



JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE ON MAINE'S FUTURE PROSPERITY

SUMMARY OF REMARKS OF MARY ANN HAYES

October 10, 2007

SUMMARY OF RECENT STATE EFFORTS TO CONNECT

1. Land Use, Transportation and Economic Development are directly related and **MUST** be considered together.
2. They are inextricably connected and we cannot **AFFORD** to address them in isolation. For example: Fairfield Downtown Revitalization CDBG work torn down w/in 2 years for Fairfield-Benton bridge replacement.
3. Responsibility for integrated planning and budgeting must be shared at the local, regional and state levels; we lack effective systems to ensure that this occurs.
4. State agencies have recognized this for some time and attempted to coordinate, primarily through a joint contract to the regional councils for technical assistance on growth management, CDBG and transportation planning. This approach was not felt to be worth the extra administration by state agencies and was abandoned several years ago. I believe currently the scopes of work to the regional councils are shared by DOT, SPO and DECD but then administered separately. SPO paid to integrate Smart Growth Plans with Comprehensive Economic Development Strategies (CEDS) documents produced by the Economic Development Districts in 2001. Marginal results.

WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?

1. State agency compartmentalization is a barrier; each needs to satisfy agency goals first.
2. State agency goals are not clearly intertwined with common ultimate outcome agendas (such as compact design, efficient infrastructure, livability, public health, environmental protection & effective governance of the composite resources)
3. Regional council staffs are also compartmentalized with department budgeting; staff have different missions and budgets; lack of cross-training.
4. Poor communication – state agencies not even reading local comprehensive plans to understand local desires – or one another's agency plans.
5. There are many inadequate comprehensive plans that did not focus on the important questions regarding state interests.
6. There are insufficient resources and capacity at all levels. Political will is also soft.
7. The State does virtually no capital budgeting beyond DOT and planned bonding for corrections.

WHAT MIGHT WE DO?

1. Develop bottom line outcome objectives that marry the disciplines and hold agencies accountable to the bigger picture. Adding indicators to Measures of Growth might be a way to build this into an existing system that has good public access.
2. Build Cabinet level organization that drives this process into culture and expectations. Brand it into the bureaucracy at all levels including performance targets and reviews.
3. Align the RESPONSIBILITY, AUTHORITY AND RESOURCES in a common body. Right now we are fractured. We need to define the objectives, set up a system and let it function and be held accountable. A regional block grant system could be piloted to places ready to try. Gateway 1 might provide the first opportunity. Washington County: One Community also has tremendous potential for creating this shared capacity.
4. We need to further connect public health, community development, our education investment and workforce development into this plan. This is where most of our budget dollars go and represent the investment we are making in our PEOPLE. Healthy Community Coalitions are in many regions perhaps the strongest building blocks for integration.
5. We need to bring in the federal agencies. They are not now tied to our existing Smart Growth policies and can drive outcomes in a contrary direction; this can be addressed.
6. Make better use of our academic talents beyond R&D. If we are to set state objectives, ALL available resources must be pulling in the same direction. Minnesota has created a Regional Sustainable Development Partnership system that builds upon Cooperative Extension to provide “in-reach” from the community into the university, not just “out-reach” from the university to the community. It is working. There are good results. We should look at it as a model. (See CERTs program invitation for November 2.)
7. To enable the cultural and political will, we need scenario building tools that visually model the impacts of our policy choices. This is not easy; choices are difficult. If we can effectively engage the public, clearly see cause and effect, we will make the best possible choices.
8. Establish a statewide healthy, green quality of life brand – smart, efficient, integrated and proud of our stewardship of our natural, human and built resources. We can integrate all of our objectives under that banner. Market this to ourselves as well as visitors. We need to increase awareness of our shared interdependency and our societal business plan to thrive. We need to live it to attain it.
9. Communities need to be challenged to define their values and assets and move consciously forward toward their desired future. Comprehensive planning needs to be sharpened into more strategic planning. This is in essence a business plan for communities (local or regional). Not every place will do it but readiness comes in cycles. We need to feed the passion of civic entrepreneurs and connectors at the right time for the greatest return on investment and assist them with technical resources such as scenario building and fiscal impact models.
10. Consider new sources of private investment to supplement very limited public dollars such as the Nebraska Legacy Challenge model. We need to start with an analysis of our fiscal capacity, as study we are calling “What is Maine Worth?” (Hope you’ll ask me more about this!)