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1.0 Introduction

Overview

In partnership with the Idaho Department of Commerce, the University of Idaho, Boise State University, and the U.S. Economic Development Administration, faculty and staff from the University Center for Economic Development, part of the College of Business at the University of Nevada, Reno, conducted a day long “Idaho Economic Development District Region III Strategic Planning Workshop” with various representatives from the jurisdictions and organizations that currently represent parts of Idaho Economic Development District Region III. The workshop was held at Boise State University in Boise, Idaho on September 8, 2017. Representatives from the Western Nevada Development District, Idaho Economic Development District Region II, the Clearwater Economic Development Association, and from Idaho Economic Development District IV, the Region IV Development Association, also participated as facilitators during the September 8, 2017 workshop.

The September 8, 2017 strategic planning workshop presented an overview of a previous assessment completed by faculty and staff from the University Center for Economic Development. A summary of this previous assessment was published as a University Center for Economic Development technical report, “An Assessment of Idaho Economic Development District Region III”, UCED Technical Report 2016/17-04. In late 2015, University Center for Economic Development faculty and staff were asked by the U.S. Economic Development Administration Seattle Regional Office to conduct an assessment of ongoing economic development activity in Idaho Economic Development District Region III and identify possible alternative approaches to the administration and organization of the Region following a steady decline in the Region’s overall administrative and organizational capacity.

As part of the previous assessment, University Center for Economic Development faculty and staff developed three specific objectives, including: (1) to collect and analyze socio-economic data and trends to determine potential socio-economic linkages between the counties that comprise Idaho Economic Development District Region III and other economic development districts in the state, (2) to collect and analyze past organizational issues in Idaho Economic Development District Region III, and (3) to develop suggested organizational changes for counties in Idaho Economic Development District Region III. Upon completion of this analysis, University Center for Economic Development faculty and staff developed four separate recommended alternatives:

1. Maintain the current structure of Idaho Economic Development District Region III but transfer administration of Region III to the two resource conservation and development districts (the Southwest Idaho Resource Conservation and Development District and the West Central Highlands Resource Conservation and Development District) that currently
(at the time this initial assessment was completed) cover the same ten-county region of Region III.

2. Divide and assign the existing Idaho Economic Development District Region III between Idaho Economic Development District Region II (Clearwater EDA located in Lewiston, Idaho) and Idaho Economic Development District Region IV (located in Twin Falls, Idaho) with the core remaining counties of Ada and Canyon counties remaining in Region III.

3. Maintain the existing Idaho Economic Development District Region III structure and continue to rely on existing organizations currently operating within Region III to implement and administer Region III’s current Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy for the 2014 to 2018 planning period.

4. Maintain the existing Idaho Economic Development District Region III structure and develop an entirely new and independent regional economic development authority to administer Region III, including continued implementation and administration of Region III’s current Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy for the 2014 to 2018 planning period.

The September 8, 2017 strategic planning workshop also presented a review of pertinent socio-demographic and economic linkages present in Region III and a further overview of current socio-demographic and economic conditions in Region III presented by faculty from Boise State University, the University of Idaho, and the University Center for Economic Development. These additional presentations regarding current socio-demographic and economic conditions in Region III are included in the attached appendices found at the end of this University Center for Economic Development technical report. The presentation from Dr. Philip Watson, Department of Agricultural Economics at the University of Idaho, titled “Idaho District III: Some Economic Diagnostics and Diagnosis”, is available in Appendix A. The presentation from Dr. Sarah Toevs, Center for the Study of Aging at Boise State University, titled “Idaho Economic Development Region III”, is available in Appendix B. The presentation from Dr. Thomas Harris, University Center for Economic Development at the University of Nevada, Reno, is available in Appendix C.

Participants who attended the September 8, 2017 strategic planning workshop also participated in a variety of strategic planning small and large group exercises using several modules from the Stronger Economies Together strategic economic development planning curriculum developed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture Rural Development. This University Center for Economic Development technical report summarizes the results of the various small and large group exercises. Approximately 50 individuals attended and participated in the September 8, 2017 strategic planning workshop. Nearly every county in Idaho Economic Development District Region III was represented. Several individual municipalities and townships, chambers of commerce, economic development authorities and organizations, and several non-profit agencies were also represented during the workshop.
2.0 Results of the September 8, 2017 Strategic Planning Workshop

Launched in 2009 by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the purpose of the Stronger Economies Together (SET) strategic economic development planning curriculum is to assist local communities in strengthening their capacity to work together in developing and implementing an economic development blueprint that strategically builds on a region’s current and emerging economic strengths. The current SET curriculum consists of eight separate modules, including:

1. Launching SET and Building a Strong Regional Team
2. Exploring the Region’s Demographics
3. Identifying the Region’s Comparative Advantage
4. Exploring Potential Regional Strategies
5. Defining Your Regional Vision and Goals
6. Discovering Assets and Barriers
7. Planning for Success
8. Measuring for Success

For the September 8, 2017 Idaho Economic Development District Region III strategic planning workshop, the SET strategic economic development planning curriculum was used for several reasons. First, the SET curriculum is a well-tested strategic economic development planning model that has been used to assist in the development of new strategic economic development plans for several regions across the United States. Second, the SET curriculum is primarily focused on encouraging local county and municipal governments to work collaboratively to build a regional economic development plan. This approach is consistent with the U.S. Economic Development Administration’s requirement that any Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) be developed using a regional perspective and approach. Third, University Center for Economic Development faculty and staff have experience with the SET curriculum after using the curriculum in partnership with the Western Nevada Development District to construct a new CEDS for the District in 2012.

SET Module 2, Exploring the Region’s Demographics, and SET Module 5, Defining Your Regional Vision and Goals, were the two SET modules used to structure and facilitate the September 8, 2017 Idaho Economic Development District Region III strategic planning workshop. The small and large group activities, part of module two and module five, that
participants of the September 8, 2017 workshop completed, are summarized in this section of this University Center for Economic Development technical report.

2.1 Results of the Small and Large Group Exercises using SET Module 2

The goals of SET Module 2, Exploring the Region’s Demographics, are to examine the current economic development strategies currently being used within the region’s communities and jurisdictions and to explore the region’s demographics and workforce features as they pertain to a region’s strategic economic development planning efforts. Upon completion of SET Module 2, participants will be able to begin development of a High Quality Plan (HQP) as outlined in Illustration 1.

Illustration 1 – The High Quality Plan (HQP)

Producing a High Quality Plan (HQP):
The Essential Components

The eventual regional strategic economic development plan, using the HQP model, should meet five general characteristics. The HQP should be (1) evidence-based, (2) practical, (3) broadly supported, (4) focused on regional economic development, and (5) aligned with a broadly agreed to vision and set of goals. Development of the HQP begins with a general assessment of current socio-demographic and economic conditions of the region followed by a thorough assessment of

Illustration 2 – The C.A.R.E. Model

Using SET Module 2, individual participants who attended the September 8, 2017 Idaho Economic Development District Region III Strategic Planning Workshop were asked to categorize current and ongoing strategic economic development activities for their community and jurisdiction. The C.A.R.E. Model consists of four categories. First, Creation, involves those activities involving encouraging the formation of new firms from within the region. Second, Attraction, includes efforts to recruit business and industry to the region. Third, Retention, involves strategies that maintain or strengthen the region’s existing firms. Fourth, Expansion, includes those strategies that encourages the growth of existing firms in the region.

Prior to workshop participants completing this exercise, an overview and review of current socio-demographic and economic conditions for Region III were presented by Dr. Philip Watson (University of Idaho), Dr. Sarah Toevs (Boise State University), Dr. Thomas Harris (University of Nevada, Reno), and Dr. Frederick Steinmann (University of Nevada, Reno). Dr. Watson’s, Dr. Toevs’s, and Dr. Harris’s presentations are available in Appendix A, Appendix B and
Appendix C of this University Center for Economic Development technical report. Dr. Steinmann presented a summary of the socio-demographic and economic analysis completed as part of the University Center for Economic Development’s past assessment of Idaho Economic Development District Region III in 2016. The results of this assessment are available in University Center for Economic Development Technical Report 2016/17-04, “An Assessment of Idaho Economic Development District Region III”.

2.1.1 Group Exercise No. 1, Utilization of the C.A.R.E. Model

Participants of the September 8, 2017 Idaho Economic Development District Region III Strategic Planning Workshop were asked to categorize existing and current strategic economic development activities for their communities in small groups as either a Creation activity, Attraction activity, Retention activity, or Expansion activity.

The following is a list of Creation activities identified by workshop participants:

- Land Use
- Infrastructure
- Planning
- Boise Valley Economic Partnership
- Western Alliance for Economic Development
- Caldwell Economic Development
- Nampa Economic Development
- Budgeted Canyon County money and resources for Economic Development
- Tax Breaks up to 5 Years
- Mentor Incubator
- Apprenticeships
- Incentives at State and Local Levels
- Family Friendly Community
- More Schools
- More Jobs and Educational Skills
- Positive Reputation
- Word on the Street
- Be Attractive
- Small Business Development Center
- Housing: (1) Trust – nonprofit decide on what types of housing for workforce
- Working with Housing Authorities
- Fiber/Broadband
- Workforce Development
- Small Business Development Center Hospitality
- Zoning Code Ordinances
- Apprentice Programs
- Department of Labor
- Job Fairs
Workshop participants identified a number of organizations currently operating throughout Region III engaged in a number of Creation strategic economic development activities. These organizations included the Boise Valley Economic Partnership, Caldwell Economic Development, the New Entrepreneurship Organization, Nampa Economic Development, the Small Business Development Center, the Small Business Development Hospitality, the Department of Labor, various housing authorities, and the Western Alliance for Economic Development.

A number of workshop participants identified various approaches to land use planning as current Creation strategic economic development activities. The strategic use of land use decisions, the planning of infrastructure, and the application of zoning code ordinances were all examples of various land use planning efforts designed to encourage the formation of new businesses within Region III. Workshop participants further identified a number of infrastructure initiatives designed to further support and facilitate new business formation across the region. Education and other related workforce development strategies, including the use of a mentor incubator, apprenticeships and apprentice programs, job fairs, and the use of an education portal for different education opportunities, were additional examples of Creation activities identified by workshop participants.

The following is a list of Attraction activities identified by workshop participants:

- Land Use
- Infrastructure
- Planning
- Boise Valley Economic Partnership
- Tax Breaks up to 5 Years
- Mentor Incubator
- Apprenticeships
- Incentives at State and Local Levels
- Livable Community
- Access to Markets
- Desired Zoning
- Infrastructure at Site
- Short Building Permit Process
- Positive Reputation
- Word on the Street
- Be Attractive
- Teaming with other Economic Development Groups and the State to market State of Idaho and the Region
- Housing: (1) Trust – nonprofit decide on what types of housing for workforce
• Working with Housing Authorities
• Fiber/Broadband
• Workforce Development
• Small Business Development Center Hospitality
• Zoning Code Ordinances
• Apprentice Programs
• Department of Labor
• Job Fairs
• Education Portal for All Education Opportunities
• Tourism: Big Loops, H2O, Access, Quality of Life
• Networking with State Department of Commerce for Leads
• Western Alliance, Canyon County, Owyhee County
• Meetings with State Directors
• Visits to Industry/Sector Companies
• Master Plans for Infrastructure

Attraction efforts in Region III, as identified by workshop participants, followed a similar approach as identified for different ongoing and current Creation activities. The strategic use of land use planning decisions and the use of various educational and workforce development activities were common strategies identified by workshop participants as part of their community’s ongoing strategic economic development efforts to recruit industries and businesses to Region III and to their respective communities.

Additional common Attraction efforts in Region III also included ongoing engagement with key stakeholders and partner organizations and entities as well as individual meetings and visits with individual firms in targeted industry sectors. Development and communication of a positive community reputation that is business friendly and strives to create and maintain a high quality of life were equally identified by workshop participants as critical Attraction strategic economic development activities.

The following is a list of Retention activities identified by workshop participants:

• Western Alliance for Economic Development
• Caldwell Economic Development
• Nampa Economic Development
• Budgeted Canyon County money and resources for Economic Development
• Tax Breaks up to 5 Years
• Building Permit Waivers
• College of Western Idaho
• Development Waivers to Existing Businesses to Retain in Community
• T-Streets
• Lamb Weston
• Mentor Incubator
• Apprenticeships
• Incentives at State and Local Levels
• Safe Community
• Good Schools
• Low Crime Rate
• Ensure Adequate Space and Infrastructure including Fire Flows, Power, Data Volume and Speeds
• Periodic Discussions with Business Owners and Operators regarding how their business is doing
• Community Knowledge and Concerning Support of Business
• Fee Waivers
• Visiting Existing Businesses
• Inviting the State to Participate as and where Needed
• Marketing Existing Businesses on Website
• Housing: (1) Trust – nonprofit decide on what types of housing for workforce
• Working with Housing Authorities
• Fiber/Broadband
• Workforce Development
• Small Business Development Center Hospitality
• Zoning Code Ordinances
• Apprentice Programs
• Department of Labor
• Job Fairs
• Education Portal for All Education Opportunities
• Tourism: Big Loops, H20, Access, Quality of Life
• Education/Workforce Development
• Communications with Business regarding their Needs
• Working with Rural Community Organizations so that Local Businesses know about Available Resources
• Western Alliance, Canyon County, Owyhee County

A number of partner organizations and entities were identified by workshop participants as vital in the development, implementation and administration of various ongoing and current local and regional Retention strategic economic development activities. Caldwell Economic Development, Nampa Economic Development, and the Western Alliance for Economic Development, along with various county and municipal governments, were all identified by workshop participants as critical Retention strategy partners.

Specific Retention strategic economic development strategies closely mirrored ongoing and current Creation and Attraction strategic economic development strategies. The strategic use and implementation of various land use planning and infrastructure decisions, development and use of specific waivers and tax incentives, focus on education and workforce development, and ongoing business engagement, outreach and visitation were general Retention strategic economic development strategies identified by workshop participants who attended the September 8, 2017 Idaho Economic Development District Region III strategic planning workshop. Developing and maintaining certain quality of life indicators, including a safe community, low crime rates, and
good schools, were further identified as part of several community’s overall Retention strategic economic development activities.

The following is a list of **Expansion** activities identified by workshop participants:

- Tax Breaks up to 5 Years
- Building Permit Waivers
- College of Western Idaho
- Development Waivers to Existing Businesses to Retain in Community
- T-Streets
- Lamb Weston
- Mentor Incubator
- Apprenticeships
- Incentives at State and Local Levels
- Safe Community
- Good Schools
- Low Crime Rate
- Ensure Adequate Space and Infrastructure including Fire Flows, Power, Data Volume and Speeds
- Periodic Discussions with Business Owners and Operators regarding how their business is doing
- Community Knowledge and Concerning Support of Business
- Fee Waivers
- Working with Cities and Counties to expand businesses
- State and Federal Grants for Implementation
- Housing: (1) Trust – nonprofit decide on what types of housing for workforce
- Working with Housing Authorities
- Fiber/Broadband
- Workforce Development
- Small Business Development Center Hospitality
- Zoning Code Ordinances
- Apprentice Programs
- Department of Labor
- Job Fairs
- Education Portal for All Education Opportunities
- Tourism: Big Loops, H20, Access, Quality of Life
- County Tax Incentives
- Master Plans for Infrastructure
- Working with Rural Community Organizations so that Local Businesses know about Available Resources
- Western Alliance, Canyon County, Owyhee County

Current and ongoing Expansion strategic economic development activities shared a similar pattern as those strategic economic development activities identified for Creation activities, Attraction activities and Retention activities. The strategic use and implementation of various
land use planning and infrastructure decisions, development and use of specific waivers and tax incentives, focus on education and workforce development, and ongoing business engagement, outreach and visitation were general Expansion strategic economic development strategies identified by workshop participants. Developing and maintaining certain quality of life indicators, including a safe community, low crime rates, and good schools, were further identified as part of several community’s overall Expansion strategic economic development activities.

Workshop participants identified a number of ongoing and current Creation, Attraction, Retention and Expansion strategic economic development activities during the September 8, 2017 strategic planning workshop. While a number of individual communities, jurisdictions, and economic development organizations are engaged in a number of activities, very few of these activities seem to be tailored towards specific Creation, Attraction, Retention and Expansion goals. A future strategic economic development plan for Idaho Economic Development District Region III should include specific Creation, Attraction, Retention and Expansion goals with specific accompanying activities. Future activities should also include a clear statement as to which community(ies), jurisdiction(s), and/or economic development organization(s) will be responsible for developing, implementing and administering them.

2.1.2 Group Exercise No. 2, Incorporating Data Analysis into the High Quality Plan

Module 2 of the SET strategic economic development planning curriculum includes instruction on how to classify socio-demographic and economic data and then how to assess the data and incorporate the assessment into a High Quality Plan or strategic economic development plan. Assessments of socio-demographic and economic data can be cross-sectional, comparative, or longitudinal. Cross-sectional assessments typically involve understanding socio-demographic data through the lens of a fixed, single point in time. Comparative assessments require an examination of the data from the perspective of one single community relative to other communities within the economic region. Longitudinal assessments focus on changes in the socio-demographic and economic data over time.

Group Exercise No. 2 asked workshop participants to focus on a single topic of the socio-demographic and economic data presented by Dr. Watson, Dr. Toevs, Dr. Harris, and Dr. Steinmann and answer five specific questions regarding each topic selected. These five questions included:

1. What **conditions** does the data describe? Example: my community’s population is ‘old’.

2. What **direction** of change does the data describe? Example: my community’s population is getting older.

3. What is the **intensity** of that change? Example: my community’s population is aging at an increasing rate.

4. How does my community **compare** with other communities? Example: my community is older and getting older at a greater rate than other communities.
5. What overall picture does the data paint? Example: it will be harder to recruit businesses that depend on a younger population.

Participants of the September 8, 2017 Idaho Economic Development District Region III Strategic Planning Workshop divided themselves into four smaller groups and each group focused on four different current socio-demographic and economic conditions, including: (1) wages and income level, (2) housing, workforce, and broadband, (3) housing, and (4) wages. The following is a summary of the answers to each of the five questions listed above that each individual group completed for this exercise.

**Group 1: Wages and Income Level**

Conditions: Elmore 17% high, Ada 12.8% high, Owyhee 27.4% high. 15.6% nationally. 10.0% GOAL.

Direction: Elmore, Owyhee, Ada: business/industry mix is off and imbalanced. Poor community health levels. Low educational attainment. Housing issues – low income housing challenges. Wage disparity between high and low income groups and disparity is growing.

Intensity: all mostly static and stable.

Compare: Elmore is below state average and national average; Owyhee is below state average and national average; Ada has wages above state level and national level.

**Group 2: Housing, Workforce, Broadband**

Condition: 70% of homes are 2nd owner homes, no rentals, no workforce or midlevel housing available. New USDA apartments – only 6 buildable lots. Community education on issue – local housing.

Direction: (1) if continues, town will be closed during the week, Housing Trust to create housing – local housing – accessory dwelling (changed zoning), (2) lots shortage – annex property, (3) IBH Codes – addressing tiny homes or modular.

Intensity: (1) no potential to grow economic base, (2) no new homes in town.

Compare: 250 open jobs but no place for new workers to live and negatively affecting business, more building but not affordable.

**Group 3: Housing**

Higher housing costs and industry are pushing affordable housing and displacing farmland.
Direction and trend are unclear.

The work, journey and income data support this trend.

Housing and industry is displacing farmland in Canyon County.

**Group 4: Wages**

Rising wages but low comparable to other areas of the state.

Increase healthcare industry – increasing in Canyon County causing more employees. Decreasing unemployment rate low – causing competition for employees, HZA program/Labor County Jail, C&S Beef (600 to 700 employees)

Increasing – competing for same worker.

TV same – workforce development, immigration, dairies

Growth good.

The four areas that the four groups that participated in Group Exercise No. 2 should serve as the basis of a future strategic economic development plan for Idaho Economic Development District Region III. Workshop participants indicated that wages and income have remained relatively low when compared to other parts of the State of Idaho. While this condition appears to be specific to certain counties and geographic territories within Region III, overall improvement and growth in individual wages and income appears to be a priority condition as identified by workshop participants.

Workshop participants further identified housing as a primary socio-demographic and economic concern for Region III. Similar concerns regarding housing were initially identified in the assessment of Region III completed by University Center for Economic Development faculty and staff in 2015 and 2016. Workshop participants indicated that current housing conditions, including a general lack of affordable and quality market-rate housing and workforce housing, serves as a primary barrier to successfully attracting new firms in targeted industry sectors to various parts of Region III. Without significant improvement in the overall availability of housing throughout the region, further economic development activities will likely become hindered in their ability to stimulate economic activity.

In addition to wage and income improvement and housing development, workshop participants also identified workforce development concerns and general infrastructure concerns as additional barriers to future economic growth and expansion throughout Region III. Workforce development and general infrastructure concerns, alongside strategies to improve overall wages and income levels and housing conditions throughout the region, should be incorporated into the development of any future strategic economic development plan for Idaho Economic Development District Region III.
2.2 Results of the Small and Large Group Exercises using SET Module 5

SET Module 5 encourages participants participating in the development of a strategic regional economic development plan to design and develop a shared regional vision statement and then to develop a series of goals that, once achieved, would eventually lead to the realization of the shared regional vision.

2.2.1 Group Exercise No. 3, Developing a Shared Vision Statement

Features of a strong shared vision statement for an economic region include focusing on the future of the region, giving overall shape and direction for the region’s future, highlighting the region’s shared purposes and values, inspiring people, groups, and communities within the region, and remaining relevant to the people, groups, and communities that comprise the region beyond the scope of the actual strategic economic development plan. Building a shared vision statement involves five individual steps, including:

1. Determining the **focus** of the vision statement.

2. Seeking input on the **hopes and aspirations** of the region.

3. Determining the **common themes** that link the people, groups, and communities that comprise the region and then **prioritizing** those common themes.

4. Drafting a **vision statement** from the key themes identified by the people, groups, and communities that comprise the region.

5. **Finalizing** the vision statement.

Workshop participants, in small groups, were asked to answer three questions designed to facilitate the development of an eventual shared vision statement that could potentially be used to develop a future strategic economic development plan for Idaho Economic Development District Region III. These three questions included:

1. What will Region III look like in 20 to 30 years?

2. How and where do people in Region III live and work?

3. What are your personal hopes and aspirations for Region III?

The four small groups that participated in this exercise provided the following responses:

**Group 1:**

- Quality of Life is maintained with the input of community members to create a sustainable live/work environment.
• Economically diverse with healthy urban and rural communities working and living together support our lifestyles.

Group 2:
• Increase population.
• Work near (work centers) to live near/recreation centers.
• Transportation network, maintain a healthy living environment/self-sufficient.

Group 3:
• Common Themes: Collaborative, Cooperative, Connected
• Regional Work: strong and diverse economy, quality of life

Group 4:
• Collaborative economic development activities to grow new and old businesses.
• Competitive wages.
• Preserve life style – protecting our green environment and values.
• 20 years out, we want to be the economic model of what a successful revitalization looks like.

As individuals, the individual workshop participants identified a number of additional desires for the future development and growth of Idaho Economic Development District Region III, including:
• Balance of vibrant and healthy communities that are clean and safe
• Living wage in homes that fit their needs
• Transportation system
• Establish a new Region III w/ designation w/in 90 days from today (December 31, 2017)
• Write a new CEDS for Region III within 1 year of the new design (December 31, 2018)
• 100% participation by a minimum of 1 elected official from each jurisdiction in the formation discussion of Region III designation by December 31
• Works collaboratively without self-imposed boarders
• 20-30 year: healthy and productive balance between rural/urban
• Opportunities for all households
• People live/work in both rural and urban settings
• Region III will be a health, thriving and economically stable region balancing quality of life and economic vibrancy
• 20 to 30 year vision: connected region, works together in cooperative and collaborative manner for strong economy, diverse economy, communities with individual identities
• Decreased poverty
• Increased jobs-housing balance
• Balanced environmental and agricultural protection
• Increased diversity
• Increased community pride
• Increased commitment to better economy
• Mentorship program
• Apprenticeship model
• Still breathing – communities work together to minimize territorial conflicts
• Jobs/housing balance
• 20-30 years: a nationally recognized collaborative organization that is the center of economic growth for the state of Idaho
• How/where do people live/work = a thriving mix of healthy, prosperous urban and rural communities
• Personal hopes-controlled/thoughtful growth that preserves Idaho values and culture
• By January 2019, establish a Region III planning organization representative of the 10-county area with a fully functioning board and two employees to carry out the economic development strategy
• A cooperative working and living environment among the communities.
• Growth in communities that want it.
• Stay small in communities that want to but have access to resources.
• Region III work/live within a 50 mile commute…there will be more housing were needed.

Workshop participants identified a number of different visions and desires for the future of Idaho Economic Development District Region III. While relatively unique, they can be organized into three general categories, including specific organizational frameworks and economic development initiatives for Region III, general improvements in specific socio-demographic and economic conditions, and overall improvement in quality of life.

General organizational framework and economic development initiatives for Region III focused on developing a new collaborative, cooperative, and connected administrative structure that has equal participation of and equal representative for each of the ten counties that currently comprise Idaho Economic Development District Region III. Along with this collaborative, cooperative, and connected administrative framework, workshop participants identified a number of specific economic development initiatives that this framework would eventually be responsible for developing, implementing, and administering. Several workshop participants expressed a short-term desire that a new strategic economic development plan, potentially developed as a U.S. Economic Development Administration approved Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy, be developed as soon as possible. Workshop participants further expressed a desire that any new strategic economic development plan clearly identify the new organizational framework and the framework’s responsibility for developing, implementing, and administering a number of new economic development initiatives.
General improvements in specific socio-demographic and economic conditions ranged from creating vibrant and healthy communities that are clean and safe to improvements in individual wages and incomes to improvements in the region’s overall housing market. Each of these desired short-term and long-term improvements in specific socio-demographic and economic conditions are similar to the results that workshop participants produced for Group Exercise No. 2. In Group Exercise No. 2, workshop participants focused on current conditions in individual wages and income levels and current housing conditions in Region III. Any future strategic economic development plan for Region III should include some mention of the overall importance placed on making measurable improvements in overall wages and income levels and various housing conditions, ranging from availability to affordability to quantity, for Region III.

Finally, workshop participants identified a number of quality of life issues as part of the visioning exercise. Increased diversity, increased community pride, improved balance between environmental and agricultural protection, communities that work together with minimal territorial conflicts, and managed growth that preserves individual values and cultural identity, were a few of the many shared aspirations that workshop participants had for Idaho Economic Development District Region III. Whatever future organizational and administrative structure is developed for Region III, and whatever future strategic economic development plan that is eventually developed for the region, should emphasize the importance of these quality of life issues.

2.1.4 Group Exercise No. 4, Development of SMART Goals for Region III

In addition to developing a strong shared regional vision statement, SET Module 5 encourages participants to develop a series of strategic economic development goals designed to enable a region to achieve the shared regional vision. SET Module 5 focuses on developing “SMART” goals, a goal that is an observable and measurable outcome that the region will attempt to achieve within a specific period of time. When developing a SMART goal, the following elements and conditions should be considered:

- Regional data. Example: growing number of small businesses within identifiable regional clusters.
- Potential barriers that would impact the ability of the region to achieve agreed upon goals. Example: lack of a trained and highly talented workforce.
- Local and regional asserts that could be used to achieve agreed upon goals. Example: Small Business Development Center, community college, major research university, etc.
- Past history and past strategies; what worked and what did not work and why. Example: business incubator successfully piloted in one county.

A SMART goal should further include the following elements:
- **Specific**: What do you want to achieve? Where will you focus your efforts?

- **Measurable**: How do you plan to measure progress toward the goal? What is the end result and milestones along the way?

- **Attainable**: Do you have the resources to achieve the goal? What factors might prevent achieving these goals?

- **Relevant**: Is this important for your region to pursue? Does this or that matter or bring benefit to the region?

- **Time Framed**: When do you want to achieve your goal? What is the target date for accomplishing this goal?

Illustration 3 presents an example of a SMART goal.

Illustration 3 – An Example of a SMART Goal

Developing a SMART Goal

An Example of a SMART Goal:

Increase the **survival rate** of **new business start-ups** (less than 5 years old) from **50% to 75%** in **Region III** by **December 2019**.
Participants of the September 8, 2017 Idaho Economic Development District Region III Strategic Planning Workshop developed the following 15 separate SMART goals for Idaho Economic Development District Region III:

- 100% participation by a minimum of one elected official from each jurisdiction in the formation discussion of a ten county Region III designation by December 31, 2017.

- Establish a new Region III (ten county) with designation by December 31, 2017.

- Complete a new CEDS for Region III (ten county) by December 31, 2018.

- Workforce Development: develop vocational training programs starting in high school to provide a 25% improvement in career/technical education to meet the needs of the businesses in that community within 3 years.

- Broadband: that every community within Region III has access to high-speed internet within 5 years.

- Housing: increase local housing inventory by 10% in 5 years to create a sustainable workforce.

- By 2026, increase the number of high school graduates and bachelor’s degrees awarded among (INSERT NAME) County residents by at least 10%.

- By 2021, increase median household, family and per capita income of (INSERT NAME) County residents by at least 10%.

- By 2020 legislative session, establish mutual understanding and common goals between state and local government officials.

- Establish regional economic development strategy for Region 3 by December 2018 that has common goals while respecting individual community needs.

- Increase regional public transportation connectivity in Region 3 within the next 5 years by 25%.

- Establish a Region III planning organization representative of the 10 county area with a fully functional board and two employees to carry out the economic development strategy.

- Increase the number of jobs in Region III by 6% by December 2020.

- Increase median wage for Region III by 10% or 12% by December 2020.

- Increase ‘live where you work’ in Region III ratio by 10% by December 2020.
Each of the 15 goals developed by workshop participants correspond with the three general areas of shared vision developed by workshop participants in the previous group exercise. These SMART goals can be categorized as either pertaining to specific organizational frameworks and economic development initiatives for Region III, general improvements in specific socio-demographic and economic conditions, and/or overall improvement in the quality of life for Region III. Further development and inclusion of these various goals as part of a larger strategic economic development plan for Idaho Economic Development District Region III should include the development of specific actionable items that Region III or individual communities, jurisdictions, or other economic development organizations within the region can pursue and implement.
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EMPLOYMENT TRENDS

District III

EMPLOYMENT TRENDS

[Graph showing employment trends for Wage & Salary and Proprietors from 1970 to 2012]
**District III**

**GROSS EMPLOYMENT**

- Gross Employment by Sector in 2015
- BEA estimates roughly 433,000 jobs in the region (including proprietors)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Gross Employment</th>
<th>Percent of Employment</th>
<th>Gross Employment Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92 Government</td>
<td>53,541</td>
<td>12.36%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541 Professional, scientific, and tech svcs</td>
<td>29,028</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561 Admin support svcs</td>
<td>28,396</td>
<td>6.55%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>722 Food svcs and drinking places</td>
<td>21,815</td>
<td>5.05%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230 Construction</td>
<td>21,747</td>
<td>5.28%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531 Real estate</td>
<td>19,033</td>
<td>4.39%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621 Ambulatory health care</td>
<td>18,773</td>
<td>4.33%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622 Hospitals</td>
<td>15,393</td>
<td>3.55%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>14,861</td>
<td>3.43%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>813 Religious, civic, grantmaking, and similar orgs</td>
<td>10,301</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BASE EMPLOYMENT**

- Base Employment by Sector in 2015
- Tells a different story about the importance of sectors in the region’s economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Base Employment</th>
<th>Percent of Employment</th>
<th>Base Employment Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>110,606</td>
<td>25.52%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92 Government</td>
<td>75,656</td>
<td>17.46%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230 Construction</td>
<td>47,141</td>
<td>10.88%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541 Professional, scientific, and tech svcs</td>
<td>27,139</td>
<td>6.26%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334 Computer and Electronic Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>26,962</td>
<td>6.22%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311 Food products manuf</td>
<td>22,720</td>
<td>5.24%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>9,892</td>
<td>2.28%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>813 Religious, civic, grantmaking, and similar orgs</td>
<td>8,852</td>
<td>2.04%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561 Admin support svcs</td>
<td>8,706</td>
<td>2.01%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112 Livestock</td>
<td>7,017</td>
<td>1.62%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
District III

QUANTITATIVE SWOT

• How is the region performing relative to other regions and over time?
• Use Location Quotients (LQ) and % change in LQ
• LQ is a measure of relative concentration
• Proxy for competitive advantage

STRENGTH SECTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>334 Computer &amp; oth electron</td>
<td>3.856</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>77.75%</td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>8,567</td>
<td>$129,094</td>
<td>$129,469</td>
<td>-$375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321 Wood Products</td>
<td>2.733</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>203.42%</td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>2,805</td>
<td>$44,436</td>
<td>$49,679</td>
<td>-$5,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112 Livestock</td>
<td>2.246</td>
<td>1.475</td>
<td>52.25%</td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>6,015</td>
<td>$48,646</td>
<td>$43,838</td>
<td>$4,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>454 Non-store retailers</td>
<td>1.788</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>98.09%</td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>7,427</td>
<td>$29,688</td>
<td>$25,381</td>
<td>$4,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315 Apparel</td>
<td>1.371</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>182.69%</td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>$21,786</td>
<td>$37,747</td>
<td>-$15,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622 Hospitals</td>
<td>1.368</td>
<td>0.970</td>
<td>41.08%</td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>15,394</td>
<td>$78,155</td>
<td>$79,057</td>
<td>-$902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>813 Religious- grantmaking- &amp;</td>
<td>1.362</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td>122.97%</td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>10,301</td>
<td>$45,937</td>
<td>$46,496</td>
<td>-$558</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>similar orgs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113 Forestry &amp; Logging</td>
<td>1.170</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>34.71%</td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>$35,453</td>
<td>$47,962</td>
<td>-$12,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312 Beverage &amp; Tobacco</td>
<td>1.154</td>
<td>0.730</td>
<td>58.15%</td>
<td>Strength</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>$38,231</td>
<td>$78,914</td>
<td>-$40,682</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Avg Wage of Strength Sectors: $62,974
### District III
#### WEAK SECTORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>339 Miscellaneous mfg</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>7.792</td>
<td>-88.45%</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
<td>1,405</td>
<td>$36,790</td>
<td>$75,835</td>
<td>-$39,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>642 Social assistance</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>1.135</td>
<td>-22.32%</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
<td>9,053</td>
<td>$21,738</td>
<td>$25,055</td>
<td>-$3,317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>493 Warehousing &amp; storage</td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td>1.061</td>
<td>-42.92%</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
<td>1,422</td>
<td>$37,275</td>
<td>$45,980</td>
<td>-$8,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>512 Motion picture &amp; sound recording</td>
<td>0.508</td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td>-21.37%</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>$11,603</td>
<td>$73,466</td>
<td>-$61,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333 Machinery Mfg</td>
<td>0.441</td>
<td>4.459</td>
<td>-90.12%</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>$64,783</td>
<td>$82,977</td>
<td>-$18,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314 Textile Products</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td>-53.79%</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>$42,876</td>
<td>$48,464</td>
<td>-$5,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326 Plastics &amp; rubber prod</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>-32.32%</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>$42,965</td>
<td>$63,542</td>
<td>-$20,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322 Paper Manufacturing</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>-70.39%</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>$81,160</td>
<td>$89,101</td>
<td>-$7,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335 Electrical eqpt &amp; appliances</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>2.171</td>
<td>-89.61%</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>$77,911</td>
<td>$84,698</td>
<td>-$6,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211 Oil &amp; gas extraction</td>
<td>0.172</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>-32.21%</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>$167,216</td>
<td>$128,890</td>
<td>$38,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486 Pipeline transportation</td>
<td>0.170</td>
<td>9.163</td>
<td>-98.15%</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>$93,216</td>
<td>$548,644</td>
<td>-$455,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331 Primary metal mfg</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>1.894</td>
<td>-92.95%</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>$39,411</td>
<td>$78,007</td>
<td>-$38,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325 Chemical Manufacturing</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td>-47.37%</td>
<td>Weakness</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>$76,525</td>
<td>$129,915</td>
<td>-$53,389</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Avg Wage of Weak Sectors:** $41,118

### District III
#### OPPORTUNITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>2015 LQ</th>
<th>2008 LQ</th>
<th>% Change LQ</th>
<th>SWOT</th>
<th>2015 EMP</th>
<th>Ave Wage</th>
<th>Average Wage USA</th>
<th>Wage Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>713 Amusement- gambling &amp; recreation</td>
<td>0.998</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>24.43%</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>4,684</td>
<td>$15,670</td>
<td>$24,429</td>
<td>-$8,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621 Ambulatory health care</td>
<td>0.978</td>
<td>0.903</td>
<td>8.34%</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>18,774</td>
<td>$52,568</td>
<td>$70,357</td>
<td>-$17,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541 Professional- scientific &amp; tech svcs</td>
<td>0.878</td>
<td>0.822</td>
<td>6.80%</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>29,029</td>
<td>$58,232</td>
<td>$85,815</td>
<td>-$27,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327 Nonmetal mineral prod</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>865.57%</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>$47,600</td>
<td>$64,226</td>
<td>-$16,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>562 Waste mgmt &amp; remediation svcs</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>66.78%</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>$65,703</td>
<td>$67,928</td>
<td>-$2,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>518 Internet &amp; data process svcs</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.792</td>
<td>6.21%</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>$67,502</td>
<td>$103,692</td>
<td>-$36,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>812 Personal &amp; laundry svc's</td>
<td>0.828</td>
<td>0.649</td>
<td>27.60%</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>7620</td>
<td>$22,348</td>
<td>$27,321</td>
<td>-$4,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>623 Nursing &amp; residential care</td>
<td>0.815</td>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>15.01%</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>6,448</td>
<td>$30,987</td>
<td>$37,335</td>
<td>-$6,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>522 Credit intermediation &amp; related</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>11.80%</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>$68,237</td>
<td>$91,335</td>
<td>-$23,099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49A Postal service, couriers &amp; messengers</td>
<td>0.806</td>
<td>0.357</td>
<td>125.67%</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>2,804</td>
<td>$55,092</td>
<td>$58,481</td>
<td>-$3,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>446 Health &amp; personal care stores</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td>0.612</td>
<td>25.94%</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>2,226</td>
<td>$35,403</td>
<td>$42,677</td>
<td>-$7,274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>445 Food &amp; beverage stores</td>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>0.299</td>
<td>156.83%</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>5,097</td>
<td>$50,285</td>
<td>$31,448</td>
<td>$18,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511 Publishing industries</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>0.261</td>
<td>193.84%</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>1,514</td>
<td>$46,897</td>
<td>$105,480</td>
<td>-$58,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332 Fabricated metal prod</td>
<td>0.605</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>63.16%</td>
<td>Opportunity</td>
<td>2,105</td>
<td>$44,888</td>
<td>$65,988</td>
<td>-$21,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Avg Wage of Opportunity Sectors:** $40,476
### District III

#### THREATS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>115 Ag &amp; Forestry Svcs</td>
<td>1.717</td>
<td>2.074</td>
<td>-17.24%</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>2,143</td>
<td>$39,008</td>
<td>$36,582</td>
<td>$2,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>519 Other information services</td>
<td>1.573</td>
<td>1.769</td>
<td>-11.08%</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>$76,641</td>
<td>$174,933</td>
<td>-$98,299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316 Leather &amp; Allied</td>
<td>1.430</td>
<td>37.880</td>
<td>-96.23%</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>$25,748</td>
<td>$53,262</td>
<td>-$27,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>453 Misc retailers</td>
<td>1.301</td>
<td>2.087</td>
<td>-37.67%</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>4,973</td>
<td>$22,622</td>
<td>$23,086</td>
<td>-$464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>443 Electronics &amp; appliances stores</td>
<td>1.228</td>
<td>2.739</td>
<td>-55.15%</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>1,623</td>
<td>$53,284</td>
<td>$55,737</td>
<td>-$2,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230 Construction</td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td>1.344</td>
<td>-12.34%</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>27,470</td>
<td>$45,843</td>
<td>$56,073</td>
<td>-$10,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>447 Gasoline stations</td>
<td>1.170</td>
<td>1.499</td>
<td>-21.90%</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>2,588</td>
<td>$30,252</td>
<td>$37,124</td>
<td>-$6,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531 Real estate</td>
<td>1.147</td>
<td>1.448</td>
<td>-20.82%</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>19,033</td>
<td>$15,630</td>
<td>$25,373</td>
<td>-$9,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>444 Bldg materials &amp; garden dealers</td>
<td>1.114</td>
<td>1.783</td>
<td>-37.50%</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>3,468</td>
<td>$42,331</td>
<td>$40,909</td>
<td>$1,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561 Admin support svcs</td>
<td>1.072</td>
<td>1.343</td>
<td>-20.13%</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>28,396</td>
<td>$32,754</td>
<td>$37,293</td>
<td>-$4,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>811 Repair &amp; maintenance</td>
<td>1.056</td>
<td>1.251</td>
<td>-15.56%</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>7,689</td>
<td>$55,120</td>
<td>$55,315</td>
<td>-$195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525 Funds - trusts &amp; other finan</td>
<td>1.021</td>
<td>1.366</td>
<td>-25.24%</td>
<td>Threat</td>
<td>3,574</td>
<td>$115,539</td>
<td>$44,370</td>
<td>$71,169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Avg Wage of Opportunity

Sectors: $38,386

---

#### WAGES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Gross Employment</th>
<th>Ave wage</th>
<th>U.S. Average</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>92 Government</td>
<td>53,541.6</td>
<td>$61,632</td>
<td>$75,422</td>
<td>-$13,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>541 Professional,scientific, and tech svcs</td>
<td>29,028.7</td>
<td>$58,232</td>
<td>$85,815</td>
<td>-$27,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>561 Admin support svcs</td>
<td>28,396.3</td>
<td>$32,754</td>
<td>$37,293</td>
<td>-$4,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>722 Food svcs and drinking places</td>
<td>28,185.0</td>
<td>$19,450</td>
<td>$23,411</td>
<td>-$3,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230 Construction</td>
<td>27,470.0</td>
<td>$45,843</td>
<td>$56,073</td>
<td>-$10,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>531 Real estate</td>
<td>19,033.4</td>
<td>$15,630</td>
<td>$25,373</td>
<td>-$9,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>621 Ambulatory health care</td>
<td>18,773.8</td>
<td>$52,568</td>
<td>$70,357</td>
<td>-$17,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>622 Hospitals</td>
<td>15,393.8</td>
<td>$78,155</td>
<td>$79,057</td>
<td>-$902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>14,861.8</td>
<td>$75,677</td>
<td>$87,286</td>
<td>-$11,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>813 Religious, civic, grantmaking, and similar orgs</td>
<td>10,301.0</td>
<td>$45,937</td>
<td>$46,496</td>
<td>-$559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall Average Wage</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,301.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>$47,461</strong></td>
<td><strong>$58,688</strong></td>
<td><strong>-$11,227</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
REGIONAL WAGES

- Average wages in a region vary greatly from place to place
  - Idaho ranks 43rd in average wage paid
  - Much has been made of this ranking by academics, politicians, and pundits in the state
  - However, we first must have a better understanding for what is causing this ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Annual mean wage (2016)</th>
<th>National Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>$56,710</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>$55,810</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>$49,710</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US Average</td>
<td>$49,630</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>$41,910</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>$41,440</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

INDUSTRY MIX VERSUS WAGES

- The average wage in a region can be low (or high) because
  - The jobs pay below the national average wage for the given sector
  - Even if the industry mix is similar to the U.S.
  - The region is over concentrated in low paying sectors
  - Even if the average wage by sector is similar to the U.S.
District III

EDUCATION

- There represent the education that the jobs in the region normally require, not necessarily the actual education of the region.
District III

EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Valley, ID</th>
<th>Adams, ID</th>
<th>Washington, ID</th>
<th>Payette, ID</th>
<th>Gem, ID</th>
<th>Boise County, ID</th>
<th>Canyon, ID</th>
<th>Ada, ID</th>
<th>Elmore, ID</th>
<th>Owyhee, ID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actual % with Bachelors Degree or Higher</td>
<td>33.99%</td>
<td>20.79%</td>
<td>14.35%</td>
<td>14.96%</td>
<td>16.89%</td>
<td>24.78%</td>
<td>17.40%</td>
<td>36.39%</td>
<td>16.98%</td>
<td>9.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected % with Bachelors Degree or Higher based on industry mix</td>
<td>19.41%</td>
<td>19.22%</td>
<td>17.34%</td>
<td>19.37%</td>
<td>18.41%</td>
<td>18.36%</td>
<td>21.67%</td>
<td>25.15%</td>
<td>24.11%</td>
<td>15.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>14.58%</td>
<td>1.57%</td>
<td>-2.99%</td>
<td>-4.41%</td>
<td>-1.52%</td>
<td>6.42%</td>
<td>-4.27%</td>
<td>11.24%</td>
<td>-7.13%</td>
<td>-6.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONCLUSIONS

- The region as a whole is economically one of the strongest in the state
- There are many shared concerns
  - Infrastructure; job growth; relatively weak wages compared to U.S., but some signs of improvement
- Some unique challenges between the counties
  - Education; wages by sector; industry mix; natural resource issues
THANK YOU

Philip Watson
pwatson@uidaho.edu

PER CAPITA COMMUTER INCOME

[Map images showing per capita commuter income data]
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“Idaho Economic Development Region III”
Idaho Economic Development Region III

One-Day Kick-Off Workshop
September 8, 2017

2017 Idaho Health Ranking (darker shading = lower rank)

Estimates of future health
Health Behaviors
• Smoking
• Obesity
• Access to food
• Alcohol Use
Clinical Care
• Uninsured
• Access (Medical, Mental, Dental)
Social and Economic Factors
• Education
• Unemployment
• Children in Poverty
• Violent Crimes
Physical Environment
• Air and Water
• Housing
• Commute Time
### Table 2.6 – Median Age
**Idaho Economic Development District Region III**
2010 to 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>Median Age 2010</th>
<th>Median Age 2014</th>
<th>Percent Change in Median Age 2010 to 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State of Idaho</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ada County</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams County</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise County</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon County</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmore County</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gem County</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owyhee County</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payette County</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley County</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of Idaho Economic Development District Region III</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Population Distribution in the U.S. by Age and Gender, 1900 and 2040

The Shift in Age: the new normal

- Permanent change in the age composition

- Most of population aging has yet to occur
  - Ratio of working adult to older adult (IDoL)
    - 2010: 6:1
    - 2020: 3:1

- Changes in retirement income favor work over leisure
  - Social security
  - Pensions
  - Savings

Retirement is Not a One-Time Permanent Event for Most Older Americans


POUNTS OF VIEW

Graphic source: http://findlayfoods.com/is-the-glass-half-full-or-half-empty
The Value Proposition of Shift in Age

- **Economic Benefits**
  - Older adults are an important part of the workforce
  - Attracting and retaining older adults is an economic development strategy
    - Retail
    - Health care and other services
  - Older adults start more new businesses than younger adults
  - Continued work later in life brings economic benefits to community and individual

The Value Proposition for Communities

- Older adults stimulate development of new companies, products and services
- Older adults generate tourism dollars

Bruneau Overlook in Owyhee County
New fully accessible attraction
Scenic Opportunities

Owyhee Uplands Back Country Byway


Scenic Opportunities

Weiser River Trail

The Value Proposition for Communities

• Social Capital
  ○ Older adults provide care and resources across generations
    ▪ Spouse caring for spouse
    ▪ Grandparents caring for grandchildren
  ○ Engage as volunteers and in community activities
  ○ Older adults support charities, schools and churches
Maximizing the Value

- **Housing and Transportation**
  - Creative Modes of Transport (Uber, Ride Share)
  - Walkability

- **Strategic Access to Health Services**
  - Community Health Paramedics
  - Community Health Workers
  - Family Caregivers
  - Personal Care Service Workers
  - Tele-health

Maximizing the Value

- **Social Services and Supports**
  - Area Agencies on Aging
  - Local Non-profit Organizations
  - Idaho Fit and Fall Proof Program
  - Phone-based supports
    - Idaho 2-1-1 Careline

- **Community Involvement**
  - Volunteer opportunities
  - Faith-based engagement
  - Involvement in city and county decision-making
Thank you

BOISE STATE UNIVERSITY,
CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF AGING

Dr. Sarah Toevs
stoevs@boisestate.edu
208 426-2452
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Presentation by Dr. Thomas Harris
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### Table 1. Percentage of County Residence by Place of Work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE OF WORK</th>
<th>Ada</th>
<th>Adams</th>
<th>Boise</th>
<th>Canyon</th>
<th>Elmore</th>
<th>Gem</th>
<th>Owyhee</th>
<th>Payett</th>
<th>Valley</th>
<th>Washington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ada</td>
<td>92.15%</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td>37.29%</td>
<td>34.14%</td>
<td>9.06%</td>
<td>32.09%</td>
<td>9.45%</td>
<td>6.80%</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
<td>4.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>67.88%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>53.71%</td>
<td>0.18%</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon</td>
<td>4.84%</td>
<td>2.75%</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
<td>60.42%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>8.77%</td>
<td>32.43%</td>
<td>5.95%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>4.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmore</td>
<td>0.39%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>85.45%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4.14%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gem</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.48%</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
<td>49.03%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owyhee</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.96%</td>
<td>1.35%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>50.14%</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payette</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.28%</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>48.81%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>9.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>22.75%</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>89.17%</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>3.25%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.83%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>64.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Idaho Counties</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>1.38%</td>
<td>1.41%</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
<td>1.44%</td>
<td>1.35%</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
<td>2.66%</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTSIDE IDAHO in U.S.</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td>0.81%</td>
<td>4.20%</td>
<td>2.49%</td>
<td>0.83%</td>
<td>4.21%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>35.31%</td>
<td>2.82%</td>
<td>15.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTSIDE U.S.</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table 2. Percentage of County Place of Work by County of Residence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACE OF RESIDENCE</th>
<th>Ada</th>
<th>Adams</th>
<th>Boise</th>
<th>Canyon</th>
<th>Elmore</th>
<th>Gem</th>
<th>Owyhee</th>
<th>Payette</th>
<th>Valley</th>
<th>Washington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ada</td>
<td>83.44%</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
<td>21.05%</td>
<td>14.53%</td>
<td>7.07%</td>
<td>6.27%</td>
<td>2.01%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>2.92%</td>
<td>2.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>81.60%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.06%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.10%</td>
<td>0.08%</td>
<td>6.88%</td>
<td>2.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>0.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>61.07%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon</td>
<td>12.13%</td>
<td>4.47%</td>
<td>3.52%</td>
<td>79.13%</td>
<td>0.78%</td>
<td>4.24%</td>
<td>26.81%</td>
<td>6.55%</td>
<td>4.28%</td>
<td>1.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmore</td>
<td>0.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.43%</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
<td>89.38%</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.42%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gem</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.60%</td>
<td>1.16%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>84.25%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.65%</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>0.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owyhee</td>
<td>0.21%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.52%</td>
<td>1.79%</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
<td>67.96%</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payette</td>
<td>0.33%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>0.92%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>2.15%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>69.88%</td>
<td>0.46%</td>
<td>6.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valley</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>6.02%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>82.21%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.38%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4.26%</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td>83.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Idaho Counties</td>
<td>0.32%</td>
<td>4.87%</td>
<td>1.95%</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
<td>0.75%</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside State of Idaho</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
<td>7.38%</td>
<td>9.44%</td>
<td>0.05%</td>
<td>1.36%</td>
<td>1.85%</td>
<td>10.82%</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
