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Introduction

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

The grant was authorized to fund an "Economic Development Technical Assistance Project to Stimulate Community Improvement." These funds were intended to provide partial support for the Economic Development Division to work in conjunction with public and private agencies in Georgia and the respective Local Development Districts (LDD) in order to examine the capabilities, resources and needs of cities in the Coastal Plains region of Georgia.

As specified in the subject grant, expanded support was to be provided by extending assistance to a minimum of 15 cities in the Georgia Certified Cities Program. This effort was designed primarily to enable the designated cities, which possessed unrealized potential for economic growth, to create action programs for improvement. These plans were to be designed by local leaders with specific guidance from professionals in the field of community development.

In undertaking this effort, it was anticipated that direction would be offered for future action which needed to be undertaken, generally in organizational structure or to expand public facilities. This approach, furthermore, would assist the subject communities to sharpen the focus of their needs where specific assistance from the LDDs might be required.

As indicated in the preceding five quarterly progress reports, we have provided insight into the identification of obstacles to economic growth existing in specific communities in the Coastal Plains region of Georgia.
Furthermore, we undertook the development of programs to correct or to ameliorate those defects in cooperation with staff support from the respective Local Development Districts.

Participating Communities

A total of 34 cities in the Coastal Plains region of Georgia participated in the first-year activity of the Certified City Program during the grant period. All of these possess the essential ingredients required for entry into the program. Involved as first-year cities were the following communities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ashburn</th>
<th>Folkston</th>
<th>Milledgeville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>Forsyth</td>
<td>Morrow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bainbridge</td>
<td>Fort Gaines</td>
<td>Sandersville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blakely</td>
<td>Fort Valley</td>
<td>Smyrna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cairo</td>
<td>Hawkinsville</td>
<td>Sparta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claxton</td>
<td>Hinesville</td>
<td>Thomaston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Park</td>
<td>Jesup</td>
<td>Thomasville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covington</td>
<td>LaGrange</td>
<td>Thomson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decatur</td>
<td>Lithonia</td>
<td>Tifton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eatonton</td>
<td>Macon</td>
<td>Vidalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitzgerald</td>
<td>McDonough</td>
<td>Vienna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waynesboro</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, 16 cities from the Coastal Plains region were participants in the Follow-Up phase of the Certified City Program during the grant period. Most of the communities were involved in correcting deficiencies which had been identified in the first-year program. These cities include:
Most importantly, 15 cities from this same region received certification at some time during the grant period. (Two of these were first-year entrants, and three were in the current Follow-Up phase). Certified were:

Alma	Conyers	Montezuma
Americus	Donalsonville	Morrow
Barnesville	Forest Park	Pelham
Butler	Manchester	Thomasville
Carrollton	Metter	West Point

Evaluation of Results

The Georgia Certified City Program has several objectives. The major ones are:

1. Facilitating the successful execution of Georgia's economic development program.
2. Motivating communities to improve themselves and to achieve the recognition that comes with certification.
3. Increasing the community's economic growth potential through civic improvement.
4. Providing guidance for community improvement and economic growth.

Actual accomplishment of the first objective depends upon effective results achieved in the other three stated objectives.
Motivation

While motivation is not always easy to determine and to measure, especially in persuading the leadership of a community to undertake action, such evaluation is possible through the Certified City Program. Major obstacles are apathy and misdirected efforts.

Program participation by most communities has involved community leadership which has diligently worked toward certification whether or not it was achieved. These leaders were, and are, genuinely interested in improving their communities. Among striking action taken by various communities were approaches used by Alma and by Smyrna. In the case of Alma, certified in the Follow-Up phase, a full-page advertisement was placed in the local newspaper to enlist community support in helping remove certain deficiencies. Smyrna issued automobile bumper stickers with the logo "Help Smyrna Become A Certified City."

Most cities which were not certified on the first attempt remained in the program to work at eliminating many of their deficiencies; such accomplishments attest to the extent of commitment and successful attainment of the motivation objective. Further demonstration of the program's long-range effects can be seen in the achievement of certification by most of the candidate communities through the Follow-Up phase. Specific deficiencies which were identified and which require correction in this activity are cited in Appendix I (discussed below).

A somewhat lesser degree of motivation is evidenced by municipalities which remained in the program through two years of the Follow-Up phase, doing little or nothing to eliminate their deficiencies other than "jawboning" or trying to talk their way into certification.

Finally, some motivation can be detected in those cases where a strict desire to obtain certification for its sake alone, with little regard for community improvement. Cities in this category usually drop out of the program when they fail to become certified in the initial years. This is an
easier solution than staying in and working at eliminating deficiencies through a follow-up program.

Growth Potential

Increasing the community's growth potential through civic improvement can be measured more easily than can community motivation. Growth potential largely reflects the readiness, or ability, of a community's infrastructure to accommodate growth. Along with infrastructure improvements, the city's physical appearance is significant, since appearance deficiencies usually result from the run-down condition of some infrastructure element. Infrastructure improvements as a segment of needed improvements or changes required for certification can be used as a measurement of improvement in growth potential.

Very few of the Coastal Plains cities attaining certification achieved this status without entering the Follow-Up phase of the program. In this context, although they initially failed certification, they did achieve the coveted certification because each community overcame identified deficiencies. In qualifying, each participant city improved its infrastructure situation and its growth potential.

Guidance

Another objective of the program is to provide guidance for community improvement and economic growth. The Annual Activity Matrix, attached as Appendix II, indicates the extent of staff activity devoted to this aspect of the program. In every instance in which a city is involved in the Follow-Up phase, Georgia Tech staff personnel are involved with the community leadership, providing needed technical assistance.
In each case where the community deficiencies prevented certification, a letter outlining the defects and recommending specific courses of action was transmitted to community officials. This report was then followed up by the field office staffs of the sponsor and co-sponsors.

Problems Identified

Specific problems have been identified in a number of towns and cities in the Coastal Plains region. Details of these, taken directly from the analysis performed in the Certified City program, are cited in Appendix I to this report. The more significant of these deficiencies fall into three categories.

The lack of a viable on-going economic development program comprehensive enough to include provisions for industrial land development and practical industrial financing plans (for both new and expanding facilities) constitutes one aspect. In a number of cases, the local leadership has not defined program objectives clearly so that the techniques for implementing these desired goals are obvious.

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

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

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

Successful economic development in the Coastal Plains region depends in large part on the ability of the individual communities to accommodate growth. No amount of research and economic inducement alone will attract new and expanded enterprise unless the cities and towns, which will actually support and benefit from that growth, are ready and offer the type of environment that makes people want to live there. To this end, the following multi-phase program is proposed.

While the Certified City program offers a system for testing a community's economic development program, those responsible for formulating and executing the local development effort need periodic assistance or guidance in defining objectives and evaluating the development program. An initial ingredient ought to be a confidential annual review of a community's development program with those persons responsible for its implementation. This review could examine the work program in the light of local objectives and accomplishments achieved in the past year.

Policy formulation in areas such as the financing of new or expanding enterprise or the identification and development of industrial parks would be encouraged. The result would be a program of work revised to guide local efforts during the coming year. During that year, there would be periodic visits to the community by professional development specialists to assess if the program is on schedule and to render additional assistance, if necessary.
Another program element would involve utilization of a computerized industrial location model to determine the most feasible industry possibilities for the Georgia Coastal Plains area in order to provide a basis for more selective industrial solicitation. Naturally, the selection of these target industries would be attuned to area-wide objectives.

Following up on this target selection process, the local development program would be closely attuned to efforts of state and area developmental organizations. The results of this activity could easily become one of the inputs into the community's annual work program review.

A final aspect would involve application of the Certified City questionnaire after a five-year lapse to determine the status of the various infrastructure elements relative to current needs and potential. This periodic inventory could provide a measure of how community readiness and livability are improving.

These program phases, expanded from the Certified City program, would facilitate growth and development of those communities which outside professionals could determine merit such assistance. Delivery of the program would be carried out by development personnel from the Commission, local development districts (LDDs) and the Georgia Tech staff.

Summary

As has been demonstrated in this report, considerable positive results have been realized in numerous communities through conduct of the Georgia Certified City program with the financial support from the Coastal Plains Regional Commission. A number of cities have been certified, and others have been given specific direction as to weaknesses which must be overcome.

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

It would appear that a systematic process for making available technical expertise available on a continuing basis would enable more communities to make consistent progress. A process for harnessing the talents and resources available in the staffs of the LDDs together with the field office extension service of EDD is recommended as a procedure to support local development efforts and to obtain maximum benefits from the efforts undertaken to date.
APPENDIX I

COASTAL PLAINS REGIONAL COMMISSION CITIES

IN THE CERTIFIED CITY PROGRAM 1976-77

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

Bainbridge

1. Fire Protection
   a. Lack of fire department operating procedures manual.

2. Community Appearance
   a. Considerable litter along city streets which should be cleaned up, and a continuing anti-litter program established.
   b. An inadequately closed dump out of compliance with regulations of the Environmental Protection Division, Georgia Department of Natural Resources.
   c. The city does not enforce the municipal ordinance requiring regular cutting of weeds and grass by property owners; as a result, many weedy, trashy lots are in evidence.

3. Streets
   a. Less than 60% of the street intersections had name signs.

Claxton

1. Economic Development
   a. Industrial site documentation was incomplete; the so-called site lacks utilities.

2. Community Appearance
   a. Visual inspection by outside team indicated a need to enforce the city's weed-cutting ordinance. Several cases of abandoned appliances and other debris were noted.
Fitzgerald

1. Community Appearance
   a. Central business district needs revitalization.
   b. Unsightly storage areas within the city should be eliminated or screened from view.
   c. The city has a litter problem citywide.
   d. Numerous weedy, trashy lots indicate the lack of municipal enforcement of the weed-cutting ordinance.

Folkston

1. Police Protection/Traffic Enforcement
   a. The city has no operating procedures manual for the police department.
   b. Continual training of the police officers is needed to provide for upgrading as well as basic instruction.
   c. The city needs to examine the pedestrian crosswalk situation and to repaint where necessary.

2. Fire Protection
   a. Class 8 fire insurance rating indicates that problems exist within the Folkston fire department which are a definite detriment to economic development.

3. Community Appearance
   a. Folkston has operated an open disposal area in violation of regulations of the Environmental Protection Division, Georgia Department of Natural Resources.
   b. Several unsightly storage areas in the city should be eliminated or screened from view.

4. Streets
   a. Throughout the city there is a lack of easily identifiable street name signs.

5. City Planning
   a. Failure in this section resulted from the city having no landuse and major thoroughfare plans.
Fort Gaines

1. Economic Development
   a. Lack of published information on industrial sites.
   b. Economic brochures were outdated.
   c. Industrial prospect solicitation efforts must be broadened to include the wealth of assistance available from Georgia agencies.

2. Sanitary Sewerage
   a. Outdoor toilets still exist within the city limits.
   b. The city's sewage treatment plant does not have a discharge permit from the Water Quality Control Section, Environmental Protection Division, Georgia Department of Natural Resources.

3. Police Protection/Traffic Enforcement
   a. Lack of clearly visible pedestrian crosswalks was considered a deficiency.

4. Fire Protection
   a. The city's Class 8 fire insurance rating indicates a need to upgrade fire fighting capabilities.

5. Community Appearance
   a. Several unsightly storage conditions exist that should be eliminated or screened from view.
   b. Many abandoned auto hulks were noted throughout the city.
   c. City streets show no evidence of having been cleaned of debris and litter.

6. Commercial Development
   a. An extremely rundown central business district was cause for failure in this section.

Hawkinsville

1. Economic Development
   a. Lack of information on the city controlled industrial site.
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Hawkinsville (continued)

1. Economic Development (continuation)
   b. No information was offered in the form of an economic brochure for firms interested in locating in the area.

2. Police Protection/Traffic Enforcement
   a. The police department does not have an operating procedures manual.

3. Community Appearance
   a. Litter was noted throughout the city.
   b. Junkyards visible from major thoroughfares should be removed or screened from view.
   c. The city ordinance requiring regular cutting of grass and weeds is not being enforced.

4. Municipal Administration
   a. Lack of an annual budget is the reason for failure in this section. Good municipal management, typified by an annual budget, is an inducement to industry to locate in a community.

5. Charter, Codes, and Ordinances
   a. Although the city has a housing ordinance, there is no inspector to enforce it. A visual inspection of the city indicated a total lack of enforcement.

Macon

1. Sanitary Sewerage
   a. The city's wastewater treatment plants are unable to operate at design efficiency or to meet secondary treatment standards established by the Water Quality Control Section, Environmental Protection Division, Georgia Department of Natural Resources.

2. Community Appearance
   a. Junkyards and other unsightly storage areas visible from the major thoroughfares need to be removed or screened from view.
Macon (continued)

2. b. The weed-cutting ordinance is not being enforced by the municipality as evidenced by many weedy, trashy lots.

Milledgeville

1. Sanitary Sewerage
   a. The city-utilized (state-owned) wastewater treatment facilities fail to meet secondary treatment standards established by the Water Quality Control Section, Environmental Protection Division, Georgia Department of Natural Resources.

2. Community Appearance
   a. Junkyards and other unsightly storage areas visible from major thoroughfares resulted in failure to pass this section.

3. Municipal Administration
   a. The city's report that 8% of delinquent taxes were outstanding for more than seven years shows poor management. Efforts should be made to collect delinquent taxes, or they should be written off.

Thomaston

1. Sanitary Sewerage
   a. The system has insufficient wastewater treatment capacity and lack of approval by the Water Quality Control Section, Environmental Protection Division, Georgia Department of Natural Resources.

2. Municipal Administration
   a. Delinquent taxes which are now carried on the books for over seven years should be collected or written off.

3. City Planning
   a. The city government has not adopted landuse and major thoroughfare plans.
Tifton
1. Community Appearance
   a. The city fails to meet requirements for solid waste disposal, as required by the Environmental Protection Division, Georgia Department of Natural Resources.
   b. Unsightly storage conditions existing in prominent locations should be cleaned up and/or screened from view.

2. Municipal Administration
   a. The city's management practices were questioned when it reported that the lowest collection of current property tax levy in the last five years was less than 90%.

Vidalia
1. Community Appearance
   a. The city failed to meet requirements for solid waste disposal, as required by the Environmental Protection Division, Georgia Department of Natural Resources.
   b. Litter problems, especially on major approaches to the city, need to be eliminated.
   c. Numerous weedy vacant lots, many with abandoned appliances or auto hulks, detract from the city's appearance and need corrective action.

Vienna
1. Economic Development
   a. Industrial solicitation efforts are hindered by a lack of adequate information on available labor.
   b. No information was supplied as to the city's solicitation procedures; it appears that individuals promoting economic development need to step up their efforts through direct contact, telephone calls, and direct mail campaigns.
Vienna (continued)

2. Police Protection/Traffic Enforcement
   a. Lack of crosswalks properly marked.

3. Fire Protection
   a. Class 8 fire insurance rating indicates a need for improvement in Vienna's fire protection capabilities.

4. Community Appearance
   a. Street cleaning, especially in residential areas, is needed as evidenced by litter and debris in and alongside city streets.
   b. The municipality's weed-cutting ordinance is not fully enforced as evidenced by several weedy, trashy lots.

5. Housing
   a. Vienna indicated inability to accommodate an influx of new personnel which new industry would bring. There is a lack of builders able to meet a projected demand for 25 new homes.

These cities participated in various phases of the Follow-Up program, including several which were up for recertification. Deficiencies are listed for each.

Blakely

Seeking recertification after five years, this city failed due to the following deficiencies.

1. Economic Development
   a. A broader program to solicit industrial prospects should be developed.

2. Community Appearance
   a. Central business district needs an on-going street cleaning program.
   b. An unscreened junkyard indicates lack of enforcement of the city's junkyard ordinance.
   c. No apparent enforcement of the city's weed-cutting ordinance is evidenced by the many weedy, trashy lots within the city.
Buena Vista

A first-year follow-up city, Buena Vista did not submit complete information requested for the Certified City Questionnaire.

Cairo

Seeking recertification after five years, Cairo failed due to deficiencies in four sections.

1. Economic Development
   a. Solicitation procedures should be strengthened to provide more prospective industry contacts.

2. Police/Traffic Enforcement
   a. The police department lacks an operating procedures manual.

3. Fire Protection
   a. Fire department lacks an operating procedures manual.

4. Community Appearance
   a. Within the city limits, the municipality was operating an inadequately closed disposal site in violation of regulations of the Environmental Protection Division, Georgia Department of Natural Resources.

College Park

Seeking recertification after five years, College Park rated well in most areas but failed in two of the nineteen sections.

1. Community Appearance
   a. An excessive amount of litter on city streets was one cause for failure to achieve recertification.

2. Municipal Administration
   a. Some outstanding taxes were listed as being delinquent for more than seven years. Good management practice dictates a greater attempt to collect these taxes or to write them off.

Cordele

In its third year in the follow-up program, having been granted a one-year extension, Cordele failed to carry out waste water treatment plant and system improvements as required by the Water Quality Control Section, Environmental Protection Division, Georgia Department of Natural Resources.
Douglas

A first-year follow-up participant, Douglas needs to correct several deficiencies.

1. Community Appearance
   a. Junkyards are unscreened within the city limits.
   b. Weedy vacant lots were noted throughout the city.
   c. The downtown is in need of a paint-up, fix-up program.

Other problem areas for Douglas exist in municipal and utilities operations and housing code enforcement.

Lincolnton

Lincolnton, in the second year of the Follow-Up phase, is working to correct deficiencies in the following areas:

1. Economic Development
   a. Inadequate data on community's economic resources.

2. Fire Protection
   a. Need to upgrade training of firefighters.
   b. Class 8 insurance rating indicates a need for improved departmental services.
   c. Fire department has no operating procedures manual.

3. Sewerage
   a. System is under construction and not certified.

4. Community Appearance
   a. City operates an open landfill in violation of solid waste regulations of the Environmental Protection Division, Georgia Department of Natural Resources.

5. Municipal Administration
   a. Annual budget does not take into account either capital expenditures or debt service.

6. Charters, Codes and Ordinances
   a. No housing or building code has been adopted by municipal government.
Lincolnton (continued)

7. City Planning
   a. Municipality operates without a zoning ordinance and without a planning commission.
   b. No major land-use or thoroughfare plans have been adopted.
   c. Municipality has not adopted any subdivision regulations.

Louisville

A first-year follow-up city, Louisville has several defective areas.

1. Community Appearance
   a. Operation of a solid waste landfill is not in compliance with regulations of the Environmental Protection Division, Georgia Department of Natural Resources.

2. Streets
   a. Only 25 percent of street intersections are clearly marked.

3. Housing
   a. A high percentage of substandard housing needs to be overcome.

Nashville

Corrections of deficiencies are needed in four areas before Nashville can be certified.

1. Economic Development
   a. The municipality has no industrial site with which to promote industrial development.

2. Community Appearance
   a. The city has a litter problem throughout its jurisdiction.
   b. Junkyards should be eliminated or screened from view.
   c. Rough, poorly paved streets detract from the appearance of the city.
Nashville (continued)

3. Municipal Administration
   a. The municipality's budget fails to make provision for capital expenditures.

4. Housing
   a. Data on housing indicate that the city's housing development potential is quite low.

Peachtree City

Now in its second year of the Follow-Up phase, this city has failed to adopt a housing code; as a result, it cannot be recommended for certification.

Riverdale

A junkyard problem in the center of the city has prevented Riverdale from achieving certification. During the first year of follow-up, the city attempted to correct this situation but has been hindered by the problem of absentee ownership.

Statesboro

A first-year Follow-Up city, Statesboro has failed to submit complete data which would permit grading of this municipality's entry.

Swainsboro

Now in its second year of the Follow-Up phase, Swainsboro has numerous junkyards and other unsightly conditions. Also, a number of street intersections have no identification markers.

Waycross

A first-year Follow-Up city, Waycross has several deficient areas to correct.

1. Community Appearance
   a. Insufficient street cleaning is obvious throughout.
   b. Lack of enforcement by the city of its weed-cutting ordinance is evident.
   c. Junkyards visible from major thoroughfares detract from the community appearance and should be cleaned up and/or screened.
   d. Numerous abandoned autos were observed on private properties.
Waycross (continued)

2. Municipal Administration
   a. There is no annual report on municipal operations
      made to the public through the paper or by other
      means.

3. Streets
   a. Only 44% of the city streets are paved.
   b. Approximately 50% of intersections are without
      street name signs.

4. Charter, Codes and Ordinances
   a. The city charter needs a review -- one has not been
      conducted for over 10 years.

Wrens

Several deficient areas must be corrected by Wrens, a first-year
follow-up city.

1. Police and Traffic Enforcement
   a. The city needs to increase its percentage of
      trained policemen from 14 to at least 50.
   b. The police department should have an operating
      procedures manual.

2. Fire Protection
   a. The fire department needs to develop a procedures
      manual.

3. Community Appearance
   a. One junkyard within the city limits should be cleaned
      up or screened from view.

4. Housing
   a. Lack of information on housing availability and
      housing development potential constitutes a
      deficiency.

5. Charter, Codes, and Ordinances
   a. The city charter has not been reviewed in over 10
      years.
   b. The city housing code is not enforced.

6. Planning
   a. No planning program has been undertaken by the city.
# ANNUAL ACTIVITY MATRIX FOR GEORGIA COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

**GOVERNORS INVITATION TO ALL CITIES. COMMUNITY PRESENTATION, PROJECT ORGANIZATION, CITY RESOLUTION TO ENTER. ENTRY SUBMITTED.**

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS; PROJECT COMPETITION PROGRAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCT.</th>
<th>NOV.</th>
<th>DEC.</th>
<th>JAN.</th>
<th>FEB.</th>
<th>MAR.</th>
<th>APR.</th>
<th>MAY.</th>
<th>JUNE</th>
<th>JULY</th>
<th>AUG.</th>
<th>SEPT.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ALL STAR PROGRAM**

**SAME AS ABOVE EXCEPT STEERING COMMITTEE FORMED TO STUDY AND REPORT ON STANDARDS. DETERMINE DEFICIENCIES. DOCUMENTATION GATHERED. TRIAL ATTITUDE SURVEY CARRIED OUT.**

**GEORGIA CERTIFIED CITY PROGRAM**

**STAFF PARTICIPATES IN VISUAL APPRAISALS (I.E. PREINSPECTIONS) OF CERTIFIED CITY PROGRAM COMMUNITIES TO BE INSPECTED NEXT SPRING.**

**Staff provides year-round publicity for certified city through Urban Georgia Magazine and through Annual Meeting.**

**GEORGIA MUNICIPAL ASSOCIATION**

**Staff contacts potential new community participants and recommends new communities to be inspected next Spring. Advises community on needed appearance improvements.**

**GEORGIA POWER COMPANY COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**

**STAFF REVIEWS, REVISES, PRINTS, AND DISTRIBUTES CERTIFIED CITY QUESTIONNAIRE (CIVIC PROGRESS STANDARDS) TO PARTICIPATING CITIES. CONSULTS WITH CO-SPONSORS ON REVISION.**

**Staff advises cities including both first-year and follow-up cities. Coordinates activities with co-sponsors.**

**GEORGIA TECH PUBLIC TECHNOLOGY GROUP, AREA OFFICE STAFF**

**ON-SITE INSPECTIONS CARRIED OUT BY STAFF. STAFF ADVISES CITIES INCLUDING BOTH FIRST-YEAR AND FOLLOW-UP FAILING CERTIFICATION CITIES.**

**ALL QUESTIONNAIRES DUE IN FOR GRADING BY STAFF. FOLLOW-UP INFORMATION OBTAINED AS NEEDED. STAFF REVISES FOLLOW-UP PROGRAM BEGINNING 8/11 CAN QUALIFY FOR CERTIFICATION AWARD ON 8/15. WRITING AND DISTRIBUTION OF EVALUATION REPORTS.**

**Atlanta and area office staffs provide assistance to communities in all phases of the program as needed. Includes follow-up of program and training.