

ASSOCIATION OF MANITOBA MUNICIPALITIES

**Community Response to
AMM's 2003 Recommendations
re: Economic Development**

MAY 2005 REPORT

Prepared by
Morris Wrighton Association Management
700-177 Lombard Ave. Winnipeg MB R3B 0W5
204-925-3000 (tel) 204-925-8000 (fax)
smmorris@mts.net

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION.....	3
CONSULTATION PROCESS	4
SURVEY RESULTS.....	5
CONSULTATIVE FINDINGS	7
I. STAFF	7
II. COORDINATION.....	9
III. FUNDING	12
IV. COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP	13
CONCLUSION	15
APPENDIX 1 - ATTENDANCE.....	16
APPENDIX 2 - SURVEY RESPONSE.....	18

ASSOCIATION OF MANITOBA MUNICIPALITIES

Community Response To AMM's 2003 Recommendations Re: Economic Development

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

During 2002-03, the Association of Manitoba Municipalities (AMM) undertook a review of economic development in Manitoba. A Task Force on Economic Development was struck which held a number of consultative sessions with both economic development practitioners and municipalities to gain a better understanding of models now in place, and their strengths and deficiencies.

Based on the input and feedback received from participating municipalities and economic development organizations, the Task Force identified a number of conclusions and recommendations in a September 2003 report, mostly focusing on:

- Organizational structure/ planning processes and the need for greater cooperation and coordination of those involved in economic development
- Concerns about the adequacy of funding and the need for review of governments' approaches to funding;
- Concerns about ongoing ability to attract and retain staff and volunteers to lead and implement community economic development strategies.

The recommendations were brought forward to the provincial and federal governments and in early 2005, another consultative meeting was organized.

A survey was conducted to get some preliminary feedback and focus the consultative meeting. Survey findings indicated that:

1. There is broad support for AMM's September 2003 recommendations.
2. The extent to which these recommendations are already in place is lacking.
3. The majority thought it was important that the recommendations be pursued.
4. In terms of satisfaction with what is now taking place, there is room for improvement based on 51% of all responses falling in the "not satisfied" category.
5. The issues that were seen to be of most importance in improving economic development delivery are
 - a. Coordination
 - b. Funding Adequacy and Responsibility
 - c. Community Leadership
 - d. Staffing

As a result, these were the issues focused on at the April 30th meeting. Specific ideas on how to implement the AMM recommendations are outlined in the report, however, there were some key points that were expressed across the breakout discussions. The participants were of the view that the underpinning of any implementation plans must include:

1. A provincial rural economic development strategy developed by the Province
2. A greater understanding of economic development by municipal councils
3. A longer term funding commitment by all levels of government.

Appreciation is extended to the organizations and individuals who took the time to participate in the April 30th meeting. The support expressed for the AMM report instills confidence that these recommendations should be pursued.

INTRODUCTION

In February 2002, The AMM received a document entitled Building an Integrated Regional Economic Development Model that discussed the renewal of Manitoba's Regional Development Corporations (RDCs). The paper was prepared by the Province of Manitoba and contained recommendations that would have had an impact on the level of RDC funding expected of municipalities.

During 2002-03, AMM struck a Task Force on Economic Development and held a number of consultative sessions with both economic development practitioners and municipalities to gain a better understanding of the economic development process in Manitoba – what models are used, who is involved, the mandates of the various organizations, what services are offered, the role of government, and successes and deficiencies from the perspective of the practitioners and communities.

From this review, the AMM Board produced a September 2003 report that outlined a number of conclusions and recommendations that it suggested should be taken into consideration in any ongoing review of an economic development delivery framework. They included:

- The need for greater cooperation and coordination across governments, communities and organizations, in terms of the organizational structure and planning processes for economic development delivery;
- Concerns about the adequacy of funding and the need for review of governments' approaches to funding;
- Concerns about ongoing ability to attract and retain staff and volunteers to lead and implement community economic development strategies;

A working committee with representation from AMM, WD, Rural Secretariat and the Province was formed to review the report recommendations. Further consultation with community stakeholders was planned to test for concurrence with the AMM recommendations and begin discussions on an implementation strategy. This report covers the issues and recommendations raised at that April 2005 meeting.

To recap, the purpose of the October 2002 meeting was to collect information; the March-May 2003 consultations asked for advice on the issues identified in October 2002. From that, AMM prepared its September 2003 report and recommendations. The intent of the April 2005 consultation was to find out if there was support for the AMM recommendations and if so, to seek input on how could they be implemented.

CONSULTATION PROCESS

A meeting was planned for April 30th to coincide with many of the intended participants attending the 2005 Rural Forum in Brandon Manitoba. Fifty people attended the meeting, representing a good cross-section of economic development practitioners working in CDCs, RDCs, CFDCs, as well as elected municipal officials and government representatives (attendance list in appendix 1).

The objective of the meeting was for attendees to reflect on the AMM report recommendations and consider an implementation plan. AMM was interested in hearing which of the recommendations were most important to the success of the regions; what needs to be done to move the concepts forward; what are the barriers and how can they be overcome; and finally, what action steps could be taken to achieve short and long-term goals.

A survey was undertaken in advance of the meeting that asked respondents for their views on the 10 key recommendations from the AMM report, specifically:

1. Do you agree with the recommendation?
2. To what extent is it already happening in your community/region?
3. How important is it that this be continued or pursued in your community/region?
4. How satisfied are you with what is now happening in your community/region?
5. Which are the three most important recommendations to **improving** economic development delivery in your community/region?

The meeting focused on discussing implementation plans for the recommendations considered most important by survey respondents. Small group discussions were held in seven break-out groups and table moderators reported their conclusions to the overall group.

SURVEY RESULTS

The survey listed ten key recommendations from AMM's September 2003 report as follows.

	Recommendation
1	Community Leadership - individual communities must take primary responsibility for economic development. Community stakeholders must assume a leadership role in driving the development of an economic development vision, plan and strategies for the community.
2	The primary objective of all government economic development programming must be to support the community initiatives as identified in recommendation # 1.
3	Coordination - all three levels of governments – federal, provincial and municipal - must work together to develop a clear delineation of roles and responsibilities of government departments and organizations involved in economic development, with a view to identifying required services and responsibility for service delivery. Increased harmonization of existing organizations is recommended to eliminate duplication and overlap and to provide for enhanced joint planning, coordination and cooperation across governments and organizations.
4	Boundaries - Existing boundaries should be reviewed and allow the flexibility for communities to self-select to work together on a project-by-project basis according to community commonality.
5	Funding Adequacy – there should be increased commitment to funding for economic development by all levels of government. More funding should flow to the local community to address base economic development requirements; and the funding should flow within a flexible framework to address community needs.
6	Funding Responsibility - government funding needs to be committed on a longer term basis and a five year term is recommended, which would allow communities to progress on economic development plans and develop expertise.
7	Private Investment - all levels of government should take a proactive and creative approach to attracting private investment in local projects – including the establishment of investment funds and the promotion of public/private partnerships.
8	Accountability - tools should be developed that would help communities to evaluate their economic development progress and allow governments to assess value for their economic development funding.
9	Volunteers - more effort and resources need to be committed by all levels of government to volunteer management, particularly in training volunteers in economic development principles and practices.
10	Staff - more recognition must be given to the importance of EDOs in the economic development process and efforts must be made by all levels of government to develop professional staff capacity by examining issues such as job security, remuneration and training.

Survey respondents were first asked to indicate if they agreed with each of the ten AMM recommendations. There was broad support for all recommendations, with an average 96% support overall and a range of 84% (recommendation # 9 Volunteers – the only recommendation with less than 94% support) to 100% (recommendations 3, 6 & 7). (See page 18 for details.)

Respondents were next asked to indicate to what extent the recommended practices were happening in their own community/region (*using a scale of 1 = not happening at all, 2 = to some extent, 3 = to a great extent.*). The responses indicated that there was room for improvement with very few indications that the recommendations were already happening to a great extent. Only 7% of total responses were in the category of already happening to “a great extent” (52% to some extent, 40% not at all). The average for all responses was 1.68, with the average range for most falling between 1.5 and 1.9. Recommendations regarding “accountability” were happening to the least extent (average response 1.23). The most positive response was for the recommendation regarding “community leadership”, which was already happening to *some* (70%) or to a *great* (27%) extent. (average response 2.24). (See page 19 for details.)

The next section of the survey asked how important it was that the recommendations be pursued (*1 = Not important 2 = Somewhat important 3 = Very important*). Consistent with part 1, there was a high level of support, with the overall average being 2.72, and all but one recommendation receiving an average response of 2.5+ (the exception being # 9 “volunteers” with a score of 2.36 which included 18% saying it was not important it be pursued). Overall, 74% of the responses fell in the “very important” category (23% somewhat important, 3% not important). (See page 20 for details.)

The last question addressed how satisfied respondents were with what is now happening in their community/region (*1 = Not satisfied 2 = Somewhat satisfied 3 = Very satisfied*). Consistent with the answers to the earlier questions, satisfaction was lacking, with the average for all responses being 1.59 and only one recommendation reaching an average response of 2 (# 1 community leadership.) Overall, 51% of the responses were in the “not satisfied” category, 45% - somewhat satisfied and 5% - very satisfied. (See page 21 for details.)

Finally, respondents were asked, “If you had to pick three from the list that are the most important to **improving** economic delivery in your community/region, which would you pick?” The top responses were:

- Recommendation 3 – Coordination (17)
- Recommendations 5 & 6 – Funding Adequacy (15) & Responsibility (14)
- Recommendations 1 & 10 – Community Leadership & Staffing (each with 11 votes)

(Numbers in brackets indicate the number selecting it as one of their three choices. See page 22 for details.)

CONSULTATIVE FINDINGS

From 9:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. participants worked in groups of five to seven people to discuss the priorities identified in the survey. Specific questions were posed, designed to encourage a solution-oriented exchange of ideas on how to begin implementing the AMM recommendations. The following represents the views of those in attendance.

I. Staff

AMM RECOMMENDATION

Staff - more recognition must be given to the importance of EDOs in the economic development process and efforts must be made by all levels of government to develop professional staff capacity by examining issues such as job security, remuneration and training.

A. What changes are needed in your region to better meet what's been proposed by AMM regarding staffing issues?

1. More needs to be done to educate Councils on the importance of economic development. A change in attitude towards community and economic development is needed, and a recognition that economic development should be considered an investment and not a cost. There needs to be an improved understanding of the role of the EDO by the Council and region, as expectations are sometimes unrealistic.
2. A regional approach to economic development should be taken – communities cannot operate in isolation. There should be more coordination of existing staff and cooperation between communities and regions. A structured EDO network should be developed that would foster peer support. Partnership agreements between neighboring communities could be struck.
3. Establish a vision within the community and long term plans that would guide the EDO. This should include an assessment of the community's assets and shortcomings and the EDO skills that are needed.
4. Guidelines on EDO job descriptions, reporting structures, salary scales and benefit packages are needed and could perhaps be standardized. The package should enhance job security and entice people to stay in EDO roles in their communities. A core set of competencies should be defined that would assist in hiring EDOs.
5. Training is an issue – there is a need for better trained EDOs and access to professional development programs. Broad economic development training for the overall community was also recommended.

B. What could be done independently by your region over the next 12 months to achieve AMM's recommendation regarding staffing?

1. Educate Councils on the importance of economic development, the long term approach that is required and success criteria. Hold workshops for Councils on CED, goal setting and EDO roles. Ensure that elected officials understand what is happening regarding economic development and that they are discussing how their community fits into the larger picture.
2. Encourage sharing of resources – EDOs and other municipal services. Form partnerships between RMs.
3. Examine staffing contingents and how they could be improved.
4. Consider establishing CDCs where none currently exist.
5. Provide funding at local level for EDO training.
6. Establish EDO job descriptions and clearly identify and define the role and expectations.
7. Have EDOs join existing organizations that support training and networking – EDAM and MCDCA.

C. What needs to be done regarding staffing that is beyond the scope of your region? Who needs to do it?

1. Training of elected Councils could be addressed on a province-wide basis.
2. The roles of ED organizations need to be clarified and coordinated – CFDCs, MAFRI, RDCs, CDCs - to ensure best value for expenditures and sharing of expertise.
3. Federal/provincial/municipal governments should provide greater access to EDOs – may not be able to have an EDO in every community but should be able to access this resource. Review whether RDCs and CFDCs could provide more staff support to CDCs.
4. Review consistency of CFDC programming across the province.
5. Develop a database of available EDOs with training and experience, as well as a forecast of future needs (how many full time EDOs are there, projections on who is leaving the profession in MB).
6. Staffing needs to be elevated with more full-time EDOs with appropriate remuneration, and a greater number of qualified provincial EDAs in realistic regions. The Province needs to provide longer term funding contracts to address job security issues.
7. EDO training issues need to be tackled on a province-wide basis. A standardized certification program should be encouraged. Partnerships with Brandon University and/or RRC might be considered. Distance education options need to be available to facilitate access to training. A mentorship program would also be beneficial.

D. What do you see as barriers to proceeding? How can they be overcome?

1. Municipal council attitude, understanding, awareness and expectations of CED.
Roles of Board vs. staff need clarification
▶ Overcome through more orientation by AMM / feature in monthly magazine suggested.
2. Lack of an overall provincial/northern rural economic development strategy.
3. Competition between communities.
4. Urbanization/depopulation (larger centres have more support); special challenges for north/remote communities – offering training in rural/remote areas is difficult when numbers are small, but travel is a barrier.
5. Time required to develop new training programs
▶ Overcome by looking at programming already offered elsewhere rather than creating from scratch, or taking advantage of professional development available through EDAM, MCDCA, University of Waterloo or CF training. Technology exists to access training, which should help address distance/cost issues in north/remote communities.
6. Lack of funding / no budget line in municipal budgets for ED.
7. Lack of qualified EDOs
8. Leadership is needed - a level of government or an organization must take/be assigned the responsibility to address staffing issues; the three levels of government need a formal process to coordinate training.
9. Some CDCs were formed to access Community Loans program and are not really functioning as an arm of economic development.

II. Coordination

AMM RECOMMENDATION

Coordination - all three levels of governments – federal, provincial and municipal - must work together to develop a clear delineation of roles and responsibilities of government departments and organizations involved in economic development, with a view to identifying required services and responsibility for service delivery. Increased harmonization of existing organizations is recommended to eliminate duplication and overlap and to provide for enhanced joint planning, coordination and cooperation across governments and organizations.

A. What changes are needed in your region to better meet what's been proposed by AMM regarding coordination?

1. The Province needs a rural economic development strategy so that communities can set their priorities within that strategy. A regional development strategy could then be developed within the overall strategy, with local ownership.
2. A better understanding of the various economic development agencies, and their roles, responsibilities and services is needed. There should be a clear identification to Councils and boards what the purpose of the various organizations is, and an assessment of whether those organizations are meeting the needs of rural and northern communities. An inventory should be taken of who is in the region, what they do, and how services can be better coordinated at the regional level.
3. Assign responsibility for educating Council on CED and programs available.
4. Municipal officials need to be aware of AMM recommendations on ED and encouraged to have a voice in the implementation.
5. There should be a recognition that some regions are functioning well as is, while others might benefit from amalgamating their CFDC and RDC programs – each region is unique.
6. More incentives should be offered to encourage communities to work together; however, it needs to be recognized that regional cooperation in the north is difficult and unrealistic.
7. More focus on CDCs is recommended. Those that are not functioning properly should be reformed. Resources could be pooled locally and RDC tools accessed as required.

B. What could be done independently by your region over the next 12 months to achieve AMM's recommendation on the need for more coordination?

1. Identify existing models that work and emulate them (Eastman region has developed a region strategy with input / participation by all stakeholders, as an example.)
2. Stop turf wars and break down the barriers to cooperation. Educate municipalities on the need to participate in partnerships.
3. Improve regional communication and information sharing. Identify who in your region is involved in economic development and schedule joint quarterly meetings to develop/review regional strategy and roles, plan what needs to be done and who will do it.
4. Evaluate and measure return on investment.
5. Lobby provincial governments to put priority on rural ED strategy.
6. Better communication with municipal councils by RDCs, CFDCs and between staff and Boards.
7. Create a database of existing services and who offers them. Work to eliminate any overlaps in service.

C. What needs to be done in the interest of better coordination that is beyond the scope of your region? Who needs to do it?

1. The Province needs to set a long-term rural economic development strategy that would provide an overall framework for regions and communities in establishing locally driven plans; and then provide direction to ED organizations on their roles in implementing the plan.
2. A northern development strategy is required.
3. Tourism should be recognized as an element within the economic development strategy.
4. There needs to be tripartite federal/provincial/municipal CED agreements.
5. The federal and provincial governments should do more to educate municipalities on ED organizations and the services they offer.
6. There should be a department/contact assigned to take responsibility for coordination of ED programs and services – perhaps under MAFRI's new 'go centres'.
7. Federal/provincial governments should do more to promote best practices from other jurisdictions on federal/provincial cooperation and share ED success stories.
8. AMM could assume greater responsibility for educating municipal councils on economic development and changing existing mindsets, perhaps by offering information on the benefits of communities working together.

D. What do you see as barriers to proceeding? How can they be overcome?

1. Turf wars – municipality versus municipality, province versus federal, CFDC versus RDC – parochial attitudes and lack of commitment to cooperation
 - ▶ Overcome by demonstrating successes and benefits of working together
 - ▶ Provide incentives for cooperative approaches
 - ▶ Regional organizations can be stronger than an individual community working alone – especially to address priority areas across a region
 - ▶ Aim for more coordination in the planning process – inclusion of all players, break out who will do what, assign tasks, timelines and budgets.
2. Too much redefining at provincial level re CED – no focus on north – moving in too many different directions, no overall strategy
3. Too much discussion, not enough action
4. Diversity of problems across the province
5. Lack of leadership – somebody has to lead the charge
6. Lack of accountability
7. Coordination/cooperation can be time and resource consuming
8. Inadequate funding – offloading to municipalities
9. Some organizations don't have any staff
10. Geography is a barrier, especially in the north
11. Red tape – forcing community plans to fit government programs
12. Buy-in from municipalities that do not feel the regional process is the best approach.

III. Funding

AMM Recommendation

Funding Adequacy – there should be increased commitment to funding for economic development by all levels of government. More funding should flow to the local community to address base economic development requirements; and the funding should flow within a flexible framework to address community needs.

Funding Responsibility - government funding needs to be committed on a longer term basis and a five year term is recommended, which would allow communities to progress on economic development plans and develop expertise.

A. What changes are needed in your region to better meet what's been proposed by AMM regarding funding?

1. A longer term funding commitment from all levels of government is required.
2. Funding should be linked to regional strategic plans.
3. Educate local leaders that CED is part of municipal responsibility. Can't ask Province for funding if not prepared to make a local dollar commitment. There needs to be an actual budget line dedicated to CED in municipal budgets with a clear definition of what are the parameters of CED.
4. Core funding needs to be in place that allows municipalities to support a CED program and cover the costs of hiring CED officers.
5. Commit a portion of VLT dollars to CED.
6. Define/guide how CED funds are spent to ensure accountability. This should be a joint process between funders and recipients to develop clear descriptions of expectations, funding and measurements.
7. Downloading of responsibilities must end.
8. Mechanisms for accessing funding need to be reviewed. In some cases, the capacity doesn't exist to even access programs, or dollars are being spent on efforts to secure future funding rather than on ED programming.

B. What could be done independently by your region over the next 12 months to achieve AMM's recommendation on funding?

1. Access community roundtable funds to bring all parties involved in CED together.
2. Promote putting in place matching formula to encourage communities to invest in ED (now being done by CDEM for example)
3. AMM to encourage communities to spend VLT dollars on CED, possibly made available on a matching basis.

4. Establish transparency measures re: CED spending.
5. Encourage private sector to support CED initiatives.
6. Seek opportunities for collaboration with other communities that could maximize funding.
7. Public communications on funding CED.
8. Coordinated lobbying efforts to advance the need for adequate funding.

C. What needs to be done regarding funding that is beyond the scope of your region? Who needs to do it?

1. Determine appropriate delivery agents – municipalities vs. higher levels of government.
2. Pursue long-term agreements with core funding and project funding.
3. AMM to lobby for increased funding, coordination of funding between federal and provincial governments and for the establishment of provincial/municipal agreements
4. Look at accessibility to existing funding – is “need” a consideration or your ability to access?
5. The Province should provide incentives for towns/municipalities that are investing in economic development.

D. What do you see as barriers to proceeding? How can they be overcome?

1. Lack of provincial strategy, continuity and commitment to long term funding.
2. Apprehension due to past experience of programs being reduced/cut.
3. Rural vs. urban bias.
4. Communities don't have control over funding agreements.

IV. Community Leadership

AMM Recommendation

Community Leadership - individual communities must take primary responsibility for economic development. Community stakeholders must assume a leadership role in driving the development of an economic development vision, plan and strategies for the community.

A. What changes are needed in your region to better meet what's been proposed by AMM regarding community leadership?

1. Stakeholders should be encouraged to become engaged in leadership roles – agencies should facilitate this happening.
2. Value ideas, start fresh, be innovative, focus on the future, broaden the vision.
3. Look outside the community for new ideas/approaches.
4. Involve youth – incorporate their ideas, work on retaining them in communities, develop leaders for tomorrow.
5. Training/capacity building – workshops on CED for volunteers and practitioners.
6. Set realistic objectives based on facts.
7. RMs must recognize that economic development is part of their mandate and they need to develop a plan.

B. What could be done independently by your region over the next 12 months to achieve AMM's recommendation on community leadership?

1. Hold leadership events and develop a network (breakfast meetings in the community to discuss projects and issues, clarify expectations for volunteers – what do they want to do and how does it relate to the community)
2. Identify local champions to take a leadership role on specific initiatives.
3. Offer training sessions on developing and implementing a vision.
4. Develop youth leadership strategies .

C. What needs to be done to foster community leadership that is beyond the scope of your region? Who needs to do it?

1. Develop community plans, visions, goals within a provincial economic development strategy.
2. Volunteer recruitment and leadership training.
3. Succession planning.
4. Introduce CED within schools and gain interest of youth

D. What do you see as barriers to proceeding? How can they be overcome?

1. Long term nature of CED
2. Inability to carry plan forward – lack of local resources
3. Lack of understanding/direction on where we want to go
4. Resistance to change
5. The will to participate
6. Ego
7. Volunteer burnout and exhaustion

8. Attitude towards inclusion – sometimes there is not recognition by municipal leaders that there are other community stakeholders that can assume leadership roles.
9. Time commitment required.

CONCLUSION

Many of the issues raised at this meeting repeat what had been heard at meetings in 2002 and 2003 – the need for more collaboration, the value of taking a regional approach to economic development, funding inadequacies, the need to train municipal councils, volunteers and staff.

However, at the April 30th session, there were also many suggestions of actions that could be taken to address the issues and improve Manitoba's economic development delivery system. Participants in the ED process are encouraged to review this report and assess what actions they can take independently in their regions. AMM will continue to assess the role it can play on a provincial scale in influencing positive change and addressing existing deficiencies.

Appendix 1 - Attendance

First Name	Last Name	Organization
Dale	Banman	Killarney
Armand	Barbeau	MB Aboriginal & Native Affairs
Jean	Beaumont	Association des Municipalites Bilingues du Manitoba
Ron	Bell	AMM
Barb	Bloodworth	Leaf Rapids, Town
Frank	Bloodworth	Leaf Rapids, Town
Ed	Brethour	Hamiota Economic Development Corporation
Joe	Bruie	Greenstone CFDC
Ivan	Bruneau	RM of Victoria
Murielle	Bugera	Chaboille CDC
Penny	Burton	Roblin-Cartwright CDC
Brenda	Clark	Ste Rose CDC
Ann	Dandenault	Province of Manitoba
Kevin	Dearing	Pinawa CDC
Adrian	DeGroot	City of Thompson
Jason	Denbow	CFPM
Joy	Dornian	Souris Glenwood CDC
Ilija	Dragojevic	Pembina Valley Development Corporation
Ron	Funk	Eastman RDC
Yvette	Gaultier	Lourdeon CDC
Ian	Goodall-George	Triple R CFDC
Todd	Goranson	Super Six CFDC
Mary	Greber	Winnipeg River Brokenhead CFDC
Maurice	Hince	CDEM
Terry	Howard	Lac du Bonnet
Tammy	Hudyma	NEICOM
Larry	Johnson	MCDCA
John	Killingbeck	Manitoba Hydro
Tyler	King	Turtle Mountain CDC
Hollis	Kinsey	MAFRI
Ron	Kosfesky	MCDCA
Bruce	Krentz	NorMan Regional Development Corporation
Morris	Lawrence	RM of East St. Paul
Herm	Martens	RM of Morris
Ruth	Mealey	MCDCA
John	Neabel	Town of Minnedosa
Brian	Nedohin	MAFRI
Teri	Nicholson	Wheat Belt Community Futures Development Corporation and Shoal Lake Regional Community Development Corporation
Paul	Overgaard	City of Dauphin
Darell	Pack	Rural Secretariat
Norm	Plett	RM Hanover
Linda	Ransom	MCDCA
John	Rigaux	Argyle

Ross	Rowan	RM of Miniota
Chris	Sanderson	NEICOM
Darryl	Stroh	MAFRI
Lilian	Tankard	Travel Manitoba
Louis	Tetrault	CDEM
Neil	Warkentin	RM Hanover
Percy	Williams	Province of Manitoba

Committee Members

Peter Reimer	Province of Manitoba
Dale Johnston	Western Economic Diversification
Darrel Pack	Rural Secretariat
Steve Lupky	AMM
Rachel Philippe	AMM

Appendix 2 - Survey Response

1. Do you agree with the recommendation?

	Recommendation	Yes	No
1	Community Leadership - individual communities must take primary responsibility for economic development. Community stakeholders must assume a leadership role in driving the development of an economic development vision, plan and strategies for the community.	32 (97%)	1
2	The primary objective of all government economic development programming must be to support the community initiatives as identified in recommendation # 1.	30 (94%)	2
3	Coordination - all three levels of governments – federal, provincial and municipal - must work together to develop a clear delineation of roles and responsibilities of government departments and organizations involved in economic development, with a view to identifying required services and responsibility for service delivery. Increased harmonization of existing organizations is recommended to eliminate duplication and overlap and to provide for enhanced joint planning, coordination and cooperation across governments and organizations.	32 (100%)	0
4	Boundaries - Existing boundaries should be reviewed and allow the flexibility for communities to self-select to work together on a project-by-project basis according to community commonality.	30 (94%)	2
5	Funding Adequacy – there should be increased commitment to funding for economic development by all levels of government. More funding should flow to the local community to address base economic development requirements; and the funding should flow within a flexible framework to address community needs.	30 (97%)	1
6	Funding Responsibility - government funding needs to be committed on a longer term basis and a five year term is recommended, which would allow communities to progress on economic development plans and develop expertise.	33 (100%)	0
7	Private Investment - all levels of government should take a proactive and creative approach to attracting private investment in local projects – including the establishment of investment funds and the promotion of public/private partnerships.	33 (100%)	0
8	Accountability - tools should be developed that would help communities to evaluate their economic development progress and allow governments to assess value for their economic development funding.	30 (97%)	1
9	Volunteers - more effort and resources need to be committed by all levels of government to volunteer management, particularly in training volunteers in economic development principles and practices.	27 (84%)	5
10	Staff - more recognition must be given to the importance of EDOs in the economic development process and efforts must be made by all levels of government to develop professional staff capacity by examining issues such as job security, remuneration and training.	31 (97%)	1
	Average overall	96%	

2. To what extent is it already happening in your community/region?

		1	2	3	
	Recommendation	Not at all	To some extent	To a great extent	Avg.
1	Community Leadership - individual communities must take primary responsibility for economic development. Community stakeholders must assume a leadership role in driving the development of an economic development vision, plan and strategies for the community.	1 (3%)	23 (70%)	9 (27%)	2.24
2	The primary objective of all government economic development programming must be to support the community initiatives as identified in recommendation # 1.	7 (23%)	21 (68%)	3 (10%)	1.87
3	Coordination - all three levels of governments – federal, provincial and municipal - must work together to develop a clear delineation of roles and responsibilities of government departments and organizations involved in economic development, with a view to identifying required services and responsibility for service delivery. Increased harmonization of existing organizations is recommended to eliminate duplication and overlap and to provide for enhanced joint planning, coordination and cooperation across governments and organizations.	15 (45%)	17 (52%)	1 (3%)	1.58
4	Boundaries - Existing boundaries should be reviewed and allow the flexibility for communities to self-select to work together on a project-by-project basis according to community commonality.	8 (25%)	19 (59%)	5 (16%)	1.91
5	Funding Adequacy – there should be increased commitment to funding for economic development by all levels of government. More funding should flow to the local community to address base economic development requirements; and the funding should flow within a flexible framework to address community needs.	13 (39%)	20 (61%)	0 (0%)	1.61
6	Funding Responsibility - government funding needs to be committed on a longer term basis and a five year term is recommended, which would allow communities to progress on economic development plans and develop expertise.	15 (45%)	15 (45%)	3 (9%)	1.64
7	Private Investment - all levels of government should take a proactive and creative approach to attracting private investment in local projects – including the establishment of investment funds and the promotion of public/private partnerships.	16 (48%)	16 (48%)	1 (3%)	1.55
8	Accountability - tools should be developed that would help communities to evaluate their economic development progress and allow governments to assess value for their economic development funding.	25 (76%)	7 (21%)	0 (0%)	1.23
9	Volunteers - more effort and resources need to be committed by all levels of government to volunteer management, particularly in training volunteers in economic development principles and practices	17 (52%)	16 (48%)	0 (0%)	1.48
10	Staff - more recognition must be given to the importance of EDOs in the economic development process and efforts must be made by all levels of government to develop professional staff capacity by examining issues such as job security, remuneration and training.	12 (38%)	17 (53%)	2 (6%)	1.70
	Average overall	40%	52%	7%	1.68

3. How important is it that the recommendations be continued or pursued in your region?

		1	2	3	
	Recommendation	Not important	Somewhat important	Very important	Avg.
1	Community Leadership - individual communities must take primary responsibility for economic development. Community stakeholders must assume a leadership role in driving the development of an economic development vision, plan and strategies for the community.	0 (0%)	2 (6%)	31 (94%)	2.94
2	The primary objective of all government economic development programming must be to support the community initiatives as identified in recommendation # 1.	0 (0%)	1 (3%)	30 (97%)	2.97
3	Coordination - all three levels of governments – federal, provincial and municipal - must work together to develop a clear delineation of roles and responsibilities of government departments and organizations involved in economic development, with a view to identifying required services and responsibility for service delivery. Increased harmonization of existing organizations is recommended to eliminate duplication and overlap and to provide for enhanced joint planning, coordination and cooperation across governments and organizations.	0 (0%)	4 (12%)	29 (88%)	2.88
4	Boundaries - Existing boundaries should be reviewed and allow the flexibility for communities to self-select to work together on a project-by-project basis according to community commonality.	2 (6%)	12 (38%)	18 (56%)	2.50
5	Funding Adequacy – there should be increased commitment to funding for economic development by all levels of government. More funding should flow to the local community to address base economic development requirements; and the funding should flow within a flexible framework to address community needs.	0 (0%)	9 (27%)	24 (73%)	2.73
6	Funding Responsibility - government funding needs to be committed on a longer term basis and a five year term is recommended, which would allow communities to progress on economic development plans and develop expertise.	0 (0%)	4 (12%)	29 (88%)	2.88
7	Private Investment - all levels of government should take a proactive and creative approach to attracting private investment in local projects – including the establishment of investment funds and the promotion of public/private partnerships.	0 (0%)	9 (27%)	24 (73%)	2.73
8	Accountability - tools should be developed that would help communities to evaluate their economic development progress and allow governments to assess value for their economic development funding.	1 (3%)	12 (36%)	20 (61%)	2.58
9	Volunteers - more effort and resources need to be committed by all levels of government to volunteer management, particularly in training volunteers in economic development principles and practices	6 (18%)	9 (27%)	18 (55%)	2.36
10	Staff - more recognition must be given to the importance of EDOs in the economic development process and efforts must be made by all levels of government to develop professional staff capacity by examining issues such as job security, remuneration and training.	1 (3%)	3 (9%)	29 (88%)	2.85
	Average Overall	3%	23%	74%	2.72

4. How satisfied are you with what is now happening in your community/region?

		1	2	3	
	Recommendation	Not satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Very satisfied	Avg.
1	Community Leadership - individual communities must take primary responsibility for economic development. Community stakeholders must assume a leadership role in driving the development of an economic development vision, plan and strategies for the community.	5 (15%)	23 (70%)	5 (15%)	2.00
2	The primary objective of all government economic development programming must be to support the community initiatives as identified in recommendation # 1.	12 (39%)	17 (55%)	2 (6%)	1.68
3	Coordination - all three levels of governments – federal, provincial and municipal - must work together to develop a clear delineation of roles and responsibilities of government departments and organizations involved in economic development, with a view to identifying required services and responsibility for service delivery. Increased harmonization of existing organizations is recommended to eliminate duplication and overlap and to provide for enhanced joint planning, coordination and cooperation across governments and organizations.	20 (61%)	11 (33%)	2 (6%)	1.45
4	Boundaries - Existing boundaries should be reviewed and allow the flexibility for communities to self-select to work together on a project-by-project basis according to community commonality.	10 (31%)	18 (56%)	4 (13%)	1.81
5	Funding Adequacy – there should be increased commitment to funding for economic development by all levels of government. More funding should flow to the local community to address base economic development requirements; and the funding should flow within a flexible framework to address community needs.	16 (48%)	17 (52%)	0 (0%)	1.52
6	Funding Responsibility - government funding needs to be committed on a longer term basis and a five year term is recommended, which would allow communities to progress on economic development plans and develop expertise.	18 (55%)	13 (39%)	2 (6%)	1.52
7	Private Investment - all levels of government should take a proactive and creative approach to attracting private investment in local projects – including the establishment of investment funds and the promotion of public/private partnerships.	19 (58%)	14 (42%)	0 (0%)	1.42
8	Accountability - tools should be developed that would help communities to evaluate their economic development progress and allow governments to assess value for their economic development funding.	22 (67%)	11 (33%)	0 (0%)	1.33
9	Volunteers - more effort and resources need to be committed by all levels of government to volunteer management, particularly in training volunteers in economic development principles and practices	15 (45%)	16 (48%)	2 (6%)	1.61
10	Staff - more recognition must be given to the importance of EDOs in the economic development process and efforts must be made by all levels of government to develop professional staff capacity by examining issues such as job security, remuneration and training.	16 (48%)	13 (42%)	3 (9%)	1.61
	Average Overall	51%	45%	5%	1.59

5. If you had to pick three from the list that are the most important to improving economic delivery in your community/region, which would you pick?

	Recommendation	#
1	Community Leadership - individual communities must take primary responsibility for economic development. Community stakeholders must assume a leadership role in driving the development of an economic development vision, plan and strategies for the community.	11
2	The primary objective of all government economic development programming must be to support the community initiatives as identified in recommendation # 1.	2
3	Coordination - all three levels of governments – federal, provincial and municipal - must work together to develop a clear delineation of roles and responsibilities of government departments and organizations involved in economic development, with a view to identifying required services and responsibility for service delivery. Increased harmonization of existing organizations is recommended to eliminate duplication and overlap and to provide for enhanced joint planning, coordination and cooperation across governments and organizations.	17
4	Boundaries - Existing boundaries should be reviewed and allow the flexibility for communities to self-select to work together on a project-by-project basis according to community commonality.	1
5	Funding Adequacy – there should be increased commitment to funding for economic development by all levels of government. More funding should flow to the local community to address base economic development requirements; and the funding should flow within a flexible framework to address community needs.	15
6	Funding Responsibility - government funding needs to be committed on a longer term basis and a five year term is recommended, which would allow communities to progress on economic development plans and develop expertise.	14
7	Private Investment - all levels of government should take a proactive and creative approach to attracting private investment in local projects – including the establishment of investment funds and the promotion of public/private partnerships.	2
8	Accountability - tools should be developed that would help communities to evaluate their economic development progress and allow governments to assess value for their economic development funding.	2
9	Volunteers - more effort and resources need to be committed by all levels of government to volunteer management, particularly in training volunteers in economic development principles and practices	5
10	Staff - more recognition must be given to the importance of EDOs in the economic development process and efforts must be made by all levels of government to develop professional staff capacity by examining issues such as job security, remuneration and training.	11