

FINAL REPORT

Southern Ohio Agricultural and Community Development
Foundation

**Economic Development Grants Program
Impact Evaluation**

Through
Mailed Questionnaires

Thomas M. Archer

August 11, 2008

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

Executive Summary3

Purpose.....5

Procedure5

Data Analysis5

Limitation.....5

Findings:

- Data Gleaned From SOACDF Office Records6
- Response Rate7
- Confirmation of Data on File Relating to SOACDF Grant and Economic Development Projects.....7
- Progress Since Economic Development Grants were Awarded.....7
- Future Plans for SOACDF Funded Economic Development Grants13

Conclusions.....14

Appendix A

- Questionnaire.....16

Appendix B

- SOACDF Grant Recipients 2003 -200719

Executive Summary
Southern Ohio Agricultural and Community Development Foundation
Economic Development Grants Program Impact Evaluation through Mailed
Questionnaires

Purpose: To review the process of funding Economic Development Grants by the Southern Ohio Agricultural and Community Development Foundation (SOACDF) and to identify changes made, outcomes achieved, and future aspirations of the grant recipients.

Procedure: A mailed questionnaire was sent to the 134 recipients who received Economic Development Grants from 2003 through 2007. The questionnaire was reproduced in a front-back, legal size paper format and included questions relating to: Confirmation of data on file relating to SOACDF grant and economic development project; Progress since the grant was awarded; and Future Plans of the people and project funded by SOACDF Economic Development Grants.

Data Analysis: Quantitative data were entered into Excel and imported into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), where data were cleaned, variables named, and value levels labeled. Frequency tables were then generated. The qualitative data were keyed into a separate Excel document, and each response individually analyzed and sorted into categories developed as responses were reviewed. Counts were made for each of the categories, and representative descriptive statements were included in this report.

Major Findings:

- [1] For the 134 Economic Development Grants awarded by the SOACDF from 2003-2007, the Average Number of Jobs Created per project = 10.9; Average Number of Jobs Retained per project = 21.8; Average Amount of Grant dollars Awarded per project = \$101,529; For each Economic Dollar Awarded, Amount Leveraged = \$7.22; Average Grant Dollars it took to generate one new job = \$9,274; Average Grant Dollars it takes to retain one job = \$4,659
- [2] The response rate was 71.7% when returned questionnaires were compared to all questionnaires delivered to grant recipients still in business (86 of 120)
- [3] Two thirds of the respondents stated that projects WOULD NOT have been completed without SOACDF funding
- [4] The grant recipients identified as “out-of-business” through this survey process comprised a relatively small portion of the economic grants: 3.1% of total Jobs Created; 1.1% of total Jobs Retained; and 4.7% of SOACDF Funding over the years 2003-2007
- [5] An additional 1062 jobs have been created by the Economic Development grants program as reported by 56 of the grant recipients since the time of the initial funding, 2003-2007
- [6] The hourly pay of full-time employees for the new jobs created as reported by 75 grant recipient respondents is \$13.04.
- [7] The sum of the 63 respondents for ANNUAL new dollars created by SOACDF Economic Development grants was \$50,455,900
- [8] Almost 63% of the respondents stated that new products or processes have been developed as a result of SOACDF economic development funded projects; Thirty-three (33) examples were listed
- [9] Classification of FTE jobs that the SOACDF grant created AND currently exist: Manufacturing (57.7%); Administrative & Support Services (10.6%); Health (7.7%); Agriculture (7.2%); Construction (5.0%); Prof., Scientific, & Tech. Services (4.5%); and Wholesale & Retail (4.2%)
- [10] The impacts, other than economic, that SOACDF projects created included: (a) Improved appeal of community/ Community pride (35.5%); Address demand for products better and

- easier/ More customer friendly (29.0%); Better health care accessibility (14.5%); Created new products (9.7%); Improved safety (4.8%).
- [11] Best Features of the SOACDF Economic Development Grant Program reported included: Financial/ Allowed expansion/ Allowed purchase of new equipment (26.5%); Financial/ Incentive to lure new businesses (12.0%); Created local jobs (12.0%); Helped achieve goals quicker (10.8%); Saved an existing business (9.6%); Monitoring process good (6.0%); Improved medical services (4.8%); Reduced financial stress (3.6%); Showed community cared (3.6%); Allowed capture of more market (3.6%); and Helped acquire additional funding (2.4%)
- [12] Five Year Outlook of Respondents: Anticipate Growth & Expansion (41.0%); See Things Staying the Same (13.4%); See a Decline (2.2%); and 43.3% did not respond to this question
- [13] The top five suggestions for changes in the SOACDF Economic Development Grant Program: included: No changes necessary; No suggestions (36.2%); More money/ Different percentage split of monies (20.7%); Change application procedure/ Modify some criteria (17.2%); Less restrictions on use of funds (12.1%); and More flexibility to address unique situations of individual projects (8.6%)
- [14] The top four responses when the question was asked, “*What other needs do you have that might be addressed by the SOACDF?*” included: Grant recipient specific needs, e.g. equipment/ marketing/ facilities/ staff training (37.9%); No further needs at present (32.8%); Additional funding (20.7%); Other (Depends on situation; Wanted to speak to SOACDF Representative; Negative comment about selection process) (5.2%)
- [15] Forty (40) of the 86 completed questionnaires contained an email address for contact information of the person who provided the responses.

Conclusions:

- [1] Data maintained by the SOACDF office is extremely accurate and the Economic Development Grants program is well managed.
- [2] Grant dollars are effective in leveraging other dollars.
- [3] Grant dollars create new jobs and retain existing jobs.
- [4] Two-thirds of the projects funded would not have been completed without the SOACDF Economic Development Grants.
- [5] Those grant recipients that have been identified as “out-of-business” are a small percentage of jobs created and grant dollars awarded.
- [6] Jobs continue to be created from past grants.
- [7] Many unanticipated products and processes have resulted from Economic Development Grant projects.
- [8] The majority of jobs created through Economic Development Grants program is in manufacturing.
- [9] Increase in “Community Appeal” is the greatest non-economic benefit of the Economic Development Grants program
- [10] Other than financial benefits and creating new jobs, the best feature of the Economic Development Grants program is that projects are completed must faster than without grants.
- [11] Five year economic outlook of grant recipients is relatively positive.

Southern Ohio Agricultural and Community Development Foundation Economic Development Grants Program Impact Evaluation through Mailed Questionnaires

Purpose:

To review the process of funding Economic Development Grants by the Southern Ohio Agricultural and Community Development Foundation (SOACDF) and to identify changes made, outcomes achieved, and future aspirations of the grant recipients.

Procedure:

A mailed questionnaire was sent to the 134 recipients who received Economic Development Grants from 2003 through 2007. After the original mailing of invitation cover letter, questionnaire, and envelope with return postage, on May 30, a reminder mailing was made to non respondents on June 18. Another reminder, this time a postcard, was mailed on July 18. Data entry was made for all questionnaires received through August 5.

The questionnaire was reproduced in a front-back, legal size paper format and included questions relating to: Confirmation of data on file relating to SOACDF grant and economic development project; Progress since the grant was awarded; and Future Plans of the people and project funded by SOACDF economic Development grants.

Data Analysis:

The questionnaires were returned to the Program Development and Evaluation Office, Ohio State University Extension, and quantitative data entered from June 11 through August 5 into an Excel spreadsheet created by Dr. Archer. On August 6 the spreadsheet was imported into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), where data were cleaned, variables named, and value levels labeled. It should be noted that in the Findings section below, the quantitative totals do not include missing data. That is, not all respondents responded to every question.

The qualitative data (Q2, Q6, and Q8 through Q12) were keyed into a separate Excel document, and each response individually analyzed and sorted into categories developed as responses were reviewed. Counts were made for each of the categories, and representative descriptive statements were included in this report.

Limitation:

[1] The original plan for this survey was to do a more extensive follow-up of non-respondents to the mail questionnaire through phone interviews. However, due to a water main break in the offices of the Investigator, and subsequent move of these offices, the phone follow-up was not made. More confidence could have been placed in the data an extrapolation of the data had a higher response rate been obtained.

Findings:

DATA GLEANED FROM SOACDF OFFICE RECORDS

Summary of Economic Development Grants by Year:

Number of Grants Awarded, Number of Jobs Created, Number of Jobs Retained, Total Amount of Economic Grants, Total Amount of Project Costs, Total Amount Leveraged

Table 1: Summary of Economic Development Grants by Year – 2003 through 2007						
<i>Year</i>	<i>Number of Grants Awarded</i>	<i>Number of Jobs Created</i>	<i>Number of Jobs Retained</i>	<i>Total Amount of Economic Grants</i>	<i>Total Amount of Project Costs</i>	<i>Total Amount Leveraged</i>
2003	31	518	716	\$2,790,993	\$18,374,441	\$15,583,449
2004	31	306	535	\$2,568,500	\$54,547,346	\$51,978,846
2005	28	250	1142	\$2,997,148	\$14,542,099	\$11,544,951
2006	19*	131	142	\$1,902,263	\$9,159,204	\$7,256,941
2007	26	273	407	\$3,447,450	\$16,035,029	\$12,587,579
Totals	135	1478	2942	\$13,706,354	\$112,658,119	\$98,951,766
<i>*Includes one grant that was used for an entity that was identified as out-of-business before data collection. The Amount of that Economic Grant – \$30,000</i>						

By the Numbers: A Closer Look at the Data 2003-2007:

Average Number of Grants per year:	25
Average Number of Jobs Created per year:	246
Average Number of Jobs Retained per year:	588
Average Amount of Grants Awarded per year:	\$2,741,271
Average Amount of Project Costs per year:	\$22,531,624
Average Amount of Dollars Leveraged per year:	\$19,790,353
Average Number of Jobs Created per project:	10.9
Average Number of Jobs Retained per project:	21.8
Average Amount of Grant dollars Awarded per project:	\$101,529
Average Amount of Total Project Costs per project:	\$834,505
Average Amount of Dollars Leveraged per project:	\$732,976
For each Economic Dollar Awarded, Amount Leveraged:	\$7.22
Average Grant Dollars it takes to generate one new job:	\$9,274
Average Grant Dollars it takes to retain one job:	\$4,659

Response Rate:

By August 5, 2008, 86 of 134 questionnaires were completed. In addition, it was determined that eight of the businesses were now out-of-business. There were six questionnaires returned by the post office as “undeliverable” after two mailings. Therefore, the response rate was 71.7% (86 of 120) when returned questionnaires were compared to all questionnaires actually delivered to grant recipients still in business and 64.2% for returned questionnaires when compared to total number of all grant recipients.

Table 2. Response Rate	
<i>Category</i>	<i>N or %</i>
Completed Questionnaires	86
Determined to be Out-of-Business	8
Undeliverable by Post Office	6
No Response	34
TOTAL	134
Response Rate of Questionnaires Delivered to Grant Recipients Still in Business	71.7%
Response Rate of Questionnaires Completed of Total Number of Grant Recipients	64.2%

Confirmation of Data on File Relating to SOACDF Grant and Economic Development Projects:

Questionnaires were individualized before mailing with a description of the grant which was awarded to each grant recipient. This description included: Name of Project; Year of Grant; County in Which Project was Located; Amount of SOACDF Funding; Number of Jobs Created; and Number of Jobs Retained. This information was obtained from reports/records maintained by the SOACDF office. Respondents were asked to verify the correctness of this information as of the time the SOACDF funds were actually received. If the information was not correct, respondents were asked to update. This portion of the questionnaire contained six pieces of data for each respondent.

Of the 86 completed questionnaires, the data on file by the SOACDF office was 94.9% correct. The data for the Year, County, and Amount of Grants were 99.2% accurate and the data concerning the Number of Jobs Created and Jobs Retained was 85.8% correct, as recalled by the respondents.

Progress since Economic Development Grants were Awarded:

Likelihood that Projects Would Have Been Completed Without SOACDF Grants:

Table 3. Likelihood that Projects Would Have Been Completed Without SOACDF Grants:

<i>Question</i>	<i>NO</i>	<i>YES</i>
Would this project have been completed without the SOACDF grant?	57	27
Percentage	67.9%	32.1%

The respondents were asked to “Explain” their responses. Those narrative responses were analyzed by creating categories of response. Not every respondent provided an explanation. The results are listed below

Explanations by those who said that projects WOULD NOT have been completed without SOACDF:

Table 4. Explanation by those who said that projects WOULD NOT have been completed without SOACDF

<i>Explanation</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Would not have had enough funding	16	38.1%
Provided incentive to initiate project	9	21.4%
Allowed to expand; Enabled to purchase equipment not available otherwise	9	21.4%
Local Match; Helped leverage additional funding	7	16.7%
Allowed faster completion	1	2.4%
TOTALS	42	100.0%

Explanations by those who said that projects WOULD have been completed without SOACDF:

Table 5. Explanation by those who said that projects WOULD have been completed without SOACDF

<i>Explanation</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Would not have happen as quickly; Would have been a smaller scale	11	52.4%
Was not a major part of the funding for the project	3	14.3%
Had to do it anyway	2	9.5%
Would have had to borrow much more	2	9.5%
Would have continued to use old facilities/ equipment	2	9.5%
Would have been located in another part of country	1	4.8%
TOTALS		100.0%

Out-of-Business:

Through the data collection process, there were businesses that were not able to be contacted and determined to be “out-of-business”. In addition, one grant recipient was identified as “out-of-business” before the mailed survey. Table 6 identifies descriptors of those businesses no longer existing, and compares dimensions of jobs created and retained, as well as funding dimensions with the totals of the 2003-2007 grant recipients, to estimate “Loss”.

Table 6. Comparison of Out-Of-Business Grant Recipients to All Grant Recipients					
	<i>Jobs Created</i>	<i>Jobs Retained</i>	<i>SOACDF Funding</i>	<i>Total Project Cost</i>	<i>Amount Leveraged</i>
Total of 8 Grant Recipients Out-Of-Business	46	31	\$641,410	\$3,044,927	\$2,403,517
Total of All	1478	2942	\$13,706,354	\$112,658,119	\$98,951,766
Percentage of Loss	3.1%	1.1%	4.7%	2.7%	2.4%

Number of Grants by Year of Grant for Out-Of-Business: 2003 (1) 2004 (3) 2005 (2) 2006 (1) 2007 (1);
Note: One \$30,000 grant in 2003 that was identified as “out-of-business” prior to the survey is not included in these totals because Jobs Created, Jobs Retained, and Total Project Cost data not available.

Changes in the Number of Jobs:

Grant recipients were asked to report if jobs created by the Economic Development Grants had increased or decreased since the time of the initial funding. Table 7 describes the changes in the number of jobs as of 2007.

Table 7. Changes in the Number of Jobs:	
<i>Category</i>	<i>N</i>
Number of Business which created New Jobs	52
Number of New Jobs Created	1223
Number of Businesses which Lost Jobs	4
Number of Jobs Lost	161
Net	+1062

Hourly Pay of Full-Time Employees for the New Jobs Created:

Potential respondents were asked that for all the jobs created since the beginning of this project, “*What is the approximate average hourly pay of full-time employees for the new jobs created by this project?*”

Table 8. Hourly Pay of Full-Time Employees for the New Jobs Created:	
Number of Respondents Reporting	75
Range of Hourly Pay Reported	\$7.00 to \$25.00
Median of Hourly Pay	\$12.50
Mean of Hourly Pay	\$13.04

Estimate of Annual New Dollars Created in the Local Economy:

From the beginning, this was anticipated to be a difficult question for respondents to answer. Of the 86 total respondents, 63 (73.2%) provided figures. However, estimates from these respondents provided better insight on the economic impact of the SOACDF Economic Development Grants than could have been otherwise identified. The approaches that were taken to provide estimates were interesting. Some used local payroll totals, while other used local income tax revenue, and some calculated the annual retail sales of a new product produced.

The sum of the 63 respondents for annual new dollars created was \$50,455,900. If this figure was extrapolated to include all respondents, plus the 34 non-respondents to which the questionnaire was delivered, the total would be \$96,106,476, or \$800,887 per grant per year.

New Products or Processes that have been Developed as a Result of SOACDF Economic Development Funded Projects:

Table 9. New Products or Processes that have been Developed as a Result of SOACDF Economic Development Funded Projects:			
	<i>YES</i>	<i>NO</i>	<i>No Response</i>
Have any new products or processes been developed as a result of this project?	54	26	6
Percentage	62.8%	30.2%	7.0%

The respondents were asked to “Explain” their responses. Some respondents listed more than one “new product”, while others did not list any. The abridged results are listed below:

Examples of new products or processes that have been developed as a result of SOACDF Economic Development Funded Projects

1. *New feed and farm supply spin-off is currently being constructed*
2. *A railroad parts mfg. facility*
3. *Able to fabricate some of our own high pressure piping*
4. *Added a new manufacturing line to make case work*
5. *Addition of SSI Case Management Service*
6. *Additional homes for the homeless*
7. *Developed a pellet manufacturing plant on the site that makes pellets for wood (pellet) burning stoves*
8. *Expanded line of plants*
9. *Opportunity to produce products with shapes and curves we couldn't do previously*
10. *Mulch from the new de-barker which is sold to a local landscaper then revised in his business within the county*
11. *Due to better efficiency, a log expert market is being developed*
12. *Lumber to individual craft and hobbyist*
13. *New buildings have been added allowing new companies to locate in the area.*
14. *New business systems - computers, technology, phones*
15. *New motor controller products, new design projects for music clients, and new robotics research which will lead to products*
16. *Now producing PGC (Potassium Gold Cyanide) which new to our plant and probably the only manufacturer of the product in Ohio*
17. *Several of our partners have developed new innovations and either applied for, or received new patents*
18. *Started a propane*
19. *Started an air filter manufacturing facility*
20. *The chassis dyno provides additional engine and parts development in house versus using other shops to perform this work*
21. *The overall project has led to sheltering, treatment, neutering, spaying and adoption of many abandoned companion pets*
22. *This involved a marketing campaign that was new*
23. *Began a custom bicycle line*
24. *Developed an uphill system to fill our own tanks*
25. *Developed a branded beef product*
26. *Expanded our operations into at least two new markets and several new products*
27. *We now operate a B&B*
28. *We now powder coat for outside mfg*
29. *Produce a galvanized version using all the same processes*
30. *Offer more services to customers*
31. *Provide coating services to industry as well as coating our own products*
32. *Production line is being expanded to include millwork, cabinets and metal working*
33. *Powder coat paint systems have also been introduced*

Classification of FTE Jobs that the SOACDF Grant Created AND Currently Exist:

Respondents were asked to indicate how many jobs (full time equivalent) that the SOACDF grant created AND currently exist in each of a possible twenty job classifications. Table 10 is the accumulation of the data provided by the 86 respondents. It shows that the vast majority of the existing jobs related to these grants are in the classification “Manufacturing”.

Table 10. Classification of FTE Jobs that the SOACDF Grant Created AND Currently Exist:		
<i>Job Classification</i>	<i>Number of Jobs</i>	<i>Percentage of Total</i>
Manufacturing	1113	57.7%
Administrative & Support Services	204	10.6%
Health	149	7.7%
Agriculture	138	7.2%
Construction	96	5.0%
Prof., Scientific, & Tech. Services	87	4.5%
Wholesale & Retail	82	4.2%
Management	36	1.9%
Information	20	1.0%
All Others	5	0.3%
TOTALS	1930	100.0%

Impacts, Other Than Economic, that SOACDF Projects Created:

A narrative response question, “Describe impacts, other than economic, that your SOACDF project created”, was asked. Sixty-two (62) of 86 respondents answered this question. Responses were analyzed, grouped into categories, and reported in Table 11.

Table 11. Impacts, Other Than Economic, That SOACDF Projects Created:		
<i>Non Economic Impact</i>	<i>Number Responding</i>	<i>Percentage of Those Responding</i>
Improved appeal of community; Community pride	22	35.5%
Address demand for products better/ easier; More customer friendly	18	29.0%
Better health care accessibility	9	14.5%
Created new products	6	9.7%
Improved safety	3	4.8%
Listed additional economic impacts	4	6.5%
TOTAL	62	100.0%

Best Features of the SOACDF Economic Development Grant Program:

Grant recipients were also asked to respond to the question, “*What is the best thing that you can say about receiving the SOACDF Economic Development Grant?*” Seventy-eight (78) of 86 respondents answered this question. Responses were analyzed, grouped into categories, and those categories are listed in Table 12. Some respondents identified best features that could be placed in more than one of the categories.

Table 12. Best Features of the SOACDF Economic Development Grant Program		
<i>Best Feature</i>	<i>Number Responding</i>	<i>Percentage of Responses</i>
Financial - Allowed expansion; Allowed purchase of new equipment	22	26.5%
Financial - Incentive to lure new businesses	10	12.0%
Created local jobs	10	12.0%
Helped achieve goals quicker	9	10.8%
Saved an existing business	8	9.6%
Monitoring process good	5	6.0%
Improved medical services	4	4.8%
Reduced financial stress	3	3.6%
Showed community cared	3	3.6%
Allowed capture of more market	3	3.6%
Helped acquire additional funding	2	2.4%
Other (Great learning process; Ability to use new technology; Increased safety for workers; Nothing good)	4	4.8%
TOTAL	83	100.0%

Future Plans for SOACDF Funded Economic Development Grants:

Five Year Outlook:

Potential respondents were asked to describe the next five year outlook for the project that was funded through the SOACDF Economic Development Grant. These descriptions were sorted into the categories in Table 13.

Table 13. Five Year Outlook of Respondents		
<i>Plans</i>	<i>Number Responding</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Anticipate Growth & Expansion	55	41.0%
See Things Staying the Same	18	13.4%
See a Decline	3	2.2%
Did Not Respond to this Question	58	43.3%
TOTALS	134	100.0%

Suggestions for Changes in the SOACDF Economic Development Grant Program:

“What should be changed about the SOACDF Economic Development Grant program?” was asked of grant recipients. Fifty-eight (58) of 86 respondents submitted suggestions. Responses were analyzed, grouped into categories Table 14 summarizes those responses by category.

Table 14. Suggestions for Changes in the SOACDF Economic Development Grant Program:		
<i>Suggestions</i>	<i>Number Responding</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
No changes necessary; No suggestions	21	36.2%
More money; Different percentage split of monies	12	20.7%
Change application procedure; Modify some criteria	10	17.2%
Less restrictions on use of funds	7	12.1%
More flexibility to address unique situations of individual projects	5	8.6%
More publicity of funding available	2	3.4%
Community assessments	1	1.7%
TOTALS	58	100.0%

Other Needs of Respondents that might be addressed by SOACDF:

Below are the responses to the question, “What other needs do you have that might be addressed by the SOACDF?”

Table 15. Other Needs of Respondents that might be addressed by SOACDF:		
<i>Categories of Needs Stated</i>	<i>Number Responding</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Grant recipient specific needs, e.g. equipment; marketing, facilities, staff training	22	37.9%
No further needs at present	19	32.8%
Additional funding	12	20.7%
Other (<i>Depends on situation; Wanted to speak to SOACDF Representative; Negative comment about selection process</i>)	3	5.2%
Changes in grant procedures (<i>Business administrative costs should be more considered in a start up new business; Consider funding new equipment or technology that is not specifically tied to on-site jobs.</i>)	2	3.4%
TOTALS	58	100.0%

Number of Respondents Reporting an Email Address:

Forty (40) of the 86 completed questionnaires contained an email address for contact information of the person who provided the responses.

Conclusions:

- [1] Data maintained by the SOACDF office is extremely accurate and the Economic Development Grants program is well managed.
- [2] Grant dollars are effective in leveraging other dollars.
- [3] Grant dollars create new jobs and retain existing jobs.
- [4] Two-thirds of the projects funded would not have been completed without the SOACDF Economic Development Grants.
- [5] Those grant recipients that have been identified as “out-of-business” are a small percentage of jobs created and grant dollars awarded.
- [6] Jobs continue to be created from past grants.
- [7] Many unanticipated products and processes have resulted from Economic Development Grant projects.
- [8] Majority of jobs created through Economic Development Grants program is in manufacturing.
- [9] Increase in “Community Appeal” is the greatest non-economic benefit of the Economic Development Grants program
- [10] Other than financial benefits and creating new jobs, the best feature of the Economic Development Grants program is that projects are completed must faster than without grants.
- [11] Five year economic outlook of grant recipients is relatively positive.

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire Content:



**Economic Development Grants
Questionnaire**
**Southern Ohio Agricultural Community Development
Foundation (SOACDF)**

Section I – Background:

[1] The primary purpose of the *SOACDF Economic Development Grants Program* is to maintain strategic investments in communities affected by the reduction in the demand for tobacco. The following is a description of the grant with which you are associated. This information was obtained from reports/ records maintained by the SOACDF office:

Please verify the correctness of the information below as of the time the SOACDF funds were actually received by circling Y = YES or N = NO in the space provided before each item. If the information is not correct, please update in the appropriate cell under the last heading, “Corrected Information”:

Project Name:

<i>Information Correct?</i>	<i>Information on File</i>	<i>Corrected Information</i>
Y N	Year of Grant:	
Y N	County in Which Project is Located:	
Y N	Amount of SOACDF Funding:	
Y N	Number of Jobs Created:	
Y N	Number of Jobs Retained:	

IF ANY OF THE INFORMATION ABOVE IS INCORRECT, please note changes in the table above, and if necessary, provide an explanation here:

Section II – Progress to Date:

[2] Would this project have been completed *without* the SOACDF grant? *(Circle and explain.)*

YES NO

Explain:

[3] ***Up to the present***, how have the number of jobs created ***changed*** since the initial funding indicated in Section I – Question #1 above? (*Please check and fill in blank where appropriate.*)

- No changes in Jobs Created
- Number of Jobs created increased by _____ jobs
- Number of Jobs created decreased by _____ jobs

[4] For all the jobs created since the beginning of this project:

What is the approximate average hourly pay of full-time employees for the new jobs created by this project? (*Consider a full-time salaried employee at 40 hours/ week to estimate an hourly rate.*) \$ _____ per hour

[5] As a result of this implemented project, estimate how many new dollars per year are created in the local (county) economy? (*Estimate to the nearest \$1000*) \$ _____ per year

[6] Have any new products or processes been developed as a result of this project? (*Circle and explain.*)

YES NO

Explain:

[7] Below are job listings as identified by the North American Industry Classification System. We will use this system to help determine the impact of the SOACDF Economic Development Grants. Please indicate how many jobs (full time equivalent) that the SOACDF grant created AND currently exist in each of these classifications. (*Place the number of jobs created in the blank if front of each classification where appropriate.*)

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture, Forestry | <input type="checkbox"/> Real Estate and Rental and Leasing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mining, Quarrying, and Oil | <input type="checkbox"/> Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities | <input type="checkbox"/> Management of Companies and Enterprises |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Construction | <input type="checkbox"/> Administrative and Support Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Manufacturing | <input type="checkbox"/> Educational |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wholesale Trade | <input type="checkbox"/> Health Care and Social Assistance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Retail Trade | <input type="checkbox"/> Arts, Entertainment, and Recreation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation | <input type="checkbox"/> Accommodation and Food Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Information | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Administration |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Finance and Insurance | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other: Please Describe: (<i>Before selecting "Other", try to fit into one of the above classifications first.</i>) | |

[8] Describe impacts, other than economic, that your SOACDF project created:

[9] What is the best thing that you can say about receiving the SOACDF Economic Development Grant?

Section III – The Future:

[10] Describe the next five year outlook for the project that you had funded through the SOACDF Economic Development Grant:

[11] What should be changed about the SOACDF Economic Development Grant program?

[12] What other needs do you have that might be addressed by the SOACDF?

If you have an email address at which we can contact you for further explanation on any of the responses that you have provided, please provide: _____



THANK YOU!!
Please Return to: Tom Archer
Ohio State University Extension
Room 25 Ag. Admin. Building
2120 Fyffe Road
Columbus, OH 43210

APPENDIX B

SOACDF GRANT RECIPIENTS 2003 -2007:

	Project	Jobs Created	Jobs Retained	SOACDF Funding	Total Project Cost	Amount Leveraged	Year
1	Adams Co. CIC (Copeland Bldg.)	100	0	\$200,000	\$1,200,000	\$1,000,000	2003
2	Angel Forest Products	7	11	\$131,093	\$262,185	\$131,093	2003
3	Buckeye Road	135	260	\$67,500	\$619,000	\$551,500	2003
4	Burnt Cabin Nursery	4	0	\$35,000	\$211,950	\$176,950	2003
5	Cargill Acquisition	0	10	\$100,000	\$950,000	\$850,000	2003
6	Cedar Works	0	160	\$70,000	\$147,000	\$77,000	2003
7	Copeland Lift Station	100	0	\$35,000	\$350,000	\$315,000	2003
8	Dunkin - Blanton	5	0	\$50,000	\$350,000	\$300,000	2003
9	Elliott Greenhouse	4	0	\$50,000	\$125,000	\$75,000	2003
10	Feed Stop Expansion	2	0	\$29,000	\$79,000	\$50,000	2003
11	Agri-Tourism in Gallia Country	0	0	\$19,000	\$96,670	\$77,670	2003
12	Greenhouse Tomatoes	2	0	\$12,750	\$25,500	\$12,750	2003
13	Hawklime LLC	30	0	\$300,000	\$2,006,155	\$1,706,155	2003
14	Highland Co. YMCA	4	0	\$60,000	\$3,470,000	\$3,410,000	2003
15	HNL Industrial Site	0	0	\$150,000	\$300,000	\$150,000	2003
16	LEDC - Spec. Bldg.	0	0	\$30,000	\$1,390,000	\$1,360,000	2003
17	Malta Wood Windows	27	0	\$220,000	\$1,797,500	\$1,577,500	2003
18	McClay 104 Greenhouse	2	0	\$7,450	\$14,900	\$7,450	2003
19	Band Resaw Mill	3	7	\$80,000	\$312,068	\$232,068	2003
20	McDermott Industries	50	0	\$150,000	\$600,000	\$450,000	2003
21	Measley Ridge Road	0	200	\$30,000	\$633,000	\$603,000	2003
22	Gardening and Employment Opportunities	3	0	\$25,000	\$50,000	\$25,000	2003
23	New Prod. Tech. Academy	0	0	\$255,700	\$725,000	\$469,300	2003
24	North High Business Center	0	0	\$69,175	\$523,000	\$453,825	2003
25	Parker House	0	0	\$46,000	\$230,000	\$184,000	2003
26	S&J Ellis Farm	4	7	\$35,000	\$142,188	\$107,188	2003
27	Sizzle Sticks	2	3	\$35,000	\$112,000	\$77,000	2003
28	Southern Hills Cabinetry	19	15	\$260,000	\$1,130,000	\$870,000	2003
29	Turning Point Learning Ctr.	9	0	\$58,325	\$117,325	\$59,000	2003
30	Business Growth & Associated Requirements	3	35	\$100,000	\$205,000	\$105,000	2003
31	West Union Gas	3	8	\$80,000	\$200,000	\$120,000	2003
32	Adams Co. CIC (Industrial Park)	0	0	\$210,000	\$1,410,000	\$1,200,000	2004

33	Cahall Brothers	6	0	\$190,000	\$600,000	\$410,000	2004
34	Cedar Valley Medical Associates	3	0	\$40,000	\$180,000	\$140,000	2004
35	Chapparral Rd. Sand & Gravel	2	2	\$40,500	\$110,000	\$69,500	2004
36	Crown Excavating	3	10	\$50,000	\$155,518	\$105,518	2004
37	Crum Farm Supply	4	4	\$65,000	\$165,000	\$100,000	2004
38	General Mills - Wellston	3	0	\$50,000	\$3,400,000	\$3,350,000	2004
39	Equipment Upgrades/Growth Plan	3	28	\$100,000	\$201,416	\$101,416	2004
40	Hall Forest Products - Mill Expansion	3	0	\$20,000	\$52,000	\$32,000	2004
41	Hawkline LLC, Expansion	20	30	\$335,000	\$670,000	\$335,000	2004
42	Jaybird Road	0	250	\$30,000	\$290,000	\$260,000	2004
43	JR Kennel	4	6	\$125,000	\$250,000	\$125,000	2004
44	HSBO	10	114	\$200,000	\$5,658,000	\$5,458,000	2004
45	Lambert Meat Products	10	8	\$40,000	\$138,500	\$98,500	2004
46	Asset Tracking System and Pharmacy	2	0	\$20,000	\$83,305	\$63,305	2004
47	LEDC - Point Industrial Park	1	0	\$70,000	\$2,555,000	\$2,485,000	2004
48	Leonard Excavating	2	0	\$40,000	\$96,000	\$56,000	2004
49	Lewis Mt. Herbs	2	3	\$20,000	\$50,034	\$30,034	2004
50	Luigino's	150	0	\$100,000	\$30,800,000	\$30,700,000	2004
51	Madison Market	5	0	\$50,000	\$121,800	\$71,800	2004
52	Marshall Quarry	3	1	\$40,000	\$123,072	\$83,072	2004
53	Mended Reeds Residential Home Renovations	22	0	\$1,000	\$200,000	\$199,000	2004
54	OBS Collision & Repair	6	5	\$90,000	\$750,000	\$660,000	2004
55	OSU Endeavor Center	6	0	\$70,000	\$4,510,000	\$4,440,000	2004
56	R&C Packing	6	5	\$125,000	\$250,000	\$125,000	2004
57	Dual Line Sawmill (S&J Lumber)	18	47	\$225,000	\$1,233,506	\$1,008,506	2004
58	S. Ohio Wood Grinding	6	3	\$75,000	\$150,000	\$75,000	2004
59	Shipley Construction	1	5	\$40,000	\$125,000	\$85,000	2004
60	South Central Construction	1	4	\$40,000	\$80,000	\$40,000	2004
61	T&J Granite	3	0	\$40,000	\$85,195	\$45,195	2004
62	Dry Fertilizer Expansion	1	10	\$27,000	\$54,000	\$27,000	2004
63	Health & Care Renovation & Expansion	5	0	\$75,000	\$826,802	\$751,802	2005
64	Equipment Acquisition	15	15	\$70,756	\$221,980	\$151,224	2005
65	Brown County Industrial Park	35	0	\$400,000	\$2,376,049	\$1,976,049	2005
66	Carrington Farm Supply - Equip. Expan.	4	0	\$36,225	\$103,500	\$67,275	2005

67	Feed Store	3	0	\$25,000	\$75,000	\$50,000	2005
68	Warehouse Construction & Renovation	2	0	\$30,000	\$85,945	\$55,945	2005
69	Columbus Industries, Inc.	30	0	\$400,000	\$1,215,000	\$815,000	2005
70	Garden Barn Renovation	2	0	\$30,000	\$89,247	\$59,247	2005
71	Hillside Re-Cut Lumber	3	2	\$51,410	\$160,620	\$109,210	2005
72	Facility Expansion	20	385	\$200,000	\$3,333,214	\$3,133,214	2005
73	J&D Prof. Lawn Seeding & Landscaping	6	6	\$60,000	\$170,312	\$110,312	2005
74	Kelvest, Inc. - Seal- Tite Expansion	9	130	\$125,000	\$700,000	\$575,000	2005
75	M&J Industries, LLC	40	337	\$150,000	\$507,000	\$357,000	2005
76	Stainless Steel Kennel Gate	3	0	\$20,000	\$97,732	\$77,732	2005
77	Metal Crafters Acquisition Project	1	3	\$3,675	\$10,500	\$6,825	2005
78	Nursery Opening Improvement	3	0	\$13,492	\$38,550	\$25,058	2005
79	Mountain Pipe Construction, LLC	2	1	\$18,865	\$53,900	\$35,035	2005
80	Peebles Test Operation Capital Improvements	10	216	\$150,000	\$977,146	\$827,146	2005
81	Port Authority Industrial Park	0	0	\$112,000	\$320,000	\$208,000	2005
82	Race Assembly	15	28	\$490,000	\$1,449,850	\$959,850	2005
83	Fabrication Facility	8	0	\$115,000	\$328,600	\$213,600	2005
84	Equipment Acquisition	5	0	\$70,000	\$279,040	\$209,040	2005
85	80CS Kobelco Trackhoe	2	0	\$30,000	\$97,178	\$67,178	2005
86	Warehouse and Showroom Construction	2	0	\$30,000	\$87,387	\$57,387	2005
87	Seaman Farm, Garden & Pet	4	0	\$45,000	\$207,470	\$162,470	2005
88	Winchester Clinic	7	0	\$39,725	\$113,500	\$73,775	2005
89	Handcrafted Originals Upgrade	2	8	\$14,000	\$39,967	\$25,967	2005
90	X-Mil Relocation and Expansion	12	11	\$192,000	\$576,610	\$384,610	2005
91	American Micro Products	4	0	\$60,000	\$310,919	\$250,919	2006
92	Chesterhill Produce Auction LLC	2	0	\$15,000	\$115,844	\$100,844	2006
93	Columbus Industries - Paint Filter Mfg.	30	0	\$384,219	\$1,097,770	\$713,551	2006
94	Reorganization	0	9	\$84,875	\$242,500	\$157,625	2006
95	D&R Engineering Machining Equipment	3	10	\$45,000	\$130,000	\$85,000	2006
96	Medical Bldg. & Exam Rm. Upgrades	2	0	\$30,000	\$113,109	\$83,109	2006
97	Building Acquisition & Improvement	12	17	\$122,500	\$2,241,081	\$2,118,581	2006

98	Fabrication Services	1	6	\$26,405	\$75,443	\$49,038	2006
99	Pallet Mill-Pine Gap	10	34	\$126,438	\$361,254	\$234,816	2006
100	LEDC - Spec. Bldg. #2	0	0	\$91,000	\$260,000	\$169,000	2006
101	Lewis Conservation	2	0	\$13,500	\$37,500	\$24,000	2006
102	New Concrete Plant	26	0	\$390,000	\$1,485,000	\$1,095,000	2006
103	TriAmerica Wheelersburg Expansion	7	25	\$100,000	\$1,500,000	\$1,400,000	2006
104	Odom Industries Capital Improvements	9	22	\$120,000	\$344,000	\$224,000	2006
105	Powder Coat Expansion	7	12	\$70,000	\$200,000	\$130,000	2006
106	Warehouse Building & Equipment	2	2	\$30,000	\$90,994	\$60,994	2006
107	Improvements - Sierra's Haven	2	0	\$24,220	\$69,200	\$44,980	2006
108	New Growth	10	0	\$150,000	\$430,000	\$280,000	2006
109	Material Recovery Facility Expansion Equipment	4	14	\$60,000	\$606,365	\$546,365	2007
110	Adams County Manor Expansion	32	35	\$350,000	\$1,600,000	\$1,250,000	2007
111	Regional Med. Ctr. Access Road & Utilities	0	0	\$203,450	\$581,300	\$377,850	2007
112	Shop Building Expansion	2	3	\$23,000	\$67,150	\$44,150	2007
113	Blodgett Dermatology Clinic, Inc.	7	0	\$105,000	\$1,033,600	\$928,600	2007
114	Brad's Garden Ctr. r	6	7	\$60,000	\$226,878	\$166,878	2007
115	Brown County Swine Equipment	14	0	\$210,000	\$1,385,412	\$1,175,412	2007
116	Expansion Project	25	31	\$100,000	\$1,480,000	\$1,380,000	2007
117	Engines Inc of Ohio	15	50	\$118,000	\$729,370	\$611,370	2007
118	Crane Bay Addition	4	4	\$48,446	\$194,340	\$145,894	2007
119	Farm Equipment Expansion	72	51	\$522,462	\$1,492,750	\$970,288	2007
120	Industrial Park Gas Line	0	0	\$258,151	\$737,576	\$479,425	2007
121	Iron Valley Landfill	1	3	\$21,350	\$61,000	\$39,650	2007
122	Kyger Dental Associates, Inc.	1	6	\$60,000	\$100,000	\$40,000	2007
123	Mercy Way Access Road	25	0	\$210,735	\$602,100	\$391,365	2007
124	Mt. Orab Patient Care Equipment	11	9	\$150,000	\$465,680	\$315,680	2007
125	Heifer Development	0	0	\$91,800	\$91,800	\$0	2007
126	PGC Project	4	57	\$60,000	\$895,363	\$835,363	2007
127	Telemonitoring Project	3	0	\$45,000	\$129,600	\$84,600	2007
128	Orbit Expansion Project	8	11	\$100,000	\$400,998	\$300,998	2007
129	Manufacturing	16	0	\$240,000	\$697,000	\$457,000	2007
130	"The Point" Spec Building #3	0	0	\$68,000	\$1,412,857	\$1,344,857	2007
131	Excess Production	8	5	\$145,502	\$418,315	\$272,813	2007

	Capacity						
132	Additional Machinery	5	110	\$70,812	\$250,575	\$179,763	2007
133	Wright Tuning Expansion	7	5	\$80,742	\$245,000	\$164,258	2007
134	Robotics Components	3	6	\$45,000	\$130,000	\$85,000	2007
135	Manufacturing Lab B&W Auto Center, LLC	Not Available	Not Available	\$30,000	Not Available	Not Available	2003