grains is unique. Some areas of our region grow the widest variety of produce outside of California. Our agricultural bounty is sometimes in stark contrast to pockets within our region with virtually no access to fresh produce. Our farmers should be prosperous and everyone in our region should have easy access to the food we grow. Can we build a fresh food network that connects all links in the food "value chain" across the entire southwest Michigan region? MSU has a world class Center to Develop Regional Food Systems: http://foodsystems.msu.edu/about

Tapping the Resources of Education to Solve Regional Challenges

Though we have been collaborating for two years we have never discussed the possibility of identifying issues and asking for university brain power to help collectively solve them. Perhaps the RPI can harness a portion of the immense student and professorial capacity of our education partners and apply them to specific regional issues like those identified above. Through studios, labs, research practicum and a wide variety of other means, our education partners could provide vital findings back to RPI that could drive our future actions. This in and of itself could be an investment that RPI makes back to its college and university partners.