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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: ADVANTAGE SHARING PROGRAM

Purpose of the Advantage Sharing Program (ASP)
The Advantage Sharing Program, or ASP, is a multi-county collaboration comprising Greene, Miami and Montgomery Counties. The program’s purpose is to provide additional dollars to economic and workforce projects that have been developed by local governments. The projects submitted by local governments address the needs of businesses that are locating, expanding or sustaining operations. ASP provides to local officials a source of additional funding to meet business needs. Local governments apply for funds after their best offer does not secure a development agreement. This funding does not replace incentives typically offered by local governments. Requests for funding are made to a Review Committee comprised of three representatives from each of the counties. Each county determines who will sit on the review Committee from the public sector (two representatives) and the private sector (one representative). Economic and workforce development projects are evaluated using information about:

- Jobs created or retained
- Economic growth (direct and indirect multipliers from wages and investments)
- Average wages and benefits paid to employees
- Type and dollar amount of company investment
- Dollar amount of infrastructure improvements needed to support the project
- Other factors such as relocation, energy efficiency, and coordination with regional development priorities

Ultimately, ASP attempts to increase investment that grows businesses and increases the pace of economic transformation in the region. Uniquely, ASP couples workforce with economic development. ASP fills gaps in the existing workforce development programs. The workforce committee identified workforce gaps related to retraining incumbent workers, internship workers or other gaps that may exist or develop within workforce development programs supported by federal, state and local governments.

Program Development
Two separate committees met to design the Economic and Workforce Development programs. Decisions were made by consensus. The major goals of the Economic Development Program are to 1) fund business development that creates or retains jobs paying the median wage of the region; 2) invest in businesses that will restore prosperity to our region; and 3) unify the region and foster efficiencies through local government collaboration. The Workforce Development Program seeks to 1) meet business workforce needs; 2) retain highly educated residents; 3) fill gaps that exist within current workforce development programs.
Funds for ASP
Research discovered that funding sources for programs that support regional collaborations, such as ASP, included local, state, and federal government or foundation sources. For example, the 16 county Northeast Ohio Fund for Our Economic Future and the EfficientGovNow Initiative raised $60 million from area foundations.

ASP will seek funds from federal sources and or foundations. ASP will also request funds from the Ohio Department of Development to launch and administrate the program. The administrative dollars will be used to apply for federal dollars over five years and implement the plan. As structured, workforce development funds will be derived from the economic development projects. Local governments receiving economic development dollars will repay 25% of the ASP grant. Given this lag in funding, the plan is to raise workforce development funds from foundations or federal sources to seed the workforce development component of the ASP program. No amount of funding has been agreed upon. However, Montgomery County’s ED/GE program provides a benchmark. Montgomery County began investing $5 million annually in economic development. Considering inflation since 1992, a much larger population and area, and loss of jobs, $10 million per year over five years seems logical.

Administrative Structure
The two main administrative elements of ASP consist of the development and management of the program and the review and selection of applicants. ASP will be developed and managed by the Dayton Development Coalition (DDC). DDC will need $48,000 in the first six months and approximately $530,000 over five years to raise the funding and administrate the ASP economic and workforce development. DDC will use Ohio Department of Development funds to raise federal/foundation dollars. Administration responsibilities include: receive, manage and distribute ASP economic and workforce dollars; receive fund applications from local jurisdictions; review applications for complete information, provide assistance to applicants (e.g. supply economic multiplier data), send applications to the Review Committee, obtain timely responses from the Review Committee and inform applicants of the Review Committee’s decision within 30 days or as needed; monitor projects for compliance with ASP terms (e.g. 25% pay-back requirement); and evaluate projects and the program annually.

The Review Committee selects projects to be funded. The committee is comprised of three designates from Greene, Miami and Montgomery Counties. Members are appointed as each county determines. Two committee members will come from the public sector and have economic and or workforce development expertise and one member will represent the private sector.
Local Support for ASP
The research team interviewed 47 local governments in the three counties. In principle, local governments unanimously agreed with that the region needed to do more to revive and transform the economy, that economic growth in one community spills over into the region, that our region needed to develop the workforce to retain highly educated residents and assist dislocated workers, and that greater collaboration among local governments would improve both economic and workforce development. The local governments also identified important issues that needed to be resolved. These issues included business location, supporting economic development projects based on sound criterion rather than politics, and the inability of local governments to share revenues or create a pool of investment dollars as Montgomery County did in 1990.

The ASP program has been shared with all local governments either directly or indirectly via mail and e-mail. Many jurisdictions have reviewed and passed resolutions supporting the ASP program. Others are still considering the program or do not have an interest in the program. Overall, 2 of 3 counties, 16 of 22 cities, 11 of 33 townships, and 3 of 18 villages have passed resolutions. The graphic below illustrates how the ASP program will work.
The Dayton region has been a national and Ohio leader in governmental innovation and regional responses to economic and political challenges for many years. The city manager form of government, the Miami Valley Conservancy District, and Montgomery County’s solid waste district and ED/GE Program are a few illustrations of how local governments in the Dayton region have responded to fiscal and operational challenges in the past. More recently, the Business First program and the establishment of regional emergency dispatch centers demonstrate how local governments can reduce interlocal competition for economic growth and better serve citizens by reducing service costs through collaboration.

The Dayton region and Ohio’s other eleven regions face new and severe economic and workforce challenges. Businesses providing hundreds of well-paying manufacturing jobs have closed or deeply restructured their operations. Many of these firms formed the backbone of region’s economy. Because of these firm, job and operation losses, the region is now challenged to reinvest in emerging and existing business sectors and retrain its workforce.

In 2008, the Ohio Department of Development (ODOD) initiated the Local Government Services and Regional Collaboration Grant Program to promote local governments acting together to restore prosperity to Ohio communities. Thirteen area local governments and Montgomery County successfully applied for ODOD’s Collaboration Grant Program. The project, titled the Advantage Sharing Program, or ASP, set out to develop a multi-county economic development program that fosters business growth and competitiveness through collaboration and workforce development. ASP symbolizes the economic benefits gained when local governments collaborate. Wright State University’s Center for Urban and Public Affairs (CUPA) was selected to lead the study. CUPA, in turn, established a partnership with the University of Dayton’s Fitz’s Center to complete the feasibility study.

The ASP Program Development Process
Montgomery County, the fiscal agent of the project, asked the Dayton Regional Network to provide leadership for the project after the grant was awarded in January 2009. The Feasibility Project Team (CUPA and Fitz Center) drafted implementation strategies that included a request for help from area business leaders. The implementation strategy was based on involving local governments in the development of the ASP program using a Steering Committee and two subcommittees; one for economic development and the other for workforce development. Paul Barbas, President and Chief Executive Officer of DPL Inc. and DP&L, agreed to serve as chair of the Steering Committee, and Bill Mercurio, former President and Chief Executive Officer of Plastic Trim, LLC, and Bill
Lukens, Chief Executive Officer of Stillwater Technologies, Inc, agreed to chair the economic development and workforce development subcommittees respectively.

The ASP project was designed to establish feasibility through community interviews (Appendices A and B), meetings to develop the program with community experts and leaders (Appendices C-E), and meetings with communities to review the final ASP program. To ensure implementation the Project Team recommended local jurisdictions pass resolutions supporting the program.

ASP project goals included: 1) creating an economic competitiveness advantage for communities through collaboration; 2) supporting new economic growth; and 3) identifying gaps in existing workforce training programs and then filling these gaps with reinvested funds from ASP economic development projects.

The Feasibility Project Team presented these strategies to the Dayton Regional Network and the Mayors and Managers Association in January 2009. Following these meetings, the Feasibility Project Team contacted local jurisdictions in Greene, Miami, and Montgomery Counties to participate in face-to-face interviews regarding the feasibility study.

Forty-seven jurisdictions participated in the interviews. The interviews established guiding principles for the study and identified deal breakers that could cause local governments to opt out of the ASP regional economic/workforce development program. Interview questions can be found in Appendix A and a summary of the key principles and deal breakers are located in Appendix B.

In late spring 2009, the Feasibility Project Team invited all local jurisdictions in the three counties to a regional meeting to present the results of the interviews and to introduce the task force members who would be working to develop the program. Representatives from the State of Ohio, Dayton Development Coalition, and the Center for Urban and Public Affairs also presented data that reinforced the need for a broad and innovative economic and workforce development program. A copy of the regional meeting agenda is in Appendix C and the attendance list is in Appendix D. In June 2009, the Feasibility Project Team invited administrators and elective officials to participate on either the Steering Committee or Economic Development and Workforce Development Subcommittees. A complete list of each committee is located in Appendix E. The work committees were provided with key questions that the program should answer that were derived from the local government interviews. These questions are located in Appendix F.

Soon after the regional meeting, concern that the state would not support a new development program and fears that residents would not support a program that required tax revenue sharing among jurisdictions in the three counties lead to meeting to redesign the project. Barbas convened a meeting of the Project Team, representatives from the three counties, and the Dayton Development Coalition. The meeting concluded with a charge to the Project Team to: 1) determine how the ASP
program could be implemented without funding from the State of Ohio; and 2) develop a program that did not require tax revenue sharing. Plans to convene a Steering Committee were also cancelled. The Project Team began researching to determine how funding could be obtained for ASP and convened the Economic and Workforce Committees to craft a development program acceptable to stakeholders in the three counties.

The Economic Development Project Committee
The Economic Development Subcommittee met five times beginning in July 2009 and completing work in February 2010. The Feasibility Project Team researched other regional economic grant programs across the country to aid in the development of ASP. The team prepared a model program and then community members altered the terms of the program to fit the region’s needs. Consensus was reached on a broad range of issues. The issues ranged from the eligibility of businesses and administration of the program to very sensitive program details such as the return of ASP funding to the program for workforce development.

Once the program was developed, the Feasibility Project Team collected sample projects from communities and ran simulations using project selection criteria. CUPA purchased IMPLAN software and data to determine the economic impact of various economic development projects. Various jurisdictions provided data from past projects to gauge how the project evaluation measures would work. The committee reach consensus on what factors would be used on an application for funding, who would review the applications, the timing of funding, a 25% pay-back provision, program administration, and how funds would be raised for the program.

Program administration was a potential deal breaker. The Dayton Development Coalition (DDC) agreed to implement and administrate the ASP program. Funds would be requested from the State of Ohio to cover expenses for raising external funding and launching the program. The DDC estimated that it would need $48,000 in the first six months and then $530,000 over the five year life-cycle of ASP.

The Workforce Development Committee
From August 2009 to February 2010, the Workforce Development Subcommittee worked to identify gaps in local workforce training programs where funding through ASP could be beneficial. Both the Economic Development and Workforce Development Subcommittees developed evaluation criteria as well as sample applications and evaluation forms for the program. The committee reach consensus that funds would be employer driven and would focus on two gaps within existing workforce development system: retraining of currently employed workers and internships to retain highly educated residents in the region.

Community Review of ASP
After the committees completed their work, Paul Barbas called project Team, committee chairs, counties, and Dayton Development Coalition together to review the results. The counties wanted Project Team to open the ASP program up to review and encourage
communities to adopt resolutions supporting the program. It was decided that there was no need to convene the Steering Committee.

The ASP program was sent to every jurisdiction in Greene, Miami and Montgomery Counties. The Feasibility Project Team organized meetings with the Dayton Regional Network, with governing associations (municipalities and townships), with groups of government by county, and with individual jurisdictions upon request. The Project Team presented the ASP program, answered questions, and asked jurisdictions to pass a resolution if they supported the program. The Project Team also hosted a focus group discussion with economic development administrators in the region to question if implementing ASP would reduce costs to local governments. Of special note, a meeting with the region’s mayors and managers association resulted in changing the program criteria to address relocation of businesses from one ASP jurisdiction to another.

Key Features of ASP Leading to Consensus

- Communities favored inclusive economic projects rather than narrowly focusing on firms doing business in new and emerging economic clusters;
- Jobs were needed in general, and rejected limiting eligibility to projects that paid a certain wage or higher. Projects that created low wage jobs would not get points for this criterion but would not be ineligible for funding;
- Interlocal agreements that included tax sharing were required if a business was relocating from one ASP jurisdiction to another jurisdiction;
- ASP should be expanded beyond the three counties. ASP will be open to local governments in other counties within the Dayton economic region;
- Communities supported criteria based on economic impact rather than selecting projects that shifted funds around to jurisdictions;
- Administration of ASP required an established and respected organization;
- There needed to be equal representation from the counties;
- Workforce programs had to fill gaps and utilize existing programs that proved to be effective (e.g. internship intermediaries);
- ASP and selection processes and criteria needed to be evaluated after implementation. Change should be expected as prosperity and economic conditions in the region improve (e.g. focus on higher wage businesses and emerging business sectors).

Resolutions Supporting ASP
Jurisdictions continue to review the ASP program. To date, 32 jurisdictions have passed resolutions supporting ASP. In Greene County, the county, the cities of Beavercreek and Bellbrook and several central townships, Beavercreek, Sugarcreek and Xenia, have not passed resolutions. The City of Beavercreek will consider a resolution next month. In Miami County, the county and jurisdictions representing 70% of the population passed resolutions supporting ASP. In Montgomery County, the county and 11 of its 15 cities passed resolutions. However, two large townships, Miami and Washington, did not pass resolutions.
The Project Team is not aware of major issues with the program. Clearly, jurisdictions without income tax (e.g. City of Beavercreek and townships) are extra cautious about the provision that requires a 25% repayment of ASP funding. Only the City of Dayton provided comments and did not pass a resolution.

Dayton suggested that the ASP program ensure return of 25% of the grant through property taxes, and recommended that jurisdictions designate ASP funds as a loan to the business or an investment in the business. Regarding this last point, if adopted by jurisdictions, the problem of repaying 25% of the grant would be minimized. Dayton also voiced concern over businesses that relocate. This issue has been resolved through an amendment to the program that was voted on by the managers and mayors association. Dayton also objected to use of IMPLAN analysis of project impacts that utilize multipliers. This is a central feature of the ASP program and, in part, places more emphasis on objective criterion. The last issue raised by Dayton concerned representation on the Review Committee. Participants developing the economic development portion of the ASP program did not want to dictate to counties how representation would be determined; ‘each county should decide this.’

The following two sections are components of the ASP program that were reviewed by program development committees and area jurisdictions.

**Selected Sources**


13(3), 229-244. Retrieved from http://edq.sagepub.com/content/13/3/229.full.pdf+html


Section 2: Economic/Workforce Development Investment Fund

Investment Fund Overview

Communities throughout our region have watched well paying jobs disappear and companies close or relocate. Every community has taken actions to stem the losses and support new business development. At the same time, economic globalization has increased the level of competition for new and existing jobs and businesses.

These challenges are simply too great for any single community. Communities must work together as a region to compete globally. Investment funds are needed to help support new and promising businesses that will transform the region’s economy and support the development of a 21st century workforce.

The Advantage Sharing Program proposes to create an Economic and Workforce Development Investment Fund (ASP-ED and ASP-WD) to provide additional investment funds above and beyond local and state incentives. First, the ED-Investment Fund will contribute additional investment dollars to projects that have been assembled by local economic development professionals. Funds will be awarded to projects that serve many of the goals and development strategies that have been established by local governments in the Dayton Economic Region, the Dayton Development Coalition, area chambers of commerce and other development councils, and, of course, the Ohio Department of Development. Second, 25% of the ED-investment dollars will be returned over three years and will used to invest in short term job training and a special internships to support and develop businesses.

It is expected that the projects funded will help support the growth of new industry clusters and help sustain existing firms critical to the region’s new economy. The ability of ASP-ED/WD to foster new growth and development is determined by the strength gained from communities joining together and more effectively utilizing their collective talents and resources. ASP-ED/WD will use this strength to secure dollars for the Investment Fund.

Dollars alone will not support new and promising businesses or restore prosperity to the Dayton regional economy. New growth and development is contingent upon transforming the workforce. Therefore, the ASP-ED is designed to provide investment funds in a Workforce Development Initiative. The Workforce Initiative will fill existing gaps left by current workforce programs and will give local economic development professionals an additional resource to support businesses in their communities that are competing in the global economy.
Creating the proposed ASP-ED/WD Investment Funds was supported by a grant from the Ohio Department of Development. The Investment Fund structure, project eligibility requirements, and mechanics of the investment fund were designed by local economic development professionals in Greene, Miami and Montgomery Counties. It is proposed that the Investment Fund will be administered and managed by the Dayton Development Coalition (DDC). Further, the DDC will facilitate a committee to review applications for funding. The Review Committee will be comprised of two economic development professionals with workforce expertise and one private sector representative from each county. Appointments are made by County Commissions or as decided by each county. Finally, the ASP-ED/WD will be evaluated annually to improve processes and otherwise modify the program to reflect economic change in the region. Details of the ASP-ED/WD Investment Funds are provided in the following sections.

As a member of the ASP Program, jurisdictions must agree to the following aspects of the program:

- Membership to the ASP Program requires a resolution from each jurisdiction.
- Jurisdictions do not pay a fee to become a member of the program.
- 25% of Investment Funds awarded to a jurisdiction must be paid back to ASP within three years or as determined by the Review Committee. The 25% will be used for workforce development initiatives or in some cases to fund other economic development projects to create and/or retain jobs.
- The Dayton Development Coalition will administer the Investment Fund Program and any federal dollars that come to the program. The DDC will also convene the Review Committee, but will not have an official vote on projects that will receive funding.
- Projects will be evaluated using a weighted point system as a guide on the following areas:
  - Number of jobs created and/or retained
  - Amount of employee wages (Projects that pay less than 75% of the current median wage will receive 0 points)
  - Investment dollars in building construction, renovations, and/or new production capacity
  - Economic growth multipliers, direct, indirect, and induced (Utilizing the IMPLAN Software)
  - Minimal costs to expand or adapt transportation and utility infrastructure
- Bonus points are awarded to projects in the following areas:
  - Environmental priorities
  - Interlocal business relocation/shared service agreements
Key Features of the ASP-ED Investment Fund

- Counties, municipalities and townships join together to attract, retain and support firms that strengthen the region’s economy. Initially, ASP-ED economic region will be defined as Greene, Miami, and Montgomery Counties.
- Local governments must decide to join ASP-ED through a resolution. ASP-ED member jurisdictions, individually or in partnership, may submit applications for funding any time after the Investment Fund has been established.
- Decisions on applications will be reached within 30 days.
- Investment funding shall be used to augment and coordinate high priority economic development initiatives.
- Eligible projects include developments that—
  - create or retain jobs;
  - support business growth within industry clusters;
  - support new, relocating, or expanding businesses;
  - minimize the need for additional capacity from area utility and transportation systems; and
  - more fully utilize existing commercial and industrial investments.
- Projects will be evaluated using the established criteria below:
  - number of jobs created and/or retained
  - amount of wages paid; eligible projects must pay no less than 75% of the median area wage (Approximately $15.00 per hour including benefits paid to the employee);
  - amount of investment dollars in building construction, renovations, and/or new production capacity;
  - economic growth multipliers, direct, indirect, and induced (household spending from jobs), for each project. IMPLAN Professional 3.0 will be used to estimate the economic impact that each project will have on the regional economy in terms of dollars flowing into the economy and jobs created;
  - minimize costs to expand or adapt transportation and utility infrastructure; and
  - meet specific environmental priorities and agreements among local governments for projects that involve intra-regional business relocation and/or shared services agreement.
- Creates a funding stream to fill gaps in the existing workforce development system. Communities that receive ASP-ED Investment Funds will return 25% of the Investment Fund dollars to support workforce development in the region.
- Dayton Development Coalition administers and manages the Investment Fund and the ASP Workforce Development Initiative. Eligibility, program criteria, and
other details are provided in the ASP-WD (Workforce Development) Initiative document.

- Evaluates ASP-ED projects to improve the program and adapt it to economic change. For example, creating jobs are now the highest priority but this may change to emerging industry clusters in the future.

**ASP-ED Investment Fund Guidelines**

1) **Eligible Applicants** are any general purpose government in Greene, Miami, and Montgomery Counties which has passed a resolution that approves the Advantage Sharing Program (ASP). Approving ASP means that the local government accepts the provisions of the Economic Development Investment Fund and the Workforce Development Initiative.

   **Note**: This proposal does not limit the Dayton Region to Greene, Miami and Montgomery Counties. As the Administrator of ASP, the Dayton Development Coalition (DDC) will invite other local governments in surrounding counties to join ASP to further strengthen our regional economy. Please see the graphic on the title page for the counties that comprise the Dayton Economic Region.

2) **Application Process** is open to one or more eligible local governments in the Dayton Economic Region. Please see Attachment 1 for a draft copy of the ASP-ED Application. All application materials will be available through the DDC website. There will be no deadlines; applications may be submitted any time after the Investment Fund has been established by the DDC. Assistance with the application may be requested. If there is a general interest, ASP-ED will organize an application informational workshop. Details of the application process follow below.

   a. A short letter signed by the chief elected official and economic development official from each local government participating in the project. The letter should state the amount of funds requested, provide any special information that was not included in the application, and indicate if any information about the project, such as the name of the business, should be kept confidential.

   b. Applications will be submitted online. The Project Review Committee will schedule a conference call with the Applicant to ask or answer questions and give the Applicant an opportunity to add context to their project.

   c. Applications may be rejected if they do not meet basic minimum requirements. In this case, the Applicant will be notified by letter and given an opportunity to rebut the decision.

   d. The Project Review Committee may negotiate with Applicants regarding the amount of funds requested and the timing of disbursement(s). The Committee will notify Applicants within 30 days as to whether their request for funds has been approved.
e. DDC will send a letter of award to the grantee with a time table for disbursing funds. The time table for the transmission of Investment Funds to the project must be provided by the applicant. The letter will also include an agreement that commits the applicant to returning 25% of the funds within three years. ASP-ED requests that the investment funds be returned within three years; however, this may not be possible for all communities. Repayment of the funds may be negotiated with the Committee in the same way that the timing and disbursing of the funds was negotiated.

f. The grantee will sign and return the agreement after completing whatever legal processes that may be required by the local government.

g. Finally, each recipient will provide an evaluation report to DDC twelve months after the project has been completed. DDC will provide a template for completing the report. Failure to complete the evaluation report will make the applicant ineligible for future funding until this obligation has been met.

3) Project Review Committee reviews applications for Investment Funds and selects which projects will be funded. The Committee is facilitated by the DDC which will advise the Committee regarding funds available. The DDC will also provide financial reports and project evaluation reports (completed by Applicants).

a. Greene, Miami, and Montgomery Counties are equally represented on the Project Review Committee. The members shall be appointed as each county determines. Members appointed to the Committee must be knowledgeable and experienced in economic development, workforce development, and business. Members from each county shall be comprised of—
   —one individual representing the private sector; and
   —two individuals (from different jurisdictions) representing the public sector with economic development and workforce expertise.

b. Committee members serve two years and will be selected in November and begin terms in January. Counties will stagger terms to achieve continuity.

c. The DDC will chair the Committee and convene meetings; however the DDC does not vote or select projects. DDC may assist the Committee by screening Applicants to determine if basic requirements have been met.

d. All selections are made by a majority vote of those participating in the project review.

4) Review and Selection Process

a. ASP-ED Investment Fund project applications will be submitted in care of the Dayton Development Coalition.

b. The DDC will electronically transmit project applications to Project Review Committee members after determining—
—the Applicant has met basic requirements such as the application contains all parts of the application, the information provided is complete, and jobs created or retained pay at least 75% of the median area wage;
— the Applicant’s numbers and other data appear to be correct;
— the Applicant’s economic impact using IMPLAN 3.0, DDC will assist communities with IMPLAN analysis; and
— a project score using the criteria detailed below.

c. Committee members will use evaluation sheet to review each application (see Attachment 2). The evaluation sheet breaks down the regional priorities through a point system. Different items are weighted to ensure all communities have a fair opportunity for grant funding.
d. Review Committee members may conduct site visits if necessary.
e. Review Committee meets face-to-face, by conference call, or by any other agreed upon method to make the final project funding decision.
f. If any Committee member fails to comment on a project, it will be assumed that the member agrees to support the project.

5) Investment Fund and Disbursement Details
a. It is not required that ASP-ED selects projects and disburses all available investment funds each year. If no quality projects exist, then the investment funds will be carried over to the next funding year.
b. Failure to meet the loan requirements listed in funding contracts may result in becoming ineligible for further funding.
c. Once the funding contract has been signed, the project must begin within six months. Should the project be delayed the Applicant must notify the DDC and request that the Project Review Committee approve an extension for a specified amount of time.
d. Applicants will provide a payment schedule with their request for funding. This schedule will list dates throughout the project when funding is needed. ASP funds will be disbursed based upon this schedule.
e. The DDC and Project Review Committee will keep reserve funds for special projects that may be good investments.
f. The DDC will also create a Workforce Development Initiative fund from projects that return investment funds and from grants that from foundations or other funding agencies.

6) Marketing the Program
a. The DDC will host a web site that will include the following:
—ASP-ED Investment Fund and Workforce Development Initiative information;
— Project Review Committee members
— Downloadable Application Forms and other materials
— Status of Projects approved and being reviewed
— Success stories
— Useful economic data
7) Evaluation will be conducted by jurisdictions that received Investment Funds one year after completing their project. Program level evaluation will be completed annually by a neutral party to determine outcomes for the firm, community and region. The neutral party will be selected by the DDC and the Project Review Committee. Based on evidence, the ASP evaluation should also address selection criteria and weighting of the criterion; e.g., did the economic analysis accurately predict the project’s multiplier impact.

8) Project Selection Factors equal 200 points and weights are based on current economic conditions. Weights may be modified in the future to reflect changes in the region’s economy. It is possible to earn more than 200 points due to bonus points and additional jobs. We set 80 jobs as a base line for the percentage of points. Therefore, any project that directly creates or retains more than 80 jobs will receive additional points. The following weights and measures provide more details and clarity.

a. The 200 Project Points used to ensure project review decisions are based on the following factors and weights.
   — Employee wages are weighted at 20% of the total points.
   — Jobs are weighted at 20% of the total points
   — Investment dollars are weighted at 10% of the total points
   — Multiplier Impact is weighted at 30% of the total points
   — Infrastructure Costs is weighted at 15% of the total points
   — Project Feasibility is weighted at 5% of the total points
   — Additional points are given for:
     • Environmental/Quality of Life may receive 10 additional points.
     • Relocation Agreement between jurisdictions in case of a firm relocating within the Dayton Economic Region and/or a Shared Services Agreement may receive 5 additional points.

b. 40 Points-Employee Wages: Employee wages are defined as the average pay of full time employees. Employee wages are compared to the median average area wage. The median wage is now $15.00 per hour with benefits, as established by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (will be adjusted by the most current data). Project points will be calculated using the following scale:
   — 20 points if average pay is at least 75% of the median area wage but less than the median wage;
   — 30 points if the average pay is equal to the median wage in our region but less than 125% of the median wage;
   — 40 points if the average pay is at least 125% of the median wage; and
   — 0 points for wages if jobs do not pay at least 75% of the median area wage.
c. **40+ Points-Jobs**: All jobs created and retained receive 0.5 points.

d. **20 Points Business Investment**: The amount of investment a company makes in a project is recognized as an economic asset to the region. The following weights reflect the economic impact from different forms of business investment.

- 1.2 times the points for investment in renovation or redevelopment of current space.
- 1.0 times the points for investment in new machinery.
- 0.8 times the points for investment in development of greenfield.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Renovation/Addition (1.2 x 10 = 12)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above $5,000,000</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$4,000,000 to $5,000,000</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000,000 to $3,999,999</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,000,000 to $2,999,999</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000,000 to $1,999,999</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$900,000 to $999,999</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$800,000 to $899,999</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$650,000 to $799,999</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$400,000 to $649,999</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250,000 to $399,999</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $249,999</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $100,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment Investment (1.0 X 10 = 10)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above $2,000,000</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,750,000 to $2,000,000</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,500,000 to $1,749,999</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,250,000 to $1,499,999</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000,000 to $1,249,999</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$750,000 to $999,999</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000 to $749,999</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$250,000 to $499,999</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $249,999</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $100,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Building Construction (0.8 x 10 = 8)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above $10 million</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$7,500,000 to $10,000,000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$5,000,000 to $7,499,999</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,500,000 to $4,999,999</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000,000 to $2,499,999</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$750,000 to $999,999</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500,000 to $749,999</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than $500,000</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
e. **60 Points-Regional Economic Impact:** Economic impact is measured by the multiplier effect from wages, investment and business operations. IMPLAN 3.0 calculates the direct, indirect, and induced multiplier in dollars for the region defined as Greene, Miami and Montgomery Counties. Other counties may be added in the future. Simulated analyses have been prepared for area projects and can be reviewed in Attachment 3. IMPLAN provided economic data for each County. In the future, we can tune the analysis more finely by correcting the data to account for economic information we may have, for example add concrete firms, for each county.

f. **30 Points Infrastructure Cost:** This factor measures the expected cost, if any, to the infrastructure. Specific Factors include:
   - water, sewer and storm sewer
   - roadways
   - traffic controls
   - gas and electric utilities
   - street lighting
   - fiber optics
   - Other

Project Points are based upon the amount of funding needed for infrastructure. Higher infrastructure needs result in fewer points. Four points are deducted for every $250,000 needed to prepare the infrastructure for the project.
   - 30 Points if infrastructure costs are less than $250,000
   - 26 Points if infrastructure costs are greater than $250,000 but less than $500,000
   - 22 points if infrastructure costs are greater than $500,000 but less than $750,000
   - 18 points if infrastructure costs are greater than $750,000 but less than $1,000,000
   - 14 points if infrastructure costs are greater than $1,000,000 but less than $1,250,000
   - 10 points if infrastructure costs are greater than $1,250,000 but less than $1,500,000
   - 6 points if infrastructure costs are greater than $1,500,000 but less than $1,750,000
   - 2 points if infrastructure costs are greater than $1,750,000 but less than $2,000,000
   - 0 points if infrastructure costs are greater than $2,000,000

g. **10 Discretionary Points:** These are discretionary points available to the Project Review Committee and are awarded base on whether the project will be developed and whether the timeline and other details of the project are realistic.
h. 15 Bonus Points for Special Features: This factor addresses development externalities that may increase or lower pollution and increase local government collaboration. Specific factors include, but are not limited to:

—up to 10 points for 1) land use coordination, such as MVRPC’s “appropriate” ranking under the Land Suitability Assessment, reuse of brown fields, make use of shovel ready sites; 2) minimize pollution such as protect well fields, LEED Certified Building, construct a Ground Water Recovery System, utilize energy efficient technologies, minimize waste production.

—5 points for business relocation agreements between jurisdictions. This factor awards 5 additional bonus points to those jurisdictions that enter into a relocation agreement when a business relocates from one jurisdiction to another within the Dayton Economic Region and/or a shared service agreement. The agreement needs to be in place when the Project Review Committee is reviewing the Application.

9) ASP-ED Agreement to Return 25% of the Investment Fund Award ASP seeks to fill gaps in the region’s workforce development system. Therefore, recipients of ASP-ED funding agree to pay back 25% of the award. Workforce Development Initiative funds will be used to fill gaps in the region’s workforce supply and/or to bolster the ED program, whichever need is greater.

   a. The 25% refund (hereafter referred to as the Fee) to ASP shall be paid in full within 3 years. The three year period will begin on the date of Certification of Occupancy.

   b. Terms for paying the Fee will be declared in the Application but may be renegotiated when the application is under review. The Applicant may also seek to renegotiate the payment of Fee at some later date if financial conditions warrant the modification to the Agreement.

   c. Payments will be due on December 1.

   d. If workforce development gaps are filled by other programs in the future, then the Fees will be used by the ASP-ED program.
Economic Development Investment Fund Program Application Form

Applicant Contact Information:

Applicant Name: _________________________________   Position: ____________________

Address: ___________________________________ City: ________________ Zip: _________

Phone: __________________  Fax: _________________ E-mail: _______________________

Name of chief elected/executive officer: ____________________________________________

Current Member: Yes or No    Paid prior Investment Fund fees: Yes or No

Meets Basic Requirements (Basic requirements are listed below): Yes or No

*If project does not meet the basic requirements, it is ineligible for ASP-ED funding.

- Application contains all sections required.
- Information provided is complete.

Basic Project Information:

Type of Project:

__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________

Proposed Project Location (If this is a “non-site specific” project, give the general location or impact area. If project has a specific site, please attach a site and vicinity map and aerial photos of the site.)

__________________________________________________________
Project size/scope (In terms of linear feet, acres, or other measures as appropriate.)

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________

Total project budget: ___________________

Amount requested from ASP-ED: _____________________

*Note: The Review and Selection Committee reserves the right to negotiate the amount of funding provided for projects based upon funding availability and demand.

Letter of Support

Please attach a letter of support indicating the amount of ASP-ED funds requested and any special information that is not included in the application, such as the name of a business that needs to be kept confidential. This letter must be submitted by the chief elected official and economic development official.

Project Summary

Please include a brief project description, justification on how the project will benefit your jurisdiction and help transform the Dayton Economic Region, and why ASP funds are crucial for this project's success. (Maximum of 750 Words)

Provide a brief statement describing how this project supports industry strategies of the region (including the DDC’s targeted sectors). (Maximum of 200 Words)
Economic Impact

A. New jobs vs. retained jobs

Please indicate the number of jobs created as a direct result of this project and the average pay of those jobs. (Attach a letter from the firm indicating the anticipated timetable for the job creation.)

Number of jobs created: ____________
Average pay for the created jobs: _______________

*Note: The base minimum average pay is to be calculated with the following formula.
Employees that work 35 or more hours a week are considered full time.

\[
\text{Total Payroll of Firm} \quad \frac{\text{Total Payroll of Firm}}{\text{Number of full time employees}} = \text{Average Pay}
\]

Please indicate the number of jobs retained as a direct result of this project and the average pay of those jobs. Use the above formula to calculate the average pay. Attach a letter from the business that will retain these jobs.

Number of jobs retained: ____________ Percentage of jobs retained: ________

Average pay for the retained jobs: _______________

B. Investment Dollars

Please indicate how additional investment dollars for this project will be used and attach a brief description.

______ Purchase of new machinery ______ New building/construction on greenfield

______ Renovation of current structure or site redevelopment

Please indicate the amount of additional investment dollars for this project.

_____________________________________________________________

C. Infrastructure Cost

Indicate the types of infrastructure available for the proposed project. Select all that apply.

____ Two or three lane road ____ Four lane road ___ Interstate highway access

____ Storm Sewer _____ Sanitary Sewer ____ Water System _____ Gas Line

____ Electric Service
If additional infrastructure is needed, please provide a brief explanation indicating why the additional infrastructure is needed, how costs will be covered, and how it will be implemented.

If infrastructure costs are included in ASP funding, indicate how much of the amount requested will be used for infrastructure. _______________________

D. Business Relocation and/or Shared Service Agreement (Optional Bonus Points)

____ Check here if the proposed projects results in inter-jurisdictional business relocation.

If above line is check, answer the following:

____ Check here if a relocation agreement has been established between local governments.

____ Check here if there is a shared service agreement present among two or more local jurisdictions for this project.

E. Environment and Quality of Life (Optional Bonus Points)

Describe how this project addresses environmental and quality life concerns (Shovel ready sites vs. greenfields, pollution potential, air pollution, waste pollution, and carbon footprint). Please give specific examples.

Implementation Schedule

Attach a project implementation schedule listing major tasks to be completed and a timeframe for completion. (Three categories: Task, Start Date, End Date)

Jurisdictional Funding

__________________  Total amount of cash funding supplied by jurisdiction for this project

__________________  Total amount of funding provided prior to application submission

In-Kind contributions:
External Funding

Please list any additional funding sources and amount provided other than ASP and the jurisdiction. Please include letters of award notification from each source. If funding has not been awarded, please detail progress made toward obtaining the funding.

Project Budget

Attach project budget that includes all major expenditures. Indicate which expenditures ASP funding will be used.

Funding Disbursement

Attach a schedule of a timeline for disbursement payments to the jurisdiction for project completion. ASP funding will be disbursed based upon this schedule.
Applicant Information
Applicant Name: ___________________ Jurisdiction: ___________________

Minimum Eligibility Requirements
Current Membership Agreement: _____  Paid prior Investment Fund fees: _____
Meets Basic Requirements (Basic requirements are listed below): ______
  • Application contains all sections required.
  • Information provided is complete.
If both are not checked, then applicant is ineligible for ASP funding.

Project Assessment
**Minimum Total Points:** 200 points
Employment wages are weighted at 20% of the total points. (40 points)
Jobs are weighted at 20% of the total points. (40 points +)
Multiplier Impact is weighted at 30% of the total points. (60 points)
Investment dollars are weighted at 10% of the total points. (20 points)
Infrastructure Costs are weighted at 15% of the total points. (30 points)
Discretionary points are weighted at 5% of the total points. (10 points)

Additional Project Assessment Criteria
Environment/Quality of Life can earn up to 10 additional bonus points to the total.
Relocation and/or Shared Service Agreements earn an additional 5 bonus points to the total.

Discretionary Points (10 points)
____ Project description clearly states justification of ASP funding usage and benefits for that
  jurisdiction. (3 points total)
____ Documentation is provided detailing how project supports industry strategies of the region.
  (3 points total)
____ Detailed project tasks are identified with start and end dates. (2 points total)
____ Project costs are reasonable and well documented within the budget. (2 points total)

________ Total Points

Employment Wages (40 points)
Employment wages are calculated based upon the average pay for jobs created/retained. Employment wages are divided into two categories: jobs created and jobs retained.

Wages for New Jobs:
Use the following formula to calculate point values for wages of jobs created.
- If the average pay is at least $12.25 and below $15.00 = 20 points
- If the average pay is at least $15.00 (median wage in our region) and below $20.41 = 30 points
- If the average pay is at least $20.41 = 40 points

_____ Total points for Wages of Jobs Created

Wages for Retained Jobs Only:
- If the average pay is at least $12.25 and below $15.00 = 20 points
- If the average pay is at least $15.00 and below $20.41 = 30 points
- If the average pay is at least $20.41 = 40 points

_____ Total points for Wages of Jobs Retained

Wages for New and Retained Jobs

- (Jobs Created) If the average pay is at least $12.25 and below $15.00: 10
- (Jobs Created) If the average pay is at least $15.00 (median wage in our region) and below $20.41: 15
- (Jobs Created) If the average pay is at least $20.41: 20
- (Jobs Retained) If the average pay is at least $12.25 and below $15.00: 10
- (Jobs Retained) If the average pay is at least $15.00 (median wage in our region) and below $20.41: 15
- (Jobs Retained) If the average pay is at least $20.41: 20

_____ Total points for Wages of Jobs Retained AND Created
*Note: Projects 0 points if they pay less than 75% of the area’s median wage.

Jobs (Minimum of 40 points)
Points for Jobs Created:

Locate the number of jobs created for the project. Each job created receives .50 points. The base number of jobs that will earn the full 40 points is 80 jobs. If the number of jobs is above 80, continue to give .50 for every job created.

_____ Number of Jobs Created X .50 = total jobs created points
Points for Retained Jobs:

Locate the number of jobs retained for the project. Each retained job earns .50 points per retained job.

\[
\text{Number of Jobs Retained} \times .50 = \text{total jobs retained points}
\]

If a project creates AND retains jobs, follow both of the above formulas. Next, add the two totals together to calculate the total points awarded for jobs.

\[
\text{Total points for jobs}
\]

Multiplier Impact (60 Points)
\[
\left(\frac{\text{total output}-\text{direct output}}{\text{direct output}} + \frac{\text{total employment} - \text{direct employment}}{\text{direct employment}}\right)/2 \times 60
\]

\[
\text{Total Points}
\]

Investment Dollars (20 Points)

\[
\text{Purchasing new machinery} \quad \text{Weighted 1.0 point} \times 20 = 10 \text{ points}
\]

- Above $2,000,000 \quad 10 \text{ points}
- $1,750,000 to $2,000,000 \quad 9 \text{ points}
- $1,500,000 to $1,749,999 \quad 8 \text{ points}
- $1,250,000 to $1,499,999 \quad 7 \text{ points}
- $1,000,000 to $1,249,999 \quad 6 \text{ points}
- $750,000 to $999,999 \quad 5 \text{ points}
- $500,000 to $749,999 \quad 4 \text{ points}
- $250,000 to $499,999 \quad 3 \text{ points}
- $100,000 to $249,999 \quad 2 \text{ points}
- Less than $100,000 \quad 1 \text{ points}

\[
\text{New building/construction on greenfield} \quad \text{Weighted .80} \times 10 = 8 \text{ points}
\]

- Above $10 million \quad 8 \text{ points}
- $7,500,000 to $10,000,000 \quad 7 \text{ points}
- $5,000,000 to $7,499,999 \quad 6 \text{ points}
- $2,500,000 to $4,999,999 \quad 5 \text{ points}
- $1,000,000 to $2,499,999 \quad 4 \text{ points}
- $750,000 to $999,999 \quad 3 \text{ points}
- $500,000 to $749,999 \quad 2 \text{ points}
- Less than $500,000 \quad 1 \text{ points}
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Renovation/redevelopment to a current structure/space (Weighted 1.2 X 10=12 points)

- Above $5,000,000: 12 points
- $4,000,000 to $5,000,000: 11 points
- $3,000,000 to $3,999,999: 10 points
- $2,000,000 to $2,999,999: 9 points
- $1,000,000 to $1,999,999: 8 points
- $900,000 to $999,999: 7 points
- $800,000 to $899,999: 6 points
- $650,000 to $799,999: 5 points
- $400,000 to $649,999: 4 points
- $250,000 to $399,999: 3 points
- $100,000 to $249,999: 2 points
- Less than $100,000: 1 point

Total Points

Infrastructure Costs (15 points)

Locate the amount of funding spent on infrastructure costs. Use the chart below to award points to the project. If the total amount of money spent on infrastructure is:

- Less than $250,000: 15 points
- $250,000-$500,000: 13 points
- $500,001-$750,000: 11 points
- $750,001-$1,000,000: 9 points
- $1,000,001-$1,250,000: 7 points
- $1,250,001-$1,500,000: 5 points
- $1,500,001-$1,750,000: 3 points
- $1,750,001-$2,000,000: 1 point
- Above $2,000,000: 0 points

Total Points

Additional Project Assessment Bonus Criteria

Environment/Quality of Life

10 Bonus Points for lower pollution potential (Examples: Brownfield vs. Greenfield use, Construction of a Certified LEED Building, Ground water recovery system, geothermal/heat pump set up, utilization of natural lighting in buildings, water-reducing plumbing, basic office sustainability practices)

Interlocal Agreements

5 Bonus Points for relocation agreement for jobs lost during business relocation and/or shared services agreement for services shared for this project among more than two jurisdiction
Add total point value awarded for each category below.

_______ Discretionary Points

_______ Points for Employee Wages

_______ Points for Jobs

_______ Points for Multiplier Impact

_______ Points for Investment Dollars

_______ Points for Infrastructure Costs

_______ Bonus Points for Environment/Quality of Life

_______ Bonus Points for Relocation Agreement

_______ Bonus Points for Shared Services Agreement

__________ Total Points
Section 3: ASP Workforce Development Initiative

ASP provides the framework for implementing an aligned economic and workforce development agenda. The Workforce Development Initiative focuses on two workforce development areas that fill existing gaps in the Dayton region and each are funded through the 25% of money paid back by the ASP jurisdiction that has received funding through the ASP-ED Program.

The first workforce development focus is bridging immediate gaps in labor supply that can be addressed with short-term training solutions that provide industry recognized certifications/credentials. Ideally, these training programs would suit the emerging industries in the region that are commonly ineligible for public workforce investment funds. These emerging industries and examples of gaps are identified in the chart below. The region has recently made investments in some of these areas, in others the region has not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>Advanced Manufacturing</th>
<th>Human Sciences/ Healthcare</th>
<th>Logistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short Term</td>
<td>• ATIC</td>
<td>• High Precision Machining</td>
<td>• Healthcare – LPN to RN</td>
<td>• Acquisitions, Contracting &amp; Logistic (DAU certification)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6 mo – 1 yr)</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintenance &amp; Repair Workers (SkillsTrac)</td>
<td>• Clinical Laboratory Science</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Composites</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The intent of making these types of targeted workforce development investments is to:

- Invest in talent development to enhance business development and attraction.
- Coordinate and connect education and training investments to fill training gaps identified by single businesses or groups of employers.
- Maximize education and training investments toward occupations that generate high industry multipliers, and relatively high earnings that workers can reinvest in communities.
Project-selection factors equal 200 points and is based on similar measures as the selection of ED projects. Project review decisions are based on the following factors and weights.

1. Occupational wages are weighted at 30% of the total points.
2. Occupations to be targeted, that support an industry with verified occupational demand, are weighted at 30% of the total points.
3. Filling Workforce Gaps Verification is weighted at 5% of the total points.
4. Investments made by employers, business associations, and education/training institutions are weighted at 15% of the total points.
5. Resource costs, foregone due to the use of existing training facilities and equipment, are weighted at 15% of the total points.
6. Discretionary points are weighted at 5% of the total points.

Explanation of Project Selection Factors

1. Occupational Wages (60 points): Occupational wages are calculated based upon the average pay for the occupation(s) being targeted by the training, based on their full or part-time nature.
   
   —30 points if average pay is at least 75% of the median area wage but less than the median wage;
   —45 points if the average pay is equal to the median wage in our region but less than 125% of the median wage;
   —60 points if the average pay is at least 125% of the median wage; and
   —0 points for wages if jobs do not pay at least 75% of the median area wage.

2. Targeted Occupations (60 points): Occupations support an industry with verified occupational demand. Industry demand can be verified preferably using the region’s Workforce Planning System (WPS) or another secondary source may be used such as EMSI. Additional validation by employers in the area may be submitted. This validation information should come on the employer’s or business association’s letterhead.

3. Investments (30 points): The amount of investment that employers, business associations, and/or education and training institutions make for the training program will be recognized as an asset. The following weights apply.
   a. 1.2 times the points for investment in additional certifications
   b. 1.0 times the points for investment in paid training time for employees

Additional Certifications (1.2 x 15 = 18)
Paid Training Time for Employees (1.0 X 15 = 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All training time paid</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99%-85% of training time paid</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84%-70% of training time paid</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69%-55% of training time paid</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54%-40% of training time paid</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39%-25% of training time paid</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25% of training time paid</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Resource Costs (40 points): Resource costs, foregone due to the use of existing training facilities and equipment, are weighted at 15% of the total points (15% of 200 points is 40 points). Project points are based upon the amount of funding needed for resources to implement the training. Higher resource needs result in fewer points. Five points are deducted for every $5,000 needed resources for the training.

   a. 40 Points if resource costs are less than $10,000
   b. 30 points if resource costs are greater than $10,000 but less than $15,000
   c. 20 points if resource costs are greater than $15,000 but less than $20,000
   d. 10 points if resource costs are greater than $20,000 but less than $25,000
   e. 0 points if resource costs are greater than $25,000

5. Discretionary points are weighted at 5% of the total points (10 points). Discretionary points are available to the Project Review Committee and are awarded based on the timeline and other details of the project.

6. Filling Workforce Gaps Verification is weighted at 5% of the total points (10 points). Points are based upon the applicant submitting a letter of verification from the County’s Job and Family Services Department that the training is a gap in workforce development.

The second focus is on bridging immediate gaps in labor supply that can be addressed with internships. The target audiences include high school students, undergraduate students, graduate students, and non-traditional participants, such as dislocated or incumbent workers who seek to improve career opportunities. The internship and co-op experience for each student will be a minimum of one term (quarter or semester) and up to one year of employment.
This program will provide internships and co-operative education experiences across the educational pipeline—from high school students, to incumbent and dislocated worker technicians, to doctorate-level researchers and scientists.

Project selection factors equal 200 points and are based on 5 of the 6 measures that will inform selection of ED projects

**Project Selection Factors**

1. Occupational Wages (60 points): Occupational wages are calculated based upon the average pay for the occupation(s) being targeted by the training, based on their full or part-time nature.
   - 30 points if average pay is at least 75% of the median area wage but less than the median wage;
   - 45 points if the average pay is equal to the median wage in our region but less than 125% of the median wage;
   - 60 points if the average pay is at least 125% of the median wage; and
   - 0 points for wages if jobs do not pay at least 75% of the median area wage.

2. Occupations targeted by the internship program support an industry with verified occupational demand. This is weighted at 20% of the total points.
3. Investments made by employers and/or business associations are weighted at 20% of the total points.
   - 1.2 times the points for investing in the intern at $4500 or more per semester.
   - 1.0 times the points for investing in the intern at $4000-4499 per semester.
   - .8 times the points for investing in the intern at less than $4,000 per semester.

4. Resources are weighted at 20% of the total points. This section addresses the support structure that an intermediary, such as the DACC or SOCHE, has in place to support the internship program including career and skills assessments used to define a good match, negotiations with the employers to ensure a meaningful internship experience, supervision of the intern, and tracking intern and employer satisfaction with the experience.

5. Discretionary points are weighted at 10% of the total points (20 points).
   Discretionary points are available to the Project Review Committee and are awarded based on the timeline, track record of the intermediary, and other details of the project.

Workforce Development Initiative Guidelines

10) Eligible Applicants for funding are any general purpose government in Greene, Miami, and Montgomery Counties which has passed a resolution that approves the Advantage Sharing Program (ASP). Approving ASP means that the local government accepts the provisions of the Economic Development Investment Fund and the Workforce Development Initiative.

Note: This proposal does not limit the Dayton Region to Greene, Miami and Montgomery Counties. As the Administrator of ASP, the Dayton Development Coalition (DDC) will invite other local governments in surrounding counties to join ASP to further strengthen our regional economy. Please see the graphic on the title page for the counties that comprise the Dayton Economic Region.

11) Application Process is open to one or more eligible local governments in the Dayton Economic Region. Please see Attachment 3 and 5 for a draft copy of the ASP-WF Application. All application materials will be available through the DDC website. There will be no deadlines; applications may be submitted any time after the Workforce Initiative has been established by the DDC. Assistance with the application may be requested. If there is a general interest, ASP-WF will organize an application informational workshop. Details of the application process follow below.
   h. A short letter signed by the chief elected official each local government and CEO of the partnering business participating in the project. The letter should state the amount of funds requested and provide any special information that was not included in the application.
   i. Applications will be submitted online. The Project Review Committee will schedule a conference call with the Applicant to ask or answer
questions and give the Applicant an opportunity to add context to their request for training.

j. Applications may be rejected if they do not meet basic minimum requirements. In this case, the Applicant will be notified by letter and given an opportunity to rebut the decision.

k. The Project Review Committee may negotiate with Applicants regarding the amount of funds requested and the timing of disbursement(s). The Committee will notify Applicants within 30 days as to whether their request for funds has been approved.

l. DDC will send a letter of award to the grantee with a time table for disbursing funds. The time table for the transmission of Workforce Initiative Funds to the project must be provided by the applicant.

m. The grantee will sign and return the agreement after completing whatever legal processes that may be required by the local government.

n. Finally, each recipient will provide an evaluation report to DDC no later than twelve months after the training/internship has been completed. DDC will provide a template for completing the report. Failure to complete the evaluation report will make the applicant ineligible for future funding until this obligation has been met.

e. The Project Review Committee reviews applications for the Workforce Initiative Funds and selects which projects will be funded. The Committee is the same committee that reviews the ASP-ED funds and makes decisions in the same manner.

   a. Greene, Miami, and Montgomery Counties are equally represented on the Project Review Committee. The members shall be appointed as each county determines. Members appointed to the Committee must be knowledgeable and experienced in economic development, workforce development, and business. Members from each county shall be comprised of—
      —one individual representing the private sector; and
      —two individuals (from different jurisdictions) representing the public sector with economic development and workforce expertise.

f. Committee members serve two years and will be selected in November and begin terms in January. Counties will stagger terms to achieve continuity.

g. The DDC will chair the Committee and convene meetings; however the DDC does not vote or select projects. DDC may assist the Committee by screening Applicants to determine if basic requirements have been met.

h. All selections are made by a majority vote of those participating in the project review.

12) Review and Selection Process

   a. ASP-WF Initiative Fund project applications will be submitted in care of the Dayton Development Coalition.
b. The DDC will electronically transmit project applications to Project Review Committee members after determining—
   —the Applicant has met basic requirements such as the application contains all parts of the application; the information provided is complete,
   —the Applicant’s numbers and other data appear to be correct; and
   —a project score using the criteria detailed below.

c. Committee members will use an evaluation sheet to review each application (see Attachment 4 & 6). The evaluation sheet breaks down the regional priorities through a point system. Different items are weighted to ensure all communities have a fair opportunity for grant funding.

d. Review Committee members may conduct site visits if necessary.

e. Review Committee meets face-to-face, by conference call, or by any other agreed upon method to make the final project funding decision.

f. If any Committee member fails to comment on a project, it will be assumed that the member agrees to support the project.

13) Workforce Initiative Fund and Disbursement Details
   a. Failure to meet the requirements listed in funding contracts may result in becoming ineligible for further funding.
   b. Once the funding contract has been signed, the training/internship program must begin within six months. Should it be delayed, the Applicant must notify the DDC and request that the Project Review Committee approve an extension for a specified amount of time.
   c. Applicants will provide a payment schedule with their request for funding. This schedule will list dates throughout the project when funding is needed. ASP funds will be disbursed based upon this schedule.
   d. The DDC and Project Review Committee will keep reserve funds for special projects that may be good investments.
   e. Short Term Training Disbursement Details
      i. ASP funding will be provided to the applying local jurisdiction, who will be obligated to disburse funding to the appropriate business partner.
   f. Internship Program Disbursement Details
      i. ASP Funding will be released to an Internship Intermediary, such as SOCHE, for reimbursement to the applicant once proof of payment has been established.
      ii. ASP will not provide funding to an applicant that has already received funding for 5 interns in one year to ensure that many businesses receive the benefits of the Internship Program.

14) Evaluation will be conducted by jurisdictions that received Workforce Initiative Funds one year after completing their training/internship program.
   a. Program level evaluation will be completed annually by a neutral party to determine outcomes for the firm, community and region. The neutral party will be selected by the DDC and the Project Review Committee. Based on
evidence, the ASP evaluation should also address selection criteria and weighting of the criterion.
b. Internship Program evaluation should include data on the number of interns that are hired on in full time positions following their internship experience. Additionally, copies of their written job descriptions with a summary of tasks completed will need to be submitted.
Applicant Name: ____________________________   Position: ____________________
Address: _________________________ City: _________________ Zip: ___________
Phone: __________________  Fax: _______________ E-mail: ___________________

Name of chief elected/executive officer:
____________________________________________________________________

Current Member: Yes or No   Paid prior Investment Fund fees: Yes or No

Meets Basic Requirements (Basic requirements are listed below): Yes or No

*If project does not meet the basic requirements, it is ineligible for ASP-WF funding.
  
  - Application contains all sections required.
  - Information provided is complete.

Basic Information:

Type of Training Program: Short Term Training

Proposed Project Business Partner:
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

Total Training Budget: ________________

Amount requested from ASP-WF: ________________

*Note: The Review Committee reserves the right to negotiate the amount of funding provided for projects based upon funding availability and demand.
Letter of Support

Please attach a letter of support indicating the amount of ASP-WF funds requested and any special information that is not included in the application. This letter must be submitted by the chief elected official and partnering business CEO.

Training Program Justification

Please provide a description on how the training will benefit your jurisdiction, how it will help transform the Dayton Economic Region, and why ASP funds are crucial for the training’s success. (Maximum of 750 Words)

Training Program Description

Please include a brief description of the training program that identifies areas of training offered, types of employees participating in the training, and the facilitators providing the training. (Maximum of 300 Words)

Short Term Training

F. Occupational Wages

Please indicate the average pay of employees participating in the training program.

Average pay of Employees: ________________

*Note: The base minimum average pay is to be calculated with the following formula. Employees that work 35 or more hours a week are considered full time.

\[
\text{Total Payroll of Firm} \div \text{Number of full time employees} = \text{Average Pay}
\]
G. Targeted Occupations

Please provide verification of the industry demand for the occupations that are in need of this short term training. Verification can be obtained from the Workforce Planning System or EMSI. Additional verification can be obtained by the employer in your area in the form of letter signed by the CEO.

H. Investment Dollars

Please indicate how additional investment dollars will be used and attach a brief description.

_____ Training is Paid Time for Employees  _____ Investment in Additional Certifications

Please indicate the amount of additional investment dollars for this training.

_____________________________________________________________

I. Resource Costs

Indicate the types of infrastructure available for the proposed project. Select all that apply.

_____ Training facility  _____ Training Equipment  _____ Administration Costs

_____ Materials  _____ Facilitators

If additional resources are needed, please provide a brief explanation indicating why additional resources are needed, how costs will be covered, and how it will be implemented.

If resource costs are included in ASP funding, indicate how much of the amount requested will be used for infrastructure.  _______________________

Implementation Schedule

Attach the training program’s implementation schedule listing major tasks to be completed and a timeframe for completion. (Three categories: Task, Start Date, End Date)

Additional Funding

_________________________ Total amount of cash funding supplied by jurisdiction for this training
In-Kind contributions:

External Funding

Please list any additional funding sources and amount provided other than ASP and the jurisdiction. Please include letters of award notification from each source. If funding has not been awarded, please detail progress made toward obtaining the funding. If the additional funding is in-kind, please list the type of in-kind assistance and a letter from each source.

Funding Verification from Job and Family Services

Please submit a letter of verification from your county’s Job and Family Services department to ensure this training fills an existing gap in workforce development training.

Project Budget

Attach training budget that includes all major expenditures. Indicate which expenditures ASP funding will be used.

Funding Disbursement

Attach a schedule of a timeline for disbursement payments to the jurisdiction for training completion. ASP funding will be disbursed based upon this schedule.
Workforce Development Initiative Evaluation: Short Term Training

Applicant Information
Applicant Name: _____________________  Jurisdiction: _____________________

Minimum Eligibility Requirements
Current Membership Agreement: ______  Paid prior Investment Fund fees: ______
Meets Basic Requirements (Basic requirements are listed below): ______
  • Application contains all sections required.
  • Information provided is complete.
If both are not checked, then applicant is ineligible for ASP funding.

Project Assessment
**Total Points:** 200 points
Occupational wages are weighted at 30% of the total points. (60 points)
Occupations are weighted at 30% of the total points. (60 points)
Investment dollars from employers, business associations, and education/training institutions are weighted at 15% of the total points. (30 points)
Resource Costs are weighted at 15% of the total points. (30 points)
Filling workforce gaps are weighted at 5% of the total points (10 points)
Discretionary points are weighted at 5% of the total points. (10 points)

Filling Workforce Gaps (10 Points)
_____ Letter submission from County Job and Family Services verifying training is a gap in workforce development. (10 Points)
Discretionary Points (10 Points)

_____ Training Program Justification clearly states how ASP funding benefits for that jurisdiction. (3 points total)

_____ Training Program description is provided outlining the types of training and employees. (3 points total)

_____ Detailed training program tasks are identified with start and end dates. (2 points total)

_____ Training costs are reasonable and well documented within the budget. (2 points total)

_________ Total Points

Occupational Wages (60 points)

Occupational wages are calculated based upon the average pay for jobs created/retained.

Use the following formula to calculate point values of occupational wages.

—30 points if average pay is at least 75% of the median area wage but less than the median wage;
—45 points if the average pay is equal to the median wage in our region but less than 125% of the median wage;
—60 points if the average pay is at least 125% of the median wage; and
—0 points for wages if jobs do not pay at least 75% of the median area wage.

_____ Total points for Occupational Wages

Targeted Occupations (60 points)

Points are awarded based upon the applicant’s ability to provide verification of the industry’s demand for requested training.

_____ Verification of Industry Demand for Requested Training

- Workforce Planning System Documentation
- EMSI Documentation
- Signed letter from employer
Investment Dollars (30 Points)

*Investment dollar points are calculated based on the following weights.*

- 1.2 times the points for investment in additional certifications
- 1.0 times the points for investment in paid training time for employees

**Additional Certifications (1.2 x 15 = 18)**

**Paid Training Time for Employees (1.0 X 15= 15)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Time Paid</th>
<th>Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All training time paid</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99%-85% of training time paid</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84%-70% of training time paid</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69%-55% of training time paid</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54%-40% of training time paid</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39%-25% of training time paid</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 25% of training time paid</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

________ Total Points

Resource Costs (40 points)

Resource costs include training facilities, equipment, administration costs, materials, and facilitators. Locate the amount of funding spent on training resources. Use the chart below to award points to the project. If the total amount of money spent on resources is:

- 40 Points if resource costs are less than $10,000
- 30 points if resource costs are greater than $10,000 but less than $15,000
- 20 points if resource costs are greater than $15,000 but less than $20,000
- 10 points if resource costs are greater than $20,000 but less than $25,000
- 0 points if resource costs are greater than $25,000

________ Total Points
Add total point value awarded for each category below.

_______ Filling Workforce Gaps

_______ Discretionary Points

_______ Points for Occupational Wages

_______ Points for Targeted Occupations

_______ Points for Investment Dollars

_______ Points for Resource Costs

__________ Total Points
Applicant Contact Information:

Applicant Name: ______________________________   Position: _________________
Address: ______________________________ City: ____________ Zip: ___________
Phone: _______________  Fax: _____________ E-mail: _______________________

Name of chief elected/executive officer: ______________________________________

Current Member: Yes  or No     Paid prior Investment Fund fees:  Yes or No

Meets Basic Requirements (Basic requirements are listed below):  Yes or No

*If project does not meet the basic requirements, it is ineligible for ASP-WF funding.

- Application contains all sections required.
- Information provided is complete.

Basic Information:

Type of Training Program:  Internship Program

Proposed Business Partner:
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

Please list the Internship Intermediary:  (Attach a letter from the intermediary verifying
the partnership for the internship program.)
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

Total Training Budget: __________________
Amount requested from ASP-WF: __________________

*Note: The Review and Selection Committee reserves the right to negotiate the amount
of funding provided for projects based upon funding availability and demand.
**Letter of Support**

Please attach a letter of support indicating the amount of ASP-WF funds requested, any special information that is not included in the application and verification that interns will not replace full time employees. This letter must be submitted by the chief elected official and partnering business CEO.

**Internship Program Justification**

Please provide a description on how this internship program will benefit your jurisdiction, how it will help transform the Dayton Economic Region, and why ASP funds are crucial for the internship program’s success. (Maximum of 750 Words)

**Training Description**

Please include a brief description of the internship program that identifies how students will be recruited, selected, and placed into internships. Additionally, a description of student expectations should be provided. (i.e. number of hours, assignments, type of work to be completed) (Maximum of 300 Words)

Please indicate the number of students to be recruited for the internship program.

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

Identify the fields that these students will be placed?

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________
Internship Program

A. Occupational Wages

Please indicate the average pay of employees in the organization.

Average pay of Employees: ______________

*Note: The base minimum average pay is to be calculated with the following formula. Employees that work 35 or more hours a week are considered full time.

Total Payroll of Firm
----------------------------------------  =   Average Pay
Number of full time employees

B. Targeted Occupations

Please provide verification of the industry demand for the occupations that are in need of interns. Verification can be obtained from the Workforce Planning System or EMSI. Additional verification can be obtained by the employer in your area in the form of letter signed by the CEO.

C. Investment Dollars

Please indicate how additional investment dollars will be used and attach a brief description.

____ Matched Intern Stipend   _____ Additional Training Opportunities for Intern
____ Work Related Travel Stipend

Please indicate the amount of additional investment dollars for the internship program.

_______________________________________________________________

D. Resource Costs

Indicate the types of support resources available for the intermediary to facilitate the internship program. Select all that apply.

____ Equipment   ____ Administration Costs   ____ Career and Skill Assessments
____ Materials
If additional resources are needed, please provide a brief explanation indicating why additional resources are needed, how costs will be covered, and how it will be implemented.

If resource costs are included in ASP funding, indicate how much of the amount requested will be used for infrastructure.

Implementation Schedule

Attach an internship program implementation schedule listing major tasks to be completed and a timeframe for completion. (Three categories: Task, Start Date, End Date)

Additional Funding

_________________ Total amount of cash funding supplied by jurisdiction for the internship program

In-Kind contributions:

External Funding

Please list any additional funding sources and amount provided other than ASP and the jurisdiction. Please include letters of award notification from each source. If funding has not been awarded, please detail progress made toward obtaining the funding. If the additional funding is in-kind, please list the type of in-kind assistance and a letter from each source.

Project Budget

Attach internship program budget that includes all major expenditures. Indicate which expenditures ASP funding will be used.

Funding Disbursement

Attach a schedule of a timeline for disbursement payments to the jurisdiction for internship program completion. ASP funding will be disbursed based upon this schedule.
Workforce Development Initiative Fund Evaluation: Internship Program

Applicant Information
Applicant Name: ____________________ Jurisdiction: ____________________

Minimum Eligibility Requirements
Current Membership Agreement: _____ Paid prior Investment Fund fees: _____
Meets Basic Requirements (Basic requirements are listed below): ______
  • Application contains all sections required.
  • Information provided is complete.
If both are not checked, then applicant is ineligible for ASP funding.

Project Assessment

Total Points: 200 points

Occupational wages are weighted at 20% of the total points. (60 points)
Targeted Occupations are weighted at 20% of the total points. (60 points)
Investment dollars from employers, business associations, and education/training institutions are weighted at 10% of the total points. (30 points)
Resource Costs are weighted at 15% of the total points. (40 points)
Discretionary points are weighted at 5% of the total points. (10 points)
Discretionary Points (10 points)

_____ Internship Program Justification clearly states how ASP funding benefits that jurisdiction.

(3 points total)

_____ Internship Program description is provided and outlining how students are recruited, selected, and placed at internship sites. (3 points total)

_____ Verification of Internship Intermediary. (2 points total)

_____ Internship Program costs are reasonable and well documented within the budget. (2 points total)

________ Total Points

Occupational Wages (60 points)

Occupational wages are calculated based upon the average pay of current employees.

*Use the following formula to calculate point values of occupational wages.*

—30 points if average pay is at least 75% of the median area wage but less than the median wage;
—45 points if the average pay is equal to the median wage in our region but less than 125% of the median wage;
—60 points if the average pay is at least 125% of the median wage; and
—0 points for wages if jobs do not pay at least 75% of the median area wage.

_____ Total points for Occupational Wages

Targeted Occupations (60 points)

Points are awarded based upon the applicant’s ability to provide verification of the industry’s demand for requested interns.

_____ Verification of Industry Demand for Requested Training
  • Workforce Planning System Documentation
  • EMSI Documentation
  • Signed letter from employer
Investment Dollars (30 Points)

Investment dollar points are calculated based on the following weights.
- 1.2 times the points for investing in the intern at $4500 or more per semester.
- 1.0 times the points for investing in the intern at $4000-4499 per semester.
- .8 times the points for investing in the intern at less than $4,000 per semester.

_______ Total Points

Resource Costs (40 points)

Locate the amount of funding spent on resources for the internship program. Use the chart below to award points to the internship program. If the total amount of money spent on resources is:

40 Points if resource costs are less than $10,000
30 points if resource costs are greater than $10,000 but less than $15,000
20 points if resource costs are greater than $15,000 but less than $20,000
10 points if resource costs are greater than $20,000 but less than $25,000
0 points if resource costs are greater than $25,000

_______ Total Points

Add total point value awarded for each category below.

_______ Discretionary Points
_______ Points for Occupational Wages
_______ Points for Targeted Occupations
_______ Points for Investment Dollars
_______ Points for Resource Costs

_________ Total Points
Section 4: Costs Savings to Local Governments through ASP

The Project Team researched the nation and even internationally for evidence that regional economic development programs reduce costs. Two studies were completed in late 2009 and early 2010 that evaluated the costs and benefits of consolidation and collaboration with special attention given to Ohio (Dustin and Levine, 2010; Dustin Jones, Levine, 2009). In short, the Project Teams research and these studies found that communities claim benefits and cost savings; however, they provide little evidence of the cost savings.

The Project Team also invited Dayton Region economic development professionals to a focus group to discuss whether an ASP type multi-county economic development program would reduce costs to local governments. The participants did not believe ASP would reduce the number of economic development professionals nor would the success of ASP result in a consolidation of economic development departments. The consensus view was that communities need and will want to retain independent economic development departments. Instead, benefits would result from increased integration of development planning and greater understanding among jurisdictions that would lead to more productive programs, policies and projects.

Examples of productivity and benefits that would reduce local budgets include joint contracting, less duplication and unproductive interlocal competition to retain or attract business opportunities and minimizing infrastructure costs and improving site selection processes. In particular, ASP could result in increased capacity to win federal and foundation grants.
Appendix A
ASP Pre-Summit Interviews

Date: ____________________________ Interviewer: ____________________________

Community: ________________________________________________________________

Participants and Titles:


Introduction

1. Confidentiality Statement

I want you to know that what is said today will be held in confidence. What I mean by this is that I will not attach your name to anything words that are said here today, nor will I attach your name to anything you say to me in informal or formal meetings with any other jurisdiction or state officials.

Further, I will closely protect your confidentiality even when reporting information anonymously. This means I will make sure that information provided by you and others cannot be connected to any individual.

I do not mean this meeting to sound so sensitive, but I hope that you speak openly and candidly about the information provided to you.
2. Feasibility Project Introduction

Thirteen area governments and Montgomery County applied for and received an $80,000 grant from the Ohio Department of Development’s “Local Government Services and Regional Collaboration Grant Program. The area governments submitting the grant included Greene, Miami and Montgomery Counties; the cities of Brookville, Dayton, Englewood, Kettering, Miamisburg, Tipp, Trotwood and Union, and the townships of Butler, Harrison and Washington (all in Montgomery County).

Our grant proposal received the maximum amount of funding to complete a feasibility study of multi-county economic development program that would foster business growth and competitiveness through collaboration and workforce development.

The purpose of our meeting is, one, to make sure that you know about the study; two, to answer questions you may have about how the study will be conducted; and three, to get suggestions and your ideas about what principles should guide us in developing a multi-county collaboration to growth business and develop our workforce.
Why we are interviewing:

The deadline for the grant did not give us enough time to reach everyone that should have been contacted. That is why I am here today. We want to make sure every community in our economic region has an opportunity to participate in discussions that will propose a unique program that could positively affect our competitiveness and workforce.

Comments, if any:

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

“Who is leading this project?”

Answer:

#1 State: The State has encouraged local governments since 2004 to become more collaborative. The State views local government collaboration as a key strategy for transforming our region’s economy, creating new jobs, and reducing costs to businesses.

#2 Our region: Our region is already a leader. ODOD has identified ED/GE and Business First as model programs. Because Montgomery County has experience with both programs they took the initial lead.
Answer Continued:

#3 DRN: However, Montgomery County passed the direction of study over to the Dayton Regional Network (DRN) in January. DRN then created a Task Force lead by Paul Barbas (DP&L’s CEO) to provide more direct, hands-on leadership.

#4 WSU: As for Wright State, the grant criteria gave points to projects that utilized state universities. Jack Dustin at Wright State has been involved in several studies like this one over the last 20 years. The study is being conducted by Wright State but they have asked the Fitz’s Center at the University of Dayton to become a partner. and they agreed.

Questions

3. ASP Task Force

Here is a list of members of the Task Force and the study team.

*Do you think your community’s interests are represented? If the answer is NO, how could the Task Force fix this?*
4. Feasibility Project Fact Sheet and Description

We stated that economic transformation, state policies and our experience with collaborative economic development, meaning ED/GE and Business First, makes this project a logical next step. How do you view the three goals?

Responses:

__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________

Goal 1: We state the first outcome of this project, if it is implemented, as creating an economic competitiveness advantage for communities through collaboration. How do you view this outcome?
Goal 2: The second outcome is supporting new economic growth and strengthening the region’s economic clusters through incentives provided by the state or shared services. How do you view this outcome?

Responses:
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Goal 3: The third outcome is to share revenues from funded projects funded to develop the workforce with attention given to retaining our young, highly educated graduates and retrain and educate displaced workers. How do you view this outcome?
5. **ASP Scope of Work**

Here is the Scope of Work we sent to you.

*Is there something we have missed?*

Responses:

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Here is the State’s strategic development plan. *What is your view of the plan?*

Responses:

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

6. Dayton Development Coalition Materials

Here are DDC’s strategies for transforming our economy. *How do you view these strategies?*

Responses:

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________

__________________________________________
Do you believe there are economic regions?

Responses:

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

7. Principles to Guide Economic Development Collaboration and Workforce Development

We plan on hosting a Summit to discuss how we can collaborate on a multi-county level to foster business growth and economic competitiveness; what principles should guide this future collaboration?

Responses:

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

8. Deal Breakers

Is there any one thing that you can identify that would cause you to automatically reject a collaborating to foster business growth and economic competitiveness?

Responses:

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________
Is there any one thing that you can identify that would cause you to automatically reject sharing a portion of earned revenues from a funded project to invest in workforce development?

Responses:

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________________

9. Summit I

Here is a draft agenda for the first Summit. Do you specific recommendations for:

Day of the Week __________________________

Starting Time __________________________

Length of Summit ________________________

Suggested Date _________________________

The content ____________________________

The order of events ______________________

Something Missing_______________________

10. Summit Data / Evidence

Wright State plans to present data about our area economy, dislocated workers, and employer demand for workers.

Responses: _____________________________________________________________
11. Conclusion and Contact Information

Thank you for meeting with me?

*Part of the results of our interviews will be presented at the Summit. The full report can be found on this website: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXX*

*Finally,*

*I want to leave contact information with you.*

Contact information for Jack Dustin
Appendix B

Summary of April 2009 Local Government Interviews

The Center for Urban and Public Affairs (CUPA) at Wright State University and the University of Dayton conducted interviews with local jurisdictions in Greene, Miami, and Montgomery Counties to assess their views of the goals for the preliminary Multi-County Competitive Advantage Sharing Program (ASP). Forty seven interviews were completed with city managers, mayors, township administrators, and trustees in March and April 2009. The purpose of these interviews was to inform jurisdictions about the feasibility study and strategies used to develop ASP. Jurisdictions were asked to name potential task force members and provide opinions on three strategies to be used in the development of ASP. Additionally, jurisdictions were asked to identify key principles and deal breakers that should guide the feasibility study.

A common theme among jurisdictions was the need for the overall program, the economic development piece, and the tax revenue sharing formula to be fair and equal to all types of jurisdictions. Below are highlights from the interviews on ASP.

**Governance of Program:**

A common theme within the governance discussion of the program was keeping politics out. Many jurisdictions felt board members of the program should consist of a “good cross representation of all communities.” This indicated the need for representation from poor, wealthy, small, and large communities. It was also suggested to keep membership to administrators and city managers.

**Economic Development Program**

Most jurisdictions indicated that the task force needs to clearly define what quality economic development projects entail. Many indicated that the ED/GE program has allowed questionable quality projects to be completed and this should not happen in this program. Several jurisdictions mentioned the need to have guidelines for economic development projects and proposals should go through a selection process. Additionally, several indicated holding onto money for multiple years if quality projects are not available. Lastly, many feel that the Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission should be part of this program.

**Regionalism**

The biggest common concern with this regional program is the fear that local governments will lose their identity. Jurisdictions discussed several reasons for this fear. One reason is that different cities have different goals and small communities feel they
will lose their influence. Townships fear they will be absorbed by cities in regionalism. Jurisdictions talked about some of the benefits of collaboration as well. The two main benefits mentioned were the reduction of competition among jurisdictions for business. Additionally, collaborating regionally will bring new jobs and residents to different areas.

**Goal 1: Economic Competitive Advantage through Collaboration**

Many jurisdictions felt collaboration for an economic competitive advantage is a good strategy because the region has a better chance of attracting new businesses together rather than one individual community. Others felt it would reduce competition among jurisdictions for businesses. Jurisdictions also indicated the need to utilize the region’s assets and strengths. There was concern over tax abatements and their impact on businesses coming to the area. Several jurisdictions felt that the private sector needs to be involved in this initiative. Several rural jurisdictions discussed the opportunities available through agriculture and alternative fuel. Also, many felt empty buildings and brownfields should be redeveloped.

**Goal 2: Using DDC Clusters and Regional Assets**

Many jurisdictions agreed that the Dayton Development Coalition’s identified clusters are in line with the region’s assets, but there are some missing pieces. The common theme among many interviews was that the DDC’s clusters should be more flexible and broaden the scope. Many believed that DDC’s focus is on aerospace and Wright Patterson Air Force Base, but this is not the only asset of the region. Some areas of the region are looking for small businesses and others feel agricultural business is another cluster focus. There were several jurisdictions that did not know exactly what the DDC does, but offered advice on what the assets of the region encompassed.

Most jurisdictions agreed that this program needs to use the region’s strengths and market those assets to bring businesses and economic development to “bring local governments together.” A few jurisdictions discussed the issue of not using the “region’s assets correctly and how it is not in the best interest of the public sector.” Some jurisdictions spoke of redeveloping brownfields rather than overturning greenfields.

Some jurisdictions discussed reviving the center city and the impact this has on the region. There is concern over changing the image of the City of Dayton. Others discussed the need to retain young talent in the Dayton area. Several jurisdictions indicated the need to look at what motivates young people to stay in an area. Others suggested focusing on the young people who may not have a college degree, but have life skills, including running a farm. Those jurisdictions suggested program opportunities to keep those young people in the area through farming.

Several key assets in the region were identified during the interviews. Below is a list of most commonly mentioned assets.
• Development near the interstate
• Good water supply in areas
• Education institutions
• Agriculture
• Infrastructure

**Goal 3: Tax Revenue Sharing and Workforce Development**

**Tax Revenue Sharing**

Several local jurisdictions agree with tax based sharing generally speaking. They also believe politics should be kept out of the equation. A challenge is equity among jurisdictions because it is hard for jurisdictions to separate themselves for the best interest of the region. Many jurisdictions were curious about the specific taxes that would be shared. Some pointed out that some jurisdictions do not have an income tax or only have property taxes. Other jurisdictions were curious to know how business relocation among regional governments would be dealt with in this program.

**Workforce Development**

Many local jurisdictions indicated that workforce development training is needed in our region especially in the current economic conditions. Some mentioned the need for training to keep talent in the area; others said the focus of the training needs to be on dislocated workers. One mentioned that the training needs one narrow focus, either on training dislocated workers or keeping talent in the region. Many businesses in the area are lacking a trained workforce.

One concern among jurisdictions is a duplication of services. Specifically, the concern is that training will be beneficial and not destroy current services. Additionally, workforce development should build on existing training. One jurisdiction mentioned specifically that funding should go to the career centers directly to let them train businesses. Another jurisdiction said the problem is not a lack of training, but a need to change the direction of existing training. Current training is for jobs that are no longer in the area.

There was also discussion on how the workforce program would function. Questions on how funding would be distributed, administration of the program, and the amount of funding needed for training were brought up. Another concern was how these trainings will affect all areas in the counties.

**Size of Economic Development Fund**

Suggestions for the size of the economic development fund ranged from $10 million, $20 million, and $50 million.
Appendix C
Regional Economic Competitiveness Meeting
May 13, 2009
Aileron Campus
8:00am-11:00am

8:00am-8:20am: Welcome

Dick Church, Chair, Dayton Regional Network, and Mayor, City of Miamisburg

8:20-8:40 am: A Message from the Dayton Area Business Community

Paul Barbas, CEO, Dayton Power and Light
Bill Lukens, CEO of Stillwater Technology Inc

- ASP Program Model
- ASP Task Force and Subcommittees

8:40am-9:05 am: A Message from the State of Ohio

Mark Barbash, Interim Director, Ohio Department of Development

9:05am-9:30am: A Message from the Dayton Development Coalition

Jim Leftwich, CEO Dayton Development Coalition

9:30am-9:55am: Workforce Development & Dislocated Workers

Jane Dockery, Center for Urban & Public Affairs, Wright State University
Kim Frazier, Dayton Development Coalition

9:55am-10:05 am: Break

10:05am-10:55 am: ASP Program and Process & Interactive Discussion

Jack Dustin, Center for Urban & Public Affairs, Wright State University
Don Vermillion, The Fitz Center, University of Dayton

- Results from ASP Interviews
- ASP Process Model
- Guiding Principles
- Feasibility Study Questions

10:55am-11:00am: Closing Message from Dick Church
## Appendix D

### ASP Meeting 1 Attendance List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rob Anderson</td>
<td>City of Vandalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Applegate</td>
<td>City of Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Barbas</td>
<td>Dayton Power and Light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Barbash</td>
<td>ODOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Benedict</td>
<td>ODOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randall Brooks</td>
<td>Harrison Twp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Brodsky</td>
<td>City of Xenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue Campbell</td>
<td>Concord Twp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Carver</td>
<td>ODOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Chodkowski</td>
<td>City of Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Church</td>
<td>City of Miamiusburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judy Cook</td>
<td>City of Oakwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phil Cox</td>
<td>Monroe Twp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Crusey</td>
<td>City of Tipp City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Cundiff</td>
<td>Village of Yellow Springs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Davis</td>
<td>City of Moraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelley Dickstein</td>
<td>City of Dayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane Dockery</td>
<td>Wright State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Evans</td>
<td>Miami County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debbie Feldman</td>
<td>Montgomery Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Fisher</td>
<td>City of Huber Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph Flanagan</td>
<td>Butler Twp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan Foley</td>
<td>Montgomery County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Frazier</td>
<td>DDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Gebhart</td>
<td>Bethel Twp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Hicks</td>
<td>City of Moraine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gregory Horn</td>
<td>City of Centerville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith Johnson</td>
<td>City of Miamusburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Mark Kingsseed</td>
<td>City of Centerville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norbert Klopsch</td>
<td>City of Oakwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Leftwich</td>
<td>DDC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellie Lewis</td>
<td>Butler Twp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesse Lightle</td>
<td>Washington Twp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Lucking</td>
<td>City of Trotwood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Lukens</td>
<td>Stillwater Technologies, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Martin</td>
<td>Bath Twp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristofer McClintick</td>
<td>Harrison Twp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deborah McDonnell</td>
<td>City of Fairborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim McGarry</td>
<td>Miami County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John O’Brien</td>
<td>Miami County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William O’Brien</td>
<td>Union Twp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Percival</td>
<td>City of Xenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Phipps</td>
<td>City of Cedarville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Pittman</td>
<td>Sugarcreek Twp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licious Plant</td>
<td>Montgomery Co. Job Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Poston</td>
<td>Greene County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Ratcliff</td>
<td>Mayors and Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trisha Reents</td>
<td>City of Huber Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Reid</td>
<td>Greene County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Rowlands</td>
<td>City of Clayton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beth Rubin</td>
<td>Greene Co. DJFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Schlagheck</td>
<td>City of Bellbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Schwieterman</td>
<td>City of Kettering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Sewert</td>
<td>City of Brookville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Shook</td>
<td>Concord Twp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justin Sommer</td>
<td>Miami Co. DJFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Thompson</td>
<td>City of Springboro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Tuss</td>
<td>Montgomery Co</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Vann</td>
<td>City of Beavercreek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Vath</td>
<td>City of Tipp City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Watt</td>
<td>Clay Twp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Widener</td>
<td>Miami County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Wimsatt</td>
<td>DACC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: Advantage Sharing Program Committees

Advantage Sharing Program Steering Committee

- **Paul Barbas**, Dayton Power & Light (Montgomery County)
- **Bill Mercurio**, Retired from Plastics Trim Inc, Economic Development Sub Committee Chair (Greene County)
- **Bill Lukens**, Stillwater Technology, Inc, Workforce Development Sub Committee Chair (Miami County)
- **Jim Leftwich**, CEO of Dayton Development Coalition
- **Howard Poston**, Greene County Administrator
- **Jim McGarry**, Miami County Economic Development Director
- **Deb Feldman**, Montgomery County Administrator

Advantage Sharing Program Economic Development Subcommittee

- **Bill Mercurio**, Retired from Plastics Trim Inc, Committee Chair
- **Chris Kershner**, Dayton Area Chamber of Commerce

Greene

- **Barry Tiffany**, Sugarcreek Township, Administrator
- **Jim Percival**, City of Xenia, City Manager
- **Phil Houston**, Greene County, Economic Development Director
- **Deborah McDonnell**, City of Fairborn, City Manager

Miami

- **Frederick Enderle**, City of Piqua, City Manager
- **Patrick Titterington**, City of Troy, City Manager
- **Charles Cochran**, Troy Development Council
- **Jerry Alexander**, SBDC
- **Bill Murphy**, City of Piqua, Economic Development Director

Montgomery

- **Mike Davis**, City of Moraine Economic Development Director
- **Bryan Chodkowski**, City of Riverside, City Manager
- **Jeff Hoagland**, City of Vandalia, City Manager
- **Joe Tuss**, Montgomery County, Assistant Administrator
Advantage Sharing Program
Workforce Development Subcommittee

- Bill Lukens, CEO of Stillwater Technologies Inc, Committee Chair
- Chris Wimsatt, Dayton Area Chamber of Commerce
- Mary Benedict, Ohio Department of Development
  Workforce Development Region 4

Montgomery County
- Lucious Plant, Montgomery County Job Center, Director
- Dick Church, Mayor of City of Miamisburg
- Mark Schwieterman, City of Kettering City Manager
- Mike Lucking, City of Trotwood City Manager

Miami County
- Justin Sommer, Miami County Job Center, Director
- Mike Gebhart, Bethel Township Administrator
- Jack Bell, Edison State University

Greene County
- Beth Rubin, Director, Greene County Jobs & Family Services
- Mark Cundiff, Village of Yellow Springs Administrator
- Mark Schlagheck, City of Bellbrook City Manager
- Jane Dockery, Center for Urban and Public Affairs at Wright State University
Appendix F: ASP Task Force Guiding Questions

Program Oversight:

1. How will jurisdictions become participants/members of this program?
2. Who /how will the overall program be governed/administered?
3. Is the program oversight fair and representative of all communities throughout these counties?
4. How will the program be evaluated and measured for success?
5. How is the governing body/administrator compensated? (If necessary)
6. What control mechanism will be in place for money disbursement?

Economic Development Program:

1. How will economic development projects be selected? Is the selection process fair for all member jurisdictions? Do smaller or poor communities see any benefit and opportunity or vice versa?
2. What guidelines should be in place to ensure quality economic development projects?
3. How often will jurisdictions be able to apply for economic development money?
4. Will there be a rotation or limit as to how often they can apply?
5. Are economic development guidelines encouraging the use of regional assets and building upon those strengths?
6. How will the grant program be structured? Will jurisdictions apply for grants within the DDC cluster categories? Or will the grant money be used for general projects? Will additional clusters categories not identified by the DDC be included? (i.e. agriculture, education, green initiatives)
7. Should it be mandated to use all economic development revenues each year?

Tax Revenue Sharing Formula:

1. What portion of the economic development revenue will be taxed?
2. Is that portion based on the size of the project or a flat percent?
3. What will the source of the shared tax be? (i.e. Property? Income? Sales?)
4. Is the anticipated revenue sharing formula feasible and fair for all jurisdictions?
5. What guidelines will be in place to address the issue of businesses moving between jurisdiction and how that affects the revenue sharing?
Workforce Development Program:

1. Are we duplicating any current workforce development services?
2. What workforce development gaps are most critical to fill in our region?
3. Is there a mutual benefit for all jurisdictions for workforce development use?
4. What will the process look like for businesses/individuals to apply for workforce development funds?
5. Should workforce development money be used in conjunction with existing services to reduce duplication?
6. What areas should workforce development focus on? (i.e. displaced workers, college students, retaining young people)
7. Does our workforce development program match the skills needed for businesses coming into our area through the economic development program?
Appendix G: County, City, Township, Village
ASP Resolutions
County ASP Resolutions

Miami County

Montgomery County
RESOLUTION NO. 10-08-1094

MIAMI COUNTY, OHIO

A RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE MULTI-COUNTY ADVANTAGE SHARING PROGRAM PROPOSAL

Mr. Evans introduced the following resolution and moved for its adoption:

WHEREAS, the Advantage Sharing Program seeks to provide additional investment funds above and beyond local and state incentives to economic and workforce development projects created by local governments to meet the needs of businesses locating, expanding, or sustaining operations in our Economic Development Region; and

WHEREAS, economic and workforce development projects will have an impact on the following areas: jobs created/retained, business growth, employee wages, company investments, infrastructure improvements, and other factors that benefit the region; and

WHEREAS, the Dayton Development Coalition will provide administrative support for the Advantage Sharing Program and will apply for federal dollars to sustain the program over the next five years; and

WHEREAS, Miami County has reviewed the Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the Board of Miami County Commissioners, Ohio that:

Section 1: The Board of Miami County Commissioners, Ohio supports and endorses the Multi-County Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

Section 2: A copy of this endorsement will be addressed and sent, along with the proposal, to the Ohio Department of Development for the Local Government Services Regional Collaboration Grant Program.
Mr. Widener seconded the motion and the Board voted as follows upon roll call:

Mr. O’Brien, Yea;         Mr. Widener, Yea;         Mr. Evans, Yea;

DATED: August 17, 2010

CERTIFICATION

I, Leigh M. Williams, Clerk to the Board of Miami County Commissioners, do hereby certify that this is a true and correct transcript of action taken by the board under the date of August 17, 2010.

Leigh M. Williams, Clerk

Cc:   Journal
      Files
      E&CD – Jim McGarry
RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE MULTI-COUNTY ADVANTAGE SHARING PROGRAM FOR THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT REGION

WHEREAS, the Advantage Sharing Program is a part of Ohio Department of Development for the Local Government Services Regional Collaboration Grant Program; and

WHEREAS, the Advantage Sharing Program seeks to provide additional investment funds above and beyond local and state incentives to economic and workforce development projects created by local governments to meet the needs of businesses locating, expanding, or sustaining operations in our Economic Development Region; and

WHEREAS, economic and workforce development projects will have an impact on the following areas: job creation/retained, economic growth, employee wages, company investments, infrastructure improvements, and other factors that benefit the region; and

WHEREAS, the Dayton Development Coalition will provide administrative support for the Advantage Sharing Program and will apply for federal dollars to sustain the program over the next five years; and

WHEREAS, Montgomery County has reviewed the Advantage Sharing Program Proposal and endorses the program to benefit the surrounding region.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Resolution endorsing the Multi-County Advantage Sharing Program for the economic development region be and is hereby approved.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Clerk of Commission certify this Resolution and make an imaged copy of this Resolution available on the Montgomery County, Ohio website at http://www.mcohio.org/.
Ms. Dodge moved the adoption of the foregoing resolution. It was seconded by Mrs. Lieberman, and upon call of the roll the following vote resulted:

Ms. Dodge, aye; Mrs. Lieberman, aye; Mr. Foley, aye: Carried.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution duly adopted by the Board of County Commissioners of Montgomery County, Ohio, the 20th day of July, 2010.

THE BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS HEREBY FINDS AND DETERMINES THAT ALL FORMAL ACTIONS RELATIVE TO THE ADOPTION OF THIS RESOLUTION WERE TAKEN IN AN OPEN MEETING OF THIS BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, AND THAT ALL DELIBERATIONS OF THIS BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, AND OF ITS COMMITTEES, IF ANY WHICH RESULTED IN FORMAL ACTION, WERE TAKEN IN MEETINGS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC, IN FULL COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE LEGAL REQUIREMENTS, INCLUDING SECTION 121.22 OF THE REVISED CODE.

Gayle L. Ingram
Clerk
Board of County Commissioners
Montgomery County, Ohio
City ASP Resolutions

City of Centerville
City of Clayton
City of Fairborn
City of Huber Heights
City of Kettering
City of Miamisburg
City of Moraine
City of Oakwood
City of Piqua
City of Riverside
City of Tipp City
City of Troy
City of Union
City of Vandalia
City of West Carrollton
City of Xenia
RESOLUTION NO. 24-10
CITY OF CENTERVILLE, OHIO

SPONSORED BY COUNCIL MEMBER Brooks Compton ON THE 19th

RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT FOR THE MULTI-COUNTY ADVANTAGE SHARING
PROGRAM PROPOSAL.

WHEREAS, the Advantage Sharing Program seeks to provide additional
investment funds above and beyond local and state incentives to economic and workforce
development projects created by local governments to meet the needs of businesses
locating, expanding, or sustaining operations in our Economic Development Region; and

WHEREAS, economic and workforce development projects will have an impact
on the following areas: job creation/retention, business growth, employee wages, company
investments, infrastructure improvements, and other factors that benefit the region; and

WHEREAS, the Dayton Development Coalition will provide administrative
support for the Advantage Sharing Program and will apply for federal dollars to sustain
the program over the next five years; and

WHEREAS, the City of Centerville has reviewed the Advantage Sharing Program
Proposal.

NOW THEREFORE, THE COUNCIL OF THE MUNICIPALITY OF
CENTERVILLE IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY, OHIO, HEREBY RESOLVES:

SECTION 1. The City of Centerville Council supports and endorses the Multi-
County Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

SECTION 2. A copy of this endorsement will be addressed and sent, along with
the proposal, to the Ohio Department of Development for the Local Government Services
Regional Collaboration Grant Program.

SECTION 3. This resolution shall be effective upon adoption.

PASSED this 19th day of July, 2010.

Mayor of the City of Centerville, Ohio
ATTEST:

[Signature]
Assistant Clerk of Council
City of Centerville, Ohio

CERTIFICATE

The undersigned, Clerk of Council of the City of Centerville, Ohio, hereby certifies the foregoing to be a true and correct copy of Resolution No. 24-10, passed by the Council of the City of Centerville, Ohio on the 19th day of July, 2010.

[Signature]
Assistant Clerk of the Council

Approved as to form, consistency with existing ordinances, the charter & constitutional provisions
Department of Law
Scott A. Liberman
Municipal Attorney
CITY OF CLAYTON, OHIO

RESOLUTION NO. R – 08 - 10 - 55

A RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE MULTI-COUNTY ADVANTAGE SHARING PROGRAM PROPOSAL

WHEREAS, the Advantage Sharing Program seeks to provide additional investment funds above and beyond local and state incentives to economic and workforce development projects created by local governments to meet the needs of businesses locating, expanding, or sustaining operations in our Economic Development Region; and

WHEREAS, economic and workforce development projects will have an impact on the following areas: job creation/retained, economic growth, employee wages, company investments, infrastructure improvements, and other factors that benefit the region; and

WHEREAS, the Dayton Development Coalition will provide administrative support for the Advantage Sharing Program and will apply for federal dollars to sustain the program over the next five years; and

WHEREAS, the City of Clayton, Ohio has reviewed the Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF CLAYTON, STATE OF OHIO:

1. That the Clayton City Council supports and endorses the Multi-County Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

2. A copy of this endorsement will be addressed and sent, along with the proposal, to the Ohio Department of Development for the Local Government Services Regional Collaboration Grant Program.

ADOPTED BY COUNCIL ON AUGUST 19, 2010.

AUTHENTICATION:

[Signatures]

Mayor (Presiding Officer of Council)

Clerk of Council

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

[Signatures]

Law Director

CERTIFICATION OF PUBLICATION
This shall certify that that the text of the above referenced enactment or a summary thereof was published once in the following newspaper and a summary posted in three places of public access as designated by Council.

Name of newspaper     Date of publication
Englewood Independent  Aug 26, 2010

CLERK

Signature
RESOLUTION NO. 62-10

A RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE MULTI-COUNTY ADVANTAGE SHARING PROGRAM (ASP).

WHEREAS, the Advantage Sharing Program (ASP) seeks to provide additional investment funds above and beyond local and state incentives to economic and workforce development projects created by local governments to meet the needs of businesses locating, expanding, or sustaining operations in our Economic Development Region; and

WHEREAS, economic and workforce development projects will have an impact on the following areas: job creation/retained, economic growth, employee wages, company investments, infrastructure improvements, and other factors that benefit the region; and

WHEREAS, the Dayton Development Coalition will provide administrative support for the Advantage Sharing Program and will apply for federal dollars to sustain the program over the next five years; and

WHEREAS, the City of Fairborn has reviewed the Advantage Sharing Program proposal.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF FAIRBORN HEREBY RESOLVES:

SECTION 1. That the City of Fairborn supports and endorses the Multi-County Advantage Sharing Program proposal.
SECTION 2. A copy of this endorsement will be addressed and sent, along with the proposal to the Ohio Department of Development for the Local Government Services Regional Collaboration Grant Program.

SECTION 3. That this Resolution shall take effect immediately upon its passage.

PASSED: MAY 8, 2010

EFFECTIVE: MAY 8, 2010

ATTEST:

CLERK, CITY OF FAIRBORN, OHIO

MICHAEL A. MAYER
CITY SOLICITOR
CITY OF FAIRBORN
510 W. MAIN STREET
FAIRBORN, OHIO 45324
ENDORSING THE MULTI-COUNTY ADVANTAGE SHARING PROGRAM PROPOSAL.

WHEREAS, the Advantage Sharing Program seeks to provide additional investment funds above and beyond local and state incentives to economic and workforce development projects created by local governments to meet the needs of businesses locating, expanding, or sustaining operations in our Economic Development Region; and

WHEREAS, economic and workforce development projects will have an impact on the following areas: job creation/retained, economic growth, employee wages, company investments, infrastructure improvements, and other factors that benefit the region; and

WHEREAS, the Dayton Development Coalition will provide administrative support for the Advantage Sharing Program and will apply for federal dollars to sustain the program over the next five years; and

WHEREAS, the City of Huber Heights has reviewed the Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of Huber Heights, Ohio that:

Section 1. The Huber Heights City Council supports and endorses the Multi-County Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

Section 2. A copy of this endorsement will be addressed and sent, along with the proposal, to the Ohio Department of Development for the Local Government Services Regional Collaboration Grant Program.

Passed by Council on the 23rd day of August, 2010;

7 Yeas; 0 Nays.

Effective Date: September 22, 2010

AUTHENTICATION:

Assistant Clerk of Council

Date 8-24-10

Mayor

Date 8-25-10
CITY OF KETTERING, OHIO

A RESOLUTION

By: MR. THOMPSON AND MR. WEBB

TO ENDORSE THE MULTI-COUNTY ADVANTAGE
SHARING PROGRAM PROPOSAL

WHEREAS, the proposed Advantage Sharing Program seeks to provide additional investment funds above and beyond local and state incentives to economic and workforce development projects created by local governments to meet the needs of businesses locating, expanding or sustaining operations in our Economic Development Region; and

WHEREAS, economic and workforce development projects will have an impact on the following areas: job creation/retention, business growth, employee wages, company investments, infrastructure improvements and other factors that benefit the region; and

WHEREAS, the Dayton Development Coalition will provide administrative support for the Advantage Sharing Program and will apply for federal dollars to sustain the program over the next five years; and

WHEREAS, this Council has reviewed the Advantage Sharing Program Proposal;

NOW, THEREFORE, Be It Resolved by the Council of the City of Kettering, State of Ohio, that:

Section 1. This Council supports and endorses the proposed Multi-County Advantage Sharing Program.

Section 2. The Clerk of Council is hereby directed to forward certified copies of this Resolution to the Dayton Development Coalition and to the Board of County Commissioners of Montgomery County, Ohio. This Council hereby acknowledges and understands a copy of this endorsement will be addressed and sent, along with the proposal, to the Ohio Department of Development for the Local Government Services Regional Collaboration Grant Program.

Section 3. This Resolution shall take full force and effect immediately upon its adoption.

Passed by Council this 27 day of JULY 2010.

DONALD E. PATTERSON, Mayor.

ATTEST:

CONNIE S. GAW,
Clerk of Council

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

DAVID L. EUBANK,
Law Director

(Requested by: City Manager's Office)
RESOLUTION NO. 2754

A RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE MULTI-COUNTY ADVANTAGE SHARING PROGRAM PROPOSAL.

Whereas, the Advantage Sharing Program seeks to provide additional investment funds above and beyond local and state incentives to economic and workforce development projects created by local governments to meet the needs of businesses locating, expanding, or sustaining operations in our Economic Development Region; and

Whereas, Economic and workforce development projects will have an impact on the following areas: job creation/retained, economic growth, employee wages, company investments, infrastructure improvements, and other factors that benefit the region; and

Whereas, the Dayton Development Coalition will provide administrative support for the Advantage Sharing Program and will apply for federal dollars to sustain the program over the next five years; and

Whereas, the City of Miamisburg has reviewed the Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MIAMISBURG, STATE OF OHIO, TWO-THIRDS OF THE ELECTED MEMBERS THERETO CONCURRING, THAT:

Section 1:

City Council of the City of Miamisburg supports and endorses the Multi-County Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

Section 2:

A copy of this endorsement will be addressed and sent, along with the proposal, to the Ohio Department of Development for the Local Government Services Regional Collaboration Grant Program.

Section 3:

This measure shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage.

Passed: July 20, 2010

Attested: 

Judith E. Barney, Clerk of Council

Approved:

Richard C Church, Jr., Mayor
RECORD OF RESOLUTIONS

Resolution No. 6599-10 Passed AUGUST 26 2010

A RESOLUTION TO ENDORSE THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE MULTI-COUNTY LOCAL GOVERNMENT COLLABORATION KNOWN AS THE "ADVANTAGE SHARING PROGRAM"

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MORAIN, STATE OF OHIO:

SECTION 1: That the City of Moraine endorses and supports the goals and objectives of the "Advantage Sharing Program" - a multi-county Local Government Collaboration to promote job growth and business development.

SECTION 2: That the Clerk be and is hereby directed to forward a certified copy of this Resolution to the City Manager and Economic Development Director.

SECTION 3: That this Resolution shall take effect and be in full force and effect from and after the date of its passage.

APPROVED:

[Signature]

MAYOR

ATTEST:

[Signature]

CLERK OF COUNCIL

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

[Signature]

LAW DIRECTOR

CERTIFICATE OF THE CLERK

I, Stephen M. French, Clerk of the City of Moraine, Ohio, do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution is a true and correct copy of Resolution No. 6599-10 passed by the Moraine City Council on the 26th day of August 2010.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, witness my hand and official seal this 26th day of August 2010.

[Signature]

Stephen M. French, CMC, CRM
RESOLUTION

BY MAYOR DUNCAN

A RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE MULTI-COUNTY ADVANTAGE SHARING PROGRAM PROPOSAL.

WHEREAS, the Advantage Sharing Program seeks to provide additional investment funds above and beyond local and state incentives to economic and workforce development projects created by local governments to meet the needs of businesses locating, expanding, or sustaining operations in our Economic Development Region; and

WHEREAS, economic and workforce development projects will have an impact on jobs created/retained, business growth, employee wages, company investments, infrastructure improvements, and other factors that benefit the region; and

WHEREAS, the Dayton Development Coalition will provide administrative support for the Advantage Sharing Program and will apply for federal dollars to sustain the program over the next five years; and

WHEREAS, the city of Oakwood has reviewed the Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF OAKWOOD, MONTGOMERY COUNTY, OHIO, THAT:

SECTION I
The Council of the city of Oakwood supports and endorses the Multi-County Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

SECTION II
A copy of this endorsement will be addressed and sent, along with the proposal, to the Ohio Department of Development for the Local Government Services Regional Collaboration Grant Program.

PASSED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF OAKWOOD this 12th day of July, 2010.

Mayor William D. Duncan

ATTEST:

Clerk of Council (Acting)

TO THE CLERK:
Publication of this resolution is not required.

City Attorney
RESOLUTION NO. R-86-10

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE TRANSPORTATION REVIEW ADVISORY COUNCIL APPLICATIONS TO THE OHIO DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FOR CALENDAR YEAR 2010

WHEREAS, the City of Piqua is authorized by the Ohio Department of Transportation to apply for funding from the Transportation Review Advisory Council for major projects that will add new capacity to existing roadways; and,

WHEREAS, the City of Piqua has identified projects which are eligible for funding from the Transportation Review Advisory Council; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Commission of the City of Piqua, Miami County, Ohio, the majority of all members elected thereto concurring that:

SEC. 1: The applications to the Transportation Review Advisory Council of the Ohio Department of Transportation are approved and the City Manager is hereby authorized and directed to submit the City's program application to the Ohio Department of Transportation and the Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission.

SEC. 2: The City Manager is authorized to be the designated project sponsor of the program in connection with the application and is authorized to execute all agreements in conjunction with the Transportation Review Advisory Council Program.

SEC. 3: This Resolution shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law.

PASSED: July 6, 2010

ATTEST: REBECCA J. COOL
REBECCA J. COOL
CLERK OF COMMISSION

LUCINDA L. FESS, MAYOR

I, the undersigned Clerk of the City Commission of the City of Piqua, Ohio do hereby certify that the above Resolution R-86-10 is a true, accurate and correct copy of Resolution R-86-10 passed by the Commission of the City of Piqua, Ohio, on the day of July, 2010.

REBECCA J. COOL
CLERK OF COMMISSION
A RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE MULTI-COUNTY ADVANTAGE SHARING PROGRAM PROPOSAL

WHEREAS, the Advantage Sharing Program seeks to provide additional investment funds above and beyond local and state incentives to economic and workforce development projects created by local governments to meet the needs of businesses locating, expanding, or sustaining operations in our Economic Development Region; and

WHEREAS, economic and workforce development projects will have an impact on the following areas: job creation/retained, business growth, employee wages, company investments, infrastructure improvements, and other factors that benefit the region; and

WHEREAS, the Dayton Development Coalition will provide administrative support for the Advantage Sharing Program and will apply for federal dollars to sustain the program over the next five years; and

WHEREAS, the Riverside City Council has reviewed the Advantage Sharing Program Proposal;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE RIVERSIDE CITY COUNCIL, MONTGOMERY COUNTY, OHIO THAT:

Section 1: The Council of the City of Riverside supports and endorses the Multi-County Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

Section 2: A copy of this endorsement will be addressed and sent, along with the proposal, to the Ohio Department of Development for the Local Government Services Regional Collaboration Grant Program.

PASSED THIS 5th DAY OF August, 2010.

APPROVED:

[Signature]
William R. Finch, MAYOR

ATTEST:

[Signature]
MaryAnn Brase
CLERK

CERTIFICATE OF THE CLERK

I, MaryAnn Brase, Clerk of the City of Riverside, Ohio do hereby certify that the foregoing Resolution is a true and correct copy of Resolution No. 10-R-1469 passed by the Riverside City Council, on the 5th day of August, 2010.

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, witness my hand and official seal this 6th day of August, 2010.

[Signature]
MaryAnn Brase
CLERK
RESOLUTION 30-10

BY: Mr. Kessler

A RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE MULTI-COUNTY ADVANTAGE SHARING PROGRAM PROPOSAL

WHEREAS, the Advantage Sharing Program seeks to provide additional investment funds above and beyond local and state incentives to economic and workforce development projects created by local governments to meet the needs of businesses locating, expanding, or sustaining operations in our Economic Development Region; and

WHEREAS, Economic and workforce development projects will have an impact on the following areas: job creation/retained, economic growth, employee wages, company investments, infrastructure improvements, and other factors that benefit the region; and

WHEREAS, the Dayton Development Coalition will provide administrative support for the Advantage Sharing Program and will apply for federal dollars to sustain the program over the next five years; and

WHEREAS, the City of Tipp City has reviewed the Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

NOW THEREFORE, THE MUNICIPALITY OF TIPP CITY HEREBY RESOLVES:

SECTION 1: That the Council of the City of Tipp City supports and endorses the Multi-County Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

SECTION 2: That a copy of this endorsement will be addressed and sent, along with the proposal, to the Ohio Department of Development for the Local Government Services Regional Collaboration Grant Program.

SECTION 3. That this Resolution shall be in full force and effect at the earliest period allowed by law.

PASSED: July 19, 2010

President of Council

ATTEST: Lynne Tivnen
Acting Clerk of Council

APPROVED: 
Law Director
RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE MULTI-COUNTY
ADVANTAGE SHARING PROGRAM (ASP) AND DECLARING
AN EMERGENCY

WHEREAS, the Advantage Sharing Program (ASP) seeks to provide additional investment funds above and beyond local and state incentives to economic and workforce development projects created by local governments to meet the needs of businesses locating, expanding or sustaining operations in our Economic Development Region; and

WHEREAS, economic and workforce development projects will have an impact on the following areas: job creation/retained, economic growth, employee wages, company investments, infrastructure improvements, and other factors that benefit the region; and

WHEREAS, the Dayton Development Coalition will provide administrative support for the Advantage Sharing Program and will apply for federal dollars to sustain the program over the next five years; and

WHEREAS, the City of Troy, Ohio has reviewed the Advantage Sharing Program proposal.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Troy, Ohio, as follows:

SECTION I: That the City of Troy, Ohio supports and endorses the Multi-County Advantage Sharing Program (ASP) proposal.

SECTION II: That a copy of this endorsement will be addressed and sent, along with the proposal to the Ohio Department of Development for the Local Government Services Regional Collaboration Grant Program.

SECTION III: That this Resolution is an emergency measure necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, and safety of the City of Troy, Ohio, and for the further reason that it is needed to coordinate an application the Ohio Department of Development and appropriate federal agencies, NOW, WHEREFORE, this Resolution shall be effective immediately upon its adoption by the Council and approval by the Mayor.

Adopted: June 21, 2010

Martha A. Baker
President of Council

Approved: June 21, 2010

Attest: Sue G. Knight
Clerk of Council

Michael L. Beamish
Mayor
RESOLUTION 10-08

Passed 8/9/2010

A RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE MULTI-COUNTY ADVANTAGE SHARING PROGRAM PROPOSAL.

WHEREAS, the Advantage Sharing Program seeks to provide additional investment funds above and beyond local and state incentives to economic and workforce development projects created by local governments to meet the needs of businesses locating, expanding, or sustaining operations in our Economic Development Region; and

WHEREAS, Economic and workforce development projects will have an impact on the following areas: job creation/retention, economic growth, employee wages, company investments, infrastructure improvements, and other factors that benefit the region; and

WHEREAS, the Dayton Development Coalition will provide administrative support for the Advantage Sharing Program and will apply for federal dollars to sustain the program over the next five years; and

WHEREAS, the City of Union has reviewed the Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Union, Montgomery County, that:

SECTION I:

The Council of the City of Union supports and endorses the Multi-County Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

SECTION II:

A copy of this endorsement will be addressed and sent, along with the proposal, to the Ohio Department of Development for the Local Government Services Regional Collaboration Grant Program.
RESOLUTION 10-08

Passed 8/9/2010

SECTION III:

That this Resolution shall take effect and be in force from and after the earliest period allowed by law.

PASSED this 9th day of AUGUST, 2010.

ATTEST:

Patricia Goudy
Mayor

Denise Winemiller
Clerk of Council

Michael O’Callaghan, Vice-mayor
CITY OF VANDALIA
MONTGOMERY COUNTY, OHIO
RESOLUTION 10-R-43

A RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE
MULTI-COUNTY ADVANTAGE SHARING PROGRAM PROPOSAL

Whereas, the Advantage Sharing Program seeks to provide additional investment funds above and beyond local and state incentives to economic and workforce development projects created by local governments to meet the needs of businesses locating, expanding, or sustaining operations in our Economic Development Region; and

Whereas, Economic and workforce development projects will have an impact on the following areas: job creation/retained, economic growth, employee wages, company investments, infrastructure improvements, and other factors that benefit the region; and

Whereas, the Dayton Development Coalition will provide administrative support for the Advantage Sharing Program and will apply for federal dollars to sustain the program over the next five years.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF VANDALIA, MONTGOMERY COUNTY, OHIO THAT:

Section 1. The Council of the City of Vandalia supports and endorses the Multi-County Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

Section 2. A copy of this endorsement will be addressed and sent, along with the proposal, to the Ohio Department of Development for the Local Government Services Regional Collaboration Grant Program.

Passed this 16th day of August, 2010.

APPROVED:

William M. Loy, Mayor

ATTEST:

Jeffrey G. Boagland
Clerk of Council
A RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE MULTI-COUNTY ADVANTAGE SHARING PROGRAM PROPOSAL.

WHEREAS, the Advantage Sharing Program seeks to provide additional investment funds above and beyond local and state incentives to economic and workforce development projects created by local governments to meet the needs of businesses locating, expanding, or sustaining operations in our Economic Development Region; and

WHEREAS, Economic and workforce development projects will have an impact on the following areas: job creation/retained, economic growth, employee wages, company investments, infrastructure improvements, and other factors that benefit the region; and

WHEREAS, the Dayton Development Coalition will provide administrative support for the Advantage Sharing Program and will apply for federal dollars to sustain the program over the next five years; and

WHEREAS, the City of West Carrollton has reviewed the Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

NOW, THEREFORE, THE MUNICIPALITY OF WEST CARROLLTON, STATE OF OHIO, HEREBY ORDAINS:

Section 1: The Council of the City of West Carrollton supports and endorses the Multi-County Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

Section 2: A copy of this endorsement will be addressed and sent, along with the proposal, to the Ohio Department of Development for the Local Government Services Regional Collaboration Grant Program.

Approved this 13th day of July, 2010

Mayor

Attest: Clerk of Council

Effective: July 13, 2010
Township ASP Resolutions

Bath Township
Bethel Township
Butler Township
Clay Township
Elizabeth Township
Harrison Township
Jefferson Township (Montgomery County)
Newberry Township
Perry Township
Staunton Township
Washington Township (Miami County)
RESOLUTION 18-2010

A resolution endorsing the Multi-County Advantage Sharing Program Proposal

Whereas, the Advantage Sharing Program seeks to provide additional investment funds above and beyond local and state incentives to economic and workforce development projects created by local governments to meet the needs of businesses locating, expanding, or sustaining operations in our Economic Development Region; and

Whereas, economic and workforce development projects will have an impact on the following areas: job creation/retention, economic growth, employee wages, company investments, infrastructure improvements, and other factors that benefit the region; and

Whereas, the Dayton Development Coalition will provide administrative support for the Advantage Sharing Program and will apply for federal dollars to sustain the program over the next five years; and

Whereas, the Bath Township Board of Trustees has reviewed the Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Board of Trustees of Bath Township, Greene County, Ohio that:

Section 1: The Board of Trustees of Bath Township supports and endorses the Multi-County Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

Section 2: A copy of this endorsement will be addressed and sent, along with the proposal, to the Ohio Department of Development for the Local Government Services Regional Collaboration Grant Program.

Passed: June 16, 2010
Effective: June 16, 2010

ATTEST:  
Elaine M. Brown
Fiscal Officer

Tom Pitstick
Steven E. Ross
John O. Martin
RESOLUTION #10-06-081

A RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE MULTI-COUNTY ADVANTAGE SHARING PROGRAM PROPOSAL

WHEREAS, the Advantage Sharing Program seeks to provide additional investment funds above and beyond local and state incentives to economic and workforce development projects created by local governments to meet the needs of businesses locating, expanding, or sustaining operations in our Economic Development Region; and

WHEREAS, Economic and workforce development projects will have an impact on the following areas: job creation/retained, economic growth, employee wages, company investments, infrastructure improvements, and other factors that benefit the region; and

WHEREAS, the Dayton Development Coalition will provide administrative support for the Advantage Sharing Program and will apply for federal dollars to sustain the program over the next five years; and

WHEREAS, Bethel Township-Miami County has reviewed the Advantage Sharing Program Proposal; and

THEREFORE, be it resolved by the Board of Trustees of Bethel Township, Miami County, Ohio that:

Section 1: The Board of Trustees of Bethel Township-Miami County supports and endorses the Multi-County Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

Section 2: A copy of this endorsement will be addressed and sent, along with the proposal, to the Ohio Department of Development for the Local Government Services Regional Collaboration Grant Program.

THE ABOVE RESOLUTION WAS MOVED BY MR. HIRT____ AND SECONDED BY MR. WRAY____ AND THE VOTE BEING TAKEN AS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Vote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MR. HIRT</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS. van HAAREN</td>
<td>ABSENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR. WRAY</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CERTIFICATE OF RECORDING OFFICER

I, DEBORAH A. WATSON, HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THE FORGOING IS A TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF RESOLUTION #10-06-081 ADOPTED BY THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF BETHEL TOWNSHIP, MIAMI COUNTY HELD ON THE 22nd DAY OF JUNE, 2010, AND THAT I AM DULY AUTHORIZED TO EXECUTE THIS CERTIFICATE.

[Signature]
DEBORAH A. WATSON
FISCAL OFFICER
BETHEL TOWNSHIP, MIAMI COUNTY
CLAY TOWNSHIP MONTGOMERY, COUNTY, Ohio

Resolution 09-2010

A resolution endorsing the Multi-County Advantage Sharing Program Proposal

Whereas, the Advantage Sharing Program seeks to provide additional investment funds above and beyond local and state incentives to economic and workforce development projects created by local governments to meet the needs of businesses locating, expanding, or sustaining operations in our Economic Development Region; and

Whereas, economic and workforce development projects will have an impact on the following areas: job created/retained, business growth, employee wages, company investments, infrastructure improvements, and other factors that benefit the region; and

Whereas, the Dayton Development Coalition will provide administrative support for the Advantage Sharing Program and will apply for federal dollars to sustain the program over the next five years; and

Whereas, Clay Township has reviewed the Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Board of Trustees of Clay Township Montgomery County, Ohio that:

Section 1: The Board of Trustees of Clay Township supports and endorses the Multi-County Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

Section 2: A copy of this endorsement will be addressed and sent, along with the proposal, to the Ohio Department of Development for the Local Government Services Regional Collaboration Grant Program.

Passed this 17th day of August, 2010

ATTEST:

Holly Buchanan, Fiscal Officer

APPROVED: Donald Aukerman, Trustee

       Steve Denlinger, Trustee

       Lon Chambers, Trustee
RESOLUTION TO SUPPORT MIAMI COUNTY’S PARTICIPATION

ELIZABETH TOWNSHIP BOARD OF TRUSTEES, MIAMI COUNTY, OHIO

RESOLUTION NUMBER 2010-007

Whereas, the Advantage Sharing Program seeks to provide additional investment funds above and beyond local and state incentives to economic and workforce development projects created by local governments to meet the needs of businesses locating, expanding, or sustaining operations in our Economic Development Region; and

Whereas, Economic and workforce development projects will have an impact on the following areas: job creation/retained, economic growth, employees wages, company investments, infrastructure improvements, and other factors that benefit the region; and

Whereas, the Dayton Development Coalition will provide administrative support for the Advantage Sharing Program and will apply for federal dollars to sustain the program over five years; and

Whereas, Elizabeth Township has reviewed the Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Board of Trustees of Elizabeth Township, Miami County, Ohio that the Board of Trustees of Elizabeth Township supports and endorses the participation of Miami County in the Advantage Sharing Program.

Passed this 21st, day of July, 2010.

[Signatures]

David E. Wagner, President

Ronald L. Swallow, Vice President

William D. Sutherly, Third Trustee
RESOLUTION NO. 71-2010

RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE MULTI-COUNTY ADVANTAGE SHARING PROGRAM PROPOSAL

WHEREAS, the Advantage Sharing Program seeks to provide additional investment funds above and beyond local and state incentives to economic and workforce development projects created by local governments to meet the needs of businesses locating, expanding, or sustaining operations in our Economic Development Region, and

WHEREAS, economic and workforce development projects will have an impact on the following areas: jobs created/retained, economic growth, employee wages, company investments, infrastructure improvements, and other factors that benefit the region, and

WHEREAS, the Dayton Development Coalition will provide administrative support for the Advantage Sharing Program and will apply for federal dollars to sustain the program over the next five years, and

WHEREAS, the Board of Trustees has reviewed the Advantage Sharing Program proposal.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Trustees of Harrison Township that

Section 1: The Board of Trustees supports and endorses the Multi-County Advantage Sharing Program proposal.

Section 2: A copy of this endorsement will be addressed and sent, along with the proposal, to the Ohio Department of Development for the Local Government Services Regional Collaboration Grant Program.

HARRISON TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF TRUSTEES

ABSENT
David A. Woods, President

Ronald L. Casey, Vice President

Darrell R. Langen, Trustee

I hereby certify that Resolution No. 71-2010 was adopted by the Harrison Township Board of Trustees at their meeting on June 7, 2010.

Deborah L. Merrick, Fiscal Officer
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
JEFFERSON TOWNSHIP, MONTGOMERY COUNTY, OHIO

RESOLUTION NO. 10 - 33

A RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE MULTI-COUNTY ADVANTAGE SHARING PROGRAM PROPOSAL

The Board of Trustees of Jefferson Township, Montgomery County, Ohio met in Special Session, the 19th day of July 2010, at the Township Offices located at One Business Park Drive, with the following members present:

Damon Woods yes Willa Bronston yes and Mary Johnson yes

Damon Woods moved for the adoption of the following resolution:

WHEREAS, the Advantage Sharing Program seeks to provide additional investment funds above and beyond local and state incentives to economic and workforce development projects created by local governments to meet the needs of businesses locating, expanding, or sustaining operations in our Economic Development Region; and

WHEREAS, Economic and workforce development projects will have an impact on the following areas: job creation/retained, economic growth, employee wages, company investments, infrastructure improvements, and other factors that benefit the region, and

WHEREAS, the Dayton Development Coalition will provide administrative support for the Advantage Sharing Program and will apply for federal dollars to sustain the program over the next five years, and

WHEREAS, Jefferson Township has reviewed the Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Jefferson Township Board of Trustees, Montgomery County, Ohio

Section 1: The Board of Trustees Jefferson Township supports and endorses the Multi-County Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

Section 2: A copy of this endorsement will be addressed and sent, along with the proposal, to the Ohio Department of Development for the Local Government Services Regional Collaboration Grant Program.

Willa Bronston seconded the motion, and the roll was called on the question of its adoption. The vote was as follows:

Damon Woods yes Willa Bronston yes and Mary Johnson yes
Adopted: July 19, 2010

Attest: Paula Hawkins

Paula Hawkins, Fiscal Officer
NEWBERRY TOWNSHIP, MIAMI COUNTY, OHIO

RESOLUTION NO. 2010-06

A Resolution supporting Miami County to participate in the Advantage Sharing Program

Whereas, the Advantage Sharing Program seeks to provide additional investment funds above and beyond local and state incentives to economic and workforce development projects created by local governments to meet the needs of businesses locating, expanding, or sustaining operations in our Economic Development Region; and

Whereas, Economic and workforce development projects will have an impact on the following areas: job creation/retained, economic growth, employee wages, company investments, infrastructure improvements, and other factors that benefit the region; and

Whereas, the Dayton Development Coalition will provide administrative support for the Advantage Sharing Program and will apply for federal dollars to sustain the program over the next five years; and

Whereas, Newberry Township has reviewed the Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Board of Trustees of Newberry Township, Miami County, Ohio that the Board of Trustees of Newberry Township, Miami County, Ohio supports and endorses the participation of Miami County in the Advantage Sharing Program.

Passed this 13th day of July, 2010

ATTEST:

Mary E. Benedict
Fiscal Officer

APPROVED:

[Signatures of Trustees]
RESOLUTION No. 10-57

PERRY TOWNSHIP, MONTGOMERY COUNTY, A RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE MULTI-COUNTY ADVANTAGE SHARING PROGRAM PROPOSAL.

WHEREAS, The Advantage Sharing Program seeks to provide additional investment funds above and beyond local and state incentives to economic and workforce development projects created by local governments to meet the needs of businesses locating, expanding, or sustaining operations in our Economic Development Region; and

WHEREAS, Economic and workforce development projects will have an impact on the following areas: job creation/retained, economic growth, employee wages, company investments, infrastructure improvements, and other factors that benefit the regions; and

WHEREAS, the Dayton Development Coalition will provide administrative support for the Advantage Sharing Program and will apply for federal dollars to sustain the program over the next five years; and

WHEREAS, Perry Township, Montgomery County, has reviewed the Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Trustees of Perry Township, Montgomery County, Ohio that:

SECTION 1: The Board of Trustees of Perry Township supports and endorses the Multi-County Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

SECTION 2: A copy of this endorsement will be addressed and sent, along with the proposal, to the Ohio Department of Development for the Local Government Services Regional Collaboration Grant Program.

Motion made by: Gerald Peters
Roll Call: AYES: Peters, Crowe and Seim.

Second by: Steve Crowe
NAYES: None

ADOPTED: JULY 13, 2010

State of Ohio: Montgomery County:
I, Rhonda Behnken, Fiscal Officer of Perry Township, Montgomery County, Ohio do hereby certify that the foregoing is taken and copied from the Record of the Proceedings of said Township meeting on July 13, 2010; that the same has been compared by me with the Resolution on said Record and that it is a true and correct copy thereof.

Rhonda Behnken
Perry Township Fiscal Officer

Where the highest of distinctions is service to others .........
Resolution No. 10-D

A Resolution supporting Miami County to participate in the Advantage Sharing Program

Whereas, the Advantage Sharing Program seeks to provide additional investment funds above and beyond local and state incentives to economic and workforce development projects created by local governments to meet the needs of businesses locating, expanding, or sustaining operations in our Economic Development Region; and

Whereas, Economic and workforce development projects will have an impact on the following areas: job creation / retained, economic growth, employee wages, company investments, infrastructure improvements, and other factors that benefit the region; and

Whereas, the Dayton Development Coalition will provide administrative support for the Advantage Sharing Program and will apply for federal dollars to sustain the program over the next five years; and

Whereas, Staunton Township Board of Trustees has reviewed the Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Board of Trustees of Staunton Township, Miami County, Ohio that the Board of Trustees of Staunton Township supports and endorses the participation of Miami County in the Advantage Sharing Program.

Approved by a vote of Three to Zero on this 19th day of July, 2010.

ATTEST: Michael E. DeWeese
Fiscal Officer
The Board of Trustees of Staunton Township,
Miami County, Ohio
THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
WASHINGTON TOWNSHIP
MIAMI COUNTY, OHIO

RESOLUTION NO. 100720

A RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF MIAMI COUNTY’S PARTICIPATION IN THE ADVANTAGE SHARING PROGRAM

WHEREAS, the Advantage Sharing Program seeks to provide additional investment funds above and beyond local and state incentives to economic and workforce development projects created by local governments to meet the needs of businesses locating, expanding, or sustaining operations in our Economic Development Region; and

WHEREAS, Economic and workforce development projects will have an impact on the following areas: job creation/retention, economic growth, employee wages, company investments, infrastructure improvements, and other factors that benefit the region; and

WHEREAS, The Dayton Development Coalition will provide administrative support for the Advantage Sharing Program and will apply for federal dollars to sustain the program over the next five years; and

WHEREAS, Washington Township Trustees have reviewed the Advantage Sharing Program Proposal,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Trustees of Washington Township, Miami County, Ohio that the Trustees of Washington Township support and endorse the participation of Miami County in the Advantage Sharing Program.

THEREUPON Mr. Paul Holfinger moved for the adoption of the Resolution; and

Mr. Ed McMaken seconded the Motion; and

Upon roll call as to the adoption of the Resolution, the vote resulted as follows:

Mr. James Hiegel ________________________ yes

Mr. Paul S. Holfinger ____________________ yes

Mr. Edward McMaken ____________________ yes
Adopted on the 20th day of July, 2010.

ATTEST: __________________________
Mikel R. Brown
Mikel R. Brown, Fiscal Officer
Washington Township
Miami County, Ohio

STATE OF OHIO

) SS

COUNTY OF MIAMI

I, Mikel R. Brown, Fiscal Officer of Washington Township, Miami County, Ohio do certify that the foregoing is taken and copied from the Record of Proceedings of the Board of Trustees of Washington Township, Miami County, Ohio, and that the same is a true, correct and complete copy of the same.

Witness my signature, this 20th day of July, 2010.

_________________________
Mikel R. Brown
Mikel R. Brown, Fiscal Officer
Washington Township
Miami County, Ohio
Village ASP Resolutions

Village of Jamestown
Village of West Milton
Village of Yellow Springs
A RESOLUTION endorsing the Multi-County Advantage Sharing Program Proposal

WHEREAS, the Advantage Sharing Program seeks to provide additional investment funds above and beyond local and state incentives to economic and workforce development projects created by local governments to meet the needs of businesses locating, expanding, or sustaining operations in our Economic Development region; and

WHEREAS, economic and workforce development projects will have an impact on the following areas: job created/retained, business growth, employee wages, company investments, infrastructure improvements, and other factors that benefit the region; and

WHEREAS, the Dayton Development Coalition will provide administrative support for the Advantage Sharing Program and will apply for federal dollars to sustain the program over the next five years; and

WHEREAS, the Village of Jamestown has reviewed the Advantage Sharing Program Proposal,

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Village of Jamestown Council that:

Section 1: The Village of Jamestown Council supports and endorses the Multi-County Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

Section 2: A copy of this endorsement will be addressed and sent, along with the proposal, to the Ohio Department of Development for the Local Government Services Regional Collaboration Grant Program.

Passed 7-19-10

Mark O. Ferrell, Mayor

Marsha Haines, Clerk
RESOLUTION TO ENDORSE THE MULTI-COUNTY
ADVANTAGE SHARING PROGRAM (ASP) PROPOSAL

Whereas, the Advantage Sharing Program seeks to provide additional
investment funds above and beyond local and state incentives to economic and
workforce development projects created by local governments to meet the needs
of businesses locating, expanding, or sustaining operations in our Economic
Development Region; and

Whereas, Economic and workforce development projects will have an impact
on the following areas: job creation/retained, economic growth, employee wages,
company investments, infrastructure improvements, and other factors that benefit
the region; and

Whereas, the Dayton Development Coalition will provide administrative support
for the Advantage Sharing Program and will apply for federal dollars to sustain the
program over the next five years; and

Whereas, Council of the Municipality of West Milton reviewed the Advantage
Sharing Program Proposal.

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Council of the Municipality of West
Milton, Miami County, Ohio that:

Section I: The Council of the Municipality of West Milton does hereby support
and endorse the Multi-County Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

Section II: A copy of this endorsement will be addressed and sent, along with
the proposal, to the Ohio Department of Development for the Local
Government Services Regional Collaboration Grant Program.

Passed this 22nd day of January, 2010

Raymond L. Moore, Mayor

Attest:

Linda L. Cantrell, CSP/CAP

Charles H. Sell, II, Law Director
VILLAGE OF YELLOW SPRINGS, OHIO
RESOLUTION 2010-28

A RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE MULTI-COUNTY
ADVANTAGE SHARING PROGRAM PROPOSAL

WHEREAS, the Advantage Sharing Program seeks to provide additional investment funds above and beyond local and state incentives to economic and workforce development projects created by local governments to meet the needs of businesses locating, expanding, or sustaining operations in our Economic Development Region; and

WHEREAS, Economic and workforce development projects will have an impact on the following areas: job creation/retained, economic growth, employee wages, company investments, infrastructure improvements, and other factors that benefit the region; and

WHEREAS, the Dayton Development Coalition will provide administrative support for the Advantage Sharing Program and will apply for federal dollars to sustain the program over the next five years; and

WHEREAS, the Village of Yellow Springs has reviewed the Advantage Sharing Program Proposal:

NOW, THEREFORE, THE COUNCIL FOR THE VILLAGE OF YELLOW SPRINGS OF OHIO HEREBY RESOLVES THAT:

Section 1: The Village Council of the Village of Yellow Springs supports and endorses the Multi-County Advantage Sharing Program Proposal.

Section 2: A copy of this endorsement will be addressed and sent, along with the proposal, to the Ohio Department of Development for the Local Government Services Regional Collaboration Grant Program.
Section 3. This Resolution shall become effective immediately upon its adoption.

Judith Hempfing, President of Council

Passed: 8-16-10

Attest: ____________________________

Judy Kintner, Clerk of Council

ROLL CALL:

Judith Hempfing _Y__ Lori Askeland _Y__ Karen Wintrow _Y__

John Booth _Y__ Rick Walkey _Y__