
**BENCHMARK STUDY OF SMALL TO MID-SIZED
COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
ORGANIZATIONS**

JULY 2004

CONDUCTED FOR



Aquila

BY

**SMART
SOLUTIONS
GROUP**

P.O. Box 65751

West Des Moines, IA 50265

515.224.2033

www.smartsolutionsgroup.net

INTRODUCTION

Economic development is more competitive than ever before. Thousands of economic development organizations throughout the country are competing for just a few hundred new locations/expansions each year. As a result of this competitive environment, economic development organizations of all sizes are forced to compete aggressively for these few new investments as well as retain existing investments. **Many smaller community economic development organizations have adapted well to the increasingly competitive environment** and are organized and focused to compete effectively with not only communities of their like size but the micro/metropolitan areas.

Aquila, a well respected economic development resource for local economic development organizations, commissioned this benchmarking study. **Based in Kansas City, Missouri, Aquila, Inc. operates electricity and natural gas distribution utilities serving 446,000 electric distribution customers in three states: Missouri, Kansas and Colorado; and 901,000 natural gas distribution customers in seven states: Missouri, Kansas, Colorado, Nebraska, Iowa, Michigan and Minnesota.** Aquila partners with the communities it serves to encourage business retention, expansion and attraction, to improve the area's assets and to market those assets to the world. Aquila has assisted hundreds of communities with a variety of project proposals, lead generation activities, community infrastructure planning, organizational development and innovative and cost-effective energy solutions.

Many of the communities Aquila serves are less than 15,000 population. To better serve communities of this size, Aquila commissioned this benchmark study to identify **economic development “best practices” and “innovative trends” in small to mid-sized communities with an emphasis on identifying strategies that are providing the best return on investment.** Aquila contracted with Smart Solutions Group, Inc., a leading Midwest consulting firm specializing in economic development organizational and marketing planning, to conduct the study.

BENCHMARK STUDY OF SMALL TO MID-SIZED COMMUNITY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS

JULY 2004

This report details the findings of a benchmark analysis of ten small to mid-sized economic development organizations in Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska and Kansas. The analysis provides insights and trends on the following issues:

- Organizational structures, board leadership, staffing, budget and funding sources.
- Fundraising strategies and innovative tactics.
- Community economic development leadership development/training.
- Functions of the organizations including programs and services, e.g. business attraction/recruitment, business retention, workforce development, entrepreneurial development, etc.
- Interaction and coordination with other economic development groups (utilities/county/state) and groups that influence economic development success (stakeholders/investors).
- Effective and innovative business attraction/recruitment marketing strategies/tactics, effective business retention practices and other effective wealth/growth generating strategies/tactics.
- Competitive “product” enhancements, e.g. business location/expansion incentive tools, industrial/business park development, speculative buildings, etc.
- Measurements of progress and success and notable achievements.

METHODOLOGY

Telephone surveys were conducted in April of 2004 with the highest level decision-maker in the organization, e.g. executive director. The survey participants were informed Smart Solutions Group (SSG) was conducting a survey of small to mid-size community economic development organizations to learn more about the needs of these organizations in order to better serve this segment of the market and that Aquila recommended the group as one of the “leading economic development organizations.” Participants were also informed the information would be utilized in aggregate form and SSG will not release specific information about their respective organizations. Supplemental information/data was gathered from the respondents’ Web site and through secondary data sources, e.g. online local newspapers, site location publications, etc.

Of the groups considered, **five are county-wide organizations; one is a two-county regional organization and four are community organizations.** The population of the area served by these organizations ranges from a high of 33,462 for the two-county regional organization to a low of 2,510. In considering the major communities served by these organizations, the population ranges from a high of 13,243 to a low of 2,150.

SURVEY FINDINGS

ORGANIZATIONAL ISSUES

On average the organizations have been in existence approximately 30 years. Four have been in existence less than 15 years (12-15); three in the range of 29-34 years and three more than 44 years (44-54). While in existence for many years, most indicated their organizations and approach to economic development are continuing to evolve.

The **primary reasons given for forming the organizations** were:

- To increase business development activity including attraction/recruitment and retention/expansion . . . initially formed to attract a specific company to the community.
- To market the community/area.
- To secure land for business development.
- To address the out migration of youth.

In forming the organization, the following groups were mentioned as the **catalysts/champions:**

- Business leaders
- Chambers of commerce . . . along with key business leaders
- Public and private leaders . . . a joint effort

The **legal structures** of these organizations:

- Six of the ten organizations are 501(c)(3) non-profit charitable organizations (development corporations).
- Two are 501(c)(6) non-profit business associations (chambers of commerce).
- Two are public/city organizations. In one city, the chamber contracts with the city to provide for economic development services. Another city has established a Missouri Urban Redevelopment Corporation (353) to acquire, construct, maintain and operate redevelopment projects.

Staffing levels for the organizations range from zero (totally volunteer organization) to three staff. The majority of the **organizations surveyed operate with one full-time director/manager of economic development** and an administrative support staff person along with guidance and assistance from their boards and volunteers.

The current **composition of the boards** of the organizations surveyed **includes public and private leaders.** Private sector representation most often includes a broad mix of small to large employers including financial institutions and industrial, technology, service and retail businesses. Public leaders include city and county officials and school district officials. Board members are appointed based on investment levels as well as “at large” appointments to ensure key stakeholder groups are represented. Organizations surveyed seek individuals with a wide range of management/business and community experiences to serve on their boards including current and retired business owners, former and current school superintendents, etc. **The majority of organizations surveyed do not have a formal board succession plan.** However, most groups indicated they proactively seek board members with a good working knowledge of economic development and business management experience and have a leadership transition plan in place. **Most organizations do not have a formal leadership/board orientation/training program but recognize the need to develop such programs.** Of the organizations surveyed, **five indicated their boards were “active to very active,” three indicated “somewhat active,” and two indicated “not active.”** **Most organizations surveyed have “active” volunteers** that serve on various task forces/committees focused on specific development issues.

Annual budgets for the organizations range from a high of \$200,000 to a low of \$20,000. The average annual budget is approximately \$119,000. Most of the organizations receive private and public investments. Public investments range from a high of 100 percent (two groups) to a low of 10 percent. For those groups receiving private funds, investments range from a high of 90 percent to a low of 20 percent. Funding levels for six of the groups are “up;” three indicated the “same” and one was “down.” **Funds are raised in a variety of ways** including:

- Annual dues structure.
- Annual or multi-year fundraising campaign.
- Combination of dues and major fundraising campaign.
- Sell industrial corporation “shares” . . . must purchase at least two shares to be a member.
- One community receives a majority of their annual funding from residents in the community . . . residents can contribute to economic development with municipal water payment.
- City/county sales tax dedicated to economic development.

Budget priorities for the coming year include:

- Stabilizing long-term funding to support staffing and programming.

- Increasing funding to develop more proactive marketing/business recruitment initiatives.
- Increasing funding for specialized programming including technology center and entrepreneurial development.
- Increasing funding to expand industrial park.
- Developing a more balanced approach to economic development including increasing funding for tourism, Main Street, housing development and product enhancements, e.g. infrastructure.

The organizations surveyed have a balanced approach to economic development focusing primarily on three “core competencies” . . . business attraction/recruitment, business retention/expansion and entrepreneurial development. Two groups mentioned having a lesser focus on “retail development.” One group mentioned operating an “entrepreneurial incubator” through a \$2 million foundation established for entrepreneurial development. Another group mentioned the importance of recognizing existing businesses; this organization has an “expansion awards program” and “industry of the month award.” And another group mentioned operating a technical assistance center for existing businesses and entrepreneurs.

Other functions mentioned include: tourism; Main Street; housing development; technical assistance for local community development organizations, e.g. grant writing; development of a “product improvement plan” focused on enhancements to the infrastructure; and serving as a resource to the community/county on a wide range of business/economic development issues.

Communities surveyed mentioned **they are currently partnering with or have partnered with in the past the following groups to enhance their local economic development programs:**

- Utilities including electric and natural gas (investor-owned and rural electric cooperatives) (8 mentions)
- State economic development departments (3 mentions)
- Regional development organizations/partnerships (3 mentions)
- Regional planning commissions
- Telecommunications service providers
- Local city and/or county
- Nearby communities
- Chambers of commerce . . . within the community . . . the region
- Rural economic development associations
- Community colleges
- Railroads

Most respondents felt **partnerships are the key to achieving success. These groups rely upon their economic development partners for information and new ideas, marketing assistance (financial and technical), and business prospect leads/referrals.**

Realizing the importance of communicating on a regular basis with members, investors and economic development partners/stakeholders, the communities surveyed are utilizing multiple communications channels including:

- Annual meeting of stakeholders/investors . . . annual goal-setting session with stakeholders/investors . . . quarterly investor meetings.
- Regular stakeholder/investor networking events with program featuring timely topic/issue.
- Various committees and task force meetings.
- Quarterly newsletter . . . regular e-mail/electronic news updates . . . monthly director's report.
- Quarterly feature article in local newspapers providing news and updates on economic development initiatives . . . regular press releases on significant news/events.
- Soliciting community-wide input . . . town hall meetings, surveys, etc.

Respondents overall felt transparent, open communications with stakeholders/investors is crucial to the organization's success and key to maintaining positive relationships with stakeholders/investors, the media and the community as a whole.

STRENGTHS, CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

The **respondents consider their strengths** to be:

- Cohesiveness of the community . . . strong local support for economic development and aggressive economic development program.
- Organizational leadership . . . active board and volunteers.
- Small town atmosphere . . . near major metropolitan center.
- Location/transportation infrastructure (highway/rail/river) . . . easy to move goods and people efficiently.
- Advanced telecommunications infrastructure including wireless.
- Growth . . . proves vitality.
- Costs of doing business including utilities, taxes, etc.
- Quality of life . . . recreational amenities . . . regional medical center . . . educational system.
- Regional marketing approach . . . able to leverage strengths and assets and resources to have a greater impact in the marketplace.

The challenges mentioned include:

- Workforce issues . . . availability . . . attraction/retention of skilled workers . . . “job ready” high tech workforce . . . declining and aging population . . . retention of young people.
- Perceptions/reality of remote location . . . perceived lack of access to a major transportation corridor.
- Lack of business development sites and available buildings.
- Alignment of technical training programs with local economic development opportunities.
- Lack of funding . . . for proactive marketing . . . for staffing . . . for maintaining/enhancing infrastructure.
- Regionalism . . . difficult to overcome “competition” among communities . . . requiring continually communication on the benefits of working together.

Potential future opportunities identified include:

- Regional cooperation and collaboration . . . sharing of services . . . building regional partnerships to increase efficiencies.
- Entrepreneurial development . . . creating an entrepreneurial culture.
- Spin-off opportunities of major existing business.
- Value-added agricultural opportunities including ethanol, soy diesel and advanced fuels.
- Logistics/warehousing/distribution . . . area well-suited to attract growing industry sector.
- Telecommunications-intensive businesses.
- Wind energy opportunities.
- Retail growth/expansion.
- Small to mid-sized businesses (30-70 employees) . . . community poised for growth for businesses that are a “good fit.”

To enhance the competitiveness of the product (the location), the communities surveyed are:

- Developing fully-serviced business parks.
- Building speculative buildings.
- Upgrading the physical infrastructure including water and sewer capacity.
- Developing and implementing workforce retention/recruitment initiative.
- Enhancing quality of life amenities to make the community a better place to live and work, e.g. recreation center, bike/walking path, housing, etc.
- Working with local employers to attract/retain talented, skilled workers.

MARKETING THE COMMUNITY

Survey respondents perceive the competition for business development projects is:

- Communities in the contiguous states . . . Midwestern states.
- Midwest, suburban communities . . . of similar size.
- Rural communities of similar size . . . within a 300-mile radius.
- Next tier size communities and regions . . . within a 10-mile radius.

In general, respondents feel they compete well with competitors . . . “when they get a chance.” For the most part, communities feel they compete well on costs . . . for some . . . they compete well on the fact they offer a small community environment within close proximity to major metropolitan center . . . and for others on quality of living. One community mentioned they compete well because they are “responsive” to the needs of the prospect/client and their state and utility partners know they can depend upon the organization to “deliver” a quality response package . . . and creatively package business and financial assistance programs. **To enhance the community’s competitiveness,** respondents indicated they need financial incentive tools and more dollars for financial assistance programs . . . others mentioned they need additional business development sites . . . and others indicated they need a more proactive marketing effort to raise awareness of the community and thus have a chance to compete more frequently for business development opportunities.

Dollars available for marketing are very limited, in general . . . on average, approximately 10 percent of the total budget is allocated to marketing. Most organizations focus limited marketing dollars on a specific target audience or a specific tactic. To maximize and leverage marketing resources, some organizations research the marketplace to identify specific company investment opportunities that are a good match for the community . . . and others mobilize local community and industry leaders to promote the community and generate business development leads. Other groups are more reactive . . . relying on their state, utility and regional partners to refer leads. In general, organizations acknowledge the importance of pre-qualifying leads and customizing the marketing-sales pitch to be relevant to the firm’s specific location needs. All organizations are striving for face-to-face contact with the prospect to “advance the sales dialogue and make the sale.”

Priority marketing expenditures include: Internet/Web, collateral materials, direct marketing/sales trips, hosting prospect site visits and trade shows. One community encourages and engages local businesses and residents in promoting and selling the community; the program has been quite successful generating several business development location leads including a recent location.

The respondents’ allies/partners are supporting local marketing efforts by:

- Providing cooperative marketing dollars and specific tools, e.g. sales trips.
- Technical assistance . . . “best practices” consultation and guidance.

- Internet assistance including Location One Information System.
- Technical assistance to establish regional marketing partnership.
- Low interest loans to develop business park.

In general, the organizations indicated their state and utility allies are crucial to their success . . . “couldn’t do it without them.”

Communities are branding/positioning their product in various ways . . . following are some of the key core messaging:

- Interstate location . . . quality workforce . . . family-style community (good schools, family-oriented indoor/outdoor recreation amenities) . . . a “fun place to live.”
- “Great” place to live work and play!
- Quality of life.
- Location . . . incentives . . . leadership.
- Community college . . . leading training provider/facility.
- Lower cost of doing business.
- Position community as part of a larger region . . . metropolitan area.

In regards to target marketing . . . communities surveyed indicated, in general, targeting small to mid-sized businesses that are a “good fit” for the community” . . . in terms of size (30-100 employee operations) and in terms of being a good corporate citizen. One individual surveyed stressed the importance of research in identifying specific businesses and then customizing the sales approach . . . **research/market intelligence is key to a successful target marketing program.**

Target industries/clusters identified include:

- Advanced manufacturing (3 mentions)
- Value-added agricultural (2)
- Biotech, e.g. bio fuel and advanced fuels (2)
- Food processing . . . Food additives (2)
- Plastics (2)
- Logistics/distribution (2)
- Wood products
- Electronics
- Auto industry subcontractors
- Paperboard
- Rubber products
- Retail

Most respondents indicate an emphasis on attracting businesses that will complement the existing business base . . . and also work with existing businesses to identify and develop “spin-off” opportunities.

Target geographic markets include:

- Major metropolitan areas, e.g. Chicago and Dallas
- Midwest
- Contiguous states
- Communities within a three-hour drive
- Europe
- Home state of existing branch plants

Several organizations mentioned the importance of having an existing industry outreach program including calls on corporate headquarters. And most organizations surveyed are targeting site location consultants.

Mentioned most frequently as **effective best practice marketing strategies/tactics for developing business prospect leads/relationships** were:

- Internet/Web site . . . mentioned most frequently as the “most important promotion/communications tool.” One organization mentioned streaming video testimonials has been effective.
- “Connection strategy” . . . mobilizing local businesses and residents to connect and promote the community to buyers/suppliers, former residents and other decision-makers with a “connection to the community.”
- Business prospect sales calls . . . customized sales presentations.
- Regional marketing partnerships to leverage resources and assets/strengths.

One of the most innovative marketing tactics was promoting an available building on E-Bay . . . generated approximately 500 hits per day. One organization mentioned utilizing a comprehensive “multi-channel marketing approach” including print advertising, two-tiered direct mail campaign, telemarketing and personal follow-up to schedule sales appointments with interested businesses; the campaign generated 20 solid prospect leads and 49 additional potential leads.

In regards to incentives, most rely on state economic development assistance programs . . . two mentioned offering “free land” . . . one community offers low-cost incubator space for entrepreneurs . . . revolving loan, tax increment financing and tax abatements were other mentions. One community surveyed indicated they are very selective in providing incentives to businesses . . . they do extensive “due diligence” to determine if the company will add long-term value to the community.

The average number of quality project leads generated annually is approximately 30. The high was 85 and the low was 7. Source of leads are: direct, internal/industry partner referrals, and partner referrals (state, regional and utilities). Five communities indicated prospect activity was “up” from 2002 to 2003 . . . four indicated activity was “down” . . . one indicated activity was about the “same” . . . overall the respondents were optimistic activity will be up in 2004.

In regards to measuring success, three communities indicated they do not have a set of metrics. Those communities that have “measurements of success” . . . measure progress and success as follows:

- Number of business locations/expansions/retentions
- Number of jobs created with focus on quality of jobs and wages
- Number of new retail starts
- Number of housing starts
- Increase in sales tax receipts
- Population growth

Progress and success is reported to stakeholders/investors and the community, in general, through direct communications including newsletters, briefings, reports, membership networking events through media outlets (press releases).

In the past 2-3 years, the most notable successes of the communities surveyed include:

- Attracting a broad range of companies including a major internationally-recognized manufacturer and a software company.
- Location of an ethanol plant and two out-of-state businesses.
- Three new wins in the industrial park including a tenant for the spec building.
- Location of a logistics/trucking firm, a major international company operation and retention of a key business segment of an existing industry.
- Location of major Fortune 500 company and other smaller successes.
- Location of a major manufacturer.
- Start-up of a learning center and entrepreneurial incubator.
- Location of a new mail processing facility . . . greater diversification of economy.
- Location of a wind energy facility and complex.
- National franchise operation.

ADDITIONAL INSIGHTS AND PERSPECTIVES

The communities surveyed provided the following final thoughts on small to mid-size community “best practices” in economic development:

- Vision is everything . . . along with good staff to implement the vision.
- A well-balanced, involved board is crucial to success.
- Do something every day to build trust in the community . . . work on it continuously . . . transparent communication is very important . . . and involve as many people as possible.

- Focus on improving Web presence . . . the most important marketing tool for economic development organizations.
- Partnerships are key for small to mid-size economic development organizations in non-metro areas of the state.
- Customize the message . . . presentation . . . based on the client’s needs.
- Organize for growth . . . and make economic development a priority of community leaders.
- Everyone needs to take stock in the community . . . get the community involved in generating business development leads/prospects.
- Concentrate on success . . . seek out assistance when needed . . . build partnerships to achieve efficiencies and enhance success.

In regards to assistance needs of the small to mid-size community development organization needs, mentioned most frequently was assistance with developing a presence on the Internet, education/training on economic development best practices and trends and the benefits of regionalism, and cooperative marketing assistance.

KEY OBSERVATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. While the organizations surveyed have been in existence for a number of years, they are continuing to evolve and adapt to the competitive economic development environment. Communities are not only competing with nearby communities and in other states for business investments, they are often competing with locations in other countries. **To compete more effectively on a national and international basis for business investments . . . and talent . . . small to mid-sized organizations are increasingly realizing the benefits of forming mutually beneficial collaborative partnerships including county-wide and regional groups that maximize and leverage assets and resources to achieve greater success.**
2. Organizations surveyed have very limited budgets and staff. To be effective organizations, **economic development leaders must identify ways to reach deeply into all segments of the business community to provide leadership and to increase funding.** Today, organizations cannot rely on public funding for economic development programming and marketing. To stabilize long-term funding organizations are striving for at least a 50/50 balance between public and private investments and to secure multi-year investor commitments. A balanced funding strategy also supports effectively positioning the organization’s public-private approach to economic development.
3. Of crucial importance in securing investments is presenting the organization’s “plan of action” to potential investors. **It is not the size of the organization or even the experience of the staff or the board that will generate support and investment in local economic development programs . . . as much as it is the organization has a focused business and marketing plan to generate a return on investment for the stakeholders and investors.** Organizations applying the 3Ms (Management, Money

and Marketing) of successful businesses will most likely be successful economic development organizations in terms of generating and maintaining support and investments.

4. In regards to management, **small to mid-sized communities for the most part do not have formal leadership development or orientation programs; however, recognize the importance of having such programs.** Development of such a program, e.g. an economic development university for local boards and volunteers, would be very beneficial for most small to mid-sized communities.
5. **Successful organizations are focusing limited resources on the “core competencies” of business retention/expansion and attraction/recruitment. There is an increasing emphasis among small to mid-sized communities on entrepreneurial development, the “third leg of the economic development stool.”** The most successful organizations have aggressive existing industry outreach programs focused on retaining existing investments and encouraging new investments as well as to identify potential “spin-off” opportunities. Those organizations with a focus on “growing their own businesses” are providing **technical assistance utilizing successful local entrepreneurs and financial assistance to assist entrepreneurs with converting ideas into profitable businesses.**
6. Organizations are also **focusing on “continuously improving the product.” Mentioned most frequently as an important product enhancement is the development of industrial sites and speculative buildings . . . “inventory on the shelf.”** These organizations realize that without a fully-serviced industrial site and/or available building . . . the community cannot compete effectively for business investments.
7. Small to mid-sized organizations have limited marketing dollars and thus are hyper-focused on industry targets that are “best suited/matched” to the community and its location assets/strengths and are utilizing methods and approaches to target specific companies. For the most part, the small to mid-sized communities are targeting operations with 30 to 70 employees. Traditional prospect identification methods such as direct mail campaigns utilizing purchased mailing lists are not cost effective in yielding results. **More effective, results-driven strategies for the small to mid-sized community economic development organization include utilizing the Internet to promote the area’s location assets/strengths, utilizing market intelligence to identify specific companies with growth/expansion plans; connecting with former residents in industry decision-making positions and buyers-suppliers of existing industry; and mobilizing existing industry and residents to market the area’s location opportunities and to refer business development leads.**
8. **To advance the sales dialogue and make the sale . . . organizations recognize the importance of “customizing the marketing-sales pitch” based on the location needs of the industry/client.**

9. While most organizations recognize the importance of the **Internet in economic development marketing, this clearly seems to be a challenge/weakness of small to mid-sized community economic development groups. Organizations recognize they need assistance in developing an effective Internet presence and updating/maintaining the Location One Information System.**
10. Success is measured in a number of ways . . . most important, **is reaching consensus on a set of metrics with the organization's stakeholders/investors and reporting to investors on a regular basis through multiple channels progress towards achieving success.**

IN SUMMARY

While each of these small to mid-sized communities is unique from each other, they tend to exhibit the following attributes related to the success of their economic development efforts. It can be said that they exhibit the **BEST PRACTICES**.

Building

While they have a variety of strengths and challenges, most believe that they must focus their efforts, work to enhance their product (community) and continue to include others in the business development process.

Evolving

These organizations have been around for a long time, but they have experienced a series of changes in their mission and emphasis which has led to a more focused, effective program.

Studying

Most of these organizations place a high priority on having up-to-date information available for decision making. This information aids in setting short and long term direction, target identification and proactive planning.

Trainning

They tend to feel that a more formal leadership/board orientation would be helpful for their future.

Partnering

These organizations understand and embrace the value of partnering with others for the common good. They all deal with many regional partners, most serving areas beyond the local community. They benefit from information, ideas, financial and technical support, marketing, financial and technical assistance and prospect leads/referrals. These organizations know that they could not be successful without their allies and partners.

Representing

However, most recognize the importance of having a broad community cross-section involved to some degree in economic development activities and leadership.

Assessing

These organizations tend to have a realistic view of their assets, weaknesses and opportunities and thus set realistic targets for prospecting. While they do not spend significant amount of money on “marketing,” they tend to be very focused in how they spend that money. They understand the importance of the Internet as a development tool and the importance of encouraging others (community, partners, state, etc.) to help them define prospects.

Communicating

These organizations keep their stakeholders and influencers informed which strengthens their relationship. Open and clear communications are a priority.

Targeting

These organizations demonstrate the importance of connecting to prospects through research, market intelligence and personal connection for their targeted marketing efforts. They tend to be more specific in the targets they pursue versus the broad overview categories. They use their existing business base as a starting point for business development.

Involving

Most realize the importance of actively involving the business community in economic development pursuit.

Concentrating

These organizations understand and embrace the importance of focusing their efforts. The primary core competencies of these groups are:

- Business attraction/recruitment
- Business retention/expansion
- Entrepreneurial development

Endowing

From a budget perspective, they are funded by a mix of public and private dollars. Organizations understand the importance of re-investing in their communities. They demonstrate a variety of approaches to raising funds, each reflecting the unique personality of their community and leadership.

Succeeding

As far as leads go, these organizations prefer quality over quantity. Many enjoy a high percentage of “win” versus “lead” due to their ability to ensure that a prospect has a high likelihood of fitting their community.