

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
OFFICE OF CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION
SPONSORED PROJECT INITIATION

Date: September 14, 1976

no 08
action
OAT

Project Title: Stimulate Community Improvement Through Enterprise Development
Technical Assistance

Project No: A-1868

Project Director: W. G. Dodson

Sponsor: The Appalachian Regional Commission

Agreement Period: From June 1, 1976 Until November 30, 1977

Type Agreement: Grant No. GA-4794-76-I-302-0315

Amount: \$24,900

Reports Required: Progress Reports, Quarterly
Final Report - Draft due October 30, 1977

Sponsor Contact Person (s):

Technical Matters

Contractual Matters

Mr. Michael Potterf, Director (thru OCA)
Enterprise Development Division
1666 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20235
(202) 673-7845

Defense Priority Rating: T D L

Assigned to: Economic Development Laboratory (School/Laboratory)

COPIES TO:

Project Director
Division Chief (EES)
School/Laboratory Director
Dean/Director-EES
Accounting Office
Procurement Office
Security Coordinator (OCA) ✓
Reports Coordinator (OCA)

Library, Technical Reports Section
Office of Computing Services
Director, Physical Plant
EES Information Office
Project File (OCA)
Project Code (GTRI)
Other _____

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
OFFICE OF CONTRACT ADMINISTRATION
SPONSORED PROJECT TERMINATION

Date: March 13, 1978

Project Title: Stimulate Community Improvement Through Enterprise Development Technical Assistance

Project No: A-1868

Project Director: W. G. Dodson

Sponsor: The Appalachian Regional Commission

Effective Termination Date: 12/31/77

Clearance of Accounting Charges: All Clear.

Grant/Contract Closeout Actions Remaining:
NONE.

- ☐ Final Invoice and Closing Documents
- ☐ Final Fiscal Report
- ☐ Final Report of Inventions
- ☐ Govt. Property Inventory & Related Certificate
- ☐ Classified Material Certificate
- ☐ Other _____

Assigned to: Technology & Development Laboratory (School/Laboratory)

COPIES TO:

Project Director
Division Chief (EES)
School/Laboratory Director
Dean/Director-EES
Accounting Office
Procurement Office
Security Coordinator (OCA) ✓
Reports Coordinator (OCA)

Library, Technical Reports Section
Office of Computing Services
Director, Physical Plant
EES Information Office
Project File (OCA)
Project Code (GTRI)
Other _____



ENGINEERING EXPERIMENT STATION
GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY • ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30332

Economic Development Laboratory
September 22, 1976

Mr. Michael Potterf, Director
Enterprise Development Division
Appalachian Regional Commission
1666 Connecticut Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20235

Subject: Progress Report on Grant No. GA-4794-76-I-302-0315

Dear Mr. Potterf:

Attached in quadruplicate is our first progress report covering the period of June 1, 1976 through August 31, 1976. Completion of this report had to wait the availability of cost data covering the period, which was not received until September 10.

If you desire additional information beyond that in the report, contact me at (404)894-3852.

Sincerely,

Winfred G. Dodson,
Head, Urban Development Services

Attachments

cc: Mr. William C. Ward
Mr. Phil Whitlow

QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT TO:

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Washington, D.C.

By

Industrial Development Division
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY
ENGINEERING EXPERIMENT STATION
GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
ATLANTA, GEORGIA

September 1976

PROGRESS REPORT ON GEORGIA CERTIFIED CITY PROGRAM

ARC GRANT NUMBER GA-4794-76-I-302-0315

During the period June 1, 1976 to August 31, 1976 the following activities were carried out under the Commission's grant for the purpose of assisting Georgia cities to improve their economic development potential:

ACCEPTED APPLICATIONS. Twenty-seven cities entered the program, including these from the Appalachian area:

Bowdon	Cartersville
Calhoun	Dahlonega
Canton	

CERTIFIED CITY AWARD PRESENTATIONS AND RECOGNITION. During the Annual Meeting of the Georgia Municipal Association at Jekyll Island, eleven cities were recognized for attaining certification. Following this meeting, special presentations of the Certified City plaque were made in each individual city at special events honoring the communities and those local citizens involved in the certification process. Representatives of the three co-sponsors were present at all local presentations.

Several communities have already indicated a desire to begin work toward the Superior certification rating. All cities have been motivated through the award process to intensify their economic development efforts, and efforts are underway to have the Certified City logo placed on all promotional materials distributed by the Bureau of Industry and Trade in behalf of the eleven newly certified cities. These materials include Economic Data Profiles, Condensed Fact Sheets and Industrial Site Flyers.

In addition, we are sending each city a copy of the logo along with a memo suggesting various ways in which the community can advertise its certification. This reinforces citizen support and community interest in local economic development efforts, rather than letting it diminish following the emotional high point of attaining certification. The cities which became certified in June are:

Americus	Manchester
Barnesville	Metter
Butler	Montezuma
Conyers	Rockmart
Donalsonville	West Point
Forest Park	

Over the 12-year life of the program 41 cities have been certified. Eleven of these cities are located in the Appalachian area of Georgia. These communities are:

Carrollton	LaFayette
Cartersville	Lavonia
Cedartown	Rockmart
Douglasville	Rome
Gainesville	Rossville
	Toccoa

EDITING ON-SITE INSPECTION DATA. In the course of each city's participation in the program, an on-site inspection is conducted by Georgia Tech personnel. During the inspection instances of community appearance problems and community improvements as well are tape-recorded for later use in writing evaluation reports. Edited transcriptions of these tapes indicate to community leaders specific instances, by geographic location, of problems in physical appearance and in other aspects and are used by them as a guide to community improvement. One participating community recently used its report to carry out a city-wide clean-up campaign and to spot locations where new street names signs were needed. A copy of the inspection report for each city is attached to its evaluation report.

PREPARATION OF EVALUATION REPORTS. Evaluation reports are prepared on each city failing to achieve certification. These reports cover both positive and negative aspects of the community, and point out to its leadership the overall strengths of their city's economic development efforts as a point of departure for working on those problems preventing certification.

The purpose of this approach is to motivate local leadership to solve those remaining problems so that the city can be certified. Oftentimes, city officials fail to realize that they have already accomplished much in

terms of improvements and that those same resources which provided existing improvements can be employed to overcome existing problems and attain certification. This method of motivation has proved effective and several communities have "Follow-up" programs underway based on the proposed work program contained in the evaluation report.

Reports are generally presented to the city council following a preliminary review with the mayor and/or city manager. Presentations are carried out through the field staffs of the three co-sponsors. To date, nine of thirteen reports have been written, and local presentations have been made on three. One city is using its report as the basis for a city-wide improvement program.

CERTIFIED CITY "FOLLOW-UP" PROGRAMS. Currently four cities in the Appalachian area are continuing to carry out their "Follow-up" programs in addition to cities just entering this phase from last year's program. The EDL field office staff is working with local leaders of these communities to assist them in eliminating those deficiencies preventing certification. One city is reportedly ready for certification, having eliminated the identified deficiencies. Most cities achieving certification do so through the "Follow-up" program.

JOINT CO-SPONSOR STAFF MEETING. In July the staffs of the program's three sponsoring organizations met jointly to review the past year's progress and to plan and coordinate efforts for the coming year. The State Coordinator for the Appalachian Regional Commission attended the meeting.

PROGRAM COORDINATION MEETING. In July, Georgia Tech, EDL personnel, held a program coordination meeting with Area Planning and Development Commission (APDC) representatives from the Appalachian area of Georgia and the Appalachian State Coordinator. The purpose of the meeting was to develop an area-wide action program for the best utilization by APDC's and their communities of the data resulting from this project; and to develop a network for future dissemination of information to provide APDC's with identified gaps in local capital or other needs of their communities.

ANNUAL REVISION OF THE CIVIC PROGRESS STANDARDS. The bulk of a city's

certification grade is attained by grading of the Certified City Questionnaire in the Civic Progress Standards (the remainder of its score comes from the on-site inspection). Each year the Standards are revised in light of feedback from community leaders, field staff personnel, state officials and others involved in the process.

Periodically, due to changing state and federal legislation it becomes necessary to undertake a major revision of the Standards. This year we are undertaking a major revision in conjunction with the co-sponsors. The revision is currently underway, and it is anticipated that it will be completed for publication in October at which time it will be distributed to the 27 first-year participating cities now in the 1976-77 program, and to Area Planning and Development Commission staffs.

CERTIFIED CITY COLOR SLIDE PRESENTATION. A 14-minute 35mm color slide presentation is currently in preparation for the October program of the Georgia Industrial Developers Association. This slide presentation, to be seen by developers from all over Georgia, will be augmented by a testimonial from a developer in a Certified City who will explain what certification has meant to his city's development program. At a later date, the slide presentation will be modified for showing to cities which might become involved in the program.

FUNDS EXPENDED. The following funds were expended during the period.

Budget	\$29,400.00
Expended	3,804.11
Free Balance	\$25,595.89

PLANS FOR NEXT PERIOD. During the next quarter revision of the Civic Progress Standards will be completed. After publication of the new edition, it will be distributed to participants late in October. On-site inspections of participating cities will begin in November.



ENGINEERING EXPERIMENT STATION

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY • ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30332

November 29, 1976

MEMO TO: Bob Rile
FROM: George Dodson
SUBJECT: Addendum to Quarterly Report dated September 22, 1976

In response to your telephone call of November 24, funds were expended on Projects A-1868 and E-402-201 (cost sharing account) between June 1 and August 31, as follows:

A-1868

Personal Services	\$2,174.57
Retirement	110.30
Materials & Supplies	18.00
Travel	22.54
Overhead	<u>1,478.70</u>
Total A-1868	\$3,804.11

E-402-201

Personal Services	\$ 569.18
Retirement	51.28
Overhead	<u>387.55</u>
Total E-402-201	\$1,008.01

Total A-1868 and E-402-201	\$4,812.12
----------------------------	------------

A1868



ENGINEERING EXPERIMENT STATION
GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY • ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30332

December 15, 1976

Mr. Michael Potterf, Director
Enterprise Development Division
Appalachian Regional Commission
1666 Connecticut Avenue, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20235

Subject: Progress Report on Grant No. GA-4794-76-I-302-0315

Dear Mr. Potterf:

Attached in quadruplicate is our second progress report covering the period of September 1, 1976, through November 30, 1976. Completion of this report had to await the availability of cost data covering the period, which was not received until December 15.

If you desire additional information beyond that in the report, please contact me at (404) 894-3852.

Sincerely,

Winfred G. Dodson, Head
Urban Development Services

WGD:jes

Attachments

cc: Mr. William C. Ward, Jr.
Mr. Phil Whitlow

QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT TO:
APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION
Washington, D. C.

By

Industrial Development Division
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY
ENGINEERING EXPERIMENT STATION
GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
ATLANTA, GEORGIA

December 1976

PROGRESS REPORT ON GEORGIA CERTIFIED CITY PROGRAM

ARC GRANT NUMBER GA-4794-76-I-302-0315

During the period September 1, 1976, to November 30, 1976, the following activities were carried out under the Commission's grant for the purpose of assisting Georgia cities to improve their economic development potential:

Evaluation Reports. Evaluation reports are written annually on each community failing to achieve certification. This year 11 reports were written, four for cities in the ARC area, and this phase of the program is now completed. Field staff personnel are currently meeting with the leadership in each community to implement follow-up programs. Four communities from the 1975-76 program already have their follow-up programs underway and are using them as the basis for a city-wide improvement effort.

Certified City "Follow-up" Programs. During the reporting period, one ARC city, Carrollton, completed its follow-up program and qualified for certification. The city's certification plaque will be awarded next June along with those for other cities achieving the award.

Annual Revision of the Civic Progress Standards. Each year, the Standards are revised in light of feedback from community leaders, field staff personnel, and state officials. Periodically, new state and/or federal legislation make it necessary to undertake a major revision. This year a major revision was completed. The revised Standards are scheduled for printing in December, with distribution in early January to participating cities, sponsors, and Georgia APDCs. The program's scoring system was also revised to reflect changes in the Standards.

Certified City Color Slide Presentation. A 14-minute, sound, 35mm color slide presentation showing the program's benefits was presented on October 11 to developers from all over Georgia. While much of the slide presentation was undertaken by the Georgia Power Company, EDL staff participated in the final product. The presentation was accompanied by a testimonial by a developer from a Certified City in the ARC area, who explained what certification has meant to his city's development program. This presentation is being modified for use in a week-long Georgia Tech display to be put on at Atlanta's World Congress Center.

Applications Under 1977-78 Program. The current year's program (1976-77) has been underway since July, and was filled to capacity before the program year began. However, because of the demand by cities to participate, we are currently accepting applications for the 1977-78 program year which begins next July. Currently, we have four applications, including one ARC community, on file. Twenty-six cities constitute the maximum number of first-year participants that can be served. Currently, there are 46 cities, 12 from the ARC area, participating in all phases of the program.

1976-77 Program Underway. Preliminary meetings between field staff personnel and community leaders have been carried out for this program year. These meetings serve a dual purpose. First, they permit organization of a Certified City Action Committee; and second, they provide for a preliminary, on-site inspection of the community, similar to the actual inspection conducted later as part of the city's program participation. In this way, communities are permitted an early review of their appearance problems so that there is opportunity for solution prior to the actual inspection. Action Committee organization at this time also permits early development of a division of labor regarding completion of the questionnaire.

Funds Expended. The following funds were expended during the period.

A-1868

Personal Services	\$3,618.32
Retirement	308.94
Materials & Supplies	44.99
Travel	81.93
Overhead	<u>2,460.47</u>
Total A-1868	\$6,514.65

E-402-201 (EDL Cost Sharing)

Personal Services	\$ 834.92
Retirement	75.23
Overhead	<u>567.75</u>
Total E-402-201	\$1,477.90
Total A-1868 and E-402-201	\$7,992.55



ENGINEERING EXPERIMENT STATION
GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY • ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30332

Economic Development Laboratory
March 16, 1977

Mr. Michael Potterf, Director
Enterprise Development Division
Appalachian Regional Commission
1666 Connecticut Avenue, N. W.
Washington, DC 20235

Subject: Progress Report on Grant No. GA-4794-76-I-302-0315

Dear Mr. Potterf:

Attached in quadruplicate is our third progress report covering the period of December 1, 1976, through February 28, 1977. Completion of this report had to await the availability of cost data covering the period, which was not received until March 14.

If you desire additional information beyond that in the report, please contact me at (404)894-3852.

Sincerely,

Winfred G. Dodson
Urban Development Services

Attachments

cc: Mr. William C. Ward, Jr.
Mr. Phil Whitlow
Mr. Bill Atcheson
A-1868 File

QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT TO:
APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION
Washington, D. C.

By
Industrial Development Division
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY
ENGINEERING EXPERIMENT STATION
GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

March 1977

PROGRESS REPORT ON GEORGIA CERTIFIED CITY PROGRAM

ARC Grant No. GA-4794-76-I-302-0315

During the period December 1, 1976 to February 28, 1977, the following activities were carried out under the Commission's grant for the purpose of assisting Georgia cities to improve their economic development potential:

Civic Progress Standards Printed and Distributed. -- The Certified City Program questionnaire Civic Progress Standards was printed and distributed in early January. One hundred copies of the 66-page questionnaire were printed. Fifty-two copies were mailed to the Program's 26 participating first-year cities. Additional copies were sent to program sponsors, to area planning and development commission staffs, to state level personnel involved with ARC and CPRC and to the Commission staffs themselves. Questionnaires are to be returned for grading by March 15.

Sponsors Meeting Held -- On February 9 the Certified City sponsors met to review the current year's program and to coordinate recruiting efforts for the 1977-78 program.

Visual Inspections -- During the period on-site, or visual inspections, were conducted in 14 communities, three of these were located in the ARC area.

Assistance to Follow-Up Communities -- During the period the Atlanta and Area Office staffs continued to render assistance to communities involved in the two-year Follow-Up Program. Currently there are 19 cities involved in this phase of the program, and five of these are located in the ARC area.

Funds Expended --(See attachment)

Funds Expended -- The following funds were expended during the period.

A-1868

Personal Services	\$2,244.93
Retirement	268.67
Materials and Supplies	143.16
Travel	71.91
Overhead	<u>1,526.56</u>
Total A-1868	\$4,255.23

E-402-201 (EDL Cost-Sharing)

Personal Services	\$ 266.60
Retirement	24.02
Overhead	<u>181.29</u>
Total E-402-201	\$ 471.91

Total A-1868 and E-402-201	\$4,727.14
----------------------------	------------

A-1868



ENGINEERING EXPERIMENT STATION

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY • ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30332

Technology and Development Laboratory
June 21, 1977

Mr. Michael Potterf, Director
Enterprise Development Division
Appalachian Regional Commission
1666 Connecticut Avenue, N. W.
Washington, DC 20235

Subject: Progress Report on Grant No. GA-4794-76-I-302-0315

Dear Mr. Potterf:

Attached in quadruplicate is our fourth progress report covering the period from March 1 through May 31. Completion of this report had to await the availability of cost data covering the final month of the period. This information was not received until recently.

If you need additional information beyond that in the report, please contact me at (404) 894-3852.

Sincerely,

Winfred G. Dodson, Head
Urban Development Services

Attachments

cc: Mr. William C. Ward, Jr.
Mr. Phil Whitlow
Mr. Bill Atcheson
✓A-1868 File

QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT TO:

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Washington, D. C.

By

Industrial Development Division
Technology & Development Laboratory
ENGINEERING EXPERIMENT STATION
GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

July 1977

PROGRESS REPORT ON GEORGIA CERTIFIED CITY PROGRAM

Grant Number GA-4794-76-I-302-0315

During the period March 1 to May 31, the following activities were carried out under the commission's grant for the purpose of assisting Georgia cities to improve their economic development potential.

Grading of the Civic Progress Standards -- The Certified City Program questionnaire Civic Progress Standards was distributed to participating first-year cities in early January. Questionnaires were due back in our offices for grading by March 15. Twenty-seven (27) first-year cities had entered the 1976-77 program, and all were sent copies of the questionnaire. Twenty (20) cities, or 74%, completed their participation by filling out and returning their questionnaires. Three of these, Bowdon, Calhoun and Canton are Appalachia/Georgia communities. Grading responsibility was carried out by four members of the professional staff skilled in community development, and was completed by late May. The four staff members conducted a joint meeting to review recommendations and to begin drafting the annual report to the Sponsors. The report, containing our recommendations for certification, will be ready for an early June Sponsor's meeting for the annual vote on certification.

Visual Inspections -- During the period, visual, or on-site, inspections were carried out in those communities which had not been inspected during the previous reporting period. The final results of this inspection provide an input to the questionnaire and comprise a part of the final grade.

Assistance to Follow-Up Communities -- Twenty (20) cities are in the current Follow-Up phase of the program, which runs for two (2) years following a city's initial year. The Appalachia/Georgia communities of Carrollton, Ellijay, Hartwell and Trion are involved in this phase of the program.

New Entries In the 1977-78 Program -- Cities are already entering the coming year's program, which officially begins July 1. To date, 12 Georgia

communities have entered and four of these Athens, Bremen, Rome and Snellville are in the ARC area. Rome, previously certified, is entering at this time to work toward the Certified Superior rating.

Funds Expended -- The following funds were expended during the period.

A-1868

Personal Services	\$1,209.13
Retirement	45.35
Materials and Supplies	47.20
Travel	2.88
Overhead	<u>822.20</u>
Total A-1868	\$2,126.76

E-402-201 (TDL Cost-Sharing)

Personal Services	\$1,057.42
Retirement	95.27
Overhead	<u>719.05</u>
Total E-402-201	\$1,871.74

Total A-1868 and E-402-201	\$3,998.50
----------------------------	------------



ENGINEERING EXPERIMENT STATION

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY • ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30332

Technology and Development Laboratory
September 27, 1977

Mr. Michael Potterf, Director
Enterprise Development Division
Appalachian Regional Commission
1666 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20235

Subject: Progress Report on Grant No. GA-4794-76-I-302-0315

Dear Mike:

Attached in quadruplicate is our fifth progress report covering the period from June 1 through August 31. Completion of this report had to await the availability of cost data covering the final month of the period. This information was not received until recently.

If you need additional information beyond that in the report, please contact me at (404) 894-3852.

Sincerely,

Winfred G. Dodson, Head
Urban Development Services

Attachments

cc: Mr. William C. Ward, Jr.
Mr. Phil Whitlow
Mr. Bill Atcheson
Mrs. D. I. Willmer
✓ A-1868 File

QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT TO:

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Washington, D. C.

By

Economic Development Division
Technology and Development Laboratory
ENGINEERING EXPERIMENT STATION
GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

September 1977

PROGRESS REPORT ON GEORGIA CERTIFIED CITY PROGRAM

Grant Number GA-4794-76-I-302-0315

During the period June 1 to August 31, the following activities were carried out under the commission's grant for the purpose of assisting Georgia cities to improve their economic development potential.

Grading and Evaluation of Cities in 1976-77 Program -- Twenty-three cities were evaluated during the program year. Evaluations involved on-site inspections in the community, as well as questionnaire grading. Inspections included 20 "first year" cities and three communities in the Follow-Up Program. Coastal Plains communities involved are:

Bowdon	Cartersville
Calhoun	Dahlonega
Canton	Roswell

The evaluation process was completed in early June, following detailed checks with pertinent state agencies regarding environmental compliance, and a memorandum of recommendations on certification was prepared for the co-sponsors, Georgia Power Company's Community Development Department and the Georgia Municipal Association. The annual Sponsors Meeting was held on June 15. A copy of the meeting agenda and memorandum are attached. Five cities were recommended for certification and approved by the sponsors. Three additional cities were recommended and approved for Special Recognition. The five communities, to be certified are:

Alma	Pelham
Carrollton	Thomasville
Morrow	

Carrollton was the only ARC community to become certified in the 1976-77 program. The city had previously been certified in 1971 and had been working on recertification for the past year. It had failed to qualify for recertification a year ago due to deficiencies in fire protection and charter/

codes and ordinances. These deficiencies were eliminated early in the 1976-77 program year.

Special Recognition Certificates were awarded to Macon for its economic development program; to Milledgeville for its community-wide participation in carrying out its Certified City Program and to Thomaston for its promotional brochure, "Thomaston/Upson County". Each year selected cities are recommended for a Special Recognition Certificate where it is seen through the Certified City evaluation process that a participating community is doing an outstanding job in a particular area.

Cities failing to achieve certification were recommended for the Follow-Up Program. Appalachian Regional Communities considered for follow-up, which continues for the next two years and provides a city the opportunity to continue working toward certification, are:

Bowdon

Calhoun

Canton

Dahlonega and Roswell both dropped out of the program during the year. Neither community submitted a questionnaire. Cartersville, previously certified in 1975, was working toward the Certified Superior rating, but decided to discontinue its effort for the present and to reenter at a later date.

Bowdon failed to qualify for certification due to deficiencies in Fire Protection, Transportation and Travel Accommodations. Calhoun could not be certified because of deficiencies in Community Appearance. Canton was not certified because the city failed to furnish enough information with its questionnaire to determine if it was qualified. More detailed information on these communities appears in the attached memorandum.

Two ARC communities, Dalton and Lawrenceville, were in the third, and final, year of the Follow-Up Program. Dalton failed to make required

improvements to its water treatment plant, and, because the plant did not have State approval, the city could not be certified. Lawrenceville failed to qualify because of insufficient information to judge. Each city had been in the program for the allotted three years and was automatically phased out.

Notification and Awards Presentation -- Following completion of the June Sponsors Meeting, all participating cities were notified by phone of the results of their evaluations. Each first year city failing to attain certification would also receive a written report reviewing its situation and setting forth a follow-up program to overcome those deficiencies preventing certification. After notification, details were finalized for the recognition of participating cities at the Georgia Municipal Association Annual Meeting in July and for the actual presentation of certification awards later on in each city. A statewide press release was prepared for each city and its distribution timed to coincide with the initial announcement at the Municipal Association Meeting. Information was distributed to those cities achieving certification describing how to advertise their certification. Those first-year cities failing to become certified received Recognition Certificates for their interest in improving their economic development potential.

1977-78 Program Underway -- Three cities from the Georgia ARC area have entered the current year's program, which began July 1, and two more are due to enter. Those with a "*" are due for recertification.

Bremen	*Rome
*Cedartown	Snellville
*Gainesville	

Project Director Attends Advanced Symposium -- George Dodson attended the Advanced Symposium I of the Industrial Development Institute on Industrial Financing: Problems and Solutions, August 8-10. The symposium was held at the Oklahoma Center for Continuing Education at the University of Oklahoma at Norman. Mr. Dodson attended in connection with the Certified City Program.

Funds Expended -- The following funds were expended during the period.

A-1868

Personal Services	\$3,395.66
Retirement	338.13
Materials and Supplies	135.07
Travel	330.60
Overhead	<u>2,309.05</u>
Total A-1868	\$6,508.51

E-402-201 (TDL Cost-Sharing)

Personal Services	\$ 703.29
Retirement	63.65
Overhead	<u>478.24</u>
Total E-402-201	\$1,245.18

Total A-1868 and E-402-201	\$7,753.69
----------------------------	------------

AGENDA

ANNUAL SPONSORS MEETING GEORGIA CERTIFIED CITY PROGRAM

June 15, 1977

Discussion and Vote on Certification

Discussion and Vote on Certificates of Special Recognition

Discussion of 1977 Certification Awards Presentation

Discussion of Certified City Display for the GMA Annual Meeting

Other Business

June 8, 1977

MEMORANDUM

To: Certified City Program Sponsors
From: George Dodson ^{WJD} and Eric Berg ^{EB}
Subject: Recommendations for Certification of Participating Cities

Entries

Twenty-seven (27) cities entered the program during the current year (1976-77). Twenty (20), or 74% of those completed their participation by filling out and returning their questionnaires. Those completing their participation are listed below. Blakely, Cairo, and College Park are due for recertification this year.

Bainbridge	College Park	Morrow
Blakely	Fitzgerald	Thomaston
Bowdon	Folkston	Thomasville
Cairo	Fort Gaines	Tifton
Calhoun	Hawkinsville	Vidalia
Canton	Macon	Vienna
Claxton	Milledgeville	

Twenty (20) cities are in the follow-up program. Six (6) of these are second-year participants. One (1) city is a third-year participant, having received a one-year extension.

Alma (2nd year)	Louisville
Buena Vista	Nashville
Carrollton	Peachtree City (2nd year)
Cordele (3rd year)	Pelham
Dalton (2nd year)	Riverdale
Douglas	Swainsboro (2nd year)
Ellijay	Statesboro
Hartwell	Trion
Lawrenceville (2nd year)	Waycross
Lincolnton (2nd year)	Wrens

Certification

Five (5) cities are recommended for certification, or recertification, at the Municipal Association's annual meeting. Since no city qualified for the Superior Award, all are recommended for certification at the basic award level. However, two cities; Morrow and Thomasville are recommended to remain in the follow-up program to work toward the Superior Award. The five municipalities recommended for certification are:

Alma
Carrollton
Morrow

Pelham
Thomasville

A complete listing of Certified Cities appears as Appendix A.

Alma. This community is winding up its second year in the follow-up program. Deficiencies, which included abandoned automobiles and junkyards, have been removed for certification.

Carrollton. This city's certification was extended for one year while deficiencies preventing certification were corrected. Work having been completed, Carrollton is recommended for certification.

Morrow. This is Morrow's first year in the program. The community has qualified in all required sections for certification and is hereby recommended to be given the Certified Award. It is also recommended that Morrow remain in the program and seek the Superior Award.

Pelham. This is Pelham's first year in the follow-up program. The city overcame deficiencies in Community Appearance and Charter, Codes and Ordinances and is recommended for certification.

Thomasville. This is Thomasville's first year in the program. The city qualified in all required sections for the award and is hereby recommended for the Certified Award. Additionally, Thomasville is recommended to stay in the follow-up program and seek the Superior Award.

Non-Certification

The following cities failed to achieve certification for the reasons specified.

Bainbridge. This is Bainbridge's first year in the program. Deficiencies preventing certification were in Fire Protection (no operating procedures manual), Community Appearance (city streets, street cleaning, weed cutting and an open dump, not in compliance with state regulations.) It is recommended that Bainbridge continue in the follow-up program.

Blakely. This community was certified five years ago and is currently in the program for recertification. The city, however, failed to qualify for recertification at this time because of deficiencies in Economic Development (solidification procedures), Community Appearance (street cleaning, and open junkyard, and weed cutting). The city is recommended for a one-year extension of certification so these deficiencies may be eliminated.

Bowdon. This is Bowdon's first year in the program. Failure to qualify for certification resulted from deficiencies in Fire Protection (Class 8 fire insurance rating), Transportation (no rail, no bus lines serving) and Travel Accommodations (motels/hotels and restaurants).

Cairo. This community is seeking recertification, having been certified five years ago. Deficiencies in Economic Development, Police Protection, Fire Protection and Community Appearance caused Cairo to fail in achieving certification. Specific areas needing improvement are Economic Development (solicitation procedures), Police Department (operating procedures manual), Fire Department (training), and upgarding of the city's landfill. An extension of Cairo's certification for one year is recommended so these deficiencies can be corrected.

Calhoun. This is Calhoun's first year in the program. Failure to achieve certification is due to the following: Community Appearance (an open dump is operated within the city, streets need cleaning, litter problem citywide). It is recommended that Calhoun remain in the program so that certification can be attained.

Canton. Completing the first year in the program, Canton failed to attain certification due to insufficient data furnished with the questionnaire.

Claxton. This is Claxton's first year in the program. Failure to attain certification is a result of deficiencies in Economic Development (lacking site information and site development), Community Appearance (street cleaning and weed cutting) and Housing (lack of potential). It is recommended that Claxton enter the follow-up program.

College Park. Seeking recertification after five years of certification College Park ranked very high in many areas, but was lacking in: Community Appearance (street cleaning -- considerable litter), Housing (supply more than 10% of residences vacant) and Municipal Administration (part of property taxes are delinquent for over 7 years). Recommend that College Park's certification be extended one year to permit correction of these deficiencies.

Cordele. Cordele is in the third year of follow-up, having been granted a one-year extension. Certification has been withheld pending upgrading of the city's public sewage facilities. However, in light of the problem still existing, no recommendation for certification can be given at this time.

Dalton. In its second year of the follow-up program, Dalton has not satisfactorily met the Department of Natural Resources (EPD) rules and regulations on operation of its water system. Therefore, Dalton is not recommended for certification.

Fitzgerald. This is Fitzgerald's first year of participation. Failure to be certified is due to deficiencies in Community Appearance (many weedy and trashy vacant lots. Litter on many roadways. Downtown in need of a facelift, junkyard needing screening). Fitzgerald is recommended for the follow-up program.

Folkston. This is Folkston's first year in the Certified City Program. Failure to qualify for certification came as a result of deficiencies in Police Protection (lack of a Police Department procedures manual, and need for additional training); Fire Protection (Class 8 insurance rating); and Community Appearance (refuse collection and disposal-operating an open dump, (junkyards/storage areas).

Fort Gaines. In its first year in the program, Fort Gaines failed to qualify for certification due to deficiencies in Economic Development (solicitation procedures); Fire Protection (Number 8 fire insurance classification, no training manual for firemen); Community Appearance (central business district needs renovation, junkyards/storage areas should be screened, streets need more cleaning); Municipal Administration (no budget); Commercial Development (modernity of stores -- need for renewal).

Hawkinsville. Completing its first year in the program, Hawkinsville fails to achieve certification due to deficiencies in Economic Development (solicitation procedures; Police Protection (no Police Department procedures manual); Municipal Administration (no annual budget); Community Appearance (junkyards/storage areas, weed cutting); Commercial Development (modernity of stores); Charter, Codes and Ordinances (no housing code enforcement).

Lawrenceville. This is the second year of follow-up for Lawrenceville. Questionnaire material was submitted over a two-year period which invalidated the response.

Lincolnton. In its second year of the follow-up program, Lincolnton has failed to correct deficiencies which prevent its consideration for certification at this time.

Macon. This is Macon's first year in the program. The city lacked fulfillment of requirements to reach certification in Sanitary Sewage (need to upgrade system) and Community Appearance (junkyards/storage areas and weed cutting). Macon is recommended for the follow-up program. Special recognition is recommended for Macon's economic development program.

Milledgeville. In its first year in the program, Milledgeville failed to attain certification because it did not meet requirements in Sanitary Sewage (need to upgrade present system); Community Appearance (junkyards/storage areas) and Municipal Administration (delinquent taxes). Recommend Milledgeville continue in the follow-up program. Also Milledgeville should be commended for its Certified Cities' organization which supplied the most complete response to the questionnaire.

Peachtree City. Completing the second year of the follow-up program, Peachtree City failed to pass a housing code and as a result cannot be recommended for certification.

Swainsboro. Deficiencies noted previously have not been corrected. Swainsboro cannot be recommended for certification.

Thomaston. Completing its first year in the program, Thomaston failed to attain certified status in the following areas: Economic Development (financing plans); Sewage (plant capacity, lack of EPD permit for one plant, need to upgrade the system to even meet current demand); Municipal Administration (delinquent taxes); City Planning (land-use and thoroughfare plan not adopted by city government). It is recommended that Thomaston remain in the follow-up program and seek certification and possibly the Superior Award. The city should receive special recognition for its promotional brochure entitled Thomaston/Upson County/Georgia

Tifton. This is Tifton's first year in the program. Failure to achieve certification results from deficiencies in Community Appearance (landfill not in compliance with state operating regulations and need for cleanup of junked automobiles along major thoroughfares); and Municipal Administration (lowest property tax collection in last five years was less than 90%. Tifton is recommended for the follow-up program.

Vidalia. This is Vidalia's first year in the program. Failure to secure certification resulted from deficiencies in the following areas: Sanitary Sewage (sewage treatment); Community Appearance (refuse collection and disposal open dump not properly closed); Street Cleaning (city approaches, and weed cutting); and Charter, Codes and Ordinances (housing code not enforced).

Vienna. A first year city, Vienna failed to attain certification because of deficiencies in Economic Development (labor supply data and solicitation procedures); Police Protection/Traffic Enforcement (pedestrian protection); Fire Protection (Class 8 insurance rating, fire department is volunteer); Community Appearance (junkyards/storage areas, street cleaning and weed cutting); Housing (availability and potential). Vienna is recommended for the follow-up program.

GEORGIA CERTIFIED CITIES 1965-1976

<u>City</u>	<u>Year Certified</u>	<u>1970 Census Population</u>
Americus	1976	16,091
Barnesville	1976	4,935
Blakely	1972	5,267
Butler	1976	1,589
Brunswick (Decertified 1974)	1968	19,585
Cairo ^{1/}	1967	8,061
Carrollton	1971	13,520
Cartersville	1975	9,929
Cedartown	1973	9,253
College Park	1972	18,203
Conyers	1976	4,890
Decatur ^{1/}	1967	21,943
Donalsonville	1976	2,907
Douglasville	1975	5,472
Forest Park	1976	19,944
Fort Valley	1973	9,251
Gainesville ^{3/}	1966	15,459
Hapeville	1974	9,567
Hinesville	1972	4,115
Jesup	1974	9,091
LaFayette ^{5/}	1969	6,044
LaGrange ^{3/}	1968	23,301
Lavonia ^{4/}	1968	2,044
Madison	1974	2,890
Manchester	1976	4,779
Marietta ^{3/} (Silver Award 1975)	1968	27,216
Metter	1976	2,912
Monroe ^{4/}	1969	8,071
Moultrie	1974	14,302
Montezuma ^{6/}	1970	4,125
Newnan ^{2/} (Silver Award 1975)	1965	11,205
Perry	1975	7,771
Rockmart	1976	3,857
Rome ^{3/}	1968	30,759
Rossville ^{4/}	1968	3,869
Sylvania ^{4/}	1968	3,199
Thomson	1973	6,503

Georgia Certified Cities 1965-1976

Page 2

<u>City</u>	<u>Year Certified</u>	<u>1970 Census Population</u>
Toccoa	1974	6,971
Valdosta ^{4/}	1968	32,303
Warner Robins	1975	33,491
West Point	1976	4,232

- 1/ Recertified 1972
- 2/ Recertified 1970
- 3/ Recertified 1973
- 4/ Recertified 1974
- 5/ Recertified 1975
- 6/ Recertified 1976

Average City Population
Size: 10,949

ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT
OF TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND TRAINING

Final Report

Prepared By

Robert B. Cassell and Winfred G. Dodson

*The activity described in this report was largely funded by a grant
from the Appalachian Regional Commission -- GA-4794-76-I-302-0315*

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

ENGINEERING EXPERIMENT STATION
Technology & Development Laboratory
Economic Development Division
Atlanta, Georgia 30332

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Final Report to Appalachian Regional Commission

Grant #GA-4794-76-I-302-0315

This grant was authorized "to fund an Enterprise Development Project to provide technical assistance and training in enterprise development to growth centers and other cities in Appalachia Georgia". It enabled the Economic Development Division (Technology and Development Laboratory, Engineering Experiment Station, Georgia Institute of Technology) to work with other agencies in examining the capabilities, resources and needs of cities in the specified area.

The Georgia Certified City Program was selected as the vehicle for data collection and analysis. Fifteen (15) cities in Appalachia Georgia were involved in this program. In the process of self analysis and comparison with impartial standards, programs for sound corrective action were formulated.

Deficiencies identified in the participating communities consist of lack of viable on-going, comprehensive economic development programs, or weaknesses in community infrastructure, or defects in community appearance.

In order to attract industry, a community must first be attractive in itself. Utilizing the Georgia Certified City Program, communities can make an impartial evaluation of their economic development potential.

Community leadership training programs, under this grant and related projects, were conducted in Rockmart, Canton, Lavonia, Lula and Summerville in the Appalachia area. In each case, a list of proposed actions was provided for the respective community to follow in expanding its economic potential.

Considerable positive results have been realized from these efforts. A number of cities have been certified and others have been given positive direction for overcoming weaknesses. It becomes abundantly clear that a systematic process for making technical expertise available on a continuing basis which would integrate the technical resources of the Economic Development Division and those of the Local Development Districts must be achieved.

Appendices provide (1) the analyses of correctable deficiencies in eight communities and (2) a report on the Leadership Training Program in Rockmart.

FINAL REPORT

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

Grant # GA-4794-76-I-302-0315

June 1976-December 1977

This report covers the work performed under the subject grant made by the Appalachian Regional Commission to the Georgia Tech Engineering Experiment Station through the Economic Development Laboratory, and its successor the Technology and Development Laboratory.

The grant was authorized "to fund an Enterprise Development Project to provide technical assistance and training in enterprise development to growth centers and other cities in Appalachia Georgia." The grant was intended to enable the Economic Development Division to work in conjunction with public and private agencies in Georgia and the respective Local Development Districts (LDD) in order to examine the capabilities, resources and needs of cities in Appalachia Georgia. In undertaking this effort, it was anticipated that direction would be offered for future programs which need to be undertaken either to improve organizational action or strengthen public facilities. This effort, furthermore, would assist the subject communities to sharpen the focus of their needs where assistance from the LDDs might be required.

As indicated in preceding quarterly progress reports, under the specific review by the Georgia coordinator for the Appalachian Regional program and the Director of the Enterprise Development Division of ARC, we have provided special insight into the identification of obstacles to economic growth in specific communities in Appalachia Georgia. Further, we undertook the development of programs to correct or to ameliorate those defects in cooperation with staff support from the respective Local Development Districts.

Accomplishments

A total of fifteen (15) cities in the Appalachia region were enrolled between 1976 and the end of 1977 in the Georgia Certified City Program as conducted

by the Economic Development Division. The target group of cities was believed to possess the essential ingredients which would make them eligible for certification. Those communities which were involved in the program under the grant provisions include:

<u>1976-77 Program</u>		<u>1977-78 Program</u>
Bowdon	Dahlonega	Bremen
Calhoun	Dalton	Cedartown
Canton	Ellijay	Gainesville
Carrollton	Lawrenceville	Rome
Cartersville	Trion	Snellville

Those communities recruited for the current program, concluding in June 1978, will benefit from the work accomplished.

While it would be desirable to have more communities enrolled in the Certified City Program, it must be emphasized that the cities which can qualify must have adequate support throughout their infrastructure. In certain instances, recognition of defects in this context automatically prevented some communities from entering. This condition, coupled with the voluntary nature of the program, has a natural tendency to restrict participation. However, this has a positive effect, since in most instances it leads to achievable results in communities which can make adjustments.

Major accomplishments from the program are cumulative in their effect. Many community leaders are motivated through the process to examine their own situations in the light of an impartial set of standards. Often, they discover obvious as well as some obscure weaknesses. Considerable data is collected in the process, for further attacks on the defects which are revealed.

The standards upon which the certification of Georgia municipalities is based have the objective of providing guidance for community improvement and economic growth. They consist of a comprehensive and detailed series of evaluations which may reveal the weaknesses and/or deficiencies that may be limiting a community's economic progress. Every municipality can profit from this kind

of thorough self-evaluation prior to launching any program of civic improvement or of industrial development. From the findings involved in this procedure, a program of sound corrective action is formulated in a progressive and systematic manner.

Also significant in this process, the technical resources of the Engineering Experiment Station, in conjunction with the respective Local Development District staffs and other external technical sources, can be involved in attempts to generate corrective programs.

Much remains to be accomplished. No overnight miracles can be expected.

Problems Identified

One of the major hurdles to more extensive participation and greater involvement by community leadership in positive programs for economic and social progress is misdirected efforts by local citizens, and sometimes apathy. The plain truth is that some community leadership is simply not concerned with areas for improvement, but seeks the awards and recognition deriving from this program.

Thus the actual certification, the attendant publicity and the classification of "certified," in some cases, seems to be the only objective. The real value of a program such as the Georgia Certified City has to be sold and reiterated: it offers insight into deficiencies and problems, and, more importantly, the opportunity to work out solutions because of the availability of technical assistance which can be focused on the problems.

Specific problems have been identified in a number of towns and cities in Appalachia Georgia. Details of these from the Certified City Program are cited in Appendix I to this report. The more significant of these deficiencies fall into three categories.

The lack of a viable on-going economic development program comprehensive enough to include provisions for industrial land development and practical industrial financing plans (for both new and expanding facilities) constitutes one phase. In a number of cases, the local leadership has not defined program

objectives clearly so that the techniques for implementing these desired goals are obvious.

A second group of deficiencies is highlighted by weaknesses in the infrastructure. Inadequate water systems, sewer systems unable to accommodate additional loads, or inadequate protective services, either in fire or police functions, surface quite frequently.

The third major class of defects comes within the community appearance category. It is often very difficult to persuade local leaders to back off and to look at their community with the perspective of an investor from beyond the community. However, if this point of view can be accommodated, the physical defects in business and residential areas become apparent. Then the leadership may be receptive to instigating improvement programs.

Certified City Program

A portion of the ARC grant was committed to support activities in the conduct of the Certified City Program in Appalachia Georgia. This program has three sponsors: the Economic Development Division of Georgia Tech's Engineering Experiment Station, the Community Development Department of the Georgia Power Company and the Georgia Municipal Association.

Development and revision of the Certified City standards, and evaluation of the candidate city's information, appearance, and qualifications is primarily the responsibility of the Georgia Tech Economic Development Division. Recruitment of cities into the program, assistance in compiling certain aspects of information, and physical arrangements for recognition of the qualifying communities have been the prime responsibility of the other sponsors.

Georgia communities have long needed a system to measure their potential for attracting and nourishing new enterprises. Most individuals are too close to the scene to recognize those unsightly aspects or other deficiencies that are apparent to the outsider. On the other hand, the prospective enterprise may find deficiencies in water supply, sewage disposal facilities, or other

municipal services that are sufficient to rule out the city for support of the new facility.

In order to attract industry, a community must first be attractive in itself. However, more than physical appearance is involved. Among other prerequisites are modern transportation and communication facilities, adequate and economical municipal services reflecting an equitable and efficient city government, convenient and up-to-date shopping areas, a variety of residential subdivisions, recreational opportunities, and other desirable amenities for good living.

Over the past 12 years, the Georgia Certified City Program has functioned to provide communities with an impartial evaluation of their economic development potential. By utilizing this program, communities have been able to accelerate development of their growth potential so that they are in a position to be more attractive to investment sources of all types much sooner than they might otherwise have been. In particular, it can provide to designated growth centers a mechanism for measuring their own assets and those of supporting communities in their orbit and the identification of those weaknesses which are subject to correction or neutralizing through new investment activities. This provides direct linkages to the total Appalachian Regional Commission program.

Meeting with LDD Representatives

Pursuant to suggestions made by the EDD at the time the grant was received, a conference session was held with the Georgia coordinator for the Appalachian Regional program and staff representatives from the North Georgia and Georgia Mountains Area Planning and Development Commissions.

At that time, plans were reviewed for selection of communities to enter the Certified City Program, and the general conduct of the program was explained. Emphasis was placed on evaluation of growth centers and secondary centers, and procedures for follow-up programs conducted on certain of these communities.

Leadership Training

As part of the grant program, the Economic Development Division undertook to conduct leadership training programs in certain communities which received certification or were close to that accomplishment. By identifying motivated community leadership and then encouraging its participation in a simulation exercise, it was believed that community assets would be more readily recognized and described by the leadership group. At the same time, the more obvious weaknesses and some obstacles to sound economic growth could be identified.

The learning process was the result of encouraging participation in a simulated industrial plant location process. A consultant searching for a location as commissioned by a metalworking firm, unidentified to the local group, was brought into the community for a meeting with those leaders and inspection of the locale. The pre-meeting response, the performance during the investigative session, and follow-up were all critiqued.

A full report containing an analysis prepared by the EDD staff, an Industry and Trade Department official, and the consultant himself was reviewed with the leadership which had participated in the training program. A list of recommended actions which the community could undertake was also presented. At the community review, in Rockmart, Messrs. Haisten and Whitlow, representing the Georgia Office of Planning and Budget, participated. Copy of the report to the Rockmart development group is attached as Appendix II to this report.

At that review session, the program was publicly cited by one of the ARC coordinators as "the best expenditure of Appalachian money yet."

In addition to Rockmart, similar programs were conducted using documentation developed through the Certified City self-examination process. These were presented in Appalachian communities of Canton, Lavonia and Summerville. In addition, the program was conducted on an experimental basis in Lula (under a related program) which had never participated in the Certified City Program. Although considerable local interest was expressed here, this community still lacks the basic ingredients and the wide range of community assets which would justify the extensive attention Certified Cities should command.

Summary

As can be determined from this analysis, considerable positive results have been realized through conduct of the Georgia Certified City Program with the financial support from the Appalachian Regional Commission. A number of cities have been certified, and others have been given specific direction as to weaknesses which must be overcome.

However, candor requires that some limitations also be mentioned. In the absence of continued and intensive professional guidance and counseling, some of the official public and informal private leaders of the subject community are unable to mount effective programs to overcome the obstacles. In certain cases, this results from lack of information as to sources of financial and technical help; in others, there are no individuals in the community able to assume responsibility for following through, either because of time restrictions or absence of local financial support.

It would appear that a systematic process for making available technical expertise on a continuing basis would enable more communities to make consistent progress. Some process for harnessing the talents and resources available in the staffs of the EDDs together with the field office extension service of EDD appears to be one avenue for a procedure whereby the results of the Certified City self-examination together with external evaluations can be applied for maximum benefit in Appalachia Georgia.

APPENDIX I

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION CITIES

IN CERTIFIED CITY PROGRAM 1976-77

AND PREVIOUS YEARS

- I. These first-year cities failed to achieve certification due to deficiencies listed below.

Bowdon

1. Economic Development
 - a. Lack of information about alternative financing plans to provide industrial plant space.
2. Water
 - a. Lack of system certification by the Environmental Protection Division, Georgia Department of Natural Resources.
3. Police Protection
 - a. No police department procedures manual.
4. Fire Protection
 - a. City's fire insurance classification is 8 (needs to be improved to 7).
5. City Planning
 - a. City should complete and adopt land-use and major thoroughfare plans, to provide for orderly growth.

Calhoun

1. Community Appearance
 - a. Operating an open dump within city limits in violation of regulations of the Environmental Protection Division, Georgia Department of Natural Resources.
 - b. Streets throughout the city, but especially in the downtown, show a lack of cleaning. A regular street-cleaning program should be established.
 - c. There is a litter problem throughout the city which can be diminished by positive community action programs.

Canton

1. Economic Development
 - a. Lack of brochures to be used in support of the community's economic development programs -- a very significant need.
 - b. Lack of an industrial park or district as an integral feature of effective economic development programs.
 - c. Lack of alternative industrial financing plans to be used to assist prospective industry.
 - d. Insufficient labor supply data on the area to demonstrate availability.
2. Community Appearance
 - a. City has a litter problem, especially in the downtown area, which can be overcome by regular cleanup program.
3. Streets
 - a. Approximately 60% of the city streets lack easily identifiable street name signs.

II. These cities in follow-up program failed to achieve certification due to deficiencies listed below.

Carrollton (qualified for recertification, Fall of 1976)

1. Fire Protection
 - a. The city's fire department did not have a departmental operating procedures manual.
2. Charter, Codes and Ordinances
 - a. The city's charter had not been reviewed for more than five years.

Dalton

1. Water
 - a. Failure to meet rules and regulations of the Environmental Protection Division, Georgia Department of Natural Resources.

Ellijay

1. Water
 - a. The city water system failed to meet certification by the Environmental Protection Division, Georgia Department of Natural Resources.

Ellijay (continuation)

- b. Additionally, the city lacks a written policy on extension of water mains.
- 2. Community Appearance
 - a. Many of the city's streets need repaving.
 - b. The city has a high percentage of slum housing, although there is a public housing program.
 - c. The city lacks an ordinance regulating advertising signs in the downtown area -- excessive amount of signs detracting from an otherwise acceptable appearance.
 - d. Outdoor storage areas and/or junkyards need cleaning up throughout the city to offset detrimental initial impression.
- 3. Streets
 - a. Lack of street name signs. (Less than 60% of all street intersections are marked).
 - b. Lack of lighted streets (only 30% lighted).
- 4. Housing
 - a. Lack of available rental and sales housing.
 - b. High percentage of slum housing (probably resulting from inadequate code enforcement).
- 5. Charter, Codes, and Ordinances
 - a. Lack of housing code leads to deficiencies cited under Housing above.
- 6. City Planning
 - a. Lack of subdivision regulations -- this is reflected in appearance defects.

Lawrenceville

- 1. Water
 - a. Water system operators lack required certification from the Environmental Protection Division, Georgia Department of Natural Resources.
- 2. Sanitary Sewerage
 - a. Lack of system certification from the Environmental Protection Division, Georgia Department of Natural Resources.

Lawrenceville (continuation)

3. Fire Protection
 - a. Deficiencies in systems, mains and storage (low downtown capacity and inadequate spacing of hydrants in residential areas).
4. Community Appearance
 - a. Unscreened junkyards within the city limits along with auto hulks on individual lots in residential areas.
5. Municipal Administration
 - a. Failure to draw up an annual budget covering daily operations, capital expenditures and debt service.

Trion

1. Water
 - a. No metered service.
 - b. No policy for the extension of water mains.
 - c. No system or plant operator certification as required by the Environmental Protection Division, Georgia Department of Natural Resources.
2. Fire Protection
 - a. City fire department lacks an operating procedures manual.
 - b. City fire department is rated 8 (needs to improve to 7).
3. Health
 - a. The city lacked a dentist.
 - b. City hospital was not accredited by the Joint Commission on the Accreditation of Hospitals.

III. The following cities in the 1976-77 program failed to submit completed Certified City questionnaires, automatically disqualifying them from that program.

Cartersville (for Superior classification)

Dahlonega

Roswell

APPENDIX II

LEADERSHIP TRAINING FOR INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

FOR ROCKMART, GEORGIA

Conducted by

Economic Development Laboratory
ENGINEERING EXPERIMENT STATION
Georgia Institute of Technology

Under Grant of
Appalachian Regional Commission

(In cooperation with the Georgia Department of Industry & Trade,
and Coosa Valley Area Planning and Development Commission)

Purpose

*The intent of this program is to
provide training for contacting
and handling of industrial and
other entrepreneurial prospects
by Rockmart community leaders.*

February 1977

COMMUNITY RESPONSE TO INITIAL INQUIRY

Nature of Inquiry

The initial letter of inquiry provided the following details:

Metal manufacturing company -- consultant making survey

Plant site of 25 to 30 acres, ready for construction, with
adequate utilities

Initial employment: 125 people (needed -- machine operators,
welders, polishers/buffers; also large number of unskilled)

Eventual employment:

Most important criteria:

union situation

community attitude

attitude of existing industry

rail and truck transportation

electric power and natural gas

COMMUNITY RESPONSE

- o The community sales team responded to the initial letter of inquiry. However, that response, while including data, did not address itself to all of the specifics.
- o Telephone call from Rockmart contact stated:
 - Had the acreage.
 - Raised questions as manner in which investigation would be conducted.
- o Missed the fact that plant building size had not been specified.

COMMUNITY HANDLING OF PROSPECT'S VISIT

Strong Points

Although the community leadership needs considerable additional experience and practice, some good points were observed.

MEETING

- o The meeting place (for the group) was a suitable one.
- o The community attitude towards new industry appeared positive.

UTILITIES

- o Utilities were fairly well covered, but should have had a statement of availability from the natural gas distributor.
- o Asked what the company utility requirements were.

SITE

- o Took prospect to industrial site, with some information.
- o Also showed available building.

PROPER QUESTIONS ASKED

- o Need for plant financing.

TAX CONCESSIONS

- o Positive position presented on behalf of community.

Community Handling of Prospect's Visit-2

Weak Points

A number of weak points appeared in the community presentation.

INTRODUCTION

- o The introduction of the community team was sketchy; each member should have been identified as to his civic responsibility and occupation.
- o The initial orientation could be improved with the use of a map of both Rockmart and the region. This gives the prospect a better feel of the location, especially in regard to the highway network, physical location, etc.
- o The group did not appear to be prepared to discuss industrial locational factors. Data used was out of date.
- o No reference was made to Rockmart being a Certified City.
- o Did not inquire about time limitations.

COMMUNITY TOUR

- o The community tour was not organized -- used mostly to show the industrial site.

LABOR

- o Labor availability and rates were not well covered.
- o No convincing data presented that this plant could be staffed.
- o Technical training facilities were not specifically identified.
- o Mentioned two plants with unions, but didn't clarify company's position.

Community Handling of Prospect's Visit-3

EXISTING INDUSTRY

- o Did not offer the prospect the opportunity to have private personal interview with local industry without presence of community representatives.
- o Prospect had to ask for data on existing employers.

TRANSPORTATION

- o Data on the truck terminals should be at top of community priority.
- o No data supplied on rail service.
- o Did not mention service by two railroads.

PLANT SITE

- o Sketch of tract showing utilities should be prepared.
- o Map of general area keyed to sites should be prepared.
- o Documentation on rail spur installation should be available.
- o Need prepared statement on what land, and at what price, could be delivered.

BUILDINGS

- o More specifics on financing and construction should have been volunteered.
- o When prospect mentioned available space, more positive response should be made.

Community Handling of Prospect's Visit-4

UTILITIES

- o Prospect indicated he would need reassurance on natural gas availability; a statement from the gas supplier would be useful; used 1969 data.
- o Should have tried to find out if sewer would be critical to company and to community.

MISCELLANEOUS

- o Community economic profile was handed over, but not referred to.
- o Did any one keep a list of unanswered questions, so that the prospect could be furnished answers later?
- o Did not cover amenities: housing, schools, recreation, etc.

SUMMARY

- o No one asked whether any subjects or questions had not been covered.
- o No one asked what, in effect, it would take to make Rockmart the company's choice.

COMMENTS FROM THE CONSULTANT

Your wide experience confirms that minute attention to the essential details before and during the prospect's visit can pay rich dividends to new jobs and capital investments for the local economy. Answers to all the technical, governmental and civic questions can be found through the talents and abilities that are readily available locally, regionally or statewide.

Failure to maintain these contacts, and apply these assets with imagination and diligence usually means the difference between winning and losing valuable new payrolls and tax revenues for a community.

Rockmart's general appearance and surroundings compare favorably with other North Georgia towns in its size range. If there were strong points which were not brought out during the meeting or shown during the tour, the visiting group was left with the impression a genuine industrial prospect would have little opportunity to learn about them.

Fairly attractive land totaling about 150 acres and ready for development presently appears to be Rockmart's main asset. Four plants already in the so-called industrial park lend an air of credibility.

The apparent reluctance to discuss details of the 30,000-sq. ft. plastics plant closed three years ago adds an element of mystery to Rockmart's efforts. Litigation caused by an SBA loan supposedly prevents its being offered to new tenants. There was no indication anything is being done to change the situation.

No economic data on Rockmart, either in the early exchange of letters or at the start of the meeting, were forthcoming for use by the prospect. It appeared that the mayor read from an outdated publication produced no later than 1969 when he attempted to enumerate the community's strong points. The cardinal sin was that a staff man of Georgia Department of Industry & Trade was present; no copy of that department's current Economic Development Profile on Rockmart was exhibited -- and there was no evidence on the part of the Rockmart delegation that they use it or know of its existence!

It would have helped for the spokesman to outline briefly a suggested agenda based on total time allocated. Options could include a slide

Comments from the Consultant-2

presentation or other visuals; a pre-determined formal statement by a local official or educator; an explanation of what would be covered during the tour.

On key points not readily explained by the local leaders, they failed to call on the professional developers and planners present.

Several unasked questions: financial rating of the firm; general type of building contemplated; whether sprinkler pressure is essential; whether plant would aim toward union or non-union shop; would management have corporate airplane(s) needing local landing facilities? The prospect asked several times if there were additional questions, so time was adequate. Also, he offered information during the latter stages on items which should have been asked about by the local people.

COMMUNITY FOLLOW-UP

If Rockmart is genuinely interested in obtaining the industry which this prospect represents, it is desirable that the consultant who is making the investigation be furnished all information which he requested as soon as possible prior to the prospect's visit.

Then, other specific details should be completed as developed from the prospect's visit. That information should be accompanied by a letter setting forth the community's interest and an offer of further material and other specifics on the town.

Do not assume when the prospect leaves that he is satisfied, and has all the facts he may need. Find out if that is the case, by asking.

As far as is known, no subsequent effort was made by the Rockmart group to follow-up on this project. The prospect could likely assume that Rockmart is really not interested in obtaining this plant.

An immediate follow-up is highly desirable since the state and area development agencies deal with many communities and many prospects. They should be kept current on local progress, particularly if there are any further contacts with the prospect.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE ACTION

Rockmart has already demonstrated that it can attract new industry (though this point was not developed in the meeting with the prospect). We are convinced that Rockmart could improve its attractiveness to new industry if the following steps are taken:

- o Develop an improved technique for responding to letters of inquiry.
- o Make Certified City an initial selling point.
- o Create specific task forces on subject areas (i.e., utilities, labor supply, taxes, sites, financing, community attitude).
- o Develop a "Briefing Book" which could be used by the team (no matter what the number of individuals) dealing with prospects.
- o Develop a detailed plan for handling industrial prospects. This plan should incorporate all matters pertaining to: (1) introductions, (2) local orientation, (3) community tour, (4) determining the precise needs of the prospect, and (5) furnishing the prospect with other needed information after his departure.
- o Emphasize more the team's business-like approach.
- o Become more conversant with data relating to building costs, labor availability and rates, truck transportation, pollution, fire protection/rating, natural gas situation.
- o Make color film slides to be used as either a substitute, or back-up, for the community tour.
- o Prepare regional orientation and community tour maps.

FINAL FINANCIAL REPORT

A-1868

Personal Services	\$ 16,120.65
Retirement	1,479.96
Materials and Supplies	530.37
Travel	306.98
Overhead	<u>10,962.04</u>
Total A-1868	\$ 29,400.00

Georgia Tech Cost-Sharing

Personal Services	\$ 4,045.08
Retirement	371.40
Overhead	<u>2,750.66</u>
Total Ga. Tech Cost-Sharing	\$ 7,167.14

Total A-1868 and Georgia Tech Cost-Sharing	\$ 36,567.14
--	--------------