Working Group Meeting Minutes

PROJECT NAME: Lancaster Economic Development Strategic Plan
MRA PROJECT #: 14045
MEETING DATE: March 19, 2015
LOCATION: Lancaster, PA — Southern Market
SUBJECT: March Working Group Meeting

1. PRESENTATION
   » Tom McGilloway and Tripp Muldrow presented a presentation of the draft plan as a preview to the public meeting. Tom indicated that the team is looking for input on any critical revisions/refinements needed prior to the public meeting.

2. DISCUSSION
   » Question about business registration program. Team clarified that it is not a prelude to a fee. Strictly tool to inventory and understand what businesses are here.
   » Aspirations slide – investment ought to be a billion dollars....increase to residential units needs to be tied to a quality level (don’t just chop up rowhouses)....along with national headquarters...retaining ones we have........parking, retail and office.....have we added cost of parking?....needs to be some kind of connection between parking part and office part....while there is argument on residential side, an example...where there are private lots and public lots...maybe impact of increasing rates and attitudes of people coming to market.....the market is publicly fostered and publicly owned.....should any surrounding business enhance that...don’t bleed. Assuming Parking Authority has done a lifespan analysis of parking structures.....need to understand impact of closing a garage...needs to go into fabric plan.....
   » Garage replacement strategy.....didn’t see that jump out....
      o Tripp: we way to address and look at a succession. Closing a garage is impact on business............
   » Question: do we have a current baseline ratio?
      o Tripp doesn’t believe we have one tracked.....you can probably back into one...capital projects that happened in past 10 years.....
      o Every public dollar needs to be a strategic public dollar.
   » 20:1 might be high.....
   » Evolution we are seeing.....3 big projects wouldn’t have been built without public dollars...not sure 20:1 is realistic but will see it go up.
      o Tripp: A difference in this plan...we aren’t calling out major public capital projects....
'If you have a public/private partnership....however those resources are....it needs to be quite clear to private community....“if you do this, then you can seek these funds”....be very specific. For instance historic tax credits. You follow these rules, you get these credits....we should include other things like this that give investment community confidence.

For 20:1, what is the backup for this? Need to understand public policy on this....(example: developing more affordable housing).

- Shouldn’t the focus be on attracting more middle upper housing and residents to bring up the tax revenue?.....need to understand the public policy. If public dollars emphasizing poorer populations....generating less people of means....

- Market rate housing in Lancaster is still affordable housing......we really need to understand what we are trying to do in the city. If we are trying to increase per capita income....different animal than trying to just attract more middle class....we are a very diverse city.....that needs to be understood this in the overall plan.....this will drive what kind of incentives we bring in

- Maybe over simplification....... It’s not “bring in more wealth”...it should be “increase the per capita income of all levels of community”....maybe this needs to be more explicit in the plan....

- Agree with notion of per capita income increase is needs to be for all not just wealthy. DOES NOT LIKE “FASTER THAN THE COUNTY” doesn’t want to pit City against County.......maybe compare to peer.... Attract headquarters to downtown sounds dated....maybe “grow” a national headquarters....

- As a banker, banks want to come right up to edges of city.....but we could be aspirational to attract a regional headquarters or bank into the City

- Maybe create the environment attractive to a headquarters.......

- Add another line about growing entrepreneurial...

- Create the environment....
  - Tripp: if we just allow the office potential to happen it would be tepid....we need a stimulation....

- From a working group perspective.... is there a next step?
  - Tom: team will emphasize priorities and implementation in coming weeks

- Wants to ask about the aspiration....suggests need to be tempered a bit.....do we aspire to create 1000 residential units or do we aspire to enhance the quality of life to make this happen?
  - Needs to be both.....“create an environment that allows us to develop....”

- Accelerating renovation....reducing costs....how do we do this?...it’s a major stumbling block.....
  - Tripp: urban infrastructure grants....sprinkling, elevator issues......facades.....also the high speed internet access to come.....we get into detail in report.....
  - If we are accelerating this activity.....how do we gear up to handle all of that review and regulation?
  - Get at concern that as we amp up all this activity.....good buzz words...one stop shop.....worried about capacity of City’s ability to handle this added need for review and control......do we have the resources added to this....ability for City to expand capacity?
  - It’s acknowledged in plan.....plan doesn’t need to be prescriptive as how do we do this.....its Council’s job to address how we do this. Plan needs to acknowledge this.....
From the beginning, thinking of intersection of retail and housing....keep talking about retail, clothing....we don’t talk about durable goods and building products...we keep building units that require building materials......refrigerator and hot water heaters....don’t need a big box....but recapture some of this in the corridors...building suppliers, washers and driers

Clarification needed:....this issue jumped out at him.....we have a Lowes, Snapleys and _____ in the City of Lancaster.....big box wants 12 acres....they are in the City of Lancaster....Randy wants to challenge this leakage......Also Penn Stone in City......
- Tripp: seems to be underreporting Home Depot in the City.... Others: it’s the allocation model that Nielson uses....
- Maybe it’s a niche retailer.....home goods......we do need a kitchen store downtown and one opened in Queen Store.....

Curious how the conversations are going with the municipalities....they need to be on board

We show masses of buildings in geographic areas...needs to be talking about what goes where, what’s appropriate where (height, mass, width.....) take it with public partnership ...if you take public money, maybe you have to enhance.....”golden handcuff”....

Implementation....if we try to target everything on plan....it will be diffused....have to be enough things happening....need to give sense of transformation

Need to marry façade master plan with streetscape.......

The more we focus on coworking concept, what stumbles back is a different interpretation of building codes....for every space that permits not having to have sprinklers....for everyone who has a traditional office who has to meet codes........start to empty those out..........unintended consequence....

Need to see if there is more recent information other than 2011 for the inflow and outflow?

3. FOR PUBLIC MEETING
   - This evening, provide more time for Q and A........
   - Too much information ...need to narrow down presentation. Detail was for Working Group.