

PART I

BUSINESS RETENTION AND EXPANSION  
IN COFFEYVILLE

A Research Report

prepared for

The Kansas Department of Commerce

Co-Principal Investigators:

Dr. Charles Krider  
Professor of Business Administration  
and

Dr. Steven Maynard-Moody  
Professor of Public Administration

Project Director: Don Eskew

Survey Director: William Cheek

Research Assistant: Byeong Hee Choi

Dr. Anthony Redwood  
Executive Director  
Institute for Public Policy and Business Research  
The University of Kansas

May 1988

Report #150

## PREFACE

### Project Background

In the summer of 1987, Southwestern Bell Telephone offered an executive-in-residence to work with the Kansas Department of Commerce. This Southwestern Bell executive was Brad Parrott. In cooperation with Kansas Governor Mike Hayden, the Department of Commerce decided to conduct a study on business retention and expansion in the state, and enlisted the assistance of the Institute for Public Policy and Business Research at the University of Kansas to assist with the project. This project was a joint effort between Southwestern Bell, the Kansas Department of Commerce, and the University of Kansas.

The project used a telephone survey to study the retention and expansion of business firms in: Coffeyville, Emporia, Garden City, Goodland, Great Bend, Hays, Hutchinson, Lawrence, McPherson, and Salina. In each community, a local committee of business representatives and community leaders were responsible for conducting personal interviews that provided additional in-depth answers to survey questions. These committees will receive a report of the community they represent, and will be responsible for local action.

### Acknowledgements

The Institute for Public Policy and Business Research would like to acknowledge the support and the assistance of Secretary of the Kansas Department of Commerce Harland Priddle; Brad Parrott, Southwestern Bell Telephone District Manager; Jack Montgomery, Director-Existing Industry Development Division, Kansas Department of Commerce; Mary Lou McPhail, Economic Development Representative, Kansas Department of Commerce; Steve Davis and Mark Barcellina, Kansas Department of Commerce Field Representatives; Steve Begshaw, Southwestern Bell Community Relations Manager; Andy Smart, Coffeyville Community College, Task Force Chairman; and Harold Springer, representative from the Coffeyville Chamber of Commerce. All had major roles in the eventual completion of this project.

The authors alone are responsible for the contents of this report.

For further information concerning economic development assistance, contact: the Kansas Department of Commerce, Southeast Regional Office, Pittsburg State University/Shirk Hall, Pittsburg, Kansas, 66762 (phone: 316-231-0983). Contact persons: Steve Davis and Mark Barcellina.

PART I

BUSINESS RETENTION AND EXPANSION  
IN COFFEYVILLE  
EXECUTIVE REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BUSINESS RETENTION AND EXPANSION  
IN COFFEYVILLE

PART I

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| Executive Summary.....  | 1    |
| Summary Implications for Economic Development Policy in Coffeyville..   | 4    |
| Business Retention and Expansion Executive Report.....  | 5    |
| Economic Growth in Kansas.....  | 7    |
| A. Employment Growth.....   | 7    |
| B. Establishment Growth.....  | 8    |
| C. Personal Income Growth.....  | 8    |
| D. Summary.....   | 9    |
| Description of Survey Population.....   | 10   |
| A. Company Size and Industry.....   | 10   |
| B. Total Annual Sales.....  | 11   |
| C. Type of Establishment and Location of Headquarters.....  | 12   |
| D. Scope of Products Sold.....  | 13   |
| E. Survey Description Summary .....   | 13   |
| Description and Determinants of Business Location and Retention.....  | 14   |
| A. Location.....  | 14   |
| 1. Attraction of Firms from Outside of the Community.....   | 14   |
| 2. Reasons for Location.....  | 15   |
| B. Retention.....   | 15   |
| 1. Retention of Firms in the Community.....   | 15   |
| 2. Additional Manufacturers or Service Providers that Would<br>Be of Benefit to Existing Companies.....                       | 16   |
| 3. Retaining and Attracting Management and Professional<br>Personnel and Perceived Images of Rural Life and<br>of Kansas..... | 16   |
| C. Location and Retention Summary .....   | 18   |
| Description and Determinants of Business Expansion.....   | 18   |
| A. Past Expansion.....  | 19   |
| 1. Employment and Physical Plant Size Expansion.....  | 19   |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 2. Problems With Past Expansion and Factors that Helped<br>Expansion.....                       | 19 |
| B. Plans for Expansion.....   | 20 |
| 1. Employment and Physical Plant Size Expansion.....  | 20 |
| 2. Expanding Into the International Market.....   | 21 |
| C. Financing for Expansion.....   | 21 |
| 1. Financing Sources.....   | 21 |
| D. Expansion Summary .....  | 22 |
| Business Climate.....   | 23 |
| A. Local Business Climate.....  | 23 |
| 1. Quality of Life.....   | 23 |
| 1. Attitude of the Local Government.....  | 23 |
| 2. Perception of Services.....  | 24 |
| B. Business Climate Improvements.....   | 25 |
| 1. Improving the Local Quality of Life.....   | 25 |
| 2. Improving the Local Business Climate.....  | 26 |
| 3. Improving the State Business Climate.....  | 27 |
| C. Business Climate Summary .....   | 28 |
| Economic Development Assistance.....  | 28 |
| A. Economic Development Programs.....   | 28 |
| B. Firms That Need a Specialized Skill.....   | 29 |
| C. Using State Universities, Community Colleges,<br>and Vocational Schools.....                 | 30 |
| 1. Employees Sought from State Universities, Community<br>Colleges, and Vocational Schools..... | 30 |
| D. Economic Development Assistance Summary.....   | 31 |
| Summary.....  | 30 |
| PART II: Business Retention and Expansion in Coffeyville.....                                   | 34 |

PART I

LIST OF TABLES

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| Table A  |      |
| Total Employment - Counties, Kansas, and the U.S. ....   | 8    |
| Table B  |      |
| Survey Companies by Number of Employees and by Industry.....   | 11   |
| Table C  |      |
| Total Annual Sales.....  | 12   |
| Table D  |      |
| Percent of Total Firms that are Part of a Larger Corporation,<br>And Location of Headquarters.....   | 12   |
| Table E  |      |
| Mean Percents of Products Sold in the Local, State, National,<br>and International Markets.....  | 13   |
| Table F  |      |
| Reasons for Location in the Community.....   | 15   |
| Table G  |      |
| Percent and Location of Where Firms are Planning to Move.....  | 16   |
| Table H  |      |
| Percent of Total Firms that have Trouble Attracting or Retaining<br>Professional and Management Personnel, and Percent of Total<br>Firms that have a Negative Image of Rural Life and of Kansas..... | 17   |
| Table I  |      |
| Past Increases in Employment and Physical Plant Size.....  | 19   |
| Table J  |      |
| Percent of Total Firms that are Planning an Expansion in<br>The Next Year.....   | 20   |
| Table K  |      |
| Percent of Total Firms that Believe they have the Potential or<br>The Desire to Expand Internationally.....  | 21   |
| Table L  |      |
| Financing Sources for Expansion.....   | 22   |
| Table M  |      |
| Firms' Perceptions of the Attitude of Their Local Government.....  | 24   |
| Table N  |      |
| Coffeyville Firms' Perceptions of Services.....  | 25   |
| Table O  |      |
| Ways to Improve the Quality of Life.....   | 26   |
| Table P  |      |
| Suggestions Given for Improving the Local Business Climate.....  | 27   |
| Table Q  |      |
| Suggestions Given for Improving the State Business Climate.....  | 27   |
| Table R  |      |
| Knowledge and Use of Economic Development Programs.....  | 29   |
| Table S  |      |
| Employees Sought from State Universities, Community Colleges,<br>Or Vocational Schools.....  | 31   |

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A survey sample of 78 business firms in Coffeyville was completed to find determinants of business retention and expansion of existing industries in the community.

These firms, drawn from sectors constituting the economic base (retail firms and service firms that were entirely local were not included), were surveyed to identify factors that influence the retention and expansion of existing industries in Coffeyville, to identify the potential of Coffeyville firms to expand within their community, to assist the establishment of local retention and expansion efforts, and to distinguish local issues that influence retention and expansion.

The major findings of the study are:

1. In recent years, there has been no employment growth for Montgomery County. From 1978 to 1986, employment decreased 15%; from 1982 to 1986, employment decreased 7%.
2. Surveyed Coffeyville firms are small and generate low revenues. The large majority of surveyed firms (78%) in Coffeyville have less than 20 employees, and of those firms that released information about their total annual sales, 82% have sales of less than \$5 million.
3. Most companies will make retention and expansion decisions in Coffeyville. Of the total number of firms, 70% are single establishment companies and are not part of a larger corporation.
4. Most companies are oriented to local and state markets, but there are firms in the community that access markets outside of the state. The total number of surveyed firms sold an approximate mean, or average, 72% of their goods or services in the local and state markets. However, firms sell an approximate average 28% in the national and international markets. In comparison, firms in the other eight communities that were surveyed for the state report on business retention and expansion sold an approximate average of 17% in the national and international markets.

5. There is opportunity for growth in Coffeyville through the offering of new or additional products. Of the total number of respondents, 43% said their firm could offer an additional product or service. In comparison, 33% of surveyed firms in the other eight communities stated they could offer an additional product or service.

6. Industrial recruitment has generally not been a successful strategy for Coffeyville. In the past five years, only 3% of the total number of surveyed firms had moved to Coffeyville from another city or state.

7. Most firms are homegrown and see the city as providing the market and location they need. Of the total number of firms, 66% stated that a reason for location was that Coffeyville was the owner's hometown, 34% stated that they were located in the community because it filled a product or service need, and 27% stated that a central location was a reason for location in the city.

8. At present, relocation of firms outside of Coffeyville does not seem to be a big problem for the community. Of the total number of surveyed firms, only 4% stated they were planning to move.

9. Many Coffeyville companies believe there are additional companies not presently located in the community that would be of benefit to existing firms. Of the total number of surveyed firms, 43% stated that an additional manufacturer or service provider would be of benefit to their respective company.

10. Some Coffeyville firms have trouble attracting and maintaining managers and professionals. For the entire survey sample, 26% stated they had trouble attracting and maintaining management and professional personnel. In comparison, only 16% of the firms in the other eight communities stated they had this trouble.

11. The majority of business representatives surveyed did not have negative images of rural life or of Kansas. Of the total number of respondents, 93% said they did not have a negative image of rural life and 99% said they did not have a negative image of Kansas.

12. Expansion growth has occurred in Coffeyville during the past two years and there is optimism concerning expansion capabilities for the future. For the total number of firms, 36% stated they had increased employment the past two years and 35% stated they had increased physical plant size. In the coming year, 39% stated they would increase employment and 22% stated they would increase physical plant size.

13. Problems and helping factors concerning past expansion centered on the market for products and financing. Of those respondents that gave problems with past expansion, 54% said a problem was a static or declining market and 40% said a problem was lack of affordable financing. Of those respondents that gave factors that helped with expansion, 59% said that an expanding market was a helping factor.

14. There are firms in Coffeyville with both the potential and the desire to export. Of the total number of respondents, 16% said their firm had the potential to expand internationally and 17% said their firm had the desire to expand internationally.

15. Financing sources for expansion in Coffeyville are traditional in nature. Of those firms that gave a financing source, 61% stated that a bank was a source for financing and 44% stated that internal financing was a source.

16. Lack of financing is impeding some expansion in Coffeyville. Of the total number of firms, 16% stated they have had to forego or postpone an expansion because of a lack of financing. In comparison, 10% of the firms surveyed in the other eight communities had this financing problem.

17. The majority of Coffeyville respondents feel the quality of life provided by the community is good. Of the total number of respondents, 74% rated the quality of life as good and only 26% gave an adequate rating.

18. Most Coffeyville firms believe the attitude of the local government towards businesses is positive. Of the total number of firms, 50% stated that the attitude of the local government towards businesses in the community was positive to very positive, while 8% believe the attitude is negative to very negative.

19. In general, firms are satisfied with the services that are provided to them. The major exceptions concerned transportation: of all respondents, 39% rated the quality of public transportation as poor, 31% rated the availability of air transportation as poor and 22% rated the quality of roads as poor.

20. Economic development initiatives are seen to be important by Coffeyville firms. Of those respondents that gave suggestions, 58% said that economic development could improve the local quality of life, 73% said economic development could improve the local business climate, and 22% said economic development could improve the state business climate.

21. State economic development programs are not well known to firms in Coffeyville. Of the total number of surveyed firms, 90% had no knowledge of Certified Development Companies, 97% had no knowledge of Centers of Excellence, 37% had no knowledge of Community Development Block Grant Programs, 33% had no knowledge of the Kansas Industrial Training Program, and 78% had no knowledge of the Job Training Partnership Act.

22. Companies in Coffeyville do not require a highly-skilled work force. Of the total number of firms, 97% stated they did not need a specialized skill for employment in their company.

## SUMMARY IMPLICATIONS FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT POLICY

### IN COFFEYVILLE

1. Local policy should be directed to encouraging local entrepreneurs who are starting new businesses and to facilitating expansion of existing businesses. Examples of such efforts include incubators and small business development centers.

2. Although the recruitment of firms from outside of Coffeyville should constitute one part of the community's economic development strategy, the major focus should be on the establishment of new firms and the expansion of existing businesses. Industrial recruiting has generally not been a successful strategy for Coffeyville.

3. Coffeyville should have a targeted business retention program. This ongoing program should identify dissatisfied firms and concentrate retention efforts upon them. Only a very small percentage of companies are planning to leave the community. The vast majority of firms are satisfied with Coffeyville and are not planning to leave. The majority of firms also have a positive image of rural life and of Kansas.

4. Larger firms and branch operations must be targeted as part of a business retention program. The loss of a large employer would have a devastating detrimental impact on the community and other firms that are suppliers to that major employer.

5. Improved access to nonconventional sources of financing should be a top local priority. Included would be access to seed and venture capital to a greater extent than currently exists. Firms are primarily dependent on conventional sources of financing (banks and internal funds) and do not have access to seed, medium, or high risk financing.

6. Firms in Coffeyville should be encouraged to participate more actively in markets outside of Kansas. Efforts to help firms realize their potential in larger markets is necessary. To do otherwise would seriously limit growth opportunities.

7. Efforts to assist firms to participate in international trade is necessary. Such assistance may include efforts to make firms aware of the potential of international trade. Specific barriers to exporting, such as financing, must be addressed. There is an unrealized opportunity to increase exports from Coffeyville.

8. A major effort is required to assure that firms know what state programs are available to assist them. The local business community and local government should initiate communication programs to insure that firms in Coffeyville know about the Kansas Technology Enterprise Corporation, Kansas Venture Capital, Inc., and other state economic development programs.

## BUSINESS RETENTION AND EXPANSION

### EXECUTIVE REPORT

At the request of the Kansas Department of Commerce, the Institute for Public Policy and Business Research surveyed business retention and expansion in Coffeyville. This was accomplished through a survey questionnaire given to a random sample of business representatives. Coffeyville companies were surveyed to identify factors that influence retention and expansion in existing industries in the community, to identify the potential of Coffeyville firms to expand within their community, to assist the establishment of local retention and expansion efforts, and to distinguish state and local level issues that influence retention and expansion.

Along with Coffeyville, eight other communities (Emporia, Garden City, Great Bend, Hays, Hutchinson, Lawrence, McPherson, and Salina) were surveyed as part of an overall state report of retention and expansion in communities with populations of 10,000 to 100,000 persons. Survey results for Coffeyville are compared to results from the other 8 communities in Part II of this report.

A total of 78 randomly selected firms participated in this study. These firms were drawn from the economic base of the community, and represented the agriculture, mining, construction, manufacturing, transportation-communications, wholesale, finance, and services industries (retail firms and service firms that were entirely local were not included in this sample).

This report focuses on five major areas: (1) the description of the survey population, (2) the description and determinants of business location

and retention, (3) the expansion of businesses in Coffeyville, (4) the local and state business climate, and (5) economic development assistance. For a more detailed analysis of any subject covered in Part I, the reader is advised to study Part II of this report.

## ECONOMIC GROWTH IN KANSAS

Before discussing the survey and the results provided by Coffeyville firms, it is necessary to review several economic growth trends for Kansas. This data will provide a background for consideration when the survey results are discussed, and will provide trends and explanations that will give a view of the total state and of Montgomery county, along with the counties of the other eight communities that were part of the overall state study of retention and expansion. It is important to remember that the data collected for this project must be observed within the context of the state as a whole.

### Employment Growth

Total employment in Montgomery county decreased 15% from 1978 to 1986. This rate of negative growth was much lower than the positive rates for Kansas and the United States during this same period (see Table A). Employment growth for Montgomery county was the lowest among the counties where communities were included for this study. From 1982 to 1986, employment growth was a negative 7%, also the lowest among the counties and much lower than state or national rates.

TABLE A  
TOTAL EMPLOYMENT - COUNTIES, KANSAS, AND U.S.  
1978-1986 (In 000's)

|                | 1978  | 1980  | 1982  | 1984  | 1985  | 1986  | % Change |       |
|----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------|-------|
|                |       |       |       |       |       |       | 1978-    | 1982- |
|                |       |       |       |       |       |       | 1986     | 1986  |
| Barton Co.     | 13.5  | 14.4  | 14.9  | 14.9  | 14.6  | 13.5  | 0%       | -9%   |
| Douglas Co.    | 26.6  | 28.2  | 27.5  | 28.0  | 29.2  | 30.4  | 14%      | 11%   |
| Ellis Co.      | 10.9  | 11.5  | 11.8  | 12.5  | 12.1  | 11.6  | 6%       | -2%   |
| Finney Co.     | 9.4   | 9.9   | 12.6  | 13.6  | 14.3  | 14.2  | 51%      | 13%   |
| Lyon Co.       | 14.4  | 14.6  | 14.4  | 14.7  | 14.8  | 14.4  | 0%       | 0%    |
| McPherson Co.  | 10.5  | 10.8  | 10.7  | 11.2  | 11.1  | 11.1  | 6%       | 4%    |
| Montgomery Co. | 17.3  | 17.4  | 15.8  | 14.8  | 14.6  | 14.7  | -15%     | -7%   |
| Reno Co.       | 27.0  | 27.1  | 24.9  | 25.3  | 25.9  | 25.4  | -6%      | 2%    |
| Saline Co.     | 22.2  | 23.1  | 21.8  | 22.6  | 22.2  | 22.5  | 1%       | 3%    |
| Kansas         | 912.5 | 944.7 | 921.4 | 960.7 | 967.9 | 983.1 | 8%       | 7%    |
| United States  | 86697 | 90408 | 89566 | 94496 | 97519 | 99610 | 15%      | 11%   |

Sources: Counties and Kansas - Kansas Department of Human Resources Research and Analysis Section; United States - Bureau of Labor Statistics, Industry Employment Data Section.

#### Establishment Growth

For Montgomery county, establishment growth from 1978 to 1985 has seen a growth rate of 9%, which is the lowest among the growth rates for the nine counties that were sampled for the state report. This is also much lower than both the rate for Kansas and the rate for the United States. Although the growth rate during recent period (1982 to 1985) increased somewhat, it is still one of the lowest among the nine counties. This data, along with the growth rate for employment indicate potential problems for the future (all figures are from the Kansas County Business Patterns and the United States County Business Patterns).

#### Personal Income Growth

Personal income growth for Montgomery county was 57% for the time period of 1978 to 1984. This was lower than the Kansas growth rate of 75% and almost the United States rate of 72%. Montgomery County's rate of growth

was the lowest among the growth rates for the nine counties of the communities selected for the state report (all figures are from the Bureau of Economic Analysis, Regional Economic Information System, U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, and the National Income and Products Accounts of the U.S.).

Summary

For Montgomery county, the percentage rates for employment growth, establishment growth, and personal income growth are the lowest among the growth rates for the nine counties of the communities surveyed for the state report. This suggests weaknesses in the economy of Coffeyville and the importance of designing and implementing appropriate economic development strategies. In recent years, the economy of Coffeyville has been under performing the Kansas economy.

## DESCRIPTION OF SURVEY POPULATION

In this section firms are described in terms of (1) their size, (2) industry, (3) annual sales, (4) type of establishment, (5) location of headquarters, and (6) markets for firms' products. It is crucial to understand the nature of the firms that make up the economic base in order to discuss business retention and expansion. For the total sample, companies represented the agriculture, mining, construction, manufacturing, transportation-communications, wholesale, finance, and services industries.

The survey focused on firms that were part of the economic base of Coffeyville. Companies that were entirely local in their offering of goods or services were not surveyed. Because of this, retail businesses and some service organizations were not included in this study.

### Company Size and Industry

Companies in Coffeyville are small: 78% of the total number of surveyed firms have less than 20 employees. This implies that the small firm in Coffeyville is a great potential source for growth in the community. This is not industry specific data; all industries have a majority of firms with less than 20 employees. Only 13% of the total surveyed firms have 50 or more employees. The random sampling done in this study shows that manufacturing, wholesale and services industries have an important representation in Coffeyville (see Table B).

TABLE B  
SURVEY COMPANIES BY NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES AND BY INDUSTRY

| Industry  | Number of Employees |       |               | Percent of<br>Total Firms<br>That Are<br>In This<br>Industry |
|---|---------------------|-------|---------------|--|
|   | 1-19                | 20-49 | 50<br>Or More |  |
| Agriculture   | 100%                | 0%    | 0%            | 3%   |
| Mining  | 100%                | 0%    | 0%            | 5%   |
| Construction  | 80%                 | 20%   | 0%            | 8%   |
| Manufacturing   | 71%                 | 13%   | 16%           | 24%  |
| Transportation-<br>Communications                                 | 70%                 | 20%   | 10%           | 15%  |
| Wholesale   | 100%                | 0%    | 0%            | 18%  |
| Finance   | 60%                 | 20%   | 20%           | 8%   |
| Services  | 67%                 | 0%    | 33%           | 19%  |
| Percent of<br>Total Firms<br>That Are In<br>This Size<br>Category | 78%                 | 9%    | 13%           | 100%   |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

#### Total Annual Sales

For the firms that gave their total annual sales, 82% stated that annual sales were under \$5 million dollars, and only 10% stated that annual sales were \$20 million dollars or more (see Table C). Industry specific data, however, revealed that finance/services industry had a relatively high percentage of firms that had sales of \$20 million dollars or more. In general, Coffeyville has small, low revenue companies.

TABLE C  
TOTAL ANNUAL SALES

| Annual Sales (000's)     |                              |                                |                              |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 0 To<br>4,999<br>Dollars | 5,000 To<br>9,999<br>Dollars | 10,000 To<br>19,999<br>Dollars | 20,000<br>Or More<br>Dollars |
| 82%                      | 4%                           | 4%                             | 10%                          |

n = 62

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Type of Establishment and Location of Headquarters

The majority of firms in Coffeyville are single establishment companies and are not part of a larger corporation. Of the total number of firms, 70% stated they were a single establishment company (see Table D). These data point out that decisions concerning retention and expansion will be made within the city, not through corporate headquarters in other areas. Another implication is that, since small, single establishment companies have less resources to obtain information, efforts should be made to ensure that these companies are receiving the knowledge necessary for expansion and growth into broader markets.

TABLE D  
PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT ARE PART OF LARGER CORPORATION,  
AND LOCATION OF HEADQUARTERS

| Single<br>Company<br>Firm | Part of a Larger Corporation |                            | Total |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------|-------|
|                           | Kansas<br>Headquarters       | Non Kansas<br>Headquarters |       |
| 70%                       | 14%                          | 16%                        | 100%  |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Scope of Products Sold

The scope of products sold by most firms in Coffeyville is relatively narrow. Firms sold a mean, or average, 53% of their goods or services in the local market, 20% in the state market, 27% in the national market, and 1% in the international market (see Table E). Size and industry breakdowns revealed that firms with less than 20 employees and finance/services firms used local markets more than other size companies or other industry companies. However, firms did sell an approximate average 28% of their goods or services outside of state markets, compared to an approximate average of 17% for firms in the other eight communities surveyed for the state report on business retention and expansion. The future competitiveness of Coffeyville firms will depend on how well they use many markets, particularly the national and the international markets. These data suggest that there is a good foundation for the encouragement to continue and to initiate trade in markets outside of Kansas.

TABLE E  
MEAN PERCENTS OF PRODUCTS SOLD IN THE  
LOCAL, STATE, NATIONAL, AND INTERNATIONAL MARKETS

| Mean<br>Percent<br>Sold<br>In The<br>Local<br>Market | Mean<br>Percent<br>Sold<br>In The<br>State<br>Market | Mean<br>Percent<br>Sold<br>In The<br>National<br>Market | Mean<br>Percent<br>Sold<br>In The<br>International<br>Market |
|--|--|---|--|
| 53%  | 20%  | 27%   | 1%   |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

### Survey Description Summary

After examining the descriptions of Coffeyville firms, it is possible to make the following summary implications:

1. The small firm is a major source for potential economic growth in the community. The large majority of firms (78%) in Coffeyville are small, regardless of industry.
2. The majority of surveyed firms (82%) in Coffeyville had total annual sales that were less than \$5 million dollars.
3. The majority of firms are single establishments, with no connection to a larger corporation. Thus, most retention and expansion decisions will be made within the community, not from parent organizations in other areas.
4. Most companies are oriented to the local market. If these firms remain focused on the local market, growth will be slow at best.

### DESCRIPTION AND DETERMINANTS OF BUSINESS

#### LOCATION AND RETENTION

In this section, firms are described in terms of (1) their location, (2) reasons for location, (3) retention, (4) additional firms that would be of benefit, (5) retaining and maintaining management and professional personnel, and (6) perceived images of rural life and of Kansas.

#### Location

Attraction of firms from outside of the community. There has been no major influx of firms to Coffeyville; 97% of all firms have not moved to Coffeyville from another city or state in the past five years. This points out that businesses in Coffeyville are locally oriented, with few companies bringing experience from other markets or regions. The major implication here is that although the recruitment of firms to Coffeyville should be a strategy for increased development, the major focus should be on the

retention and on the encouragement of expansion of firms already located in the community.

Reasons for Location. Most companies in Coffeyville are home grown and see the city as providing the market and location they need. Of the total number of firms, 66% stated that a reason for location was that Coffeyville was the owner's hometown, and 34% stated that they were located in the community because it filled a product or service need (see Table F). A positive sign here is that with so many small hometown firms, the atmosphere for entrepreneurship seems to be good.

TABLE F  
REASONS FOR LOCATION IN THE COMMUNITY\*

| Home-<br>town | Local<br>Economy | Local<br>Govt. | Public<br>Fin-<br>ancing | Tax In-<br>centives<br>and-or<br>Lease,<br>Pur-<br>chase<br>Prices | Afford-<br>able<br>Good<br>Local<br>Labor<br>Pool | Ade-<br>quate<br>Space<br>for<br>Expan-<br>sion | Good<br>Access<br>to<br>Market | Good<br>Access<br>to<br>Mat-<br>erials | Central<br>Loc-<br>ation | Good<br>Trans-<br>por-<br>tation<br>Facil-<br>ities | Filled<br>A<br>Service<br>Need | Small<br>Town/<br>Rural<br>Life |
|---------------|------------------|----------------|--------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------------|--|--------------------------|---|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 66%           | 6%               | 1%             | 2%                       | 7%   | 3%  | 4%  | 21%                            | 4%                                     | 27%                      | 9%  | 34%                            | 2%                              |

n = 78

\*Since firms could give more than one reason, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

### Retention

Retention of firms in the community. Only a small percentage of firms are planning to move, and all of those firms that are leaving are locating out of state. Of the total number of surveyed firms, 4% stated they were planning to move (see Table G). This implies that retention programs should be continued but are most likely to be successful if highly focused on the small number of firms that are dissatisfied and are planning to move outside of the city.

TABLE G  
PERCENT AND LOCATION OF WHERE FIRMS ARE PLANNING TO MOVE

|  | Moving<br>Within The<br>Community | Moving<br>Within<br>The State | Moving<br>Out<br>Of State | Total<br>Percent<br>Moving |
|--|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Firms That Are<br>Planning To Move<br>From Their Present<br>Location In The<br>Next Year | 0%<br>Of Total<br>Firms           | 0%<br>Of Total<br>Firms       | 4%<br>Of Total<br>Firms   | 4%<br>Of Total<br>Firms    |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Additional Manufacturers or service providers that would be of benefit to existing companies. Many Coffeyville firms believe that there are certain types of companies that are not presently in Coffeyville that could benefit the firms already established in the community. Of the total number of surveyed firms, 43% stated that there were additional manufacturers or service providers that would be of benefit to their company if they were located in Coffeyville. When asked what types of firms that would be of benefit, 62% said raw materials suppliers and 19% said business services. Such companies should be targets for industrial recruitment and for targeting support for new firms or expansions. New firms in Coffeyville will have the added benefit of strengthening existing companies and their ties to the community.

Retaining and attracting management and professional personnel and perceived images of rural life and of Kansas. The majority of firms in Coffeyville (a) do not have trouble retaining and/or attracting managers or

professionals; (b) do not have a negative image of rural life; and (c) do not have a negative image of Kansas (see Table H). For these firms, retention strategies that focus on the quality of the community or of the state will have little impact on retention decisions. However, comparison data revealed that retaining and attracting managers and/or professionals is more of a problem in Coffeyville: 26% of the firms surveyed in Coffeyville stated they had this problem but only 16% of the surveyed firms in the other eight communities stated they had this trouble. As firms expand and their need for this type of personnel grows, this problem may become worse. This implies that attention will need to be paid to quality of life issues, such as the arts and recreational activities.

TABLE H  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT HAVE TROUBLE ATTRACTING OR RETAINING PROFESSIONAL AND MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL, AND PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT HAVE A NEGATIVE IMAGE OF RURAL LIFE AND OF KANSAS

| Do you have trouble attracting and/or retaining professional and management level personnel? |     | Do you have a negative image of rural life? |     | Do you have a negative image of Kansas? |     |
|--|-----|---|-----|---|-----|
| NO   | YES | NO  | YES | NO                                      | YES |
| 74%  | 26% | 93%   | 7%  | 99%                                     | 1%  |

n = 78 (for each question)

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

### Location and Retention Summary

After examining the data on location and retention, it is possible to make the following summary implications:

1. Firms in Coffeyville are predominantly homegrown and small, indicating that a good climate for future entrepreneurship from within these communities can be fostered for new expansion.
2. Very few firms are moving from their present location. Retention strategies may be more successful if focused on those few firms that are dissatisfied with the community.
3. Raw materials suppliers and business services are viewed by many firms as additional companies that would be of benefit to existing firms. Location and expansion decisions will be made upon the proximity and the delivery of supporting materials and services.
4. Firms do not have negative images about rural life or the state of Kansas, suggesting that policy which exclusively stresses the quality of the community or of the state will have little or no effect on retention or expansion.
5. As companies expand and grow larger, there will be greater difficulty in attracting and maintaining management and professional personnel.

### DESCRIPTION AND DETERMINANTS OF BUSINESS EXPANSION

In this section firms are described in terms of (1) expansion they have experienced in the past two years, (2) problems with expansion and factors that helped expansion, (3) planned expansion for the next year, (4) location of future expansions, (5) the perceived ability to expand into the international market, and (6) their sources for expansion financing. It is important to understand why firms do or do not expand, the barriers that may inhibit growth, and where companies go for financial assistance when expansion decisions are made.

Past Expansion

Employment and physical plant expansion. In the past two years, the majority of firms have neither increased nor decreased employment and size. However, 36% of all of the surveyed firms increased employment and 35% increased size the past two years (see Table I). Maintaining and increasing these growth rates should be a high local priority.

TABLE I  
PAST INCREASES IN EMPLOYMENT AND PHYSICAL PLANT SIZE

In the past two years, has your firm increased or decreased its employment and/or its physical plant size?

|                     | Decreased | Remained<br>Constant | Increased |
|---------------------|-----------|----------------------|-----------|
| Employment          | 20%       | 44%                  | 36%       |
| Physical Plant Size | 7%        | 58%                  | 35%       |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Problems with past expansion and factors that helped expansion. The market for products and a lack of financing are major problems for expansion in Coffeyville. For the firms that gave problems with expansion, 54% stated that a static or declining market was a problem and 40% stated that a lack of affordable financing was a problem. The fact that a static or declining market is a major problem associated with not expanding, indicates that, for some firms, the locally centered scope of products is deterring expansion. The problem of finding affordable financing may indicate a need at the city level to make known additional ways to finance an expansion.

Of those firms that have experienced an expansion, 59% stated that an expanding market was a helping factor, and 22% stated a desire to expand market was also a factor. An expanding market was a reason for expansion given by a high percentage of firms, again indicating the need for many companies to broaden the scope of their products or services and to reach other markets outside of the local area.

Plans for Expansion

Employment and physical plant size expansion. Firms in Coffeyville are very optimistic about their ability to increase employment and physical plant size. Although the majority of firms will remain constant in both employment and plant size, 39% of the total number of surveyed firms said they will increase employment in the next year and 22% stated they will experience a plant size expansion in the next year (see Table J). The major implication is that the city strategy must ensure assistance that will build upon this optimistic attitude towards both employment and plant size expansion.

TABLE J  
PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT ARE PLANNING  
AN EXPANSION IN THE NEXT YEAR

| In the next year, is your firm planning to increase or decrease your employment? Are you planning an expansion or contraction in the physical size of your plant? |                            |                    |                          |
|---|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|
|   | Decrease or<br>Contraction | Remain<br>Constant | Increase or<br>Expansion |
| Employment  | 4%                         | 57%                | 39%                      |
| Physical Plant Size   | 4%                         | 74%                | 22%                      |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Expanding into the international market. There are firms in Coffeyville that can and want to expand into the international market. Although the large majority of firms do not believe they can expand, 16% of the firms that answered these questions stated they had the potential to expand, and 17% stated they had the desire to expand into the international market (see Table K). Size breakdowns revealed that the highest percentage of firms that believe they have the potential and the desire to expand internationally came from firms with 20 to 49 employees, so to concentrate expansion efforts solely on very large firms would be a mistake. If the potential for exports is not realized and the desire to export not encouraged, the scope of products for many companies will remain narrow and locally oriented.

TABLE K  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT BELIEVE THEY HAVE THE  
 POTENTIAL OR THE DESIRE TO EXPAND INTERNATIONALLY

|                     | Do you feel your business has the potential to expand into the international market? Does your firm have the desire to expand into the international market? |     |
|---------------------|--|-----|
|                     | NO   | YES |
| Potential to Expand | 84%  | 16% |
| Desire to Expand    | 83%  | 17% |

n = 72

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Financing for Expansion

Financing Sources. Sources for financing expansion in Coffeyville firms are traditional in nature. Of the firms that gave a financing source, 61% said a bank was a source and 44% said internal financing was a source (see Table L). Economic development programs designed to aid the small business

are apparently not used, which may be because of a lack of knowledge about such programs. A first step in assisting firms to expand would be to make sure that firms are aware of forms of financing for expansion other than traditional sources. Continued dependence on traditional sources for financing could impede expansion growth.

TABLE L  
FINANCING SOURCES FOR EXPANSION

| Bank | Internal Financing | Private Sources | Small Business Administration | Certified Development Companies | Industrial Revenue Bonds |
|------|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 61%  | 44%                | 7%              | 4%                            | 0%                              | 9%                       |

n = 75

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

#### Expansion Summary

After examining the data regarding expansion, it is possible to make the following summary implications:

1. Expansion growth has occurred in Coffeyville during the past two years and there is optimism about expansion capabilities for the future. Now is an excellent time to assist and foster expansion in the community.
2. An expanding market was the major factor associated with past expansion, and a declining or static market was the greatest reason associated with past contractions. This emphasizes the importance of participating in markets outside of Coffeyville and outside of Kansas.
3. There are firms that have potential and desire to expand in the international market and the majority of firms in Coffeyville with the potential and the desire to expand into the international market have 20 to 49 employees. Because of the importance of the international market, it is imperative that these firms be encouraged to meet their potential and desire.

4. Financing sources for expansion are traditional in nature (banks and internal funds). Alternative forms of financing must be made known to these firms to increase the opportunities and chances for expansion. Continued dependence on standard sources for financing could impede expansion growth.

#### BUSINESS CLIMATE

This section describes firms perceptions of (1) the attitude of the local government, (2) local services, (3) how to improve the quality of life, (4) how to improve the local business climate, and (5) how to improve the state business climate. For firms contemplating staying or expanding in Coffeyville, the business climate plays an important part in the decision process.

##### Local Business Climate

Quality of life. The majority of respondents feel that the quality of life they experience in Coffeyville is good. Of the total number of respondents, 74% rated the quality of life as good, 26% gave an adequate rating. Not one firm rated the quality of life as poor. Quality of life issues will play an important part in firms' decisions concerning locating, remaining, or expanding in the community. City officials will need to maintain the general good perception of the quality of life, and will need to find ways for improvement.

Attitude of the local government. The attitude of the local government towards Coffeyville firms is viewed by 50% of the firms to be positive to very positive (see Table M). It is important to note the high percentage (42%) of companies that stated that local government's attitude was neutral,

implying that many firms in the community do not believe the local government will have any affect upon the business community. This could be a time for the local government to actively involve itself in finding means to assist their companies with growth strategies.

TABLE M  
FIRMS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE  
ATTITUDE OF THEIR LOCAL GOVERNMENT

| Attitude of Local Government |         |                              |
|------------------------------|---------|------------------------------|
| Positive To<br>Very Positive | Neutral | Negative To<br>Very Negative |
| 50%                          | 42%     | 8%                           |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Perception of services. In general, firms are satisfied with the services that are provided to them (see Table N). High good ratings were given to the electric system (85%), fire protection (82%), and the public school system (81%). High poor ratings were given to the quality of public transportation (39%), the availability of air transportation (31%) and the quality of roads<sup>1</sup> (22%). The poor ratings given to transportation issues will be important as firms decide to expand. Firms that want to grow will look to see if they can adequately move products to and from their

<sup>1</sup> At the time when this survey was conducted, the highway system was a much debated topic in the state capitol and between Kansas citizens. Statements about the highway system made here may be different from opinions made if the survey was given in another time period, and this should be considered when reading any discussion of roads or highways.

destination as well as the timely delivery of necessary materials. Important for the local business climate, however, is the perceived good quality of local services. These are positive signs for the city and will help in decisions of location and expansion.

TABLE N  
COFFEYVILLE FIRMS' PERCEPTIONS OF SERVICES

|                                       | No<br>Opinion | Good | Adequate | Poor |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|------|----------|------|
| Quality of Roads                      | 1%            | 25%  | 52%      | 22%  |
| Quality of Railroads                  | 29%           | 39%  | 26%      | 6%   |
| Cost of Transportation                | 14%           | 32%  | 46%      | 8%   |
| Availability of Air<br>Transportation | 32%           | 11%  | 26%      | 31%  |
| Quality of Public<br>Transportation   | 26%           | 15%  | 20%      | 39%  |
| Freight Delivery Time                 | 7%            | 56%  | 35%      | 2%   |
| Quality of Training                   | 17%           | 31%  | 39%      | 13%  |
| Fire Protection                       | 5%            | 82%  | 13%      | 0%   |
| Police Protection                     | 0%            | 74%  | 25%      | 1%   |
| Telephone System                      | 3%            | 73%  | 20%      | 3%   |
| Electric System                       | 0%            | 85%  | 15%      | 0%   |
| Public School System                  | 5%            | 81%  | 7%       | 6%   |
| Quality of Garbage<br>Collection      | 2%            | 72%  | 21%      | 5%   |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

#### Business Climate Improvements

Improving the local quality of life. Suggestions for improving the local quality of life centered mainly on economic development. Of the respondents who suggested ways to improve the local quality of life, 58% mentioned economic development as a way to improve the local quality of life (see Table O). Followed are improving public morale, cleaning up town and fixing properties, and more recreational activities as the best ways to improve the

local quality of life. Officials in Coffeyville must note the kinds of suggestions mentioned by their businesses, and find ways to improve the local quality of life. As mentioned previously, the quality of life will be an important factor in a company's decision concerning location and expansion in the community.

TABLE O  
WAYS TO IMPROVE THE LOCAL QUALITY OF LIFE

| Economic<br>Develop-<br>ment | More<br>Enter-<br>tainment | More Act-<br>ivities<br>For Town | More Recre-<br>ational<br>Activities | Improve<br>Public<br>Morale | Clean up<br>Town/Fix<br>Property | Upgrade<br>Education |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------|
| 58%                          | 6%                         | 4%                               | 15%                                  | 19%                         | 18%                              | 6%                   |

n = 58

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Improving the local business climate. Of the firms that gave suggestions for improving the local business climate, 73% suggested economic development, 23% suggested tax incentives or abatements and 23% suggested that the local government be more responsive (see Table P). Economic development as a way to improve the local business climate did receive the greatest percentage of responses from Coffeyville firms. These are areas where the local government can have an impact on the future of its businesses. As seen in Table M, many Coffeyville firms believe that their local government has a positive attitude towards businesses in the community. The local government should work with companies to improve the local business climate, and have a real influence on change.

TABLE P  
SUGGESTIONS GIVEN FOR IMPROVING THE LOCAL BUSINESS CLIMATE

| Economic Development | Better Cooperation Between State & Local | Increase and Improve Local Image | Improve Local Financing | Tax Incentives, Abatements | Local Govt. More Responsive | Help Entrepreneurs | Spend Municipal Funds |
|----------------------|--|----------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 73%                  | 3%                                       | 13%                              | 18%                     | 23%                        | 23%                         | 16%                | 3%                    |

n = 43

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Improving the state business climate. Suggestions for improving the state business climate did not center so heavily on economic development, but included a variety of recommendations. Of the firms that gave suggestions, 49% suggested to improve highway systems, 23% suggested to change or lower taxes, and 22% suggested economic development (see Table Q). Transportation is once again a factor that is of consequence to these firms, and will gain even more importance if companies are to use more than the local market.

TABLE Q  
SUGGESTIONS GIVEN FOR IMPROVING THE STATE BUSINESS CLIMATE\*

| Economic Development | Increase and Improve State Image | Better Financing Opportunities | Tax Incentives | Better Competition | Eliminate Severance Tax | Improve Highway System | Seek Diversification | Change Or Lower Taxes |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 22%                  | 16%                              | 6%                             | 12%            | 4%                 | 3%                      | 49%                    | 3%                   | 23%                   |

n = 55

\*Since firms could give more than one suggestion, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

## Business Climate Summary

After examining the data regarding the local business climate, it is possible to make the following summary implications:

1. The majority of firms believed the attitude of the local government towards businesses was positive to very positive, but a relatively high percentage of firms suggested that to improve the local business climate the local government should be more responsive to businesses in the community. Now is an excellent time for the local government to assist in retention and expansion strategies.

2. Local public services were seen mainly to be good or adequate. However, the quality of public transportation, the availability of air transportation and the quality of roads were seen by many firms to be poor. The poor ratings given to transportation issues will be important as firms decide to expand.

3. Suggestions for improving the local business climate included economic development, tax incentives/abatements, and that the local government should be more responsive. Coffeyville firms are looking for development assistance from their community officials.

4. Economic development is very much on the minds of these respondents, and better knowledge of existing state and local programs or the creation of new local assistance will be accepted as efforts to increase developmental opportunities.

## ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

In this section (1) economic development programs designed to assist businesses in the state; (2) firms that utilize special employment skills for their operations; and (3) employees sought from state universities, community colleges, or vocational schools will be examined.

### Economic Development Programs

State economic development programs are not well-known to companies in Coffeyville. For the total number of surveyed firms, 90% had no knowledge of Certified Development Companies, 97% had no knowledge of Centers of

Excellence, 37% had no knowledge of Community Development Block Grant Programs, 33% had no knowledge of the Kansas Industrial Training Program, and 78% had no knowledge of the Job Training Partnership Act (see Table R). Local officials need to make sure information about economic development programs reaches the business community, with emphasis on what these programs were designed for and how they can be used. Without such assistance, expansion and growth opportunities may continue to be unrealized.

TABLE R  
KNOWLEDGE AND USE OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

|   | No<br>Knowledge | Knowledge,<br>No Use | Used<br>Program |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| Certified Development<br>Companies            | 90%             | 9%                   | 1%              |
| Centers of<br>Excellence                      | 97%             | 3%                   | 0%              |
| Community Development<br>Block Grant Programs | 37%             | 58%                  | 5%              |
| Kansas Industrial<br>Training Program         | 33%             | 41%                  | 26%             |
| Job Training<br>Partnership Act               | 78%             | 22%                  | 0%              |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

#### Firms That Need a Specialized Skill

Companies in Coffeyville do not require a highly-skilled work force. Of the total number of surveyed firms, 97% stated they did not need a specialized work force for employment in their company. What is important to note is that with the rapid changes in technology and technical advancement in business operations, skilled positions will become more common for all

types of firm sizes and industries. To remain competitive, companies will have to adapt. This will mean that companies in Coffeyville will have to train a great deal of workers in the future, which will affect the resources available for expansion.

Using State Universities, Community Colleges, or Vocational Schools

The majority of firms in Coffeyville have not used the services of these institutions in the past two years. Sixty-eight percent of the total number of firms said they have not used these educational institution's services in the past two years. Assistance from Coffeyville Community College, the Southeast Kansas Area Vocational-Technical School, and Pittsburg State University can be extremely helpful to companies, and the innovation that provided by these institutions can help firms meet their potential. City officials should discover if there are any barriers between the business community and these schools, and encourage cooperation between educational institutions and Coffeyville companies.

Employees sought from state universities, community colleges, or vocational schools. Of the firms that stated they sought employees from these institutions, 34% said they sought mechanics and machinists, 30% said they sought entry level clerical workers, and 21% said they sought business and management personnel (see Table S). Besides management personnel, the variety of employees hired reflects the relatively low-skill nature of Coffeyville firms, with few percentages given for technicians, engineers, or drafters. The future competitiveness of Coffeyville firms will depend upon the recruitment and use of these latter types of employees.

TABLE S  
EMPLOYEES SOUGHT FROM STATE UNIVERSITIES, COMMUNITY COLLEGES, OR VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS\*

| Entry-Level Clerical | Mechanics, Data Processors | Electronics, Electrical Techs. | Drafters | Engineers | Business Management Personnel | Agricultural, Veterinary Personnel | Heavy Equipment Operators | General Labor |
|----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------|-----------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|
| 30%                  | 34%                        | 6%                             | 3%       | 4%        | 12%                           | 21%                                | 6%                        | 15%           |

n = 44

\*Since firms could give more than one type of employee sought, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

### Economic Development Assistance Summary

After examining the data regarding economic development assistance, it is possible to make the following summary implications:

1. State economic development programs are not well-known to firms in Coffeyville. Many firms have not heard of the programs and very few firms actually used the programs. Local officials must work in cooperation with state agencies to supply information and means of access to Coffeyville firms for better use of these programs. At the present time, economic development assistance has had an impact on only a small number of firms in the community.
2. Coffeyville has relatively low-skill workers, making their ability to compete in the future heavily dependent on training and access to training.
3. Many firms do not use the services of a state university, community college, or vocational school, indicating possible difficulties for firms to find, make, and/or initiate contacts with these institutions.

## SUMMARY

Firms in Coffeyville are small, low revenue companies that are oriented to the local market. They are predominantly homegrown and generally pleased with their community and with their state, indicating that a good climate for future entrepreneurship from within the city can be fostered for new expansion. The large majority of firms here have not moved to Coffeyville from another city or state in the past two years, and few firms are planning to move from their present location. Thus, the city's retention strategy will be most successful if aimed at small numbers of firms which are dissatisfied with the city. Sustained future growth will come from the expansion and growth of the firms presently in Coffeyville, not from firms recruited to relocate in the area.

It looks as if now is an excellent time to facilitate the expansion of existing firms in Coffeyville, and there are many companies that are planning employment and physical plant size increases. Financing was a major problem associated with expansion; the implication here is a need at the city level to make known additional ways to finance an expansion.

Now is also a good time for the local government to assist business in Coffeyville. The majority of companies here believe the local government has a positive to very positive attitude towards their businesses and many firms believe that the local business climate can be improved with a more responsive local government.

The scope of products sold by many firms in Coffeyville is narrow, with the majority of firms selling their goods or services the local and state markets. The future competitiveness of Coffeyville firms depends on how well they use many markets, particularly the national and the international

markets. This is strengthened by the survey results: the major reason for contractions was a static or declining market and the greatest factor helping expansion was an expanding market. There are firms in Coffeyville that have the potential and the desire to expand into the international market. Local officials must make sure companies have the proper information and the sources necessary for trade in markets outside of Kansas.

Firms in Coffeyville also do not have much knowledge about state economic development programs. Many firms have not heard of the programs and very few have actually used the programs. Information about assistance should reach these firms. At the present time, many firms may be missing expansion opportunities simply from not knowing who to contact, where to go for help, or what these programs can do for their company. Coffeyville should work with the state in disseminating this information, and should help companies find the type of assistance that will be beneficial.

PART II

BUSINESS RETENTION AND EXPANSION  
IN COFFEYVILLE

A Research Report  
prepared for  
The Kansas Department of Commerce

Co-Principal Investigators:

Dr. Charles Krider  
Professor of Business Administration  
and  
Dr. Steven Maynard-Moody  
Professor of Public Administration

Project Director: Don Eskew

Survey Director: William Cheek

Research Assistant: Byeong Hee Choi

Dr. Anthony Redwood  
Executive Director  
Institute for Public Policy and Business Research  
The University of Kansas

May 1988

Report #150

PART II

BUSINESS RETENTION AND EXPANSION  
IN COFFEYVILLE  
SURVEY RESULTS

BUSINESS RETENTION AND EXPANSION IN COFFEYVILLE

PART II

TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| Business Retention and Expansion in Coffeyville.....                | 34   |
| Introduction.....   | 34   |
| I. Economic Growth in Kansas.....                                   | 36   |
| A. Employment Growth.....   | 36   |
| B. Establishment Growth.....  | 37   |
| C. Personal Income Growth.....                                      | 39   |
| D. Summary.....   | 40   |
| II. Survey Methodology for Business Retention and Expansion.....    | 41   |
| A. Sample.....  | 41   |
| B. Confidence Interval.....   | 42   |
| III. Description of Survey Population.....                          | 44   |
| A. Firm Size and Industry.....                                      | 45   |
| B. Annual Sales.....  | 46   |
| 1. Type of Establishment.....                                       | 48   |
| C. Location of Headquarters.....                                    | 51   |
| 1. Regional/Corporate Headquarters.....                             | 51   |
| 2. Scope of Products Sold.....                                      | 53   |
| 3. Developing Additional Products.....                              | 55   |
| D. Survey Description Summary.....                                  | 58   |
| IV. Description and Determinants of Business Location and Retention | 59   |
| A. Location.....  | 59   |
| 1. Attraction of Firms from Outside the Community.....              | 59   |
| 2. Reasons for Location.....  | 61   |
| B. Retention.....   | 63   |
| 1. Retention of Firms in the Community.....                         | 63   |
| 2. Advantages of the Community.....                                 | 65   |
| 3. Reasons for Relocation.....                                      | 67   |

|     |  |     |
|-----|--|-----|
| 4.  | Additional Manufacturers or Service Providers that Would be of Benefit Existing Companies..... | 67  |
| 5.  | Retaining and Attracting Management and Professional Personnel.....                            | 71  |
| 6.  | Perceived Images of Rural Life and Kansas.....   | 73  |
| C.  | Location and Retention Summary.....  | 77  |
| V.  | Description and Determinants of Business Expansion.....  | 79  |
| A.  | Past Expansion.....  | 79  |
| 1.  | Employment Expansion.....  | 79  |
| 2.  | Physical Plant Expansion.....  | 81  |
| 3.  | Problems with Past Expansion.....  | 83  |
| 4.  | Factors Helping Expansion.....   | 85  |
| 5.  | Reasons for Contraction.....   | 87  |
| B.  | Plans for Expansion.....   | 89  |
| 1.  | Employment Expansion.....  | 89  |
| 2.  | Physical Plant Size Expansion.....   | 92  |
| 3.  | Location of Expansion.....   | 95  |
| 4.  | Advantages that Influenced Expansion.....  | 97  |
| 5.  | Problems that Led to Expansion Outside of the Community..                                      | 98  |
| 6.  | Additional Products and Expansion.....   | 98  |
| 8.  | Expanding into the International Market.....   | 100 |
| 9.  | Reasons for Not Expanding Into the International Market..                                      | 104 |
| 10. | Problems Associated with Exporting.....  | 104 |
| C.  | Financing for Expansion.....   | 104 |
| 1.  | Financing Sources.....   | 104 |
| 2.  | Financing Sources Outside of Kansas.....   | 106 |
| 3.  | Foregoing Expansion Because of a Lack of Financing.....  | 108 |
| D.  | Expansion Summary.....   | 110 |
| VI. | Business Climate.....  | 112 |
| A.  | Local and State Business Climate.....  | 112 |
| 1.  | Quality of Life.....   | 112 |
| 2.  | Attitude of the Local Government.....  | 114 |
| 3.  | Perception of Services.....  | 117 |
| 4.  | Government Regulations That Impede Business Operations...                                      | 119 |
| 5.  | Taxes That Influenced Expansion Decisions.....   | 121 |
| B.  | Business Climate Improvements.....   | 123 |
| 1.  | Improving the Quality of Life.....   | 123 |
| 2.  | Improving the Local Business Climate.....  | 125 |
| 3.  | Improving the State Business Climate.....  | 127 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| C. Business Climate Summary.....   | 129 |
| VII. Economic Development Programs.....  | 130 |
| A. Economic Development Assistance.....  | 130 |
| 1. Certified Development Companies (CDCs).....   | 130 |
| 2. The Community Development Block Grant Program.....  | 132 |
| 3. Centers of Excellence Programs.....   | 134 |
| 4. The Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA).....  | 136 |
| 5. The Kansas Industrial Training Program (KIT).....   | 138 |
| B. Firms That Need a Specialized Skill.....  | 141 |
| 1. Using State Universities, Community Colleges, or<br>Vocational Schools.....                 | 143 |
| 2. Services Used from State Universities, Community<br>Colleges, or Vocational Schools.....    | 146 |
| 3. Employees Sought from State Universities, Community<br>Colleges, or Vocational Schools..... | 147 |
| C. Economic Development Assistance Program Summary.....  | 149 |

PART II

LIST OF TABLES

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| Table 1  |      |
| Total Employment - Counties, Kansas, and the U.S. ....   | 37   |
| Table 2  |      |
| Total Number of Establishments: Counties, Kansas, U.S. ....  | 38   |
| Table 3  |      |
| Personal Income: Counties, Kansas, U.S. ....   | 39   |
| Table 4  |      |
| Survey Companies by Number of Employees and Industry.....  | 45   |
| Table 5  |      |
| Total Annual Sales by Size of Firm.....  | 47   |
| Table 6  |      |
| Total Annual Sales by Industry.....  | 47   |
| Table 7  |      |
| Total Annual Sales by Community Comparison.....  | 48   |
| Table 8  |      |
| Percent of Total Firms That are a Single Company or Part of a<br>Larger Corporation, by Size of Firm.....                | 49   |
| Table 9  |      |
| Percent of Total Firms That are a Single Company or Part of a<br>Larger Corporation, by Industry.....                    | 49   |
| Table 10   |      |
| Percent of Total Firms That are a Single Company or Part of a<br>Larger Corporation, by Community Comparison.....        | 50   |
| Table 11   |      |
| Location of Firm Headquarters by Kansas/Non Kansas Location.....   | 51   |
| Table 12   |      |
| Percent of Total Firms That Are Corporate/Regional Headquarters or<br>a Distributor, by Size of Firm.....                | 52   |
| Table 13   |      |
| Percent of Total Firms That Are Corporate/Regional Headquarters or<br>a Distributor, by Industry.....                    | 52   |
| Table 14   |      |
| Percent of Total Firms That Are Corporate/Regional Headquarters or<br>a Distributor, by Community Comparison.....        | 53   |
| Table 15   |      |
| Mean Percents of Products Sold in the Local, State, National, and<br>International Markets, by Size of Firm.....         | 54   |
| Table 16   |      |
| Mean Percents of Products Sold in the Local, State, National, and<br>International Markets, by Industry.....             | 54   |
| Table 17   |      |
| Mean Percents of Products Sold in the Local, State, National, and<br>International Markets, by Community Comparison..... | 55   |
| Table 18   |      |
| Percent of Total Firms That Can Offer Additional Products or<br>Services, by Size of Firm.....                           | 56   |

|          |  |    |
|----------|--|----|
| Table 19 | Percent of Total Firms That Can Offer Additional Products or Services, by Industry.....                                      | 57 |
| Table 20 | Percent of Total Firms That Can Offer Additional Products or Services, by Community Comparison.....                          | 57 |
| Table 21 | Percent of Total Firms That Have Moved From Another City or State to Their Present Location, by Size of Firm.....            | 60 |
| Table 22 | Percent of Total Firms That Have Moved From Another City or State to Their Present Location, by Industry.....                | 60 |
| Table 23 | Percent of Total Firms That Have Moved From Another City or State to Their Present Location, by Community Comparison.....    | 61 |
| Table 24 | Reasons for Location in the Community, by Size of Firm.....  | 62 |
| Table 25 | Reasons for Location in the Community, by Industry.....  | 62 |
| Table 26 | Reasons for Location in the Community, by Community Comparison.....  | 63 |
| Table 27 | Percent and Location of Where Firms are Planning to Move.....  | 64 |
| Table 28 | Local Advantages of the Community, by Size of Firm.....  | 65 |
| Table 29 | Local Advantages of the Community, by Industry.....  | 66 |
| Table 30 | Local Advantages of the Community, by Industry by Community Comparison.....  | 68 |
| Table 31 | Additional Manufacturers or Service Providers That Would be of Benefit for Firms, by Size of Firm.....                       | 68 |
| Table 32 | Additional Manufacturers or Service Providers That Would be of Benefit for Firms, by Industry.....                           | 68 |
| Table 33 | Additional Manufacturers or Service Providers That Would be of Benefit for Firms, by Community Comparison.....               | 69 |
| Table 34 | Additional Companies That Would be of Benefit by Size of Firm.....   | 69 |
| Table 35 | Additional Companies That Would be of Benefit by Industry.....   | 70 |
| Table 36 | Additional Companies That Would be of Benefit by Community Comparison.....   | 70 |
| Table 37 | Percent of Total Firms That Have Trouble Attracting or Retaining Professional and Management Personnel, by Size of Firm..... | 72 |
| Table 38 | Percent of Total Firms That Have Trouble Attracting or Retaining Professional and Management Personnel, by Industry.....     | 72 |

|          |  |    |
|----------|--|----|
| Table 39 | Percent of Total Firms That Have Trouble Attracting or Retaining Professional and Management Personnel, by Community Comparison..... | 73 |
| Table 40 | Percent of Total Firms with a Negative Image of Rural Life, by Size of Firm.....   | 74 |
| Table 41 | Percent of Total Firms with a Negative Image of Rural Life, by Industry.....   | 75 |
| Table 42 | Percent of Total Firms with a Negative Image of Rural Life, by Community Comparison.....   | 75 |
| Table 43 | Percent of Total Firms with a Negative Image of Kansas, by Size of Firm.....   | 76 |
| Table 44 | Percent of Total Firms with a Negative Image of Kansas, by Industry.....   | 76 |
| Table 45 | Percent of Total Firms with a Negative Image of Kansas, by Community Comparison.....   | 77 |
| Table 46 | Past Increases in Employment, by Size of Firm.....   | 80 |
| Table 47 | Past Increases in Employment, by Industry.....   | 80 |
| Table 48 | Past Increases in Employment, by Community Comparison.....   | 81 |
| Table 49 | Past Increases in Physical Plant Size, by Size of Firm.....  | 82 |
| Table 50 | Past Increases in Physical Plant Size, by Industry.....  | 83 |
| Table 51 | Past Increases in Physical Plant Size, by Community Comparison.....  | 83 |
| Table 52 | Specific Problems with Expansion, by Size of Firm.....   | 84 |
| Table 53 | Specific Problems with Expansion, by Industry.....   | 84 |
| Table 54 | Specific Problems with Expansion, by Community Comparison.....   | 85 |
| Table 55 | Factors That Helped Expansion, by Size of Firm.....  | 86 |
| Table 56 | Factors That Helped Expansion, by Industry.....  | 86 |
| Table 57 | Factors That Helped Expansion, by Community Comparison.....  | 86 |
| Table 58 | Reasons for Contraction, by Size of Firm.....  | 88 |
| Table 59 | Reasons for Contraction, by Industry.....  | 88 |
| Table 60 | Reasons for Contraction, by Community Comparison.....  | 89 |
| Table 61 | Percent of Total Firms Planning to Increase Employment, by Size of Firm.....   | 90 |

|          |   |     |
|----------|---|-----|
| Table 62 | Percent of Total Firms Planning to Increase Employment, by Industry.....  | 90  |
| Table 63 | Percent of Total Firms Planning to Increase Employment, by Community Comparison.....  | 91  |
| Table 64 | Percent of Total Firms That Have Increased Employment the Last Two Years and are Planning Future Increases in Employment.....                   | 92  |
| Table 65 | Percent of Total Firms That are Planning an Expansion, by Size of Firm.....   | 93  |
| Table 66 | Percent of Total Firms That are Planning an Expansion, by Industry.....   | 93  |
| Table 67 | Percent of Total Firms That are Planning an Expansion, by Community Comparison.....   | 94  |
| Table 68 | Percent of Total Firms That Have Increased Physical Plant Size the Last Two Years and are Planning Future Increases in Physical Plant Size..... | 95  |
| Table 69 | Location of Where Expansion Will Take Place for Firms That are Planning Expansion, by Size of Firm.....   | 96  |
| Table 70 | Location of Where Expansion Will Take Place for Firms That are Planning Expansion, by Industry.....   | 96  |
| Table 71 | Location of Where Expansion Will Take Place for Firms That are Planning Expansion, by Community Comparison.....                                 | 97  |
| Table 72 | Reasons for Not Offering an Additional Product or Service, by Size of Firm.....   | 99  |
| Table 73 | Reasons for Not Offering an Additional Product or Service, by Industry.....   | 99  |
| Table 74 | Reasons for Not Offering an Additional Product or Service, by Community Comparison.....   | 99  |
| Table 75 | Percent of Total Firms That Feel They Have the Potential to Expand Internationally, by Size of Firm.....  | 101 |
| Table 76 | Percent of Total Firms That Feel They Have the Potential to Expand Internationally, by Industry.....  | 101 |
| Table 77 | Percent of Total Firms That Feel They Have the Potential to Expand Internationally, by Community Comparison.....                                | 102 |
| Table 78 | Percent of Total Firms That Feel They Have the Desire to Expand Internationally, by Size of Firm.....   | 102 |

|          |   |     |
|----------|---|-----|
| Table 79 | Percent of Total Firms That Feel They Have the Desire to Expand Internationally, by Industry.....                           | 103 |
| Table 80 | Percent of Total Firms That Feel They Have the Desire to Expand Internationally, by Community Comparison.....               | 103 |
| Table 81 | Financing Sources for Expansion, by Size of Firm.....   | 105 |
| Table 82 | Financing Sources for Expansion, by Industry.....   | 105 |
| Table 83 | Financing Sources for Expansion, by Community Comparison.....   | 105 |
| Table 84 | Percent of Total Firms That Have Gone Outside of Kansas to Finance an Expansion, by Size of Firm.....                       | 107 |
| Table 85 | Percent of Total Firms That Have Gone Outside of Kansas to Finance an Expansion, by Industry.....                           | 107 |
| Table 86 | Percent of Total Firms That Have Gone Outside of Kansas to Finance an Expansion, by Community Comparison.....               | 108 |
| Table 87 | Percent of Total Firms Forced to Forego or Postpone an Expansion Because of Lack of Financing, by Size of Firm.....         | 109 |
| Table 88 | Percent of Total Firms Forced to Forego or Postpone an Expansion Because of Lack of Financing, by Industry.....             | 109 |
| Table 89 | Percent of Total Firms Forced to Forego or Postpone an Expansion Because of Lack of Financing, by Community Comparison..... | 110 |
| Table 90 | Firms' Perceptions of the Quality of Life in Their Community, by Size of Firm.....  | 113 |
| Table 91 | Firms' Perceptions of the Quality of Life in Their Community, by Industry.....  | 113 |
| Table 92 | Firms' Perceptions of the Quality of Life in Their Community, by Community Comparison.....                                  | 114 |
| Table 93 | Firms' Perceptions of the Attitude of Their Local Government, by Size of Firm.....  | 115 |
| Table 94 | Firms' Perceptions of the Attitude of Their Local Government, by Industry.....  | 116 |
| Table 95 | Firms' Perceptions of the Attitude of Their Local Government, by Community Comparison.....                                  | 116 |
| Table 96 | Coffeyville Perceptions of Services.....  | 118 |
| Table 97 | Other 8 Community Firm's Perceptions of Services.....   | 118 |
| Table 98 | Government Regulations That Impede Operation, by Size of Firm.....  | 120 |

|           |  |     |
|-----------|--|-----|
| Table 99  | Government Regulations That Impede Operation, by Industry.....   | 120 |
| Table 100 | Government Regulations That Impede Operation, by Community Comparison.....   | 121 |
| Table 101 | Reasons to Forego Expansion, by Size of Firm.....  | 122 |
| Table 102 | Reasons to Forego Expansion, by Industry.....  | 122 |
| Table 103 | Reasons to Forego Expansion, by Community Comparison.....  | 122 |
| Table 104 | Ways to Improve the Local Quality of Life, by Size of Firm.....  | 123 |
| Table 105 | Ways to Improve the Local Quality of Life, by Industry.....  | 124 |
| Table 106 | Ways to Improve the Local Quality of Life, by Community Comparison.....  | 124 |
| Table 107 | Suggestions Given for Improving the Local Business Climate, by Size of Firm.....   | 125 |
| Table 108 | Suggestions Given for Improving the Local Business Climate, by Industry.....   | 126 |
| Table 109 | Suggestions Given for Improving the Local Business Climate, by Community Comparison.....   | 126 |
| Table 110 | Suggestions Given for Improving the State Business Climate, by Size of Firm.....   | 127 |
| Table 111 | Suggestions Given for Improving the State Business Climate, by Industry.....   | 128 |
| Table 112 | Suggestions Given for Improving the State Business Climate, by Community Comparison.....   | 128 |
| Table 113 | Percent of the Total Number of Firms That Have Knowledge and Have Used Certified Development Companies, by Size of Firm.....                       | 131 |
| Table 114 | Percent of the Total Number of Firms That Have Knowledge and Have Used Certified Development Companies, by Industry.....                           | 131 |
| Table 115 | Percent of the Total Number of Firms That Have Knowledge and Have Used Certified Development Companies, by Community Comparison.....               | 132 |
| Table 116 | Percent of the Total Number of Firms That Have Knowledge and Have Used The Community Development Block Grant Program, by Size of Firm              | 133 |
| Table 117 | Percent of the Total Number of Firms That Have Knowledge and Have Used The Community Development Block Grant Program, by Industry....              | 133 |
| Table 118 | Percent of the Total Number of Firms That Have Knowledge and Have Used The Community Development Block Grant Program, by Community Comparison..... | 134 |

|           |   |     |
|-----------|---|-----|
| Table 119 | Percent of the Total Number of Firms That Have Knowledge and Have Used The Centers of Excellence Programs, by Size of Firm.....             | 135 |
| Table 120 | Percent of the Total Number of Firms That Have Knowledge and Have Used The Centers of Excellence Programs, by Industry.....                 | 135 |
| Table 121 | Percent of the Total Number of Firms That Have Knowledge and Have Used The Centers of Excellence Programs, by Community Comparison...       | 136 |
| Table 122 | Percent of the Total Number of Firms That Have Knowledge and Have Used The Job Training Partnership Act, by Size of Firm.....               | 137 |
| Table 123 | Percent of the Total Number of Firms That Have Knowledge and Have Used The Job Training Partnership Act, by Industry.....                   | 137 |
| Table 124 | Percent of the Total Number of Firms That Have Knowledge and Have Used The Job Training Partnership Act, by Community Comparison.....       | 138 |
| Table 125 | Percent of the Total Number of Firms That Have Knowledge and Have Used The Kansas Industrial Training Program, by Size of Firm.....         | 139 |
| Table 126 | Percent of the Total Number of Firms That Have Knowledge and Have Used The Kansas Industrial Training Program, by Industry.....             | 139 |
| Table 127 | Percent of the Total Number of Firms That Have Knowledge and Have Used The Kansas Industrial Training Program, by Community Comparison..... | 140 |
| Table 128 | Summary Table for Economic Development Programs.....  | 140 |
| Table 129 | Percent of Total Firms That Need a Specialized Skill, By Size of Firm.....  | 142 |
| Table 130 | Percent of Total Firms That Need a Specialized Skill, By Industry..   | 143 |
| Table 131 | Percent of Total Firms That Need a Specialized Skill, By Community Comparison.....  | 143 |
| Table 132 | Percent of Total Firms That Have Used the Services of a State School by Size of Firm.....   | 144 |
| Table 133 | Percent of Total Firms That Have Used the Services of a State School by Industry.....   | 145 |
| Table 134 | Percent of Total Firms That Have Used the Services of a State School by Community Comparison.....   | 145 |
| Table 135 | Services Used from State Universities, Community Colleges, or Vocational Schools, by Size of Firm.....                                      | 146 |
| Table 136 | Services Used from State Universities, Community Colleges, or Vocational Schools, by Industry.....  | 147 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Table 137  |     |
| Services Used from State Universities, Community Colleges, or<br>Vocational Schools, by Community Comparison.....    | 147 |
| Table 138  |     |
| Employees Sought from State Universities, Community Colleges, or<br>Vocational Schools, by Size of Firm.....         | 148 |
| Table 139  |     |
| Employees Sought from State Universities, Community Colleges, or<br>Vocational Schools, by Industry.....             | 148 |
| Table 140  |     |
| Employees Sought from State Universities, Community Colleges, or<br>Vocational Schools, by Community Comparison..... | 149 |

## BUSINESS RETENTION AND EXPANSION IN COFFEYVILLE

### Introduction

A major component of state economic development is the retention and expansion of existing firms. Identification of problems that may cause a firm to relocate or forego expansion problems is critical to local economic efforts. Knowledge of factors favoring business expansion and retention also helps authorities at the local level capitalize on development opportunities.

At the request of the Kansas Department of Commerce, the Institute of Public Policy and Business Research analyzed business retention and expansion in representative Kansas communities of 10,000 to 100,000 persons, with the goal of identifying local and state issues that could influence this type of economic growth. Data were collected through a survey questionnaire given by phone to a randomly selected sample of firms. Specifically, the purpose of the study is to identify factors that influence retention and expansion of existing industries in Kansas mid-size communities, to identify the potential of Kansas firms to expand within their existing communities, establish local efforts of retention/expansion, and distinguish state level issues that influence retention/expansion.

Throughout Part II of this report, survey findings from Coffeyville will be compared to the "other 8 communities" included in the state report (Emporia, Garden City, Great Bend, Hays, Hutchinson, Lawrence, McPherson, and Salina).

It is hoped that this project will be used to open communications between the business sector and local economic development specialists concerning business retention and expansion. By discussing the findings and suggestions issued in this report, Coffeyville can take the first step needed towards keeping and encouraging economic growth from their existing firms.

## ECONOMIC GROWTH IN KANSAS

Before discussing the survey and the results provided by the surveyed firms in Coffeyville, it is necessary to review several economic growth trends for Kansas. These trends and explanations will give a view of the total state, for Montgomery county, for the counties of the comparison communities also surveyed, and a background for consideration when the survey results are discussed. It is important to remember that the data collected for this project must be observed within the context of the state as a whole.

Employment Growth

Total employment in Montgomery County decreased 15% from 1978 to 1986. This percentage is much lower than the state percentage for the same time period and the percentage for the United States. This percentage for Montgomery County was also the lowest of the nine counties in which the state study's communities are located (see Table 1). The growth in employment for Montgomery County from 1982 to 1986 was also lower than the state's growth rate and the U.S. growth rate, as well as being the second lowest rate among the nine counties.

TABLE 1  
TOTAL EMPLOYMENT - COUNTIES, KANSAS, AND U.S.  
1978-1986 (in Thousands)

|                | 1978  | 1980  | 1982  | 1984  | 1985  | 1986  | % Change  |           |
|----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-----------|-----------|
|                |       |       |       |       |       |       | 1978-1986 | 1982-1986 |
| Barton Co.     | 13.5  | 14.4  | 14.9  | 14.9  | 14.6  | 13.5  | 0%        | -9%       |
| Douglas Co.    | 26.6  | 28.2  | 27.5  | 28.0  | 29.2  | 30.4  | 14%       | 11%       |
| Ellis Co.      | 10.9  | 11.5  | 11.8  | 12.5  | 12.1  | 11.6  | 6%        | -2%       |
| Finney Co.     | 9.4   | 9.9   | 12.6  | 13.6  | 14.3  | 14.2  | 51%       | 13%       |
| Lyon Co.       | 14.4  | 14.6  | 14.4  | 14.7  | 14.8  | 14.4  | 0%        | 0%        |
| McPherson Co.  | 10.5  | 10.8  | 10.7  | 11.2  | 11.1  | 11.1  | 6%        | 4%        |
| Montgomery Co. | 17.3  | 17.4  | 15.8  | 14.8  | 14.6  | 14.7  | -15%      | -7%       |
| Reno Co.       | 27.0  | 27.1  | 24.9  | 25.3  | 25.9  | 25.4  | -6%       | 2%        |
| Saline Co.     | 22.2  | 23.1  | 21.8  | 22.6  | 22.2  | 22.5  | 1%        | 3%        |
| Kansas         | 912.5 | 944.7 | 921.4 | 960.7 | 967.9 | 983.1 | 8%        | 7%        |
| United States  | 86697 | 90406 | 89566 | 94496 | 97519 | 99610 | 15%       | 11%       |

Sources: Counties and Kansas - Kansas Department of Human Resources Research and Analysis Section; United States - Bureau of Labor Statistics, Industry Employment Data Section.

While employment has increased for Kansas and the United States from 1978 to 1986, Montgomery County has experienced a negative growth rate. It is important to increase employment growth levels to stop out-migration and population losses. From 1982 to 1986, employment has decreased 7% for Montgomery County. When these county figures are examined, and when comparisons are made between Montgomery County, Kansas, and the U.S., it is apparent that economic development strategies are needed to help Coffeyville initiate employment growth, and to create even more opportunities for the future.

#### Establishment Growth

The total number of establishments has shown a positive growth of 9% for Montgomery County from 1978 to 1985. This figure is much lower than the rates for the state and for the United States during the same time period. For 1978-1985, no county had a lower percentage of growth. From 1982 to

1985, growth in number of establishments for the county increased slightly, but was still lower than the Kansas figure and the U.S. figure. For the 1982-1985 time period, establishment growth for Montgomery County is higher than one other county (Barton) in which comparison communities are located (see Table 2).

TABLE 2  
TOTAL NUMBER OF ESTABLISHMENTS: COUNTIES, KANSAS, U.S.  
1978-1985

|                | 1978    | 1980    | 1982    | 1984    | 1985    | % Change  |           |
|----------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|-----------|
|                |         |         |         |         |         | 1978-1985 | 1982-1985 |
| Barton Co.     | 1042    | 1079    | 1117    | 1248    | 1189    | 14%       | 6%        |
| Douglas Co.    | 1205    | 1246    | 1283    | 1574    | 1635    | 36%       | 27%       |
| Ellis Co.      | 810     | 771     | 822     | 970     | 986     | 22%       | 20%       |
| Finney Co.     | 728     | 744     | 751     | 900     | 953     | 31%       | 27%       |
| Lyon Co.       | 724     | 725     | 731     | 901     | 881     | 22%       | 21%       |
| McPherson Co.  | 754     | 731     | 716     | 825     | 832     | 10%       | 16%       |
| Montgomery Co. | 969     | 977     | 953     | 1069    | 1053    | 9%        | 10%       |
| Reno Co.       | 1524    | 1489    | 1482    | 1736    | 1740    | 14%       | 17%       |
| Saline Co.     | 1431    | 1458    | 1399    | 1618    | 1596    | 11%       | 14%       |
| Kansas         | 54299   | 55021   | 55476   | 65015   | 65510   | 21%       | 18%       |
| United States  | 4409223 |         | 5246737 |         | 5902453 | 34%       | 12%       |
|                |         | 4543167 |         | 5517715 |         |           |           |

Sources: Kansas County Business Patterns, United States County Business Patterns.

A combination of negative growth in employment and positive growth in number of establishments indicates that Coffeyville's industrial climate has turned increasingly toward development of the smaller business rather than relying on big companies to strengthen the economy. This also points to the need Coffeyville has to establish growth in their small developing companies.

To further illustrate this point, between 1980 and 1985 in Kansas, establishments with less than 50 employees increased their number of employees by 6%, while establishments with over 50 employees decreased their

employment by 1%. A total of 21,486 net new jobs were created in Kansas in companies with less than 50 employees between 1980 and 1985, not including proprietors themselves. Small businesses are also a more important factor in the Kansas economy than in the national economy: as of 1985, firms in Kansas with less than 50 employees made up a higher percentage of companies, jobs, and payroll than they did for the nation as a whole (all figures are from the U.S. Bureau of the Census).

Personal Income Growth

Increases in personal income have been high in Montgomery County, and these changes have occurred in the other eight counties as well as the state. From 1978 to 1984, personal income has increased 57%, however, this is much lower than the Kansas and United States changes, as well as being the lowest among the other eight comparison counties (see Table 3). The next lowest increase in personal income was 65% (for Reno County).

TABLE 3  
PERSONAL INCOME: COUNTIES, KANSAS, U.S.  
1978-1984 (Millions of Dollars)

|                | 1978   | 1980   | 1982   | 1984   | % Change<br>1978-<br>1984 |
|----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------------------------|
| Barton Co.     | .252   | .328   | .435   | .483   | 92%                       |
| Douglas Co.    | .420   | .521   | .604   | .708   | 69%                       |
| Ellis Co.      | .175   | .224   | .288   | .338   | 93%                       |
| Finney Co.     | .177   | .219   | .349   | .383   | 116%                      |
| Lyon Co.       | .242   | .306   | .374   | .415   | 71%                       |
| McPherson Co.  | .203   | .255   | .310   | .352   | 73%                       |
| Montgomery Co. | .297   | .384   | .442   | .466   | 57%                       |
| Reno Co.       | .488   | .599   | .705   | .804   | 65%                       |
| Saline Co.     | .377   | .482   | .556   | .647   | 72%                       |
| Kansas         | 18.529 | 23.198 | 28.247 | 32.454 | 75%                       |
| United States  | 1812.4 | 2258.5 | 2670.8 | 3110.2 | 71%                       |

Sources: Bureau of Economic Analysis, Regional Economic Information System, U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, The National Income and Product Accounts of the U.S.

The rapid growth of personal income is a positive sign for Coffeyville. However, this percentage must be viewed in the context of the state and of comparison counties, which shows that Montgomery County is lagging behind in personal income growth. It will be important to maintain and increase these income levels, placing an emphasis on keeping and creating jobs that have provided such growth.

#### Summary

Employment growth in Montgomery County has been lower than employment growth in Kansas, the United States, and comparison counties. This suggests weaknesses in the Coffeyville economy and the importance of designing and implementing appropriate economic development strategies that will maintain growth. Coffeyville is particularly important since it serves as a regional center for its part of the state. In recent years the economy of Montgomery County has been under performing the Kansas economy.

## II.

### SURVEY METHODOLOGY FOR BUSINESS RETENTION AND EXPANSION

The primary data used in this research was collected by a telephone survey of businesses in Coffeyville. The questionnaire was collaboratively developed by the Institute for Public Policy and Business Research and the Department of Commerce.

#### Sample

The findings for Coffeyville and the comparison communities are based on a disproportionate stratified probability sample of businesses in Coffeyville and other small to mid-size Kansas communities. These communities were restricted to those with populations between 10,000 and 100,000 individuals. In addition, towns such as Overland Park or Prairie Village were excluded as part of the greater Kansas City metropolitan area.

To assure coverage of the entire state, these communities were then divided into six geographical regions corresponding to the Department of Commerce districts. Besides Coffeyville, eight communities were randomly selected from these six regions. They were: Emporia, Garden City, Great Bend, Hays, Hutchinson, Lawrence, McPherson, and Salina.

In addition, Goodland was added to the sample. Kansas has a number of towns with less than 10,000 residents. Although small towns have few businesses, they may have unique problems creating and retaining businesses. Goodland was included in this study to test the research methodology in a small community. Goodland was also added to increase the representation of western Kansas. Goodland data are not included when making statistical comparisons between Coffeyville and other communities. Their inclusion would

violate proper sampling and reduce the validity of the overall results.

Once Coffeyville was selected, individual businesses were sampled in the community. This research examines only businesses that buy or sell in a region larger than the specific community. All retail businesses are excluded unless the business is a regional headquarters, distribution center, or manufacturer. For example, a local shoe store would not be included, but a distributor for a line of shoes would be. These determinations were based on the examination of the Standard Industrial Codes (SIC) for all businesses in the community.

Manufacturing firms were over sampled. They are a primary focus of state economic policy and therefore warrant special attention. For example, 19 percent of the businesses in Coffeyville are manufacturers. This over sampling allows greater accuracy in the analysis of manufacturing firms. Any biasing effect is eliminated from the overall findings through the use of weight factors.

Once selected for the sample, letters were sent to the highest administrative official at the local firm. These were followed by a telephone call to initiate the interview. Of those contacted, 92 percent agreed to participate in the study. This is a very high response rate.

#### Confidence Interval

The findings are based on 78 completed interviews. (The number of responses may vary with each question.) This large sample provides a solid basis for generalizing to all non-retail businesses in Coffeyville. At the 95 percent level of confidence, the sampling error in Coffeyville is plus or minus 10 percent. As in all sample surveys, other sources of error may affect the results.

The data were collected by trained and closely supervised interviewers thus reducing measurement error to a minimum. Interviews were conducted between mid-August and mid-October 1987.

### III.

#### DESCRIPTION OF SURVEY POPULATION

In this section firms are described in terms of their size, industry, annual sales, type of establishment, and location of headquarters. It is crucial to understand the nature of the firms that make up the economic base in order to discuss business retention and expansion in city of Coffeyville. The major findings are (1) firms in the economic base of Coffeyville are overwhelmingly small (most with less than 20 employees), (2) the majority of firms have less than \$5 million dollars in total annual sales, (3) most companies are single establishments with headquarters located within the state, and (4) the scope of products sold is local in nature.

In Coffeyville, 78 firms participated in the survey. The companies represented the agricultural, mining, construction, manufacturing, transportation-communications, wholesale, finance, and services industries. In this report, the firms will be divided into three size categories: 1 to 19 employees, 20 to 49 employees, and 50 or more employees; and into three industry categories: manufacturing, finance and services, and other industries. Along with tables showing percentages by these breakdowns, the total percentages given by surveyed Coffeyville firms will be compared to the total percentages given by surveyed firms in the "other 8 communities" that were sampled for the state report on business retention and expansion. These communities were: Emporia, Garden City, Great Bend, Hays, Hutchinson, Lawrence, McPherson, and Salina.

Firm Size and Industry

The businesses in Coffeyville are small: 78% have less than 20 employees (see table 4). This is not industry specific data; all industries have a majority of firms with less than 20 employees. Every surveyed firm in the agriculture, mining, and wholesale industries had less than 20 employees, and only 13% of total surveyed firms have 50 or more employees. Although it is obviously true to say that the retention and expansion of large size firms is important, the small firm must be included in economic development strategies. The small firm, which is a major presence in Coffeyville, should receive every effort designed for economic growth.

TABLE 4  
SURVEY COMPANIES BY NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES AND INDUSTRY

| Industry  | Number of Employees |       |            | Percent of Total Firms That are In This Industry |
|---|---------------------|-------|------------|--|
|   | 1-19                | 20-49 | 50 Or More |  |
| Agriculture   | 100%                | 0%    | 0%         | 3%   |
| Mining  | 100%                | 0%    | 0%         | 5%   |
| Construction  | 80%                 | 20%   | 0%         | 8%   |
| Manufacturing   | 71%                 | 13%   | 16%        | 24%  |
| Transportation-<br>Communication                      | 70%                 | 20%   | 10%        | 15%  |
| Wholesale   | 100%                | 0%    | 0%         | 18%  |
| Finance   | 60%                 | 20%   | 20%        | 8%   |
| Services  | 67%                 | 0%    | 33%        | 19%  |
| Percent of Total Firms That are in This Size Category | 78%                 | 9%    | 13%        | 100%   |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

The random sampling done in this study shows that manufacturing, wholesale and services industries have an important representation in Coffeyville. Followed are transportation-communication, construction and finance industries. Although agriculture industry has a small number of firms included in this sample, attention should be given to this industry. Overall, the data suggest that for development strategies to truly have an impact in the city, policy must recognize a broader economic base for future growth.

#### Annual Sales

Total annual sales for surveyed Coffeyville firms are not large, with 82% of all firms having annual sales of less than \$5 million (see Tables 5 and 6). The distribution of sales is different by size of firm: for the most part, as one would expect, the larger the firm the larger the annual sales, but all firms with 20 to 49 employees have annual sales of less than 5 million (see Table 5). All industries had a large majority of their firms that made under \$5 million in annual sales. For every industry category, more than two thirds of firms had annual sales of less than \$5 million. Finance/services industry has the highest percentage (23%) of firms that had \$20 million or more in annual sales (see Table 6). Compared to the other 8 cities, a major difference is found in the percentage of firms with \$20 million or more in annual sales (see Table 7).

TABLE 5  
TOTAL ANNUAL SALES  
BY SIZE OF FIRM

| Number<br>of<br>Employees | Annual Sales (000's)     |                              |                                |                              |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
|                           | 0 To<br>4,999<br>Dollars | 5,000 To<br>9,999<br>Dollars | 10,000 To<br>19,999<br>Dollars | 20,000<br>Or More<br>Dollars |
| 1-19                      | 94%                      | 2%                           | 2%                             | 2%                           |
| 20-49                     | 100%                     | 0%                           | 0%                             | 0%                           |
| 50+                       | 15%                      | 14%                          | 14%                            | 57%                          |
| TOTAL<br>PERCENT          | 82%                      | 4%                           | 4%                             | 10%                          |

n = 62

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 6  
TOTAL ANNUAL SALES  
BY INDUSTRY

| Industry         | Annual Sales (000's)     |                              |                                |                              |
|------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
|                  | 0 To<br>4,999<br>Dollars | 5,000 To<br>9,999<br>Dollars | 10,000 To<br>19,999<br>Dollars | 20,000<br>Or More<br>Dollars |
| Manufacturing    | 84%                      | 8%                           | 0%                             | 8%                           |
| Finance/Services | 69%                      | 0%                           | 8%                             | 23%                          |
| Other Industries | 88%                      | 4%                           | 4%                             | 4%                           |
| TOTAL<br>PERCENT | 82%                      | 4%                           | 4%                             | 10%                          |

n = 62

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 7  
TOTAL ANNUAL SALES  
BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Community              | Annual Sales (000's)     |                              |                                |                              |
|------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------|
|                        | 0 To<br>4,999<br>Dollars | 5,000 To<br>9,999<br>Dollars | 10,000 To<br>19,999<br>Dollars | 20,000<br>Or More<br>Dollars |
| Coffeyville            | 82%                      | 4%                           | 4%                             | 10%                          |
| Other 8<br>Communities | 86%                      | 5%                           | 5%                             | 4%                           |

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Of all Coffeyville firms, 82% have annual sales that are less than \$5 million a year, and only 10% of all firms have annual sales greater than \$20 million a year. For the most part, these data emphasize the type of firm that is prevalent in Coffeyville as well as in communities of the same size that were sampled for this study: small, low revenue companies. However, in comparison to those firms surveyed in the other eight communities, there is a high percentage of Coffeyville firms with annual sales that are \$20 million or more, and these firms are predominantly very large (see Table 5). This implies that retention strategies may be especially important to Coffeyville: the loss of a major employer would take with it a major loss of wealth in the community.

Type of establishment. The majority of surveyed companies (70%) are single establishment firms and are not part of a larger corporation (see Tables 8-10). As might be expected, the smaller the firm the higher the percentage of firms that are single establishment companies (see Table 8). Over 60% of every industry category's firms stated they were a single establishment company (see Table 9). In Coffeyville, the percentage of

firms that are single establishment companies (70%) is higher than the percentage given by firms in the other 8 communities (63%) (see Table 10).

TABLE 8  
PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT ARE A SINGLE COMPANY OR PART OF A LARGER CORPORATION, BY SIZE OF FIRM

| Number of Employees | Single Company | Part of a Larger Corporation |
|---------------------|----------------|------------------------------|
| 1-19                | 77%            | 23%                          |
| 20-49               | 67%            | 33%                          |
| 50+                 | 35%            | 65%                          |
| TOTAL PERCENT       | 70%            | 30%                          |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 9  
PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT ARE A SINGLE COMPANY OR PART OF A LARGER CORPORATION, BY INDUSTRY

| Industry         | Single Company | Part of a Larger Corporation |
|------------------|----------------|------------------------------|
| Manufacturing    | 68%            | 32%                          |
| Finance/Services | 77%            | 23%                          |
| Other Industries | 69%            | 31%                          |
| TOTAL PERCENT    | 70%            | 30%                          |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 10  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT ARE A SINGLE COMPANY OR PART  
 OF A LARGER CORPORATION  
 BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Community              | Single<br>Company | Part of a<br>Larger<br>Corpor-<br>ation |
|------------------------|-------------------|---|
| Coffeyville            | 70%               | 30%                                     |
| Other 8<br>Communities | 63%               | 37%                                     |

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

The number of single establishment companies points to many implications for the city. For the majority of firms in Coffeyville, decisions concerning retention and expansion will be made within the city itself, not through corporate headquarters in other areas. Attention must be paid to policy that addresses the single establishment firm as well as the large corporations that have operations in Coffeyville. City officials should recognize that much of the community's economic future is dependent upon the small, single establishment company. To design policy that ignores these firms, or that provides little assistance for growth, will reduce retention and expansion.

Information about assistance must reach these companies, also. Since small, single establishment companies have less resources to obtain information, efforts should be made to ensure that these companies are receiving the knowledge necessary for expansion and growth into broader markets. Assistance should encompass such important issues as financing, job training, adaptations to new technologies, and access to broader markets.

Location of Headquarters

The majority of firms in Coffeyville are headquartered in Kansas. Of the total number of firms surveyed, 84% have their headquarters in Kansas (this includes the single establishment firms) (see Table 11). This is a positive sign for the community, because parent organization decisions concerning retention and expansion will, for the most part, take place within the state.

TABLE 11  
LOCATION OF FIRM HEADQUARTERS BY  
KANSAS/NON KANSAS LOCATION

| Kansas<br>Headquarters | Non Kansas<br>Headquarters | Single<br>Company<br>Firm | Total |
|------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-------|
| 14%                    | 16%                        | 70%                       | 100%  |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Regional/Corporate Headquarters. The majority of firms that are part of a larger corporation are of major importance to their parent organizations. Of the firms that stated they were part of a larger corporation, 65% said they were a corporate or regional headquarters or a distributorship (see Tables 12-14). Important to note is the percentage of firms with less than 20 employees (64%) that are headquarters or a distributorship (see Table 12). This highlights the importance of all types of small firms in the community.

The total percentages given by Coffeyville firms were almost identical to those given by firms in the other 8 communities (see Table 14).

TABLE 12  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT ARE CORPORATE/REGIONAL  
 HEADQUARTERS OR A DISTRIBUTOR, BY SIZE OF FIRM

Is your local operation a corporate headquarters regional headquarters, or a distributorship?

| Number of Employees | NO  | YES |
|---------------------|-----|-----|
| 1-19                | 36% | 64% |
| 20-99               | 25% | 75% |
| 100+                | 50% | 50% |
| TOTAL PERCENT       | 35% | 65% |

n = 35

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 13  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT ARE CORPORATE/REGIONAL  
 HEADQUARTERS OR A DISTRIBUTOR, BY INDUSTRY

Is your local operation a corporate headquarters regional headquarters, or a distributorship?

| Industry         | NO  | YES |
|------------------|-----|-----|
| Manufacturing    | 18% | 82% |
| Finance/Services | 29% | 71% |
| Other Industries | 44% | 56% |
| TOTAL PERCENT    | 35% | 65% |

n = 35

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 14  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT ARE CORPORATE/REGIONAL  
 HEADQUARTERS OR A DISTRIBUTOR  
 BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Community              | NO  | YES |
|------------------------|-----|-----|
| Coffeyville            | 35% | 65% |
| Other 8<br>Communities | 36% | 64% |

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Scope of Products Sold. The firms in this survey sample have a fairly narrow scope of where they sell their products and services. Firms sold a mean, or average, 52% of their products and/or services in the local market, 20% in the state market, 27% in the national market, and only a mean 1% in the international market (see Tables 15 and 16). That is, firms sold only an approximate average of 28% of their goods or services outside of Kansas. This is a very important finding because a city's competitiveness and economic future depends upon the ability to export and to participate in many markets, especially the national and the international markets. Small firms are more locally oriented than large firms, and the finance/services industry firms sold their products/services more on a local basis than other industries. Compared to firms in the other eight cities, firms in Coffeyville sold a lower average percentage of products and/or services in the local and the state markets and a higher average in the national market, indicating that Coffeyville firms are more involved in markets outside of Kansas (see Table 17).

TABLE 15  
 MEAN PERCENTS OF PRODUCTS SOLD IN THE  
 LOCAL, STATE, NATIONAL, AND INTERNATIONAL MARKETS  
 BY SIZE OF FIRM

| Number of<br>Employees | Mean<br>Percent<br>Sold<br>In The<br>Local<br>Market | Mean<br>Percent<br>Sold<br>In The<br>State<br>Market | Mean<br>Percent<br>Sold<br>In The<br>National<br>Market | Mean<br>Percent<br>Sold<br>In The<br>International<br>Market |
|------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| 1-19                   | 58%  | 21%  | 20%   | 1%   |
| 20-49                  | 41%  | 20%  | 35%   | 4%   |
| 50+                    | 25%  | 11%  | 63%   | 1%   |
| GRAND<br>MEANS         | 52%  | 20%  | 27%   | 1%   |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 16  
 MEAN PERCENTS OF PRODUCTS SOLD IN THE  
 LOCAL, STATE, NATIONAL, AND INTERNATIONAL MARKETS  
 BY INDUSTRY

| Industry         | Mean<br>Percent<br>Sold<br>In The<br>Local<br>Market | Mean<br>Percent<br>Sold<br>In The<br>State<br>Market | Mean<br>Percent<br>Sold<br>In The<br>National<br>Market | Mean<br>Percent<br>Sold<br>In The<br>International<br>Market |
|------------------|--|--|---|--|
| Manufacturing    | 36%  | 22%  | 40%   | 2%   |
| Finance/Services | 63%  | 6%   | 30%   | 1%   |
| Other Industries | 54%  | 25%  | 20%   | 1%   |
| GRAND<br>MEANS   | 52%  | 20%  | 27%   | 1%   |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 17  
 MEAN PERCENTS OF PRODUCTS SOLD IN THE  
 LOCAL, STATE, NATIONAL, AND INTERNATIONAL MARKETS  
 BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Community              | Mean<br>Percent<br>Sold<br>In The<br>Local<br>Market | Mean<br>Percent<br>Sold<br>In The<br>State<br>Market | Mean<br>Percent<br>Sold<br>In The<br>National<br>Market | Mean<br>Percent<br>Sold<br>In The<br>International<br>Market |
|------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| Coffeyville            | 52%  | 20%  | 27%   | 1%   |
| Other 8<br>Communities | 56%  | 27%  | 16%   | 1%   |

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

The focus of selling products for most firms, especially small ones, is on the local market. For these firms to expand or to increase economic growth, the scope of products must be broadened to include larger markets, particularly the national and the international markets. A positive sign for the community comes from Table 17: where a relatively larger average percentage of products/services are sold on a national basis, and a lower average percentage are sold in the local market. This implies that Coffeyville has a strong foundation for encouraging more companies to expand their markets and increasing sales growth in the community.

Developing additional products. Developing additional products is one way for firms to participate in different and wider markets, and many Coffeyville firms feel they can offer additional products. For all firms, 43% stated that they could offer additional products or services to the ones presently being offered (see Tables 18 and 19). Within size categories,

more than a half of firms with 50 or more employees stated they could offer additional products, while within industries, the finance/services industries had more than half of their respondents who thought their company could offer additional products. Community comparison data revealed that Coffeyville had a higher percentage of firms that believed they could offer an additional product or service than the other 8 cities (see Table 20).

TABLE 18  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT CAN OFFER  
 ADDITIONAL PRODUCTS OR SERVICES  
 BY SIZE OF FIRM

Are there any additional products or services that  
 you feel your company could offer that it is not  
 now offering?

| Number of<br>Employees | NO  | YES |
|------------------------|-----|-----|
| 1-19                   | 58% | 42% |
| 20-49                  | 75% | 25% |
| 50+                    | 41% | 59% |
| TOTAL<br>PERCENT       | 57% | 43% |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 19  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT CAN OFFER  
 ADDITIONAL PRODUCTS OR SERVICES  
 BY INDUSTRY

Are there any additional products or services that  
 you feel your company could offer that it is not  
 now offering?

| Industry         | NO  | YES |
|------------------|-----|-----|
| Manufacturing    | 52% | 48% |
| Finance/Services | 47% | 53% |
| Other Industries | 66% | 34% |
| TOTAL<br>PERCENT | 57% | 43% |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size  
 Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public  
 Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 20  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT CAN OFFER  
 ADDITIONAL PRODUCTS OR SERVICES  
 BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

Are there any additional products or services that  
 you feel your company could offer that it is not  
 now offering?

| Community              | NO  | YES |
|------------------------|-----|-----|
| Coffeyville            | 57% | 43% |
| Other 8<br>Communities | 67% | 33% |

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size  
 Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public  
 Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

More than 40% of total firms believed that there were additional products  
 or services they could offer, indicating potential for the growth in  
 Coffeyville. In addition, higher percentage of firms in Coffeyville than the  
 other 8 cities stated that they could offer additional products. These

responses indicate that a high proportion of firms in the economic base of the community are optimistic about opportunities for introducing new products or services. There is potential for economic growth from the offering of new products or services.

#### Survey Description Summary

After examining the descriptions of Coffeyville firms, it is possible to make the following summary implications:

1. The majority of surveyed Coffeyville companies are small. Of the total number of firms, 78% have fewer than 20 employees. To concentrate assistance or specific city policy solely on the large company or corporation would be to overlook a major source for increased economic growth.
2. Of those firms that released information, 82% have total annual sales that are less than \$5 million.
3. The majority of firms (70%) are single establishments, with no connection to a larger corporation. Thus, most retention and expansion decisions will be made within the community, not from parent organizations in other areas.
4. Most companies are oriented to local markets. However, surveyed firms sold an approximate average of 28% of their goods and services in the national and international markets. In comparison, companies in the other eight communities sold an approximate average of 17% in these markets.
5. There is a relatively high percentage of firms that feel they can provide new products, indicating that potential for economic growth exists.

#### IV.

### DESCRIPTION AND DETERMINANTS OF BUSINESS

#### LOCATION AND RETENTION

In this section we describe the attraction of firms from outside of the community, the reasons for location, the retention of firms in the community, the advantages of the community, the reasons for relocation, additional manufacturers or service providers that may help existing firms, retaining or attracting management and professional personnel, and the perceived images of rural life and Kansas in general. Of particular importance are factors that influence the decision to locate in the community. The major findings are (1) the vast majority of firms have not moved to the community from another city or state in the past five years, (2) a major reason for location is because Coffeyville is the owner's hometown, and (3) most firms are satisfied with the city and do not plan to leave. Because of the large numbers that do not plan to leave, the city's retention strategy will be most successful if aimed at the small number of firms which are dissatisfied with the city.

#### Location

Attraction of firms from outside the community. Regardless of size or industry, there has been no major influx of firms to Coffeyville; 97% of all firms have not moved to Coffeyville from another city or state in the past five years (see Tables 21, 22 and 23). This is higher than the percentage given by firms in the other eight communities: 94%. Only two firms out of the total surveyed firms moved to Coffeyville in the past five years. Those firms have less than 20 employees and in the manufacturing and finance/services industries.

TABLE 21  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT HAVE MOVED FROM ANOTHER  
 CITY OR STATE TO THEIR PRESENT LOCATION  
 BY SIZE OF FIRM

Has your firm moved to its present location from  
 another city or state in the last five years?

| Number of<br>Employees | NO   | YES |
|------------------------|------|-----|
| 1-19                   | 96%  | 4%  |
| 20-49                  | 100% | 0%  |
| 50+                    | 100% | 0%  |
| -----                  |      |     |
| TOTAL<br>PERCENT       | 97%  | 3%  |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 22  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT HAVE MOVED FROM ANOTHER  
 CITY OR STATE TO THEIR PRESENT LOCATION  
 BY INDUSTRY

Has your firm moved to its present location from  
 another city or state in the last five years?

| Industry         | NO   | YES |
|------------------|------|-----|
| Manufacturing    | 94%  | 6%  |
| Finance/Services | 94%  | 6%  |
| Other Industries | 100% | 0%  |
| -----            |      |     |
| TOTAL<br>PERCENT | 97%  | 3%  |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 23  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT HAVE MOVED FROM ANOTHER  
 CITY OR STATE TO THEIR PRESENT LOCATION  
 BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

Has your firm moved to its present location from  
 another city or state in the last five years?

| Community              | NO  | YES |
|------------------------|-----|-----|
| Coffeyville            | 97% | 3%  |
| Other 8<br>Communities | 94% | 6%  |

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

The major implication from these tables is that recruitment of firms from another city or state has generally not been successful for Coffeyville. As the data that only two surveyed firms moved to the community in the past five years point out, significant growth from bringing companies to the area has not happened (see Table 21). This places emphasis on the importance of fostering home grown companies, and assisting the expansion of existing firms. If recruitment of firms from outside of the community becomes the city's only focus, sustained growth from expansion and additional business start-ups will be lost.

Reasons for location. Most companies are homegrown and see Coffeyville as providing the market and location they need. For the total number of surveyed firms, 66% stated that Coffeyville was the hometown of the company as a reason for location, 34% stated that they were located in the community because it filled a product or service need, and 27% stated that a central location was a reason for location in the city (see Tables 24 and 25). Business representatives gave many explanations for locating in the city,

including "I have been in Coffeyville for 29 years", "the vice president knew someone in Coffeyville", and "the population is small, and the city has a small town image". Forty-five percent of firms surveyed in the other 8 communities gave central location as a reason for location (27% for Coffeyville firms), and 53% of the surveyed firms in the other 8 communities gave hometown as a reason (66% for Coffeyville) (see Table 26).

TABLE 24  
REASONS FOR LOCATION IN THE COMMUNITY\*  
BY SIZE OF FIRM

| Number of Employees | Home-town | Strong Local Economy | More receptive Local Govt. | Tax Incentives and-or Public Financing | Affordable Lease, Purchase Prices | Good Local Labor Pool | Adequate Space for Expansion | Good Access to Market | Good Access to Raw Materials | Central Location | Good transportation Facilities | Filled Production Service Need | Small Town/Rural Life |
|---------------------|-----------|----------------------|----------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 1-19                | 69%       | 6%                   | 1%                         | 0%                                     | 9%                                | 2%                    | 5%                           | 21%                   | 2%                           | 24%              | 8%                             | 35%                            | 2%                    |
| 20-49               | 67%       | 0%                   | 0%                         | 17%                                    | 0%                                | 0%                    | 0%                           | 42%                   | 8%                           | 58%              | 0%                             | 25%                            | 0%                    |
| 50+                 | 47%       | 12%                  | 0%                         | 0%                                     | 0%                                | 12%                   | 0%                           | 6%                    | 12%                          | 18%              | 18%                            | 35%                            | 0%                    |
| PERCENT OF TOTAL    | 66%       | 6%                   | 1%                         | 2%                                     | 7%                                | 3%                    | 4%                           | 21%                   | 4%                           | 27%              | 9%                             | 34%                            | 2%                    |

n = 78

\*Since firms could give more than one reason, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 25  
REASONS FOR LOCATION IN THE COMMUNITY\*  
BY INDUSTRY

| Industry         | Home-town | Strong Local Economy | More receptive Local Govt. | Tax Incentives and-or Public Financing | Affordable Lease, Purchase Prices | Good Local Labor Pool | Adequate Space for Expansion | Good Access to Market | Good Access to Raw Materials | Central Location | Good transportation Facilities | Filled Production Service Need | Small Town/Rural Life |
|------------------|-----------|----------------------|----------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Manufacturing    | 60%       | 0%                   | 3%                         | 0%                                     | 10%                               | 13%                   | 10%                          | 23%                   | 17%                          | 27%              | 17%                            | 27%                            | 0%                    |
| Finance/Services | 71%       | 6%                   | 0%                         | 0%                                     | 12%                               | 0%                    | 0%                           | 6%                    | 0%                           | 6%               | 0%                             | 41%                            | 0%                    |
| Other Industries | 66%       | 9%                   | 0%                         | 3%                                     | 3%                                | 0%                    | 3%                           | 28%                   | 0%                           | 38%              | 9%                             | 34%                            | 3%                    |
| PERCENT OF TOTAL | 66%       | 6%                   | 1%                         | 2%                                     | 7%                                | 3%                    | 4%                           | 21%                   | 4%                           | 27%              | 9%                             | 34%                            | 2%                    |

n = 78

\*Since firms could give more than one reason, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 26  
REASONS FOR LOCATION IN THE COMMUNITY\*  
BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Community              | Home-<br>town | Strong<br>Local<br>Economy | More<br>Recep-<br>tive<br>Local<br>Govt. | Tax In-<br>centives<br>and-or<br>Public<br>Fin-<br>ancing | Suit-<br>able<br>Zoning | Afford-<br>able<br>Lease,<br>Pur-<br>chase<br>Prices | Good<br>Local<br>Labor<br>Pool | Ade-<br>quate<br>Space<br>for<br>Expan-<br>sion | Good<br>Access<br>to<br>Market | Good<br>Access<br>to<br>Mat-<br>erials | Central<br>Loc-<br>ation | Good<br>Trans-<br>por-<br>tation<br>Fac-<br>ilities | Proximity<br>To<br>Educ.-<br>Fac-<br>ilities | Filled<br>A<br>Prod.-<br>Service<br>Need | Small<br>Town,<br>Rural<br>Life |
|------------------------|---------------|----------------------------|--|---|-------------------------|--|--------------------------------|---|--------------------------------|--|--------------------------|---|--|--|---------------------------------|
| Coffeyville            | 66%           | 6%                         | 1%                                       | 2%  | 0%                      | 7%   | 3%                             | 4%  | 21%                            | 4%                                     | 27%                      | 9%  | 0%   | 34%                                      | 2%                              |
| Other 8<br>Communities | 53%           | 9%                         | 2%                                       | 1%  | 1%                      | 9%   | 7%                             | 5%  | 26%                            | 8%                                     | 45%                      | 7%  | 3%   | 47%                                      | 1%                              |

\*Since firms could give more than one reason, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

The major conclusion is that firms are homegrown and locally oriented. The preceding tables underscore this fact: 66% stated that a reason for location was because the city was the hometown and 34% stated that they located to fill a product or service need. Reasons that one might expect to figure prominently in a firm's decision to locate, such as tax incentives, a good local labor pool, and good access to raw materials were not given by a high percentage of companies. A positive sign here is that with so many small hometown firms, the atmosphere for entrepreneurship seems to be good. Any efforts to assist new entrepreneurial enterprise may foster additional business start-ups and additional expansion growth. Indeed, the data indicate that the economic growth of Coffeyville is primarily dependent on the ability to encourage entrepreneurship, rather than recruiting from outside of the community.

#### Retention

Retention of firms in the community. The number of companies that are going to move is very small, but, for those firms that are planning to move

all are moving out of state. Only 4% of firms stated that they will move, and none of those firms are moving to locations that are within the city (see Table 27). These figures are a positive sign for Coffeyville in the fact that not many companies are leaving, but negative in the fact that firms are leaving the state. In general, these figures indicate firm satisfaction with the community and a desire to remain in Coffeyville.

TABLE 27  
PERCENT AND LOCATION OF WHERE FIRMS ARE PLANNING TO MOVE

|  | Moving<br>Within the<br>City | Moving<br>Within the<br>County | Moving<br>Out<br>of State | Total<br>%<br>Moving    |
|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| Firms That Are<br>Planning to Move<br>From Their Present<br>Location In The<br>Next Year | 0%<br>of Total<br>Firms      | 0%<br>of Total<br>Firms        | 4%<br>of Total<br>Firms   | 4%<br>of Total<br>Firms |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

At present, relocation of firms outside of Coffeyville does not seem to be a major problem for the community. Only 4% of the total number of surveyed firms are moving outside of the city. The implication here is that while Coffeyville should have a retention program, that program should be targeted on the very small number of firms that are dissatisfied and moving out of the city. This data, along with the information that not many firms have moved to Coffeyville in the past five years (see Tables 21-23), suggest that the primary focus in Coffeyville should be on the expansion of its existing industries.

Advantages of the community. Firms gave several advantages for locating within the city. The hometown atmosphere and a central, good location were the greatest advantages, followed by the city provided a small-town, rural life and the city filled a product/service need for the company (see Tables 28, 29, and 30). Business representatives said "there is an existing customer base," "it is nice to live in the small town, and folks are real nice," and "the city is in a central location among refineries." Only 8% of the firms that gave an advantage stated that they believe that Coffeyville offers no advantages (see Tables 28 and 29). The focus of these firms is definitely local: 31% of Coffeyville firms gave hometown atmosphere as an advantage, compared to 18% for firms in the other 8 communities (see Table 30). The relatively larger average percentages of products sold in the national market and lower average percentages sold in the local market (see Tables 15-17) may have influenced another comparison difference: 30% of the Coffeyville firms that gave local advantages believed the central, good location was an advantage of the city while 53% of the firms in the other 8 communities gave central location as an advantage.

TABLE 28  
LOCAL ADVANTAGES OF THE COMMUNITY\*  
BY SIZE OF FIRM

| Number of Employees | No Advantage | Hometown Atmosphere | Small Town-Rural Life | Quality of Work Force | Central, Good Location | Filling A Need |
|---------------------|--------------|---------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|----------------|
| 1-19                | 11%          | 30%                 | 24%                   | 4%                    | 29%                    | 22%            |
| 20-49               | 0%           | 42%                 | 0%                    | 50%                   | 58%                    | 0%             |
| 50+                 | 0%           | 30%                 | 29%                   | 35%                   | 18%                    | 12%            |

PERCENT OF TOTAL

n = 68

\*Since firms could give more than one advantage, total percentages may not add to 100%.  
Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 29  
LOCAL ADVANTAGES OF THE COMMUNITY\*  
BY INDUSTRY

| Industry             | No<br>Ad-<br>vantage | Home-<br>town<br>Atmos-<br>phere | Small<br>Town-<br>Rural<br>Life | Qual-<br>ity<br>of<br>Work<br>Force | Central,<br>Good<br>Loc-<br>ation | Filling<br>A<br>Need |
|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Manufacturing        | 13%                  | 33%                              | 20%                             | 20%                                 | 33%                               | 0%                   |
| Finance/<br>Services | 0%                   | 28%                              | 33%                             | 28%                                 | 0%                                | 28%                  |
| Other<br>Industries  | 11%                  | 31%                              | 17%                             | 3%                                  | 46%                               | 20%                  |
| PERCENT OF<br>TOTAL  | 8%                   | 31%                              | 22%                             | 13%                                 | 30%                               | 18%                  |

n = 68

\*Since firms could give more than one advantage, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 30  
LOCAL ADVANTAGES OF THE COMMUNITY\*  
BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Community              | No<br>Ad-<br>vantage | Home-<br>town<br>Atmos-<br>phere | Small<br>Town-<br>Rural<br>Life | Qual-<br>ity<br>of<br>Work<br>Force | Central,<br>Good<br>Loc-<br>ation | Filling<br>A<br>Need |
|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| Coffeyville            | 8%                   | 31%                              | 22%                             | 13%                                 | 30%                               | 18%                  |
| Other 8<br>Communities | 7%                   | 18%                              | 27%                             | 8%                                  | 53%                               | 14%                  |

\*Since firms could give more than one advantage, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

The advantages given in Tables 28 and 29, along with the statements made by business representatives, again emphasize the fact that Coffeyville firms are homegrown and locally oriented. This is particularly so when integrating the data found in Tables 24-26: surveyed firms located because Coffeyville was their hometown and the city provided the product market they needed. The greatest advantages given by all companies were the hometown

atmosphere and a good, central location. It must be remembered, however, that most of these firms are locally oriented, and their central location and satisfactory product/service market may only be relevant to their community. This also suggests that if the local market shrinks because of out-migration or increased competition, there would be a good chance for some business contractions in the city. However, these advantages were given by a lower percentage of firms in comparison to firms in the other 8 communities. As Table 30 shows, few firms feel the quality of work force is an advantage of the city. This implies that firms should know about and be prepared to access the training assistance programs available in the community.

Reasons for relocation. In Coffeyville only two firms are planning to move from the city, which is insufficient to make general conclusions for the community as a whole. The reason for moving given by these firms were high cost of labor, high cost of utilities, access to new market, difficulty in finding labor and difficulty in serving customers.

Additional manufacturers or service providers that would be of benefit to existing companies. Many firms feel that additional companies would be benefit to them. Forty-three percent of the total number of firms stated that additional manufacturers or service providers would benefit their companies (see Tables 31-33). This percentage is higher than the 36% given by firms in the other 8 cities (see Table 33). When asked what those companies might be, 62% of those firms that gave additional companies that would be of benefit stated that raw materials suppliers would be of benefit, compared to the 59% response of the other 8 cities (see Tables 34-36). Firms that most often expressed a need for more raw materials suppliers had

less than 20 employees and were in the other industry category (see Tables 34 and 35).

TABLE 31  
 ADDITIONAL MANUFACTURERS OR SERVICE PROVIDERS  
 THAT WOULD BE OF BENEFIT FOR FIRMS  
 BY SIZE OF FIRM

Are there any manufacturers or service providers that would be of benefit to your company if they were located in your community?

| Number of Employees | NO  | YES |
|---------------------|-----|-----|
| 1-19                | 59% | 41% |
| 20-49               | 75% | 25% |
| 50+                 | 29% | 71% |
| TOTAL PERCENT       | 57% | 43% |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 32  
 ADDITIONAL MANUFACTURERS OR SERVICE PROVIDERS  
 THAT WOULD BE OF BENEFIT FOR FIRMS  
 BY INDUSTRY

Are there any manufacturers or service providers that would be of benefit to your company if they were located in your community?

| Industry         | NO  | YES |
|------------------|-----|-----|
| Manufacturing    | 68% | 32% |
| Finance/Services | 41% | 59% |
| Other Industries | 59% | 41% |
| TOTAL PERCENT    | 57% | 43% |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 33  
 ADDITIONAL MANUFACTURERS OR SERVICE PROVIDERS  
 THAT WOULD BE OF BENEFIT FOR FIRMS  
 BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

Are there any manufacturers or service providers that  
 would be of benefit to your company if they  
 were located in your community?

| Community              | NO  | YES |
|------------------------|-----|-----|
| Coffeyville            | 57% | 43% |
| Other 8<br>Communities | 64% | 36% |

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 34  
 ADDITIONAL COMPANIES THAT WOULD BE OF BENEFIT\*  
 BY SIZE OF FIRM

| Number<br>of<br>Employees | More<br>Customers<br>For<br>Products | Repair<br>Maint-<br>enance | Business<br>Services | Raw<br>Materials<br>Suppliers |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1-19                      | 7%                                   | 7%                         | 13%                  | 73%                           |
| 20-49                     | 0%                                   | 0%                         | 100%                 | 0%                            |
| 50+                       | 50%                                  | 0%                         | 0%                   | 50%                           |
| PERCENT OF<br>TOTAL       | 14%                                  | 5%                         | 19%                  | 62%                           |

n = 13

\*Since firms could mention more than one additional company that would be of benefit, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 35  
 ADDITIONAL COMPANIES THAT WOULD BE OF BENEFIT\*  
 BY INDUSTRY

| Industry         | More Customers For Products | Repair Maintenance | Business Services | Raw Materials Suppliers |
|------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Manufacturing    | 33%                         | 33%                | 0%                | 33%                     |
| Finance/Services | 20%                         | 0%                 | 40%               | 40%                     |
| Other Industries | 0%                          | 0%                 | 0%                | 100%                    |
| PERCENT OF TOTAL | 14%                         | 5%                 | 19%               | 62%                     |

n = 13

\*Since firms could mention more than one additional company that would be of benefit, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 36  
 ADDITIONAL COMPANIES THAT WOULD BE OF BENEFIT\*  
 BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Community           | More Customers For Products | Repair Maintenance | Business Services | Raw Materials Suppliers |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|
| Coffeyville         | 14%                         | 5%                 | 19%               | 62%                     |
| Other 8 Communities | 28%                         | 4%                 | 18%               | 59%                     |

\*Since firms could mention more than one additional company that would be of benefit, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

The large number of companies that would benefit from additional manufacturers or service firms presents opportunities for the city. When

industrial recruitment is attempted, such companies should be targets for industrial recruitment and for targeting support for new firms or expansions. New firms, for example, that provide needed products or services for existing firms in the economic base could be given a priority in economic development programs. New firms in their area have the added benefit of strengthening existing companies and their ties to the city.

Retaining and attracting management and professional personnel. There is a problem in attracting and retaining management or professional personnel to Coffeyville, which could affect future competitiveness and growth of these firms. For the total number of surveyed firms, 26% stated they had this trouble (see Tables 37-39), with companies with 50 or more employees having a greater problem than smaller companies (see Table 37). Forty-seven percent of firms with 50 or more employees indicated a problem with recruiting or retention of managerial employees. This reflects the greater need for professional and managerial employees by firms of this size. Finance/services industry firms had a greater problem than other industry firms. About 41% of firms in finance/services industry indicated the problem (see Table 38). The percentage of firms in Coffeyville that had this problem (26%) is greater than that for the other 8 communities (16%) (see Table 39).

TABLE 37  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT HAVE TROUBLE ATTRACTING  
 OR RETAINING PROFESSIONAL AND MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL  
 BY SIZE OF FIRM

Do you have any trouble attracting and/or  
 retaining professional and management level  
 personnel to your business?

| Number of<br>Employees | NO  | YES |
|------------------------|-----|-----|
| 1-19                   | 77% | 23% |
| 20-49                  | 83% | 17% |
| 50+                    | 53% | 47% |
| TOTAL<br>PERCENT       | 74% | 26% |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size  
 Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public  
 Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 38  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT HAVE TROUBLE ATTRACTING  
 OR RETAINING PROFESSIONAL AND MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL  
 BY INDUSTRY

Do you have any trouble attracting and/or  
 retaining professional and management level  
 personnel to your business?

| Industry         | NO  | YES |
|------------------|-----|-----|
| Manufacturing    | 84% | 16% |
| Finance/Services | 59% | 41% |
| Other Industries | 78% | 22% |
| TOTAL<br>PERCENT | 74% | 26% |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size  
 Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public  
 Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 39  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT HAVE TROUBLE ATTRACTING  
 OR RETAINING PROFESSIONAL AND MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL  
 BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Do you have any trouble attracting and/or<br>retaining professional and management level<br>personnel to your business? |     |     |
|---|-----|-----|
| Community   | NO  | YES |
| Coffeyville   | 74% | 26% |
| Other 8<br>Communities  | 84% | 16% |

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

That very large firms have more trouble retaining and attracting management and professional personnel than do smaller firms (see Table 38) indicates a future problem for expansion. As smaller firms expand, they may have more difficulty keeping and hiring this type of employee. As will be made more clear in the Business Climate section later in this report, attention to quality of life issues in the city, particularly the arts, entertainment, and recreational activities, will be important in attracting professional and management employees to the city. In general, attracting and retaining this type of employee is more of a problem for Coffeyville in comparison to the other communities included in the state report on business retention and expansion.

Perceived images of rural life and Kansas. For community companies, there does not seem to be a problem with the images that rural life and the state of Kansas projects. For all firms, 93% stated they do not have a negative image of rural life (see Tables 40-42), compared with 94% from the other eight cities (see Table 42). Of the total number of surveyed firms,

99% stated that they did not have a negative image of Kansas (see Tables 43-45), compared with 98% given by firms in the other 8 cities (see Table 45). However, Tables 40 and 43 show that firms with 20 to 49 employees have a slightly more negative view of rural life and of Kansas. Table 41 indicates that relatively high percentage of firms in the finance/services industry have a more negative view of rural life.

TABLE 40  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS WITH A NEGATIVE  
 IMAGE OF RURAL LIFE  
 BY SIZE OF FIRM

| Do you have a negative image<br>of rural life? |     |     |
|--|-----|-----|
| Number of<br>Employees                         | NO  | YES |
| 1-19   | 94% | 6%  |
| 20-49  | 83% | 17% |
| 50+  | 94% | 6%  |
| TOTAL<br>PERCENT                               | 93% | 7%  |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 41  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS WITH A NEGATIVE  
 IMAGE OF RURAL LIFE  
 BY INDUSTRY

| Do you have a negative image<br>of rural life? |      |     |
|--|------|-----|
| Industry                                       | NO   | YES |
| Manufacturing                                  | 97%  | 3%  |
| Finance/Services                               | 76%  | 24% |
| Other Industries                               | 100% | 0%  |
| TOTAL<br>PERCENT                               | 93%  | 7%  |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 42  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS WITH A NEGATIVE  
 IMAGE OF RURAL LIFE  
 BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Do you have a negative image<br>of rural life? |     |     |
|--|-----|-----|
| Community                                      | NO  | YES |
| Coffeyville                                    | 93% | 7%  |
| Other 8<br>Communities                         | 94% | 6%  |

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 43  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS WITH A NEGATIVE  
 IMAGE OF KANSAS  
 BY SIZE OF FIRM

| Do you have a negative image<br>of Kansas? |      |     |
|--|------|-----|
| Number of<br>Employees                     | NO   | YES |
| 1-19                                       | 100% | 0%  |
| 20-49                                      | 83%  | 17% |
| 50+  | 100% | 0%  |
| TOTAL<br>PERCENT                           | 99%  | 1%  |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 44  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS WITH A NEGATIVE  
 IMAGE OF KANSAS  
 BY INDUSTRY

| Do you have a negative image<br>of Kansas? |      |     |
|--|------|-----|
| Industry                                   | NO   | YES |
| Manufacturing                              | 100% | 0%  |
| Finance/Services                           | 94%  | 6%  |
| Other Industries                           | 100% | 0%  |
| TOTAL<br>PERCENT                           | 99%  | 1%  |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 45  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS WITH A NEGATIVE  
 IMAGE OF KANSAS  
 BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Community              | Do you have a negative image<br>of Kansas? |     |
|------------------------|--|-----|
|                        | NO   | YES |
| Coffeyville            | 99%  | 1%  |
| Other 8<br>Communities | 98%  | 2%  |

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

It must be recognized that these data stem somewhat from the hometown nature of these firms. It also points out that any city policy that stresses the quality of the city or the state will probably not be that helpful in retaining or encouraging expansion. At present, firms are pleased with rural life and their state, and this is another good sign to be considered when discussing retention of Coffeyville companies. However, there are indications that larger firms could be more likely to have negative images of rural life. The city needs to address the concerns of larger companies or risk the possibility of losing companies as they succeed and grow.

#### Location and Retention Summary

After examining the data on location and retention, it is possible to make the following summary implications:

1. Firms are predominantly homegrown and small, indicating that a good climate for future entrepreneurship from within these communities can be fostered for new expansion.

2. Very few firms are moving from their present location, and all of those that are moving are moving out of state. This indicates that the city's retention strategy will be most successful if aimed at the small number of firms which are dissatisfied with the city.

3. The city policy for retention and expansion should include the development and access of the programs under which quality workers will be provided.

4. Raw materials suppliers are additional companies that would be of benefit to existing firms. Location and expansion decisions will be made upon the proximity and the delivery of supporting materials and services.

5. Firms do not have negative images about rural life or the state of Kansas, suggesting that policy which exclusively stresses the quality of the community will have little or no effect on retention or expansion.

6. Coffeyville firms, in comparison to communities of relative size, do have trouble attracting and maintaining managers and professionals. This is especially so for firms with 50 or more employees. As companies expand and grow larger, there will be greater difficulty in attracting and maintaining management and professional personnel.

V.

DESCRIPTION AND DETERMINANTS OF BUSINESS EXPANSION

In this section firms are described in terms of their past expansion and plans for future expansion, which include employment changes, physical plant size changes, factors that help expansion, factors that lead to contraction, location where expansion will take place, and problems that lead to expansion out of the community and out of state. Also described are findings that focus on additional products that may be offered, the potential and desire to expand internationally, factors that assist or impede exporting a product or service, and financing for expansion.

The major findings are (1) the majority of firms are optimistic about growth in the city, (2) the market for products and a lack of financing are major problems for expansion, (3) an expanding market is a major factor helping expansion, (4) the majority of planned expansions will take place within the city limit, (5) financing for expansion is mainly from traditional sources such as banks and internal financing, with little assistance coming from state programs, and (6) there are firms that have the potential and desire to expand internationally.

Past Expansion

Employment expansion. In the past two years, the majority of firms have neither increased nor decreased employment (see Tables 46-48). However, 36% of all firms increased employment during the past two years with larger firms increasing employment more than smaller firms (see Table 46). Of the firms with 20 to 49 employees, 50% increased employment in the past two years. Yet a sizable number of surveyed firms, 20%, decreased employment during the period.

TABLE 46  
PAST INCREASES IN EMPLOYMENT  
BY SIZE OF FIRM

In the last two years, has your firm increased  
or decreased its employment?

| Number of<br>Employees | Decreased<br>Employment | Employment           |                         |
|------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
|                        |                         | Remained<br>Constant | Increased<br>Employment |
| 1-19                   | 19%                     | 48%                  | 33%                     |
| 20-49                  | 25%                     | 25%                  | 50%                     |
| 50+                    | 24%                     | 29%                  | 47%                     |
| TOTAL<br>PERCENT       | 20%                     | 44%                  | 36%                     |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Of all industries, the manufacturing industry had the highest employment decreases and the lowest employment increases while the finance/services industry had the lowest employment decreases (see Table 47).

TABLE 47  
PAST INCREASES IN EMPLOYMENT  
BY INDUSTRY

In the last two years, has your firm increased  
or decreased its employment?

| Industry         | Decreased<br>Employment | Employment           |                         |
|------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
|                  |                         | Remained<br>Constant | Increased<br>Employment |
| Manufacturing    | 32%                     | 45%                  | 23%                     |
| Finance/Services | 12%                     | 47%                  | 41%                     |
| Other Industries | 19%                     | 40%                  | 41%                     |
| TOTAL PERCENT    | 20%                     | 44%                  | 36%                     |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

The percentage of firms in Coffeyville that remained employment constant or decreased employment in the past two years is lower and the percentage of firms in Coffeyville that increased employment is higher than those of the other 8 cities, indicating that surveyed Coffeyville firms were growing more during the past two years than firms surveyed in the other 8 cities (see Table 48).

TABLE 48  
PAST INCREASES IN EMPLOYMENT  
BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Community           | In the last two years, has your firm increased or decreased its employment? |                              |                      |
|---------------------|---|------------------------------|----------------------|
|                     | Decreased Employment  | Employment Remained Constant | Increased Employment |
| Coffeyville         | 20%   | 44%                          | 36%                  |
| Other 8 Communities | 22%   | 46%                          | 32%                  |

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

If most smaller firms remain predominantly oriented towards the local market, their employment growth will continue to be lower than that for larger firms. This again points out the importance of expanding current product/service markets. Table 48 shows that a larger percentage of surveyed Coffeyville firms increased employment than surveyed firms in the other 8 cities. Local leaders should try to maintain this growth.

Physical plant expansion. In the past two years, the majority of firms have held physical plant size constant. Of the total number of firms, only 7% decreased plant size over the last two years and 35% increased size (see

Tables 49-51). Larger firms increased their physical size more than smaller firms, and there were notable contractions in the manufacturing industries category. No firms in the finance/services industries decreased their physical size over the last two years. In Coffeyville, the percentage of firms that increased their physical size is consistent with, and the percentage of firms that decreased their physical size is less than, percentages for firms in the other eight cities (see Table 51). This indicates that, along with higher employment increases, the Coffeyville economy has been growing more than the other 8 cities.

TABLE 49  
PAST INCREASES IN PHYSICAL PLANT SIZE  
BY SIZE OF FIRM

| In the last two years, has your firm increased or decreased the size of its physical plant? |                |                   |                |
|---|----------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Number of Employees   | Size           |                   |                |
|   | Decreased Size | Remained Constant | Increased Size |
| 1-19  | 7%             | 63%               | 30%            |
| 20-49   | 17%            | 17%               | 66%            |
| 50+   | 0%             | 59%               | 41%            |
| TOTAL PERCENT   | 7%             | 58%               | 35%            |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 50  
PAST INCREASES IN PHYSICAL PLANT SIZE  
BY INDUSTRY

| In the last two years, has your firm increased or decreased the size of its physical plant? |                |                   |                |
|---|----------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Industry  | Size           |                   |                |
|   | Decreased Size | Remained Constant | Increased Size |
| Manufacturing   | 23%            | 54%               | 23%            |
| Finance/Services  | 0%             | 47%               | 53%            |
| Other Industries  | 3%             | 66%               | 31%            |
| TOTAL PERCENT   | 7%             | 58%               | 35%            |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 51  
PAST INCREASES IN PHYSICAL PLANT SIZE  
BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| In the last two years, has your firm increased or decreased the size of its physical plant? |                |                   |                |
|---|----------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Community   | Size           |                   |                |
|   | Decreased Size | Remained Constant | Increased Size |
| Coffeyville   | 7%             | 58%               | 35%            |
| Other 8 Communities   | 9%             | 56%               | 35%            |

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Problems with past expansion. The market for products and a lack of financing are major problems for expansion in Coffeyville. For the firms that mentioned problems, 54% stated that a static or declining market was a problem and 40% stated that a lack of affordable financing was a problem

(See Tables 52-54). Other problems included strong competition, the decline in oil prices and the availability of labor. In comparison to firms surveyed in the other 8 communities, Coffeyville had notable higher percentages of firms that gave a declining market and lack of affordable financing as problems (see Table 54). Ways are needed to assist companies to increase their markets for products and obtain financing for their expansions.

TABLE 52  
SPECIFIC PROBLEMS WITH EXPANSION\*  
BY SIZE OF FIRM

| Number of Employees | Availability of Labor | Static or Declining Market | Lack of Affordable Financing | Utility Costs | Transpor- tation Dif- ficul- ties | Avail- ability of Space | Strong Compe- tition | Decline In Oil Prices |
|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1-19                | 8%                    | 61%                        | 39%                          | 0%            | 0%                                | 5%                      | 16%                  | 16%                   |
| 20-49               | 0%                    | 0%                         | 0%                           | 0%            | 0%                                | 0%                      | 100%                 | 0%                    |
| 50+                 | 0%                    | 0%                         | 67%                          | 34%           | 34%                               | 0%                      | 0%                   | 0%                    |
| PERCENT OF TOTAL    | 7%                    | 54%                        | 40%                          | 2%            | 2%                                | 5%                      | 19%                  | 14%                   |

n = 26

\*Since firms could give more than one problem, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 53  
SPECIFIC PROBLEMS WITH EXPANSION\*  
BY INDUSTRY

| Industry          | Availability of Labor | Static or Declining Market | Lack of Affordable Financing | Utility Costs | Transpor- tation Dif- ficul- ties | Avail- ability of Space | Strong Compe- tition | Decline In Oil Prices |
|-------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| Manufacturing     | 14%                   | 71%                        | 14%                          | 14%           | 14%                               | 0%                      | 0%                   | 0%                    |
| Finance/ Services | 17%                   | 33%                        | 50%                          | 0%            | 0%                                | 17%                     | 17%                  | 0%                    |
| Other Industries  | 0%                    | 58%                        | 58%                          | 0%            | 0%                                | 0%                      | 25%                  | 25%                   |
| PERCENT OF TOTAL  | 7%                    | 54%                        | 40%                          | 2%            | 2%                                | 5%                      | 19%                  | 14%                   |

n = 26

\*Since firms could give more than one problem, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 54  
 SPECIFIC PROBLEMS WITH EXPANSION\*  
 BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Community           | Zoning Regulations | Availability of Labor | Static or Declining Market | Lack of Financing | Lack of Raw Materials | Utility Costs | Transportation Difficulties | Availability of Space | Lack of Training Resources | Tax Laws | Strong Competition | Decline in Oil Prices |
|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Coffeyville         | 0%                 | 7%                    | 54%                        | 40%               | 0%                    | 2%            | 2%                          | 5%                    | 0%                         | 0%       | 19%                | 14%                   |
| Other 8 Communities | 12%                | 11%                   | 40%                        | 22%               | 1%                    | 3%            | 1%                          | 7%                    | 5%                         | 3%       | 7%                 | 11%                   |

\*Since firms could give more than one problem, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

That the market for products is the major problem for not expanding may result from the narrow scope of markets many Coffeyville firms use. A lack of financing is one of the major problems associated with not expanding, indicating that ways are needed to assist companies to obtain financing for their expansions and to help companies to know additional ways to finance an expansion. Lack of financing may come from lack of knowledge, not a lack of desire to use available programs.

Factors helping expansion. For those firms that have expanded, an expanding market played a significant role. Of those firms that have experienced an expansion, 59% stated that an expanding market was a helping factor (see Tables 55-57). Desire to expand market (22%), the availability of space (18%) and more efficient operation (14%) were seen as helping factors. For large firms and the other industry firms especially, new customers to purchase products has been a great expansion factor (see Table 55 and 56). Community comparisons revealed that a smaller percentage of firms in Coffeyville stated an expanding market was a helping factor (see Table 57).

TABLE 55  
FACTORS THAT HELPED EXPANSION\*  
BY SIZE OF FIRM

| Number of Employees | Expanding Market | Availability of Public Assist. | Availability of Tech. Innovation | Availability of Space | Desire To Expand Market | Improved Financing | More Efficient Operations |
|---------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| 1-19                | 56%              | 5%                             | 2%                               | 21%                   | 23%                     | 0%                 | 16%                       |
| 20-49               | 70%              | 0%                             | 0%                               | 0%                    | 20%                     | 10%                | 20%                       |
| 50+                 | 60%              | 20%                            | 0%                               | 20%                   | 20%                     | 20%                | 0%                        |
| PERCENT OF TOTAL    | 59%              | 6%                             | 2%                               | 18%                   | 22%                     | 5%                 | 14%                       |

n = 38

\*Since firms could give more than one factor, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Note: This question was answered only by those firms that had previously stated they had increased plant size and/or employment.

TABLE 56  
FACTORS THAT HELPED EXPANSION\*  
BY INDUSTRY

| Industry         | Expanding Market | Availability of Public Assist. | Availability of Tech. Innovation | Availability of Space | Desire To Expand Market | Improved Financing | More Efficient Operations |
|------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Manufacturing    | 46%              | 0%                             | 9%                               | 27%                   | 18%                     | 9%                 | 9%                        |
| Finance/Services | 46%              | 9%                             | 0%                               | 36%                   | 27%                     | 9%                 | 9%                        |
| Other Industries | 73%              | 7%                             | 0%                               | 0%                    | 20%                     | 0%                 | 20%                       |
| PERCENT OF TOTAL | 59%              | 6%                             | 2%                               | 18%                   | 22%                     | 5%                 | 14%                       |

n = 38

\*Since firms could give more than one factor, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Note: This question was answered only by those firms that had previously stated they had increased plant size and/or employment.

TABLE 57  
FACTORS THAT HELPED EXPANSION\*  
BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Community           | Expanding Market | Availability of Tax Incentives | Availability of Public Assist. | Availability of Tech. Innovation | Availability of Space | Desire To Expand Market | Improved Financing | More Efficient Operations |
|---------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Coffeyville         | 59%              | 0%                             | 6%                             | 2%                               | 18%                   | 22%                     | 5%                 | 14%                       |
| Other 8 Communities | 70%              | 1%                             | 4%                             | 4%                               | 21%                   | 27%                     | 4%                 | 30%                       |

\*Since firms could give more than one factor, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Note: This question was answered only by those firms that had previously stated they had increased plant size and/or employment.

Information and assistance that will help firms reach new customers is very important to the future expansion of Coffeyville firms. An expanding market is considered an important helping factor for expansion in the minds of Coffeyville respondents. This indicates the need for many companies in the community to broaden the scope of their products or services and to reach broader markets. To be more effective, city policy will have to consider a variety of assistance and problems, not single issues.

Reasons for contraction. Just as expansion is affected by an expanding market for products, contraction is affected by a declining or static market. Of the few (n = 14) firms that stated they had experienced a contraction, 74% gave a declining or static market as a reason for decreases (see Tables 58, 59 and 60). All firms with 20 to 49 employees and in the finance/services industry gave this reason. Thirty-nine percent of Coffeyville firms that stated they had experienced a contraction gave a decline in oil prices as a reason for contraction, compared with 19% from firms in the other 8 cities.

TABLE 58  
REASON FOR CONTRACTION\*  
BY SIZE OF FIRM

| Number of Employees | Declining or Static Market | Lack of Affordable Financing | Decline In Oil Prices | To Increase Efficiency |
|---------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| 1-19                | 72%                        | 6%                           | 44%                   | 0%                     |
| 20-49               | 100%                       | 0%                           | 0%                    | 67%                    |
| 50+                 | 50%                        | 0%                           | 50%                   | 50%                    |
| TOTAL PERCENT       | 74%                        | 4%                           | 39%                   | 13%                    |

n = 14

\*Since firms could give more than one reason, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Note: This question was answered only by those firms that previously stated they had experienced a contraction in employment and/or plant size.

TABLE 59  
REASONS GIVEN FOR CONTRACTION\*  
BY INDUSTRY

| Industry         | Declining or Static Market | Lack of Affordable Financing | Decline In Oil Prices | To Increase Efficiency |
|------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| Manufacturing    | 56%                        | 11%                          | 33%                   | 11%                    |
| Finance/Services | 100%                       | 0%                           | 0%                    | 0%                     |
| Other Industries | 83%                        | 0%                           | 50%                   | 17%                    |
| TOTAL PERCENT    | 74%                        | 4%                           | 39%                   | 13%                    |

n = 14

\*Since firms could give more than one reason, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Note: This question was answered only by those firms that previously stated they had experienced a contraction in employment and/or plant size.

TABLE 60  
REASONS FOR CONTRACTION\*  
BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Community              | De-<br>clining<br>or<br>Static<br>Market | Con-<br>tracting<br>Labor<br>Pool | Rising<br>Labor<br>Costs | Rising<br>Raw<br>Mat-<br>erials<br>Costs | Rising<br>Plant-<br>Space<br>Costs | Lack of<br>Afford-<br>able<br>Fin-<br>ancing | De-<br>cline<br>in Oil<br>Prices | In-<br>crease<br>Effic-<br>iency | Taxes-<br>Regu-<br>latory<br>Costs |
|------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Coffeyville            | 74%                                      | 0%                                | 0%                       | 0%                                       | 0%                                 | 4%   | 39%                              | 13%                              | 0%                                 |
| Other 8<br>Communities | 71%                                      | 4%                                | 2%                       | 3%                                       | 1%                                 | 5%   | 19%                              | 16%                              | 1%                                 |

\*Since firms could give more than one reason, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Note: this question was only answered by firms that previously stated they had experienced a contraction in physical plant size and/or employment.

### Plans for Expansion

Employment expansion. Firms are very optimistic about their ability to retain or increase employment. Only 4% of the total number of firms stated that they would decrease employment in the next year and 39% stated that they would increase employment in the next year (see Tables 61, 62 and 63). All firms that stated that they would decrease employment in the next year have less than 20 employees. The finance/services industry have the highest percentage of firms that stated that they would increase employment in the next year. The percentage of Coffeyville firms that stated that they would decrease or increase employment in the next year is almost the same as that given by the surveyed firms in the other 8 cities (see Table 63). The major implication here is that the city strategy must ensure assistance that will build upon this optimistic attitude towards employment expansion.

TABLE 61  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS PLANNING TO  
 INCREASE EMPLOYMENT  
 BY SIZE OF FIRM

| In the next year, is your firm planning to<br>increase or decrease employment? |                                |                            |                                |
|--|--------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Number of<br>Employees   | Employment                     |                            |                                |
|  | Will<br>Decrease<br>Employment | Will<br>Remain<br>Constant | Will<br>Increase<br>Employment |
| 1-19   | 5%                             | 61%                        | 34%                            |
| 20-49  | 0%                             | 50%                        | 50%                            |
| 50+  | 0%                             | 33%                        | 67%                            |
| TOTAL<br>PERCENT   | 4%                             | 57%                        | 39%                            |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 62  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS PLANNING TO  
 INCREASE EMPLOYMENT  
 BY INDUSTRY

| In the next year, is your firm planning to<br>increase or decrease employment? |                                |                            |                                |
|--|--------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Industry   | Employment                     |                            |                                |
|  | Will<br>Decrease<br>Employment | Will<br>Remain<br>Constant | Will<br>Increase<br>Employment |
| Manufacturing  | 3%                             | 58%                        | 39%                            |
| Finance/Services   | 0%                             | 56%                        | 44%                            |
| Other Industries   | 6%                             | 56%                        | 38%                            |
| TOTAL<br>PERCENT   | 4%                             | 57%                        | 39%                            |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 63  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS PLANNING TO  
 INCREASE EMPLOYMENT  
 BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Community              | In the next year, is your firm planning to<br>increase or decrease employment? |  |                                |
|------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------|
|                        | Will<br>Decrease<br>Employment   | Employment<br>Will<br>Remain<br>Constant | Will<br>Increase<br>Employment |
| Coffeyville            | 4%   | 57%                                      | 39%                            |
| Other 8<br>Communities | 3%   | 57%                                      | 40%                            |

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

There is opportunity for new employment growth in the community, also. Of the total number of firms, 23% decreased employment or held employment levels constant the past two years but expect to increase employment next year (see Table 64). Only 1% of these firms decreased employment the past two years and plan to increase employment next year, and 16% increased employment the past two years and will do the same next year. These data again emphasize the optimism firms in Coffeyville have concerning employment in the future.

TABLE 64  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT HAVE  
 INCREASED EMPLOYMENT THE LAST TWO YEARS  
 AND ARE PLANNING FUTURE INCREASES IN EMPLOYMENT

| Changes In<br>Employment<br>The Last Two Years | Employment<br>In The Next Year |                            |                                |
|--|--------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
|  | Will<br>Decrease<br>Employment | Will<br>Remain<br>Constant | Will<br>Increase<br>Employment |
| Decreased Employment                           | 1%                             | 10%                        | 9%                             |
| Employment Remained<br>Constant                | 3%                             | 37%                        | 14%                            |
| Increased Employment                           | 0%                             | 10%                        | 16%                            |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Physical plant size expansion. As with employment, firms are optimistic about plant size expansion. While 22% of total firms stated that they are planning an expansion in physical plant size next year, only 4% of the firms stated they would experience a contraction in physical plant size next year (see Tables 65, 66 and 67). Firms in Coffeyville feel they are in good position to expand, although the greatest percentage of firms will remain constant in physical plant size. This implies that city policy must make sure that this growth is realized to the extent possible.

TABLE 65  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT  
 ARE PLANNING AN EXPANSION  
 BY SIZE OF FIRM

In the next year, is your firm planning on an expansion or a contraction in the size of your physical plant?

| Number of<br>Employees | Size<br>Will |                    |           |
|------------------------|--------------|--------------------|-----------|
|                        | Contraction  | Remain<br>Constant | Expansion |
| 1-19                   | 5%           | 77%                | 18%       |
| 20-49                  | 0%           | 92%                | 8%        |
| 50+                    | 0%           | 47%                | 53%       |
| TOTAL<br>PERCENT       | 4%           | 74%                | 22%       |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 66  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT  
 ARE PLANNING AN EXPANSION  
 BY INDUSTRY

In the next year, is your firm planning on an expansion or a contraction in the size of your physical plant?

| Industry         | Size<br>Will |                    |           |
|------------------|--------------|--------------------|-----------|
|                  | Contraction  | Remain<br>Constant | Expansion |
| Manufacturing    | 3%           | 84%                | 13%       |
| Finance/Services | 0%           | 59%                | 41%       |
| Other Industries | 6%           | 78%                | 16%       |
| TOTAL<br>PERCENT | 4%           | 74%                | 22%       |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 67  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT  
 ARE PLANNING AN EXPANSION  
 BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Community           | In the next year, is your firm planning on an expansion or a contraction in the size of your physical plant? |                           |           |
|---------------------|--|---------------------------|-----------|
|                     | Contraction  | Size Will Remain Constant | Expansion |
| Coffeyville         | 4%   | 74%                       | 22%       |
| Other 8 Communities | 1%   | 77%                       | 22%       |

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

There is also opportunity for new growth in physical plant size. Of the total number of firms, 13% decreased plant size or kept size constant the past two years but expect to increase size next year (see Table 68). No firm that decreased size plan to do the same next year. Another positive sign for the community is that 9% of these firms increased plant size the past two years and will increase size next year.

TABLE 68  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT HAVE  
 INCREASED PHYSICAL PLANT SIZE THE LAST TWO YEARS  
 AND ARE PLANNING FUTURE INCREASES IN PHYSICAL PLANT SIZE

| Changes In<br>Physical Plant Size<br>The Last Two Years | Physical Plant Size<br>In The Next Year |                            |                              |
|---|---|----------------------------|------------------------------|
|   | Will<br>Have A<br>Contraction           | Will<br>Remain<br>Constant | Will<br>Have An<br>Expansion |
| Decreased Plant Size                                    | 0%                                      | 8%                         | 0%                           |
| Plant Size Remained<br>Constant                         | 4%                                      | 44%                        | 13%                          |
| Increased Plant Size                                    | 0%                                      | 22%                        | 9%                           |

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Location of expansion. For those firms that are planning an expansion, expansion for the majority (58%) will be within the city limits (see Tables 69, 70 and 71). All firms with 20 to 49 employees and firms in the manufacturing industry will expand within the community. A relatively high percentage of firms with 50 or more employees and firms in the finance/ services industries expect to expand outside of Montgomery County. The percentage of Coffeyville firms that will expand within Coffeyville is lower than that (63%) of the other 8 cities, although total percentages are similar (see Table 71).

TABLE 69  
 LOCATION OF WHERE EXPANSION WILL TAKE PLACE  
 FOR FIRMS THAT ARE PLANNING EXPANSION, BY SIZE OF FIRM

| Number of Employees | Where Expansion Will Be |                        |                  |              |
|---------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------|--------------|
|                     | Within The City Limits  | Within The Same County | Within The State | Out of State |
| 1-19                | 45%                     | 33%                    | 11%              | 11%          |
| 20-49               | 100%                    | 0%                     | 0%               | 0%           |
| 50+                 | 78%                     | 0%                     | 22%              | 0%           |
| TOTAL PERCENT       | 58%                     | 21%                    | 14%              | 7%           |

n = 17

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Note: This question was asked only to firms that previously stated they were planning an expansion.

TABLE 70  
 LOCATION OF WHERE EXPANSION WILL TAKE PLACE  
 FOR FIRMS THAT ARE PLANNING EXPANSION, BY INDUSTRY

| Industry         | Where Expansion Will Be |                        |                  |              |
|------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|------------------|--------------|
|                  | Within The City Limits  | Within The Same County | Within The State | Out of State |
| Manufacturing    | 100%                    | 0%                     | 0%               | 0%           |
| Finance/Services | 71%                     | 0%                     | 29%              | 0%           |
| Other Industries | 20%                     | 60%                    | 0%               | 20%          |
| TOTAL PERCENT    | 58%                     | 21%                    | 14%              | 7%           |

n = 17

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Note: This question was asked only to firms that previously stated they were planning an expansion.

TABLE 71  
 LOCATION OF WHERE EXPANSION WILL TAKE PLACE  
 FOR FIRMS THAT ARE PLANNING EXPANSION,  
 BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Community              | Where Expansion Will Be         |                                 |                        |                    |
|------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|
|                        | Within<br>The<br>City<br>Limits | Within<br>The<br>Same<br>County | Within<br>The<br>State | Out<br>of<br>State |
| Coffeyville            | 58%                             | 21%                             | 14%                    | 7%                 |
| Other 8<br>Communities | 63%                             | 18%                             | 13%                    | 6%                 |

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Note: This question was asked only to firms that previously stated they were planning an expansion.

Although the majority of expansions are planned to take place within Coffeyville, 42% of these firms are expanding outside of the city limits. The number of respondents is small (n = 17), but these are firms that can provide growth for the community. Needed is the city strategy that can isolate reasons for expanding outside of the city and that can encourage firms to expand within the community. If reasons for lost growth are not found and acted upon, expansion loss could continue.

Advantages that influenced expansion. Only four firms gave local advantages that influenced expansion. These advantages were a good local labor pool, that space was available, tax incentives and public assistance, and strong local economy. Firms in the other 8 cities that mentioned local advantages gave a space availability, strong local economy and good local labor as advantages. Four firms are not enough to make general conclusions for the community.

Problems that led to expansion outside of the community. Two surveyed firms in Coffeyville mentioned problems that led to expansion outside of the community, which is not enough to generalize for the community. These problems were "specific problems" in the community and city taxes. Firms in the other 8 communities also mentioned specific problems in the community and city taxes, as well as zoning regulations as problems that led to expansion outside of the community.

Additional Products and Expansion. Whether it is financial, informational, or regulatory, firms need assistance in tackling problems of offering new products. Lack of affordable financing, no desire to expand, lack of adequate skill, and the static or declining market are the four major reasons given by firms that are not offering an additional product (see Tables 72-74). Small firms especially have these problems, as well as a lack of specific knowledge about offering additional products (see Table 72). Lack of affordable financing and no desire to expand are particular problems for the manufacturing industry firms (see Table 73). In Coffeyville, compared to the other eight cities, more firms stated that they had the problem of a lack of affordable financing and that expressed no desire to expand (see Table 74).

TABLE 72  
REASONS FOR NOT OFFERING AN ADDITIONAL PRODUCT OR SERVICE\*  
BY SIZE OF FIRM

| Number of Employees | Lack of Financing | Lack of Specific Knowledge | No Desire To Expand | Static or Declining Market | Lack of Skilled Labor | Lack of Equipment, Tech. | Introducing Product or Service Now |
|---------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1-19                | 22%               | 11%                        | 20%                 | 14%                        | 19%                   | 6%                       | 36%                                |
| 20-49               | 0%                | 0%                         | 0%                  | 100%                       | 0%                    | 0%                       | 0%                                 |
| 50+                 | 30%               | 0%                         | 20%                 | 0%                         | 0%                    | 10%                      | 50%                                |
| PERCENT OF TOTAL    | 23%               | 9%                         | 19%                 | 13%                        | 15%                   | 6%                       | 38%                                |

n = 28

\*Since firms could give more than one reason, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 73  
REASONS FOR NOT OFFERING AN ADDITIONAL PRODUCT OR SERVICE\*  
BY INDUSTRY

| Industry         | Lack of Financing | Lack of Specific Knowledge | No Desire To Expand | Static or Declining Market | Lack of Skilled Labor | Lack of Equipment, Tech. | Introducing Product or Service Now |
|------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Manufacturing    | 39%               | 0%                         | 39%                 | 15%                        | 8%                    | 8%                       | 15%                                |
| Finance/Services | 25%               | 0%                         | 25%                 | 0%                         | 13%                   | 0%                       | 63%                                |
| Other Industries | 11%               | 22%                        | 0%                  | 22%                        | 22%                   | 11%                      | 33%                                |
| PERCENT OF TOTAL | 23%               | 9%                         | 19%                 | 13%                        | 15%                   | 6%                       | 38%                                |

n = 28

\*Since firms could give more than one reason, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 74  
REASONS FOR NOT OFFERING AN ADDITIONAL PRODUCT OR SERVICE\*  
BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Community           | Restrictive Laws or Regulations | Lack of Financing | Lack of Specific Knowledge | No Desire To Expand | Static or Declining Market | Low Cash Flow | Business Complex Enough Now | Lack of Skilled Labor | Lack of Equipment, Tech. | Introducing Product or Service Now |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Coffeyville         | 0%                              | 23%               | 9%                         | 19%                 | 13%                        | 0%            | 0%                          | 15%                   | 6%                       | 38%                                |
| Other 8 Communities | 13%                             | 14%               | 5%                         | 8%                  | 13%                        | 14%           | 15%                         | 10%                   | 12%                      | 20%                                |

\*Since firms could give more than one reason, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Companies do not seem to have the resources or knowledge necessary to introduce a new product. Added to this is the lack of desire to expand. Financing and information which are designed to assist firms creating new products must be considered a priority, especially since new products will help companies reach new markets and increase their chances for expansion. Although most of these firms stated they are currently introducing a new product or service, information and financing must be made available to those who need assistance to increase the chances for growth.

Expanding into the international market. Offering new or existing products to the international market will help the city economically, and there are firms that can and want to expand into the international market. Of those business representatives that gave responses, 16% said that their firm had the potential and 17% stated that they had the desire to expand internationally (see Tables 75-80). Firms with 20 to 49 employees had the highest percentages of firms that stated they had the potential and desire to expand internationally (see Tables 75 and 78). The manufacturing industry had the highest percentage of firms that stated they had the potential and the other industries had the highest percentages of firms that stated they had the desire to enter the international market (see Tables 76 and 79). In comparison to surveyed firms in the other 8 communities, Coffeyville firms had the higher total percentages of firms with both the expressed potential and desire to expand internationally (see Tables 77 and 80).

TABLE 75  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT FEEL THEY HAVE  
 THE POTENTIAL TO EXPAND INTERNATIONALLY, BY SIZE OF FIRM

Do you feel your business has the potential  
 to expand into the international market?

| Number of<br>Employees | NO  | YES |
|------------------------|-----|-----|
| 1-19                   | 86% | 14% |
| 20-49                  | 56% | 44% |
| 50+                    | 86% | 14% |
| TOTAL<br>PERCENT       | 84% | 16% |

n = 71

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 76  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT FEEL THEY HAVE  
 THE POTENTIAL TO EXPAND INTERNATIONALLY, BY INDUSTRY

Do you feel your business has the potential  
 to expand into the international market?

| Industry         | NO  | YES |
|------------------|-----|-----|
| Manufacturing    | 82% | 18% |
| Finance/Services | 86% | 14% |
| Other Industries | 84% | 16% |
| TOTAL<br>PERCENT | 84% | 16% |

n = 71

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 77  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT FEEL THEY HAVE  
 THE POTENTIAL TO EXPAND INTERNATIONALLY,  
 BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Do you feel your business has the potential to expand into the international market? |     |     |
|--|-----|-----|
| Community  | NO  | YES |
| Coffeyville  | 84% | 16% |
| Other 8 Communities  | 87% | 13% |

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 78  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT HAVE THE  
 DESIRE TO EXPAND INTERNATIONALLY, BY SIZE OF FIRM

| Does your firm have the desire to expand into the international market? |     |     |
|---|-----|-----|
| Number of Employees   | NO  | YES |
| 1-19  | 84% | 16% |
| 20-49   | 56% | 44% |
| 50+   | 93% | 7%  |
| TOTAL PERCENT   | 83% | 17% |

n = 72

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 79  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT HAVE THE  
 DESIRE TO EXPAND INTERNATIONALLY, BY INDUSTRY

| Does your firm have the desire to expand into the international market? |     |     |
|---|-----|-----|
| Industry  | NO  | YES |
| Manufacturing   | 85% | 15% |
| Finance/Services  | 87% | 13% |
| Other Industries  | 81% | 19% |
| TOTAL PERCENT   | 83% | 17% |

n = 72

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 80  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT HAVE THE  
 DESIRE TO EXPAND INTERNATIONALLY  
 BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Does your firm have the desire to expand into the international market? |     |     |
|---|-----|-----|
| Community   | NO  | YES |
| Coffeyville   | 83% | 17% |
| Other 8 Communities   | 88% | 12% |

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Considering the importance of competing in the international market, it is imperative that these firms be encouraged to meet their potential and desire. Making sure all firms know what is needed to export, where they might get assistance, and how they can initiate such a venture will encourage more companies to export their products. The ability of the firms to trade internationally cannot be emphasized enough. If the potential for

firms is not realized, and the desire to expand not encouraged, the scope of products for many companies will remain narrow and locally oriented.

Reasons for not expanding into the international market. Only 9 firms gave reasons for not expanding into the international market, which is not sufficient to make general conclusions for the community. Reasons included that the business was too small, a lack of knowledge about exporting, restrictive export regulations, lack of affordable financing, and that the costs are too high.

Problems associated with exporting. Only 2 Coffeyville firms gave a problem associated with expansion: unfavorable exchange rates. This number of firms is not sufficient to make generalizations for the community. Firms in the other 8 communities also gave this problem, along with high tariffs and/or trade barriers, inadequate knowledge about exporting, lack of financing and restrictive state/federal regulations.

#### Financing for Expansion

Financing Sources. Sources for financing expansion in Coffeyville are traditional in nature. For the total number of firms, 61% stated that a bank was a source for financing expansion and 44% stated that internal financing was used (see Tables 81, 82 and 83). Firms with 50 or more employees had a lower within size category percentage of bank usage. Compared to firms in the other 8 cities, Coffeyville had a higher percentage of firms that used banks as a source and a lower percentage of firms that used internal financing (see Table 83).

TABLE 81  
FINANCING SOURCES FOR EXPANSION\*  
BY SIZE OF FIRM

| Number of Employees | Small Business Industrial Revenue Bonds |                     |                 |                  |              |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------|
|                     | Bank                                    | Inter-nal Financing | Private Sources | Admin- istration | Indust- rial |
| 1-19                | 63%                                     | 43%                 | 9%              | 4%               | 2%           |
| 20-49               | 30%                                     | 80%                 | 0%              | 10%              | 30%          |
| 50+                 | 67%                                     | 27%                 | 0%              | 0%               | 40%          |
| PERCENT OF TOTAL    | 61%                                     | 44%                 | 7%              | 4%               | 9%           |

n = 75

\*Since firms could give more than one source, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 82  
FINANCING SOURCES FOR EXPANSION\*  
BY INDUSTRY

| Industry          | Small Business Industrial Revenue Bonds |                     |                 |                  |              |
|-------------------|---|---------------------|-----------------|------------------|--------------|
|                   | Bank                                    | Inter-nal Financing | Private Sources | Admin- istration | Indust- rial |
| Manufacturing     | 57%                                     | 43%                 | 10%             | 10%              | 3%           |
| Finance/ Services | 63%                                     | 44%                 | 0%              | 0%               | 19%          |
| Other Industries  | 61%                                     | 45%                 | 10%             | 3%               | 7%           |
| PERCENT OF TOTAL  | 61%                                     | 44%                 | 7%              | 4%               | 9%           |

n = 75

\*Since firms could give more than one source, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 83  
FINANCING SOURCES FOR EXPANSION\*  
BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Community           | Small Business Industrial Revenue Bonds |              |                    |                      |                 |                  |                               |                            |
|---------------------|---|--------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------|------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|
|                     | Bank                                    | Credit Union | Sav- ings and Loan | Inter- nal Financing | Private Sources | Admin- istration | Cert- ified Development Comp. | Indust- rial Revenue Bonds |
| Coffeyville         | 61%                                     | 0%           | 0%                 | 44%                  | 7%              | 4%               | 0%                            | 9%                         |
| Other 8 Communities | 53%                                     | 2%           | 3%                 | 53%                  | 6%              | 3%               | 1%                            | 4%                         |

\*Since firms could give more than one source, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Very few, or no, companies used the Small Business Administration, certified development companies, or industrial revenue bonds. Economic development programs designed to aid the small business are apparently not used, which may be because of a lack of knowledge about such programs. This point is strengthened by the very high percentage of firms that use traditional sources. A first step in assisting firms to expand would be to make sure that firms are aware of forms of financing for expansion other than traditional sources. Banks and internal financing may be what firms are comfortable with, but increased efforts to assist expansion will need to come from alternative sources.

Financing sources outside of Kansas. The majority of Coffeyville firms do not go outside of Kansas to get financing. For the total number of firms, 90% stated that in the past five years they have not gone outside the state to receive financing for expansion (see Tables 84-86). Larger firms did go outside of the state more than smaller firms, and the manufacturing industry businesses had a relatively high percentage of firms that went to other states. Total percentages for Coffeyville are consistent with the total percentages from the other 8 communities (see Table 86).

TABLE 84  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT HAVE GONE OUTSIDE OF  
 KANSAS TO FINANCE AN EXPANSION, BY SIZE OF FIRM

In the last five years, have you had to  
 go outside of Kansas to finance an expansion  
 because of a lack of affordable financing?

| Number of<br>Employees | NO  | YES |
|------------------------|-----|-----|
| 1-19                   | 93% | 7%  |
| 20-49                  | 90% | 10% |
| 50+                    | 76% | 24% |
| TOTAL<br>PERCENT       | 90% | 10% |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size  
 Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public  
 Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 85  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT HAVE GONE OUTSIDE OF  
 KANSAS TO FINANCE AN EXPANSION, BY INDUSTRY

In the last five years, have you had to  
 go outside of Kansas to finance an expansion  
 because of a lack of affordable financing?

| Industry         | NO  | YES |
|------------------|-----|-----|
| Manufacturing    | 87% | 13% |
| Finance/Services | 94% | 6%  |
| Other Industries | 91% | 9%  |
| TOTAL<br>PERCENT | 90% | 10% |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size  
 Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public  
 Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 86  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT HAVE GONE OUTSIDE OF  
 KANSAS TO FINANCE AN EXPANSION  
 BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

In the last five years, have you had to  
 go outside of Kansas to finance an expansion  
 because of a lack of affordable financing?

| Community              | NO  | YES |
|------------------------|-----|-----|
| Coffeyville            | 90% | 10% |
| Other 8<br>Communities | 91% | 9%  |

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Table 84 shows that larger firms go outside of the state more for financing than do smaller firms; given the nature of financial sources in the state this may indicate a reliance on out of state parent companies for internal financing or an inability of state financial institutions to provide the large size of capital needed for expansion. The important point these data provide is that a determination must be made of whether companies are going out of state because of choice or necessity.

Foregoing expansion because of a lack of financing. Although the total percentage is relatively small, there are firms that have had to forego an expansion because of lack of financing. For the total number of firms, 16% stated that they had foregone an expansion because of lack of financing (see Tables 87-89). This percentage is higher than what was given by firms in the other 8 communities. No firms with 20 to 49 employees had this problem, and firms in the other industry category (agriculture, mining, construction, transportation-communications, and wholesale) had a lower percentage of

respondents who mentioned this problem. The city could assist expansion by making sure that information about alternative methods for financing is available to firms, and that these firms know how to access and implement those sources.

TABLE 87  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS FORCED TO FOREGO OR POSTPONE  
 AN EXPANSION BECAUSE OF LACK OF FINANCING, BY SIZE

In the last five years, has your firm ever been forced to forego or postpone a planned expansion because of a lack of affordable financing?

| Number of Employees | NO   | YES |
|---------------------|------|-----|
| 1-19                | 83%  | 17% |
| 20-49               | 100% | 0%  |
| 50+                 | 82%  | 18% |
| TOTAL PERCENT       | 84%  | 16% |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 88  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS FORCED TO FOREGO OR POSTPONE  
 AN EXPANSION BECAUSE OF LACK OF FINANCING, BY INDUSTRY

In the last five years, has your firm ever been forced to forego or postpone a planned expansion because of a lack of affordable financing?

| Industry         | NO  | YES |
|------------------|-----|-----|
| Manufacturing    | 81% | 19% |
| Finance/Services | 81% | 19% |
| Other Industries | 88% | 12% |
| TOTAL PERCENT    | 84% | 16% |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 89  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS FORCED TO FOREGO OR POSTPONE  
 AN EXPANSION BECAUSE OF LACK OF FINANCING  
 BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

In the last five years, has your firm ever been  
 forced to forego or postpone a planned expansion  
 because of a lack of affordable financing?

| Community              | NO  | YES |
|------------------------|-----|-----|
| Coffeyville            | 84% | 16% |
| Other 8<br>Communities | 90% | 10% |

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

As previous data have shown, financing is a major problem when expansion is considered. Tables 87, 88 and 89 support this, demonstrating that there are firms that have not experienced a chance for growth because financing was unavailable. When expansion comes down to a question of obtaining financing, the city must make sure that the firms are receiving the information necessary to access and use nontraditional sources for financing expansion.

#### Expansion Summary

After examining the data regarding expansion, it is possible to make the following summary implications:

1. In the past two years, there has been expansion growth. Of the total number of firms, 36% increased employment the past two years and 35% increased physical plant size.

2. Compared to the other eight cities included in the state report, employment in Coffeyville firms increased more and decreased less, indicating that Coffeyville firms were growing more during the past two years than firms in the other eight cities.
3. A static or declining market and a lack of financing are the major problems associated with not expanding, indicating that the locally centered scope of products is deterring expansion. This also implies that ways are needed to assist companies obtain financing for their expansions and to help companies find additional ways to finance an expansion.
4. There is optimism about expansion opportunities in the city, and now is an excellent time to offer expansion assistance.
5. The percentage of firms that will expand outside of the city limit is relatively high (43%). Needed is the city strategy that find reasons for not expanding within the city limit and encourage firms to expand within the city limit.
6. There are firms in the city with the potential and the desire to expand into the international market. These firms include small as well as large companies.
7. The majority of firms use traditional sources (banks and internal funds) for expansion financing.
9. Affordable financing is a major problem, and there are companies that have foregone expansion because of lack of financing. This indicates that there are firms who want to expand but have not found the right financing methods for them to make expansion possible.
10. City policy that can make known forms of financing that already exist and that can create other innovative methods of financing will further increase chances for growth through expansion.

## VI.

### BUSINESS CLIMATE

In this section, firm perspectives of local government attitudes, perception of local services, laws and regulations that may impede business operation, taxes that affect business operation, and business climate improvements are discussed. The major findings here include (1) the majority of companies find the attitude of their local government to be positive to very positive, (2) firms are generally satisfied with the local services provided to them, (3) city and state regulations were seen to impede business operation the most, (4) the property tax on inventory was seen to impede operations the most of all taxes, and (5) the preferred way to improve the local and state business climate is through economic development.

#### Local And State Business Climate

Quality of life. The quality of life is perceived to be good by a majority of Coffeyville firms. Of the total number of respondents, 74% rated the quality of life as good and 26% rated the quality of life as adequate (see Tables 90-92). Not one firm rated the quality of life as poor. Larger firms and firms in the finance/services industry had the higher percentages of firms that stated the quality of life was good. Comparison data reveal that although no firm rated the quality of life as poor, the total Coffeyville percentage for good ratings was lower than for firms in the other 8 communities, and the total percentage for adequate ratings was higher than for firms surveyed in the other 8 communities (see Table 92).

TABLE 90  
 FIRM'S PERCEPTIONS OF THE QUALITY OF LIFE  
 IN THEIR COMMUNITY  
 BY SIZE OF FIRM

| Number of<br>Employees | Good | Adequate | Poor |
|------------------------|------|----------|------|
| 1-19                   | 70%  | 30%      | 0%   |
| 20-49                  | 92%  | 8%       | 0%   |
| 50+                    | 82%  | 18%      | 0%   |
| TOTAL<br>PERCENT       | 74%  | 26%      | 0%   |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 91  
 FIRM'S PERCEPTIONS OF THE QUALITY OF LIFE  
 IN THEIR COMMUNITY  
 BY INDUSTRY

| Industry         | Good | Adequate | Poor |
|------------------|------|----------|------|
| Manufacturing    | 74%  | 26%      | 0%   |
| Finance/Services | 80%  | 20%      | 0%   |
| Other Industries | 72%  | 28%      | 0%   |
| TOTAL<br>PERCENT | 74%  | 26%      | 0%   |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 92  
 FIRM'S PERCEPTIONS OF THE QUALITY OF LIFE  
 IN THEIR COMMUNITY  
 BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Community              | No<br>Opinion | Good | Adequate | Poor |
|------------------------|---------------|------|----------|------|
| Coffeyville            | 0%            | 74%  |          |      |
| Other 8<br>Communities | 1%            | 82%  | 26%      | 0%   |
|                        |               |      | 15%      | 2%   |

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

These results have both positive and negative implications. Although no poor ratings were given and the majority of firms believe the quality of life is good, total percentages do not fair well in comparison to firms in the other 8 communities. Quality of life issues are an important factor decisions concerning recruitment, retention, and expansion. For Coffeyville to use the quality of life as a major component in the attraction of firms and the encouragement of companies to remain in the community, activities that include the arts, entertainment, and recreation will become increasingly significant.

Attitude of the local government. The attitude of the local government towards the Coffeyville business community is viewed to be generally positive. Of the total number of surveyed firms, 50% stated the attitude of the local government towards Coffeyville firms was positive to very positive, 42% stated the attitude of the local government was neutral, and 8% stated the attitude of the local government was negative to very negative (see Tables 93-95). Firms with 50 or more employees had a higher percentage of respondents that thought the local government had a negative to very

negative attitude, as did firms in the manufacturing industry. Coffeyville had a lower percentage of firms that thought the local government had a positive to very positive attitude than surveyed firms in the other 8 communities and a lower percentage of firms that thought the local government had a negative to very negative attitude (see Table 95).

TABLE 93  
FIRMS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE  
ATTITUDE OF THEIR LOCAL GOVERNMENT  
BY SIZE OF FIRM

| Number<br>of<br>Employees | Attitude of Local Government |         |                              |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|---------|------------------------------|
|                           | Positive To<br>Very Positive | Neutral | Negative To<br>Very Negative |
| 1-19                      | 45%                          | 47%     | 8%                           |
| 20-49                     | 58%                          | 42%     | 0%                           |
| 50+                       | 76%                          | 12%     | 12%                          |
| TOTAL<br>PERCENT          | 50%                          | 42%     | 8%                           |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 94  
FIRMS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE  
ATTITUDE OF THEIR LOCAL GOVERNMENT  
BY INDUSTRY

| Attitude of Local Government |                              |         |                              |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|---------|------------------------------|
| Industry                     | Positive To<br>Very Positive | Neutral | Negative To<br>Very Negative |
| Manufacturing                | 48%                          | 32%     | 19%                          |
| Finance/Services             | 59%                          | 41%     | 0%                           |
| Other Industries             | 47%                          | 47%     | 6%                           |
| TOTAL<br>PERCENT             | 50%                          | 42%     | 8%                           |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 95  
FIRMS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE  
ATTITUDE OF THEIR LOCAL GOVERNMENT  
BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Attitude of Local Government |                              |         |                              |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|---------|------------------------------|
| Community                    | Positive To<br>Very Positive | Neutral | Negative To<br>Very Negative |
| Coffeyville                  | 50%                          | 42%     | 8%                           |
| Other 8<br>Communities       | 55%                          | 35%     | 10%                          |

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

It is important to note the high percentage of companies in Coffeyville that believed the local government's attitude was neutral, indicating a belief that the local government really did not have an effect upon business practices in the city. However, there are a great deal of firms that believe the attitude of the local government towards business is positive,

indicating that this could be a good time for the local government to actively involve itself in finding means to assist their companies with growth strategies.

Perception of services. In general, firms are satisfied with the services that are provided to them. High percentages of firms evaluate the electric system, fire protection, and the public school system as good, while relatively high percentages of poor ratings are given for the quality of public transportation, the availability of air transportation and the quality of roads (see Table 96). The quality of public transportation received the highest poor rating of 39% and only a 15% good rating. The availability of air transportation (31% said poor while 11% said good) and the quality of roads<sup>1</sup> (22% said poor while 25% said good) also showed dissatisfaction with transportation issues. Obviously, there is concern over transportation issues in the community. In comparison to surveyed firms in the other 8 communities, notable differences include the higher poor percentage given by Coffeyville firms for the quality of roads and the quality of public transportation, and the higher good percentages given by Coffeyville firms for the electric system, the public school system, and fire protection (see Table 97).

---

<sup>1</sup> At the time when this survey was conducted, the highway system was a much debated topic in the state capitol and between Kansas citizens. Statements about the highway system made here may be different from opinions made if the survey were given in another time period, and this should be considered when reading any discussion of roads or highways.

TABLE 96  
COFFEYVILLE FIRMS' PERCEPTIONS OF SERVICES

|                                       | No<br>Opinion | Good | Adequate | Poor |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|------|----------|------|
| Quality of Roads                      | 1%            | 25%  | 52%      | 22%  |
| Quality of Railroads                  | 29%           | 39%  | 26%      | 6%   |
| Cost of Transportation                | 14%           | 32%  | 46%      | 8%   |
| Availability of Air<br>Transportation | 32%           | 11%  | 26%      | 31%  |
| Quality of Public<br>Transportation   | 26%           | 15%  | 20%      | 39%  |
| Freight Delivery Time                 | 7%            | 56%  | 35%      | 2%   |
| Quality of Training                   | 17%           | 31%  | 39%      | 13%  |
| Fire Protection                       | 5%            | 82%  | 13%      | 0%   |
| Police Protection                     | 0%            | 74%  | 25%      | 1%   |
| Telephone System                      | 3%            | 73%  | 20%      | 4%   |
| Electric System                       | 0%            | 85%  | 15%      | 0%   |
| Public School System                  | 5%            | 81%  | 7%       | 6%   |
| Quality of Garbage<br>Collection      | 2%            | 72%  | 21%      | 5%   |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 97  
OTHER 8 COMMUNITY FIRMS' PERCEPTIONS OF SERVICES

|                                       | No<br>Opinion | Good | Adequate | Poor |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|------|----------|------|
| Quality of Roads                      | 1%            | 37%  | 44%      | 18%  |
| Quality of Railroads                  | 34%           | 27%  | 27%      | 12%  |
| Cost of Transportation                | 10%           | 29%  | 46%      | 15%  |
| Availability of Air<br>Transportation | 21%           | 12%  | 29%      | 38%  |
| Quality of Public<br>Transportation   | 28%           | 13%  | 25%      | 34%  |
| Freight Delivery Time                 | 13%           | 52%  | 30%      | 5%   |
| Quality of Training                   | 18%           | 38%  | 30%      | 14%  |
| Fire Protection                       | 3%            | 75%  | 21%      | 1%   |
| Police Protection                     | 2%            | 68%  | 28%      | 3%   |
| Telephone System                      | 0%            | 63%  | 31%      | 6%   |
| Electric System                       | 0%            | 73%  | 22%      | 5%   |
| Public School System                  | 7%            | 73%  | 18%      | 2%   |
| Quality of Garbage<br>Collection      | 6%            | 64%  | 26%      | 4%   |

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

The poor ratings given to transportation issues will be important as firms decide to expand. Firms that want to grow will look to see if they can adequately move products to and from their destination as well as the timely delivery of necessary materials. At this time the quality of such issues is in question. Important for the local business climate, however, is the perceived good quality of local services. In comparison to firms surveyed in the other 8 communities, Coffeyville firms gave a higher percentage of the good rating to 10 of the 13 services asked about. These are positive signs for the city and will help in decisions of location and expansion.

Government regulations that impede business operations. Regulations that may impede the successful operation of a business were seen to be mainly city or state regulations. Of the firms that gave a government caused problem, 98% stated that hampering city and/or state regulations impede operation (see Tables 98-100). Specific regulations mentioned by business representatives were medicaid funding laws, zoning and sign regulations, and property taxes on inventory. The next highest percentage of factors was EPA regulations. No firms giving government caused problems in Coffeyville mentioned government over-regulations as an impeding factor while 21% of firms in the other 8 cities did (19%).

TABLE 98  
GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS THAT IMPEDE OPERATION\*  
BY SIZE OF FIRM

| Number of Em-<br>ployees | Hampering<br>City/State<br>Regulations | KCC<br>Over-<br>Regulations | EPA<br>Regulations |
|--------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| 1-19                     | 97%                                    | 6%                          | 16%                |
| 20-49                    | 100%                                   | 0%                          | 0%                 |
| 50+                      | 100%                                   | 0%                          | 22%                |
| TOTAL<br>PERCENT         | 98%                                    | 5%                          | 16%                |

n = 26

\*Since firms could mention more than one government regulation that impedes operation, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 99  
GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS THAT IMPEDE OPERATION\*  
BY INDUSTRY

| Industry            | Hampering<br>City/State<br>Regulations | KCC<br>Over-<br>Regulations | EPA<br>regulations |
|---------------------|--|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| Manufacturing       | 80%                                    | 0%                          | 20%                |
| Finance/Services    | 100%                                   | 0%                          | 0%                 |
| Other Industries    | 100%                                   | 7%                          | 20%                |
| PERCENT OF<br>TOTAL | 98%                                    | 5%                          | 16%                |

n = 26

\*Since firms could mention more than one government regulation that impedes operation, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 100  
 GOVERNMENT REGULATIONS THAT IMPEDE OPERATION\*  
 BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Community              | Hamp-<br>ering<br>City-<br>State<br>Regs. | KCC<br>Over<br>Reg-<br>ula-<br>tion | EPA<br>Regs. | OSHA<br>Regs. | Zoning | KS<br>Dept.<br>of<br>Health | Gvt.<br>Over<br>Reg-<br>ula-<br>tion |
|------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--------------|---------------|--------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Coffeyville            | 98%                                       | 5%                                  | 16%          | 0%            | 0%     | 0%                          | 0%                                   |
| Other 8<br>Communities | 98%                                       | 6%                                  | 19%          | 5%            | 19%    | 8%                          | 21%                                  |

\*Since firms could give more than one regulation, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Coffeyville firms do believe there are city regulations that are impeding operation (zoning, for example), and these will be factors in future expansion. It would be a mistake to think that operations are impeded solely by state or federal regulations. Developing a better understanding of which laws and regulations under city control are hurting businesses, and seeking to correct unnecessary restrictions to the extent possible will improve the local business climate.

Taxes that influence expansion decisions. Taxes also have a negative effect on expansion. Of the firms that stated a tax reason to forego expansion, 70% gave property tax on inventories as a reason, 47% gave workers compensation, 40% gave the unemployment insurance tax, and 37% gave the tax on machines as a reason to forego expansion (see Tables 101-103). Although the city is not in control of the majority of the taxes that inhibit expansion, city officials should be aware of the business taxes that limit expansion, and make state agencies aware of the types of burdens are placed upon community businesses.

TABLE 101  
REASONS TO FOREGO EXPANSION\*  
BY SIZE OF FIRM

| Number of Employees | Over-all State Tax Burden | Over-all City Tax Burden | Corporate Income Tax | Property Tax on Inventories | Sales Tax on Machines and Equipment | Unemployment Insurance Tax | Workers Compensation | Severance Tax |
|---------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| 1-19                | 30%                       | 9%                       | 31%                  | 70%                         | 35%                                 | 41%                        | 28%                  | 6%            |
| 20-49               | 34%                       | 34%                      | 17%                  | 50%                         | 83%                                 | 50%                        | 50%                  | 0%            |
| 50+                 | 43%                       | 0%                       | 0%                   | 86%                         | 14%                                 | 29%                        | 29%                  | 0%            |
| PERCENT OF TOTAL    | 31%                       | 11%                      | 27%                  | 70%                         | 37%                                 | 40%                        | 30%                  | 5%            |

n = 41

\*Since firms could give more than one reason, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 102  
REASONS TO FOREGO EXPANSION\*  
BY INDUSTRY

| Industry         | Over-all State Tax Burden | Over-all City Tax Burden | Corporate Income Tax | Property Tax on Inventories | Sales Tax on Machines and Equipment | Unemployment Insurance Tax | Workers Compensation | Severance Tax |
|------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| Manufacturing    | 37%                       | 16%                      | 11%                  | 58%                         | 37%                                 | 37%                        | 21%                  | 5%            |
| Finance/Services | 20%                       | 20%                      | 20%                  | 100%                        | 40%                                 | 60%                        | 40%                  | 0%            |
| Other Industries | 32%                       | 5%                       | 37%                  | 68%                         | 37%                                 | 37%                        | 32%                  | 5%            |
| PERCENT OF TOTAL | 31%                       | 11%                      | 27%                  | 70%                         | 37%                                 | 40%                        | 30%                  | 5%            |

n = 41

\*Since firms could give more than one reason, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 103  
REASONS TO FOREGO EXPANSION\*  
BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Community           | Over-all State Tax Burden | Over-all City Tax Burden | Corporate Income Tax | Property Tax on Inventories | Sales Tax on Machines and Equipment | Unemployment Insurance Tax | Workers Compensation | Severance Tax | Gas Tax |
|---------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|---------------|---------|
| Coffeyville         | 31%                       | 11%                      | 27%                  | 70%                         | 37%                                 | 40%                        | 30%                  | 5%            | 0%      |
| Other 8 Communities | 23%                       | 14%                      | 19%                  | 60%                         | 31%                                 | 47%                        | 49%                  | 9%            | 2%      |

\*Since firms could give more than one reason, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Firms believe that a variety of taxes cause them to forego expansion. Tables 101-103 show that, regardless of size and industry, firms feel the property tax on inventory, the unemployment insurance tax, or workers compensation is a major burden. Although taxes affect large as well as small firms, it is important to remember the strain certain taxes place on the small firm, and how that inhibits expansion.

Business Climate Improvements

Improving the quality of life. Suggestions for improving the local quality of life centered mainly on economic development (see Tables 104-106). Of the firms that suggested ways to improve the local quality of life, 58% mentioned economic development as a way for improvement. Other suggestions included improving public morale, cleaning up town and fixing properties, and more recreational activities. The percentage (58%) of firms in Coffeyville that gave economic development is almost the same as that given by surveyed firms in the other 8 cities (57%) (see Table 106).

TABLE 104  
WAYS TO IMPROVE THE LOCAL QUALITY OF LIFE\*  
BY SIZE OF FIRM

| Number of Employees | Economic Development | More Entertainment | More Activities For Town | More Recreational Activities | Improve Public Morale | Improve Town, Fix Property | Upgrade Education |
|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|
| 1-19                | 56%                  | 5%                 | 4%                       | 12%                          | 21%                   | 21%                        | 5%                |
| 20-49               | 60%                  | 20%                | 0%                       | 30%                          | 10%                   | 10%                        | 0%                |
| 50+                 | 70%                  | 0%                 | 10%                      | 20%                          | 10%                   | 0%                         | 20%               |
| PERCENT OF TOTAL    | 58%                  | 6%                 | 4%                       | 15%                          | 19%                   | 18%                        | 6%                |

n = 58

\*Since firms could give more than one suggestion, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 105  
WAYS TO IMPROVE THE LOCAL QUALITY OF LIFE\*  
BY INDUSTRY

| Industry             | Econ-<br>omic<br>Dev-<br>elop-<br>ment | More<br>Enter-<br>tain-<br>ment | More<br>Activ-<br>ities<br>For<br>Town | More<br>Recre-<br>ational<br>Activ-<br>ities | Improve<br>Public<br>Morale | Im-<br>prove<br>Town,<br>Fix<br>Prop-<br>erty | Up-<br>grade<br>Edu-<br>cation |
|----------------------|--|---------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| Manufacturing        | 63%                                    | 7%                              | 7%                                     | 7%   | 22%                         | 11%   | 7%                             |
| Finance/<br>Services | 54%                                    | 8%                              | 0%                                     | 31%  | 0%                          | 23%   | 15%                            |
| Other<br>Industries  | 57%                                    | 5%                              | 5%                                     | 10%  | 29%                         | 19%   | 0%                             |
| PERCENT OF<br>TOTAL  | 58%                                    | 6%                              | 4%                                     | 15%  | 19%                         | 18%   | 6%                             |

n = 58

\*Since firms could give more than one suggestion, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 106  
WAYS TO IMPROVE THE LOCAL QUALITY OF LIFE\*  
BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Community              | Econ-<br>omic<br>Dev-<br>elop-<br>ment | More<br>Enter-<br>tain-<br>ment | More<br>Activ-<br>ities<br>For<br>Town | More<br>Recre-<br>ational<br>Activ-<br>ities | Improve<br>Public<br>Morale | Im-<br>prove<br>Town,<br>Fix<br>Prop-<br>erty | Up-<br>grade<br>Edu-<br>cation |
|------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| Coffeyville            | 58%                                    | 6%                              | 4%                                     | 15%  | 19%                         | 18%   | 6%                             |
| Other 8<br>Communities | 57%                                    | 18%                             | 8%                                     | 17%  | 4%                          | 4%  | 11%                            |

\*Since firms could give more than one suggestion, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Coffeyville firms seem to be looking for economic development assistance. This indicates that now may be a good time for the city to initiate assistance programs that will be used more than in the past. Firms also seem to want more activities in the city which are unrelated to business operations and may improve public morale. More recreational activities and entertainment are for the most part under city control, and firms feel these

do play a role in the perceived quality of life. As stated earlier, this will become increasingly important as firms expand and recruit personnel from other areas, as well as becoming an important factor in firms' decisions concerning expanding or staying within the community.

Improving the local business climate. Economic development was suggested the most as a way to improve the local business climate: this way was given by 73% of the firms that gave suggestions (see Tables 107-109). This percentage was higher than 58% given by surveyed firms in the other 8 communities (see Table 109). Other suggestions included that the local government needs to be more responsive, to increase tax incentives/abatements, and to improve local financing.

TABLE 107  
SUGGESTIONS GIVEN FOR IMPROVING THE LOCAL BUSINESS CLIMATE\*  
BY SIZE OF FIRM

| Number of Employees | Economic Development | Better                          | Increase and Improve Local Image | Improve Local Financing | Tax Incentives, Abatements | Local Gvt. More Responsive | Help Entrepreneurs | Spend Municipal Funds |
|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
|                     |                      | Cooperation Between State/Local |                                  |                         |                            |                            |                    |                       |
| 1-19                | 68%                  | 3%                              | 15%                              | 15%                     | 20%                        | 20%                        | 15%                | 3%                    |
| 20-49               | 100%                 | 0%                              | 0%                               | 43%                     | 43%                        | 43%                        | 29%                | 0%                    |
| 50+                 | 100%                 | 0%                              | 0%                               | 20%                     | 20%                        | 20%                        | 0%                 | 0%                    |
| PERCENT OF TOTAL    | 73%                  | 3%                              | 13%                              | 18%                     | 23%                        | 23%                        | 16%                | 3%                    |

n = 43

\*Since firms could give more than one suggestion, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 108  
SUGGESTIONS GIVEN FOR IMPROVING THE LOCAL BUSINESS CLIMATE\*  
BY INDUSTRY

| Industry         | Economic Development | Better Cooperation Between State/Local | Increase and Improve Local Image | Local Financing | Tax Incentives, Abate-ments | Local Gvt. More Responsive | Help Entrepreneurs | Spend Municipal Funds |
|------------------|----------------------|--|----------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Manufacturing    | 73%                  | 0%                                     | 9%                               | 27%             | 36%                         | 36%                        | 9%                 | 0%                    |
| Finance/Services | 70%                  | 10%                                    | 20%                              | 20%             | 20%                         | 20%                        | 20%                | 0%                    |
| Other Industries | 75%                  | 0%                                     | 10%                              | 15%             | 20%                         | 20%                        | 15%                | 5%                    |
| PERCENT OF TOTAL | 73%                  | 3%                                     | 13%                              | 18%             | 23%                         | 23%                        | 16%                | 3%                    |

n = 43

\*Since firms could give more than one suggestion, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 109  
SUGGESTIONS GIVEN FOR IMPROVING THE LOCAL BUSINESS CLIMATE\*  
BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Community           | Economic Development | Better Cooperation Between State/Local | Increase and Improve Local Image | Local Financing | Tax Incentives, Abate-ments | Local Gvt. More Responsive | Help Entrepreneurs | Spend Municipal Funds |
|---------------------|----------------------|--|----------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Coffeyville         | 73%                  | 3%                                     | 13%                              | 18%             | 23%                         | 23%                        | 16%                | 3%                    |
| Other 8 Communities | 58%                  | 2%                                     | 12%                              | 12%             | 14%                         | 23%                        | 11%                | 8%                    |

\*Since firms could give more than one suggestion, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Firms seem to be responsive towards local development efforts. There is also a desire for the local government to be more responsive, for increases in tax incentives, and for more local financing. As has been shown throughout this report, financing is a key issue for Coffeyville. This

implies that now is a good time for the city to initiate or increase efforts of assistance. Another implication is that city officials should assist the state in communicating Kansas government programs that would be of benefit to Coffeyville firms.

Improving the state business climate. Suggestions for improving the state business climate did not center so heavily on economic development, but included a variety of recommendations. Suggested by the highest percentage of firms was to improve highway systems (49% of all firms made this suggestion), while other suggestions included to change or lower taxes (23%), economic development (22%), to increase and improve the state image (16%), and tax incentives (12%) (see Tables 110-112). One notable comparison difference was that the percentage of Coffeyville firms that made the suggestion of improving highway systems was higher than the percentage given by surveyed firms in the other 8 cities (28%) (see Table 112).

TABLE 110  
SUGGESTIONS GIVEN FOR IMPROVING THE STATE BUSINESS CLIMATE\*  
BY SIZE OF FIRM

| Number of Employees | Economic Development | Increase and Improve State Image | Better Financing Opportunities | Financial Incentives | Better Competition | Eliminate Severance Tax | Improve Highway System | Seek Diversification | Change Or Lower Taxes |
|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| 1-19                | 18%                  | 18%                              | 5%                             | 13%                  | 3%                 | 5%                      | 46%                    | 2%                   | 19%                   |
| 20-49               | 40%                  | 0%                               | 20%                            | 20%                  | 20%                | 0%                      | 40%                    | 20%                  | 40%                   |
| 50+                 | 31%                  | 16%                              | 0%                             | 0%                   | 0%                 | 0%                      | 69%                    | 0%                   | 31%                   |
| PERCENT OF TOTAL    | 22%                  | 16%                              | 6%                             | 12%                  | 4%                 | 3%                      | 49%                    | 3%                   | 23%                   |

n = 55

\*Since firms could give more than one suggestion, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 111  
SUGGESTIONS GIVEN FOR IMPROVING THE STATE BUSINESS CLIMATE\*  
BY INDUSTRY

| Industry   | Econ-<br>omic<br>Devel-<br>opment | In-<br>crease<br>and Im-<br>prove<br>State<br>Image | More<br>Coop-<br>eration<br>and Im-<br>prove<br>State/<br>Local<br>Image | Im-<br>prove<br>State<br>Image | Fin-<br>ancing<br>Opp-<br>ortun-<br>ities | Tax<br>Incen-<br>tives | Bet-<br>ter<br>Com-<br>muni-<br>cation | Elim-<br>inate<br>Sev-<br>erance<br>Tax | Im-<br>prove<br>High-<br>way<br>System | Seek<br>Divers-<br>ifica-<br>tion | Change<br>Or<br>Lower<br>Taxes |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|--|--------------------------------|---|------------------------|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Manufacturing<br>Finance/<br>Services<br>Other<br>Industries | 10%<br>23%<br>27%                 | 20%<br>15%<br>14%                                   | 5%<br>15%<br>0%  | 5%<br>8%<br>18%                | 0%<br>8%<br>5%                            | 5%<br>0%<br>5%         | 50%<br>54%<br>46%                      | 5%<br>8%<br>0%                          | 5%<br>8%<br>0%                         | 35%<br>31%<br>14%                 |                                |
| PERCENT OF<br>TOTAL<br>n = 55                                | 22%                               | 16%   | 6%   | 12%                            | 4%  | 3%                     | 49%                                    | 3%                                      | 23%                                    |                                   |                                |

\*Since firms could give more than one suggestion, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 112  
SUGGESTIONS GIVEN FOR IMPROVING THE STATE BUSINESS CLIMATE\*  
BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Community                             | Econ-<br>omic<br>Devel-<br>opment | More<br>Coop-<br>eration<br>and Im-<br>prove<br>State/<br>Local<br>Image | In-<br>crease<br>and Im-<br>prove<br>State<br>Image | Im-<br>prove<br>State<br>Image | Fin-<br>ancing<br>Opp-<br>ortun-<br>ities | Tax<br>Incen-<br>tives | Bet-<br>ter<br>Com-<br>muni-<br>cation | Elim-<br>inate<br>Sev-<br>erance<br>Tax | Im-<br>prove<br>High-<br>way<br>System | Seek<br>Divers-<br>ifica-<br>tion | Change<br>Or<br>Lower<br>Taxes |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|---|------------------------|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Coffeyville<br>Other 8<br>Communities | 22%<br>30%                        | 0%<br>1%   | 16%<br>15%  | 6%<br>7%                       | 12%<br>17%                                | 4%<br>6%               | 3%<br>4%                               | 49%<br>28%                              | 3%<br>2%                               | 23%<br>26%                        |                                |

\*Since firms could give more than one suggestion, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Transportation is once again a factor that is of consequence to these firms: of those Coffeyville firms that gave suggestions, the improvement of roads was a key issue. The issue of roads will gain even more importance if companies are to use more than the local market. Firms will need quality highways for the timely shipping of goods and for receiving materials from

suppliers. Taxes are also very much on the mind of businesses, underlying the growth restrictions certain taxes may be making on firms. In both instances, this implies that local leaders must make state officials aware of the problems experienced by Coffeyville companies, and how changes could help the state's economy as well as the community's.

#### Business Climate Summary

After examining the data regarding the local and state business climates, it is possible to make the following summary implications:

1. The majority of Coffeyville firms are satisfied with the local quality of life. However, the percentage of Coffeyville firms that rated the quality of life as good (74%) was lower than the total percentage of good ratings given by firms in the other 8 communities (82%).
2. Half of all respondents feel the local government has a positive to very positive attitude towards the business community. Many respondents, though, feel local administrators have a neutral attitude towards their businesses.
3. A majority of firms gave transportation services adequate or poor ratings. Relatively high poor ratings were given to the quality of public transportation, the availability of air transportation and the quality of roads. Also, 49% of those firms that gave suggestions to improve the state business climate mentioned improving the highways in the state. If the scope of where products are sold is to increase, the quality factors related to transportation must be improved for firms to initiate expansion into other markets.
4. Regulations that are perceived to be of harm to these firms come from the city or the state. It would be a mistake to think that operations are impeded solely by federal regulations.
5. Economic development is seen to be important by Coffeyville firms. For those that gave suggestions, 58% mentioned economic development as a way to improve the local quality of life, 73% mentioned economic development as a way to improve the local business climate, and 22% mentioned economic development as a way to improve the state business climate.

## VII.

### ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

In this section economic development programs designed to assist businesses in the state, firms that utilize special employment skills for their operations, services from state schools that are used by firms, and employees sought from these state schools are discussed. It is imperative that policy makers know whether programs designed for firms are being used, and whether the state is assisting companies to be more competitive.

The major findings are (1) at the present time, there is very little knowledge about economic development programs, and an overwhelming majority of the firms in Coffeyville do not use the assistance available; (2) the employees in these firms are generally low-skilled; (3) many firms do not use the services of a state university, community college or vocational school; (4) the highest service used is the training of presently employed personnel; and (5) most of the employees sought from state educational institutions by surveyed Coffeyville firms are mechanics and machinists.

#### Economic Development Assistance

Certified Development Companies (CDCs). Certified Development Companies assist small businesses with long term financing through the Small Business Administration 503 loan program. The nearest CDC to Coffeyville firms is Mid-America, Inc., 1715 Corning, Parsons, Kansas. Only 1% of the total number of surveyed firms in Coffeyville have used CDCs, and 90% had no knowledge of the program. Firms with 20 to 49 employees did have a greater knowledge of CDCs, and the only firms to use the program were in this size category and in the finance/services industry category (see Tables 113 and

114). Table 115 shows that there were no great differences between Coffeyville firms and firms in the other 8 cities.

TABLE 113  
 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF FIRMS  
 THAT HAVE KNOWLEDGE AND HAVE USED  
 CERTIFIED DEVELOPMENT COMPANIES  
 BY SIZE OF FIRM

| Number of Employees | Had No Knowledge of This Program | Had Knowledge of Program, but Had Not Used It | Had Used The Program |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| 1-19                | 92%                              | 8%  | 0%                   |
| 20-49               | 67%                              | 17%   | 16%                  |
| 50+                 | 94%                              | 6%  | 0%                   |
| TOTAL PERCENT       | 90%                              | 9%  | 1%                   |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 114  
 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF FIRMS  
 THAT HAVE KNOWLEDGE AND HAVE USED  
 CERTIFIED DEVELOPMENT COMPANIES  
 BY INDUSTRY

| Industry         | Had No Knowledge of This Program | Had Knowledge of Program, but Had Not Used It | Had Used The Program |
|------------------|----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Manufacturing    | 90%                              | 10%   | 0%                   |
| Finance/Services | 94%                              | 0%  | 6%                   |
| Other Industries | 88%                              | 12%   | 0%                   |
| TOTAL PERCENT    | 90%                              | 9%  | 1%                   |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 115  
 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF FIRMS  
 THAT HAVE KNOWLEDGE AND HAVE USED  
 CERTIFIED DEVELOPMENT COMPANIES  
 BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Community              | Had No<br>Knowledge of<br>This Program | Had Knowledge<br>of Program,<br>but Had<br>Not Used It | Had Used<br>The Program |
|------------------------|--|--|-------------------------|
| Coffeyville            | 90%                                    | 9%   | 1%                      |
| Other 8<br>Communities | 88%                                    | 10%  | 2%                      |

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

As will be a pattern when discussing most of these assistance programs, the majority of firms (90%) had no knowledge of Certified Development Companies. In comparison to surveyed firms in the other 8 communities, Coffeyville companies do have less knowledge about the program and do use CDCs less often, but differences are not significant. The implication is that the city may be missing chances for increased growth not through the unwillingness of firms to use this program, but because most companies are simply uninformed. Knowledge about this assistance and how it may be used must be communicated better to the firms in the city.

The Community Development Block Grant Program. The Community Development Block Grant Program is a federal program administered by the state government to assist communities in providing low and moderate income persons. Grants are given for such projects as infrastructure improvements, business financing, and comprehensive planning for communities. Many firms do know about the Community Development Block Grant Program, with the majority of the total number of firms (58%) stating they had knowledge of

the program (see Tables 116, 117 and 118). However, only 5% of total firms have actually used this program. Larger firms and firms in the finance/services industries had more knowledge about this program. Coffeyville had similar percentages of firms with no knowledge of the program as did surveyed firms in the other 8 communities (see Table 118).

TABLE 116  
 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF FIRMS  
 THAT HAVE KNOWLEDGE AND HAVE USED  
 THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM  
 BY SIZE OF FIRM

| Number of Employees | Had No Knowledge of This Program | Had Knowledge of Program, but Had Not Used It | Had Used The Program |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| 1-19                | 39%                              | 58%   | 3%                   |
| 20-49               | 33%                              | 50%   | 17%                  |
| 50+                 | 29%                              | 65%   | 6%                   |
| TOTAL PERCENT       | 37%                              | 58%   | 5%                   |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 117  
 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF FIRMS  
 THAT HAVE KNOWLEDGE AND HAVE USED  
 THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM  
 BY INDUSTRY

| Industry         | Had No Knowledge of This Program | Had Knowledge of Program, but Had Not Used It | Had Used The Program |
|------------------|----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Manufacturing    | 32%                              | 61%   | 7%                   |
| Finance/Services | 18%                              | 76%   | 6%                   |
| Other Industries | 50%                              | 47%   | 3%                   |
| TOTAL PERCENT    | 37%                              | 58%   | 5%                   |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 118  
 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF FIRMS  
 THAT HAVE KNOWLEDGE AND HAVE USED  
 THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM  
 BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Community              | Had No<br>Knowledge of<br>This Program | Had Knowledge<br>of Program,<br>but Had<br>Not Used It | Had Used<br>The Program |
|------------------------|--|--|-------------------------|
| Coffeyville            | 37%                                    | 58%  | 5%                      |
| Other 8<br>Communities | 37%                                    | 61%  | 2%                      |

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

The lack of knowledge among small firms about this program indicates that a greater effort is needed to reach these companies with information and assistance. If this does not occur, small firms will remain uninformed and growth potential from these businesses will not be realized to its fullest.

Centers of Excellence Programs. Centers of Excellence, located at state universities, offer state-of-the-art research capabilities, fit within the long range objectives of the universities, and offer long term potential for economic development. The nearest Center to Coffeyville is at the University of Kansas. The majority of firms had no knowledge of this program, either, with only 3% stating that they had knowledge of the program and no firms stating they had actually used the program (see Tables 119, 120 and 121). All firms with less than 20 employees and all firms in the other industry category (agriculture, mining, construction, transportation-communications, and wholesale) had no knowledge of the program (see Tables 119 and 120). A larger percentage of firms in Coffeyville (97%) had no knowledge of this program than did firms from the other eight cities (83%).

TABLE 119  
 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF FIRMS  
 THAT HAVE KNOWLEDGE AND HAVE USED  
 THE CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE PROGRAMS  
 BY SIZE OF FIRM

| Number<br>of<br>Employees | Had No<br>Knowledge of<br>This Program | Had Knowledge<br>of Program,<br>but Had<br>Not Used It | Had Used<br>The Program |
|---------------------------|--|--|-------------------------|
| 1-19                      | 100%                                   | 0%   | 0%                      |
| 20-49                     | 92%                                    | 8%   | 0%                      |
| 50+                       | 82%                                    | 18%  | 0%                      |
| TOTAL<br>PERCENT          | 97%                                    | 3%   | 0%                      |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 120  
 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF FIRMS  
 THAT HAVE KNOWLEDGE AND HAVE USED  
 THE CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE PROGRAMS  
 BY INDUSTRY

| Industry         | Had No<br>Knowledge of<br>This Program | Had Knowledge<br>of Program,<br>but Had<br>Not Used It | Had Used<br>The Program |
|------------------|--|--|-------------------------|
| Manufacturing    | 94%                                    | 6%   | 0%                      |
| Finance/Services | 94%                                    | 6%   | 0%                      |
| Other Industries | 100%                                   | 0%   | 0%                      |
| TOTAL<br>PERCENT | 97%                                    | 3%   | 0%                      |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 121  
 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF FIRMS  
 THAT HAVE KNOWLEDGE AND HAVE USED  
 THE CENTERS OF EXCELLENCE PROGRAMS  
 BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Community              | Had No<br>Knowledge of<br>This Program | Had Knowledge<br>of Program,<br>but Had<br>Not Used It | Had Used<br>The Program |
|------------------------|--|--|-------------------------|
| Coffeyville            | 97%                                    | 3%   | 0%                      |
| Other 8<br>Communities | 83%                                    | 16%  | 1%                      |

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

The high percentage of firms that do not have knowledge of this program points to added effort that must be made in communicating this program to firms. The constant proportion of larger firms that are receiving more information about these programs indicates that a few firms are receiving at least some information and assistance. This should be broadened to smaller firms or large growth will not occur.

The Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). The Job Training Partnership Act is a federal training program aimed primarily at disadvantaged and dislocated workers. For information concerning JTPA, contact the Kansas State Department of Human Resources. This assistance program was the most well known and most highly used, with 67% stating they had knowledge about the program and 26% stating that they had actually used the program (see Tables 122, 123 and 124). The percentage of firms that had no knowledge of JTPA for Coffeyville was a lower percentage than that for firms in the other 8 communities (see Table 124). Small firms had less knowledge and used the assistance less than larger firms. The highest percentage of industry use was in the finance/services industry.

TABLE 122  
 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF FIRMS  
 THAT HAVE KNOWLEDGE AND HAVE USED  
 THE JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT  
 BY SIZE OF FIRM

| Number of Employees | Had No Knowledge of This Program | Had Knowledge of Program, but Had Not Used It | Had Used The Program |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| 1-19                | 38%                              | 40%   | 22%                  |
| 20-49               | 17%                              | 58%   | 25%                  |
| 50+                 | 12%                              | 35%   | 53%                  |
| TOTAL PERCENT       | 33%                              | 41%   | 26%                  |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 123  
 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF FIRMS  
 THAT HAVE KNOWLEDGE AND HAVE USED  
 THE JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT  
 BY INDUSTRY

| Industry         | Had No Knowledge of This Program | Had Knowledge of Program, but Had Not Used It | Had Used The Program |
|------------------|----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Manufacturing    | 26%                              | 48%   | 26%                  |
| Finance/Services | 24%                              | 47%   | 29%                  |
| Other Industries | 41%                              | 34%   | 25%                  |
| TOTAL PERCENT    | 33%                              | 41%   | 26%                  |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 124  
 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF FIRMS  
 THAT HAVE KNOWLEDGE AND HAVE USED  
 THE JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT  
 BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Community              | Had No<br>Knowledge of<br>This Program | Had Knowledge<br>of Program,<br>but Had<br>Not Used It | Had Used<br>The Program |
|------------------------|--|--|-------------------------|
| Coffeyville            | 33%                                    | 41%  | 26%                     |
| Other 8<br>Communities | 43%                                    | 47%  | 10%                     |

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

The Job Training Partnership Act is more well known and used more among these firms than other economic development programs asked about in this survey. Also, the proportion of Coffeyville firms that know about JTPA is greater than the proportion in the other 8 communities, and the percentage of actual use is also higher for Coffeyville firms. JTPA is a training program that can be of great assistance to firms that want to cut training costs and develop more highly skilled workers, and efforts to increase the knowledge and use of this program should be encouraged.

The Kansas Industrial Training Program (KIT). The Kansas Industrial Training Program provides job training grants to firms that are new to the state or existing firms that are expanding in Kansas. For information concerning KIT, contact the Kansas State Department of Commerce. The majority of firms had no knowledge of this program, with 78% of firms having no knowledge about this program and no firms having actually used the program (see Tables 125, 126 and 127). Again, larger firms and companies in the manufacturing industry had more knowledge about the program.

TABLE 125  
 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF FIRMS  
 THAT HAVE KNOWLEDGE AND HAVE USED  
 THE KANSAS INDUSTRIAL TRAINING PROGRAM  
 BY SIZE OF FIRM

| Number of Employees | Had No Knowledge of This Program | Had Knowledge of Program, but Had Not Used It | Had Used The Program |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| 1-19                | 83%                              | 17%   | 0%                   |
| 20-49               | 58%                              | 42%   | 0%                   |
| 50+                 | 65%                              | 35%   | 0%                   |
| TOTAL PERCENT       | 78%                              | 22%   | 0%                   |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 126  
 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF FIRMS  
 THAT HAVE KNOWLEDGE AND HAVE USED  
 THE KANSAS INDUSTRIAL TRAINING PROGRAM  
 BY INDUSTRY

| Industry         | Had No Knowledge of This Program | Had Knowledge of Program, but Had Not Used It | Had Used The Program |
|------------------|----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Manufacturing    | 61%                              | 39%   | 0%                   |
| Finance/Services | 94%                              | 6%  | 0%                   |
| Other Industries | 78%                              | 22%   | 0%                   |
| TOTAL PERCENT    | 78%                              | 22%   | 0%                   |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 127  
 PERCENT OF THE TOTAL NUMBER OF FIRMS  
 THAT HAVE KNOWLEDGE AND HAVE USED  
 THE KANSAS INDUSTRIAL TRAINING PROGRAM  
 BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Community           | Had No Knowledge of This Program | Had Knowledge of Program, but Had Not Used It | Had Used The Program |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|----------------------|
| Coffeyville         | 78%                              | 22%   | 0%                   |
| Other 8 Communities | 63%                              | 35%   | 2%                   |

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

The Kansas Industrial Training Program is a special program designed to aid new expansion that employs new personnel. The use of this program can greatly assist firms in their training capabilities, and like the other assistance that has been discussed, more firms need knowledge about the program and how to access it.

TABLE 128  
 SUMMARY TABLE FOR  
 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

|  | No Knowledge | Knowledge, No Use | Used Program |
|--|--------------|-------------------|--------------|
| Certified Development Companies            | 90%          | 9%                | 1%           |
| Centers of Excellence                      | 97%          | 3%                | 0%           |
| Community Development Block Grant Programs | 37%          | 58%               | 5%           |
| Kansas Industrial Training Program         | 33%          | 41%               | 26%          |
| Job Training Partnership Act               | 78%          | 22%               | 0%           |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Note: Percentages are of the total number of firms.

It is clear that programs designed to assist economic development are not well known to firms in the city. There was a very large majority of firms that had no knowledge of the existence of some economic development programs, and a very small amount of firms actually used the programs for their benefit (see Table 128). Smaller companies had a greater proportion of firms that had no knowledge of these programs, also, suggesting that by mere lack of information the city is missing great potential for growth. Given the fact that 32% of firms stated that a lack of affordable financing was a problem associated with past expansion, a priority for the city is to make sure information about economic development programs reaches the business community, with emphasis on what these programs were designed for and how they can be used.

#### Firms That Need A Specialized Skill

As the lack of a trained, or highly skilled, work force is not a major complaint among surveyed Coffeyville firms, for the total number of firms, 97% stated that they did not need a specialized skill for employment in their company (see Tables 129, 130 and 131). All firms that stated that they need a specialized skill were smaller firms and in the other industry. The percentage of Coffeyville firms that stated they did not need a specialized skill for employment in their company mirror that given by firms in the other 8 cities.

TABLE 129  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT NEED A  
 SPECIALIZED SKILL, BY FIRM SIZE

Does your firm need a specialized skill for  
 employment in your company?

| Number of<br>Employees | NO   | YES |
|------------------------|------|-----|
| 1-19                   | 96%  | 4%  |
| 20-49                  | 100% | 0%  |
| 50+                    | 100% | 0%  |
| TOTAL<br>PERCENT       | 97%  | 3%  |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size  
 Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public  
 Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 130  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT NEED A  
 SPECIALIZED SKILL, BY INDUSTRY

Does your firm need a specialized skill for  
 employment in your company?

| Industry         | NO   | YES |
|------------------|------|-----|
| Manufacturing    | 100% | 0%  |
| Finance/Services | 100% | 0%  |
| Other Industries | 94%  | 6%  |
| TOTAL<br>PERCENT | 97%  | 3%  |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size  
 Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public  
 Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 131  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT NEED A  
 SPECIALIZED SKILL  
 BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Community           | Does your firm need a specialized skill for employment in your company? |     |
|---------------------|---|-----|
|                     | NO  | YES |
| Coffeyville         | 97%   | 3%  |
| Other 8 Communities | 97%   | 3%  |

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

The work force in the city is not highly skilled, and this factor could keep many firms from being truly competitive in the future. What is important to note is that with the rapid changes in technology and technical advancement in business operations, skilled positions will become more common for all types of firm sizes and industries. To remain competitive, companies will have to adapt. This will mean that companies will have to train a great deal of workers in the future, which will affect the resources available for expansion. Programs such as the Job Training Partnership Act and the Kansas Industrial Training Program take on added significance when this subject is discussed, and firms should be made aware of such assistance.

Using state universities, community colleges, or vocational schools. Development and innovation that can be fostered by these state educational institutions is not being fully realized by all firms in the city. For the total number of firms, 68% have not used the services of any state university, community college, or vocational school (see Tables 132, 133 and

134). Larger firms used these institutions more than did smaller firms, and the manufacturing industries had a relatively high percentage of firms that used these schools. The percentage of Coffeyville firms that have used the services of a state school is lower than 40% given by firms in the other 8 cities.

TABLE 132  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT HAVE USED THE  
 SERVICES OF A STATE SCHOOL  
 BY SIZE OF FIRM

In the past two years, has your company ever used the services of any state university, community college, or vocational school?

| Number of Employees | NO  | YES |
|---------------------|-----|-----|
| 1-19                | 77% | 23% |
| 20-49               | 50% | 50% |
| 50+                 | 29% | 71% |
| TOTAL PERCENT       | 68% | 32% |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 133  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT HAVE USED THE  
 SERVICES OF A STATE SCHOOL  
 BY INDUSTRY

In the past two years, has your company ever used the services of any state university, community college, or vocational school?

| Industry         | NO  | YES |
|------------------|-----|-----|
| Manufacturing    | 65% | 35% |
| Finance/Services | 71% | 29% |
| Other Industries | 69% | 31% |
| TOTAL PERCENT    | 68% | 32% |

n = 78

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 134  
 PERCENT OF TOTAL FIRMS THAT HAVE USED THE  
 SERVICES OF A STATE SCHOOL  
 BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

In the past two years, has your company ever used the services of any state university, community college, or vocational school?

| Community           | NO  | YES |
|---------------------|-----|-----|
| Coffeyville         | 68% | 32% |
| Other 8 Communities | 60% | 40% |

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Assistance from these schools can be extremely helpful to companies, and the innovation that can come from small firms is of great potential. Companies and state educational institutions should be working together

more, and finding ways to continue or initiate contacts and work together should be given high priority.

Services used from state universities, community colleges, and vocational schools. For firms that do use the services of these schools, the majority use universities, community colleges, or vocational schools for the training of presently employed personnel. Of these firms, 57% mentioned training as a service, with technical courses, and consulting in business planning being other highly used services mentioned (see Tables 135, 136 and 137). The use of other services as well as these services should be continued and encouraged.

TABLE 135  
SERVICES USED FROM STATE UNIVERSITIES, COMMUNITY COLLEGES, OR VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS\*  
BY SIZE OF FIRM

| Number of Employees | Training of Presently Employed Personnel | Technical Courses | Business Courses | Consulting In Product Development | Consulting In Innovation | Consulting In Business Planning | Agriculture-Vet. Services |
|---------------------|--|-------------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1-19                | 45%                                      | 18%               | 9%               | 6%                                | 6%                       | 18%                             | 15%                       |
| 20-49               | 86%                                      | 14%               | 0%               | 0%                                | 0%                       | 29%                             | 0%                        |
| 50+                 | 69%                                      | 15%               | 15%              | 0%                                | 8%                       | 8%                              | 0%                        |
| PERCENT OF TOTAL    | 57%                                      | 17%               | 9%               | 4%                                | 6%                       | 17%                             | 9%                        |

n = 32

\*Since firms could give more than one service used, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 136  
SERVICES USED FROM STATE UNIVERSITIES, COMMUNITY COLLEGES, OR VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS\*  
BY INDUSTRY

| Industry         | Training of Presently Employed Personnel | Tech-nical Courses | Busi-ness Courses | Con-sulting In Product Devel-opment | Con-sulting In Process Inno-vation | Con-sulting In Busi-ness Planning | Agri-cul-ture-Vet. Services |
|------------------|--|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Manufacturing    | 40%                                      | 20%                | 7%                | 0%                                  | 20%                                | 20%                               | 7%                          |
| Finance/Services | 56%                                      | 22%                | 22%               | 11%                                 | 0%                                 | 22%                               | 0%                          |
| Other Industries | 70%                                      | 10%                | 0%                | 0%                                  | 0%                                 | 10%                               | 20%                         |
| PERCENT OF TOTAL | 57%                                      | 17%                | 9%                | 4%                                  | 6%                                 | 17%                               | 9%                          |

n = 32

\*Since firms could give more than one service used, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 137  
SERVICES USED FROM STATE UNIVERSITIES, COMMUNITY COLLEGES, OR VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS\*  
BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Community           | Training of Presently Employed Personnel | Tech-nical Courses | Busi-ness Courses | Con-sulting In Product Devel-opment | Con-sulting In Process Inno-vation | Con-sulting In Busi-ness Planning | Con-sulting In struc-ture-Vet. Services | Agri-cul-ture-Vet. Services |
|---------------------|--|--------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| Coffeyville         | 57%                                      | 17%                | 9%                | 4%                                  | 6%                                 | 17%                               | 0%                                      | 9%                          |
| Other 8 Communities | 40%                                      | 26%                | 23%               | 9%                                  | 12%                                | 24%                               | 2%                                      | 9%                          |

\*Since firms could give more than one service used, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

Employees sought from state universities, community colleges, and vocational schools. Employees sought from these educational institutions are mainly mechanics and machinists, entry level clerical workers, and business and management personnel (see Tables 138, 139 and 140). Except

mechanics and machinists, the variety of employees hired reflects the relatively low-skill nature of these firms, with few percentages given of technicians, engineers, and drafters. The future competitiveness of these firms will depend on the recruitment and use of these latter types of employees.

TABLE 138  
EMPLOYEES SOUGHT FROM STATE UNIVERSITIES, COMMUNITY COLLEGES, OR VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS\*  
BY SIZE OF FIRM

| Number of Employees | Entry-Level Clerical | Mechanics, Machinists | Data Processors | Electronics, Electrical Technicians | Drafters | Engineers | Business Management Personnel | Agricultural, Veterinary Personnel | Heavy Equipment Operators | General Labor |
|---------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|----------|-----------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|
| 1-19                | 30%                  | 32%                   | 0%              | 4%                                  | 6%       | 9%        | 19%                           | 7%                                 | 9%                        | 2%            |
| 20-49               | 29%                  | 43%                   | 0%              | 0%                                  | 0%       | 29%       | 0%                            | 0%                                 | 29%                       | 0%            |
| 50+                 | 33%                  | 42%                   | 33%             | 0%                                  | 0%       | 17%       | 42%                           | 0%                                 | 33%                       | 0%            |
| PERCENT OF TOTAL    | 30%                  | 34%                   | 6%              | 3%                                  | 4%       | 12%       | 21%                           | 6%                                 | 15%                       | 1%            |

n = 44

\*Since firms could give more than one type of employee sought, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 139  
EMPLOYEES SOUGHT FROM STATE UNIVERSITIES, COMMUNITY COLLEGES, OR VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS\*  
BY INDUSTRY

| Industry         | Entry-Level Clerical | Mechanics, Machinists | Data Processors | Electronics, Electrical Technicians | Drafters | Engineers | Business Management Personnel | Agricultural, Veterinary Personnel | Heavy Equipment Operators | General Labor |
|------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|----------|-----------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|
| Manufacturing    | 0%                   | 73%                   | 0%              | 0%                                  | 7%       | 20%       | 7%                            | 0%                                 | 7%                        | 7%            |
| Finance/Services | 58%                  | 0%                    | 8%              | 0%                                  | 8%       | 0%        | 33%                           | 0%                                 | 8%                        | 0%            |
| Other Industries | 24%                  | 41%                   | 6%              | 6%                                  | 0%       | 18%       | 18%                           | 12%                                | 24%                       | 0%            |
| PERCENT OF TOTAL | 30%                  | 34%                   | 6%              | 3%                                  | 4%       | 12%       | 21%                           | 6%                                 | 15%                       | 1%            |

n = 44

\*Since firms could give more than one type of employee sought, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

TABLE 140  
 EMPLOYEES SOUGHT FROM STATE UNIVERSITIES, COMMUNITY COLLEGES, OR VOCATIONAL SCHOOLS\*  
 BY COMMUNITY COMPARISON

| Community              | Entry-<br>Level<br>Cler-<br>ical | Mech-<br>anics,<br>Mach-<br>inists | Data<br>Proc-<br>essors | Elec-<br>tronic,<br>Elec-<br>trical<br>Techs. | Draf-<br>ters | Chem-<br>ical<br>Pro-<br>cess,<br>Lab<br>Techs. | Engi-<br>neers | Bus-<br>iness<br>Manage-<br>ment<br>Pers-<br>onnel | Agri-<br>cul-<br>tural,<br>Vet.<br>Pers-<br>onnel | Heavy<br>Equip-<br>ment<br>Oper-<br>ators | General<br>Labor |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|---|---------------|---|----------------|--|---|---|------------------|
| Coffeyville            | 30%                              | 34%                                | 6%                      | 3%  | 4%            | 0%  | 12%            | 21%  | 6%  | 15%                                       | 1%               |
| Other 8<br>Communities | 25%                              | 19%                                | 9%                      | 8%  | 3%            | 6%  | 10%            | 33%  | 9%  | 6%  | 14%              |

\*Since firms could give more than one type of employee sought, total percentages may not add to 100%.

Source: Business Retention and Expansion Survey for Kansas Mid-Size Communities with Populations of 10,000 to 100,000, Institute for Public Policy and Business Research, The University of Kansas, 1987.

#### Economic Development Assistance Programs Summary

After examining the data regarding economic development programs, it is possible to make the following summary implications:

1. Economic development programs are not well known nor heavily used by firms in Coffeyville. This implies that efforts to bring information about economic development programs must be increased in the city. By making these programs more well known and accessible to firms, there will be greater opportunities for increased expansion and economic growth.
2. Low percentages of actual use of these economic development programs should be examined carefully; lack of use may be the result of lack of information.
3. Firms in Coffeyville have requirements for general, nonspecialized skills. This makes the community's ability to compete in the future heavily dependent on training and access to training programs.
4. Larger firms use the services of a state school more than smaller firms, indicating possible difficulties for small firms to find, make, and/or afford contacts with state educational institutions.