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**APPENDIX A: ADDITIONAL TABLES**

**Table A1: Descriptive statistics**

**Summary Statistics**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | PEAK Firms | Non-PEAK Firms |
| Ln Employment Pre-Peak Program (2006) | 3.246 | 1.081 |
|  | (1.716) | (1.264) |
| Ln Employment Post PEAK Program | 2.682 | 0.961 |
|  | (1.836) | (1.161) |
| Subsidiary (1=yes) | 0.121 | 0.012 |
|  | (0.328) | (0.109) |
| Multiple Moves (1= firm moved more than twice) | 0.065 | 0.016 |
|  | (0.248) | (0.125) |

**Note: Means and standard deviations of variables for PEAK and non-PEAK firms**

**Table A2: Balance tables for entropy balancing**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Balance Before Weighting** | | | | |
|  | Treatment | | Control | |
|  | Mean | Variance | Mean | Variance |
| Ln Employment 2006 | 3.246 | 2.943 | 1.081 | 1.597 |
| Subsidiary | 0.203 | 0.165 | 0.018 | 0.018 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Balance After Weighting with Sector** | | | | |
|  | Treatment | | Control | |
|  | Mean | Variance | Mean | Variance |
| Ln Employment 2006 | 3.246 | 2.943 | 3.242 | 6.215 |
| Subsidiary | 0.203 | 0.165 | 0.2031 | 0.162 |

**Table A3. CEM with Additional Covariates**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | |  |
|  | CEM | CEM | CEM | CEM |
|  | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 4 | Model 5 |
| PEAK | 0.059 | 0.115 | 0.058 | 0.099 |
|  | (0.210) | (0.128) | (0.127) | (0.095) |
| Foreign | 1.608\*\*\* | 1.290\*\*\* | 0.144\*\*\* | 0.291\*\*\* |
|  | (0.025) | (0.019) | (0.012) | (0.012) |
| Border | 0.635\*\*\* | 0.535\*\*\* | -0.036\*\*\* | -0.052\*\*\* |
|  | (0.027) | (0.017) | (0.014) | (0.011) |
| Sales |  |  | 0.818\*\*\* | 0.613\*\*\* |
|  |  |  | (0.002) | (0.003) |
| Constant | 2.331\*\*\* | 0.972\*\*\* | 2.798\*\*\* | 2.659\*\*\* |
|  | (0.007) | (0.074) | (0.241) | (0.253) |
| Sector | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| N | 79,752 | 79,752 | 56,636 | 56,636 |

*Note:* All four models are CEM models building on Model 2 from Table 1 (CEM with additional three digit SIC dummy variables). All estimates are OLS with the dependent variable of the natural log of total establishment employment in 2012. Model 1 includes a dummy variable for foreign firms and firms that are located in the Kansas City region. Model 2 includes dummy variables for three digit SIC codes. Models 3 and 4 include a measure of pre-PEAK sales (natural log of sales in 2006).

\*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1.

**APPENDIX B: SURVEY RECRUITMENT EMAIL**

*Note: Author names and emails reviewed for the purpose of peer review.*

You are invited to participate in a research study under the direction of AUTHOR of the Department of AUTHOR DEPARTMENT and funded by the Ewing Marion Kauffman Foundation. Taking part in this research is entirely voluntary. The link to the survey is at the end of this email.

The purpose of the study is to ask about your views on the Kansas Business Environment and the Kansas “Promoting Employment Across Kansas” (PEAK) Program.

If you choose to take part in this study, you will answer a brief online survey that *doesn’t collect any personal information*. The total amount of time you will spend in connection with this study is 10–15 minutes. You may refuse to answer any of the questions and you may stop your participation in this study at any time.

There is no compensation for participating in this study, but we are happy to share the results of this survey. Please email AUTHOR at AUTHOR EMAIL if you would like a summary report of this survey.

The Office of AUTHOR UNIVERSITY INFO, at telephone number (202) 994-2715, can provide further information about your rights as a research participant. Further information regarding this study may be obtained by contacting AUTHOR at AUTHOR EMAIL

Your willingness to participate in this research study is implied if you proceed with completing the survey.

Your link directly to this survey is here:

<SURVEY LINK>

**APPENDIX C: PEAK INCENTIVE SURVEY**

First we will ask a few quick questions about your company. Please fill in the following details:

1. **Background**

1. Is your company headquartered in Kansas?

Yes

No

2. How many states does your company operate in and how many full-time employees does your company employ in Kansas

Number of states [Blank]

Total number of employees [Blank]

**2. Kansas PEAK Program**

3. Public records indicate your company applied for a Promoting Employment Across Kansas (PEAK) grant. Is this correct?

Yes

No

***[If respondent answers “No”, skip to Section 3]***

4. What was the purpose of the PEAK incentive? (Check all that apply)

Expansion

Relocation

Retention

Other [Blank]

5. How would you rate the process of applying for the PEAK grant? Note that we are asking about the application process in terms of how much time and energy you and your organization invested in the process. We will ask you about your experience with the program later.

1. Very Efficient
2. Somewhat efficient
3. Neither efficient nor inefficient
4. Somewhat Inefficient
5. Very Inefficient

6. Did you company receive the incentive or was it terminated or never granted?

Received incentive

Terminated

Never granted

Other [Blank]

7. Please briefly comment on any problems your organization had with this program.

[Blank paragraph]

**3. Company Plans and the PEAK Program**

8. Given your company experience, would you recommend other companies to apply for PEAK incentives?

Definitely would recommend

Probably recommend

Probably not recommend

Definitely would not recommend

Don’t know

9. Did your company receive any other incentive offers to expand or locate in other States at the time you were applying for the PEAK incentive?

Yes

No

Don’t know

***[Provide Question 10 only if the respondent answered “Yes” to Question 9]***

10. Comparing the PEAK program benefits to the other offers would you say that:

The PEAK program was more generous

The PEAK program was roughly equal to other states

The PEAK program was less generous

11. Without the PEAK incentive would your company have left the state of Kansas?

No

Yes

Unsure

12. Without the PEAK incentive would you have company hired less employees or the same number of employees?

Less

Same

Other [Blank]

***[Provide Question 13 only if the respondent answered “less” in Question 12]***

13. In your best guess, how many fewer employees would your company have in Kansas if the company didn’t receive a PEAK incentive? Write “0” if your company would have employed the same number of workers.

[Blank]

**4. Opinions on the Kansas Business Environment**

14. The Missouri Legislature has passed a bill that would limit incentive competition in the Kansas City region. Have you heard about this bill?

Yes

No

15. Overall, would you support Kansas passing legislation limiting the use of incentives in the Kansas City area?

Yes

No

Other [Blank]

16. If you could provide one concrete of policy advice to the Governor or state legislature that would help businesses like your own, what would it be?

[Paragraph]