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The Economic Challenge for Governors in 2012

Achieving Fiscal Stability

Enhancing State Competitiveness
What is Competitiveness?

• Competitiveness is the **productivity** with which a state utilizes its human, capital, and natural endowments to create value

• Productivity determines **wages**, **jobs**, and the **standard of living**

• It is not **what** fields a state competes in that determines its prosperity, but **how productively** it competes
Where Does Productivity Come From?

Businesses and government play different but interrelated roles in creating a productive economy

- Only **businesses** can create **jobs** and **wealth**
- **States** compete to offer the **most productive environment** for business
Agenda

1. How is your state doing?  
   State Performance Scorecard

2. Why?  
   Explaining your state’s performance, strengths, and weaknesses

3. Where to go from here?  
   Action Steps
Why?
What Drives State Productivity?

1. Quality of the Overall Business Environment
2. Cluster Development
3. Policy Coordination among Multiple Levels of Geography/Government
## Connecticut Performance Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Start Position</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prosperity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per Capita, 2000-2010</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4, -1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wages</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2, +0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Private Wage, 1998-2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Creation</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21, +22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labor Mobilization</strong></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14, +20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proportion of Working Age Population in the Workforce, 2000-2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Labor Productivity</strong></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4, -1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per Workforce Participant, 2000-2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Business Formation</strong></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41, +2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovation</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8, -4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patents per Employee, 2000-2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cluster Strength</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16, -1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment in Strong Clusters, 1998-2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leading Clusters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by employment size, 2009 (national rank)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Financial Services (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Education and Knowledge Creation (14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Aerospace Vehicles and Defense (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Analytical Instruments (16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Aerospace Engines (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**State Rank**
- 1-10
- 11-20
- 31-40
- 41-50
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Comparative State *Prosperity* Performance

2000 - 2010

Source: BEA. Notes: GDP in real 2005 dollars. Growth rate is calculated as compound annual growth rate.
Comparative State Labor Mobilization Performance
1999-2010

High but declining versus U.S.

High Labor Force Participation and Participation rising versus U.S.

U.S. Labor Force Participation Rate: 64.7%

Notes: Source BLS.
Comparative State Labor Force Productivity Performance 2000-2010

Real Growth in Gross Domestic Product per Labor Force Participant, 2000-2010

Sources: BEA, BLS. Notes: GDP in real 2005 dollars. Growth rate is calculated as compound annual growth rate.
Comparative State Employee Productivity Performance 2000-2010

Real Growth in Gross Domestic Product per Employed Worker, 2000-2010

Sources: BEA, BLS. Notes: GDP in real 2005 dollars. Growth rate is calculated as compound annual growth rate.
Comparative State Innovation Performance

2000 - 2010

U.S. average Growth Rate of Patenting: +2.25%

High and declining innovation

High and improving innovation rate versus U.S.

Low and declining innovation
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Why?
What Drives State Productivity?

1. Quality of the Overall Business Environment
2. Cluster Development
3. Policy Coordination among Multiple Levels of Geography/Government
Quality of the Overall Business Environment

Context for Firm Strategy and Rivalry

Rules and incentives that encourage local competition, investment and productivity
- e.g., tax policy that encourages investment and R&D
- Flexible labor policies
- Intellectual property protection
- Antitrust enforcement

Factor (Input) Conditions

Access to high quality business inputs
- Human resources
- Capital access
- Physical infrastructure
- Administrative processes (e.g., permitting, regulatory efficiency)
- Scientific and technological infrastructure

Demand Conditions

Sophisticated and demanding local needs and customers
- e.g., Strict quality, safety, and environmental standards
- Consumer protection laws
- Government procurement of advanced technology
- Early demand for products and services

Related and Supporting Industries

Local availability of suppliers and supporting industries

- Many things matter for competitiveness
- Economic development is the process of improving the business environment to enable companies to compete in increasingly sophisticated ways
Improving the Business Environment
Common Action Items

1. Simplify and speed up regulation and permitting

2. Reduce unnecessary costs of doing business

3. Establish training programs that are aligned with the needs of the state’s businesses

4. Focus infrastructure investments on the most leveraged areas for productivity and economic growth

5. Design all policies to support emerging growth companies

6. Protect and enhance the state’s higher education and research institutions

7. Relentlessly improve the public education system, the essential foundation for productivity in the long run
Why?
What Drives State Productivity?

1. Quality of the Overall Business Environment
2. Cluster Development
3. Policy Coordination among Multiple Levels of Geography/Government
What is a Cluster?

A geographically concentrated group of interconnected companies and associated institutions in a particular field

Traded Clusters
- Compete to serve national and international markets
- Can locate anywhere
- 30% of employment

Local Clusters
- Serve almost exclusively the local market
- Not directly exposed to cross-regional competition
- 70% of employment
Example: Massachusetts Life Sciences Cluster

Health and Beauty Products

Surgical Instruments and Suppliers

Medical Equipment

Dental Instruments and Suppliers

Ophthalmic Goods

Diagnostic Substances

Containers

Teaching and Specialized Hospitals

Biological Products

Biopharmaceutical Products

Research Organizations

Educational Institutions

Harvard, MIT, Tufts, Boston University, UMass

Cluster Organizations

MassMedic, MassBio, others

Specialized Business Services

Banking, Accounting, Legal

Specialized Risk Capital

VC Firms, Angel Networks

Specialized Research Service Providers

Laboratory, Clinical Testing

Analytical Instruments Cluster
Example: Houston Oil and Gas Cluster

Upstream

Oil & Natural Gas Exploration & Development

Equipment Suppliers
(e.g., Oil Field Chemicals, Drilling Rigs, Drill Tools)

Specialized Technology Services
(e.g., Drilling Consultants, Reservoir Services, Laboratory Analysis)

Subcontractors
(e.g., Surveying, Mud Logging, Maintenance Services)

Business Services
(e.g., MIS Services, Technology Licenses, Risk Management)

Downstream

Oil & Natural Gas Completion & Production

Gas Gathering

Gas Processing

Gas Trading

Gas Transmission

Gas Distribution

Gas Marketing

Oil Refining

Oil Trading

Oil Distribution

Oil Wholesale Marketing

Oil Retail Marketing

Oilfield Services/Engineering & Contracting Firms

Specialized Institutions
(e.g., Academic Institutions, Training Centers, Industry Associations)
Strong Clusters Drive Regional Performance

- Specialization in strong clusters
- Breadth of industries within each cluster
- Strength in related clusters
- Presence of a region’s clusters in neighboring regions

- Job growth
- Higher wages
- Higher patenting rates
- Greater new business formation, growth and survival

On average, cluster strength is much more important (78.1%) than cluster mix (21.9%) in driving regional performance in the U.S.

Clusters and Economic Diversification

Note: Clusters with overlapping borders or identical shading have at least 20% overlap (by number of industries) in both directions.
The Evolution of Regional Economies
San Diego

- Climate and Geography
- U.S. Military
- Biological Research Centers
- Hospitality and Tourism
- Transport and Logistics
- Power Generation
- Communications Equipment
- Information Technology
- Medical Devices
- Biotech / Pharmaceuticals
- Education and Knowledge Creation
- Aerospace Vehicles and Defense
- Analytical Instruments
- Information Technology

Traded Cluster Composition of the Connecticut Economy

Overall change in the Connecticut Share of US Traded Employment: -0.14%

Connecticut Overall Share of US Traded Employment: 1.43%

Traded Cluster Composition of the Connecticut Economy (continued)

Overall change in the Connecticut Share of US Traded Employment: -0.14%

Connecticut Overall Share of US Traded Employment: 1.43%
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Connecticut Job Creation in Traded Clusters
1998 to 2009

Net traded job creation, 1998 to 2009: -59,287

* Percent change in national benchmark times starting regional employment. Overall traded job creation in the state, if it matched national benchmarks, would be -7,727

* Indicates expected job creation given national cluster growth.*
## Connecticut Wages in Traded Clusters vs. National Benchmarks

### Wages, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Connecticut Average Traded Wage</th>
<th>U.S. Average Traded Wage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>$74,918</td>
<td>$56,906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil and Gas Products and Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace Engines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical Instruments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education and Knowledge Creation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing and Printing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Devices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Construction Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biopharmaceuticals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Driven Products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Logistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automotive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Machinery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Manufacturing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lighting and Electrical Equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Fixtures, Equipment and Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leather and Related Products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plastics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processed Food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewelry and Precious Metals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting, Recreational and Children's Goods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality and Tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Generation and Transmission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace Vehicles and Defense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefabricated Enclosures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing and Fishing Products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footwear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apparel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Productivity Depends on How a State Competes, Not What Industries It Competes In

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>State Traded Wage versus National Average</th>
<th>Cluster Mix Effect</th>
<th>Relative Cluster Wage Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>+27,171</td>
<td>7,028</td>
<td>20,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>+24,102</td>
<td>3,628</td>
<td>20,474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>+16,169</td>
<td>4,391</td>
<td>11,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>+13,535</td>
<td>3,761</td>
<td>9,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>+9,573</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>9,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>+6,651</td>
<td>2,496</td>
<td>4,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>+5,652</td>
<td>2,692</td>
<td>2,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>+5,319</td>
<td>1,617</td>
<td>3,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>+2,658</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>+1,662</td>
<td>2,416</td>
<td>-754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>+352</td>
<td>2,494</td>
<td>-2,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>+164</td>
<td>11,060</td>
<td>-10,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>-930</td>
<td>-2,417</td>
<td>1,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>-3,970</td>
<td>-995</td>
<td>-2,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>-4,280</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>-4,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>-5,322</td>
<td>-1,102</td>
<td>-4,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>-5,576</td>
<td>-425</td>
<td>-5,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>-6,387</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>-6,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>-7,021</td>
<td>1,149</td>
<td>-8,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>-7,705</td>
<td>2,241</td>
<td>-9,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>-8,057</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>-9,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>-8,176</td>
<td>-2,544</td>
<td>-5,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>-9,245</td>
<td>-4,330</td>
<td>-4,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>-9,284</td>
<td>-2,495</td>
<td>-6,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>-9,791</td>
<td>-2,290</td>
<td>-7,501</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>State Traded Wage versus National Average</th>
<th>Cluster Mix Effect</th>
<th>Relative Cluster Wage Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>-10,359</td>
<td>-1,304</td>
<td>-9,056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>-10,427</td>
<td>-1,425</td>
<td>-9,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>-10,934</td>
<td>-3,563</td>
<td>-7,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>-11,007</td>
<td>-1,559</td>
<td>-9,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>-11,722</td>
<td>-3,516</td>
<td>-8,206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>-11,777</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>-12,018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>-11,992</td>
<td>2,072</td>
<td>-14,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>-12,172</td>
<td>-3,156</td>
<td>-9,016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>-12,554</td>
<td>-4,840</td>
<td>-7,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>-13,368</td>
<td>-1,572</td>
<td>-11,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>-13,572</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>-14,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>-14,277</td>
<td>-2,365</td>
<td>-11,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>-14,394</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>-15,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>-15,276</td>
<td>-5,067</td>
<td>-10,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>-15,378</td>
<td>-4,560</td>
<td>-10,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>-16,043</td>
<td>-12,555</td>
<td>-3,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>-16,123</td>
<td>-288</td>
<td>-15,835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>-16,215</td>
<td>-5,024</td>
<td>-11,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>-16,379</td>
<td>-968</td>
<td>-15,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>-16,606</td>
<td>-2,721</td>
<td>-13,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>-16,645</td>
<td>-3,894</td>
<td>-12,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>-18,671</td>
<td>-787</td>
<td>-17,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>-19,942</td>
<td>-5,291</td>
<td>-14,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>-20,073</td>
<td>-2,259</td>
<td>-17,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>-20,968</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>-21,257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On average, cluster strength is much more important (78.1%) than cluster mix (21.9%) in driving regional performance in the U.S.

LQ, or Location Quotient, measures the state’s share in cluster employment relative to its overall share of U.S. employment. An LQ > 1 indicates an above average employment share in a cluster.
## Connecticut Performance Scorecard

### Prosperity

**GDP per Capita, 2000-2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Position</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wages

**Average Private Wage, 1998-2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Position</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Job Creation


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Position</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Labor Mobilization

**Proportion of Working Age Population in the Workforce, 2000-2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Position</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Labor Productivity

**GDP per Workforce Participant, 2000-2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Position</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### New Business Formation


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Position</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Innovation

**Patents per Employee, 2000-2010**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Position</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cluster Strength

**Employment in Strong Clusters, 1998-2009**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start Position</th>
<th>Trend</th>
<th>Current Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Leading Clusters

**by employment size, 2009 (national rank)**

- Financial Services (9)
- Education and Knowledge Creation (14)
- Aerospace Vehicles and Defense (6)
- Analytical Instruments (16)
- Aerospace Engines (2)

**State Rank**

- 1-10: 21-30
- 11-20: 31-40
- 41-50: 1-10
Cluster Development
Common Action Items

1. Build on the state’s **existing and emerging clusters** rather than chase “hot” fields

2. Pursue economic diversification **within clusters** and **across related clusters**

3. Create a private sector-led **cluster upgrading program** with matching support for participating private sector cluster organizations
   - Government should **listen** and **remove obstacles** to cluster improvement

4. **Align** other state economic policies and programs with clusters

Aligning Economic Policy and Clusters

- Business Attraction
- Education and Workforce Training
- Export Promotion
- Science and Technology Investments (e.g., centers, university departments)
- Natural Resource Protection
- Standard Setting / Certification Organizations
- Specialized Physical Infrastructure
- Environmental Improvement

- Clusters provide a framework for organizing the implementation of many public policies and public investments to achieve greater effectiveness.
Why?
What Drives State Productivity?

1. Quality of the Overall Business Environment
2. Cluster Development
3. Policy Coordination among Multiple Levels of Geography/Government
Geographic and Governmental Influences on Productivity

- Nation
  - State
    - Metropolitan Areas
    - Rural Regions
  - Neighboring State
    - State
    - Metropolitan Areas
    - Rural Regions
  - Neighboring State
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The economies of states are often an aggregation of distinct economic areas with differing circumstances.
Wage Performance in Connecticut Metropolitan Areas

Connecticut Growth Rate of Wages: 3.44%

U.S. Growth Rate of Wages: 2.86%

Connecticut Average Private Wage: $53,141

U.S. Average Private Wage: $42,403

Average Private Wage, 2009

Growth Rate of Private Wages, 1998-2009

Source: Census CBP, authors’ analysis. Note: “Bubble” size in chart is proportional to employment in 2009.
Employment Performance in Connecticut Metropolitan Areas

Growth Rate of Private Employment, 1998-2009

-0.6% -0.4% -0.2% 0.0% 0.2% 0.4% 0.6%

$35,000 $40,000 $45,000 $50,000 $55,000 $60,000 $65,000 $70,000 $75,000

Connecticut Average Private Wage: $53,141
U.S. Average Private Wage: $42,403

Source: Census CBP, authors' analysis. Note: “Bubble” size in chart is proportional to employment in 2009.
Geographic and Governmental Influences on Productivity

1. **Influence** and access federal policies and programs

2. Work with each metro area to develop a prioritized strategic agenda

3. **Connect** rural regions with proximate urban areas

4. **Integrate** policies and infrastructure planning with neighbors
Agenda

1. How is your state doing?        State Performance Scorecard

2. Why?                             Explaining your state’s performance, strengths, and weaknesses

3. Where to go from here?         Action Steps
Agenda

1. How is your state doing? State Performance Scorecard
2. Why? Explaining your state’s performance, strengths, and weaknesses
3. Where to go from here? Action Steps

Biggest Action Item of All
Create an Economic Strategy

• What is the distinctive competitive position of the state or region given its location, legacy, existing strengths, and potential strengths?
  – What unique value as a business location?
  – For what types of activities and clusters?

Define the Value Proposition

Develop Unique Strengths

• What elements of the business environment can be unique strengths relative to peers/neighbors?
• What existing and emerging clusters represent local strengths?

Achieve and Maintain Parity with Peers

• What weaknesses must be addressed to remove key constraints and achieve parity with peer locations?

• Economic strategy requires setting priorities and moving beyond long lists of separate recommendations.
How Should States Compete for Investment?

Tactical (Zero Sum Competition)

- Focus on attracting **new** investments
- Compete for **every** plant
- Offer **generalized** tax breaks
- Provide **subsidies** to lower / offset business costs
- Every city and sub-region **for itself**
- **Government** drives investment attraction

Strategic (Positive Sum Competition)

- Also support greater local investment by **existing** companies
- Reinforce areas of **specialization** and emerging cluster strength
- Provide state support for training, infrastructure, and institutions with **enduring benefits**
- Improve the **efficiency of doing business**
- Harness efficiencies and coordination **across jurisdictions**, especially with neighbors
- **Government and the private sector collaborate** to build cluster strength
Harnessing the New Process of Economic Development

Competitiveness is the result of both top-down and bottom-up processes in which many companies and institutions take responsibility.

**Old Model**

- **Government** drives economic development through policy decisions and incentives

**New Model**

- Economic development is a collaborative process involving government at multiple levels, companies, teaching and research institutions, and private sector organizations
Example: Organizing for Economic Development

- Chaired by a business leader and reporting to the governor
- Convenes working groups, provides direction and strength, holds working groups accountable

Cluster Committees

- Automotive
- Hydrogen / Fuel Cells
- Textiles
- Apparel
- Agriculture
- Travel and Tourism

Task Forces

- Cluster Activation
- Research / Investment
- Distressed / Disadvan. Areas
- Education / Workforce
- Start-ups / Local Firms
- Measuring Progress

Effective economic policy also requires coordination within government
Summary

• The goal of economic strategy is to enhance **productivity**. This is the only way to create jobs, high income, and wealth in the long run

• Improving **productivity** and **innovation** must be the guiding principles for every state policy choice

• Improving productivity does not require new public resources, but **using existing resources better**

• Improving productivity demands that governors **mobilize the private sector**, not rely on government alone

• Economic strategy is non-partisan and about getting **results**
Next Steps

1. Reach out to your team

2. Reach out to the business community


The prosperity of the U.S. economy will depend more on the success of states in improving competitiveness than what happens in Washington.