



**City of Kansas City, Missouri
Economic Development & Incentive Policy
Task Force
Meeting #10**

Date: Wednesday, August 29, 2007, 5:00 – 8:00 p.m.

Location: St. James Lutheran Church, 1104 NE Vivion Road

Time: 5:00 – 6:45 p.m. Business Session
7:00 – 8:00 p.m. Public Hearing

Meeting Purpose:

1. Determine consensus on open policy questions
2. Determine consensus on of policy recommendations from public
3. Review results from policy factor prioritization exercise
4. Final comments on policy recommendation to Mayor

AGENDA

5:00 p.m.	Remarks from Chair about the objective of the meeting	Bill Haw
5:05 p.m.	Determine consensus on open policy questions <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Definition of Economic Development (see page 12) b. Definition of Quality Jobs (see page 13) c. Recommendations related to small business (see page 10) 	Sheila Shockey
6:05 p.m.	Determine consensus on policy recommendations from public testimony (page 14)	Sheila Shockey
6:25 p.m.	Review results from policy factor prioritization exercise (see page 8)	Sheila Shockey
6:30 p.m.	Task Force comments on policy recommendation/important impacts of policy	Sheila Shockey
6:45 p.m.	Adjourn work session portion of Task Force meeting	
7:00–8:00 p.m.	Public hearing	

Thank you for your service!!

Next Steps:

- Bill Haw will deliver the final policy recommendation to the Mayor and City Council on Thursday, August 30 by the end of business as required by the enabling council resolution
- If you would like to provide a communication to the Mayor and Council to accompany the final policy, please deliver it to Bill Haw **by 3:00 P.M. on Thursday** (livestockexchange@kc.rr.com)

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND INCENTIVE POLICY RECOMMENDATION

Statement of Purpose:

The purpose of the Kansas City's Economic Development and Incentive Policy is to:

- ✓ Define economic development in Kansas City
- ✓ Establish a framework for actions needed to make Kansas City more livable for all residents
- ✓ Generate lasting private investment in Kansas City, benefiting all residents
- ✓ Guide decision-making regarding how public investments are made in support of economic development

The City's Economic Development and Incentive Policy is a living document and is periodically evaluated to ensure that the policy direction reflects the City's desired outcomes.

What is Economic Development?

For Kansas City, economic development is defined as:

The process whereby a community creates the conditions which foster economic growth, the outcome of which is an improvement in the quality of life. The outcomes of economic development are the return for the City's investment in this process. Economic development that only benefits one segment of the community, despite an investment by all, is not sustainable. Therefore, sustainable economic development must encompass a process which produces outcomes for all concerned. Desired outcomes include: an increase in human capital development, such as education, job skills, and childcare; an increase in financial capital development, such as job growth, small business development and access to credit; the protection of natural capital, including natural and physical resources; and the betterment of community, such as blight reduction, poverty reduction, crime reduction and increased recreational opportunities.

[See Attachment A on page XX for an alternative definition]

Outcomes of Kansas City's Economic Development and Incentive Policy:

Quality of life and economic development are interdependent community priorities. Achieving one cannot be at the expense of the other. A strong, vibrant community attracts economic investment. Outcome-driven economic investment results in long-range financial returns, as well as community benefits that improve quality of life. To improve the quality of life for all residents and secure Kansas City's future as a vital, livable community, certain outcomes must be achieved as a result of economic development investments:

- **Create quality jobs**
- **Strengthen the economy and build the wealth of Kansas City**
- **Sustain a high quality of life**

- **Promote stewardship of the City’s resources**
- **Maintain and develop affordable, quality housing opportunities**
- **Promote comprehensive opportunities for education, skills development and lifelong learning**

The six Policy Outcomes, and a number of factors for each outcome, are described in more depth below.

▶ Create Quality Jobs

Kansas City’s Economic Development and Incentive Policy assists the City in generating and maintaining quality jobs. Quality jobs are **[see Attachment B on page XX]**.

- ✓ **Business Assistance:** support small businesses in the city; preserve, develop and sustain businesses, and promote an entrepreneurial culture.
- ✓ **Focus on Economically Disadvantaged Areas:** target economic opportunities for economically disadvantaged areas of the city.
- ✓ **High Quality Benefits:** focus on jobs that provide quality benefits, including affordable health insurance and retirement; subsidize the health insurance costs of employers who employ workers who live and work within certain empowerment zones or communities.
- ✓ **Local Jobs for City Residents:** tie public investments in private enterprise to the creation of quality jobs for existing residents of the city, especially jobs that will create opportunities for the city’s unemployed.
- ✓ **Provide Connections:** connect skilled workers with employers needing skilled help using city partnerships, such as faith-based organizations, community colleges and vocational/technical facilities.
- ✓ **Workforce Development:** invest in workforce development activities, such as job training and development of life skills; improve opportunities for high-tech educational opportunities and jobs.
- ✓ **Workforce Support:** provide support to employees, such as assistance with day care, transportation or housing needs; ensure displaced employees are reintegrated quickly into the city’s workforce.

▶ Strengthen the Economy and Build the Wealth of the Kansas City

Kansas City’s Economic Development and Incentive Policy assists the City in strengthening the local economy and building the wealth of the city by increasing the income of all residents while reflecting a concern for the distribution of income, growing the profits of city businesses, reducing poverty and strengthening the tax bases of the city’s local governments.

- ✓ **Business Development:** grow small businesses into larger ones and create opportunities for new businesses to flourish; promote an entrepreneurial culture.
- ✓ **Business Recruitment:** recruit and relocate existing businesses from outside of the city.

- ✓ **Business Retention:** retain a diverse array of current businesses within the city. Develop and maintain business relationships with existing businesses and gather better business intelligence (who is growing and who is shrinking).
- ✓ **Cluster Development Promotion:** recruit, retain and grow multiple and complementary businesses in the same industry type. Kansas City, for instance, is seeking to develop a biosciences cluster following the construction of the Stowers Institute.
- ✓ **Improved Business Climate:** improve the City's friendliness to business; streamline the City's practices and procedures by which businesses obtain permits, licenses and other requirements for operation; ensure quality customer service by City employees through high expectations, training and multilingualism.
- ✓ **Integration of Diversity:** ensure the integration of all races, ethnicities and cultures into the City's economy and social structure.
- ✓ **Marketing Efforts:** promote Kansas City through electronic, print and other media to attract private investment, promote tourism and encourage enjoyment of the city's many benefits by residents of the Metro area.
- ✓ **Sustainable Development:** ensure development meets both today's needs and those of future generations.
- ✓ **Target Development Areas:** identify specific areas within the city that will be the target of economic development activity.

▶ Sustain a High Quality of Life

Kansas City's Economic Development and Incentive Policy assists the City in enhancing Kansas City as a "most livable city" by supporting basic public services, promoting public safety (both real and perceived), protecting the environment and fostering a vital creative culture.

- ✓ **Blight Reduction:** reduce or eliminate blight.
- ✓ **Collaboration:** link neighborhood groups, religious institutions and businesses to work together in a collaborative way to improve quality of life.
- ✓ **Crime Reduction:** pursue strategies that reduce crime and enhance the perception of safety in every neighborhood.
- ✓ **Culture/Arts:** enhance existing or develop new arts and culture infrastructure, programs, activities and opportunities for residents and visitors to experience a diverse, high-quality mix of arts and culture (examples of outcomes to be measured include the numbers of resident artists, galleries, artist studios and live/work spaces, performance venues, arts organizations, and museums, as well as annual attendance at arts and cultural events and facilities).
- ✓ **Environment:** focus on development/redevelopment projects that are "climate-friendly" meaning they help minimize or reduce greenhouse gas emissions; promote "green construction," such as requiring developments to design and construct according to the U.S. Green Building Council's LEED (Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design) Standards.
- ✓ **Infrastructure Plans:** preserve, enhance & construct physical infrastructure to support economic development.

- ✓ **Land Preservation/Restoration:** acquire, preserve land as a tool of economic development. Examples include preserving the City's green infrastructure and remediating "brownfields" sites.
- ✓ **Livability:** create livable neighborhoods that help in making physical and social connections between people.
- ✓ **Maintain Unique Assets:** preserve and enhance the natural and man-made assets unique to the city.
- ✓ **Neighborhoods/Community Development:** preserve and enhance neighborhoods and small communities within the city. Examples include micro development business opportunities and the preservation of historic neighborhoods.
- ✓ **Partnerships:** build long-term partnerships between law enforcement, community groups, developers and other key parties in troubled communities to reduce persistent crime, disorder and fear.
- ✓ **Physical Improvements:** target physical improvements and improve development design to prevent crime and improve the perception of public safety.
- ✓ **Public Transit:** promote "transit-oriented design," promoting the use of public transportation as a tool of economic development.
- ✓ **Quality of Life:** promote city quality of life. Examples include park and open space development, walking/biking trails, and access to unique retail and dining within the city.
- ✓ **Youth Involvement:** develop programming and opportunities to engage the city's youth, including job opportunities and skills development, and to steer youth away from crime.

▶ Promote Stewardship of the City's Resources

Kansas City's Economic Development and Incentive Policy provides a framework to ensure that public investment in economic development is measured, appropriate, effective and affordable.

- ✓ **Fiscal Impact on City:** control the fiscal impacts of the economic development plan or policy on the city government.
- ✓ **Impact on Neighborhoods:** require development applications to include a statement of neighborhood impact including both examples of the positives from the development (for example, the opening of a community grocery) and the negatives (for example, traffic congestion and light pollution).
- ✓ **Measurement:** monitor, measure and report on each development's progress in delivering on its economic, social and environmental promises.
- ✓ **Social Impact on City:** ensure that private development benefiting from public investment produces benefits broader than just financial.
- ✓ **Sustainability:** make decisions and take actions promoting the "3 Es"—economic vitality, social equity, and environmental quality.

► Maintain and Develop Affordable, Quality Housing Opportunities

Kansas City's Economic Development and Incentive Policy assists the City in ensuring that every Kansas Citian—in every corner of the city—has access to quality, affordable housing. The City promotes a diverse housing supply through implementation of its own housing policy (City Ordinance #070062), and partners with state and local agencies, organizations, non-profits and community groups to ensure the success of its housing initiatives.

- ✓ **Compete for Development:** compete with neighboring communities for new housing development projects.
- ✓ **Construct Quality, Affordable Housing:** use incentives and public/private partnerships to promote the construction of quality, affordable housing, especially in economically-challenged areas.
- ✓ **Encourage Mixed-Income Development:** de-concentrate areas of poverty and integrate market rate, affordable and public housing units in the same neighborhood (i.e. mixed income housing development).
- ✓ **Identify Market Impediments to Housing Development:** analyze impediments to quality, affordable and market-rate housing and use public investment to correct problem conditions.
- ✓ **Protect Existing Housing Stock:** Re-use and conserve existing buildings so that prevailing character of the neighborhood is maintained; ensure renters have access to rehabilitation and improvement funds, as well as owner-occupants.
- ✓ **Replace Housing Stock:** require the replacement of housing units that are viable and demolished as a result of development projects receiving incentives.
- ✓ **Target Development Areas:** identify specific areas within the city that will be the target of economic development activity.
- ✓ **Uniform Application of Housing Standards:** apply housing standards uniformly across the city for every type of new and rehabilitated housing to ensure quality construction.

► Promote Comprehensive Opportunities for Education, Skills Development and Lifelong Learning

Kansas City's Economic Development and Incentive Policy recognizes that a quality education for every Kansas Citian forms the foundation for all other economic development efforts. Quality academic, vocational, and technical education provides the existing and future workforce with the skills necessary to allow Kansas City to build its own knowledge asset base and to compete for private investment.

- ✓ **Early Childhood Education:** ensure availability and access to early childhood education for all families and involving all segments of the city in sponsoring youth education and recreation programs.
- ✓ **Lifelong Learning:** ensure that residents are afforded the opportunity to learn throughout their lives and in every phase of what they do.
- ✓ **Post-Secondary Education:** Provide opportunities for after high school and adult learning through a variety of alternatives, including post-secondary

education, continuing education and training, workforce development and on-the-job-training, and “recreational” or vocational learning.

- ✓ **Primary and Secondary Education:** Support kindergarten through high school education by demanding high quality education and supporting positive family involvement.
- ✓ **Quality:** improve both the quality of K-12 public education and the perception of public school quality in the city.

Application Review, Project Compliance, and Policy Evaluation:

The City’s economic development investment process has three steps and includes a feedback loop to promote policy refinement from time to time. The three steps are: **application intake and review; project compliance; and policy evaluation.**

▶ Application intake and review

The Economic Development Corporation (EDC) serves as the initial point-of-entry for all applications for public investment in economic development projects. Once a developer has filed an application with the EDC, the EDC immediately conveys the application materials to the City Manager’s Office which coordinates the City’s review.

- ✓ **Objective system to evaluate applications for assistance:** the EDC and City use the same standard, quantifiable, objective system to evaluate the extent to which project applications address the City’s economic development Policy Outcomes.
- ✓ **Project achievement of City policy objectives:** developers are required to identify how their proposed projects meet the Policy Outcomes of the City.
- ✓ **Evaluation of impact on existing businesses:** the impact on existing businesses of a proposed development is considered when incentives are proposed for new or expanding businesses, including a quantification of potential substitution effects, a quantification of any adverse impact on other areas of the City already having received public investment, and a description of whether unfair competition would result from the public investment being made in the project.
- ✓ **City Council approval of all requests for public investment:** the City Council has final approval over *all* incentives or public investments granted by the City or any of its partner economic development agencies.
- ✓ **Summary impact statement:** City staff prepares and the City Council reviews a summary fiscal and social impact analysis, transmitted with any development-related agenda item to be considered by the City Council or its committees, for every project under consideration. This statement identifies the extent to which the proposed project comports to this policy and achieves the City’s Policy Outcomes.
- ✓ **Public access to application:** the City uses a formal process to engage Kansas City residents in the application review process and, at a minimum, makes detailed information about the application and proposed project available to the public timely enough to allow public comment to the EDC, City Council, Council Committees, or the boards of the City’s partner agencies, on the pending application.

- ✓ **Exceptions to process:** the City Council may grant exceptions to the evaluation system after making a finding or findings that the project cannot or should not be evaluated using the standard process.

Each application for public investment will be reviewed for its attention to a number of policy factors. In order of priority, these factors include:

	Policy Measurement	Policy Objective	Votes
8	Reduce or remove blight	Quality of Life	8
3	Generate net new Quality Jobs	Create Quality Jobs	7
17	High ratio of private to public investment	Stewardship of City Resources	7
11	Preserve, enhance or build infrastructure in priority areas as defined by the City	Quality of Life	6
14	Results of City fiscal model show net positive benefit to the City	Stewardship of City Resources	6
4	Generate net new jobs for unemployed residents	Create Quality Jobs	5
15	Mitigates potential financial impacts on other taxing jurisdictions/ provides an immediate share of increment to schools & others	Stewardship of City Resources	4
18	Project minimizes negative impacts on existing Kansas City businesses	Strengthen Economy	4
22	Jobs and/or development targeted to economically distressed areas	Strengthen Economy	3
5	Offer workforce development activities (job training, advancement opportunities, skill development)	Create Quality Jobs	3
2	Produce affordable housing opportunities	Affordable Housing	3
13	Promote crime reduction and enhance perception of safety	Quality of Life	3
10	Promote environmental protection, conservation and the protection of natural resources	Quality of Life	3
1	Protect or enhance existing housing stock	Affordable Housing	3
20	Project focused on building small business or microenterprises	Strengthen Economy	2
16	Requests less than the maximum duration and extent of incentives available	Stewardship of City Resources	2
12	Promote access to and financial support for public transit	Quality of Life	1
21	Proposed development adjacent to areas of existing development activity	Strengthen Economy	1
7	Provide direct support for primary, secondary, post-secondary, vocational or technical education in Kansas City	Education	1
9	Enhance the cultural and arts environment of the City	Quality of Life	0
19	Project complements existing Kansas City businesses/contributes to existing business cluster	Strengthen Economy	0
6	Provide workforce support to employees (day care, housing, transportation)	Create Quality Jobs	0

▶ Project compliance

Once public investment in an economic development project is awarded, the City, coordinated by the City Manager's Office, conducts on-going compliance review of each project.

- ✓ **Review process:** the City has a formal process by which it measures, on a continuous basis over the life of any public investment granted, the extent to which the performance of a project meets or exceeds the promises identified in the application.
- ✓ **Verification of data:** the City routinely audits information provided in reports from projects having been granted public investment to verify the information provided.
- ✓ **Third-party verification:** the City may employ a third-party to provide verification of project performance.
- ✓ **Enforcement of contract:** the City is responsible for the enforcement of the development agreement, including clawback provisions for underperformance.

▶ Policy evaluation

The City promotes economic development to achieve the Policy Outcomes described earlier in this policy document. In order to ensure that the City's economic development and incentive policy is serving this goal, the effectiveness of the policy is evaluated on a regular basis and the results of those evaluations are reported to the City Council and the public.

- ✓ **Citizens' Evaluation Committee:** the Mayor appoints a standing committee of citizens to coordinate the evaluation of the City's economic development and incentive policy. The committee meets periodically (at least annually) to review information provided by the EDC, the City and other resources as directed by the committee. The committee makes recommendations to the Mayor and City Council about modifications or improvements to the policy to improve the effectiveness of the policy in achieving its stated outcomes.

▶ *Development of Economically Distressed Areas*

- ✓ **Definition.** "Economically distressed" areas are those Census block groups where the median household income (MHI) is no more than 70% of MHI for Kansas City as of the last decennial census or more recent official data, if available. Special consideration is given to those areas where MHI is no more than 50% of MHI for Kansas City.
- ✓ **Avoiding concentration of poverty.** The City avoids development that results in a concentration of poverty and encourages mixed-income development.

▶ *Special Consideration for Small Businesses*

- ✓ The City employs a formal, streamlined application review and ongoing evaluation process for small businesses. [discussion of small business considerations]

Use of Incentives and Other Public Investments:

The City recognizes that its ability to invest in economic development projects is limited. As a result, its use of public investment is measured, prudent and targeted in such a way as to achieve its desired Policy Outcomes.

▶ *Investments Vary from Project to Project*

- ✓ **Different incentives for different projects:** the incentives available to a project vary depending upon the type of development proposed.
- ✓ **Incentives available throughout City:** a project in any part of the community has the potential to qualify for public investment.
- ✓ **First Movers:** early projects in a redeveloping area should receive larger incentives (incentivizing “first movers”) than those projects that follow.

▶ *“But-For” Standard for All Incentives*

- ✓ **But-For test on every project:** the City and all of its partner agencies use a standard, “but-for” test that includes both fiscal and social considerations, evaluates the project’s attention to the City’s Policy Outcomes, and is broader than just a calculation of developer rate of return. The but-for analysis is used on every public investment decision.
- ✓ **Incentives only granted when necessary:** incentives will only be granted to those projects that would not otherwise occur without the incentives requested.
- ✓ **Incentives are limited:** projects qualifying for incentives will receive only those incentives required to make the project feasible, and no more.
- ✓ **Incentives are not universal:** not every economic development project will necessarily qualify for public investment.

▶ *Evaluation of Impact*

- ✓ **Fiscal and social considerations:** the City determines the economic, fiscal and social costs and benefits of every economic development investments it makes.
- ✓ **Fiscal impact analysis on every project:** every project requesting incentives is analyzed to determine its potential impact on the City’s finances.
- ✓ **Use of clawbacks required:** the City requires the use and enforcement of clawbacks on every project as a tool for accountability when making public investments in economic development projects.
- ✓ **Developer dialogue with other taxing jurisdictions:** applicants for public investment are encouraged to begin an early dialogue with taxing jurisdictions that will be impacted by the public investments requested for the project.

- ✓ **Impact on other taxing jurisdictions:** the City favors projects that provide immediate financial benefit to other taxing jurisdictions, unless those taxing jurisdictions have explicitly consented to the full abatement or redirection of their portion of incremental taxes.

▶ *Appropriate Uses for Public Investment*

- ✓ **Business recruitment**, including from other areas in the Metro.
- ✓ Direct participation in programs to **enhance job skills** and **develop qualified workers** for local businesses.
- ✓ Direct participation in programs to **create, develop and sustain small businesses** in Kansas City.
- ✓ The creation of **high quality jobs**.
- ✓ The **expansion** of existing Kansas City businesses.
- ✓ The **creation of development-ready sites** in economically distressed areas.
- ✓ **Business retention**, including preventing Kansas City businesses from moving to other parts of the Metro area.
- ✓ The **development of public infrastructure**.
- ✓ **Downtown housing** development (lofts, condos).
- ✓ Urban core, **single-family infill housing**.
- ✓ The **revitalization of economically distressed areas**.

▶ *Appropriate Local Tools for Public Investment*

- ✓ **Tax increment finance:** the use of tax increment finance (TIF) is an appropriate economic development tool. The redirection of up to 50% of incremental economic activity taxes is appropriate.
- ✓ **Property tax abatement:** the use of property tax abatement is an appropriate economic development tool. The maximum available period and level of abatement are not the City's standard practice. The period and level of abatement are based upon the needs of the project, the needs of the community's taxing jurisdictions, and the benefits of the project to the community.
- ✓ **Use of General Fund guarantees:** the use of General Fund guarantees of economic development debt is *not* appropriate, except in extraordinary cases.
- ✓ **Leverage of State investment:** the use of tools that leverage investment by the State of Missouri.
- ✓ **Duration tied to asset life:** the duration of a public investment is not longer than the useful life of the asset(s) financed by the investment.

▶ *Leveraging Economic Development Success*

- ✓ **Success used to support other goals:** the City uses the "profits" from economic development investments to support key policy goals, such as housing, environmental protection and public transit.

ATTACHMENT A: DEFINITION OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The Task Force came to consensus on the definition of “economic development” some weeks ago (see page 2). Task Force member, Bob Berkibile, has suggested replacing it with the following:

Economic development is the process whereby our community creates the conditions that foster economic vitality, the outcome of which is an improvement in quality of life for all Kansas Citians. Sustainable economic development must be informed by an evolving strategic plan which informs our community decisions and investments and ensures that each opportunity being considered is judged on the basis of its potential to increase social, economic and environmental systems simultaneously.

Desired outcomes include: an increase in human capital (education, job skills, child care, health, and sense of community), an increase in economic vitality (job growth, productivity, greater efficiency, small business development, and access to credit), and an increase in natural capital (air, water, and soil quality, quantity and quality of natural systems,). Achieving these outcomes consistently will require a clear vision, specific tools for evaluation, decision-making and monitoring individual projects, supported by strong partnerships, creative leadership and political will.

Policy question: which definition does the Task Force wish to use?

ATTACHMENT B: DEFINITION OF “QUALITY JOBS”

The Task Force has identified the creation of quality jobs as one of the six policy outcomes of the economic development policy. Quality jobs are:

OPTION 1

Full-time jobs that pay an average wage equal to or greater than the county average wage (as published by the Missouri Department of Economic Development), include affordable health insurance with at least 50% of the premium paid by the employer, provide opportunities for advancement and a comprehensive benefits package including opportunities to save for retirement.

PRO

By setting the standard at the county average wage, quality jobs as defined in Option 1 would be those that offered approximately \$20.68 an hour or \$43,021 per year and included a comprehensive benefit package as indicated. At this level, quality jobs are more likely to be professional, skilled jobs. As these positions are created research shows that a “job chain” is developed, leading to openings for medium- and low-skilled workers.

CON

Many projects will be approved that do not have such high paying jobs so by using this definition there is a lost opportunity to encourage good benefits for jobs that pay less than the county average wage.

OPTION 2

Full-time jobs [note 1 below] that pay a wage of at least 120% of the hourly mean wage for comparable occupations (as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in its most recent “Metropolitan Area Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates” report for the Kansas City, MO-KS Metropolitan Statistical Area), include affordable health insurance paid by the employer [note 2], provide opportunities for advancement and a comprehensive benefits package including opportunities to save for retirement.

Note 1: the terms “full-time” and “comparable” need to be defined

Note 2: affordable health insurance is defined as a 50% cost share between employer and employee for jobs with annual salaries at or above the hourly mean wage. Jobs with annual salaries less than the hourly mean wage for the Kansas City, KS-MO MSA require health insurance that is paid in full by the employer, i.e. no cost to the employee.

PRO

Since it uses a wider range of wages, Option 2 calls for health benefits for lower paid workers. This would be an incentive to bring health benefits to lower skilled jobs, lower paying jobs.

CON

This definition lowers the bar for quality jobs by referencing “comparable jobs” instead of an overall average wage for the county. The definition of a quality job would change according to the type of job and would consider a wider range of wages. For a food services employee, 120% above the county average wage for a comparable job would be \$17,578; for a construction worker it would be \$55,981. Both would be considered quality jobs as long as the employer paid the defined percentage of health insurance costs (in this case, 100% and 50% respectively).

Policy question: which definition does the Task Force wish to use?

ATTACHMENT C: POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PUBLIC TESTIMONY

Policy question: should any of these recommendations be included in the Task Force’s final policy?

Open Items

Recommendation	Addressed in Draft Policy?
Phelps Murdock-8-1-07 meeting: Discourage sprawl, encourage infill housing, reuse and relocate new businesses to old retail areas; Reduce use of energy and increase protection of resources.	No (sprawl) Yes (infill) No (reuse and relocate) Yes (energy/resources)
Phelps Murdock-8-1-07 meeting: Discourage sprawl, encourage infill housing, reuse and relocate new businesses to old retail areas; Reduce use of energy and increase protection of resources.	No (sprawl) Yes (infill) No (reuse and relocate) Yes (energy/resources)
Woman for Michael Duffy-8-8-07: Provide balance in presentation; someone to speak to why the project should not be done; provide more facts and analysis	No (“devil’s advocate”) Yes (more facts and analysis)
Ron McLinden-8-8-07 meeting: FOCUS plan is the key; access to public transportation; emphasize quality of life; consider resource effectiveness.	No (FOCUS) Yes (transit, quality of life, resource effectiveness)
Joe Swert-8-8-07 meeting: Zona Rosa looks like cookie cutter mediocrity, we should promote independent businesses; streamline the City’s process for small businesses; hold bigger businesses to higher standards; green projects and prevailing wage projects.	Not yet (small business) No (independent businesses) Yes (green projects) Yes (quality jobs)
Harold Saulte-8-15-07 meeting: Debris and codes ordinances need to be enforced	No (code enforcement)
Bobbie Campbell-8-15-07 meeting: Homeowners are the last to know about projects using TIF or eminent domain.	No (inform homeowners earlier)
Suzie Aron-8-15-07 meeting: Assistance for small business owners; Requested assistance from EDC to develop TIF uses for creative people; Policy should be flexible.	Not yet (small business) No (direct incentives for creative arts) Yes (flexibility)

Recommendation	Addressed in Draft Policy?
<p>Pat Jordon-8-15-07 meeting: Incentives for projects/developers/businesses in distressed areas; Developments in non-distressed areas should be required to contribute to the development of housing in distressed areas; Development in distressed communities should be provided with expedited permitting; impact fee reduction, special zoning or density bonuses and a public ombudsman at City Hall to help small developers</p>	<p>Yes (targeting) No (cross-subsidy from non-distressed to distressed areas) No (expedited permitting, impact fee reductions, special zoning and density bonuses) No (public ombudsman)</p>
<p>David Morse-8-15-07 meeting: Lower taxes across the board, make government more efficient and user friendly, improve education, reduce crime, and let the entrepreneurs and free market play a role.</p>	<p>No (lower taxes) Yes (more friendly government) Yes (improve education) Yes (reduce crime) Yes (entrepreneurialism)</p>
<p>Aisha Jones-8-15-07 meeting: 3rd and 5th Districts should be strongly considered for incentives; residents should have more information regarding proposed development projects.</p>	<p>Yes (targeting) No (better public information about development)</p>
<p>Preston Jenkis-8-15-07 meeting: Banks get incentives for purchasing bonds.</p>	<p>No (banks purchasing bonds)</p>
<p>Barrett Hatches-8-15-07 meeting: Need to look at economic from holistic, comprehensive standpoint; TIF was created for the removal of blight and it should be focused in that area.</p>	<p>Yes (comprehensive policy) No (targeting of TIF only to blighted areas)</p>
<p>William Threat-8-15-07 meeting: Urban developers need to be given an even chance. Ways to do this include; develop an understanding of demographics in underserved markets; develop corridor plans, incentives should be commensurate with the risk taken; developer's return in urban core should be greater; True one-stop shop should be instituted; Public incentives should be subject to "but-for" test; developer should be done in accordance with Master Plan.</p>	<p>No (specific consideration for developers) No (corridor plans) No (ensure greater developer rate of return in distressed areas) Yes (but-for)</p>
<p>Joe Medley-8-15-07 meeting: Suggestions regarding TIF; There should be an independent review board instead of the EDC, as their funding stream creates a conflict of interest; there should be a more rigorous cost-benefit analysis; focus on job creation (quality jobs), need restrictions on eminent domain; detailed project deadlines and milestones, with clawbacks, restrictions on abatements.</p>	<p>No (EDC conflict of interest) Yes (cost-benefit analysis) Yes (quality jobs) No (eminent domain) No (project deadlines) Yes (clawbacks)</p>

Recommendation	Addressed in Draft Policy?
Judy Ancel-8-15-07 meeting: Policy should not incent companies like Wal-Mart which violate labor laws; we need clawbacks and public participation	No (prohibited industries/businesses) Yes (clawbacks) No (public participation)
Mary Lindsay-8-15-07 meeting: Objects to EDC being initial point of entry; process does not provide enough notice to residents of development area; need to create good quality jobs with living wages.	Yes (EDC as point of entry) No (notice to residents) Yes (quality jobs)
Bill Vacas-8-15-07 meeting: Follow the FOCUS plan.	No (FOCUS)
Michael Brouter-8-22-07: creation of Community Development venture capital fund; good jobs in depressed areas	No (venture capital fund) Yes (quality jobs/targeted areas)
John Fiarro-8-22-07: consider incentives for non-profits; seamless and comprehensive ED policy; ensure interests of EDC are aligned with City; appoint City employees to coordinate evaluation of requests for incentives	No (incentives for non-profits) No (alignment of EDC interests with City) Yes (appoint City employees to coordinate evaluation of requests for incentives)
Clinton Adams-8-15-07 meeting: Point system will do little to spur develop in distressed communities. There should be a parcel to parcel linkage policy for developers.	No (parcel for parcel linkage)

Open Items—Small Business

Dave Smith-President of KCMO School District Board-8-15-07 meeting: School district has lost millions of dollars to TIF projects alone, not to mention losses related to 353, tax abatement and other development tools. This has affected the district's ability to address its operational issues and provide for its students.	To be addressed 8/29
Tom Levett-8-8-07 meeting: Provide incentives for small developers and small scale projects; Separate mechanisms for small developments	To be addressed on 8/29
Michael Rosales-8-8-07 meeting: Small business development is important	To be addressed 8/29
Jan Johnson-8-8-07 meeting: Kansas City has too much duplication of services; difficult for small developer to use TIF and other development tools	To be addressed 8/29

Recommendation	Addressed in Draft Policy?
Spark Bookhart-8-15-07 meeting: Bulk of City-backed incentives should go to distressed areas; Review social impacts of development project; Institute apparatus for small business projects and micro projects; Consider disincentives as well as incentives; Provide incentive for small business incubators/Give high ratings to business that employ residents of distressed communities	Yes (targeting) Yes (social considerations) Not yet (small business) Yes (disincentives/clawbacks) Yes (points system)
Anita Dixon-Cultural Convention Visitors Services-8-15-07 meeting: Need to bring more small business to 18 th and Vine; Greater assistance should be provided to small business	Yes (targeting) Not yet (small business)
Brad Nicholson-8-15-07 meeting: Small developers should be able to utilize TIF	Not yet (small business)
Kelvin Simmons-8-15-07 meeting: Target development in distressed communities; reduce barriers to entry for TIF in distressed communities; MBE/WBE needs to be more involved; lower fees as incentive for involvement of minority and woman-owned developers	Yes (targeting) Yes (diversity/inclusiveness) Not yet (small business)
Tom Levin-8-15-07 meeting: EDC has not done a good job for small business creation; the City should establish a goal or quota for small business for the EDC; Large developers can subsidize and help defray the legal fees for small developers and businesses (perhaps on a needs-based test for fees as well)	Not yet (small business)
Peter Hughes-8-15-07 meeting: PIEA benefits should not impact small businesses as these businesses have such thin margins; Fees should be reduced or abated completely for small developers; City should have staff to seek out small businesses.	Not yet (small business)

Resolved Items

Recommendation	Addressed in Draft Policy?
Father Rotert-8-1-07 meeting: Revitalization of Neighborhoods; Establish a Housing Policy	Yes
Warren Erdman, EDC-8-1-07 meeting: First Movers get more incentives; Standardized "But-For" Test: Retain EDC as the initial point of contact for development project	Yes
Richard Tolbert-8-1-07 meeting: Increase density of neighborhoods through the development of infill housing.	Yes (infill housing an appropriate use of incentives)
Bruce Wiggins-8-1-07 meeting; Incentives should not negatively impact the City economically, socially or environmentally	Yes
Ezeikel Amater-8-8-07 meeting: Important to listen to neighborhoods; Promote environment of safety	Yes
Lindell Selen-8-8-07 meeting: Strictly apply "But-For" test; real affordable housing	Yes
Michael Dudaway-8-8-07 meeting: Direct subsidies to developments that increase quality jobs, provide health benefits and support the health safety net	Yes
Janice Graicey-8-8-07 meeting; Effective utilization of scarce resources;	Yes
Pedro Zamora-8-8-07 meeting: No high school on the Westside; consider a paint program for people who can't paint their own homes; invest in the community while retaining the Hispanic culture	Not directly
Henry Johnson-8-8-07 meeting: Strategic sketch and framework to restore the Eastside of Kansas City; focus on wealth creation; diverse housing stock	Yes
Shelby Jolis-8-8-07 meeting: Give affordable housing to artists; look at projects on a case by case basis.	Yes
Steve Taylor-Kansas City Council-8-15-07 meeting: Downtown is a neighborhood and provides a disproportionate of the jobs and revenue to the City and should receive consideration for its contribution. Unified point of entry at the EDC; Improve coordination of the review process for incentives	Yes

Recommendation	Addressed in Draft Policy?
Bob Regnier-8-15 meeting: KCMO must strategically target industries where there is a competitive advantage; Must impose objective evaluation of direct and indirect impacts created by projects	Yes (targeting) Yes (fiscal and economic impact analysis)
Jewel Scott-8-15-07 meeting: City needs to increase growth of jobs with real income as well as fiscal growth; policy should be flexible; Invest strategically and smartly	Yes (quality jobs) Yes (flexibility)
Mustofac Elscai-8-15-07 meeting: Need to consider human part of economic development; increase educational opportunities, invest in schools, loss of human capital	Yes (human capital) Yes (educational opportunities)
Ebi Craig-8-15-07 meeting: Build people not just structures; consider fear that people live with in these districts.	Yes (human capital)
Travis Ceitto-8-15-07 meeting: We want parity.	Yes (targeting)
Emmett Pearson-8-15-07 meeting: Address the refusal of major companies to locate within the urban core	Yes (targeting)
Marilynn Simmons-8-15-07 meeting: Need to think about the young people; economic development has bypassed this community; developers need to give something back.	Yes (human capital)
Jim Swear-8-15-07 meeting: Need better stewardship	Yes (stewardship of resources)
Jon Matthew-8-15-07 meeting: The 3 rd and 5 th Districts are being burned for the benefit of developers; the pump has been primed and now it is flooded; human capital needs to be fostered within the city.	Yes (human capital) Yes (limits to incentives)
Henry Johnson-8-15-07 meeting: Need to create walkable neighborhoods; rebuilding of Eastside should be a priority; there should be an action plan to rebuild the Eastside, that includes a strong entrepreneurial component and a range of housing; schools of choice and excellence should be created.	Yes (neighborhood livability) Yes (targeting) Yes (housing) Yes (education)
Ken Bacchus-8-15-07 meeting: Policy should be flexible and include housing policies.	Yes (flexible) Yes (housing)
NKC Schools-8-22-07: Hope for a balanced policy that recognizes the impact of ED incentives on schools.	Yes (attention to other taxing jurisdictions)
Chuck Webber-8-22-07: TIF is a tool to move the City forward	Yes (appropriate uses of incentives)

Recommendation	Addressed in Draft Policy?
KC Chamber-8-22-07: TIF and other incentives are part of toolbox; Chamber supports EDC as point of entry;	Yes (EDC as initial point-of-entry)
Northland Chamber-8-22-07: TIF is important tool for growth	Yes (appropriate uses of incentives)
Jim Swear-8-22-07: honest process with clawbacks	Yes (clawbacks)
Pete Hall-8-22-07: flexibility in the use of TIF	Yes (appropriate uses of incentives)
Steve Boniello-8-22-07: uses of TIF to provide neighborhood improvements	Yes (appropriate uses of incentives)
Joe Medley-8-22-07: NKC property tax A/V down for 2007; if TIF is so great, where did the money go?	n/a
Keith ?-8-22-07: TIF is an important tool for growth in the Northland	Yes (appropriate uses of incentives)
Rick Osborne-8-22-07: Crime reduction should be an important goal for the Task Force	Yes (Quality of Life outcome/crime reduction as policy factor)