plante moran

# State of Ohio Copy Centers Final Report

## March, 2002

*Office of State Printing and Standards*


Contact:

Silvio Vano:
248.223.3337

Christine Andrysiak:
248.223.3330

**State of Ohio**
**Department of Administrative Services**

# Assessment of State Copy Centers

## FINAL REPORT

March, 2002

**State of Ohio Department of Administrative Services**
**Assessment of State Copy Centers**

Table of Contents


I. Introduction ..... 1

II. Executive Summary ..... 2

A. Scope and Objective ..... 2
B. Project Approach ..... 2
C. Summary Conclusions and Recommendations ..... 5

III. Findings ..... 7

A. Site Visit/Interviews ..... 8
B. Customer Service Survey Results ..... 10
C. Comparative Analysis ..... 14
D. Current Legislative Code Analysis ..... 24

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations ..... 26

A. Operating Model ..... 27
B. Conclusions ..... 28
C. General Recommendations ..... 29

Table of Contents (Continued)

Appendix:

Appendix A – Customer Service Survey Instrument
Appendix B – Customer Service Survey Summary Results
Appendix C – Customer Service Survey Data by Individual Copy Center Used Most Often
Appendix D – Customer Service Survey Data by Aggregate Copy Center Used Most Often
Appendix E – Customer Service Survey Open-End Responses
Appendix F – Detailed Cost Model
Appendix G – Current Legislative Code Analysis
Appendix H – Revised Operating Model Legislative Opinion
Appendix I – Suggested Bindery and Finishing Pricing

## I. *INTRODUCTION*

Plante & Moran was engaged to assist the State of Ohio in evaluating and comparing the operations of the Office of State Printing (OSP) with a sample of other State Agency Copy Centers. The Office of State printing through the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) was granted the authority to regulate the production of all printed materials for State agencies, by statutes dating back to 1953. Outside the scope of Office of State Printing authority are those copy centers designated as exempt from the Ohio Revised Code legislation, such as those headed by elected officials and the Bureau of Workers' Compensation. The current statutes allow State agencies to implement independent copy centers under specific conditions, only if given permission by the Ohio Department of Administrative Services, Office of State Printing. These independent Agency Copy Centers can manage their own copy and print facilities, but must coordinate the procurement of printing services through the Office of State Printing for print jobs exceeding 5,000 impressions.

This Management Report is presented in three major sections.

**Executive Summary** – This section outlines the project scope, project objectives and project approach. In addition, this section presents a summary of our key findings and recommendations.

**Findings** – This section provides our findings based upon site visits and observations, a customer survey, and comparative analysis of cost, equipment, services, staffing, and capacity.

**Conclusions** – This section present our conclusions regarding the Office of State Printing future operating model, including general recommendations for improving efficiency and effectiveness of the Office of State Printing.

# Executive Summary

## II. *EXECUTIVE SUMMARY*

### A. Project Scope and Objectives

The key objectives of the assessment of State Copy Centers project included:

- Determining how the State Printing's operating model could be altered to increase efficiency and customer service.
- Assessing the need to update statutes to better reflect the current printing and copy market and technology.

Included in our assessment are evaluation of the two following viable alternatives:

- Shifting control of the Agency Copy Centers to the Office of State Printing;
- Disbanding the Office of State Printing's copy centers, thereby creating a model in which agencies manage a copy center of their own.

### B. Project Approach

Consistent with Plante & Moran's Operational Review and Analysis Methodology, we approached the analysis of the State of Ohio copy centers utilizing the approach listed below:

#### 1. Project Initiation

We conducted a project initiation meeting with State of Ohio Department of Administrative Management to finalize the project work plan; clarify project goals and objectives; discuss project approach, milestones, and timeline.

#### 2. Document Review

We reviewed existing documentation to gain a comprehensive understanding of the Office of State Printing's and other Agency Copy Center operations and purpose. Documents reviewed included current organization structure and staffing levels, operating policies and procedures, technology applications, job descriptions,

## B. Project Approach (continued)

workflow documentation and flowcharts, prior year financial statements, and contractual and/or other collaborative agreements. All statutes related to the Office of State Printing were reviewed by the law offices of Bricker & Eckler, LLP.

### 3. Preliminary Data Collection Process

We developed a data collection form that was reviewed by the Office of State Printing prior to distribution. Each copy center included in the study completed the form and provided requested supporting documentation. We worked with copy centers as necessary to complete the data collection form. Key information gathered included copy and print services description, equipment inventories, detailed volume data, and preliminary cost data. Sample information collected included in-house publishing machinery, annual equipment lease/maintenance/support/service costs, offset printing jobs and volumes, black and white reproduction jobs and volumes, color reproduction jobs and volumes, bindery services and volumes, and costs of production. Agency Copy Centers maintained their records in a variety of formats and provided us with the most complete information possible, given the parameters of their routine data collection procedures.

### 4. Site Visits and Interviews

We conducted interviews with management and staff from the following copy centers to gain a detailed understanding of the organization's operations, services provided, equipment, costs, and staffing.

- Office of State Printing Main, Rhodes, Riffe, and Fountain Square facilities (OSP)
- The Ohio Data Network Printing Facility (ODN)
- The Ohio Department of Education Copy Center (DOE)
- The Ohio Department of Transportation Copy Center (DOT)
- The Ohio Department of Health Copy Center (DOH)
- The Ohio Department of Public Safety Copy Center (ODPS)
- The Ohio Bureau of Workers' Compensation Copy Center (BWC)
- The Ohio Department of Development Copy Center (DOD)

## B. Project Approach (continued)

### 5. Customer Satisfaction Survey Development and Distribution

In an effort to assess the intrinsic value of copy center services, we administered a customer service survey to the internal customers of all Office of State Printing and State agency operated copy centers included in our study. The survey was administered via Internet email to numerous customers, with responses returned directly to Plante & Moran to ensure confidentiality. It was designed to address issues related to customer service, with specific questions in the areas of overall customer service, turnaround time, accuracy, and availability of services. The survey was designed to address both customer importance and customer satisfaction ratings for specific survey questions, so that recommendations relating to customer attributes could be identified. We received 271 survey responses in total.

### 6. Draft Work Report 1

Based on our site visits, interviews and preliminary data collection, we developed a Copy Center Profile for each copy center in our study. These Copy Center Profiles documented equipment, services provided and production volumes and were presented in Work Report 1.

### 7. Current Legislative Code Analysis

The law firm Bricker & Eckler LLP conducted a review and analysis of the current legislative code concerning copy/print operations in the State of Ohio.

### 8. Cost Analysis and Conclusions

Based upon our site visits, cost, equipment and survey data analysis, we identified several conclusions and recommendations in the areas of a future operating model, service pricing and efficiency and effectiveness improvements.

### 9. Revised Legislative Code

Based upon our future operating model recommendation, the law firm of Bricker & Eckler, LLP provided a legal opinion regarding the need for the Department of Administrative Services, Office of State Printing to amend the Ohio

## II. *EXECUTIVE SUMMARY*

### B. Project Approach (continued)

Revised Code. Note: the project team determined that revising the legislative code is not necessary to implement the suggestions, as presented in this report.

**10. Final Report and Presentation**

We compiled this draft management report containing findings and recommendations for review by management. Upon completion of a draft report meeting with OSP leadership and subsequent revisions, we issued this final report.

### C. Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations

A list of our key conclusions and recommendations are presented below.

- Copy center customers value the following attributes of a copy center; proximity of copy services to the customer, ability to meet on demand printing needs, quick job turnaround time, and pleasant and friendly service.
- There are several misconceptions amongst Agency staff that the use of their Agency Copy Center is "free". These perceptions are perpetuated since the Agency Copy Centers do not directly charge back their customer or publish their rates.
- Both the Office of State Printing and Agency Copy Centers use similar equipment. There appears to be significant black & white and color xerography capacity among the copy centers included in this study.
- The Office of State Printing on an aggregate basis provides equal or better overall customer service than the Agency Copy Centers, based on "customer" survey data.
- The Office of State Printing, in most cases, can provide copy/print services at a lower cost than the Agency Copy Centers. The Office of State Printing normalized per impression cost is $0.0305, while the aggregate normalized per impression cost for the Agency Copy Centers is $0.0509. This can be attributed to the specific "management" expertise and economies of scale afforded to the Office of State Printing.

- The potential cost savings associated with the Office of State Printing administering the copy/print services for the Agencies included in this study would range between $1,432,111 - $1,172,210.

- The Office of State Printing should consider centralized oversight and/or management of the independent Agency Copy Centers in an effort to decrease costs on a "state-wide" basis, however we suggest implementing this approach on a voluntary basis.

- The Office of State Printing appears to have the authority to assume administrative responsibility for all Independent Agency Copy Centers given the parameters of the current legislation.

- The Office of State Printing may wish to increase their level of collaboration with the other agency copy centers through ongoing performance monitoring, periodic performance reviews at the time of major equipment purchase requests, assistance with contract and equipment negotiations, and annual customer service surveys in an effort to continuously improve state-wide copy operations.

- The Office of State Printing should consider development of print and copy operation standards for implementation within the State of Ohio, specifically related to equipment specifications, performance measures, and evaluation criteria.

- The Office of State Printing should consider developing a customer service and communication plan to improve communications and awareness amongst its customers regarding job completion, timeliness, urgent requests, and exceptions handling.

- The Office of State Printing should consider consolidating all offset printing and color copying for agencies. There appears to be significant capacity available and this would provide for a more cost effective use of equipment.

- The Office of State Printing should consider revising its customer pricing structure to reflect job costing, including a reproduction fee component and bindery/finishing component. It also may want to consider using a job costing software program.

## Findings

## *III. FINDINGS*

We have structured our findings into three major categories:

- Site Visits/Interviews
- Customer Service Survey Results
- Comparative Analysis

## A. Site Visits/Interviews

- Independent and exempt Agency Copy Center staff unanimously believe there are four factors necessary for the success of a copy center. These factors are:

  - Proximity of copy services to customers
  - Ability to meet "On Demand Printing" needs
  - Quick job turnaround time
  - Pleasant reception and a customer friendly experience

- Customers of both Agency Copy Centers and OSP satellites have verbally stressed the importance of on demand printing and copy services to the center's respective staff.

- Agency Copy Center management believes they operate on a customer service driven model, while OSP operates on a cost driven model.

- OSP satellite facilities staff believes that proximity to their customers and short turn around times are integral components of good customer service.

- Some Agency Copy Center staff expressed frustration and mild dissatisfaction with their customer service experiences when working with staff of the OSP Main facility.

- There appears to be a general perception amongst agency and OSP satellite facilities staff that on-site copy centers facilitate a more collaborative approach between themselves and their customers in planning and executing various jobs.

- Agency Copy Center staff stated their customers either believe their services are free or at least less expensive than OSP. This perception is perpetuated since Agency Copy Centers generally do not directly charge back or publish their rates to their customers and the OSP has a specific per impression charge back procedure.

- The majority of black & white copy/print equipment operated by OSP and Agency Copy Centers are xerography based. These include a variety of Xerox analog and digital machines, plus machines from Oce and Kodak.

- Several copy centers also have color copy capacity. Equipment is from a variety of manufacturers including Xerox, Canon, Ricoh, and Toshiba.

- Offset press technology is also available at the OSP Main facility and select Agency Copy Centers. This equipment is either AB Dick or Hamada presses and various prepress equipment.

- There appears to be an impression amongst Agency Copy Centers that OSP uses outdated copy processes and equipment, even though the equipment used by OSP is similar and in some cases newer than the equipment used at the Agency Copy Centers.

## B. Customer Service Survey Results

In an effort to assess the intrinsic value of copy center services, a customer survey of all Office of State Printing and independent and exempt State agency operated copy centers included in our study was conducted. The copy centers whose customers were surveyed include:

- Office of State Printing, Fountain Square
- Office of State Printing, Main
- Office of State Printing, Rhodes
- Office of State Printing, Riffe
- Ohio Data Network
- Bureau of Workers' Compensation
- Department of Development
- Department of Education
- Department of Health
- Department of Public Safety
- Department of Transportation

The survey was administered via Internet email to internal customers of the above copy centers. A total of 271 survey responses were received. The following detailed information is presented in the Appendix:

Appendix A – Customer Service Survey Instrument
Appendix B – Customer Service Survey Summary Results
Appendix C – Customer Service Survey Data by Individual Copy Center Used Most Often
Appendix D – Customer Service Survey Data by Aggregate Copy Center Used Most Often
Appendix E – Customer Service Survey Open-End Responses

## General Observations

- Over 80% of all survey respondents rated the following as important or very important:

  - Staff responsiveness to urgent requests
  - Staff responsiveness to issues and questions
  - Jobs delivered according to agreed upon timelines
  - Requested turnaround times met
  - Staff make you aware when requested turnaround times can not be met
  - Jobs are of high quality
  - Jobs are delivered to specifications the first time.

- Most respondents also believe it is important or very important to be able to transfer files electronically.

## Office of State Printing Observations

- The OSP satellite site aggregate survey rating was above the aggregate survey rating of the agency operated copy centers. These satellites rated very high on customer service, turnaround, and accuracy. The Fountain Square Facility consistently ranks among the highest of all copy centers in customer satisfaction.

- Rhodes, Fountain Square and Riffe customers believe the staff of these copy centers are very professional.

- Riffe and Fountain Square rate high in satisfaction for making customers aware when turnaround times could not be met and for responding to urgent requests.

- A significant majority (90% +) of the survey respondents who use the OSP Main facility rated the following categories important to them:

  - Staff make them aware when requested turnaround time cannot be met
  - Staff be responsive to urgent requests
  - Staff be responsive to issues and questions
  - Job be delivered according to specifications the first time

- The respondents' satisfaction with the OSP Main facility's ability to meet their expectations in these categories was rated below average as compared to the Agency Copy Centers and aggregate of the entire sample.

**Agency Operated Copy Center Observations**

- The Department of Public Safety and Bureau of Worker Compensation provides a high level of customer satisfaction.

- The Department of Public Safety, Bureau of Worker Compensation and Department of Development were rated higher in satisfaction than OSP Main and Satellite facilities in the categories of staff always available to meet my needs/address concerns and staff responsiveness to issues and questions.

- The Departments of Health and Transportation rated below average in customer satisfaction compared to aggregate customer satisfaction rating for agency operated copy centers.

- The Department of Education survey results were determined to be invalid because the survey did not clearly differentiate between pre-OSP and current OSP responsibility for the operation of the department's copy center.

**Customer Service Conclusions**

- Turnaround time and accuracy are the most important service criteria to all copy center customers.

- Customers appear to make a clear distinction between the OSP Main facility and satellite facilities (Rhodes, Riffe and Fountain Square) consistently rating the OSP Main's customer service below that of the respective satellites.

- The OSP in aggregate does as well or better in meeting the service expectations of its customers than the Agency Copy Centers. Although, the OSP Main as opportunities to improve in the areas of overall communications, responsiveness and making customer aware of job status.

## C. Comparative Analysis

A comparison of cost and other operating attributes was conducted to develop an understanding of the opportunities, which may exist to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of copy and print operations on a "statewide" level. The key component in our comparison was the normalized cost per million impressions. This factor is truly the determinant in evaluating the most cost effective operating model for serving the State of Ohio's printing needs as a whole. Due to the fixed nature of overhead expenditures and desire to compare direct operating expenses in order to provide a reasonable estimate of possible "statewide" economies of scale, overhead was excluded from the analysis.

Additional operating attributes examined included: services provided, staffing, and equipment capacity and utilization.

## Normalized Costs

The table below presents the normalized costs per million impressions (cost/million impressions) based upon fiscal year 2001 information. This cost provides a consistent method of comparing the cost effectiveness of each copy center.

| Cost Per Million Impressions | OSP | ODPS | DOT | DOE | DOD | BWC | DOH | Agency Copy Centers Combined |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Paper | $4,600 | $4,600 | $4,800 | $4,800 | $5,113 | $4,500 | $4,260 | $4,695 |
| Labor | $11,844 | $15,561 | $13,568 | $12,829 | $15,492 | $20,778 | $10,543 | $15,481 |
| Maintenance Agreements | $4,635 | $4,104 | $5,136 | $11,784 | $3,082 | $7,909 | $11,486 | $6,164 |
| Click Charges | $1,549 | $11,893 | $1,667 | $4,442 | $5,996 | $2,492 | $10,240 | $5,417 |
| Depreciation | $4,195 | $10,615 | $1,337 | $13,594 | $6,043 | $10,725 | $26,386 | $8,343 |
| Interest | $507 | $0 | $0 | $1,774 | $358 | $2,549 | $4,524 | $945 |
| Other Materials | $383 | $5,239 | $1,633 | $5,144 | $1,001 | $3,183 | $5,055 | $3,236 |
| Outside Services | $47 | $129 | $741 | $0 | $539 | $0 | $0 | $319 |
| Total Cost of Production | $3,561,505 | $950,921 | $663,735 | $379,577 | $303,698 | $995,261 | $281,349 | $3,574,541 |
| Total Volume (impressions) | 116,846,876 | 16,798,101 | 22,113,556 | 6,183,193 | 7,155,441 | 14,293,980 | 3,699,330 | 70,243,601 |
| Cost Per Impression | $0.0305 | $0.0566 | $0.0300 | $0.0614 | $0.0424 | $0.0696 | $0.0761 | $0.0509 |
| Ranking | 2 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 7 | |

Notes

1. Number of impressions is a standard industry measure and represents the lowest common production increment. For example a signal sided b&w copied page equals 1 impression, a two color offset processed signal page equals 2 impressions, etc.

2. The Ohio Department of Transportation copy center appears to be slightly more cost effective than the Office of State Printing due to timing of equipment purchases. Since collection of the data presented in this report during December 2001, ODOT has replaced some equipment, thus increasing their cost basis.

Our detailed cost analysis is presented in Appendix F.

The following conclusions can be drawn from a comparison of the normalized costs.

- The cost of paper is relatively consistent among all the copy centers.
- There are significant cost variations in most of the other cost categories, especially regarding maintenance agreements and click charges.
- The OSP consistently enjoys the lowest costs in all categories compared to the aggregate of the Agency Copy Centers, which can be attributed to the "management expertise" and economies of scale afforded to the OSP because copy/printing is its core business.
- Specifically the OSP's labor costs are 30% lower than the average labor cost of the aggregate Agency Copy Centers. Its maintenance costs are 33% lower and its click charge costs are 250% lower than the aggregate Agency Copy Center costs.
- The Office of State Printing is able to offer the State of Ohio low cost duplication and printing services due to their extensive knowledge of the printing industry, understanding of equipment standards and purchase/lease options, including negotiation of maintenance agreements and packaged click charges, and the ability to allocate resources efficiently to incoming print/copy jobs. This industry "expertise" is a key benefit to the State of Ohio in attaining cost effective print and copy services within the context of shrinking budgets and diminishing resources.
- The total normalized cost of copy/printing incurred by the ODPS, DOT, DOE, DOD, BWC and DOH equaled $3,574,541 for a combined number of 70,2433,601 impressions, equating to an average cost per impression rate of $0.0509. The Office of State Printing expected normalized cost per impression is between $0.0305 - $0.0342, this range considers a potential increase in labor costs associated with the increased volume and distributed operations, the expected costs would be $2,142,430 - $2,402,331. This represents a potential $1,432,111 - $1,172,210 in direct cost savings.

**Services Provided**

The table below provides a summary of the services provided by OSP and the Agency Copy Centers.

| | OSP | ODPS | DOT | DOE | DOD | BWC | DOH |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Design Services** | X | | | X | | X | |
| **Records Management Services** | X | | | X | | | |
| **Forms Management Services** | X | | X | | X | X | |
| **In-House Publishing Services (see below)** | | | | | | | |
| B&W copying | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| Color Copying | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| 1-color offset printing | X | X | X | | X | X | |
| 2-color offset printing | X | X | X | | X | X | |
| 4-color process offset printing | X | | X | | X | | |
| Wide Format Printing & Mounting | X | | | | | X | |
| Carbonless forms | X | X | X | | X | X | |
| Business Cards | X | X | X | X | X | X | |
| Laminating | X | X | | | | X | |

Based on the services provided, the copy centers can be logically grouped into two types:

- **Full Service Copy Center** – these centers provide design services, black & white (analog and digital), and color xerography, offset printing, and a variety of basic and custom finishing services. The centers which are in this category are:

  - OSP Main Copy Center
  - The Bureau of Workers Compensation Copy Center
  - The Department of Public Safety Copy Center
  - The Department of Development Copy Center

- The Department of Transportation Copy Center

- **Basic Service Copy Center** – these centers provide black & white (analog and digital) and color xerography and some basic finishing services, such as folding, drilling, spiral and tape binding. The centers which are in this category are:

  - OSP Riffe, Rhodes and Fountain Square Copy Centers
  - Department of Health Copy Center
  - Department of Education Copy Center

The following table provides a summary of fiscal year 2001 impression production volumes by primary service type provided, for each of the copy centers included in the study. It also shows the aggregate data for all of the Agency Copy Centers combined.

| Primary In-House Publishing Service Volumes (impressions) | OSP | ODPS | DOT | DOE | DOD | BWC | DOH | Agency Copy Centers Combined |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **B&W Copying** | 77,194,756 | 15,337,393 | 11,748,121 | 5,932,946 | 6,213,134 | 8,685,159 | 3,427,924 | 51,344,677 |
| **Color Copying** | 384,998 | 740,138 | 326,725 | 250,247 | 90,887 | 890,700 | 271,406 | 2,570,103 |
| **Offset Printing** | 39,267,122 | 720,570 | 10,038,710 | N/A | 851,420 | 4,718,121 | N/A | 16,328,821 |
| **Total Volume** | 116,846,876 | 16,798,101 | 22,113,556 | 6,183,193 | 7,155,441 | 14,293,980 | 3,699,330 | 70,243,601 |

Based upon the volume information shown, we present the following observations:

- Black and white copying is by far the highest volume service requested. Offset printing is the second highest volume service provided, for those copy centers that offer this type of service, with the exception of ODPS. Color copying appears to be lowest volume service requested amongst all of the copy centers analyzed. Please note that ODPS may provide more color copying services due to their

advanced implementation of network digital submission capability for color copying machines. They may be using this capability for jobs that might otherwise be requested for offset printing.

- Color copying is performed on a higher percentage basis within the agency copy centers, than the Office of State Printing (4% versus less than 1%.) Some agency copy centers, including ODPS and BWC, provide considerably more color copying service (approximately 800,000 impressions annually) to their agencies than the others.

- Proliferation of color copying and offset printing equipment and labor within the agency copy centers provides for a higher cost structure than if the operations were combined. Economies of scale can generally be gained through the consolidation of low volume operations.

**Staffing Analysis**

In the table listed below, we compare the production data provided by the Office of State Printing and each Agency Copy Center in the study. In order to measure how well a copy center's staff level was aligned with its production capacity, we identified a criterion of Impressions per FTE. FTE defined as full time equivalent staff involved in actual copy and print production. The table below summaries the copy center production, staffing and impressions/FTE.

| | OSP | ODPS | DOT | DOE | DOD | BWC | DOH |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Total Impressions FY 2001 (millions)** | 116.85 | 16.80 | 22.11 | 3.47 | 7.16 | 14.29 | 3.70 |
| **Number of FTE FY 2001** | 32 | 5 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 1 |
| **Impressions/FTE FY 2001 (millions)** | 3.7 | 3.4 | 3.7 | 1.7 | 2.4 | 1.8 | 3.7 |

- Based upon 2001 total production volume it appears that the average Impressions/FTE is approximately 3.2M.
- The OSP facilities, Department of Public Safety, Department of Transportation and Department of Health are operating at an impression per staff ratio, which exceeds this average.
- The Department of Education, Department of Development, and Bureau of Workers' Compensation are operating at an impressions per staff ratio which is significantly below this average, which could indicate these center are more richly staffed.

**Equipment Capacity Utilization**

The table below provides a summary of the utilization of the xerography equipment in each copy center.

| | OSP | ODPS | DOT | DOE | DOD | BWC | DOH |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Black and White** | 60% | 49% | 218% | 14% | 50% | 48% | 19% |
| **Color** | 10% | 62% | 22% | 70% | 13% | 15% | 23% |
| **Overall** | 58% | 46% | 175% | 14% | 48% | 40% | 23% |

Notes

1. Capacity utilization was developed by taking the annual rated capacity, divided into the annual actual number of impressions. Annual rated capacity was obtained from the various equipment vendors.

2. The Black and White equipment capacity utilization numbers reflect both digital and analog technologies.

Based on our understanding of effective copy/print equipment utilization, the equipment used by the OSP and Agency Copy Centers should be used at a minimum of 50% capacity utilization, up to 70-80% capacity utilization under "normal" operating conditions. Anything below 50% can be considered inefficient use of equipment resources and anything above 80% can be considered excess wear and tear on the machinery. In addition, operating duplication equipment at capacities significantly above 80% may indicate an inability to provide sufficient flexibility/availability in equipment resources to meet the variable nature of incoming print/copy job demand. The following conclusions can be drawn based on the current utilization of equipment.

- All copy centers, except for DOT underutilize black & white equipment. The Office of State Printing is the most efficient user of its black and white copy equipment, at 60% capacity utilization, with the Department of Education at the low end of efficiency (14%.)

- The Department of Transportation is at the other extreme regarding black & white equipment utilization, as they utilize their equipment beyond its rated capacity. This excessive equipment use suggests that DOT may have difficulty in meeting their copy/print demands in timely fashion, due to the variable nature of incoming print/copy demand. This assumption is supported by the data received in the customer survey, which indicated a below average customer satisfaction rating for DOT when compared to the aggregate of agency operated copy centers.

- There is significant color copy capacity in the current operating model, especially at the OSP, DOD, and BWC.

- The OSP has significant available capacity in its color operations, and could assume additional workload from the Agency Copy Centers.

- The apparent under utilization of the color copy equipment suggests a considerable amount of excess equipment capacity within the context of the current operating model. This proliferation of color copying equipment within the Agency Copy Centers provides for a higher cost structure than if the operations were combined. Economies of scale can likely be gained through the consolidation of color copying operations.

- With 58% overall equipment utilization, the Office of State Printing maintains the lowest cost structure, with the exception of DOT, which over utilizes its equipment. Increasing equipment utilization within the OSP should further lower costs of production, significantly benefiting the State of Ohio as a whole.

**Office of State Printing and Ohio Data Network**

Based on our site visit and analysis we present our findings related to the comparison of the Office of State Printing and Ohio Data Network (ODN).

- The Ohio Data Network operates under a completely different mission and operating model than the Office of State Printing. It provides high volume and high speed data printing via rolled stock paper from the State of Ohio's' mainframe computer system. Its primary customer is the Ohio Department of Job and Family Services, printing disbursement checks and reports.

- The majority of equipment operated by ODN is to fulfill this mission and includes several IBM printers attached to the states' mainframe computer system and paper roll systems used to unwind, rewind, cut, fold and staple the large rolls of paper stock.

- ODN has one manual production copier a Xerox 5830 and a Xerox Digipath 4635 system, which is attached to the state mainframe computer and is used to print a variety of certification forms and licenses on preprinted color forms from a variety of mainframe databases.

- ODN leadership expressed an interest in assisting the Office of State Printing through possible shared utilization of its Xerox Digipath 4635 to supplement the current services provided to OSP customers. Their Digipath 4635 system is currently networked to the state mainframe computer, a capability that is not currently in place within OSP, however it is also capable of performing standard duplication. ODN leadership indicated receptiveness to the concept of being used as a resource to OSP in targeted situations that would benefit joint OSP/ODN customers.

- If this working arrangement is considered an enhancement to current OSP operations and is implemented, an agreement would need to be reached regarding the allocation of costs between the departments (OSP and ODN,) as well as the "charge back" system for customers.

## D. Current Legislative Code Analysis

A comprehensive review of Ohio Revised Code printing statutes was conducted by the law firm of Bricker & Eckler, LLP. The salient points of the analysis are presented below.

Interpretation of the Ohio Revised Code suggests that the Ohio Department of Administrative Services (DAS,) Office of State Printing (OSP) has the statutory authority to regulate all public printing services for the State of Ohio, with the exception of the following specifically exempt agencies:

- General Assembly
- Ohio Arts Council
- Capital Square Review and Advisory Board
- Bureau of Workers' Compensation
- State colleges and universities
- State-wide elected office holders (Attorney General, Auditor, Secretary of State, and Treasurer)

There is limited ability for the agencies within the scope of DAS' authority to bypass the Office of State Printing, and in such cases, they are required to obtain permission from DAS. DAS may give agencies permission to operate their own office reproduction services (i.e. copy center,) under the following specific conditions:

- Sheets must be limited to sheets no larger than 17 inch by 22 inch
- Orders are limited to 5,000 press impressions
- Multiple page orders are limited to 1,000 production copies
- Multiple page order in an emergency or hardship may be between 5,000 and 10,000 press impressions

If permission was granted to a particular agency, generally through written format, the Office of State Printing has the authority to modify their decision at any time. However, if permission was never obtained or granted, reconsideration would not be necessary.

If permission was granted to a particular agency, generally through written format, the Office of State Printing has the authority to modify their decision at any time. However, if permission was never obtained or granted, reconsideration would not be necessary.

As a matter of public policy, the centralization of printing services and competitive bidding process was institutionalized to "combat abuses and protect the public treasury." The legislation states that the Office of State Printing may procure printing services for the General Assembly only with a contract between the two parties, may not perform printing for political subdivisions, and cannot curtail release of public information by any elected state official.

The Ohio Department of Administrative Services, Office of State Printing has specific duties within the context of the legislation, including:

- Approval of printing requests
- Annual budgeting for all state entities, for all printing mandated by law
- Office reproduction services (i.e. copying)
- Binding Services
- Accounting for printing, reproduction, and binding work
- Establishment of paper quality standards
- Paper inspection upon receipt
- Quality control of print jobs (i.e. proof sheets and indexes)

The legislative code also outlines detailed requirements associated with procuring services outside of DAS. The statutes include the topics of bidding, Internet reverse auctions, performance bonds, performance standards, standard definitions used in procurement, classes of printing, in-state printing requirement with certain exceptions, and furnishing of paper.

Please reference Appendices G and H for more detailed discussion of the legal aspects of the governing authority of the Ohio Department of Administrative Services, Office of State Printing and related statutes.

# Conclusions and Recommendations

## IV. *CONCLUSIONS*

### Overview

Based upon our assessment of the sample of State of Ohio copy centers, we present the following conclusions, which we have structured as follows:

A. **Operating Model** - This section describes the potential Operating Models for the State of Ohio to provide copy and print services.

B. **Conclusions**– This section outlines our general conclusions which the Office of State Printing may wish to consider as it moves forward with evaluating the appropriate operating model under which to function.

C. **Recommendations** – This section provides several recommendations the Office of State Printing may want to consider.

## A. Operating Model

Based on our findings and analysis, we have identified two copy/print service-operating models for the State of Ohio Department of Administrative Services Office of State Printing to consider. These operating models are:

**Agency Administered Copy/Print Services (Decentralized)** – This option would call for the disbandment of the Office of State Printing and allow agencies to run their own independent copy centers.

**Office of State Printing Administered Copy/Printer Services (Centralized)** – This option would call for the shift of control of all independent copy centers to the Office of State Printing, eliminating Agency Administered Copy Centers. The exempt copy centers would remain exempt.

A summary of the advantages and disadvantages of each of these options is presented below:

| | ***Advantages*** | ***Disadvantages*** |
|---|---|---|
| **Option I – Agency Administered Copy/Print Services (Decentralized)** | • Copy centers will be able to maintain close relationships with customers<br>• Agencies would be able to make all their own decisions regarding copy/print needs.<br>• Could provide high levels of customer satisfaction – agency customers would have a feeling of control over copy center | • Higher cost approach<br>• The State of Ohio would lose a significant amount of production capacity currently provided by the OSP Main facility<br>• The State of Ohio would lose the advantage of equipment purchasing and bulk supply purchasing done at the OSP.<br>• No control over equipment procurement |
| **Option II – Office of State Printing Administered Copy/Print Services (Centralized)** | • Lowest cost approach<br>• Comparable customer service levels<br>• Allows central management to shift work, and priorities to meet demand and maximize capacity of copy and print equipment<br>• Ability to take advantage of existing Office of State Printing "management" expertise and economies of scale | • Certain Agency Copy Centers are currently operating efficiently and effectively<br>• The shift to central control could cause a perception of decreased service levels if policies and procedures are significantly altered |

**B. Conclusions:**

Based on our analysis, we present the following conclusions.

- There are several misconceptions amongst agency staff regarding the cost effectiveness of Office of State Printing copy/print services. These customers need to be better educated concerning the actual costs associated with Agency Copy Centers providing copy/print services.

- The Office of State Printing on an aggregate basis provides equal or better overall customer service than the Agency Copy Centers. Perceived limitations to the customer service provided by the Office of State Printing are associated with the Office of State Printing Main facility staff effectively communicating status and turnaround time to customers.

- The cost in most cases associated with providing copy/print services is lower for the Office of State Printing than any Agency Copy Center. This can be attributed to specific "management" expertise and economies of scale afforded the Office of State Printing. This industry "expertise" is a key benefit to the State of Ohio in attaining cost effective print and copy services within the context of shrinking budgets and diminishing resources

- The potential cost savings associated with the Office of State printing administering copy/print services to the agencies included in this study would range between $1,432,111 - $1,172,210.

- Most of the current equipment used by the Office State Printing and the Agency Copy Centers is under utilized. The majority of color copy equipment is substantially under utilized, even within the Office of State Printing. The Department of Transportation appears to be over utilizing its equipment, which may be affecting quality.

- There are obvious redundancies in several publishing services provided by the OSP and agency copy centers, with some of these services being provided in relatively small scale at the agency operated copy centers. Analysis of the service and volume data indicates the opportunity for gaining economies of scale and enjoying a lower cost structure through the consolidation of offset printing and color copying operations.

- The Office of State Printing appears to have the authority to assume administrative responsibility for all Agency Copy Centers, with the exception of exempt entities. Please see Appendix H for the legal opinion completed by the law firm of Bricker & Eckler, LLP regarding this issue.

**C. Recommendations:**

We present the following recommendations for your consideration.

- Pursue implementation of a centralized management and oversight operating model for the independent Agency Copy Centers. The data presented in this report supports this conclusion, however we suggest that the Office of State Printing "offer" this concept to other agency senior leadership on a voluntary basis. We believe this would provide for a much more effective approach within the context of the governmental arena. While the Ohio Revised Code "exempts" some agencies from DAS authority, it does not preclude them from using its services. If desired by the Office of State Printing, this concept could also be "sold" to exempt agency senior leadership based upon the ability to provide lower costs and the same, if not improved customer service levels.

- The Office of State Printing may wish to increase its level of involvement with the Agency Copy Centers in an effort to facilitate their ability to provide print/copy services in a more cost effective manner. This involvement can be provided in various ways, and we recommend that following assistance be provided to Agency Copy Centers on an ongoing basis.

    - Offer performance reviews, in an effort for continued performance improvement.
    - Periodic performance reviews, required when requesting a major equipment purchase. This essentially would provide the Office of State Printing with the ability to understand the justification/need for new equipment and provide their recommendation on equipment requirements.
    - Contract/equipment negotiation services, to assist Agency Copy Centers with procurement of the most cost effective equipment arrangement, including maintenance charges and click charges.
    - Periodic/annual customer service surveys for continuous improvement purposes, to ensure customer needs and expectations are met on an ongoing basis. A survey instrument similar to the one utilized during the course of this project could be administered at regular intervals to assess ongoing copy center performance.

  We also encourage the Office of State Printing to be subject to similar reviews, as suggested above, either internally or by an independent party to ensure ongoing competitiveness with Agency Copy Centers.

- In an effort to facilitate a collaborative process between the Office of State Printing and Agency Copy Centers, we recommend that the following select standards be established within the State of Ohio regarding print/copy center operations. These should assist in providing state agencies with significant guidance on print/copy shop "best practices" and help gain their cooperation in striving for "best-in-class" copy center operations.

- Establishment of performance measures for all copy center operations, in an effort to standardize how each is evaluated and measured.
- Development of standard evaluation criteria for assessment of all independent copy centers, to ensure a normalized comparative base, similar to the one used during the course of this study.
- Establishment of recommended standard equipment/copier purchasing specifications, to assist in educated equipment decisions within all state agencies.

- The Office of State Printing Main facility should consider developing a customer service and communication plan to improve communication regarding job completion timelines, urgent printing requests, and exception handling.

- The Office of State Printing and all agencies should consider actively pursuing digital submission of high volume copy jobs. The industry trend is toward digital submission of jobs, with many vendors indicating to OSP that they will be limiting support of purely analog machines in the future. We further suggest that OSP satellites acquire digital submission capable equipment as they replace existing analog equipment.

- The Office of State Printing and agency operated copy centers may wish to consider consolidating all offset printing and color copying with the OSP Main facility to gain significant economies of scale. The most likely service for improved cost effectiveness is offset printing since the operations and maintenance of the equipment are more labor intensive and the material costs are more costly than those used for xerography equipment. The centralization of color copying equipment would also provide for more cost effective use of color copy capacity due to the considerably low utilization rates seen at most copy center locations.

- Based upon the significant amount of possible cost savings identified as the result of this project, we suggest the Office of State Printing consider a similar effort for walk-up copiers within the State of Ohio. This study could be used to gain a better understanding of issues including the cost effectiveness and utilization of the walk-up copiers and whether the walk-up copiers may be impacting the copy center volumes, resulting in excessive available capacity. These types of studies have generally proven beneficial from a cost savings perspective for several of our previous clients.

- The Office of State Printing may wish to consider revising the current per impression customer pricing structure to reflect job costing, including a reproduction fee component plus a bindery/finishing cost component. This pricing strategy would assist in addressing the concern identified during the course of our interviews regarding perceived high per impression costs for basic print jobs. With the current pricing strategy, those customers requesting simple print jobs are essentially subsidizing those whom request more sophisticated services, such as advanced bindery and finishing requirements. We have

included some example bindery and finishing prices to consider based upon a recent print industry survey in Appendix I.

- The Office of State Printing should consider the purchase of a personal computer based system to support individual job costing. This is common practice in the printing industry. This system would assist the department in tracking historical data for use in projecting annual pricing. Sample job cost components to be considered for inclusion in implementation of this type of system include labor costs, paper costs, equipment usage costs, bindery/finishing material costs, etc.

  These types of systems generally also have a scheduling component available for balancing workload across the copy centers, which will become a crucial skill in moving forward with our suggested operating model. Through the purchase of this type of technology, the Office of State Printing may also be provided with the opportunity to advance their current electronic queuing capabilities for customer print jobs, which was a significant desire of the majority of customers surveyed. Implementation of this recommendation would assist in ensuring copy center customers are charged a fair price for the services provided.

## Appendix A

**DRAFT**
**Ohio Copy Center Customer Survey**
**November 2, 2001**

**Introduction**

Plante & Moran, LLP is conducting an independent assessment of State Copy Centers, per the request of the Department of Administrative Services, Office of State Printing. A key component of this assessment is a customer satisfaction survey for all users of the print shop/copy centers (both the Office of State Printing as well as your individual agency centers). In order to ensure that the needs of the Copy Center's customers are being addressed, we are asking that you take a few minutes to complete the following survey. Please note that the survey is intended to address only in-house publishing services provided by the Office of State Printing and independent agency print shop/copy centers. In order to maintain objectivity and confidentiality in this process, Plante & Moran, LLP will administer the survey and provide the Office of State Printing with only the compiled results. All individual survey responses will be kept confidential. Thank you in advance for your help on this very important assignment.

1. Which agency do you work for?
   - ❑ Department of Administrative Services (DAS)
   - ❑ Department of Natural Resources (DNR)
   - ❑ Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
   - ❑ Commerce (COM)
   - ❑ Department of Mental Health (DMH)
   - ❑ Department of Public Safety (ODPS)
   - ❑ Bureau of Workers Compensation (BWC)
   - ❑ Department of Development (DEV)
   - ❑ Department of Transportation (DOT)
   - ❑ Department of Education (EDU)
   - ❑ Department of Health (DOH)
   - ❑ Department of Job and Family Services (JFS)
   - ❑ Other_____
2. On average, how would you describe your level of usage of Office of State Printing Services?
   - ❑ Very Frequent (Greater than 100 times per year)
   - ❑ Frequent (Between 20 and 100 times per year)
   - ❑ Occasional (Less than 20 times per year)
   - ❑ Not Applicable
3. On average, how would you describe your level of usage of your individual agency print shop/copy center?
   - ❑ Very Frequent (Greater than 100 times per year)
   - ❑ Frequent (Between 20 and 100 times per year)
   - ❑ Occasional (Less than 20 times per year)
   - ❑ Not Applicable

4. Which print shop/copy center do you utilize most often? (Please give only one answer)
    - ❑ Office of State Printing- Main
    - ❑ Office of State Printing-Fountain Square
    - ❑ Office of State Printing-Rhodes
    - ❑ Office of State Printing- Riffe
    - ❑ Ohio Data Network
    - ❑ Department of Public Safety
    - ❑ Bureau of Workers Compensation
    - ❑ Department of Development
    - ❑ Department of Transportation
    - ❑ Department of Education
    - ❑ Department of Health
5. If you use your agency print shop/copy center most often, do you know when/why certain jobs need to be sent to the Office of State Printing rather than being completed in-house by your agency print shop/copy center?

_____Yes _____No _____Unsure

*Understanding your needs*

This section will help us to better understand your needs. Please mark the appropriate box on the right that best reflects the importance of the following statements relative to your choice of service providers.
*Scale: Very Important, Important, Neutral, Not Very Important, Not Relevant*

**Overall Customer Service**

- ❑ Staff is always available to meet my needs/address my concerns
- ❑ Staff is responsive to issues and questions
- ❑ Staff provides appropriate resolutions to issues and questions
- ❑ Staff is responsive to urgent requests
- ❑ Staff is sensitive to the confidential nature of some printing projects
- ❑ Staff is proactive in addressing needs
- ❑ Staff provides innovative solutions to needs
- ❑ Staff effectively interacts with you concerning your project
- ❑ Staff makes decisions to help with aesthetics of final project
- ❑ Quality and professionalism of print shop/copy center staff

**Turnaround Time**

- ❑ Requested turnaround time- from the point the project is given to the print shop/copy center until the time it is completed and returned to the user
- ❑ Staff makes you aware when your requested turnaround time cannot be met
- ❑ Staff meets short lead times
- ❑ Staff is responsive to requests of late night/overnight projects
- ❑ Staff uses technology to help complete job quickly
- ❑ Jobs are delivered according to agreed upon timeframes

**Accuracy**

- ❑ Staff understands my printing needs
- ❑ Staff helps outline deliverables/expectations at the time of initial request
- ❑ Jobs are delivered according to specifications the first time
- ❑ Overall, finished jobs are of high quality

**Availability of Services**

- ❑ Availability of black and white copy services
- ❑ Availability of color copy services
- ❑ Availability of offset printing services
- ❑ Availability of finishing and binding operations
- ❑ Ability to transfer files electronically

***Your Satisfaction with your Printing Agency***

While these questions are similar to those above, in this section we only are asking about the print shop/copy center that you utilize ***MOST OFTEN*** (the answer you provided in Question 4). Please indicate your level of satisfaction with the printing entity (either your agency's internal print shop/copy center or the appropriate Office of State Printing location) with whom you have the most interaction by marking the box that is closest to your experience. When reviewing the questions, please keep in mind that they are meant to address in house publishing services only.
*Scale: Far Exceeds Expectations, Exceeds Expectations, Meets Expectations, Below Expectations, Far Below Expectations, Not Relevant*

**Overall Customer Service**

- ❑ Staff is always available to meet my needs/address my concerns
- ❑ Staff is responsive to issues and questions
- ❑ Staff provides appropriate resolutions to issues and questions
- ❑ Staff is responsive to urgent requests
- ❑ Staff is sensitive to the confidential nature of some printing projects
- ❑ Staff is proactive in addressing needs
- ❑ Staff provides innovative solutions to needs
- ❑ Staff effectively interacts with you concerning your project
- ❑ Staff makes decisions to help with aesthetics of final project
- ❑ Quality and professionalism of print shop/copy center staff

**Turnaround Time**

- ❑ Requested turnaround time- from the point the project is given to the print shop/copy center until the time it is completed and returned to the user
- ❑ Staff makes you aware when your requested turnaround time cannot be met
- ❑ Staff meets short lead times
- ❑ Staff is responsive to requests of late night/overnight projects
- ❑ Staff uses technology to help complete job quickly
- ❑ Jobs are delivered according to agreed upon timeframes

**Accuracy**

- ❑ Staff understands my printing needs
- ❑ Staff helps outline deliverables/expectations at the time of initial request
- ❑ Jobs are delivered according to specifications the first time
- ❑ Overall, finished jobs are of high quality

**Availability of Services**

- ❑ Availability of black and white copy services
- ❑ Availability of color copy services
- ❑ Availability of offset printing services
- ❑ Availability of finishing and binding operations
- ❑ Ability to transfer files electronically

***Additional Questions***

6. Overall, how satisfied are you with the level of service you receive from the Office of State Printing?

*Very satisfied, satisfied, somewhat satisfied, dissatisfied, very dissatisfied, not applicable*

7. Overall, how satisfied are you with the level of service you receive from your individual agency print shop/copy center?

*Very satisfied, satisfied, somewhat satisfied, dissatisfied, very dissatisfied, not applicable*

8. Overall, how satisfied are you with the turn around time from the Office of State Printing?

*Very satisfied, satisfied, somewhat satisfied, dissatisfied, very dissatisfied, not applicable*

9. Overall, how satisfied are you with the turn around time from your individual agency copy center/print shop?

*Very satisfied, satisfied, somewhat satisfied, dissatisfied, very dissatisfied, not applicable*

10. What additional service(s) would you like offered by the print shop/copy center you use most often, which are currently not available?

11. In order of importance, what are your top three suggestions for improvement of the print shop/copy center you use most often?

12. If provided other options, would the print shop/copy center you use most often be your provider of choice?

Please include any additional comments concerning the Office of State Printing or individual print shop/copy center that you feel are valuable to this survey.

# Appendix B

# CUSTOMER SERVICE SURVEY SUMMARY RESULTS

| Total Scores by Agency | |
|---|---|
| BWC | 3.97 |
| OSP- Fountain Sq. | 3.91 |
| ODPS | 3.85 |
| OSP-Riffe | 3.72 |
| DEV | 3.64 |
| *Ohio Data Network* | *3.63* |
| *OSP Satellites* | 3.60 |
| ***ALL OSPs*** | ***3.44*** |
| ***Entire Sample*** | ***3.41*** |
| ***ALL IPS*** | ***3.40*** |
| OSP- Rhodes | 3.40 |
| OSP-Main | 3.32 |
| EDU | 3.27 |
| DOT | 3.20 |
| DOH | 3.10 |

| Total Scores- Customer Service | |
|---|---|
| OSP- Fountain Sq. | 4.13 |
| BWC | *4.08* |
| ODPS | *3.96* |
| *Ohio Data Network* | *3.90* |
| OSP-Riffe | *3.77* |
| *OSP Satellites* | 3.75 |
| DEV | *3.74* |
| OSP- Rhodes | *3.61* |
| ***ALL OSPs*** | ***3.57*** |
| ***Entire Sample*** | ***3.52*** |
| ***ALL IPS*** | ***3.50*** |
| OSP-Main | 3.44 |
| EDU | *3.37* |
| DOT | *3.31* |
| DOH | *3.18* |

| Total Scores- Turnaround Time | |
|---|---|
| OSP- Fountain Sq. | 4.01 |
| BWC | 3.88 |
| ODPS | 3.78 |
| OSP-Riffe | 3.73 |
| *Ohio Data Network* | *3.72* |
| DEV | 3.56 |
| *OSP Satellites* | 3.56 |
| ***ALL IPS*** | ***3.31*** |
| ***Entire Sample*** | ***3.31*** |
| ***ALL OSPs*** | ***3.30*** |
| OSP- Rhodes | 3.28 |
| EDU | 3.17 |
| DOT | 3.13 |
| OSP-Main | 3.12 |
| DOH | 2.95 |

| Total Scores- Accuracy | |
|---|---|
| BWC | 4.38 |
| OSP- Fountain Sq. | 4.19 |
| OSP-Riffe | 3.98 |
| DEV | 3.88 |
| ODPS | 3.86 |
| *Ohio Data Network* | *3.75* |
| *OSP Satellites* | 3.73 |
| ***ALL IPS*** | ***3.56*** |
| ***ALL OSPs*** | ***3.54*** |
| ***Entire Sample*** | ***3.54*** |
| EDU | 3.46 |
| OSP-Main | 3.40 |
| OSP- Rhodes | 3.40 |
| DOT | 3.37 |
| DOH | 3.26 |

| Total Scores- Availability of Services | |
|---|---|
| ODPS | 3.72 |
| BWC | 3.55 |
| OSP-Riffe | 3.41 |
| DEV | 3.37 |
| OSP-Main | 3.27 |
| ***ALL OSPs*** | ***3.25*** |
| *OSP Satellites* | 3.22 |
| ***Entire Sample*** | ***3.19*** |
| ***ALL IPS*** | ***3.18*** |
| OSP- Fountain Sq. | 3.14 |
| OSP- Rhodes | 3.12 |
| EDU | 3.05 |
| DOH | 2.98 |
| DOT | 2.90 |
| *Ohio Data Network* | 2.88 |

CUSTOMER SERVICE SURVEY SATISFACTION SUMMARY RESULTS

| | ***Entire Sample*** | OSP-Main | OSP- Fountain Sq. | OSP- Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | OSP Satellites | ***ALL OSPs*** | *Ohio Data Network* | ODPS | BWC | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | ***ALL IPS*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***Overall Customer Service*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Staff is always available to meet my needs/address my concerns. | ***3.70*** | 3.58 | 4.38 | 3.91 | 4.00 | 4.02 | ***3.76*** | *4.00* | 4.15 | 4.75 | 3.93 | 3.52 | 3.48 | 3.18 | ***3.66*** |
| Staff is responsive to issues and questions. | ***3.73*** | 3.63 | 4.50 | 3.91 | 4.06 | 4.07 | ***3.81*** | *4.00* | 4.19 | 4.00 | 3.86 | 3.55 | 3.56 | 3.24 | ***3.68*** |
| Staff provides appropriate resolutions to issues and questions. | ***3.64*** | 3.55 | 4.38 | 3.77 | 3.63 | 3.83 | ***3.67*** | *4.00* | 4.04 | 4.00 | 3.86 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 3.29 | ***3.62*** |
| Staff is responsive to urgent requests. | ***3.68*** | 3.49 | 4.63 | 3.65 | 4.13 | 3.98 | ***3.70*** | *4.20* | 4.22 | 4.25 | 3.93 | 3.52 | 3.45 | 3.29 | ***3.66*** |
| Staff is sensitive to the confidential nature of some printing projects. | ***2.91*** | 2.75 | 2.13 | 3.00 | 3.63 | 3.06 | ***2.88*** | *4.20* | 3.52 | 4.00 | 2.93 | 2.68 | 2.68 | 2.82 | ***2.92*** |
| Staff is proactive in addressing needs. | ***3.41*** | 3.37 | 4.38 | 3.43 | 3.56 | 3.64 | ***3.48*** | *3.80* | 3.81 | 3.75 | 3.79 | 3.20 | 3.24 | 3.18 | ***3.40*** |
| Staff provides innovative solutions to needs. | ***3.38*** | 3.34 | 4.38 | 3.30 | 3.53 | 3.57 | ***3.43*** | *3.80* | 3.89 | 4.00 | 3.50 | 3.03 | 3.30 | 3.18 | ***3.38*** |
| Staff effectively interacts with me concerning my project. | ***3.64*** | 3.60 | 4.13 | 3.70 | 3.57 | 3.73 | ***3.65*** | *4.00* | 4.11 | 3.75 | 3.86 | 3.52 | 3.58 | 3.24 | ***3.66*** |
| Staff makes decisions to help with aesthetics of final project. | ***3.34*** | 3.28 | 4.00 | 3.48 | 3.31 | 3.51 | ***3.38*** | *3.80* | 3.59 | 3.75 | 3.64 | 3.10 | 3.30 | 3.00 | ***3.33*** |
| Quality and professionalism of print shop/copy center staff. | ***3.79*** | 3.80 | 4.38 | 3.96 | 4.25 | 4.13 | ***3.94*** | *3.20* | 4.11 | 4.50 | 4.07 | 3.48 | 3.56 | 3.41 | ***3.71*** |
| ***Turnaround Time*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Meeting the requested turnaround time, from the point the project is given to the print shop/copy center until the time it is completed and returned. | ***3.54*** | 3.35 | 4.50 | 3.61 | 3.81 | 3.83 | ***3.55*** | *3.80* | 4.04 | 4.00 | 3.79 | 3.52 | 3.35 | 2.94 | ***3.53*** |
| Staff makes me aware when my requested turnaround time cannot be met. | ***3.32*** | 3.09 | 4.38 | 3.17 | 3.75 | 3.57 | ***3.30*** | *3.00* | 3.89 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 3.23 | 3.12 | 3.18 | ***3.35*** |
| Staff meets short lead times. | ***3.52*** | 3.40 | 4.50 | 3.57 | 4.06 | 3.89 | ***3.61*** | *3.50* | 4.15 | 4.25 | 3.79 | 3.29 | 3.25 | 2.88 | ***3.47*** |
| Staff is responsive to requests of late night/overnight projects. | ***2.60*** | 2.40 | 3.13 | 2.52 | 3.25 | 2.87 | ***2.60*** | *4.00* | 3.15 | 3.50 | 2.64 | 2.26 | 2.35 | 2.35 | ***2.55*** |
| Staff uses technology to help complete job quickly. | ***3.44*** | 3.34 | 3.29 | 3.17 | 3.69 | 3.37 | ***3.35*** | *4.00* | 3.59 | 4.25 | 3.79 | 3.17 | 3.49 | 3.50 | ***3.49*** |
| Jobs are delivered according to agreed upon timeframes. | ***3.44*** | 3.11 | 4.25 | 3.64 | 3.81 | 3.80 | ***3.40*** | *4.00* | 3.85 | 3.75 | 3.86 | 3.33 | 3.44 | 2.82 | ***3.47*** |
| ***Accuracy*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Staff understands my printing needs. | ***3.58*** | 3.54 | 4.25 | 3.36 | 3.94 | 3.72 | ***3.61*** | *3.60* | 3.89 | 4.25 | 3.71 | 3.30 | 3.52 | 3.47 | ***3.58*** |
| Staff helps outline deliverables/expectations at the time of initial request. | ***3.38*** | 3.22 | 3.88 | 3.22 | 3.75 | 3.51 | ***3.34*** | *3.80* | 3.74 | 4.25 | 3.79 | 3.29 | 3.37 | 2.88 | ***3.43*** |
| Jobs are delivered according to specifications the first time. | ***3.52*** | 3.29 | 4.38 | 3.43 | 4.13 | 3.83 | ***3.52*** | *4.00* | 3.73 | 4.50 | 3.93 | 3.45 | 3.42 | 3.24 | ***3.54*** |
| Overall, finished jobs are of high quality. | ***3.67*** | 3.57 | 4.25 | 3.57 | 4.13 | 3.87 | ***3.70*** | *3.60* | 4.07 | 4.50 | 4.07 | 3.45 | 3.53 | 3.47 | ***3.69*** |
| ***Availability of Services*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Availability of black and white copy services. | ***3.56*** | 3.37 | 4.25 | 3.48 | 4.06 | 3.81 | ***3.55*** | *3.80* | 4.19 | 3.25 | 3.77 | 3.23 | 3.39 | 3.71 | ***3.57*** |
| Availability of color copy services. | ***3.29*** | 3.23 | 3.50 | 3.18 | 3.63 | 3.39 | ***3.30*** | *2.40* | 3.89 | 4.00 | 3.71 | 3.16 | 3.00 | 3.29 | ***3.34*** |
| Availability of offset printing services. | ***2.84*** | 3.19 | 2.13 | 2.86 | 2.88 | 2.73 | ***3.00*** | *1.80* | 3.27 | 3.25 | 3.00 | 2.71 | 2.88 | 1.82 | ***2.81*** |
| Availability of finishing and binding operations. | ***3.27*** | 3.43 | 3.13 | 3.22 | 3.56 | 3.32 | ***3.38*** | *2.20* | 3.67 | 3.25 | 3.71 | 3.00 | 3.09 | 2.94 | ***3.23*** |
| Ability to transfer files electronically. | ***2.98*** | 3.14 | 2.71 | 2.86 | 2.93 | 2.86 | ***3.03*** | *4.20* | 3.58 | 4.00 | 2.64 | 2.42 | 2.88 | 3.13 | ***2.94*** |
| ***Overall*** | ***3.41*** | ***3.32*** | ***3.91*** | ***3.40*** | ***3.72*** | ***3.60*** | ***3.44*** | ***3.63*** | ***3.85*** | ***3.97*** | ***3.64*** | ***3.20*** | ***3.27*** | ***3.10*** | ***3.40*** |

Note: Highlighted responses indicate lowest scores.

CUSTOMER SERVICE SUR .MPORTANCE SUMMARY RESULTS

| ***Overall Customer Service*** | Entire Sample | OSP-Main | - Fountain | SP- Rhod | OSP-Riffe | SP Satellit | ***All OSPs*** | ODPS | BWC | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | ***All IPs*** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Staff is always available to meet my needs/address my concerns | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Very Important* | 67.20% | 67.70% | 75.00% | 66.70% | 62.50% | 66.67% | ***67.26%*** | 74.10% | 100.00% | 60.00% | 71.00% | 67.30% | 64.70% | ***69.18%*** |
| *Important* | 26.20% | 29.20% | 25.00% | 16.70% | 31.30% | 22.92% | ***26.55%*** | 22.20% | | 20.00% | 29.00% | 26.90% | 29.40% | ***25.34%*** |
| *Neutral* | 2.20% | 3.10% | | 4.20% | 6.30% | 4.17% | ***3.54%*** | | | | | 3.80% | | ***1.37%*** |
| *Not Relevant* | 2.60% | | | 4.20% | | 2.08% | ***0.88%*** | | | 13.30% | | 1.90% | 5.90% | ***2.74%*** |
| Staff is responsive to issues and questions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Very Important* | 68.60% | 70.80% | 87.50% | 62.50% | 50.00% | 62.50% | ***67.26%*** | 81.50% | 100.00% | 73.30% | 71.00% | 61.50% | 76.50% | ***71.23%*** |
| *Important* | 25.50% | 27.70% | | 25.00% | 43.80% | 27.08% | ***27.43%*** | 14.80% | | 6.70% | 29.00% | 32.70% | 17.60% | ***23.29%*** |
| *Neutral* | 2.20% | 1.50% | 12.50% | 4.20% | 6.30% | 6.25% | ***3.54%*** | | | | | 3.80% | | ***1.37%*** |
| *Not Relevant* | 2.20% | | | 4.20% | | 2.08% | ***0.88%*** | | | 13.30% | | 1.90% | 5.90% | ***2.74%*** |
| Staff provides appropriate resolutions to issues and questions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Very Important* | 63.10% | 64.60% | 87.50% | 50.00% | 50.00% | 56.25% | ***61.06%*** | 70.40% | 75.00% | 66.70% | 61.30% | 61.50% | 76.50% | ***65.75%*** |
| *Important* | 29.90% | 32.30% | 12.50% | 37.50% | 43.80% | 35.42% | ***33.63%*** | 25.90% | 25.00% | 13.30% | 35.50% | 30.80% | 17.60% | ***27.40%*** |
| *Neutral* | 2.60% | 3.10% | | 4.20% | 6.30% | 4.17% | ***3.54%*** | | | | | 5.80% | | ***2.05%*** |
| *Not Relevant* | 2.60% | | | 4.20% | | 2.08% | ***0.88%*** | | | 13.30% | | 1.90% | 5.90% | ***2.74%*** |
| Staff is responsive to urgent requests | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Very Important* | 73.40% | 76.90% | 100.00% | 70.80% | 68.80% | 75.00% | ***76.11%*** | 88.90% | 100.00% | 73.30% | 71.00% | 63.50% | 76.50% | ***73.29%*** |
| *Important* | 20.70% | 23.10% | | 16.70% | 18.80% | 14.58% | ***19.47%*** | 7.40% | | 6.70% | 29.00% | 30.80% | 17.60% | ***21.23%*** |
| *Neutral* | 1.50% | | | 4.20% | 6.30% | 4.17% | ***1.77%*** | | | | | 3.80% | | ***1.37%*** |
| *Not Very Important* | 0.40% | | | | 6.30% | 2.08% | ***0.88%*** | | | | | | | ***0.00%*** |
| *Not Relevant* | 2.60% | | | 4.20% | | 2.08% | ***0.88%*** | | | 13.30% | | 1.90% | 5.90% | ***2.74%*** |
| Staff is sensitive to the confidential nature of some printing projects | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Very Important* | 42.80% | 43.10% | 12.50% | 29.20% | 37.50% | 29.17% | ***37.17%*** | 66.70% | 100.00% | 33.30% | 35.50% | 40.40% | 58.80% | ***47.26%*** |
| *Important* | 23.60% | 18.50% | 37.50% | 45.80% | 31.30% | 39.58% | ***27.43%*** | 11.10% | | 26.70% | 22.60% | 30.80% | 5.90% | ***21.23%*** |
| *Neutral* | 14.80% | 20.00% | 12.50% | 16.70% | 12.50% | 14.58% | ***17.70%*** | 11.10% | | 6.70% | 16.10% | 15.40% | 11.80% | ***13.01%*** |
| *Not Very Important* | 4.10% | 3.10% | 12.50% | | | 2.08% | ***2.65%*** | 7.40% | | | 9.70% | 5.80% | | ***5.48%*** |
| *Not Relevant* | 13.30% | | | 4.20% | | 12.50% | ***14.16%*** | | | 26.70% | | 7.70% | 23.50% | ***11.64%*** |
| Staff is proactive in addressing needs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Very Important* | 42.10% | 41.50% | 62.50% | 29.20% | 43.80% | 39.58% | ***40.71%*** | 59.30% | | 46.70% | 48.40% | 38.50% | 41.20% | ***44.52%*** |
| *Important* | 44.60% | 50.80% | 37.50% | 50.00% | 50.00% | 47.92% | ***49.56%*** | 29.60% | 75.00% | 26.70% | 38.70% | 48.10% | 52.90% | ***41.78%*** |
| *Neutral* | 7.70% | 6.20% | | 12.50% | 6.30% | 8.33% | ***7.08%*** | 7.40% | | 6.70% | 12.90% | 9.60% | | ***8.22%*** |
| *Not Relevant* | 3.30% | | | 4.20% | | 2.08% | ***1.77%*** | | | 13.30% | | 1.90% | 5.90% | ***2.74%*** |
| Staff provides innovative solutions to needs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Very Important* | 37.60% | 32.30% | 75.00% | 37.50% | 43.80% | 45.83% | ***38.05%*** | 33.30% | 50.00% | 46.70% | 35.50% | 32.70% | 52.90% | ***37.67%*** |
| *Important* | 46.10% | 60.00% | 12.50% | 29.20% | 37.50% | 29.17% | ***46.90%*** | 51.90% | 50.00% | 33.30% | 51.60% | 50.00% | 35.30% | ***47.26%*** |
| *Neutral* | 9.60% | 7.70% | 12.50% | 25.00% | 12.50% | 18.75% | ***12.39%*** | 7.40% | | | 12.90% | 9.60% | 5.90% | ***8.22%*** |
| *Not Very Important* | 1.10% | | | | | 0.00% | ***0.00%*** | 3.70% | | | | 1.90% | | ***1.37%*** |
| *Not Relevant* | 3.30% | | | 4.20% | | 4.17% | ***1.77%*** | | | 13.30% | | 1.90% | 5.90% | ***2.74%*** |
| Staff effectively interacts with you concerning your project | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Very Important* | 52.00% | 55.40% | 75.00% | 41.70% | 56.30% | 52.08% | ***53.98%*** | 63.00% | 75.00% | 46.70% | 41.90% | 53.80% | 52.90% | ***52.74%*** |
| *Important* | 36.50% | 40.00% | 25.00% | 41.70% | 31.30% | 35.42% | ***38.05%*** | 25.90% | 25.00% | 33.30% | 48.40% | 34.60% | 35.30% | ***35.62%*** |
| *Neutral* | 5.90% | 4.60% | | 8.30% | 6.30% | 6.25% | ***5.31%*** | 7.40% | | | 6.50% | 9.60% | 5.90% | ***6.85%*** |
| *Not Very Important* | 0.40% | | | | | 0.00% | ***0.00%*** | | | | | | | ***0.00%*** |
| *Not Relevant* | 3.30% | | | 4.20% | | 4.17% | ***1.77%*** | | | 13.30% | | 1.90% | 5.90% | ***2.74%*** |
| Staff makes decisions to help with aesthetics of final project | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Very Important* | 30.30% | 26.20% | 25.00% | 29.20% | 25.00% | 27.08% | ***26.55%*** | 37.00% | 50.00% | 46.70% | 25.80% | 32.70% | 29.40% | ***33.56%*** |
| *Important* | 41.30% | 52.30% | 37.50% | 29.20% | 50.00% | 37.50% | ***46.02%*** | 37.00% | 25.00% | 20.00% | 51.60% | 44.20% | 23.50% | ***39.04%*** |
| *Neutral* | 17.70% | 18.50% | 12.50% | 29.20% | 6.30% | 18.75% | ***18.58%*** | 14.80% | 25.00% | 13.30% | 19.40% | 15.40% | 29.40% | ***17.81%*** |
| *Not Very Important* | 4.10% | 1.50% | 25.00% | 4.20% | | 6.25% | ***3.54%*** | 3.70% | | | 3.20% | 3.80% | 11.80% | ***4.11%*** |
| *Not Relevant* | 4.80% | | | 4.20% | | 8.33% | ***3.54%*** | | | 13.30% | | 3.80% | 5.90% | ***4.11%*** |
| Quality and professionalism of print shop/copy center staff | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Very Important* | 62.00% | 63.10% | 100.00% | 54.20% | 43.80% | 58.33% | ***61.06%*** | 74.10% | 75.00% | 60.00% | 67.70% | 61.50% | 58.80% | ***65.07%*** |
| *Important* | 30.60% | 33.80% | | 33.30% | 50.00% | 33.33% | ***33.63%*** | 22.20% | 25.00% | 20.00% | 22.60% | 32.70% | 35.30% | ***27.40%*** |
| *Neutral* | 3.30% | 3.10% | | 4.20% | 6.30% | 4.17% | ***3.54%*** | | | | 9.70% | 3.80% | | ***3.42%*** |
| *Not Relevant* | 2.60% | | | 4.20% | | 2.08% | ***0.88%*** | | | 13.30% | | 1.90% | 5.90% | ***2.74%*** |

***Turnaround Time***

Requested turnaround time-from the point the project is given to the print

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *Very Important* | 75.30% | 67.70% | 87.50% | 66.70% | 81.30% | 75.00% | ***70.80%*** | 81.50% | 100.00% | 66.70% | 80.60% | 76.90% | 94.10% | ***80.14%*** |
| *Important* | 18.80% | 32.30% | 12.50% | 25.00% | 12.50% | 18.75% | ***26.55%*** | 14.80% | | 13.30% | 16.10% | 15.40% | | ***13.01%*** |
| *Neutral* | 1.10% | | | 4.20% | | 2.08% | ***0.88%*** | | | | 3.20% | 1.90% | | ***1.37%*** |
| *Not Very Important* | 0.70% | | | | 6.30% | 2.08% | ***0.88%*** | | | | | 1.90% | | ***0.68%*** |
| *Not Relevant* | 2.20% | | | | | 0.00% | ***0.00%*** | | | 13.30% | | 1.90% | 5.90% | ***2.74%*** |
| Staff makes you aware when your requested turnaround time cannot be met | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Very Important* | 76.40% | 67.70% | 100.00% | 79.20% | 81.30% | 83.33% | ***74.34%*** | 77.80% | 75.00% | 73.30% | 71.00% | 86.50% | 88.20% | ***80.14%*** |
| *Important* | 18.10% | 30.80% | | 8.30% | 12.50% | 8.33% | ***21.24%*** | 18.50% | 25.00% | 6.70% | 29.00% | 9.60% | 5.90% | ***15.07%*** |
| *Neutral* | 1.10% | 1.50% | | 8.30% | | 4.17% | ***2.65%*** | | | | | | | ***0.00%*** |
| *Not Very Important* | 0.70% | | | | 6.30% | 2.08% | ***0.88%*** | | | | | 1.90% | | ***0.68%*** |
| *Not Relevant* | 2.20% | | | | | 0.00% | ***0.00%*** | | | 13.30% | | 1.90% | 5.90% | ***2.74%*** |
| Staff meets short lead times | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Very Important* | 49.10% | 52.30% | 75.00% | 41.70% | 43.80% | 47.92% | ***50.44%*** | 55.60% | 75.00% | 33.30% | 48.40% | 51.90% | 41.20% | ***49.32%*** |
| *Important* | 41.00% | 38.50% | 12.50% | 50.00% | 43.80% | 41.67% | ***39.82%*** | 40.70% | 25.00% | 46.70% | 38.70% | 42.30% | 47.10% | ***41.78%*** |
| *Neutral* | 4.40% | 7.70% | | 4.20% | 6.30% | 4.17% | ***6.19%*** | | | | 9.70% | 1.90% | 5.90% | ***3.42%*** |
| *Not Very Important* | 1.50% | | 12.50% | | 6.30% | 4.17% | ***1.77%*** | | | | 3.20% | 1.90% | | ***1.37%*** |
| *Not Relevant* | 2.60% | | | | | 0.00% | ***0.88%*** | | | 13.30% | | 1.90% | 5.90% | ***2.74%*** |
| Staff is responsive to requests of late night/overnight projects | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Very Important* | 32.10% | 33.80% | 12.50% | 16.70% | 37.50% | 22.92% | ***29.20%*** | 29.60% | 75.00% | 40.00% | 25.80% | 38.50% | 29.40% | ***34.25%*** |
| *Important* | 28.40% | 29.20% | 50.00% | 33.30% | 31.30% | 35.42% | ***31.86%*** | 33.30% | | 20.00% | 25.80% | 25.00% | 29.40% | ***26.03%*** |
| *Neutral* | 19.60% | 20.00% | 12.50% | 33.30% | 12.50% | 22.92% | ***21.24%*** | 14.80% | 25.00% | 13.30% | 19.40% | 25.00% | 11.80% | ***19.18%*** |
| *Not Very Important* | 4.40% | | 12.50% | 4.20% | 6.30% | 6.25% | ***2.65%*** | 3.70% | | 6.70% | 16.10% | 1.90% | 5.90% | ***6.16%*** |
| *Not Relevant* | 14.00% | | | 8.30% | | 10.42% | ***14.16%*** | | | 13.30% | | 9.60% | 23.50% | ***13.01%*** |
| Staff uses technology to help complete job quickly | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Very Important* | 42.40% | 35.40% | 62.50% | 29.20% | 37.50% | 37.50% | ***36.28%*** | 48.10% | 50.00% | 53.30% | 41.90% | 50.00% | 52.90% | ***48.63%*** |
| *Important* | 41.30% | 53.80% | 25.00% | 37.50% | 37.50% | 35.42% | ***46.02%*** | 48.10% | 50.00% | 13.30% | 41.90% | 36.50% | 35.30% | ***37.67%*** |
| *Neutral* | 11.10% | 10.80% | 12.50% | 29.20% | 18.80% | 22.92% | ***15.93%*** | | | 13.30% | 12.90% | 7.70% | 5.90% | ***7.53%*** |
| *Not Very Important* | 0.70% | | | | | 0.00% | ***0.00%*** | | | | 3.20% | 1.90% | | ***1.37%*** |
| *Not Relevant* | 3.00% | | | | | 2.08% | ***0.88%*** | | | 13.30% | | 3.80% | 5.90% | ***3.42%*** |
| Jobs are delivered according to agree upon timeframes | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Very Important* | 73.80% | 72.30% | 87.50% | 70.80% | 81.30% | 77.08% | ***74.34%*** | 74.10% | 100.00% | 73.30% | 61.30% | 76.90% | 88.20% | ***74.66%*** |
| *Important* | 21.00% | 27.70% | 12.50% | 20.80% | 12.50% | 16.67% | ***23.01%*** | 22.20% | | 6.70% | 38.70% | 17.30% | 5.90% | ***19.86%*** |
| *Neutral* | 0.70% | | | 4.20% | | 2.08% | ***0.88%*** | | | | | 1.90% | | ***0.68%*** |
| *Not Very Important* | 0.70% | | | | 6.30% | 2.08% | ***0.88%*** | | | | | 1.90% | | ***0.68%*** |
| *Not Relevant* | 2.20% | | | | | 0.00% | ***0.00%*** | | | 13.30% | | 1.90% | 5.90% | ***2.74%*** |

CUSTOMER SERVICE SUR MPORTANCE SUMMARY RESULTS

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***Accuracy*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Staff understands my printing needs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Very Important* | 64.90% | 69.20% | 75.00% | 66.70% | 56.30% | 64.58% | ***67.26%*** | 74.10% | 75.00% | 46.70% | 71.00% | 61.50% | 58.80% | ***64.38%*** |
| *Important* | 28.00% | 29.20% | 25.00% | 25.00% | 31.30% | 27.08% | ***28.32%*** | 18.50% | 25.00% | 33.30% | 29.00% | 28.80% | 35.30% | ***28.08%*** |
| *Neutral* | 1.50% | | | 4.20% | 6.30% | 4.17% | ***1.77%*** | 3.70% | | | | 1.90% | | ***1.37%*** |
| *Not Very Important* | 0.70% | | | | | 0.00% | ***0.00%*** | | | | | 1.90% | | ***0.68%*** |
| *Not Relevant* | 1.80% | | | | | 0.00% | ***0.00%*** | | | 13.30% | | 1.90% | 5.90% | ***2.74%*** |
| Staff helps outline deliverables/expectations at the time of initial request | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Very Important* | 50.60% | 53.80% | 50.00% | 41.70% | 56.30% | 47.92% | ***51.33%*** | 44.40% | 75.00% | 53.30% | 45.20% | 59.60% | 41.20% | ***51.37%*** |
| *Important* | 38.40% | 41.50% | 37.50% | 45.80% | 25.00% | 37.50% | ***39.82%*** | 51.90% | 25.00% | 20.00% | 48.40% | 26.90% | 41.20% | ***36.99%*** |
| *Neutral* | 4.10% | 1.50% | | 8.30% | 6.30% | 6.25% | ***3.54%*** | | | 6.70% | 6.50% | 5.80% | 5.90% | ***4.79%*** |
| *Not Very Important* | 0.70% | | | | | 0.00% | ***0.00%*** | | | | | 1.90% | 5.90% | ***1.37%*** |
| *Not Relevant* | 3.00% | | | | | 2.08% | ***1.77%*** | | | 13.30% | | 1.90% | 5.90% | ***2.74%*** |
| Jobs are delivered according to specifications the first time | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Very Important* | 70.50% | 70.80% | 87.50% | 58.30% | 81.30% | 70.83% | ***70.80%*** | 66.70% | 100.00% | 60.00% | 74.20% | 69.20% | 88.20% | ***71.92%*** |
| *Important* | 21.40% | 27.70% | 12.50% | 25.00% | 6.30% | 16.67% | ***23.01%*** | 25.90% | | 20.00% | 25.80% | 21.20% | 5.90% | ***20.55%*** |
| *Neutral* | 1.80% | | | 12.50% | 6.30% | 8.33% | ***3.54%*** | | | | | 1.90% | | ***0.68%*** |
| *Not Very Important* | 0.40% | | | | | 0.00% | ***0.00%*** | | | | | 1.90% | | ***0.68%*** |
| *Not Relevant* | 1.80% | | | | | 0.00% | ***0.00%*** | | | 13.30% | | 1.90% | | ***2.05%*** |
| Overall, finished jobs are of high quality | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Very Important* | 78.60% | 80.00% | 100.00% | 66.70% | 62.50% | 70.83% | ***76.11%*** | 81.50% | 100.00% | 73.30% | 90.30% | 75.00% | 94.10% | ***82.19%*** |
| *Important* | 13.70% | 18.50% | | 20.80% | 25.00% | 18.75% | ***18.58%*** | 14.80% | | 6.70% | 9.70% | 11.50% | | ***9.59%*** |
| *Neutral* | 1.10% | | | 4.20% | 6.30% | 4.17% | ***1.77%*** | | | | | 1.90% | | ***0.68%*** |
| *Not Very Important* | 0.40% | | | | | 0.00% | ***0.00%*** | | | | | 1.90% | | ***0.68%*** |
| *Not Relevant* | 2.20% | | | | | 0.00% | ***0.00%*** | | | 13.30% | | 1.90% | 5.90% | ***2.74%*** |

CUSTOMER SERVICE SUR 1PORTANCE SUMMARY RESULTS

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ***Availability of Services*** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Availability of black and white copy services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Very Important* | 45.40% | 43.10% | 87.50% | 37.50% | 43.80% | 47.92% | ***45.13%*** | 55.60% | | 33.30% | 45.20% | 44.20% | 52.90% | ***45.21%*** |
| *Important* | 35.40% | 32.30% | 12.50% | 37.50% | 43.80% | 35.42% | ***33.63%*** | 33.30% | 50.00% | 46.70% | 32.30% | 40.40% | 41.20% | ***38.36%*** |
| *Neutral* | 11.80% | 21.50% | | 16.70% | 12.50% | 12.50% | ***17.70%*** | 7.40% | 50.00% | | 9.70% | 9.60% | | ***8.22%*** |
| *Not Very Important* | 2.60% | 3.10% | | | | 0.00% | ***1.77%*** | | | | 9.70% | 1.90% | | ***2.74%*** |
| *Not Relevant* | 2.60% | | | | | 0.00% | ***0.00%*** | | | 13.30% | | 1.90% | 5.90% | ***3.42%*** |
| Availability of color copy services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Very Important* | 44.60% | 52.30% | 37.50% | 37.50% | 31.30% | 35.42% | ***45.13%*** | 51.90% | 25.00% | 46.70% | 54.80% | 40.40% | 41.20% | ***45.89%*** |
| *Important* | 36.90% | 35.40% | 37.50% | 16.70% | 37.50% | 27.08% | ***31.86%*** | 37.00% | 75.00% | 33.30% | 35.50% | 44.20% | 47.10% | ***41.10%*** |
| *Neutral* | 8.50% | 9.20% | | 25.00% | 25.00% | 20.83% | ***14.16%*** | | | | 6.50% | 7.70% | 5.90% | ***4.79%*** |
| *Not Very Important* | 3.30% | 1.50% | 25.00% | 4.20% | 6.30% | 8.33% | ***4.42%*** | | | | 3.20% | 3.80% | | ***2.05%*** |
| *Not Relevant* | 3.70% | | | 4.20% | | 2.08% | ***0.88%*** | | | 13.30% | | 1.90% | 5.90% | ***4.11%*** |
| Availability of offset printing services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Very Important* | 31.40% | 53.80% | 37.50% | 25.00% | 31.30% | 29.17% | ***43.36%*** | 29.60% | 25.00% | 20.00% | 22.60% | 25.00% | 11.80% | ***23.29%*** |
| *Important* | 36.20% | 29.20% | 62.50% | 41.70% | 37.50% | 43.75% | ***35.40%*** | 40.70% | 25.00% | 20.00% | 54.80% | 32.70% | 41.20% | ***38.36%*** |
| *Neutral* | 18.80% | 10.80% | | 20.80% | 31.30% | 20.83% | ***15.04%*** | 14.80% | 50.00% | 20.00% | 12.90% | 28.80% | 17.60% | ***21.23%*** |
| *Not Very Important* | 3.30% | 1.50% | | | | 0.00% | ***0.88%*** | 3.70% | | | 6.50% | 5.80% | 11.80% | ***5.48%*** |
| *Not Relevant* | 6.60% | | | 4.20% | | 2.08% | ***3.54%*** | | | 20.00% | | 1.90% | 17.60% | ***6.85%*** |
| Availability of finishing and binding operations | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Very Important* | 39.90% | 50.80% | 62.50% | 37.50% | 37.50% | 41.67% | ***46.90%*** | 48.10% | 25.00% | 33.30% | 41.90% | 26.90% | 35.30% | ***35.62%*** |
| *Important* | 40.20% | 44.60% | 37.50% | 33.30% | 31.30% | 33.33% | ***39.82%*** | 29.60% | 75.00% | 40.00% | 48.40% | 40.40% | 41.20% | ***41.10%*** |
| *Neutral* | 12.20% | 4.60% | | 12.50% | 31.30% | 16.67% | ***9.73%*** | 18.50% | | 6.70% | 3.20% | 21.20% | 5.90% | ***13.01%*** |
| *Not Very Important* | 2.60% | | | 4.20% | | 2.08% | ***0.88%*** | | | | 6.50% | 5.80% | 5.90% | ***4.11%*** |
| *Not Relevant* | 2.60% | | | 4.20% | | 2.08% | ***0.88%*** | | | 13.30% | | 1.90% | 11.80% | ***3.42%*** |
| Ability to transfer files electronically | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| *Very Important* | 43.50% | 53.80% | 50.00% | 29.20% | 37.50% | 35.42% | ***46.02%*** | 63.00% | 50.00% | 13.30% | 38.70% | 44.20% | 35.30% | ***42.47%*** |
| *Important* | 34.70% | 33.80% | 50.00% | 37.50% | 18.80% | 33.33% | ***33.63%*** | 33.30% | 50.00% | 26.70% | 32.30% | 36.50% | 41.20% | ***34.93%*** |
| *Neutral* | 13.70% | 9.20% | | 20.80% | 43.80% | 25.00% | ***15.93%*** | | | 33.30% | 16.10% | 13.50% | 11.80% | ***13.01%*** |
| *Not Very Important* | 1.50% | | | | | 0.00% | ***0.00%*** | | | | 6.50% | 1.90% | 5.90% | ***2.74%*** |
| *Not Relevant* | 4.40% | | | 4.20% | | 2.08% | ***2.65%*** | | | 20.00% | | 1.90% | 5.90% | ***4.79%*** |

# Appendix C

**Respondent Batch Numbers**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC | DEV |
| Batch Number | 1000 | 126 | 45 | 5 | 19 | 11 | 4 | 7 | 3 | |
| | | 46.5% | 69.2% | 62.5% | 79.2% | 68.8% | 80.0% | 25.9% | 75.0% | |
| | 200 | 15 | 2 | | 1 | | | | | 12 |
| | | 5.5% | 3.1% | | 4.2% | | | | | 80.0% |
| | 300 | 15 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | |
| | | 5.5% | 1.5% | | 4.2% | | | | | |
| | 400 | 18 | 1 | | | | | | | |
| | | 6.6% | 1.5% | | | | | | | |
| | 500 | 17 | 2 | | | | | 15 | | |
| | | 6.3% | 3.1% | | | | | 55.6% | | |
| | 5000 | 1 | | | | | | 1 | | |
| | | .4% | | | | | | 3.7% | | |
| | 6000 | 11 | | | | | | | | |
| | | 4.1% | | | | | | | | |
| | None/DK | 68 | 14 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| | | 25.1% | 21.5% | 37.5% | 12.5% | 31.3% | 20.0% | 14.8% | 25.0% | 20.0% |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 | 15 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Respondent Batch Numbers**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Batch Number | 1000 | 3<br>9.7% | 20<br>38.5% | 2<br>11.8% | 7<br>100.0% |
| | 200 | | | | |
| | 300 | | | 13<br>76.5% | |
| | 400 | 17<br>54.8% | | | |
| | 500 | | | | |
| | 5000 | | | | |
| | 6000 | | 11<br>21.2% | | |
| | None/DK | 11<br>35.5% | 21<br>40.4% | 2<br>11.8% | |
| Total | | 31<br>100.0% | 52<br>100.0% | 17<br>100.0% | 7<br>100.0% |

**1. Which agency do you work for?**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC | DEV |
| Agency Worked For | DAS | 19 | 10 | | 4 | | 5 | | | |
| | | 7.0% | 15.4% | | 16.7% | | 100.0% | | | |
| | DNR | 10 | 2 | 8 | | | | | | |
| | | 3.7% | 3.1% | 100.0% | | | | | | |
| | EPA | 2 | 1 | | | 1 | | | | |
| | | .7% | 1.5% | | | 6.3% | | | | |
| | COM | 8 | 5 | | 1 | 2 | | | | |
| | | 3.0% | 7.7% | | 4.2% | 12.5% | | | | |
| | DMH | 5 | 3 | | 2 | | | | | |
| | | 1.8% | 4.6% | | 8.3% | | | | | |
| | ODPS | 26 | 1 | | | | | 25 | | |
| | | 9.6% | 1.5% | | | | | 92.6% | | |
| | BWC | 5 | | | | | | | 4 | |
| | | 1.8% | | | | | | | 100.0% | |
| | DEV | 18 | 2 | | | 1 | | | | 15 |
| | | 6.6% | 3.1% | | | 6.3% | | | | 100.0% |
| | DOT | 35 | 2 | | 1 | | | | | |
| | | 12.9% | 3.1% | | 4.2% | | | | | |
| | EDU | 54 | 3 | | | | | | | |
| | | 19.9% | 4.6% | | | | | | | |
| | DOH | 21 | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | |
| | | 7.7% | 1.5% | | 4.2% | | | 3.7% | | |
| | JFS | 8 | 5 | | 2 | | | | | |
| | | 3.0% | 7.7% | | 8.3% | | | | | |
| | Other | 60 | 30 | | 13 | 12 | | 1 | | |
| | | 22.1% | 46.2% | | 54.2% | 75.0% | | 3.7% | | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 | 15 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**1. Which agency do you work for?**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Agency Worked For | DAS | | | | |
| | DNR | | | | |
| | EPA | | | | |
| | COM | | | | |
| | DMH | | | | |
| | ODPS | | | | |
| | BWC | | | | 1<br>14.3% |
| | DEV | | | | |
| | DOT | 31<br>100.0% | | | 1<br>14.3% |
| | EDU | | 51<br>98.1% | | |
| | DOH | | 1<br>1.9% | 17<br>100.0% | |
| | JFS | | | | 1<br>14.3% |
| | Other | | | | 4<br>57.1% |
| Total | | 31<br>100.0% | 52<br>100.0% | 17<br>100.0% | 7<br>100.0% |

**2. How would you describe your level of usage of the Office of State Printing Services?**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC | DEV |
| Level of Usage of State Office | Very Frequent | 29 | 13 | 3 | 1 | 2 | | 3 | | |
| | | 10.7% | 20.0% | 37.5% | 4.2% | 12.5% | | 11.1% | | |
| | Frequent | 82 | 25 | 4 | 10 | 10 | | 8 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 30.3% | 38.5% | 50.0% | 41.7% | 62.5% | | 29.6% | 25.0% | 6.7% |
| | Occasional | 121 | 25 | 1 | 10 | 4 | 5 | 13 | 2 | 7 |
| | | 44.6% | 38.5% | 12.5% | 41.7% | 25.0% | 100.0% | 48.1% | 50.0% | 46.7% |
| | Not Applicable | 36 | 2 | | 3 | | | 3 | 1 | 6 |
| | | 13.3% | 3.1% | | 12.5% | | | 11.1% | 25.0% | 40.0% |
| | Refused | 3 | | | | | | | | 1 |
| | | 1.1% | | | | | | | | 6.7% |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 | 15 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**2. How would you describe your level of usage of the Office of State Printing Services?**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Level of Usage of State Office | Very Frequent | 1 | 5 | 1 | |
| | | 3.2% | 9.6% | 5.9% | |
| | Frequent | 4 | 11 | 6 | 2 |
| | | 12.9% | 21.2% | 35.3% | 28.6% |
| | Occasional | 16 | 27 | 9 | 2 |
| | | 51.6% | 51.9% | 52.9% | 28.6% |
| | Not Applicable | 10 | 8 | 1 | 2 |
| | | 32.3% | 15.4% | 5.9% | 28.6% |
| | Refused | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | | 1.9% | | 14.3% |
| Total | | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**3. How would you describe your level of usage of your individual agency print shop/copy center?**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Level of Usage of Individual Agency Shop | Very Frequent | 52 | 9 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 11 | 1 |
| | | 19.2% | 13.8% | 37.5% | 12.5% | 6.3% | 60.0% | 40.7% | 25.0% |
| | Frequent | 100 | 22 | 4 | 12 | 9 | | 11 | 2 |
| | | 36.9% | 33.8% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 56.3% | | 40.7% | 50.0% |
| | Occasional | 84 | 18 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| | | 31.0% | 27.7% | 12.5% | 20.8% | 6.3% | 20.0% | 18.5% | 25.0% |
| | Not Applicable | 34 | 16 | | 4 | 5 | 1 | | |
| | | 12.5% | 24.6% | | 16.7% | 31.3% | 20.0% | | |
| | Refused | 1 | | | | | | | |
| | | .4% | | | | | | | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

3. How would you describe your level of usage of your individual agency print shop/copy center?

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Level of Usage of Individual Agency Shop | Very Frequent | 3 | 6 | 9 | 2 | 1 |
| | | 20.0% | 19.4% | 17.3% | 11.8% | 14.3% |
| | Frequent | 5 | 11 | 13 | 9 | 2 |
| | | 33.3% | 35.5% | 25.0% | 52.9% | 28.6% |
| | Occasional | 7 | 14 | 23 | 6 | 2 |
| | | 46.7% | 45.2% | 44.2% | 35.3% | 28.6% |
| | Not Applicable | | | 7 | | 1 |
| | | | | 13.5% | | 14.3% |
| | Refused | | | | | 1 |
| | | | | | | 14.3% |
| Total | | 15 | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**4. Which print shop/copy center do you utilize most often?**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Shop Used Most Often | OSP-Main | 65 | 65 | | | | | | |
| | | 24.0% | 100.0% | | | | | | |
| | OSP-Fountain Square | 8 | | 8 | | | | | |
| | | 3.0% | | 100.0% | | | | | |
| | OSP-Rhodes | 24 | | | 24 | | | | |
| | | 8.9% | | | 100.0% | | | | |
| | OSP-Riffe | 16 | | | | 16 | | | |
| | | 5.9% | | | | 100.0% | | | |
| | Ohio Data Network | 5 | | | | | 5 | | |
| | | 1.8% | | | | | 100.0% | | |
| | Dept. of Public Safety | 27 | | | | | | 27 | |
| | | 10.0% | | | | | | 100.0% | |
| | Bureau of Workers Comp. | 4 | | | | | | | 4 |
| | | 1.5% | | | | | | | 100.0% |
| | Dept. of Development | 15 | | | | | | | |
| | | 5.5% | | | | | | | |
| | Dept. of Transportation | 31 | | | | | | | |
| | | 11.4% | | | | | | | |
| | Dept. of Education | 52 | | | | | | | |
| | | 19.2% | | | | | | | |
| | Dept. of Health | 17 | | | | | | | |
| | | 6.3% | | | | | | | |
| | Refused | 7 | | | | | | | |
| | | 2.6% | | | | | | | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**4. Which print shop/copy center do you utilize most often?**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Shop Used Most Often | OSP-Main | | | | | |
| | OSP-Fountain Square | | | | | |
| | OSP-Rhodes | | | | | |
| | OSP-Riffe | | | | | |
| | Ohio Data Network | | | | | |
| | Dept. of Public Safety | | | | | |
| | Bureau of Workers Comp. | | | | | |
| | Dept. of Development | 15<br>100.0% | | | | |
| | Dept. of Transportation | | 31<br>100.0% | | | |
| | Dept. of Education | | | 52<br>100.0% | | |
| | Dept. of Health | | | | 17<br>100.0% | |
| | Refused | | | | | 7<br>100.0% |
| Total | | 15<br>100.0% | 31<br>100.0% | 52<br>100.0% | 17<br>100.0% | 7<br>100.0% |

**5. Do you know when/why certain jobs need to be sent to the Office of State Printing?**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC | DEV |
| Know Why Jobs Sent to State Office | Yes | 152 | 35 | 8 | 12 | 11 | 3 | 20 | 4 | 5 |
| | | 56.1% | 53.8% | 100.0% | 50.0% | 68.8% | 60.0% | 74.1% | 100.0% | 33.3% |
| | No | 44 | 3 | | 6 | 2 | 1 | 5 | | 5 |
| | | 16.2% | 4.6% | | 25.0% | 12.5% | 20.0% | 18.5% | | 33.3% |
| | Unsure | 45 | 8 | | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | 3 |
| | | 16.6% | 12.3% | | 12.5% | 12.5% | 20.0% | 3.7% | | 20.0% |
| | Refused | 30 | 19 | | 3 | 1 | | 1 | | 2 |
| | | 11.1% | 29.2% | | 12.5% | 6.3% | | 3.7% | | 13.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 | 15 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**5. Do you know when/why certain jobs need to be sent to the Office of State Printing?**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Know Why Jobs Sent to State Office | Yes | 14 | 22 | 13 | 5 |
| | | 45.2% | 42.3% | 76.5% | 71.4% |
| | No | 8 | 10 | 4 | |
| | | 25.8% | 19.2% | 23.5% | |
| | Unsure | 9 | 18 | | |
| | | 29.0% | 34.6% | | |
| | Refused | | 2 | | 2 |
| | | | 3.8% | | 28.6% |
| Total | | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff is always available to meet my needs/address my concerns.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC | DEV |
| Importance of Availability | Very Important | 182 | 44 | 6 | 16 | 10 | 3 | 20 | 4 | 9 |
| | | 67.2% | 67.7% | 75.0% | 66.7% | 62.5% | 60.0% | 74.1% | 100.0% | 60.0% |
| | Important | 71 | 19 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 6 | | 3 |
| | | 26.2% | 29.2% | 25.0% | 16.7% | 31.3% | 20.0% | 22.2% | | 20.0% |
| | Neutral | 6 | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| | | 2.2% | 3.1% | | 4.2% | 6.3% | | | | |
| | Not Relevant | 7 | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 2 |
| | | 2.6% | | | 4.2% | | 20.0% | | | 13.3% |
| | Refused | 5 | | | 2 | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | 1.8% | | | 8.3% | | | 3.7% | | 6.7% |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 | 15 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff is always available to meet my needs/address my concerns.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Importance of Availability | Very Important | 22<br>71.0% | 35<br>67.3% | 11<br>64.7% | 2<br>28.6% |
| | Important | 9<br>29.0% | 14<br>26.9% | 5<br>29.4% | 3<br>42.9% |
| | Neutral | | 2<br>3.8% | | |
| | Not Relevant | | 1<br>1.9% | 1<br>5.9% | 1<br>14.3% |
| | Refused | | | | 1<br>14.3% |
| Total | | 31<br>100.0% | 52<br>100.0% | 17<br>100.0% | 7<br>100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff is responsive to issues and questions.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Importance of Responsiveness | Very Important | 186 | 46 | 7 | 15 | 8 | 4 | 22 | 4 |
| | | 68.6% | 70.8% | 87.5% | 62.5% | 50.0% | 80.0% | 81.5% | 100.0% |
| | Important | 69 | 18 | | 6 | 7 | 1 | 4 | |
| | | 25.5% | 27.7% | | 25.0% | 43.8% | 20.0% | 14.8% | |
| | Neutral | 6 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | |
| | | 2.2% | 1.5% | 12.5% | 4.2% | 6.3% | | | |
| | Not Relevant | 6 | | | 1 | | | | |
| | | 2.2% | | | 4.2% | | | | |
| | Refused | 4 | | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| | | 1.5% | | | 4.2% | | | 3.7% | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff is responsive to issues and questions.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Importance of Responsiveness | Very Important | 11 | 22 | 32 | 13 | 2 |
| | | 73.3% | 71.0% | 61.5% | 76.5% | 28.6% |
| | Important | 1 | 9 | 17 | 3 | 3 |
| | | 6.7% | 29.0% | 32.7% | 17.6% | 42.9% |
| | Neutral | | | 2 | | |
| | | | | 3.8% | | |
| | Not Relevant | 2 | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 13.3% | | 1.9% | 5.9% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 1 | | | | 1 |
| | | 6.7% | | | | 14.3% |
| Total | | 15 | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff provides appropriate resolutions to issues and questions.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC | DEV |
| Importance of Resolving Questions | Very Important | 171 | 42 | 7 | 12 | 8 | 4 | 19 | 3 | 10 |
| | | 63.1% | 64.6% | 87.5% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 80.0% | 70.4% | 75.0% | 66.7% |
| | Important | 81 | 21 | 1 | 9 | 7 | | 7 | 1 | 2 |
| | | 29.9% | 32.3% | 12.5% | 37.5% | 43.8% | | 25.9% | 25.0% | 13.3% |
| | Neutral | 7 | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| | | 2.6% | 3.1% | | 4.2% | 6.3% | | | | |
| | Not Relevant | 7 | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 2 |
| | | 2.6% | | | 4.2% | | 20.0% | | | 13.3% |
| | Refused | 5 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | 1.8% | | | 4.2% | | | 3.7% | | 6.7% |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 | 15 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff provides appropriate resolutions to issues and questions.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Importance of Resolving Questions | Very Important | 19 | 32 | 13 | 2 |
| | | 61.3% | 61.5% | 76.5% | 28.6% |
| | Important | 11 | 16 | 3 | 3 |
| | | 35.5% | 30.8% | 17.6% | 42.9% |
| | Neutral | | 3 | | |
| | | | 5.8% | | |
| | Not Relevant | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | | 1.9% | 5.9% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 1 | | | 1 |
| | | 3.2% | | | 14.3% |
| Total | | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff is responsive to urgent requests.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC | DEV |
| Importance of Response to Urgent Requests | Very Important | 199 | 50 | 8 | 17 | 11 | 4 | 24 | 4 | 11 |
| | | 73.4% | 76.9% | 100.0% | 70.8% | 68.8% | 80.0% | 88.9% | 100.0% | 73.3% |
| | Important | 56 | 15 | | 4 | 3 | | 2 | | 1 |
| | | 20.7% | 23.1% | | 16.7% | 18.8% | | 7.4% | | 6.7% |
| | Neutral | 4 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| | | 1.5% | | | 4.2% | 6.3% | | | | |
| | Not Very Important | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | |
| | | .4% | | | | 6.3% | | | | |
| | Not Relevant | 7 | | | 1 | | 1 | | | 2 |
| | | 2.6% | | | 4.2% | | 20.0% | | | 13.3% |
| | Refused | 4 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | 1.5% | | | 4.2% | | | 3.7% | | 6.7% |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 | 15 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff is responsive to urgent requests.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Importance of Response to Urgent Requests | Very Important | 22<br>71.0% | 33<br>63.5% | 13<br>76.5% | 2<br>28.6% |
| | Important | 9<br>29.0% | 16<br>30.8% | 3<br>17.6% | 3<br>42.9% |
| | Neutral | | 2<br>3.8% | | |
| | Not Very Important | | | | |
| | Not Relevant | | 1<br>1.9% | 1<br>5.9% | 1<br>14.3% |
| | Refused | | | | 1<br>14.3% |
| Total | | 31<br>100.0% | 52<br>100.0% | 17<br>100.0% | 7<br>100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff is sensitive to the confidential nature of some printing projects.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Importance of Sensitivity to Confidentiality | Very Important | 116 | 28 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 18 | 4 |
| | | 42.8% | 43.1% | 12.5% | 29.2% | 37.5% | 80.0% | 66.7% | 100.0% |
| | Important | 64 | 12 | 3 | 11 | 5 | | 3 | |
| | | 23.6% | 18.5% | 37.5% | 45.8% | 31.3% | | 11.1% | |
| | Neutral | 40 | 13 | 1 | 4 | 2 | | 3 | |
| | | 14.8% | 20.0% | 12.5% | 16.7% | 12.5% | | 11.1% | |
| | Not Very Important | 11 | 2 | 1 | | | | 2 | |
| | | 4.1% | 3.1% | 12.5% | | | | 7.4% | |
| | Not Relevant | 36 | 10 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | | |
| | | 13.3% | 15.4% | 25.0% | 4.2% | 18.8% | 20.0% | | |
| | Refused | 4 | | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| | | 1.5% | | | 4.2% | | | 3.7% | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff is sensitive to the confidential nature of some printing projects.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Importance of Sensitivity to Confidentiality | Very Important | 5 | 11 | 21 | 10 | 1 |
| | | 33.3% | 35.5% | 40.4% | 58.8% | 14.3% |
| | Important | 4 | 7 | 16 | 1 | 2 |
| | | 26.7% | 22.6% | 30.8% | 5.9% | 28.6% |
| | Neutral | 1 | 5 | 8 | 2 | 1 |
| | | 6.7% | 16.1% | 15.4% | 11.8% | 14.3% |
| | Not Very Important | | 3 | 3 | | |
| | | | 9.7% | 5.8% | | |
| | Not Relevant | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 2 |
| | | 26.7% | 16.1% | 7.7% | 23.5% | 28.6% |
| | Refused | 1 | | | | 1 |
| | | 6.7% | | | | 14.3% |
| Total | | 15 | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff is proactive in addressing needs.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC | DEV |
| Importance of Proactivity | Very Important | 114 | 27 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 3 | 16 | | 7 |
| | | 42.1% | 41.5% | 62.5% | 29.2% | 43.8% | 60.0% | 59.3% | | 46.7% |
| | Important | 121 | 33 | 3 | 12 | 8 | 1 | 8 | 3 | 4 |
| | | 44.6% | 50.8% | 37.5% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 20.0% | 29.6% | 75.0% | 26.7% |
| | Neutral | 21 | 4 | | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | | 1 |
| | | 7.7% | 6.2% | | 12.5% | 6.3% | 20.0% | 7.4% | | 6.7% |
| | Not Relevant | 9 | 1 | | 1 | | | | | 2 |
| | | 3.3% | 1.5% | | 4.2% | | | | | 13.3% |
| | Refused | 6 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 2.2% | | | 4.2% | | | 3.7% | 25.0% | 6.7% |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 | 15 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff is proactive in addressing needs.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Importance of Proactivity | Very Important | 15 | 20 | 7 | |
| | | 48.4% | 38.5% | 41.2% | |
| | Important | 12 | 25 | 9 | 3 |
| | | 38.7% | 48.1% | 52.9% | 42.9% |
| | Neutral | 4 | 5 | | |
| | | 12.9% | 9.6% | | |
| | Not Relevant | | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| | | | 1.9% | 5.9% | 42.9% |
| | Refused | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | | 1.9% | | 14.3% |
| Total | | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff provides innovative solutions to needs.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC | DEV |
| Importance of Innovation | Very Important | 102 | 21 | 6 | 9 | 7 | 3 | 9 | 2 | 7 |
| | | 37.6% | 32.3% | 75.0% | 37.5% | 43.8% | 60.0% | 33.3% | 50.0% | 46.7% |
| | Important | 125 | 39 | 1 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 14 | 2 | 5 |
| | | 46.1% | 60.0% | 12.5% | 29.2% | 37.5% | 20.0% | 51.9% | 50.0% | 33.3% |
| | Neutral | 26 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 2 | | 2 | | |
| | | 9.6% | 7.7% | 12.5% | 25.0% | 12.5% | | 7.4% | | |
| | Not Very Important | 3 | | | | | | 1 | | |
| | | 1.1% | | | | | | 3.7% | | |
| | Not Relevant | 9 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 2 |
| | | 3.3% | | | 4.2% | 6.3% | 20.0% | | | 13.3% |
| | Refused | 6 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | 2.2% | | | 4.2% | | | 3.7% | | 6.7% |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 | 15 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff provides innovative solutions to needs.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Importance of Innovation | Very Important | 11 | 17 | 9 | 1 |
| | | 35.5% | 32.7% | 52.9% | 14.3% |
| | Important | 16 | 26 | 6 | 2 |
| | | 51.6% | 50.0% | 35.3% | 28.6% |
| | Neutral | 4 | 5 | 1 | |
| | | 12.9% | 9.6% | 5.9% | |
| | Not Very Important | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | | 1.9% | | 14.3% |
| | Not Relevant | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| | | | 1.9% | 5.9% | 28.6% |
| | Refused | | 2 | | 1 |
| | | | 3.8% | | 14.3% |
| Total | | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff effectively interacts with me concerning my project.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC | DEV |
| Importance of Effective Interaction | Very Important | 141 | 36 | 6 | 10 | 9 | 3 | 17 | 3 | 7 |
| | | 52.0% | 55.4% | 75.0% | 41.7% | 56.3% | 60.0% | 63.0% | 75.0% | 46.7% |
| | Important | 99 | 26 | 2 | 10 | 5 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 5 |
| | | 36.5% | 40.0% | 25.0% | 41.7% | 31.3% | 20.0% | 25.9% | 25.0% | 33.3% |
| | Neutral | 16 | 3 | | 2 | 1 | | 2 | | |
| | | 5.9% | 4.6% | | 8.3% | 6.3% | | 7.4% | | |
| | Not Very Important | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| | | .4% | | | | | | | | |
| | Not Relevant | 9 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | | 2 |
| | | 3.3% | | | 4.2% | 6.3% | 20.0% | | | 13.3% |
| | Refused | 5 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | 1.8% | | | 4.2% | | | 3.7% | | 6.7% |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 | 15 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff effectively interacts with me concerning my project.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Importance of Effective Interaction | Very Important | 13<br>41.9% | 28<br>53.8% | 9<br>52.9% | |
| | Important | 15<br>48.4% | 18<br>34.6% | 6<br>35.3% | 3<br>42.9% |
| | Neutral | 2<br>6.5% | 5<br>9.6% | 1<br>5.9% | |
| | Not Very Important | | | | 1<br>14.3% |
| | Not Relevant | | 1<br>1.9% | 1<br>5.9% | 2<br>28.6% |
| | Refused | 1<br>3.2% | | | 1<br>14.3% |
| Total | | 31<br>100.0% | 52<br>100.0% | 17<br>100.0% | 7<br>100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff makes decisions to help with aesthetics of final project.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC | DEV |
| Importance of Help with Aesthetics | Very Important | 82 | 17 | 2 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 10 | 2 | 7 |
| | | 30.3% | 26.2% | 25.0% | 29.2% | 25.0% | 60.0% | 37.0% | 50.0% | 46.7% |
| | Important | 112 | 34 | 3 | 7 | 8 | | 10 | 1 | 3 |
| | | 41.3% | 52.3% | 37.5% | 29.2% | 50.0% | | 37.0% | 25.0% | 20.0% |
| | Neutral | 48 | 12 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
| | | 17.7% | 18.5% | 12.5% | 29.2% | 6.3% | 20.0% | 14.8% | 25.0% | 13.3% |
| | Not Very Important | 11 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | | 1 | | |
| | | 4.1% | 1.5% | 25.0% | 4.2% | | | 3.7% | | |
| | Not Relevant | 13 | | | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | | 2 |
| | | 4.8% | | | 4.2% | 18.8% | 20.0% | 3.7% | | 13.3% |
| | Refused | 5 | 1 | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | 1.8% | 1.5% | | 4.2% | | | 3.7% | | 6.7% |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 | 15 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff makes decisions to help with aesthetics of final project.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Importance of Help with Aesthetics | Very Important | 8<br>25.8% | 17<br>32.7% | 5<br>29.4% | |
| | Important | 16<br>51.6% | 23<br>44.2% | 4<br>23.5% | 3<br>42.9% |
| | Neutral | 6<br>19.4% | 8<br>15.4% | 5<br>29.4% | |
| | Not Very Important | 1<br>3.2% | 2<br>3.8% | 2<br>11.8% | 1<br>14.3% |
| | Not Relevant | | 2<br>3.8% | 1<br>5.9% | 2<br>28.6% |
| | Refused | | | | 1<br>14.3% |
| Total | | 31<br>100.0% | 52<br>100.0% | 17<br>100.0% | 7<br>100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Quality and professionalism of print shop/copy center staff.**

| | | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Entire Sample | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Importance of Professionalism | Very Important | 168 | 41 | 8 | 13 | 7 | 3 | 20 | 3 |
| | | 62.0% | 63.1% | 100.0% | 54.2% | 43.8% | 60.0% | 74.1% | 75.0% |
| | Important | 83 | 22 | | 8 | 8 | 1 | 6 | 1 |
| | | 30.6% | 33.8% | | 33.3% | 50.0% | 20.0% | 22.2% | 25.0% |
| | Neutral | 9 | 2 | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| | | 3.3% | 3.1% | | 4.2% | 6.3% | | | |
| | Not Relevant | 7 | | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| | | 2.6% | | | 4.2% | | 20.0% | | |
| | Refused | 4 | | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| | | 1.5% | | | 4.2% | | | 3.7% | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Quality and professionalism of print shop/copy center staff.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Importance of Professionalism | Very Important | 9 | 21 | 32 | 10 | 1 |
| | | 60.0% | 67.7% | 61.5% | 58.8% | 14.3% |
| | Important | 3 | 7 | 17 | 6 | 4 |
| | | 20.0% | 22.6% | 32.7% | 35.3% | 57.1% |
| | Neutral | | 3 | 2 | | |
| | | | 9.7% | 3.8% | | |
| | Not Relevant | 2 | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 13.3% | | 1.9% | 5.9% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 1 | | | | 1 |
| | | 6.7% | | | | 14.3% |
| Total | | 15 | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Meeting the requested turnaround time, from the point the project is given to the print shop/copy center until the time it is completed and returned.**

| | | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Entire Sample | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Importance of Meeting Turnaround Time | Very Important | 204 | 44 | 7 | 16 | 13 | 4 | 22 | 4 |
| | | 75.3% | 67.7% | 87.5% | 66.7% | 81.3% | 80.0% | 81.5% | 100.0% |
| | Important | 51 | 21 | 1 | 6 | 2 | | 4 | |
| | | 18.8% | 32.3% | 12.5% | 25.0% | 12.5% | | 14.8% | |
| | Neutral | 3 | | | 1 | | | | |
| | | 1.1% | | | 4.2% | | | | |
| | Not Very Important | 2 | | | | 1 | | | |
| | | .7% | | | | 6.3% | | | |
| | Not Relevant | 6 | | | | | 1 | | |
| | | 2.2% | | | | | 20.0% | | |
| | Refused | 5 | | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| | | 1.8% | | | 4.2% | | | 3.7% | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Meeting the requested turnaround time, from the point the project is given to the print shop/copy center until the time it is completed and returned.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Importance of Meeting Turnaround Time | Very Important | 10 | 25 | 40 | 16 | 3 |
| | | 66.7% | 80.6% | 76.9% | 94.1% | 42.9% |
| | Important | 2 | 5 | 8 | | 2 |
| | | 13.3% | 16.1% | 15.4% | | 28.6% |
| | Neutral | | 1 | 1 | | |
| | | | 3.2% | 1.9% | | |
| | Not Very Important | | | 1 | | |
| | | | | 1.9% | | |
| | Not Relevant | 2 | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 13.3% | | 1.9% | 5.9% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 1 | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | 6.7% | | 1.9% | | 14.3% |
| Total | | 15 | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff makes me aware when my requested turnaround time cannot be met.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC | DEV |
| Importance of Knowing Time Cannot Be Met | Very Important | 207 | 44 | 8 | 19 | 13 | 4 | 21 | 3 | 11 |
| | | 76.4% | 67.7% | 100.0% | 79.2% | 81.3% | 80.0% | 77.8% | 75.0% | 73.3% |
| | Important | 49 | 20 | | 2 | 2 | | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 18.1% | 30.8% | | 8.3% | 12.5% | | 18.5% | 25.0% | 6.7% |
| | Neutral | 3 | 1 | | 2 | | | | | |
| | | 1.1% | 1.5% | | 8.3% | | | | | |
| | Not Very Important | 2 | | | | 1 | | | | |
| | | .7% | | | | 6.3% | | | | |
| | Not Relevant | 6 | | | | | 1 | | | 2 |
| | | 2.2% | | | | | 20.0% | | | 13.3% |
| | Refused | 4 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | 1.5% | | | 4.2% | | | 3.7% | | 6.7% |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 | 15 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff makes me aware when my requested turnaround time cannot be met.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Importance of Knowing Time Cannot Be Met | Very Important | 22<br>71.0% | 45<br>86.5% | 15<br>88.2% | 2<br>28.6% |
| | Important | 9<br>29.0% | 5<br>9.6% | 1<br>5.9% | 3<br>42.9% |
| | Neutral | | | | |
| | Not Very Important | | 1<br>1.9% | | |
| | Not Relevant | | 1<br>1.9% | 1<br>5.9% | 1<br>14.3% |
| | Refused | | | | 1<br>14.3% |
| Total | | 31<br>100.0% | 52<br>100.0% | 17<br>100.0% | 7<br>100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff meets short lead times.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC | DEV |
| Importance of Meeting Short Lead Times | Very Important | 133 | 34 | 6 | 10 | 7 | 3 | 15 | 3 | 5 |
| | | 49.1% | 52.3% | 75.0% | 41.7% | 43.8% | 60.0% | 55.6% | 75.0% | 33.3% |
| | Important | 111 | 25 | 1 | 12 | 7 | 1 | 11 | 1 | 7 |
| | | 41.0% | 38.5% | 12.5% | 50.0% | 43.8% | 20.0% | 40.7% | 25.0% | 46.7% |
| | Neutral | 12 | 5 | | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| | | 4.4% | 7.7% | | 4.2% | 6.3% | | | | |
| | Not Very Important | 4 | | 1 | | 1 | | | | |
| | | 1.5% | | 12.5% | | 6.3% | | | | |
| | Not Relevant | 7 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | 2 |
| | | 2.6% | 1.5% | | | | 20.0% | | | 13.3% |
| | Refused | 4 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | 1.5% | | | 4.2% | | | 3.7% | | 6.7% |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 | 15 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff meets short lead times.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Importance of Meeting Short Lead Times | Very Important | 15 | 27 | 7 | 1 |
| | | 48.4% | 51.9% | 41.2% | 14.3% |
| | Important | 12 | 22 | 8 | 4 |
| | | 38.7% | 42.3% | 47.1% | 57.1% |
| | Neutral | 3 | 1 | 1 | |
| | | 9.7% | 1.9% | 5.9% | |
| | Not Very Important | 1 | 1 | | |
| | | 3.2% | 1.9% | | |
| | Not Relevant | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | | 1.9% | 5.9% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | | | | 1 |
| | | | | | 14.3% |
| Total | | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff is responsive to requests of late night/overnight projects.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Importance of Response to Late Night Projects | Very Important | 87 | 22 | 1 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 8 | 3 |
| | | 32.1% | 33.8% | 12.5% | 16.7% | 37.5% | 60.0% | 29.6% | 75.0% |
| | Important | 77 | 19 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 9 | |
| | | 28.4% | 29.2% | 50.0% | 33.3% | 31.3% | 20.0% | 33.3% | |
| | Neutral | 53 | 13 | 1 | 8 | 2 | | 4 | 1 |
| | | 19.6% | 20.0% | 12.5% | 33.3% | 12.5% | | 14.8% | 25.0% |
| | Not Very Important | 12 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 1 | |
| | | 4.4% | | 12.5% | 4.2% | 6.3% | | 3.7% | |
| | Not Relevant | 38 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | |
| | | 14.0% | 16.9% | 12.5% | 8.3% | 12.5% | 20.0% | 14.8% | |
| | Refused | 4 | | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| | | 1.5% | | | 4.2% | | | 3.7% | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff is responsive to requests of late night/overnight projects.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Importance of Response to Late Night Projects | Very Important | 6 | 8 | 20 | 5 | 1 |
| | | 40.0% | 25.8% | 38.5% | 29.4% | 14.3% |
| | Important | 3 | 8 | 13 | 5 | 2 |
| | | 20.0% | 25.8% | 25.0% | 29.4% | 28.6% |
| | Neutral | 2 | 6 | 13 | 2 | 1 |
| | | 13.3% | 19.4% | 25.0% | 11.8% | 14.3% |
| | Not Very Important | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | |
| | | 6.7% | 16.1% | 1.9% | 5.9% | |
| | Not Relevant | 2 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 2 |
| | | 13.3% | 12.9% | 9.6% | 23.5% | 28.6% |
| | Refused | 1 | | | | 1 |
| | | 6.7% | | | | 14.3% |
| Total | | 15 | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff uses technology to help complete job quickly.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC | DEV |
| Importance of Use of Technology | Very Important | 115 | 23 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 3 | 13 | 2 | 8 |
| | | 42.4% | 35.4% | 62.5% | 29.2% | 37.5% | 60.0% | 48.1% | 50.0% | 53.3% |
| | Important | 112 | 35 | 2 | 9 | 6 | 1 | 13 | 2 | 2 |
| | | 41.3% | 53.8% | 25.0% | 37.5% | 37.5% | 20.0% | 48.1% | 50.0% | 13.3% |
| | Neutral | 30 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 3 | | | | 2 |
| | | 11.1% | 10.8% | 12.5% | 29.2% | 18.8% | | | | 13.3% |
| | Not Very Important | 2 | | | | | | | | |
| | | .7% | | | | | | | | |
| | Not Relevant | 8 | | | | 1 | 1 | | | 2 |
| | | 3.0% | | | | 6.3% | 20.0% | | | 13.3% |
| | Refused | 4 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | 1.5% | | | 4.2% | | | 3.7% | | 6.7% |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 | 15 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff uses technology to help complete job quickly.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Importance of Use of Technology | Very Important | 13 | 26 | 9 | |
| | | 41.9% | 50.0% | 52.9% | |
| | Important | 13 | 19 | 6 | 4 |
| | | 41.9% | 36.5% | 35.3% | 57.1% |
| | Neutral | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 12.9% | 7.7% | 5.9% | 14.3% |
| | Not Very Important | 1 | 1 | | |
| | | 3.2% | 1.9% | | |
| | Not Relevant | | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| | | | 3.8% | 5.9% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | | | | 1 |
| | | | | | 14.3% |
| Total | | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Jobs are delivered according to agreed upon timeframes.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC | DEV |
| Importance of Delivering Jobs On Time | Very Important | 200 | 47 | 7 | 17 | 13 | 4 | 20 | 4 | 11 |
| | | 73.8% | 72.3% | 87.5% | 70.8% | 81.3% | 80.0% | 74.1% | 100.0% | 73.3% |
| | Important | 57 | 18 | 1 | 5 | 2 | | 6 | | 1 |
| | | 21.0% | 27.7% | 12.5% | 20.8% | 12.5% | | 22.2% | | 6.7% |
| | Neutral | 2 | | | 1 | | | | | |
| | | .7% | | | 4.2% | | | | | |
| | Not Very Important | 2 | | | | 1 | | | | |
| | | .7% | | | | 6.3% | | | | |
| | Not Relevant | 6 | | | | | 1 | | | 2 |
| | | 2.2% | | | | | 20.0% | | | 13.3% |
| | Refused | 4 | | | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | 1.5% | | | 4.2% | | | 3.7% | | 6.7% |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 | 15 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Jobs are delivered according to agreed upon timeframes.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Importance of Delivering Jobs On Time | Very Important | 19<br>61.3% | 40<br>76.9% | 15<br>88.2% | 3<br>42.9% |
| | Important | 12<br>38.7% | 9<br>17.3% | 1<br>5.9% | 2<br>28.6% |
| | Neutral | | 1<br>1.9% | | |
| | Not Very Important | | 1<br>1.9% | | |
| | Not Relevant | | 1<br>1.9% | 1<br>5.9% | 1<br>14.3% |
| | Refused | | | | 1<br>14.3% |
| Total | | 31<br>100.0% | 52<br>100.0% | 17<br>100.0% | 7<br>100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff understands my printing needs.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC | DEV |
| Importance of Having Needs Understood | Very Important | 176 | 45 | 6 | 16 | 9 | 4 | 20 | 3 | 7 |
| | | 64.9% | 69.2% | 75.0% | 66.7% | 56.3% | 80.0% | 74.1% | 75.0% | 46.7% |
| | Important | 76 | 19 | 2 | 6 | 5 | | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| | | 28.0% | 29.2% | 25.0% | 25.0% | 31.3% | | 18.5% | 25.0% | 33.3% |
| | Neutral | 4 | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | |
| | | 1.5% | | | 4.2% | 6.3% | | 3.7% | | |
| | Not Very Important | 2 | | | | | 1 | | | |
| | | .7% | | | | | 20.0% | | | |
| | Not Relevant | 5 | | | | | | | | 2 |
| | | 1.8% | | | | | | | | 13.3% |
| | Refused | 8 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | 3.0% | 1.5% | | 4.2% | 6.3% | | 3.7% | | 6.7% |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 | 15 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff understands my printing needs.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Importance of Having Needs Understood | Very Important | 22<br>71.0% | 32<br>61.5% | 10<br>58.8% | 2<br>28.6% |
| | Important | 9<br>29.0% | 15<br>28.8% | 6<br>35.3% | 3<br>42.9% |
| | Neutral | | 1<br>1.9% | | |
| | Not Very Important | | 1<br>1.9% | | |
| | Not Relevant | | 1<br>1.9% | 1<br>5.9% | 1<br>14.3% |
| | Refused | | 2<br>3.8% | | 1<br>14.3% |
| Total | | 31<br>100.0% | 52<br>100.0% | 17<br>100.0% | 7<br>100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff helps outline deliverables/expectations at the time of initial request.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Importance of Help Outlining Deliverables | Very Important | 137 | 35 | 4 | 10 | 9 | 3 | 12 | 3 |
| | | 50.6% | 53.8% | 50.0% | 41.7% | 56.3% | 60.0% | 44.4% | 75.0% |
| | Important | 104 | 27 | 3 | 11 | 4 | 1 | 14 | 1 |
| | | 38.4% | 41.5% | 37.5% | 45.8% | 25.0% | 20.0% | 51.9% | 25.0% |
| | Neutral | 11 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| | | 4.1% | 1.5% | | 8.3% | 6.3% | | | |
| | Not Very Important | 2 | | | | | | | |
| | | .7% | | | | | | | |
| | Not Relevant | 8 | 1 | 1 | | | 1 | | |
| | | 3.0% | 1.5% | 12.5% | | | 20.0% | | |
| | Refused | 9 | 1 | | 1 | 2 | | 1 | |
| | | 3.3% | 1.5% | | 4.2% | 12.5% | | 3.7% | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff helps outline deliverables/expectations at the time of initial request.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Importance of Help Outlining Deliverables | Very Important | 8 | 14 | 31 | 7 | 1 |
| | | 53.3% | 45.2% | 59.6% | 41.2% | 14.3% |
| | Important | 3 | 15 | 14 | 7 | 4 |
| | | 20.0% | 48.4% | 26.9% | 41.2% | 57.1% |
| | Neutral | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | |
| | | 6.7% | 6.5% | 5.8% | 5.9% | |
| | Not Very Important | | | 1 | 1 | |
| | | | | 1.9% | 5.9% | |
| | Not Relevant | 2 | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 13.3% | | 1.9% | 5.9% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 1 | | 2 | | 1 |
| | | 6.7% | | 3.8% | | 14.3% |
| Total | | 15 | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Jobs are delivered according to specifications the first time.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Importance of Meeting Specifications | Very Important | 191 | 46 | 7 | 14 | 13 | 4 | 18 | 4 |
| | | 70.5% | 70.8% | 87.5% | 58.3% | 81.3% | 80.0% | 66.7% | 100.0% |
| | Important | 58 | 18 | 1 | 6 | 1 | | 7 | |
| | | 21.4% | 27.7% | 12.5% | 25.0% | 6.3% | | 25.9% | |
| | Neutral | 5 | | | 3 | 1 | | | |
| | | 1.8% | | | 12.5% | 6.3% | | | |
| | Not Very Important | 1 | | | | | | | |
| | | .4% | | | | | | | |
| | Not Relevant | 5 | | | | | 1 | | |
| | | 1.8% | | | | | 20.0% | | |
| | Refused | 11 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 2 | |
| | | 4.1% | 1.5% | | 4.2% | 6.3% | | 7.4% | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Jobs are delivered according to specifications the first time.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Importance of Meeting Specifications | Very Important | 9 | 23 | 36 | 15 | 2 |
| | | 60.0% | 74.2% | 69.2% | 88.2% | 28.6% |
| | Important | 3 | 8 | 11 | 1 | 2 |
| | | 20.0% | 25.8% | 21.2% | 5.9% | 28.6% |
| | Neutral | | | 1 | | |
| | | | | 1.9% | | |
| | Not Very Important | | | 1 | | |
| | | | | 1.9% | | |
| | Not Relevant | 2 | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | 13.3% | | 1.9% | | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| | | 6.7% | | 3.8% | 5.9% | 28.6% |
| Total | | 15 | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Overall, finished jobs are of high quality.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC | DEV |
| Importance of Quality of Jobs | Very Important | 213 | 52 | 8 | 16 | 10 | 4 | 22 | 4 | 11 |
| | | 78.6% | 80.0% | 100.0% | 66.7% | 62.5% | 80.0% | 81.5% | 100.0% | 73.3% |
| | Important | 37 | 12 | | 5 | 4 | | 4 | | 1 |
| | | 13.7% | 18.5% | | 20.8% | 25.0% | | 14.8% | | 6.7% |
| | Neutral | 3 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| | | 1.1% | | | 4.2% | 6.3% | | | | |
| | Not Very Important | 1 | | | | | | | | |
| | | .4% | | | | | | | | |
| | Not Relevant | 6 | | | | | 1 | | | 2 |
| | | 2.2% | | | | | 20.0% | | | 13.3% |
| | Refused | 11 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | 4.1% | 1.5% | | 8.3% | 6.3% | | 3.7% | | 6.7% |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 | 15 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Overall, finished jobs are of high quality.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Importance of Quality of Jobs | Very Important | 28 | 39 | 16 | 3 |
| | | 90.3% | 75.0% | 94.1% | 42.9% |
| | Important | 3 | 6 | | 2 |
| | | 9.7% | 11.5% | | 28.6% |
| | Neutral | | 1 | | |
| | | | 1.9% | | |
| | Not Very Important | | 1 | | |
| | | | 1.9% | | |
| | Not Relevant | | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | | 1.9% | 5.9% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | | 4 | | 1 |
| | | | 7.7% | | 14.3% |
| Total | | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Availability of black and white copy services.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC | DEV |
| Importance of Black and White Services | Very Important | 123 | 28 | 7 | 9 | 7 | 4 | 15 | | 5 |
| | | 45.4% | 43.1% | 87.5% | 37.5% | 43.8% | 80.0% | 55.6% | | 33.3% |
| | Important | 96 | 21 | 1 | 9 | 7 | | 9 | 2 | 7 |
| | | 35.4% | 32.3% | 12.5% | 37.5% | 43.8% | | 33.3% | 50.0% | 46.7% |
| | Neutral | 32 | 14 | | 4 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | |
| | | 11.8% | 21.5% | | 16.7% | 12.5% | | 7.4% | 50.0% | |
| | Not Very Important | 7 | 2 | | | | | | | |
| | | 2.6% | 3.1% | | | | | | | |
| | Not Relevant | 7 | | | | | 1 | | | 2 |
| | | 2.6% | | | | | 20.0% | | | 13.3% |
| | Refused | 6 | | | 2 | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | 2.2% | | | 8.3% | | | 3.7% | | 6.7% |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 | 15 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Availability of black and white copy services.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Importance of Black and White Services | Very Important | 14 | 23 | 9 | 2 |
| | | 45.2% | 44.2% | 52.9% | 28.6% |
| | Important | 10 | 21 | 7 | 2 |
| | | 32.3% | 40.4% | 41.2% | 28.6% |
| | Neutral | 3 | 5 | | |
| | | 9.7% | 9.6% | | |
| | Not Very Important | 3 | 1 | | 1 |
| | | 9.7% | 1.9% | | 14.3% |
| | Not Relevant | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 3.2% | 1.9% | 5.9% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | | 1.9% | | 14.3% |
| Total | | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Availability of color copy services.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC | DEV |
| Importance of Color Services | Very Important | 121 | 34 | 3 | 9 | 5 | 2 | 14 | 1 | 7 |
| | | 44.6% | 52.3% | 37.5% | 37.5% | 31.3% | 40.0% | 51.9% | 25.0% | 46.7% |
| | Important | 100 | 23 | 3 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 10 | 3 | 5 |
| | | 36.9% | 35.4% | 37.5% | 16.7% | 37.5% | 40.0% | 37.0% | 75.0% | 33.3% |
| | Neutral | 23 | 6 | | 6 | 4 | | | | |
| | | 8.5% | 9.2% | | 25.0% | 25.0% | | | | |
| | Not Very Important | 9 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| | | 3.3% | 1.5% | 25.0% | 4.2% | 6.3% | | | | |
| | Not Relevant | 10 | | | 1 | | 1 | 2 | | 2 |
| | | 3.7% | | | 4.2% | | 20.0% | 7.4% | | 13.3% |
| | Refused | 8 | 1 | | 3 | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | 3.0% | 1.5% | | 12.5% | | | 3.7% | | 6.7% |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 | 15 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Availability of color copy services.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Importance of Color Services | Very Important | 17 | 21 | 7 | 1 |
| | | 54.8% | 40.4% | 41.2% | 14.3% |
| | Important | 11 | 23 | 8 | 2 |
| | | 35.5% | 44.2% | 47.1% | 28.6% |
| | Neutral | 2 | 4 | 1 | |
| | | 6.5% | 7.7% | 5.9% | |
| | Not Very Important | 1 | 2 | | 1 |
| | | 3.2% | 3.8% | | 14.3% |
| | Not Relevant | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| | | | 1.9% | 5.9% | 28.6% |
| | Refused | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | | 1.9% | | 14.3% |
| Total | | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Availability of offset printing services.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC | DEV |
| Importance of Offset Printing Services | Very Important | 85 | 35 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 3 |
| | | 31.4% | 53.8% | 37.5% | 25.0% | 31.3% | 40.0% | 29.6% | 25.0% | 20.0% |
| | Important | 98 | 19 | 5 | 10 | 6 | | 11 | 1 | 3 |
| | | 36.2% | 29.2% | 62.5% | 41.7% | 37.5% | | 40.7% | 25.0% | 20.0% |
| | Neutral | 51 | 7 | | 5 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| | | 18.8% | 10.8% | | 20.8% | 31.3% | 20.0% | 14.8% | 50.0% | 20.0% |
| | Not Very Important | 9 | 1 | | | | | 1 | | |
| | | 3.3% | 1.5% | | | | | 3.7% | | |
| | Not Relevant | 18 | 3 | | 1 | | 2 | 2 | | 3 |
| | | 6.6% | 4.6% | | 4.2% | | 40.0% | 7.4% | | 20.0% |
| | Refused | 10 | | | 2 | | | 1 | | 3 |
| | | 3.7% | | | 8.3% | | | 3.7% | | 20.0% |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 | 15 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Availability of offset printing services.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Importance of Offset Printing Services | Very Important | 7 | 13 | 2 | |
| | | 22.6% | 25.0% | 11.8% | |
| | Important | 17 | 17 | 7 | 2 |
| | | 54.8% | 32.7% | 41.2% | 28.6% |
| | Neutral | 4 | 15 | 3 | 2 |
| | | 12.9% | 28.8% | 17.6% | 28.6% |
| | Not Very Important | 2 | 3 | 2 | |
| | | 6.5% | 5.8% | 11.8% | |
| | Not Relevant | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| | | 3.2% | 1.9% | 17.6% | 28.6% |
| | Refused | | 3 | | 1 |
| | | | 5.8% | | 14.3% |
| Total | | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Availability of finishing and binding operations.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Importance of Finishing/Binding Operations | Very Important | 108 | 33 | 5 | 9 | 6 | 2 | 13 | 1 |
| | | 39.9% | 50.8% | 62.5% | 37.5% | 37.5% | 40.0% | 48.1% | 25.0% |
| | Important | 109 | 29 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 8 | 3 |
| | | 40.2% | 44.6% | 37.5% | 33.3% | 31.3% | 40.0% | 29.6% | 75.0% |
| | Neutral | 33 | 3 | | 3 | 5 | 1 | 5 | |
| | | 12.2% | 4.6% | | 12.5% | 31.3% | 20.0% | 18.5% | |
| | Not Very Important | 7 | | | 1 | | | | |
| | | 2.6% | | | 4.2% | | | | |
| | Not Relevant | 7 | | | 1 | | | | |
| | | 2.6% | | | 4.2% | | | | |
| | Refused | 7 | | | 2 | | | 1 | |
| | | 2.6% | | | 8.3% | | | 3.7% | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Availability of finishing and binding operations.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Importance of Finishing/Binding Operations | Very Important | 5 | 13 | 14 | 6 | 1 |
| | | 33.3% | 41.9% | 26.9% | 35.3% | 14.3% |
| | Important | 6 | 15 | 21 | 7 | 2 |
| | | 40.0% | 48.4% | 40.4% | 41.2% | 28.6% |
| | Neutral | 1 | 1 | 11 | 1 | 2 |
| | | 6.7% | 3.2% | 21.2% | 5.9% | 28.6% |
| | Not Very Important | | 2 | 3 | 1 | |
| | | | 6.5% | 5.8% | 5.9% | |
| | Not Relevant | 2 | | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| | | 13.3% | | 1.9% | 11.8% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 1 | | 2 | | 1 |
| | | 6.7% | | 3.8% | | 14.3% |
| Total | | 15 | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Ability to transfer files electronically.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC | DEV |
| Importance of Electronic File Transfer | Very Important | 118 | 35 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 3 | 17 | 2 | 2 |
| | | 43.5% | 53.8% | 50.0% | 29.2% | 37.5% | 60.0% | 63.0% | 50.0% | 13.3% |
| | Important | 94 | 22 | 4 | 9 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 4 |
| | | 34.7% | 33.8% | 50.0% | 37.5% | 18.8% | 40.0% | 33.3% | 50.0% | 26.7% |
| | Neutral | 37 | 6 | | 5 | 7 | | | | 5 |
| | | 13.7% | 9.2% | | 20.8% | 43.8% | | | | 33.3% |
| | Not Very Important | 4 | | | | | | | | |
| | | 1.5% | | | | | | | | |
| | Not Relevant | 12 | 2 | | 1 | | | | | 3 |
| | | 4.4% | 3.1% | | 4.2% | | | | | 20.0% |
| | Refused | 6 | | | 2 | | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | 2.2% | | | 8.3% | | | 3.7% | | 6.7% |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 | 15 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff is always available to meet my needs/address my concerns.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Satisfaction with Availability | Far Exceeds Expectations | 64 | 7 | 3 | 7 | 5 | 3 | 11 | 3 |
| | | 23.6% | 10.8% | 37.5% | 29.2% | 31.3% | 60.0% | 40.7% | 75.0% |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 88 | 27 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 1 | 9 | 1 |
| | | 32.5% | 41.5% | 62.5% | 25.0% | 37.5% | 20.0% | 33.3% | 25.0% |
| | Meets Expectations | 89 | 26 | | 9 | 5 | | 7 | |
| | | 32.8% | 40.0% | | 37.5% | 31.3% | | 25.9% | |
| | Below Expectations | 15 | 4 | | | | | | |
| | | 5.5% | 6.2% | | | | | | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 8 | | | | | 1 | | |
| | | 3.0% | | | | | 20.0% | | |
| | Refused | 7 | 1 | | 2 | | | | |
| | | 2.6% | 1.5% | | 8.3% | | | | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff is always available to meet my needs/address my concerns.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Availability | Far Exceeds Expectations | 6<br>40.0% | 7<br>22.6% | 8<br>15.4% | 3<br>17.6% | 1<br>14.3% |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 3<br>20.0% | 9<br>29.0% | 16<br>30.8% | 3<br>17.6% | 2<br>28.6% |
| | Meets Expectations | 4<br>26.7% | 9<br>29.0% | 21<br>40.4% | 6<br>35.3% | 2<br>28.6% |
| | Below Expectations | | 5<br>16.1% | 2<br>3.8% | 4<br>23.5% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 1<br>6.7% | 1<br>3.2% | 3<br>5.8% | 1<br>5.9% | 1<br>14.3% |
| | Refused | 1<br>6.7% | | 2<br>3.8% | | 1<br>14.3% |
| Total | | 15<br>100.0% | 31<br>100.0% | 52<br>100.0% | 17<br>100.0% | 7<br>100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff is responsive to issues and questions.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Satisfaction with Responsiveness | Far Exceeds Expectations | 62 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 12 | |
| | | 22.9% | 10.8% | 50.0% | 25.0% | 37.5% | 60.0% | 44.4% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 97 | 29 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 8 | 4 |
| | | 35.8% | 44.6% | 50.0% | 33.3% | 31.3% | 20.0% | 29.6% | 100.0% |
| | Meets Expectations | 87 | 27 | | 8 | 5 | | 7 | |
| | | 32.1% | 41.5% | | 33.3% | 31.3% | | 25.9% | |
| | Below Expectations | 11 | 2 | | | | | | |
| | | 4.1% | 3.1% | | | | | | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 8 | | | | | 1 | | |
| | | 3.0% | | | | | 20.0% | | |
| | Refused | 6 | | | 2 | | | | |
| | | 2.2% | | | 8.3% | | | | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff is responsive to issues and questions.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Responsiveness | Far Exceeds Expectations | 4<br>26.7% | 7<br>22.6% | 9<br>17.3% | 3<br>17.6% | 1<br>14.3% |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 6<br>40.0% | 9<br>29.0% | 18<br>34.6% | 3<br>17.6% | 2<br>28.6% |
| | Meets Expectations | 3<br>20.0% | 10<br>32.3% | 18<br>34.6% | 7<br>41.2% | 2<br>28.6% |
| | Below Expectations | | 4<br>12.9% | 2<br>3.8% | 3<br>17.6% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 1<br>6.7% | 1<br>3.2% | 3<br>5.8% | 1<br>5.9% | 1<br>14.3% |
| | Refused | 1<br>6.7% | | 2<br>3.8% | | 1<br>14.3% |
| Total | | 15<br>100.0% | 31<br>100.0% | 52<br>100.0% | 17<br>100.0% | 7<br>100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff provides appropriate resolutions to issues and questions.**

| | | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Entire Sample | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Satisfaction with Resolving Issues | Far Exceeds Expectations | 55 | 8 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 9 | |
| | | 20.3% | 12.3% | 37.5% | 29.2% | 25.0% | 60.0% | 33.3% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 90 | 23 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 4 |
| | | 33.2% | 35.4% | 62.5% | 12.5% | 25.0% | 20.0% | 33.3% | 100.0% |
| | Meets Expectations | 96 | 32 | | 12 | 7 | | 8 | |
| | | 35.4% | 49.2% | | 50.0% | 43.8% | | 29.6% | |
| | Below Expectations | 12 | 1 | | | | | | |
| | | 4.4% | 1.5% | | | | | | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 10 | 1 | | | 1 | 1 | | |
| | | 3.7% | 1.5% | | | 6.3% | 20.0% | | |
| | Refused | 8 | | | 2 | | | 1 | |
| | | 3.0% | | | 8.3% | | | 3.7% | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff provides appropriate resolutions to issues and questions.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Resolving Issues | Far Exceeds Expectations | 4<br>26.7% | 5<br>16.1% | 9<br>17.3% | 3<br>17.6% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 6<br>40.0% | 11<br>35.5% | 17<br>32.7% | 4<br>23.5% | 3<br>42.9% |
| | Meets Expectations | 3<br>20.0% | 9<br>29.0% | 17<br>32.7% | 6<br>35.3% | 2<br>28.6% |
| | Below Expectations | | 4<br>12.9% | 4<br>7.7% | 3<br>17.6% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 1<br>6.7% | 1<br>3.2% | 3<br>5.8% | 1<br>5.9% | 1<br>14.3% |
| | Refused | 1<br>6.7% | 1<br>3.2% | 2<br>3.8% | | 1<br>14.3% |
| Total | | 15<br>100.0% | 31<br>100.0% | 52<br>100.0% | 17<br>100.0% | 7<br>100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff is responsive to urgent requests.**

| | | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Entire Sample | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Satisfaction with Response to Urgent Requests | Far Exceeds Expectations | 72 | 10 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 13 | 1 |
| | | 26.6% | 15.4% | 62.5% | 25.0% | 43.8% | 80.0% | 48.1% | 25.0% |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 82 | 20 | 3 | 5 | 6 | | 8 | 3 |
| | | 30.3% | 30.8% | 37.5% | 20.8% | 37.5% | | 29.6% | 75.0% |
| | Meets Expectations | 78 | 29 | | 11 | 2 | | 5 | |
| | | 28.8% | 44.6% | | 45.8% | 12.5% | | 18.5% | |
| | Below Expectations | 19 | 4 | | | | | 1 | |
| | | 7.0% | 6.2% | | | | | 3.7% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 14 | 2 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| | | 5.2% | 3.1% | | 4.2% | 6.3% | 20.0% | | |
| | Refused | 6 | | | 1 | | | | |
| | | 2.2% | | | 4.2% | | | | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff is responsive to urgent requests.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Response to Urgent Requests | Far Exceeds Expectations | 5<br>33.3% | 7<br>22.6% | 8<br>15.4% | 6<br>35.3% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 5<br>33.3% | 11<br>35.5% | 17<br>32.7% | 1<br>5.9% | 3<br>42.9% |
| | Meets Expectations | 3<br>20.0% | 7<br>22.6% | 16<br>30.8% | 3<br>17.6% | 2<br>28.6% |
| | Below Expectations | | 3<br>9.7% | 5<br>9.6% | 6<br>35.3% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 1<br>6.7% | 3<br>9.7% | 3<br>5.8% | 1<br>5.9% | 1<br>14.3% |
| | Refused | 1<br>6.7% | | 3<br>5.8% | | 1<br>14.3% |
| Total | | 15<br>100.0% | 31<br>100.0% | 52<br>100.0% | 17<br>100.0% | 7<br>100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff is sensitive to the confidential nature of some printing projects.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Satisfaction with Sensitivity to Confidentiality | Far Exceeds Expectations | 43 | 6 | | 1 | 5 | 4 | 10 | 1 |
| | | 15.9% | 9.2% | | 4.2% | 31.3% | 80.0% | 37.0% | 25.0% |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 54 | 12 | 3 | 8 | 6 | | 4 | 2 |
| | | 19.9% | 18.5% | 37.5% | 33.3% | 37.5% | | 14.8% | 50.0% |
| | Meets Expectations | 86 | 27 | | 9 | 2 | | 8 | 1 |
| | | 31.7% | 41.5% | | 37.5% | 12.5% | | 29.6% | 25.0% |
| | Below Expectations | 2 | | | | | | | |
| | | .7% | | | | | | | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 81 | 20 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 5 | |
| | | 29.9% | 30.8% | 62.5% | 20.8% | 18.8% | 20.0% | 18.5% | |
| | Refused | 5 | | | 1 | | | | |
| | | 1.8% | | | 4.2% | | | | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff is sensitive to the confidential nature of some printing projects.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Sensitivity to Confidentiality | Far Exceeds Expectations | 2<br>13.3% | 4<br>12.9% | 7<br>13.5% | 3<br>17.6% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 3<br>20.0% | 6<br>19.4% | 6<br>11.5% | 3<br>17.6% | 1<br>14.3% |
| | Meets Expectations | 5<br>33.3% | 9<br>29.0% | 18<br>34.6% | 5<br>29.4% | 2<br>28.6% |
| | Below Expectations | | | 2<br>3.8% | | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 4<br>26.7% | 12<br>38.7% | 17<br>32.7% | 6<br>35.3% | 3<br>42.9% |
| | Refused | 1<br>6.7% | | 2<br>3.8% | | 1<br>14.3% |
| Total | | 15<br>100.0% | 31<br>100.0% | 52<br>100.0% | 17<br>100.0% | 7<br>100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff is proactive in addressing needs.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Satisfaction with Proactivity | Far Exceeds Expectations | 46 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 8 | 1 |
| | | 17.0% | 9.2% | 37.5% | 12.5% | 25.0% | 60.0% | 29.6% | 25.0% |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 73 | 21 | 5 | 6 | 4 | | 8 | 1 |
| | | 26.9% | 32.3% | 62.5% | 25.0% | 25.0% | | 29.6% | 25.0% |
| | Meets Expectations | 109 | 32 | | 12 | 6 | 1 | 10 | 2 |
| | | 40.2% | 49.2% | | 50.0% | 37.5% | 20.0% | 37.0% | 50.0% |
| | Below Expectations | 16 | 3 | | 2 | 1 | | | |
| | | 5.9% | 4.6% | | 8.3% | 6.3% | | | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 20 | 3 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| | | 7.4% | 4.6% | | | 6.3% | 20.0% | 3.7% | |
| | Refused | 7 | | | 1 | | | | |
| | | 2.6% | | | 4.2% | | | | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff is proactive in addressing needs.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Proactivity | Far Exceeds Expectations | 5<br>33.3% | 4<br>12.9% | 5<br>9.6% | 4<br>23.5% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 5<br>33.3% | 6<br>19.4% | 16<br>30.8% | 1<br>5.9% | |
| | Meets Expectations | 2<br>13.3% | 14<br>45.2% | 19<br>36.5% | 8<br>47.1% | 3<br>42.9% |
| | Below Expectations | | 4<br>12.9% | 4<br>7.7% | 2<br>11.8% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 2<br>13.3% | 2<br>6.5% | 5<br>9.6% | 2<br>11.8% | 3<br>42.9% |
| | Refused | 1<br>6.7% | 1<br>3.2% | 3<br>5.8% | | 1<br>14.3% |
| Total | | 15<br>100.0% | 31<br>100.0% | 52<br>100.0% | 17<br>100.0% | 7<br>100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff provides innovative solutions to needs.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Satisfaction with Innovation | Far Exceeds Expectations | 47 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 10 | |
| | | 17.3% | 9.2% | 50.0% | 16.7% | 25.0% | 60.0% | 37.0% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 67 | 23 | 3 | 4 | 2 | | 4 | 4 |
| | | 24.7% | 35.4% | 37.5% | 16.7% | 12.5% | | 14.8% | 100.0% |
| | Meets Expectations | 115 | 28 | 1 | 12 | 8 | 1 | 13 | |
| | | 42.4% | 43.1% | 12.5% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 20.0% | 48.1% | |
| | Below Expectations | 13 | 3 | | 1 | | | | |
| | | 4.8% | 4.6% | | 4.2% | | | | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 23 | 5 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | | |
| | | 8.5% | 7.7% | | 8.3% | 6.3% | 20.0% | | |
| | Refused | 6 | | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| | | 2.2% | | | 4.2% | 6.3% | | | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff provides innovative solutions to needs.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Innovation | Far Exceeds Expectations | 2<br>13.3% | 4<br>12.9% | 7<br>13.5% | 3<br>17.6% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 7<br>46.7% | 6<br>19.4% | 11<br>21.2% | 3<br>17.6% | |
| | Meets Expectations | 3<br>20.0% | 12<br>38.7% | 26<br>50.0% | 7<br>41.2% | 4<br>57.1% |
| | Below Expectations | | 5<br>16.1% | 2<br>3.8% | 2<br>11.8% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 2<br>13.3% | 4<br>12.9% | 4<br>7.7% | 2<br>11.8% | 2<br>28.6% |
| | Refused | 1<br>6.7% | | 2<br>3.8% | | 1<br>14.3% |
| Total | | 15<br>100.0% | 31<br>100.0% | 52<br>100.0% | 17<br>100.0% | 7<br>100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff effectively interacts with me concerning my project.**

| | | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Entire Sample | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Satisfaction with Effective Interaction | Far Exceeds Expectations | 66 | 12 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 11 | 1 |
| | | 24.4% | 18.5% | 50.0% | 29.2% | 18.8% | 60.0% | 40.7% | 25.0% |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 78 | 23 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 9 | 1 |
| | | 28.8% | 35.4% | 12.5% | 20.8% | 25.0% | 20.0% | 33.3% | 25.0% |
| | Meets Expectations | 93 | 25 | 3 | 9 | 6 | | 6 | 2 |
| | | 34.3% | 38.5% | 37.5% | 37.5% | 37.5% | | 22.2% | 50.0% |
| | Below Expectations | 13 | 2 | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| | | 4.8% | 3.1% | | 4.2% | | | 3.7% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 14 | 3 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| | | 5.2% | 4.6% | | 4.2% | 6.3% | 20.0% | | |
| | Refused | 7 | | | 1 | 2 | | | |
| | | 2.6% | | | 4.2% | 12.5% | | | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff effectively interacts with me concerning my project.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Effective Interaction | Far Exceeds Expectations | 5 | 6 | 10 | 4 | |
| | | 33.3% | 19.4% | 19.2% | 23.5% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 4 | 9 | 16 | 3 | 2 |
| | | 26.7% | 29.0% | 30.8% | 17.6% | 28.6% |
| | Meets Expectations | 4 | 12 | 20 | 4 | 2 |
| | | 26.7% | 38.7% | 38.5% | 23.5% | 28.6% |
| | Below Expectations | | 3 | 1 | 5 | |
| | | | 9.7% | 1.9% | 29.4% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 |
| | | 6.7% | 3.2% | 5.8% | 5.9% | 28.6% |
| | Refused | 1 | | 2 | | 1 |
| | | 6.7% | | 3.8% | | 14.3% |
| Total | | 15 | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff makes decisions to help with aesthetics of final project.**

| | | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Entire Sample | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Satisfaction with Help with Aesthetics | Far Exceeds Expectations | 42 | 7 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 1 |
| | | 15.5% | 10.8% | 25.0% | 29.2% | 18.8% | 60.0% | 22.2% | 25.0% |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 79 | 21 | 4 | 3 | 5 | | 8 | 1 |
| | | 29.2% | 32.3% | 50.0% | 12.5% | 31.3% | | 29.6% | 25.0% |
| | Meets Expectations | 100 | 27 | 2 | 10 | 5 | 1 | 11 | 2 |
| | | 36.9% | 41.5% | 25.0% | 41.7% | 31.3% | 20.0% | 40.7% | 50.0% |
| | Below Expectations | 10 | 3 | | | | | | |
| | | 3.7% | 4.6% | | | | | | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 32 | 7 | | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | |
| | | 11.8% | 10.8% | | 12.5% | 18.8% | 20.0% | 7.4% | |
| | Refused | 8 | | | 1 | | | | |
| | | 3.0% | | | 4.2% | | | | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff makes decisions to help with aesthetics of final project.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Help with Aesthetics | Far Exceeds Expectations | 2<br>13.3% | 4<br>12.9% | 6<br>11.5% | 1<br>5.9% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 7<br>46.7% | 7<br>22.6% | 16<br>30.8% | 6<br>35.3% | 1<br>14.3% |
| | Meets Expectations | 4<br>26.7% | 11<br>35.5% | 21<br>40.4% | 4<br>23.5% | 2<br>28.6% |
| | Below Expectations | | 4<br>12.9% | 1<br>1.9% | 2<br>11.8% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 1<br>6.7% | 4<br>12.9% | 6<br>11.5% | 3<br>17.6% | 2<br>28.6% |
| | Refused | 1<br>6.7% | 1<br>3.2% | 2<br>3.8% | 1<br>5.9% | 2<br>28.6% |
| Total | | 15<br>100.0% | 31<br>100.0% | 52<br>100.0% | 17<br>100.0% | 7<br>100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Quality and professionalism of print shop/copy center staff.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Satisfaction with Staff Professionalism | Far Exceeds Expectations | 68 | 13 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 11 | 2 |
| | | 25.1% | 20.0% | 50.0% | 25.0% | 43.8% | 20.0% | 40.7% | 50.0% |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 98 | 27 | 3 | 10 | 6 | 1 | 9 | 2 |
| | | 36.2% | 41.5% | 37.5% | 41.7% | 37.5% | 20.0% | 33.3% | 50.0% |
| | Meets Expectations | 79 | 23 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 6 | |
| | | 29.2% | 35.4% | 12.5% | 29.2% | 18.8% | 40.0% | 22.2% | |
| | Below Expectations | 9 | | | | | | 1 | |
| | | 3.3% | | | | | | 3.7% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 9 | 1 | | | | 1 | | |
| | | 3.3% | 1.5% | | | | 20.0% | | |
| | Refused | 8 | 1 | | 1 | | | | |
| | | 3.0% | 1.5% | | 4.2% | | | | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Quality and professionalism of print shop/copy center staff.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Staff Professionalism | Far Exceeds Expectations | 6 | 4 | 10 | 4 | |
| | | 40.0% | 12.9% | 19.2% | 23.5% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 5 | 13 | 15 | 3 | 4 |
| | | 33.3% | 41.9% | 28.8% | 17.6% | 57.1% |
| | Meets Expectations | 2 | 9 | 18 | 7 | 1 |
| | | 13.3% | 29.0% | 34.6% | 41.2% | 14.3% |
| | Below Expectations | | 4 | 2 | 2 | |
| | | | 12.9% | 3.8% | 11.8% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 6.7% | 3.2% | 5.8% | 5.9% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 1 | | 4 | | 1 |
| | | 6.7% | | 7.7% | | 14.3% |
| Total | | 15 | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Meeting the requested turnaround time, from the point the project is given to the print shop/copy center until the time it is completed and returned.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Satisfaction with Meeting Turnaround Time | Far Exceeds Expectations | 58 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 12 | 1 |
| | | 21.4% | 6.2% | 62.5% | 20.8% | 37.5% | 60.0% | 44.4% | 25.0% |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 70 | 22 | 2 | 6 | 4 | | 6 | 2 |
| | | 25.8% | 33.8% | 25.0% | 25.0% | 25.0% | | 22.2% | 50.0% |
| | Meets Expectations | 102 | 32 | 1 | 11 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 1 |
| | | 37.6% | 49.2% | 12.5% | 45.8% | 25.0% | 20.0% | 25.9% | 25.0% |
| | Below Expectations | 24 | 7 | | | 1 | | 2 | |
| | | 8.9% | 10.8% | | | 6.3% | | 7.4% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 10 | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| | | 3.7% | | | 4.2% | 6.3% | 20.0% | | |
| | Refused | 7 | | | 1 | | | | |
| | | 2.6% | | | 4.2% | | | | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Meeting the requested turnaround time, from the point the project is given to the print shop/copy center until the time it is completed and returned.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Meeting Turnaround Time | Far Exceeds Expectations | 5 | 7 | 8 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 33.3% | 22.6% | 15.4% | 5.9% | 14.3% |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 3 | 8 | 12 | 4 | 1 |
| | | 20.0% | 25.8% | 23.1% | 23.5% | 14.3% |
| | Meets Expectations | 5 | 11 | 20 | 6 | 3 |
| | | 33.3% | 35.5% | 38.5% | 35.3% | 42.9% |
| | Below Expectations | | 4 | 5 | 5 | |
| | | | 12.9% | 9.6% | 29.4% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 6.7% | 3.2% | 5.8% | 5.9% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 1 | | 4 | | 1 |
| | | 6.7% | | 7.7% | | 14.3% |
| Total | | 15 | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff makes me aware when my requested turnaround time cannot be met.**

| | | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Entire Sample | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Satisfaction with Knowing Time Cannot Be Met | Far Exceeds Expectations | 39 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 5 | | 9 | |
| | | 14.4% | 6.2% | 62.5% | 4.2% | 31.3% | | 33.3% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 79 | 20 | 1 | 8 | 5 | 2 | 8 | 2 |
| | | 29.2% | 30.8% | 12.5% | 33.3% | 31.3% | 40.0% | 29.6% | 50.0% |
| | Meets Expectations | 88 | 21 | 2 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 8 | 2 |
| | | 32.5% | 32.3% | 25.0% | 41.7% | 25.0% | 20.0% | 29.6% | 50.0% |
| | Below Expectations | 40 | 16 | | 2 | 1 | | 2 | |
| | | 14.8% | 24.6% | | 8.3% | 6.3% | | 7.4% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 17 | 3 | | 2 | 1 | 1 | | |
| | | 6.3% | 4.6% | | 8.3% | 6.3% | 20.0% | | |
| | Refused | 8 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| | | 3.0% | 1.5% | | 4.2% | | 20.0% | | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff makes me aware when my requested turnaround time cannot be met.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Knowing Time Cannot Be Met | Far Exceeds Expectations | 4<br>26.7% | 4<br>12.9% | 4<br>7.7% | 3<br>17.6% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 3<br>20.0% | 9<br>29.0% | 14<br>26.9% | 4<br>23.5% | 3<br>42.9% |
| | Meets Expectations | 5<br>33.3% | 10<br>32.3% | 19<br>36.5% | 4<br>23.5% | 2<br>28.6% |
| | Below Expectations | | 6<br>19.4% | 8<br>15.4% | 5<br>29.4% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 2<br>13.3% | 2<br>6.5% | 4<br>7.7% | 1<br>5.9% | 1<br>14.3% |
| | Refused | 1<br>6.7% | | 3<br>5.8% | | 1<br>14.3% |
| Total | | 15<br>100.0% | 31<br>100.0% | 52<br>100.0% | 17<br>100.0% | 7<br>100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff meets short lead times.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Satisfaction with Meeting Short Lead Times | Far Exceeds Expectations | 62 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 13 | 1 |
| | | 22.9% | 12.3% | 62.5% | 25.0% | 37.5% | 40.0% | 48.1% | 25.0% |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 69 | 20 | 2 | 6 | 5 | | 6 | 3 |
| | | 25.5% | 30.8% | 25.0% | 25.0% | 31.3% | | 22.2% | 75.0% |
| | Meets Expectations | 93 | 30 | 1 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 7 | |
| | | 34.3% | 46.2% | 12.5% | 33.3% | 31.3% | 20.0% | 25.9% | |
| | Below Expectations | 21 | 4 | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| | | 7.7% | 6.2% | | 4.2% | | | 3.7% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 18 | 3 | | 2 | | 1 | | |
| | | 6.6% | 4.6% | | 8.3% | | 20.0% | | |
| | Refused | 8 | | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| | | 3.0% | | | 4.2% | | 20.0% | | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff meets short lead times.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Meeting Short Lead Times | Far Exceeds Expectations | 5<br>33.3% | 5<br>16.1% | 6<br>11.5% | 3<br>17.6% | 2<br>28.6% |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 3<br>20.0% | 8<br>25.8% | 14<br>26.9% | 2<br>11.8% | |
| | Meets Expectations | 5<br>33.3% | 12<br>38.7% | 18<br>34.6% | 4<br>23.5% | 2<br>28.6% |
| | Below Expectations | | 3<br>9.7% | 6<br>11.5% | 6<br>35.3% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 1<br>6.7% | 3<br>9.7% | 4<br>7.7% | 2<br>11.8% | 2<br>28.6% |
| | Refused | 1<br>6.7% | | 4<br>7.7% | | 1<br>14.3% |
| Total | | 15<br>100.0% | 31<br>100.0% | 52<br>100.0% | 17<br>100.0% | 7<br>100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff is responsive to requests of late night/overnight projects.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Satisfaction with Response to Late Night Projects | Far Exceeds Expectations | 34 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 8 | |
| | | 12.5% | 9.2% | 25.0% | 8.3% | 31.3% | 60.0% | 29.6% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 42 | 11 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 |
| | | 15.5% | 16.9% | 37.5% | 12.5% | 12.5% | 20.0% | 14.8% | 50.0% |
| | Meets Expectations | 71 | 15 | | 9 | 5 | | 7 | 2 |
| | | 26.2% | 23.1% | | 37.5% | 31.3% | | 25.9% | 50.0% |
| | Below Expectations | 18 | 4 | | | | | | |
| | | 6.6% | 6.2% | | | | | | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 99 | 29 | 3 | 9 | 4 | 1 | 8 | |
| | | 36.5% | 44.6% | 37.5% | 37.5% | 25.0% | 20.0% | 29.6% | |
| | Refused | 7 | | | 1 | | | | |
| | | 2.6% | | | 4.2% | | | | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff is responsive to requests of late night/overnight projects.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Response to Late Night Projects | Far Exceeds Expectations | 2<br>13.3% | 2<br>6.5% | 2<br>3.8% | 2<br>11.8% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 1<br>6.7% | 4<br>12.9% | 6<br>11.5% | 3<br>17.6% | 2<br>28.6% |
| | Meets Expectations | 6<br>40.0% | 8<br>25.8% | 16<br>30.8% | 1<br>5.9% | 2<br>28.6% |
| | Below Expectations | | 3<br>9.7% | 7<br>13.5% | 4<br>23.5% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 5<br>33.3% | 14<br>45.2% | 17<br>32.7% | 7<br>41.2% | 2<br>28.6% |
| | Refused | 1<br>6.7% | | 4<br>7.7% | | 1<br>14.3% |
| Total | | 15<br>100.0% | 31<br>100.0% | 52<br>100.0% | 17<br>100.0% | 7<br>100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff uses technology to help complete job quickly.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Satisfaction with Use of Technology | Far Exceeds Expectations | 54 | 8 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 2 |
| | | 19.9% | 12.3% | 25.0% | 16.7% | 31.3% | 60.0% | 25.9% | 50.0% |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 67 | 22 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 1 |
| | | 24.7% | 33.8% | 12.5% | 20.8% | 18.8% | 20.0% | 25.9% | 25.0% |
| | Meets Expectations | 102 | 25 | 2 | 9 | 7 | | 9 | 1 |
| | | 37.6% | 38.5% | 25.0% | 37.5% | 43.8% | | 33.3% | 25.0% |
| | Below Expectations | 17 | 4 | 1 | 1 | | | 3 | |
| | | 6.3% | 6.2% | 12.5% | 4.2% | | | 11.1% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 22 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| | | 8.1% | 9.2% | 12.5% | 16.7% | 6.3% | 20.0% | 3.7% | |
| | Refused | 9 | | 1 | 1 | | | | |
| | | 3.3% | | 12.5% | 4.2% | | | | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff uses technology to help complete job quickly.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Use of Technology | Far Exceeds Expectations | 5 | 3 | 11 | 4 | |
| | | 33.3% | 9.7% | 21.2% | 23.5% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 3 | 7 | 11 | 3 | 3 |
| | | 20.0% | 22.6% | 21.2% | 17.6% | 42.9% |
| | Meets Expectations | 5 | 13 | 22 | 7 | 2 |
| | | 33.3% | 41.9% | 42.3% | 41.2% | 28.6% |
| | Below Expectations | | 6 | 1 | 1 | |
| | | | 19.4% | 1.9% | 5.9% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 6.7% | 3.2% | 7.7% | 5.9% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 6.7% | 3.2% | 5.8% | 5.9% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 15 | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Jobs are delivered according to agreed upon timeframes.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Satisfaction with Delivering Jobs On Time | Far Exceeds Expectations | 58 | 6 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 9 | 1 |
| | | 21.4% | 9.2% | 50.0% | 25.0% | 37.5% | 60.0% | 33.3% | 25.0% |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 59 | 14 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 1 |
| | | 21.8% | 21.5% | 25.0% | 16.7% | 25.0% | 20.0% | 25.9% | 25.0% |
| | Meets Expectations | 97 | 27 | 2 | 11 | 4 | | 9 | 2 |
| | | 35.8% | 41.5% | 25.0% | 45.8% | 25.0% | | 33.3% | 50.0% |
| | Below Expectations | 37 | 17 | | | 1 | | 2 | |
| | | 13.7% | 26.2% | | | 6.3% | | 7.4% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 11 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| | | 4.1% | 1.5% | | 4.2% | 6.3% | 20.0% | | |
| | Refused | 9 | | | 2 | | | | |
| | | 3.3% | | | 8.3% | | | | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Jobs are delivered according to agreed upon timeframes.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Delivering Jobs On Time | Far Exceeds Expectations | 5 | 5 | 10 | 2 | 1 |
| | | 33.3% | 16.1% | 19.2% | 11.8% | 14.3% |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 4 | 7 | 11 | 3 | 1 |
| | | 26.7% | 22.6% | 21.2% | 17.6% | 14.3% |
| | Meets Expectations | 4 | 12 | 20 | 3 | 3 |
| | | 26.7% | 38.7% | 38.5% | 17.6% | 42.9% |
| | Below Expectations | | 5 | 4 | 8 | |
| | | | 16.1% | 7.7% | 47.1% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 6.7% | 3.2% | 5.8% | 5.9% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 1 | 1 | 4 | | 1 |
| | | 6.7% | 3.2% | 7.7% | | 14.3% |
| Total | | 15 | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff understands my printing needs.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Satisfaction with Having Needs Understood | Far Exceeds Expectations | 46 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 8 | 1 |
| | | 17.0% | 10.8% | 50.0% | 4.2% | 25.0% | 20.0% | 29.6% | 25.0% |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 92 | 25 | 2 | 8 | 7 | 3 | 9 | 3 |
| | | 33.9% | 38.5% | 25.0% | 33.3% | 43.8% | 60.0% | 33.3% | 75.0% |
| | Meets Expectations | 103 | 30 | 2 | 12 | 5 | | 9 | |
| | | 38.0% | 46.2% | 25.0% | 50.0% | 31.3% | | 33.3% | |
| | Below Expectations | 11 | 2 | | | | | 1 | |
| | | 4.1% | 3.1% | | | | | 3.7% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 10 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| | | 3.7% | 1.5% | | 4.2% | | 20.0% | | |
| | Refused | 9 | | | 2 | | | | |
| | | 3.3% | | | 8.3% | | | | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff understands my printing needs.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Having Needs Understood | Far Exceeds Expectations | 5<br>33.3% | 4<br>12.9% | 6<br>11.5% | 5<br>29.4% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 2<br>13.3% | 8<br>25.8% | 20<br>38.5% | 2<br>11.8% | 3<br>42.9% |
| | Meets Expectations | 6<br>40.0% | 12<br>38.7% | 18<br>34.6% | 7<br>41.2% | 2<br>28.6% |
| | Below Expectations | | 5<br>16.1% | 1<br>1.9% | 2<br>11.8% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 1<br>6.7% | 1<br>3.2% | 3<br>5.8% | 1<br>5.9% | 1<br>14.3% |
| | Refused | 1<br>6.7% | 1<br>3.2% | 4<br>7.7% | | 1<br>14.3% |
| Total | | 15<br>100.0% | 31<br>100.0% | 52<br>100.0% | 17<br>100.0% | 7<br>100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff helps outline deliverables/expectations at the time of initial request.**

| | | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Entire Sample | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Satisfaction with Help Outlining Deliverables | Far Exceeds Expectations | 45 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 2 |
| | | 16.6% | 7.7% | 37.5% | 12.5% | 31.3% | 60.0% | 29.6% | 50.0% |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 74 | 19 | 3 | 5 | 5 | | 7 | 1 |
| | | 27.3% | 29.2% | 37.5% | 20.8% | 31.3% | | 25.9% | 25.0% |
| | Meets Expectations | 103 | 30 | 1 | 11 | 4 | 1 | 10 | 1 |
| | | 38.0% | 46.2% | 12.5% | 45.8% | 25.0% | 20.0% | 37.0% | 25.0% |
| | Below Expectations | 20 | 5 | | 2 | 1 | | 1 | |
| | | 7.4% | 7.7% | | 8.3% | 6.3% | | 3.7% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 22 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | |
| | | 8.1% | 7.7% | 12.5% | 8.3% | 6.3% | 20.0% | 3.7% | |
| | Refused | 7 | 1 | | 1 | | | | |
| | | 2.6% | 1.5% | | 4.2% | | | | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff helps outline deliverables/expectations at the time of initial request.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Help Outlining Deliverables | Far Exceeds Expectations | 4<br>26.7% | 4<br>12.9% | 7<br>13.5% | 1<br>5.9% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 5<br>33.3% | 7<br>22.6% | 16<br>30.8% | 5<br>29.4% | 1<br>14.3% |
| | Meets Expectations | 4<br>26.7% | 15<br>48.4% | 19<br>36.5% | 4<br>23.5% | 3<br>42.9% |
| | Below Expectations | | 4<br>12.9% | 2<br>3.8% | 5<br>29.4% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 1<br>6.7% | 1<br>3.2% | 5<br>9.6% | 2<br>11.8% | 2<br>28.6% |
| | Refused | 1<br>6.7% | | 3<br>5.8% | | 1<br>14.3% |
| Total | | 15<br>100.0% | 31<br>100.0% | 52<br>100.0% | 17<br>100.0% | 7<br>100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Jobs are delivered according to specifications the first time.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Satisfaction with Meeting Specifications | Far Exceeds Expectations | 55 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 2 |
| | | 20.3% | 7.7% | 62.5% | 16.7% | 37.5% | 60.0% | 22.2% | 50.0% |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 72 | 21 | 1 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 9 | 2 |
| | | 26.6% | 32.3% | 12.5% | 20.8% | 43.8% | 20.0% | 33.3% | 50.0% |
| | Meets Expectations | 101 | 27 | 2 | 12 | 2 | | 9 | |
| | | 37.3% | 41.5% | 25.0% | 50.0% | 12.5% | | 33.3% | |
| | Below Expectations | 26 | 12 | | 1 | 1 | | 2 | |
| | | 9.6% | 18.5% | | 4.2% | 6.3% | | 7.4% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 9 | | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| | | 3.3% | | | 4.2% | | 20.0% | | |
| | Refused | 8 | | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| | | 3.0% | | | 4.2% | | | 3.7% | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Jobs are delivered according to specifications the first time.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Meeting Specifications | Far Exceeds Expectations | 5 | 7 | 9 | 3 | |
| | | 33.3% | 22.6% | 17.3% | 17.6% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 5 | 5 | 12 | 3 | 1 |
| | | 33.3% | 16.1% | 23.1% | 17.6% | 14.3% |
| | Meets Expectations | 3 | 15 | 20 | 7 | 4 |
| | | 20.0% | 48.4% | 38.5% | 41.2% | 57.1% |
| | Below Expectations | | 3 | 4 | 3 | |
| | | | 9.7% | 7.7% | 17.6% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 6.7% | 3.2% | 5.8% | 5.9% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 1 | | 4 | | 1 |
| | | 6.7% | | 7.7% | | 14.3% |
| Total | | 15 | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Overall, finished jobs are of high quality.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Satisfaction with Quality of Jobs | Far Exceeds Expectations | 69 | 10 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 2 | 10 | 2 |
| | | 25.5% | 15.4% | 50.0% | 29.2% | 37.5% | 40.0% | 37.0% | 50.0% |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 70 | 21 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 9 | 2 |
| | | 25.8% | 32.3% | 25.0% | 8.3% | 37.5% | 20.0% | 33.3% | 50.0% |
| | Meets Expectations | 102 | 30 | 2 | 12 | 4 | 1 | 8 | |
| | | 37.6% | 46.2% | 25.0% | 50.0% | 25.0% | 20.0% | 29.6% | |
| | Below Expectations | 13 | 4 | | 1 | | | | |
| | | 4.8% | 6.2% | | 4.2% | | | | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 9 | | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| | | 3.3% | | | 4.2% | | 20.0% | | |
| | Refused | 8 | | | 1 | | | | |
| | | 3.0% | | | 4.2% | | | | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Overall, finished jobs are of high quality.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Quality of Jobs | Far Exceeds Expectations | 6 | 7 | 10 | 5 | |
| | | 40.0% | 22.6% | 19.2% | 29.4% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 5 | 7 | 12 | 2 | 1 |
| | | 33.3% | 22.6% | 23.1% | 11.8% | 14.3% |
| | Meets Expectations | 2 | 11 | 21 | 7 | 4 |
| | | 13.3% | 35.5% | 40.4% | 41.2% | 57.1% |
| | Below Expectations | | 5 | 1 | 2 | |
| | | | 16.1% | 1.9% | 11.8% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 6.7% | 3.2% | 5.8% | 5.9% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 1 | | 5 | | 1 |
| | | 6.7% | | 9.6% | | 14.3% |
| Total | | 15 | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Availability of black and white copy services.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Satisfaction with Black and White Services | Far Exceeds Expectations | 61 | 7 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 11 | |
| | | 22.5% | 10.8% | 50.0% | 12.5% | 37.5% | 60.0% | 40.7% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 70 | 22 | 2 | 7 | 5 | | 10 | 1 |
| | | 25.8% | 33.8% | 25.0% | 29.2% | 31.3% | | 37.0% | 25.0% |
| | Meets Expectations | 110 | 30 | 2 | 12 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 3 |
| | | 40.6% | 46.2% | 25.0% | 50.0% | 31.3% | 20.0% | 22.2% | 75.0% |
| | Below Expectations | 2 | | | | | | | |
| | | .7% | | | | | | | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 21 | 6 | | 1 | | 1 | | |
| | | 7.7% | 9.2% | | 4.2% | | 20.0% | | |
| | Refused | 7 | | | 1 | | | | |
| | | 2.6% | | | 4.2% | | | | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Availability of black and white copy services.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Black and White Services | Far Exceeds Expectations | 6 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 1 |
| | | 40.0% | 22.6% | 15.4% | 29.4% | 14.3% |
| | Exceeds Expectations | | 6 | 12 | 4 | 1 |
| | | | 19.4% | 23.1% | 23.5% | 14.3% |
| | Meets Expectations | 6 | 11 | 24 | 7 | 3 |
| | | 40.0% | 35.5% | 46.2% | 41.2% | 42.9% |
| | Below Expectations | | 1 | 1 | | |
| | | | 3.2% | 1.9% | | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 1 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 6.7% | 19.4% | 7.7% | 5.9% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 2 | | 3 | | 1 |
| | | 13.3% | | 5.8% | | 14.3% |
| Total | | 15 | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Availability of color copy services.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Satisfaction with Color Services | Far Exceeds Expectations | 47 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 10 | 1 |
| | | 17.3% | 10.8% | 25.0% | 12.5% | 25.0% | 20.0% | 37.0% | 25.0% |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 63 | 16 | 3 | 4 | 6 | | 8 | 2 |
| | | 23.2% | 24.6% | 37.5% | 16.7% | 37.5% | | 29.6% | 50.0% |
| | Meets Expectations | 102 | 32 | 1 | 12 | 3 | | 7 | 1 |
| | | 37.6% | 49.2% | 12.5% | 50.0% | 18.8% | | 25.9% | 25.0% |
| | Below Expectations | 20 | 3 | 1 | | 2 | 3 | | |
| | | 7.4% | 4.6% | 12.5% | | 12.5% | 60.0% | | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 31 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | |
| | | 11.4% | 9.2% | 12.5% | 12.5% | 6.3% | 20.0% | 7.4% | |
| | Refused | 8 | 1 | | 2 | | | | |
| | | 3.0% | 1.5% | | 8.3% | | | | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Availability of color copy services.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Color Services | Far Exceeds Expectations | 5<br>33.3% | 5<br>16.1% | 6<br>11.5% | 3<br>17.6% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 2<br>13.3% | 8<br>25.8% | 8<br>15.4% | 4<br>23.5% | 2<br>28.6% |
| | Meets Expectations | 6<br>40.0% | 10<br>32.3% | 22<br>42.3% | 7<br>41.2% | 1<br>14.3% |
| | Below Expectations | | 3<br>9.7% | 6<br>11.5% | 1<br>5.9% | 1<br>14.3% |
| | Far Below Expectations | 1<br>6.7% | 5<br>16.1% | 7<br>13.5% | 2<br>11.8% | 2<br>28.6% |
| | Refused | 1<br>6.7% | | 3<br>5.8% | | 1<br>14.3% |
| Total | | 15<br>100.0% | 31<br>100.0% | 52<br>100.0% | 17<br>100.0% | 7<br>100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Availability of offset printing services.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Satisfaction with Offset Printing Services | Far Exceeds Expectations | 29 | 8 | | 2 | 2 | 1 | 5 | |
| | | 10.7% | 12.3% | | 8.3% | 12.5% | 20.0% | 18.5% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 51 | 14 | 1 | 3 | 5 | | 5 | 1 |
| | | 18.8% | 21.5% | 12.5% | 12.5% | 31.3% | | 18.5% | 25.0% |
| | Meets Expectations | 100 | 32 | 3 | 11 | 3 | | 12 | 3 |
| | | 36.9% | 49.2% | 37.5% | 45.8% | 18.8% | | 44.4% | 75.0% |
| | Below Expectations | 9 | 2 | | | 1 | | | |
| | | 3.3% | 3.1% | | | 6.3% | | | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 71 | 8 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | |
| | | 26.2% | 12.3% | 50.0% | 20.8% | 31.3% | 80.0% | 14.8% | |
| | Refused | 11 | 1 | | 3 | | | 1 | |
| | | 4.1% | 1.5% | | 12.5% | | | 3.7% | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Availability of offset printing services.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Offset Printing Services | Far Exceeds Expectations | 4<br>26.7% | 2<br>6.5% | 5<br>9.6% | | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | | 8<br>25.8% | 12<br>23.1% | 2<br>11.8% | |
| | Meets Expectations | 5<br>33.3% | 10<br>32.3% | 17<br>32.7% | 3<br>17.6% | 1<br>14.3% |
| | Below Expectations | | 1<br>3.2% | 2<br>3.8% | 2<br>11.8% | 1<br>14.3% |
| | Far Below Expectations | 4<br>26.7% | 10<br>32.3% | 13<br>25.0% | 10<br>58.8% | 4<br>57.1% |
| | Refused | 2<br>13.3% | | 3<br>5.8% | | 1<br>14.3% |
| Total | | 15<br>100.0% | 31<br>100.0% | 52<br>100.0% | 17<br>100.0% | 7<br>100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Availability of finishing and binding operations.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Satisfaction with Finishing/Binding Operations | Far Exceeds Expectations | 37 | 6 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 6 | |
| | | 13.7% | 9.2% | 12.5% | 16.7% | 18.8% | 20.0% | 22.2% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 70 | 19 | 2 | 7 | 6 | | 9 | 1 |
| | | 25.8% | 29.2% | 25.0% | 29.2% | 37.5% | | 33.3% | 25.0% |
| | Meets Expectations | 111 | 38 | 2 | 7 | 5 | | 10 | 3 |
| | | 41.0% | 58.5% | 25.0% | 29.2% | 31.3% | | 37.0% | 75.0% |
| | Below Expectations | 14 | 1 | 3 | | 1 | 2 | 1 | |
| | | 5.2% | 1.5% | 37.5% | | 6.3% | 40.0% | 3.7% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 30 | 1 | | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | |
| | | 11.1% | 1.5% | | 20.8% | 6.3% | 40.0% | 3.7% | |
| | Refused | 9 | | | 1 | | | | |
| | | 3.3% | | | 4.2% | | | | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Availability of finishing and binding operations.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Finishing/Binding Operations | Far Exceeds Expectations | 5<br>33.3% | 3<br>9.7% | 5<br>9.6% | 2<br>11.8% | 1<br>14.3% |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 2<br>13.3% | 9<br>29.0% | 11<br>21.2% | 4<br>23.5% | |
| | Meets Expectations | 6<br>40.0% | 11<br>35.5% | 21<br>40.4% | 5<br>29.4% | 3<br>42.9% |
| | Below Expectations | | 1<br>3.2% | 1<br>1.9% | 3<br>17.6% | 1<br>14.3% |
| | Far Below Expectations | 1<br>6.7% | 7<br>22.6% | 8<br>15.4% | 3<br>17.6% | 1<br>14.3% |
| | Refused | 1<br>6.7% | | 6<br>11.5% | | 1<br>14.3% |
| Total | | 15<br>100.0% | 31<br>100.0% | 52<br>100.0% | 17<br>100.0% | 7<br>100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Ability to transfer files electronically.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Satisfaction with Electronic File Transfer | Far Exceeds Expectations | 38 | 9 | | 3 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 1 |
| | | 14.0% | 13.8% | | 12.5% | 12.5% | 80.0% | 22.2% | 25.0% |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 44 | 12 | 2 | 4 | 3 | | 7 | 2 |
| | | 16.2% | 18.5% | 25.0% | 16.7% | 18.8% | | 25.9% | 50.0% |
| | Meets Expectations | 98 | 30 | 2 | 8 | 5 | | 9 | 1 |
| | | 36.2% | 46.2% | 25.0% | 33.3% | 31.3% | | 33.3% | 25.0% |
| | Below Expectations | 32 | 7 | 2 | 1 | 2 | | 4 | |
| | | 11.8% | 10.8% | 25.0% | 4.2% | 12.5% | | 14.8% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 47 | 7 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 1 | | |
| | | 17.3% | 10.8% | 12.5% | 25.0% | 18.8% | 20.0% | | |
| | Refused | 12 | | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 1 | |
| | | 4.4% | | 12.5% | 8.3% | 6.3% | | 3.7% | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Ability to transfer files electronically.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Electronic File Transfer | Far Exceeds Expectations | 2 | 1 | 7 | 3 | |
| | | 13.3% | 3.2% | 13.5% | 17.6% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 1 | 4 | 4 | 5 | |
| | | 6.7% | 12.9% | 7.7% | 29.4% | |
| | Meets Expectations | 5 | 11 | 23 | 2 | 2 |
| | | 33.3% | 35.5% | 44.2% | 11.8% | 28.6% |
| | Below Expectations | 2 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 1 |
| | | 13.3% | 19.4% | 7.7% | 17.6% | 14.3% |
| | Far Below Expectations | 4 | 9 | 10 | 3 | 3 |
| | | 26.7% | 29.0% | 19.2% | 17.6% | 42.9% |
| | Refused | 1 | | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 6.7% | | 7.7% | 5.9% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 15 | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Ability to transfer files electronically.**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Electronic File Transfer | Very Important | 2 | 1 | 7 | 3 | |
| | | 13.3% | 3.2% | 13.5% | 17.6% | |
| | Important | 1 | 4 | 4 | 5 | |
| | | 6.7% | 12.9% | 7.7% | 29.4% | |
| | Neutral | 5 | 11 | 23 | 2 | 2 |
| | | 33.3% | 35.5% | 44.2% | 11.8% | 28.6% |
| | Not Very Important | 2 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 1 |
| | | 13.3% | 19.4% | 7.7% | 17.6% | 14.3% |
| | Not Relevant | 4 | 9 | 10 | 3 | 3 |
| | | 26.7% | 29.0% | 19.2% | 17.6% | 42.9% |
| | Refused | 1 | | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 6.7% | | 7.7% | 5.9% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 15 | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**6. Overall, how satisfied are you with the level of service you receive from the Office of State Printing?**

| | | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Entire Sample | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Satisfaction with State Office Service | Very Satisfied | 68 | 24 | 3 | 7 | 9 | 1 | 5 | |
| | | 25.1% | 36.9% | 37.5% | 29.2% | 56.3% | 20.0% | 18.5% | |
| | Satisfied | 100 | 27 | 4 | 11 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 2 |
| | | 36.9% | 41.5% | 50.0% | 45.8% | 25.0% | 40.0% | 29.6% | 50.0% |
| | Somewhat Satisfied | 41 | 11 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 1 |
| | | 15.1% | 16.9% | 12.5% | 16.7% | 12.5% | 20.0% | 22.2% | 25.0% |
| | Dissatisfied | 11 | 3 | | | 1 | | 1 | |
| | | 4.1% | 4.6% | | | 6.3% | | 3.7% | |
| | Very Dissatisfied | 2 | | | | | | | 1 |
| | | .7% | | | | | | | 25.0% |
| | Not Applicable | 45 | | | 2 | | 1 | 7 | |
| | | 16.6% | | | 8.3% | | 20.0% | 25.9% | |
| | Refused | 4 | | | | | | | |
| | | 1.5% | | | | | | | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**6. Overall, how satisfied are you with the level of service you receive from the Office of State Printing?**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Satisfaction with State Office Service | Very Satisfied | | 5 | 8 | 5 | 1 |
| | | | 16.1% | 15.4% | 29.4% | 14.3% |
| | Satisfied | 2 | 7 | 23 | 7 | 3 |
| | | 13.3% | 22.6% | 44.2% | 41.2% | 42.9% |
| | Somewhat Satisfied | 2 | 4 | 7 | 2 | |
| | | 13.3% | 12.9% | 13.5% | 11.8% | |
| | Dissatisfied | | 1 | 3 | 2 | |
| | | | 3.2% | 5.8% | 11.8% | |
| | Very Dissatisfied | 1 | | | | |
| | | 6.7% | | | | |
| | Not Applicable | 9 | 14 | 9 | 1 | 2 |
| | | 60.0% | 45.2% | 17.3% | 5.9% | 28.6% |
| | Refused | 1 | | 2 | | 1 |
| | | 6.7% | | 3.8% | | 14.3% |
| Total | | 15 | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**7. Overall, how satisfied are you with the level of service you receive from your individual agency print shop/copy center?**

| | | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Entire Sample | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Satisfaction with Individual Agency Service | Very Satisfied | 126 | 24 | 6 | 7 | 11 | 2 | 18 | 4 |
| | | 46.5% | 36.9% | 75.0% | 29.2% | 68.8% | 40.0% | 66.7% | 100.0% |
| | Satisfied | 80 | 20 | 2 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 7 | |
| | | 29.5% | 30.8% | 25.0% | 58.3% | 12.5% | 40.0% | 25.9% | |
| | Somewhat Satisfied | 19 | 6 | | | | | | |
| | | 7.0% | 9.2% | | | | | | |
| | Dissatisfied | 6 | | | | | | 1 | |
| | | 2.2% | | | | | | 3.7% | |
| | Very Dissatisfied | 4 | 2 | | | | | | |
| | | 1.5% | 3.1% | | | | | | |
| | Not Applicable | 28 | 13 | | 3 | 3 | | | |
| | | 10.3% | 20.0% | | 12.5% | 18.8% | | | |
| | Refused | 8 | | | | | 1 | 1 | |
| | | 3.0% | | | | | 20.0% | 3.7% | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

7. **Overall, how satisfied are you with the level of service you receive from your individual agency print shop/copy center?**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Individual Agency Service | Very Satisfied | 11 | 15 | 20 | 5 | 3 |
| | | 73.3% | 48.4% | 38.5% | 29.4% | 42.9% |
| | Satisfied | 2 | 8 | 18 | 3 | 2 |
| | | 13.3% | 25.8% | 34.6% | 17.6% | 28.6% |
| | Somewhat Satisfied | | 3 | 5 | 5 | |
| | | | 9.7% | 9.6% | 29.4% | |
| | Dissatisfied | | 2 | 1 | 2 | |
| | | | 6.5% | 1.9% | 11.8% | |
| | Very Dissatisfied | | 2 | | | |
| | | | 6.5% | | | |
| | Not Applicable | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 6.7% | 3.2% | 9.6% | 5.9% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 1 | | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| | | 6.7% | | 5.8% | 5.9% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 15 | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**8. Overall, how satisfied are you with the turnaround time from the Office of State Printing?**

| | | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Entire Sample | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Satisfaction with State Office Turnaround Time | Very Satisfied | 48 | 17 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 3 | |
| | | 17.7% | 26.2% | 25.0% | 20.8% | 43.8% | 20.0% | 11.1% | |
| | Satisfied | 99 | 27 | 4 | 12 | 5 | 3 | 8 | 1 |
| | | 36.5% | 41.5% | 50.0% | 50.0% | 31.3% | 60.0% | 29.6% | 25.0% |
| | Somewhat Satisfied | 46 | 12 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| | | 17.0% | 18.5% | 25.0% | 8.3% | 6.3% | 20.0% | 18.5% | 25.0% |
| | Dissatisfied | 21 | 8 | | 1 | 2 | | 3 | |
| | | 7.7% | 12.3% | | 4.2% | 12.5% | | 11.1% | |
| | Very Dissatisfied | 6 | 1 | | | 1 | | 1 | 1 |
| | | 2.2% | 1.5% | | | 6.3% | | 3.7% | 25.0% |
| | Not Applicable | 43 | | | 3 | | | 6 | 1 |
| | | 15.9% | | | 12.5% | | | 22.2% | 25.0% |
| | Refused | 8 | | | 1 | | | 1 | |
| | | 3.0% | | | 4.2% | | | 3.7% | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**8. Overall, how satisfied are you with the turnaround time from the Office of State Printing?**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Satisfaction with State Office Turnaround Time | Very Satisfied | | 2 | 7 | 3 | 1 |
| | | | 6.5% | 13.5% | 17.6% | 14.3% |
| | Satisfied | 2 | 7 | 19 | 10 | 1 |
| | | 13.3% | 22.6% | 36.5% | 58.8% | 14.3% |
| | Somewhat Satisfied | 2 | 6 | 9 | 3 | 2 |
| | | 13.3% | 19.4% | 17.3% | 17.6% | 28.6% |
| | Dissatisfied | | 2 | 5 | | |
| | | | 6.5% | 9.6% | | |
| | Very Dissatisfied | 1 | | | 1 | |
| | | 6.7% | | | 5.9% | |
| | Not Applicable | 9 | 11 | 11 | | 2 |
| | | 60.0% | 35.5% | 21.2% | | 28.6% |
| | Refused | 1 | 3 | 1 | | 1 |
| | | 6.7% | 9.7% | 1.9% | | 14.3% |
| Total | | 15 | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**9. Overall, how satisfied are you with the turnaround time from your individual agency copy center/print shop?**

| | | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Entire Sample | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC |
| Satisfaction with Individual Agency Turnaround Time | Very Satisfied | 119 | 18 | 7 | 6 | 11 | 2 | 21 | 4 |
| | | 43.9% | 27.7% | 87.5% | 25.0% | 68.8% | 40.0% | 77.8% | 100.0% |
| | Satisfied | 82 | 21 | 1 | 13 | 2 | 2 | 5 | |
| | | 30.3% | 32.3% | 12.5% | 54.2% | 12.5% | 40.0% | 18.5% | |
| | Somewhat Satisfied | 24 | 7 | | 1 | | | | |
| | | 8.9% | 10.8% | | 4.2% | | | | |
| | Dissatisfied | 6 | 3 | | | | | | |
| | | 2.2% | 4.6% | | | | | | |
| | Very Dissatisfied | 4 | | | | | | 1 | |
| | | 1.5% | | | | | | 3.7% | |
| | Not Applicable | 31 | 16 | | 4 | 3 | 1 | | |
| | | 11.4% | 24.6% | | 16.7% | 18.8% | 20.0% | | |
| | Refused | 5 | | | | | | | |
| | | 1.8% | | | | | | | |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

9. **Overall, how satisfied are you with the turnaround time from your individual agency copy center/print shop?**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DEV | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Individual Agency Turnaround Time | Very Satisfied | 10 | 14 | 19 | 4 | 3 |
| | | 66.7% | 45.2% | 36.5% | 23.5% | 42.9% |
| | Satisfied | 3 | 10 | 21 | 3 | 1 |
| | | 20.0% | 32.3% | 40.4% | 17.6% | 14.3% |
| | Somewhat Satisfied | | 3 | 4 | 8 | 1 |
| | | | 9.7% | 7.7% | 47.1% | 14.3% |
| | Dissatisfied | | 3 | | | |
| | | | 9.7% | | | |
| | Very Dissatisfied | | | 1 | 2 | |
| | | | | 1.9% | 11.8% | |
| | Not Applicable | 1 | | 5 | | 1 |
| | | 6.7% | | 9.6% | | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 1 | 1 | 2 | | 1 |
| | | 6.7% | 3.2% | 3.8% | | 14.3% |
| Total | | 15 | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**12. If you had other options, would the print shop/copy center you use most often be your provider of choice?**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OSP-Main | OSP-Fountain Sq. | OSP-Rhodes | OSP-Riffe | Ohio Data Network | ODPS | BWC | DEV |
| Would You Keep the Same Provider? | Yes | 151 | 34 | 5 | 10 | 11 | 4 | 22 | 4 | 9 |
| | | 55.7% | 52.3% | 62.5% | 41.7% | 68.8% | 80.0% | 81.5% | 100.0% | 60.0% |
| | No | 27 | 11 | | 3 | | 1 | 1 | | 1 |
| | | 10.0% | 16.9% | | 12.5% | | 20.0% | 3.7% | | 6.7% |
| | Unsure | 56 | 16 | 1 | 8 | 3 | | 1 | | 1 |
| | | 20.7% | 24.6% | 12.5% | 33.3% | 18.8% | | 3.7% | | 6.7% |
| | Refused | 37 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | | 3 | | 4 |
| | | 13.7% | 6.2% | 25.0% | 12.5% | 12.5% | | 11.1% | | 26.7% |
| Total | | 271 | 65 | 8 | 24 | 16 | 5 | 27 | 4 | 15 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**12. If you had other options, would the print shop/copy center you use most often be your provider of choice?**

| | | Shop Used Most Often | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | DOT | EDU | DOH | Refused |
| Would You Keep the Same Provider? | Yes | 15 | 28 | 7 | 2 |
| | | 48.4% | 53.8% | 41.2% | 28.6% |
| | No | 5 | 1 | 4 | |
| | | 16.1% | 1.9% | 23.5% | |
| | Unsure | 8 | 12 | 5 | 1 |
| | | 25.8% | 23.1% | 29.4% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 3 | 11 | 1 | 4 |
| | | 9.7% | 21.2% | 5.9% | 57.1% |
| Total | | 31 | 52 | 17 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

# Appendix D

**Respondent Batch Numbers**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Batch Number | 1000 | 126 | 80 | 39 | 7 |
| | | 46.5% | 70.8% | 25.8% | 100.0% |
| | 200 | 15 | 3 | 12 | |
| | | 5.5% | 2.7% | 7.9% | |
| | 300 | 15 | 2 | 13 | |
| | | 5.5% | 1.8% | 8.6% | |
| | 400 | 18 | 1 | 17 | |
| | | 6.6% | .9% | 11.3% | |
| | 500 | 17 | 2 | 15 | |
| | | 6.3% | 1.8% | 9.9% | |
| | 5000 | 1 | | 1 | |
| | | .4% | | .7% | |
| | 6000 | 11 | | 11 | |
| | | 4.1% | | 7.3% | |
| | None/DK | 68 | 25 | 43 | |
| | | 25.1% | 22.1% | 28.5% | |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**1. Which agency do you work for?**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often: Office of State Printing | Shop Used Most Often: Agency Print Shop | Shop Used Most Often: Refused |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Agency Worked For | DAS | 19 | 14 | 5 | |
| | | 7.0% | 12.4% | 3.3% | |
| | DNR | 10 | 10 | | |
| | | 3.7% | 8.8% | | |
| | EPA | 2 | 2 | | |
| | | .7% | 1.8% | | |
| | COM | 8 | 8 | | |
| | | 3.0% | 7.1% | | |
| | DMH | 5 | 5 | | |
| | | 1.8% | 4.4% | | |
| | ODPS | 26 | 1 | 25 | |
| | | 9.6% | .9% | 16.6% | |
| | BWC | 5 | | 4 | 1 |
| | | 1.8% | | 2.6% | 14.3% |
| | DEV | 18 | 3 | 15 | |
| | | 6.6% | 2.7% | 9.9% | |
| | DOT | 35 | 3 | 31 | 1 |
| | | 12.9% | 2.7% | 20.5% | 14.3% |
| | EDU | 54 | 3 | 51 | |
| | | 19.9% | 2.7% | 33.8% | |
| | DOH | 21 | 2 | 19 | |
| | | 7.7% | 1.8% | 12.6% | |
| | JFS | 8 | 7 | | 1 |
| | | 3.0% | 6.2% | | 14.3% |
| | Other | 60 | 55 | 1 | 4 |
| | | 22.1% | 48.7% | .7% | 57.1% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**2. How would you describe your level of usage of the Office of State Printing Services?**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Level of Usage of State Office | Very Frequent | 29 | 19 | 10 | |
| | | 10.7% | 16.8% | 6.6% | |
| | Frequent | 82 | 49 | 31 | 2 |
| | | 30.3% | 43.4% | 20.5% | 28.6% |
| | Occasional | 121 | 40 | 79 | 2 |
| | | 44.6% | 35.4% | 52.3% | 28.6% |
| | Not Applicable | 36 | 5 | 29 | 2 |
| | | 13.3% | 4.4% | 19.2% | 28.6% |
| | Refused | 3 | | 2 | 1 |
| | | 1.1% | | 1.3% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**3. How would you describe your level of usage of your individual agency print shop/copy center?**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Level of Usage of Individual Agency Shop | Very Frequent | 52 | 16 | 35 | 1 |
| | | 19.2% | 14.2% | 23.2% | 14.3% |
| | Frequent | 100 | 47 | 51 | 2 |
| | | 36.9% | 41.6% | 33.8% | 28.6% |
| | Occasional | 84 | 25 | 57 | 2 |
| | | 31.0% | 22.1% | 37.7% | 28.6% |
| | Not Applicable | 34 | 25 | 8 | 1 |
| | | 12.5% | 22.1% | 5.3% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 1 | | | 1 |
| | | .4% | | | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**4. Which print shop/copy center do you utilize most often?**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Shop Used Most Often | OSP-Main | 65 | 65 | | |
| | | 24.0% | 57.5% | | |
| | OSP-Fountain Square | 8 | 8 | | |
| | | 3.0% | 7.1% | | |
| | OSP-Rhodes | 24 | 24 | | |
| | | 8.9% | 21.2% | | |
| | OSP-Riffe | 16 | 16 | | |
| | | 5.9% | 14.2% | | |
| | Ohio Data Network | 5 | | 5 | |
| | | 1.8% | | 3.3% | |
| | Dept. of Public Safety | 27 | | 27 | |
| | | 10.0% | | 17.9% | |
| | Bureau of Workers Comp. | 4 | | 4 | |
| | | 1.5% | | 2.6% | |
| | Dept. of Development | 15 | | 15 | |
| | | 5.5% | | 9.9% | |
| | Dept. of Transportation | 31 | | 31 | |
| | | 11.4% | | 20.5% | |
| | Dept. of Education | 52 | | 52 | |
| | | 19.2% | | 34.4% | |
| | Dept. of Health | 17 | | 17 | |
| | | 6.3% | | 11.3% | |
| | Refused | 7 | | | 7 |
| | | 2.6% | | | 100.0% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**5. Do you know when/why certain jobs need to be sent to the Office of State Printing?**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Know Why Jobs Sent to State Office | Yes | 152 | 66 | 81 | 5 |
| | | 56.1% | 58.4% | 53.6% | 71.4% |
| | No | 44 | 11 | 33 | |
| | | 16.2% | 9.7% | 21.9% | |
| | Unsure | 45 | 13 | 32 | |
| | | 16.6% | 11.5% | 21.2% | |
| | Refused | 30 | 23 | 5 | 2 |
| | | 11.1% | 20.4% | 3.3% | 28.6% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff is always available to meet my needs/address my concerns.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Importance of Availability | Very Important | 182 | 76 | 104 | 2 |
| | | 67.2% | 67.3% | 68.9% | 28.6% |
| | Important | 71 | 30 | 38 | 3 |
| | | 26.2% | 26.5% | 25.2% | 42.9% |
| | Neutral | 6 | 4 | 2 | |
| | | 2.2% | 3.5% | 1.3% | |
| | Not Relevant | 7 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| | | 2.6% | .9% | 3.3% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| | | 1.8% | 1.8% | 1.3% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff is responsive to issues and questions.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Importance of Responsiveness | Very Important | 186 | 76 | 108 | 2 |
| | | 68.6% | 67.3% | 71.5% | 28.6% |
| | Important | 69 | 31 | 35 | 3 |
| | | 25.5% | 27.4% | 23.2% | 42.9% |
| | Neutral | 6 | 4 | 2 | |
| | | 2.2% | 3.5% | 1.3% | |
| | Not Relevant | 6 | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| | | 2.2% | .9% | 2.6% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| | | 1.5% | .9% | 1.3% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff provides appropriate resolutions to issues and questions.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Importance of Resolving Questions | Very Important | 171 | 69 | 100 | 2 |
| | | 63.1% | 61.1% | 66.2% | 28.6% |
| | Important | 81 | 38 | 40 | 3 |
| | | 29.9% | 33.6% | 26.5% | 42.9% |
| | Neutral | 7 | 4 | 3 | |
| | | 2.6% | 3.5% | 2.0% | |
| | Not Relevant | 7 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| | | 2.6% | .9% | 3.3% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| | | 1.8% | .9% | 2.0% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff is responsive to urgent requests.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Importance of Response to Urgent Requests | Very Important | 199 | 86 | 111 | 2 |
| | | 73.4% | 76.1% | 73.5% | 28.6% |
| | Important | 56 | 22 | 31 | 3 |
| | | 20.7% | 19.5% | 20.5% | 42.9% |
| | Neutral | 4 | 2 | 2 | |
| | | 1.5% | 1.8% | 1.3% | |
| | Not Very Important | 1 | 1 | | |
| | | .4% | .9% | | |
| | Not Relevant | 7 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| | | 2.6% | .9% | 3.3% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| | | 1.5% | .9% | 1.3% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff is sensitive to the confidential nature of some printing projects.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Importance of Sensitivity to Confidentiality | Very Important | 116 | 42 | 73 | 1 |
| | | 42.8% | 37.2% | 48.3% | 14.3% |
| | Important | 64 | 31 | 31 | 2 |
| | | 23.6% | 27.4% | 20.5% | 28.6% |
| | Neutral | 40 | 20 | 19 | 1 |
| | | 14.8% | 17.7% | 12.6% | 14.3% |
| | Not Very Important | 11 | 3 | 8 | |
| | | 4.1% | 2.7% | 5.3% | |
| | Not Relevant | 36 | 16 | 18 | 2 |
| | | 13.3% | 14.2% | 11.9% | 28.6% |
| | Refused | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| | | 1.5% | .9% | 1.3% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff is proactive in addressing needs.**

| | | | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Entire Sample | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Importance of Proactivity | Very Important | 114 | 46 | 68 | |
| | | 42.1% | 40.7% | 45.0% | |
| | Important | 121 | 56 | 62 | 3 |
| | | 44.6% | 49.6% | 41.1% | 42.9% |
| | Neutral | 21 | 8 | 13 | |
| | | 7.7% | 7.1% | 8.6% | |
| | Not Relevant | 9 | 2 | 4 | 3 |
| | | 3.3% | 1.8% | 2.6% | 42.9% |
| | Refused | 6 | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| | | 2.2% | .9% | 2.6% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff provides innovative solutions to needs.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Importance of Innovation | Very Important | 102 | 43 | 58 | 1 |
| | | 37.6% | 38.1% | 38.4% | 14.3% |
| | Important | 125 | 53 | 70 | 2 |
| | | 46.1% | 46.9% | 46.4% | 28.6% |
| | Neutral | 26 | 14 | 12 | |
| | | 9.6% | 12.4% | 7.9% | |
| | Not Very Important | 3 | | 2 | 1 |
| | | 1.1% | | 1.3% | 14.3% |
| | Not Relevant | 9 | 2 | 5 | 2 |
| | | 3.3% | 1.8% | 3.3% | 28.6% |
| | Refused | 6 | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| | | 2.2% | .9% | 2.6% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff effectively interacts with me concerning my project.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Importance of Effective Interaction | Very Important | 141 | 61 | 80 | |
| | | 52.0% | 54.0% | 53.0% | |
| | Important | 99 | 43 | 53 | 3 |
| | | 36.5% | 38.1% | 35.1% | 42.9% |
| | Neutral | 16 | 6 | 10 | |
| | | 5.9% | 5.3% | 6.6% | |
| | Not Very Important | 1 | | | 1 |
| | | .4% | | | 14.3% |
| | Not Relevant | 9 | 2 | 5 | 2 |
| | | 3.3% | 1.8% | 3.3% | 28.6% |
| | Refused | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| | | 1.8% | .9% | 2.0% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff makes decisions to help with aesthetics of final project.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Importance of Help with Aesthetics | Very Important | 82 | 30 | 52 | |
| | | 30.3% | 26.5% | 34.4% | |
| | Important | 112 | 52 | 57 | 3 |
| | | 41.3% | 46.0% | 37.7% | 42.9% |
| | Neutral | 48 | 21 | 27 | |
| | | 17.7% | 18.6% | 17.9% | |
| | Not Very Important | 11 | 4 | 6 | 1 |
| | | 4.1% | 3.5% | 4.0% | 14.3% |
| | Not Relevant | 13 | 4 | 7 | 2 |
| | | 4.8% | 3.5% | 4.6% | 28.6% |
| | Refused | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| | | 1.8% | 1.8% | 1.3% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Quality and professionalism of print shop/copy center staff.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Importance of Professionalism | Very Important | 168 | 69 | 98 | 1 |
| | | 62.0% | 61.1% | 64.9% | 14.3% |
| | Important | 83 | 38 | 41 | 4 |
| | | 30.6% | 33.6% | 27.2% | 57.1% |
| | Neutral | 9 | 4 | 5 | |
| | | 3.3% | 3.5% | 3.3% | |
| | Not Relevant | 7 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| | | 2.6% | .9% | 3.3% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| | | 1.5% | .9% | 1.3% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Meeting the requested turnaround time, from the point the project is given to the print shop/copy center until the time it is completed and returned.**

| | | | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Entire Sample | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Importance of Meeting Turnaround Time | Very Important | 204 | 80 | 121 | 3 |
| | | 75.3% | 70.8% | 80.1% | 42.9% |
| | Important | 51 | 30 | 19 | 2 |
| | | 18.8% | 26.5% | 12.6% | 28.6% |
| | Neutral | 3 | 1 | 2 | |
| | | 1.1% | .9% | 1.3% | |
| | Not Very Important | 2 | 1 | 1 | |
| | | .7% | .9% | .7% | |
| | Not Relevant | 6 | | 5 | 1 |
| | | 2.2% | | 3.3% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| | | 1.8% | .9% | 2.0% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff makes me aware when my requested turnaround time cannot be met.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Importance of Knowing Time Cannot Be Met | Very Important | 207 | 84 | 121 | 2 |
| | | 76.4% | 74.3% | 80.1% | 28.6% |
| | Important | 49 | 24 | 22 | 3 |
| | | 18.1% | 21.2% | 14.6% | 42.9% |
| | Neutral | 3 | 3 | | |
| | | 1.1% | 2.7% | | |
| | Not Very Important | 2 | 1 | 1 | |
| | | .7% | .9% | .7% | |
| | Not Relevant | 6 | | 5 | 1 |
| | | 2.2% | | 3.3% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| | | 1.5% | .9% | 1.3% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff meets short lead times.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Importance of Meeting Short Lead Times | Very Important | 133 | 57 | 75 | 1 |
| | | 49.1% | 50.4% | 49.7% | 14.3% |
| | Important | 111 | 45 | 62 | 4 |
| | | 41.0% | 39.8% | 41.1% | 57.1% |
| | Neutral | 12 | 7 | 5 | |
| | | 4.4% | 6.2% | 3.3% | |
| | Not Very Important | 4 | 2 | 2 | |
| | | 1.5% | 1.8% | 1.3% | |
| | Not Relevant | 7 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| | | 2.6% | .9% | 3.3% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| | | 1.5% | .9% | 1.3% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff is responsive to requests of late night/overnight projects.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Importance of Response to Late Night Projects | Very Important | 87 | 33 | 53 | 1 |
| | | 32.1% | 29.2% | 35.1% | 14.3% |
| | Important | 77 | 36 | 39 | 2 |
| | | 28.4% | 31.9% | 25.8% | 28.6% |
| | Neutral | 53 | 24 | 28 | 1 |
| | | 19.6% | 21.2% | 18.5% | 14.3% |
| | Not Very Important | 12 | 3 | 9 | |
| | | 4.4% | 2.7% | 6.0% | |
| | Not Relevant | 38 | 16 | 20 | 2 |
| | | 14.0% | 14.2% | 13.2% | 28.6% |
| | Refused | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| | | 1.5% | .9% | 1.3% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff uses technology to help complete job quickly.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Importance of Use of Technology | Very Important | 115 | 41 | 74 | |
| | | 42.4% | 36.3% | 49.0% | |
| | Important | 112 | 52 | 56 | 4 |
| | | 41.3% | 46.0% | 37.1% | 57.1% |
| | Neutral | 30 | 18 | 11 | 1 |
| | | 11.1% | 15.9% | 7.3% | 14.3% |
| | Not Very Important | 2 | | 2 | |
| | | .7% | | 1.3% | |
| | Not Relevant | 8 | 1 | 6 | 1 |
| | | 3.0% | .9% | 4.0% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| | | 1.5% | .9% | 1.3% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Jobs are delivered according to agreed upon timeframes.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Importance of Delivering Jobs On Time | Very Important | 200 | 84 | 113 | 3 |
| | | 73.8% | 74.3% | 74.8% | 42.9% |
| | Important | 57 | 26 | 29 | 2 |
| | | 21.0% | 23.0% | 19.2% | 28.6% |
| | Neutral | 2 | 1 | 1 | |
| | | .7% | .9% | .7% | |
| | Not Very Important | 2 | 1 | 1 | |
| | | .7% | .9% | .7% | |
| | Not Relevant | 6 | | 5 | 1 |
| | | 2.2% | | 3.3% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| | | 1.5% | .9% | 1.3% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff understands my printing needs.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Importance of Having Needs Understood | Very Important | 176 | 76 | 98 | 2 |
| | | 64.9% | 67.3% | 64.9% | 28.6% |
| | Important | 76 | 32 | 41 | 3 |
| | | 28.0% | 28.3% | 27.2% | 42.9% |
| | Neutral | 4 | 2 | 2 | |
| | | 1.5% | 1.8% | 1.3% | |
| | Not Very Important | 2 | | 2 | |
| | | .7% | | 1.3% | |
| | Not Relevant | 5 | | 4 | 1 |
| | | 1.8% | | 2.6% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 8 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| | | 3.0% | 2.7% | 2.6% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Staff helps outline deliverables/expectations at the time of initial request.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Importance of Help Outlining Deliverables | Very Important | 137 | 58 | 78 | 1 |
| | | 50.6% | 51.3% | 51.7% | 14.3% |
| | Important | 104 | 45 | 55 | 4 |
| | | 38.4% | 39.8% | 36.4% | 57.1% |
| | Neutral | 11 | 4 | 7 | |
| | | 4.1% | 3.5% | 4.6% | |
| | Not Very Important | 2 | | 2 | |
| | | .7% | | 1.3% | |
| | Not Relevant | 8 | 2 | 5 | 1 |
| | | 3.0% | 1.8% | 3.3% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 9 | 4 | 4 | 1 |
| | | 3.3% | 3.5% | 2.6% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Jobs are delivered according to specifications the first time.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Importance of Meeting Specifications | Very Important | 191 | 80 | 109 | 2 |
| | | 70.5% | 70.8% | 72.2% | 28.6% |
| | Important | 58 | 26 | 30 | 2 |
| | | 21.4% | 23.0% | 19.9% | 28.6% |
| | Neutral | 5 | 4 | 1 | |
| | | 1.8% | 3.5% | .7% | |
| | Not Very Important | 1 | | 1 | |
| | | .4% | | .7% | |
| | Not Relevant | 5 | | 4 | 1 |
| | | 1.8% | | 2.6% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 11 | 3 | 6 | 2 |
| | | 4.1% | 2.7% | 4.0% | 28.6% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Overall, finished jobs are of high quality.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Importance of Quality of Jobs | Very Important | 213 | 86 | 124 | 3 |
| | | 78.6% | 76.1% | 82.1% | 42.9% |
| | Important | 37 | 21 | 14 | 2 |
| | | 13.7% | 18.6% | 9.3% | 28.6% |
| | Neutral | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| | | 1.1% | 1.8% | .7% | |
| | Not Very Important | 1 | | 1 | |
| | | .4% | | .7% | |
| | Not Relevant | 6 | | 5 | 1 |
| | | 2.2% | | 3.3% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 11 | 4 | 6 | 1 |
| | | 4.1% | 3.5% | 4.0% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Availability of black and white copy services.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Importance of Black and White Services | Very Important | 123 | 51 | 70 | 2 |
| | | 45.4% | 45.1% | 46.4% | 28.6% |
| | Important | 96 | 38 | 56 | 2 |
| | | 35.4% | 33.6% | 37.1% | 28.6% |
| | Neutral | 32 | 20 | 12 | |
| | | 11.8% | 17.7% | 7.9% | |
| | Not Very Important | 7 | 2 | 4 | 1 |
| | | 2.6% | 1.8% | 2.6% | 14.3% |
| | Not Relevant | 7 | | 6 | 1 |
| | | 2.6% | | 4.0% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 6 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| | | 2.2% | 1.8% | 2.0% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Availability of color copy services.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Importance of Color Services | Very Important | 121 | 51 | 69 | 1 |
| | | 44.6% | 45.1% | 45.7% | 14.3% |
| | Important | 100 | 36 | 62 | 2 |
| | | 36.9% | 31.9% | 41.1% | 28.6% |
| | Neutral | 23 | 16 | 7 | |
| | | 8.5% | 14.2% | 4.6% | |
| | Not Very Important | 9 | 5 | 3 | 1 |
| | | 3.3% | 4.4% | 2.0% | 14.3% |
| | Not Relevant | 10 | 1 | 7 | 2 |
| | | 3.7% | .9% | 4.6% | 28.6% |
| | Refused | 8 | 4 | 3 | 1 |
| | | 3.0% | 3.5% | 2.0% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Availability of offset printing services.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Importance of Offset Printing Services | Very Important | 85 | 49 | 36 | |
| | | 31.4% | 43.4% | 23.8% | |
| | Important | 98 | 40 | 56 | 2 |
| | | 36.2% | 35.4% | 37.1% | 28.6% |
| | Neutral | 51 | 17 | 32 | 2 |
| | | 18.8% | 15.0% | 21.2% | 28.6% |
| | Not Very Important | 9 | 1 | 8 | |
| | | 3.3% | .9% | 5.3% | |
| | Not Relevant | 18 | 4 | 12 | 2 |
| | | 6.6% | 3.5% | 7.9% | 28.6% |
| | Refused | 10 | 2 | 7 | 1 |
| | | 3.7% | 1.8% | 4.6% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Availability of finishing and binding operations.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Importance of Finishing/Binding Operations | Very Important | 108 | 53 | 54 | 1 |
| | | 39.9% | 46.9% | 35.8% | 14.3% |
| | Important | 109 | 45 | 62 | 2 |
| | | 40.2% | 39.8% | 41.1% | 28.6% |
| | Neutral | 33 | 11 | 20 | 2 |
| | | 12.2% | 9.7% | 13.2% | 28.6% |
| | Not Very Important | 7 | 1 | 6 | |
| | | 2.6% | .9% | 4.0% | |
| | Not Relevant | 7 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| | | 2.6% | .9% | 3.3% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 7 | 2 | 4 | 1 |
| | | 2.6% | 1.8% | 2.6% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Importance Rating: Ability to transfer files electronically.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Importance of Electronic File Transfer | Very Important | 118 | 52 | 65 | 1 |
| | | 43.5% | 46.0% | 43.0% | 14.3% |
| | Important | 94 | 38 | 53 | 3 |
| | | 34.7% | 33.6% | 35.1% | 42.9% |
| | Neutral | 37 | 18 | 19 | |
| | | 13.7% | 15.9% | 12.6% | |
| | Not Very Important | 4 | | 4 | |
| | | 1.5% | | 2.6% | |
| | Not Relevant | 12 | 3 | 7 | 2 |
| | | 4.4% | 2.7% | 4.6% | 28.6% |
| | Refused | 6 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| | | 2.2% | 1.8% | 2.0% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff is always available to meet my needs/address my concerns.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Availability | Far Exceeds Expectations | 64 | 22 | 41 | 1 |
| | | 23.6% | 19.5% | 27.2% | 14.3% |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 88 | 44 | 42 | 2 |
| | | 32.5% | 38.9% | 27.8% | 28.6% |
| | Meets Expectations | 89 | 40 | 47 | 2 |
| | | 32.8% | 35.4% | 31.1% | 28.6% |
| | Below Expectations | 15 | 4 | 11 | |
| | | 5.5% | 3.5% | 7.3% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 8 | | 7 | 1 |
| | | 3.0% | | 4.6% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 7 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| | | 2.6% | 2.7% | 2.0% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff is responsive to issues and questions.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Responsiveness | Far Exceeds Expectations | 62 | 23 | 38 | 1 |
| | | 22.9% | 20.4% | 25.2% | 14.3% |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 97 | 46 | 49 | 2 |
| | | 35.8% | 40.7% | 32.5% | 28.6% |
| | Meets Expectations | 87 | 40 | 45 | 2 |
| | | 32.1% | 35.4% | 29.8% | 28.6% |
| | Below Expectations | 11 | 2 | 9 | |
| | | 4.1% | 1.8% | 6.0% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 8 | | 7 | 1 |
| | | 3.0% | | 4.6% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 6 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| | | 2.2% | 1.8% | 2.0% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff provides appropriate resolutions to issues and questions.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Resolving Issues | Far Exceeds Expectations | 55 | 22 | 33 | |
| | | 20.3% | 19.5% | 21.9% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 90 | 35 | 52 | 3 |
| | | 33.2% | 31.0% | 34.4% | 42.9% |
| | Meets Expectations | 96 | 51 | 43 | 2 |
| | | 35.4% | 45.1% | 28.5% | 28.6% |
| | Below Expectations | 12 | 1 | 11 | |
| | | 4.4% | .9% | 7.3% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 10 | 2 | 7 | 1 |
| | | 3.7% | 1.8% | 4.6% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 8 | 2 | 5 | 1 |
| | | 3.0% | 1.8% | 3.3% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff is responsive to urgent requests.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Response to Urgent Requests | Far Exceeds Expectations | 72 | 28 | 44 | |
| | | 26.6% | 24.8% | 29.1% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 82 | 34 | 45 | 3 |
| | | 30.3% | 30.1% | 29.8% | 42.9% |
| | Meets Expectations | 78 | 42 | 34 | 2 |
| | | 28.8% | 37.2% | 22.5% | 28.6% |
| | Below Expectations | 19 | 4 | 15 | |
| | | 7.0% | 3.5% | 9.9% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 14 | 4 | 9 | 1 |
| | | 5.2% | 3.5% | 6.0% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 6 | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| | | 2.2% | .9% | 2.6% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff is sensitive to the confidential nature of some printing projects.**

| | | | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Entire Sample | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Sensitivity to Confidentiality | Far Exceeds Expectations | 43 | 12 | 31 | |
| | | 15.9% | 10.6% | 20.5% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 54 | 29 | 24 | 1 |
| | | 19.9% | 25.7% | 15.9% | 14.3% |
| | Meets Expectations | 86 | 38 | 46 | 2 |
| | | 31.7% | 33.6% | 30.5% | 28.6% |
| | Below Expectations | 2 | | 2 | |
| | | .7% | | 1.3% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 81 | 33 | 45 | 3 |
| | | 29.9% | 29.2% | 29.8% | 42.9% |
| | Refused | 5 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
| | | 1.8% | .9% | 2.0% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff is proactive in addressing needs.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Proactivity | Far Exceeds Expectations | 46 | 16 | 30 | |
| | | 17.0% | 14.2% | 19.9% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 73 | 36 | 37 | |
| | | 26.9% | 31.9% | 24.5% | |
| | Meets Expectations | 109 | 50 | 56 | 3 |
| | | 40.2% | 44.2% | 37.1% | 42.9% |
| | Below Expectations | 16 | 6 | 10 | |
| | | 5.9% | 5.3% | 6.6% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 20 | 4 | 13 | 3 |
| | | 7.4% | 3.5% | 8.6% | 42.9% |
| | Refused | 7 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| | | 2.6% | .9% | 3.3% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff provides innovative solutions to needs.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Innovation | Far Exceeds Expectations | 47 | 18 | 29 | |
| | | 17.3% | 15.9% | 19.2% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 67 | 32 | 35 | |
| | | 24.7% | 28.3% | 23.2% | |
| | Meets Expectations | 115 | 49 | 62 | 4 |
| | | 42.4% | 43.4% | 41.1% | 57.1% |
| | Below Expectations | 13 | 4 | 9 | |
| | | 4.8% | 3.5% | 6.0% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 23 | 8 | 13 | 2 |
| | | 8.5% | 7.1% | 8.6% | 28.6% |
| | Refused | 6 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| | | 2.2% | 1.8% | 2.0% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff effectively interacts with me concerning my project.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Effective Interaction | Far Exceeds Expectations | 66 | 26 | 40 | |
| | | 24.4% | 23.0% | 26.5% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 78 | 33 | 43 | 2 |
| | | 28.8% | 29.2% | 28.5% | 28.6% |
| | Meets Expectations | 93 | 43 | 48 | 2 |
| | | 34.3% | 38.1% | 31.8% | 28.6% |
| | Below Expectations | 13 | 3 | 10 | |
| | | 4.8% | 2.7% | 6.6% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 14 | 5 | 7 | 2 |
| | | 5.2% | 4.4% | 4.6% | 28.6% |
| | Refused | 7 | 3 | 3 | 1 |
| | | 2.6% | 2.7% | 2.0% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff makes decisions to help with aesthetics of final project.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Help with Aesthetics | Far Exceeds Expectations | 42 | 19 | 23 | |
| | | 15.5% | 16.8% | 15.2% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 79 | 33 | 45 | 1 |
| | | 29.2% | 29.2% | 29.8% | 14.3% |
| | Meets Expectations | 100 | 44 | 54 | 2 |
| | | 36.9% | 38.9% | 35.8% | 28.6% |
| | Below Expectations | 10 | 3 | 7 | |
| | | 3.7% | 2.7% | 4.6% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 32 | 13 | 17 | 2 |
| | | 11.8% | 11.5% | 11.3% | 28.6% |
| | Refused | 8 | 1 | 5 | 2 |
| | | 3.0% | .9% | 3.3% | 28.6% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Quality and professionalism of print shop/copy center staff.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Staff Professionalism | Far Exceeds Expectations | 68 | 30 | 38 | |
| | | 25.1% | 26.5% | 25.2% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 98 | 46 | 48 | 4 |
| | | 36.2% | 40.7% | 31.8% | 57.1% |
| | Meets Expectations | 79 | 34 | 44 | 1 |
| | | 29.2% | 30.1% | 29.1% | 14.3% |
| | Below Expectations | 9 | | 9 | |
| | | 3.3% | | 6.0% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 9 | 1 | 7 | 1 |
| | | 3.3% | .9% | 4.6% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 8 | 2 | 5 | 1 |
| | | 3.0% | 1.8% | 3.3% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Meeting the requested turnaround time, from the point the project is given to the print shop/copy center until the time it is completed and returned.**

| | | | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Entire Sample | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Meeting Turnaround Time | Far Exceeds Expectations | 58 | 20 | 37 | 1 |
| | | 21.4% | 17.7% | 24.5% | 14.3% |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 70 | 34 | 35 | 1 |
| | | 25.8% | 30.1% | 23.2% | 14.3% |
| | Meets Expectations | 102 | 48 | 51 | 3 |
| | | 37.6% | 42.5% | 33.8% | 42.9% |
| | Below Expectations | 24 | 8 | 16 | |
| | | 8.9% | 7.1% | 10.6% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 10 | 2 | 7 | 1 |
| | | 3.7% | 1.8% | 4.6% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 7 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| | | 2.6% | .9% | 3.3% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff makes me aware when my requested turnaround time cannot be met.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Knowing Time Cannot Be Met | Far Exceeds Expectations | 39 | 15 | 24 | |
| | | 14.4% | 13.3% | 15.9% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 79 | 34 | 42 | 3 |
| | | 29.2% | 30.1% | 27.8% | 42.9% |
| | Meets Expectations | 88 | 37 | 49 | 2 |
| | | 32.5% | 32.7% | 32.5% | 28.6% |
| | Below Expectations | 40 | 19 | 21 | |
| | | 14.8% | 16.8% | 13.9% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 17 | 6 | 10 | 1 |
| | | 6.3% | 5.3% | 6.6% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 8 | 2 | 5 | 1 |
| | | 3.0% | 1.8% | 3.3% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff meets short lead times.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Meeting Short Lead Times | Far Exceeds Expectations | 62 | 25 | 35 | 2 |
| | | 22.9% | 22.1% | 23.2% | 28.6% |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 69 | 33 | 36 | |
| | | 25.5% | 29.2% | 23.8% | |
| | Meets Expectations | 93 | 44 | 47 | 2 |
| | | 34.3% | 38.9% | 31.1% | 28.6% |
| | Below Expectations | 21 | 5 | 16 | |
| | | 7.7% | 4.4% | 10.6% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 18 | 5 | 11 | 2 |
| | | 6.6% | 4.4% | 7.3% | 28.6% |
| | Refused | 8 | 1 | 6 | 1 |
| | | 3.0% | .9% | 4.0% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff is responsive to requests of late night/overnight projects.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Response to Late Night Projects | Far Exceeds Expectations | 34 | 15 | 19 | |
| | | 12.5% | 13.3% | 12.6% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 42 | 19 | 21 | 2 |
| | | 15.5% | 16.8% | 13.9% | 28.6% |
| | Meets Expectations | 71 | 29 | 40 | 2 |
| | | 26.2% | 25.7% | 26.5% | 28.6% |
| | Below Expectations | 18 | 4 | 14 | |
| | | 6.6% | 3.5% | 9.3% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 99 | 45 | 52 | 2 |
| | | 36.5% | 39.8% | 34.4% | 28.6% |
| | Refused | 7 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| | | 2.6% | .9% | 3.3% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff uses technology to help complete job quickly.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Use of Technology | Far Exceeds Expectations | 54 | 19 | 35 | |
| | | 19.9% | 16.8% | 23.2% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 67 | 31 | 33 | 3 |
| | | 24.7% | 27.4% | 21.9% | 42.9% |
| | Meets Expectations | 102 | 43 | 57 | 2 |
| | | 37.6% | 38.1% | 37.7% | 28.6% |
| | Below Expectations | 17 | 6 | 11 | |
| | | 6.3% | 5.3% | 7.3% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 22 | 12 | 9 | 1 |
| | | 8.1% | 10.6% | 6.0% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 9 | 2 | 6 | 1 |
| | | 3.3% | 1.8% | 4.0% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Jobs are delivered according to agreed upon timeframes.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Delivering Jobs On Time | Far Exceeds Expectations | 58 | 22 | 35 | 1 |
| | | 21.4% | 19.5% | 23.2% | 14.3% |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 59 | 24 | 34 | 1 |
| | | 21.8% | 21.2% | 22.5% | 14.3% |
| | Meets Expectations | 97 | 44 | 50 | 3 |
| | | 35.8% | 38.9% | 33.1% | 42.9% |
| | Below Expectations | 37 | 18 | 19 | |
| | | 13.7% | 15.9% | 12.6% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 11 | 3 | 7 | 1 |
| | | 4.1% | 2.7% | 4.6% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 9 | 2 | 6 | 1 |
| | | 3.3% | 1.8% | 4.0% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff understands my printing needs.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Having Needs Understood | Far Exceeds Expectations | 46 | 16 | 30 | |
| | | 17.0% | 14.2% | 19.9% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 92 | 42 | 47 | 3 |
| | | 33.9% | 37.2% | 31.1% | 42.9% |
| | Meets Expectations | 103 | 49 | 52 | 2 |
| | | 38.0% | 43.4% | 34.4% | 28.6% |
| | Below Expectations | 11 | 2 | 9 | |
| | | 4.1% | 1.8% | 6.0% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 10 | 2 | 7 | 1 |
| | | 3.7% | 1.8% | 4.6% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 9 | 2 | 6 | 1 |
| | | 3.3% | 1.8% | 4.0% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Staff helps outline deliverables/expectations at the time of initial request.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Help Outlining Deliverables | Far Exceeds Expectations | 45 | 16 | 29 | |
| | | 16.6% | 14.2% | 19.2% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 74 | 32 | 41 | 1 |
| | | 27.3% | 28.3% | 27.2% | 14.3% |
| | Meets Expectations | 103 | 46 | 54 | 3 |
| | | 38.0% | 40.7% | 35.8% | 42.9% |
| | Below Expectations | 20 | 8 | 12 | |
| | | 7.4% | 7.1% | 7.9% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 22 | 9 | 11 | 2 |
| | | 8.1% | 8.0% | 7.3% | 28.6% |
| | Refused | 7 | 2 | 4 | 1 |
| | | 2.6% | 1.8% | 2.6% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Jobs are delivered according to specifications the first time.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Meeting Specifications | Far Exceeds Expectations | 55 | 20 | 35 | |
| | | 20.3% | 17.7% | 23.2% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 72 | 34 | 37 | 1 |
| | | 26.6% | 30.1% | 24.5% | 14.3% |
| | Meets Expectations | 101 | 43 | 54 | 4 |
| | | 37.3% | 38.1% | 35.8% | 57.1% |
| | Below Expectations | 26 | 14 | 12 | |
| | | 9.6% | 12.4% | 7.9% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 9 | 1 | 7 | 1 |
| | | 3.3% | .9% | 4.6% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 8 | 1 | 6 | 1 |
| | | 3.0% | .9% | 4.0% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Overall, finished jobs are of high quality.**

| | | | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Entire Sample | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Quality of Jobs | Far Exceeds Expectations | 69 | 27 | 42 | |
| | | 25.5% | 23.9% | 27.8% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 70 | 31 | 38 | 1 |
| | | 25.8% | 27.4% | 25.2% | 14.3% |
| | Meets Expectations | 102 | 48 | 50 | 4 |
| | | 37.6% | 42.5% | 33.1% | 57.1% |
| | Below Expectations | 13 | 5 | 8 | |
| | | 4.8% | 4.4% | 5.3% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 9 | 1 | 7 | 1 |
| | | 3.3% | .9% | 4.6% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 8 | 1 | 6 | 1 |
| | | 3.0% | .9% | 4.0% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Availability of black and white copy services.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Black and White Services | Far Exceeds Expectations | 61 | 20 | 40 | 1 |
| | | 22.5% | 17.7% | 26.5% | 14.3% |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 70 | 36 | 33 | 1 |
| | | 25.8% | 31.9% | 21.9% | 14.3% |
| | Meets Expectations | 110 | 49 | 58 | 3 |
| | | 40.6% | 43.4% | 38.4% | 42.9% |
| | Below Expectations | 2 | | 2 | |
| | | .7% | | 1.3% | |
| | Far Below Expectations | 21 | 7 | 13 | 1 |
| | | 7.7% | 6.2% | 8.6% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 7 | 1 | 5 | 1 |
| | | 2.6% | .9% | 3.3% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Availability of color copy services.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Color Services | Far Exceeds Expectations | 47 | 16 | 31 | |
| | | 17.3% | 14.2% | 20.5% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 63 | 29 | 32 | 2 |
| | | 23.2% | 25.7% | 21.2% | 28.6% |
| | Meets Expectations | 102 | 48 | 53 | 1 |
| | | 37.6% | 42.5% | 35.1% | 14.3% |
| | Below Expectations | 20 | 6 | 13 | 1 |
| | | 7.4% | 5.3% | 8.6% | 14.3% |
| | Far Below Expectations | 31 | 11 | 18 | 2 |
| | | 11.4% | 9.7% | 11.9% | 28.6% |
| | Refused | 8 | 3 | 4 | 1 |
| | | 3.0% | 2.7% | 2.6% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Availability of offset printing services.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Offset Printing Services | Far Exceeds Expectations | 29 | 12 | 17 | |
| | | 10.7% | 10.6% | 11.3% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 51 | 23 | 28 | |
| | | 18.8% | 20.4% | 18.5% | |
| | Meets Expectations | 100 | 49 | 50 | 1 |
| | | 36.9% | 43.4% | 33.1% | 14.3% |
| | Below Expectations | 9 | 3 | 5 | 1 |
| | | 3.3% | 2.7% | 3.3% | 14.3% |
| | Far Below Expectations | 71 | 22 | 45 | 4 |
| | | 26.2% | 19.5% | 29.8% | 57.1% |
| | Refused | 11 | 4 | 6 | 1 |
| | | 4.1% | 3.5% | 4.0% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Availability of finishing and binding operations.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Finishing/Binding Operations | Far Exceeds Expectations | 37 | 14 | 22 | 1 |
| | | 13.7% | 12.4% | 14.6% | 14.3% |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 70 | 34 | 36 | |
| | | 25.8% | 30.1% | 23.8% | |
| | Meets Expectations | 111 | 52 | 56 | 3 |
| | | 41.0% | 46.0% | 37.1% | 42.9% |
| | Below Expectations | 14 | 5 | 8 | 1 |
| | | 5.2% | 4.4% | 5.3% | 14.3% |
| | Far Below Expectations | 30 | 7 | 22 | 1 |
| | | 11.1% | 6.2% | 14.6% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 9 | 1 | 7 | 1 |
| | | 3.3% | .9% | 4.6% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**Satisfaction Level: Ability to transfer files electronically.**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Electronic File Transfer | Far Exceeds Expectations | 38 | 14 | 24 | |
| | | 14.0% | 12.4% | 15.9% | |
| | Exceeds Expectations | 44 | 21 | 23 | |
| | | 16.2% | 18.6% | 15.2% | |
| | Meets Expectations | 98 | 45 | 51 | 2 |
| | | 36.2% | 39.8% | 33.8% | 28.6% |
| | Below Expectations | 32 | 12 | 19 | 1 |
| | | 11.8% | 10.6% | 12.6% | 14.3% |
| | Far Below Expectations | 47 | 17 | 27 | 3 |
| | | 17.3% | 15.0% | 17.9% | 42.9% |
| | Refused | 12 | 4 | 7 | 1 |
| | | 4.4% | 3.5% | 4.6% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**6. Overall, how satisfied are you with the level of service you receive from the Office of State Printing?**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Satisfaction with State Office Service | Very Satisfied | 68 | 43 | 24 | 1 |
| | | 25.1% | 38.1% | 15.9% | 14.3% |
| | Satisfied | 100 | 46 | 51 | 3 |
| | | 36.9% | 40.7% | 33.8% | 42.9% |
| | Somewhat Satisfied | 41 | 18 | 23 | |
| | | 15.1% | 15.9% | 15.2% | |
| | Dissatisfied | 11 | 4 | 7 | |
| | | 4.1% | 3.5% | 4.6% | |
| | Very Dissatisfied | 2 | | 2 | |
| | | .7% | | 1.3% | |
| | Not Applicable | 45 | 2 | 41 | 2 |
| | | 16.6% | 1.8% | 27.2% | 28.6% |
| | Refused | 4 | | 3 | 1 |
| | | 1.5% | | 2.0% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**7. Overall, how satisfied are you with the level of service you receive from your individual agency print shop/copy center?**

| | | | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Entire Sample | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Individual Agency Service | Very Satisfied | 126 | 48 | 75 | 3 |
| | | 46.5% | 42.5% | 49.7% | 42.9% |
| | Satisfied | 80 | 38 | 40 | 2 |
| | | 29.5% | 33.6% | 26.5% | 28.6% |
| | Somewhat Satisfied | 19 | 6 | 13 | |
| | | 7.0% | 5.3% | 8.6% | |
| | Dissatisfied | 6 | | 6 | |
| | | 2.2% | | 4.0% | |
| | Very Dissatisfied | 4 | 2 | 2 | |
| | | 1.5% | 1.8% | 1.3% | |
| | Not Applicable | 28 | 19 | 8 | 1 |
| | | 10.3% | 16.8% | 5.3% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 8 | | 7 | 1 |
| | | 3.0% | | 4.6% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**8. Overall, how satisfied are you with the turnaround time from the Office of State Printing?**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Satisfaction with State Office Turnaround Time | Very Satisfied | 48 | 31 | 16 | 1 |
| | | 17.7% | 27.4% | 10.6% | 14.3% |
| | Satisfied | 99 | 48 | 50 | 1 |
| | | 36.5% | 42.5% | 33.1% | 14.3% |
| | Somewhat Satisfied | 46 | 17 | 27 | 2 |
| | | 17.0% | 15.0% | 17.9% | 28.6% |
| | Dissatisfied | 21 | 11 | 10 | |
| | | 7.7% | 9.7% | 6.6% | |
| | Very Dissatisfied | 6 | 2 | 4 | |
| | | 2.2% | 1.8% | 2.6% | |
| | Not Applicable | 43 | 3 | 38 | 2 |
| | | 15.9% | 2.7% | 25.2% | 28.6% |
| | Refused | 8 | 1 | 6 | 1 |
| | | 3.0% | .9% | 4.0% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**9. Overall, how satisfied are you with the turnaround time from your individual agency copy center/print shop?**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Satisfaction with Individual Agency Turnaround Time | Very Satisfied | 119 | 42 | 74 | 3 |
| | | 43.9% | 37.2% | 49.0% | 42.9% |
| | Satisfied | 82 | 37 | 44 | 1 |
| | | 30.3% | 32.7% | 29.1% | 14.3% |
| | Somewhat Satisfied | 24 | 8 | 15 | 1 |
| | | 8.9% | 7.1% | 9.9% | 14.3% |
| | Dissatisfied | 6 | 3 | 3 | |
| | | 2.2% | 2.7% | 2.0% | |
| | Very Dissatisfied | 4 | | 4 | |
| | | 1.5% | | 2.6% | |
| | Not Applicable | 31 | 23 | 7 | 1 |
| | | 11.4% | 20.4% | 4.6% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 5 | | 4 | 1 |
| | | 1.8% | | 2.6% | 14.3% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

**12. If you had other options, would the print shop/copy center you use most often be your provider of choice?**

| | | Entire Sample | Shop Used Most Often | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Office of State Printing | Agency Print Shop | Refused |
| Would You Keep the Same Provider? | Yes | 151 | 60 | 89 | 2 |
| | | 55.7% | 53.1% | 58.9% | 28.6% |
| | No | 27 | 14 | 13 | |
| | | 10.0% | 12.4% | 8.6% | |
| | Unsure | 56 | 28 | 27 | 1 |
| | | 20.7% | 24.8% | 17.9% | 14.3% |
| | Refused | 37 | 11 | 22 | 4 |
| | | 13.7% | 9.7% | 14.6% | 57.1% |
| Total | | 271 | 113 | 151 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

## Appendix E

**Please specify the other agency you work for.**

| Resp. No. | Other Agency Worked For |
|---|---|
| 4 | Development |
| 5 | Arc Board |
| 12 | Ohio SchoolNet Commission |
| 17 | Department of Insurance |
| 18 | Agriculture |
| 24 | Agriculture |
| 26 | Alcohol and Drug Addiction Services |
| 28 | Attorney General |
| 32 | Ohio Expo Center |
| 33 | MR/DD |
| 36 | Insurance |
| 44 | OTPTAT Board |
| 45 | Governor's Office |
| 46 | Adjutant General |
| 51 | Adjutant General's Department |
| 56 | SOH, Bd. Of Embalmers & Funeral Directors |
| 58 | Attorney General |
| 59 | Aging |
| 70 | State Employment Relations Board (ERB) |
| 73 | Agriculture |
| 74 | Board of Regents |
| 79 | Air Quality Development (AIR) |
| 80 | Office of Budget and Management |
| 93 | Ohio State Chiropractic Board |
| 102 | OSRC |
| 111 | Ohio School Facilities Commission |
| 112 | Department of Alcohol and Drug Addiction Services |
| 121 | Pharmacy Board |
| 127 | Ohio Department of Aging |
| 128 | Ohio SchoolNet |
| 130 | Agriculture |
| 131 | Optometry Board |
| 135 | Secretary of State |
| 153 | Commission on Dispute Resolution and Conflict Management |
| 155 | Department of Taxation |
| 157 | State Library Board |
| 160 | Dental Board |
| 162 | EBR |
| 164 | Criminal Justice Services |
| 172 | Board of Psychology |
| 173 | Accountancy Board |
| 174 | Rehabilitation Services Commission |
| 175 | SOS |
| 178 | Office of Criminal Justice Services (CJS) |
| 179 | Ohio Ethics Commission |
| 183 | Public Defender (PUB) |
| 195 | Ohio Expositions Commission |
| 197 | Dental Board (DEN) |

**Please specify the other agency you work for.**

| Resp. No. | Other Agency Worked For |
|---|---|
| 201 | Agriculture |
| 207 | Civil Rights |
| 209 | Accountancy Board |
| 215 | Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities (MRDD) |
| 223 | House of Representatives |
| 225 | OSN |
| 228 | MIH |
| 229 | Department of Taxation (ODT) |
| 233 | DD Council |
| 244 | Ambulance Licensing Board |
| 266 | Ohio Consumers' Counsel |
| 268 | Oh Rural Dev Partnership |

**10. What additional service(s) not currently available would you like to see offered by the print shop/copy center you use most often?**

| Resp. No. | Suggested Additional Services |
|---|---|
| 6 | The ability to translate/convert foreign languages to English |
| 7 | None at this time. |
| 13 | First, let me say that the copy center is the best addition to our building. I can not say enough positive comments about it. |
| 15 | High-Speed Color Laser Printing |
| 18 | Use of electronically sending documents to be printed. Double checking the job to ensure it is correct before returning it to the sender. Printing of colored documents at a reasonable cost. |
| 22 | More design/typesetting assistance - i.e., provision of templates that users can follow instead of waiting for designer to get to the job. |
| 26 | Cannot think of any at this time. |
| 33 | More on-line features, which I know is in process now. Great! :) |
| 34 | be able to e-mail files for copying instead of providing hard copy. Also do all paperwork (PPO) electronically. |
| 35 | Perhaps the print shop should conduct a training session for those who use their services most often so we could know what types of document layout packages work best and the things we could do to produce a better final product |
| 37 | Graphic art --- need creative design on a budget!! |
| 38 | The current services they provide are more than adequate for my needs. They do an excellent job! |
| 45 | None |
| 48 | The ability to send print requests electronically. Currently, the DAS Print Center does not have a working PC, and there is some question as to whether this Copy Center should have access rights to our network system (ODJFS)(jumping over firewall). I personally, would like the option of being able to submit my office's print needs electionically if so desired. |
| 50 | None |
| 52 | Easier way to electronically transmit large files, or desktop computer to printer |
| 54 | Some way to track print orders. This would allow me to see why or where delays are. |
| 55 | Artwork services offered for forms design. State Printing currently has 2 graphic artists, however, designing of forms is currently not done. State Forms Management requires that forms be designed according to industry design standards, however, most artwork services in the public sector have so idea what the design standards are. |
| 59 | 4 color pocess offset |
| 61 | More sophisticated printing abilities |
| 65 | Have never had to use the Office of State Printing so far and only used print shop/copy center once as lead timtes are too long to be practical. Do not know what additional services i might want. |
| 69 | Ohio Data Network Print Services should purchase full-color high-speed laser printers and finishing/binding equipment |
| 71 | Variable data printing. More binding options such as shrink wrap, paper wrap, GBC. A large collator. |
| 73 | A graphics library available on the web for Copy Center clients to use - ESPECIALLY graphics like the state seal, agency seals, etc. - to be used in the preparation of materials for printing. |
| 75 | For the ODOD print shop, I would like for them to have the ability to print jobs on "paper plates" (one-time use) instead of metal plates. |
| 77 | Large format printing/coping |
| 79 | Use of requested paper. |
| 81 | none I can think of |

| Resp. No. | Suggested Additional Services |
|---|---|
| 85 | I have just taken over the duties of the ordering and I have not been able to attend one of you meetings. Hope to get to attend the next quartly meeting. |
| 87 | I would like print shop to use the digital files that I send, and not print one copy, then reproduce from copy. I would also like to have more options available for more professional looking jobs. More options for cover paper and binding. Better quality image reproduction from electronic file. More knowledgeable staff. |
| 90 | None that I know of at this time. |
| 91 | I would like to see additional services available from our copy center. They are unable to do color, perforations, binding and other services that we have requested in the past. I am interested in getting a small, 1", sticker to use on envelopes and I never got a response on my request. |
| 94 | Not an additional service, but would like to be ablel to fill out the form from my PC rather than making a trip to the basement. |
| 98 | more ability to print from computer files directly. |
| 101 | Fine as is |
| 103 | Two-color offset printing |
| 104 | The ability to enter work orders AND send product to be copied ELECTRONICALLY FROM MY DESK |
| 107 | to save time proof's sent electronically |
| 108 | Allow agencies to pay own invoices for jobs state printing bids out |
| 109 | None |
| 113 | none comes to mind |
| 114 | Electronic transmission of documents |
| 115 | someone to do the layout once basic information is provided so final product looks very professional |
| 120 | Direct-to-plate capabilities |
| 122 | Mailing solutions |
| 123 | none |
| 124 | O.K. with services that exist. |
| 125 | folding and inserting services |
| 126 | I am happy with all that they do now. |
| 130 | 1. ability to provide more information regarding electronically transferring files 2. additional binding services and mailing services (bulk mail sorting, folding and sealing of newsletters, etc.) |
| 134 | I would like to see a "shared" database indicating that my document(s) have been received and are scheduled for printing...which would alleviate the necessity for phone calls checking on the final product. |
| 139 | Do personal work for me -- and I would pay. This would save much time for busy professionals and volunteers for family and volunteer projects outside of the Ohio work. |
| 140 | additional binding options |
| 142 | Having color copying services available for larger amounts for improving the ease of understanding when presenting charts on the computer/overhead and having copies of the slides in black and white for the participants to make certain all can follow along, even if the screen is too far or blurry to some people, instead of just having blacka nd white copies of what started out in two dark colors, because this would make it clear to all and the presenter could refer to the colors on the chart to make it faster and more concise. |
| 147 | Because of Karen's incredible work , I can't think of one area that can be improved...unless you can provide better equipment for your employees. I am not aware if that is a need or not. |
| 148 | I would like to be able to get all orders set up and processed through my PC at my desk and simply e-mail the jobs for scheduling in DMS. |
| 150 | availability to print to copier from desktop pc. |

| Resp. No. | Suggested Additional Services |
|---|---|
| 153 | Color copying at Riffe copy center |
| 158 | New ways to create new report bindings and conference brochures. |
| 160 | none |
| 162 | Unkown, as we are a small commission. We mainly use the Quick Copy Center on Surface Road. |
| 163 | Color copies |
| 171 | Compatability of computer software to enable all types of files to be transmitted electronically. |
| 172 | folding in-house |
| 173 | Ability to email a job and have printed. |
| 174 | laminating, pin-feed sheets |
| 175 | explain the difference between copy center and print shop. I never know which one to contact. do not understand completely how charges are calculated. |
| 176 | Some bindery services such as drilling. |
| 177 | Possibly add staffing so lead time on getting forms revised and printed may be decreased. |
| 181 | The ability to produce high-quality color booklets and brochures for distribution. If they provide this service, I am not aware of it. |
| 182 | A new color copier. The one we have is at a different location. |
| 188 | Improved contract paper selection |
| 190 | Would like to have a phone list of the copy center I use sent to my office |
| 191 | Paper selections, colors, and weight options should be listed on the internet so that we can select appropriate specifications that are in stock, and that are inexpensive. |
| 192 | shrink wrap, offset printing |
| 199 | mass manufacturing of CD's |
| 205 | ability to send copy directly to the printshop |
| 207 | posters large or signs |
| 209 | I believe that all they are able to do are standard copies. I wish they were able to offer a variety of services at this location. |
| 214 | None at this time. |
| 217 | Our print shop is very accomodating and tends to our needs in a very courteous and professional manner. |
| 219 | none |
| 220 | Additional Staff |
| 221 | to view sample of finished product and to provide cost estimate |
| 224 | nothing at this time |
| 226 | I would like the copier to read my instructions carefully and if they are not understood to ask me what I mean. I was very embarrassed at a meeting once when I noticed that the policy we were going to review was only printed on one side when I had requested two sided. |
| 230 | ability to do larger jobs, ie more than 5,000 imprints |
| 232 | A website detailing what they can do besides business cards. |
| 237 | no additional at this time |
| 241 | perfect buinding and saddle sitch 8.5x11 books |
| 244 | None. |
| 245 | Large format color printing (Posters, signs etc.) |
| 246 | Color printing available at the Quick Copy Center |
| 249 | Send jobs directly via my computer at my desk due to my work load - could be beneficial to me and print shop |
| 251 | Capability to make extremely large signs and/or banners for meetings and workshops. |
| 254 | My needs are being met |
| 256 | Online submission of work to printer from internal and external terminals |

| Resp. No. | Suggested Additional Services |
|---|---|
| 259 | We don't use our local copy center. They were too busy to handle our mailings so we went with an outside service or state printing, then eventually went electronic (online). |
| 266 | blueline proofs |

**11. In order of importance, what are your top three suggestions for improvement of the print shop/copy center you use most often?**

| Resp. No. | Most Important Suggestion |
|---|---|
| 1 | hire retain knowledgable people in the printing industry |
| 6 | More staff |
| 11 | Availability of staff to answer questions |
| 13 | That they could take over layout and design and run it the same way! |
| 15 | High-Speed Full Color Laser Printing |
| 18 | Electronic transmitting of documents |
| 22 | Better identification of costs associated with copy center work - i.e., running totals that enable user to track expenses in relation to encumbered amounts. |
| 23 | More electronic design staff |
| 31 | up to date printers |
| 33 | Continue to expand Graphics/Design |
| 34 | better turn around time |
| 35 | Improve turn around time. Lately this has been improving |
| 37 | None - they are exemplary just like they ARE!!! |
| 38 | Continue the level of customer service they currently provide |
| 45 | When deadlines cannot be met inform the requester. Keep the lines of communication open. |
| 48 | ON LINE ORDERING AVAILABILITY BETWEEN DAS AND ODJFS |
| 50 | Satisfied |
| 52 | Better communication of expected delivery date, especially notification if not able to meet requested delivery date |
| 53 | communication from central office to district levels |
| 54 | On time delivery |
| 55 | Artwork services offered for forms design. |
| 57 | Must ALWAYS meet deadlines. |
| 58 | Bidding procedures bogg down timely production of publications |
| 59 | User Groups be more specific topic, less big picture |
| 61 | location, would prefer to buy directly , locally |
| 63 | Purchase quality equipment |
| 64 | Quicker pickup service |
| 65 | cut turnaround times from 3 weeks in print shop/copy center to 2-3 days |
| 67 | Instant availability |
| 68 | Being able to transfer a file electronically for reproduction |
| 69 | Full Color printing |
| 71 | Improvement in turnaround when jobs need to be sent to the Surface Rd center. |
| 72 | Privatize |
| 75 | See above -- #10 |
| 76 | In regards to Surface Road facility-- might be nice to know they've received the job and can meet timelines. Often I hear nothing until I see a proof or hear about a job being done |
| 77 | have more knowledgable people easier to contact |
| 79 | Maintain files so the same documents are not designed everytime they are requested (i.e. business cards). |
| 87 | Quality of product |
| 90 | One employee needs an attitude adjustment-one is fine |
| 91 | Color copies |
| 94 | Make the technology for requests |
| 98 | electronic printing |
| 101 | Fine as is |

**11. In order of importance, what are your top three suggestions for improvement of the print shop/copy center you use most often?**

| Resp. No. | Most Important Suggestion |
|---|---|
| 103 | Accurately identifying turnaround time |
| 104 | The ability to enter work orders AND send product to be copied ELECTRONICALLY FROM MY DESK |
| 108 | Change laws to allow agencies to advertise in printed documents and have companies that are advertising pay State printing or the awarded contract vendor directly so that agencies do not have to use appropriation authority. |
| 109 | Announcements of new publications are sent out to all ODE employees |
| 110 | Accessability |
| 112 | Communicate more frequently - courtesy calls when a project is completed would be much appreciated, rather than waiting on a courier to show up to know something was done |
| 113 | delivery time |
| 114 | return phone calls |
| 115 | assistance is layout so final product looks professional |
| 118 | More staff |
| 119 | Notification of when a print job is completed and placed in the inventory for ordering. |
| 120 | Color copier reliability - copier can't realistically do what was stated |
| 122 | Overal Print to Mail Solution that DAS should offer. |
| 123 | none |
| 126 | can't think of any improvemnts needed |
| 127 | no comment |
| 128 | Delivery time |
| 130 | answer phone calls on a more timely basis. When you finally receive a return phone call, staff is usually very helpful. However, in some cases it takes three to five days to receive a phone call, if you receive a call at all. |
| 133 | communication when deadline cannot be met |
| 134 | Some type of scheduling |
| 136 | Turn around time |
| 137 | Notification on time project will be complted |
| 139 | Continue to help me design what is needed. Artful |
| 140 | ability to meet deadlines (more staff) |
| 141 | if you are not sure how your customer wants something done -- ask |
| 142 | This is very difficult because Kennon Hughes does such a great job with our orders, whether we have several jobs down there, then have a printing crisis with special needs and faster turn around times or a need for thicker paper, or whatever. Having another large machine to handle some of the urgent orders or having more coverage for when he needs to be out so as not to put anyone's orders behind if the machine breaks should he have to be out suddenly, even though now arrangements have been made for the coverageof completing urgent orders.away |
| 146 | More capabilities to handle larger print jobs |
| 147 | Updatede equipment |
| 148 | A more user friendly work request form that will be picked up from the computer and not hand carried to DMS. |
| 153 | Meeting requested deadlines |
| 158 | Print Shop to verfiy all print orders by calling customer |
| 160 | none |
| 162 | No suggestions at this time. |
| 171 | Technology |
| 173 | electronic capability |

**11. In order of importance, what are your top three suggestions for improvement of the print shop/copy center you use most often?**

| Resp. No. | Most Important Suggestion |
|---|---|
| 176 | To straighten out the computer interface problems with copy machines. This is an IT problem. |
| 177 | Proof final draft before mass producation. |
| 178 | More flexibility to use outside vendors for emergency print jobs, eliminating the waiver process. |
| 181 | User-Friendly quality of computer program for entering work orders, and making changes in those work orders when necessary. |
| 182 | Could use one or two more staff, (preferrably 2) |
| 188 | Higher level of desktop publishing expertise |
| 189 | More feedback on production schedule....when will specific jobs be completed/delivered. |
| 190 | need contact name and phone numbers |
| 191 | Getting a print request out of DOH to the print shop needs to be improved. |
| 192 | give her the support she needs to do her job. |
| 193 | The copy center is wonderful |
| 195 | Verbal Communication upon receipt of job to know turnaround time |
| 197 | Updated copiers |
| 199 | Color Copiers in all centers for mass publications |
| 202 | Better communications with Chief of Printing. |
| 205 | ability to submit copy jobs via computer |
| 206 | Turnaround Time |
| 208 | Instructions on how to utilize the form to capacity |
| 209 | Color copies |
| 210 | really don't have any |
| 211 | Have copy center able to do some of the projects only handled by the main copy centerain |
| 213 | Consistent Quality |
| 214 | I have never had a problem, so I cannot suggest any improvements. |
| 219 | Lower costs |
| 220 | Better turn around |
| 221 | provide sample view of finished product |
| 223 | better communication with agency |
| 224 | see above |
| 225 | Meet agreed deadlines |
| 226 | Careful reading and understanding of printing instructions. |
| 230 | staff should be available more (in the room) |
| 231 | to deliver as soon as job is done or call and give opportunity to pick up.. |
| 237 | everything fine for EPA |
| 240 | Improving accuracy |
| 244 | None |
| 246 | Have none at this time |
| 249 | The do an excellent job. |
| 251 | Professionalism - our people have "attitudes" about their work and it shows |
| 265 | Make sure people have items delivered to them not left someplace for pickpup. This has not happened lately. |
| 266 | Meet delivery date requirements. |
| 268 | Have full-time staff at print shop, with full knowledge of equipment and services |
| 271 | Friendliness of staff |
| 273 | MORE STAFF |

**11. In order of importance, what are your top three suggestions for improvement of the print shop/copy center you use most often?**

| Resp. No. | 2nd Most Important Suggestion |
|---|---|
| 1 | do not privitise copying and printing as they often are not responsive to our needs |
| 6 | Better color quality |
| 13 | Someone under copy/print shop that has more design experience. |
| 15 | Binding Equipment |
| 18 | Quality |
| 23 | Better skills in template design |
| 31 | more professional, courteous employees |
| 33 | Focus on making certain all users know what detailed services you offer |
| 34 | higher level of technology |
| 35 | Continue looking into new technology, which you are likely doing already |
| 37 | Work out better plan with DAS Communications to have more time for printing. They need to understand and respect your processes and flow chart their slow approval/review process. Liaison for change of administration--things were crazy?? |
| 45 | Stop charging the requester for errors made by State Printing. |
| 48 | MORE ADVERTISING |
| 52 | Clear instruction or training in transferring electronic files |
| 53 | what services they do have available we are unaware of our options |
| 54 | quality of deliverables- (if its not going to look good because of a bad original - Let me know before its printed and I have copies that I have to pay for but will not distribute) |
| 58 | State-awarded bids often result in substandard work product-- you get what you pay for |
| 59 | A little faster turnaround on offset |
| 61 | more communications of what services/forms are available |
| 63 | Produce projects more quickly |
| 65 | do an on-site orientation for new staff like me showing what services are available and how to cost services and access thenm |
| 69 | finishing/binding equipment |
| 72 | Privatize |
| 76 | Paper selection and inventory has become such a guessing game-- better communication about available papers ongoing |
| 77 | select better and larger selection of paper |
| 79 | Maintain agency files so logos and documents ordered frequently are reproduced on the same paper each time. |
| 87 | Expertise of staff |
| 91 | binding |
| 98 | making copies on CD |
| 103 | Communicating when deadlines are not met |
| 109 | Someone is always at the reception desk when you walk in |
| 110 | Economical |
| 112 | Continue to develop/refine electronic order processing capabilities |
| 113 | contact client if going to be late |
| 115 | very quick turn around time |
| 118 | Better turn around time for fixing broken equipment |
| 120 | personnel necessary to do the job |
| 123 | none |
| 130 | Additional assistance in resolving problems with outside vendors. In the case of our department we have had a number of jobs in the last year that have been awarded to sub par vendors. There have been major problems with turnaround time and the vendor capabilities have been overstated. State printing needs to serve as more of an advocate for the agencies it represents when these problems arise. |

**11. In order of importance, what are your top three suggestions for improvement of the print shop/copy center you use most often?**

| Resp. No. | 2nd Most Important Suggestion |
|---|---|
| 133 | communication when deadline cannot be met |
| 134 | Availability of evening/night hours to allow for better turnaround |
| 137 | Need more staff to be able to complete all the work requests. |
| 139 | Deliver it on time |
| 140 | overnight/late night requests for 1-2 day turn-around |
| 141 | if you a file will not allow high quality reproduction - notify customer |
| 142 | Continue the electronic transfer capabilities and great coordination between the Graphic Arts Section and the DOH Copy Center, along with the great coordination we have grown accustomed to by Linn, Rene, Nancy and others at the State Inhouse Printing, where, like Kennon or Lyndell, we can expect a call if they do not understand an order and our contact is out, or if they have a suggestion based on knowing their equipment or the changing printing technology better than we do, or because of experience in seeing other jobs and offering suggestions for making the finished product look more professional for the same price, or very little more. Often these suggestions will come prior to a print job being typed, and that really helps in the budget department. . Staff shortages means delays and shortened turn arounds which I try to avoid, but am not always successful depending on what the media and world events are creating for us to deal with, and how much printing that may generate. We are using more fax/phone transmissions, but not all have a |
| 146 | More staffing, mabye a late night printing position |
| 147 | keep your great employees happy so we don't loose them! |
| 148 | All envelope orders processed through the Intranet instead of printing out paper and hand carrying it to DMS. |
| 153 | Communicate better when jobs will not meet deadline or have to be altered |
| 158 | Suggest better layout or printing options to the customer |
| 171 | Electronic transmitting |
| 173 | color printing |
| 176 | Acquire a larger, faster color copier. |
| 177 | Reduce the 90 days lead time on getting forms revised and printed |
| 181 | Better understanding of products and services available. |
| 182 | Purchase color copier for ACF |
| 191 | Responsiveness and accuracy of requests transfered from DOH to Print Shop need to be improved. |
| 192 | provide her with the equipment she needs to do my job in-house |
| 195 | Verbal communication regarding questions about what is required |
| 197 | Less Down time due to equipment breakdown |
| 199 | Review of costs - not always competitive with other small comercial print shops |
| 202 | Understanding that policy and procedures can not always be followed. |
| 209 | Additional services |
| 213 | Reduced turn-around |
| 219 | Lower costs |
| 221 | provide cost estimates |
| 223 | accuracy |
| 225 | plain explanations of materials and procedures for those unfamiliar with the printing "business" |
| 226 | Provide sample before full order printed so mistakes can be corrected easily with less waste. |
| 230 | contact program if deadline can't be met |
| 240 | Immediate communicate any difficulty in meeting project timelines. |
| 251 | If your unit cannot accommodate the needs, call the person immediately. |
| 266 | Availability of more paper types |
| 273 | MORE STAFF |

**11. In order of importance, what are your top three suggestions for improvement of the print shop/copy center you use most often?**

| Resp. No. | 3rd Most Important Suggestion |
|---|---|
| 1 | keep copy centers avaialble in agencies for job of less than 1,000 copies |
| 6 | Bigger/better choice on namecard colors |
| 13 | The print shop is great and has helped our office a lot!! |
| 15 | Staff Training |
| 18 | Printing color documents at reasonable rates |
| 23 | Better support and coordination from State Printing |
| 31 | outsource ODOT's print shop if found to be more cost effective |
| 33 | Keeping all users informed of new techniques |
| 34 | able to blow up photos |
| 45 | Do not change artwork without approval from requester. |
| 48 | POSITIVE PROMOTION OF SERVICES BY DIRECTOR/DEPUTY DIRECTORS |
| 53 | if they forward to state printing they contact us to we know where our job is being completed. |
| 54 | Notification if print order cannot be completed by requested date. I usually build in 4-5 days before I really need a print order to be certain I receive it by the time I need it. |
| 61 | envelopes |
| 63 | Commit to a turnaround date when the project is submitted |
| 65 | give seminars/workshops on technical topics related to copying/printing/binding, etc. to educate employees on how to produce professional-looking products |
| 69 | staff training |
| 72 | Privatize |
| 79 | Stop using voice mail to answer the telephone. |
| 87 | Satisfaction |
| 91 | more innovation with unusual requests. |
| 98 | delivery of finished product |
| 103 | Addtional print services in-house, ie offset printing |
| 112 | Continue to expand paper selection (colors, weight, texture, size, etc.) |
| 113 | place shrink-wrap services needed in in-house center |
| 133 | communication when deadline cannot be met |
| 134 | Availibility to make conference handouts and to produce a conference packet. |
| 139 | Be available to do private copying so I do not have to go to Kinkos. |
| 140 | increased communication if deadlines can not be met |
| 141 | prepress services |
| 142 | Continue to have the DOH Copy Center because it is the most efficient, high quality, and inexpensive set-up we have been able to arrange through the years, especially with the coordination of where it is located in relation to the other staff with whom our "Master Printer" Kennon Hughes coordinates: Bob Hill, Joe Speakman, Lyndell Mills, and Maggie Buckholtz. And continue to have copiers located on the floors for shorter and faster turnaround jobs for staff meetings, drafts, bioterrorism sudden needs, etc. without key access so that anyone in need can get to a copier and not have to waste time waiting--a former problem. |
| 153 | Better communication when there is a questionable element to a job or job request. for example if they are out of the color paper we requested, they should call and ask us if it is okay to put it on a different color before doing so. These kinds of simple communications don't always happen. |
| 158 | Teach us about color specifications |
| 181 | Communicating to all staff who does what in the print shop/copy center |
| 182 | A 3-color or 4-color press along with a 2-color press |
| 191 | Customers need to be aware of which print requests are appropriate for internal copy center and which are appropriate for the State Print Shop. |

**11. In order of importance, what are your top three suggestions for improvement of the print shop/copy center you use most often?**

| Resp. No. | 3rd Most Important Suggestion |
|---|---|
| 192 | Give her back-up |
| 195 | If necessary, send a proof of job to be sure it is what client wants |
| 219 | Lower costs |
| 221 | have direct contact between office and state printing rather than go through communication office |
| 223 | promptness |
| 226 | Copier be proactive so that when a print job looks bad steps are taken to make it look better. |
| 230 | be able to laminate |
| 251 | Mainstream your computers to be like everyone else's (pc - not mac) |
| 273 | MORE STAFF |

**Please include any additional comments concerning the Office of State Printing or individual print shop/copy center that you feel are valuable to this survey.**

| Resp. No. | Additional Comments |
|---|---|
| 1 | Please don't privitize this service. This isn't a union thing with me as I don't trust the union anyways. When my boss come to me at the last minute for 200 hundred copies of a 20 page document for a meeting that starts in a couple of hours, I want the flexibility to give it to the copy center here at ODOT not having to get a purchase order, call for pick up or go to an outside commericial copy center and not be able to deliver what my supervisior wants. Sometime privitising an operation which it seems where this might be going is the absolute wrong thing to do. State employees are often more flexible and in the end run may cost the government less money than getting a contract to do the work. We recently did this with some warranty pavement markings hiring an ooutside vender to survey pavement markings, we couldn't get him when we wanted him and his price was ten time more expensive than if our staff had done it. Bill Carty. |
| 6 | Considering the number of staff and the number of printing/copying requests, they do a great job! |
| 10 | The Manager for the ODOT Print Shop is always accessible, cordial, helpful, professional, timely and efficient. |
| 13 | The problem with State printing is that it takes to long from when you submit your print order until arrival of product. |
| 14 | The Staff in Rhodes Tower is very professional and helpful in assisting us with our needs. There follow-through on projects that they complete or that have to be sent to main center is impeccable. Its reassuring to know that when you leave a job - you don't have to worry about how it will be handled. |
| 22 | State Printing staff are uniformly friendly, knowledgeable, and pro-active. They are a pleasure to work with. |
| 26 | My experience with the Rhodes Office Tower Copy Center staff/work has only been extremely positive. They are to be commended for helpfulness, quality of work and timeliness of completion. |
| 29 | Staff is always very cooperative,Responsive, and friendly during all contacts. |
| 31 | ODOT makes way to many copies of unnecessary material, someone should oversee or better monitor the amount and content of materials being copied!! |
| 33 | I attended the SPUG Meeting on 11/28 and was impressed with the entire operation. It seemed each department head was knowledgeable and on top of modern improvements. They seemed to be a "TEAM" and a good team always prevails. Keep up the good work! :) |
| 34 | I think the level of service we get in our agency print shop is outstanding. The staff tries to the best of their ability to give high quality work and quick service, but are limited by equipment. |
| 35 | I appreciate the help the print shop provides and especially Deb Moreno who is always willing to help in any way. I appreciate the recent addition of the ability to send our newsletter directly to the print shop printer. This has improved the turn around time and has enabled us to add color to the newsletter. I've heard many positive comments about the newsletter since this process has been in place. |
| 36 | I think they both do a Fantastic job! In all my years working with them I have have had only a handful of problems and that's saying something in today's workforce. |
| 37 | State Printing is awesome and should be an example for all of the Divisions of DAS and other governmental print operations. Staff are exceptional in knowledge, customer service and efficiency. Amy & all staff at Rhodes location as well as Nancy Patete and all staff in the Copy Center at Surface Road are great print consultants and can always be reached and get right back to you. Due to slow approval processes we often take in items that need done in short turn around time. They go to extremes to be certain we have the best design, paper and that we are satisfied with their products. All delivery staff go the extra mile to be certain large orders are delivered to conferences or other locations for us frequently. They are always timely and have even helped us unpack books when setting up large events for conferences. Diane Spiller in the Office of State Printing is so helpful that you never need to worry -- just call her and she knows EVERYTHING and can solve any print problem (including impossible timelines and keeping you under budget & that is |

**Please include any additional comments concerning the Office of State Printing or individual print shop/copy center that you feel are valuable to this survey.**

| Resp. No. | Additional Comments |
|---|---|
| 40 | I have had contact with many people over the years, they all are dedicated to providing a great product and service. They take a lot of pride in the quality of their work. I only have one concern. That is when the SOT copy shop is closed on the 29th floor because they are printing some exams. Maybe that kind of job would be better handled at the main printing office. |
| 41 | The convenience of having a copy center close at hand is very important when your faced with a rush assignment. |
| 45 | Deadlines and quality products are essential to this office. Prior notification from State Printing would be appreciated when deadlines cannot be met. Artwork should be proofed and not altered by State Printing prior to production. Artwork on disc's have been altered, printed, and delivered. State Printing is then notified the artwork is altered and corrections are made. The requester is charged for the mistakes and corrections. This is not a one-time deal but reoccurring. Communictaion can prevent most problems. |
| 48 | Those of us now occupying this building (255 E. Main Street, since August)moved from the Capitol Square Office Building located at 65 E. State Street. In the thirteen years that my office had been located at State Street, any large print requests were handled in the State Office Tower. DAS has evidently sub-leased a large area in our basement as we now have the DAS Copy Center located in this buildiing! Having an on-site copy service is new to us, as we would have to walk to the SOT to submit and pickup our copy requests. I have utilizied their services once so far, and was very satisfied with their services. The employee (Van Nylton) and his supervisor (Kirk) are both very knowledgable, professional, and very courteous. Van is very approachablre and is always there to answer questions. I am always impressed with this type of service. If you have good people skills and are always willing to do the best job that you can do, it's a win-win situation for all involved. I am happy to have this DAS Copy Center located within our building. |
| 53 | Employees are very helpful at the printshop, but district employees need to be made aware of what is available. |
| 54 | The staff at State Printing are very polite and normally very helpful. But as with most things the bad experiences stand out more than when things do go right. The key, I feel, it better communication. It is very important to me to get print jobs when I need them. If I were to go to a private print shop and they didn't meet my requested deadline and did not tell me in advance that they wouldn't. I probably would not utualize them again. |
| 55 | State Printing's copy center probably does 60% of the printing for DMH. We have always received excellent service from them. |
| 58 | The staff of state printing offset and copy centers have always been very professional and helpful, within the restrictions that they have to operate under. What is hurting the effective operation of State Printing is the red tape of their long, drawn-out bidding procedures, and once the lowest bid is accepted, a substandard work product. The problem is in the system they operate under, not in the service the State Printing employees try to provide. |
| 59 | Great job overall!!!! Special thanks on fast turnarounds and crazy projets. |
| 60 | Very professional staff that is very aware of customer needs. |
| 61 | we would prefer the ability to run up the street and go to a "kinko's" type of place..... |
| 63 | The ODOT Print Shop does not produce a quality product. They need to purchase quality equipment. They never let me know when my project will be completed. I feel they should contact me and let me know when I can expect to receive the final product. They need to communicate more with their users. If they don't understand something, they should call and ask to make sure they are doing things correctly. I have had many projects ruined, because someone at the Print Shop made an assumption about what they should do rather than contacting me directly. I have only had to deal with State Printing once. The brochure they contracted out for me looked horrible. There were smudges on the paper and the colors were weak. I barely received it in time for a news conference. |

**Please include any additional comments concerning the Office of State Printing or individual print shop/copy center that you feel are valuable to this survey.**

| Resp. No. | Additional Comments |
|---|---|
| 65 | Most of the survey questions don't "fit" me as I am a 9-month employee who has only used these services 3 times because of lack of need and/or inability to wait for turnaround time available |
| 67 | My needs are of a nature that copies must be done immediately and they are met at our individual copy center due to location and excellent service. |
| 68 | The copy center at Fountain Square is utilized quite frequently. The service received from this copy center is outstanding! It would be great if we could send files electronically for some of the printing projects we do at the Fountain Square copy center location. |
| 69 | I am a Programmer Specialist I for ODN Print Services. I believe that I have a keen insight and technical perspective on where the future of printing needs to be in the State of Ohio. You are welcome to contact me. In sum, these are my opinions: 1.) ODN Print Services and the Office of State Printing need to begin a working reltationship. A combination of high-speed variable print by ODN Print Services with the binding/finishing skills of State Printing would benefit the people of the State of Ohio. 2.) The wave of the future is not offset lithographic color printing but high-speed color laser printing. 3.) All printing should be done in-house by State of Ohio skilled employees. NO CONTRACTING-OUT by the Office of State Printing should be done, before the offer of printing services has been made to ODN Print Services. Thank you. Feel free to contact me. Alice Yuhas 614-728-8618 Programmer Specialist 1 (ODN Print Services' Senior Technical Person) 614-728-8618 You are welcome to contact me again if you wish. |
| 70 | Our agency has dealt with the main copy center for many years. The product that is produced is always top quality. We sincerely appreciate all the hard work and professionalism of the Copy Center Staff from the person who answers the phone to those who deliver. |
| 71 | The Office of State Printing recently opened a copy center in the Dept of Education and have been most helpful in resolving all issues concerning quality and turn-around. They have worked with us on billing issues and provide helpful suggestions to all our concerns. |
| 72 | Why do we, in this day and age, still have in-house printing? This is such a waste. There are so many private, local companies who would "bend over backwards" to get our work, and yet we are slaves to the dictates of in-house printing and their archaic ways of thinking and doing business. |
| 73 | The level of professionalism and "can do" attitude are wonderful at the Main Copy Center and are VALUED by me as a client - they ALWAYS make me look good to the clients that I serve!!!! |
| 75 | The location of the ODOD copy center and print shop is invaluabe to me. I can easily converse with the employees and retrieve my completed jobs quickly. |
| 76 | I'm very satisfied with the response of all state printing employees when I call to discuss a problem, concern or project. I've also encountered employees (i.e. Karen from Copy Center at Fountain square) who consistently goes above and beyond her job to get a project done in both a timely and high quality manner. |
| 77 | Hire more people like Crawford. He is not only knowledgable about the business that he is in. Working with him is so easy. |
| 79 | Customer Service responses apply to Crawford Wall only! He handles all of our requests and problems, and does it well! He should be the model for the entire staff. |
| 81 | The print shop/copy center has been a valuable service to our small Division. They provide an excellent, professional service that is convienient to our offices. Their personnel have gone over and beyond the call of duty to prepare our printing/copying needs and have, on numerous occasions, completed jobs on short notice and worked personnel on an extra shift to get things done. They have always been of great assistance to our needs. |
| 83 | Manager of print shop/copy center is professional and competent. He always gives immediate feedback as to turn around time and what I will need to provide to complete the job. I am confident that my jobs will be returned without me needing to double check their work. |
| 85 | I need training..... |

**Please include any additional comments concerning the Office of State Printing or individual print shop/copy center that you feel are valuable to this survey.**

| Resp. No. | Additional Comments |
|---|---|
| 86 | Dante, Renee and Crawford and those guys do really good work and they've been a big help to me as I learn my way around the print production process. |
| 87 | The print shop staff is courteous and helpful but not knowledgeable. |
| 90 | My experience with the ODPS Print Shope has been a good one. Almost always, projects are done on time or ahead of time. The lady who works there is just not very personable. |
| 91 | I am satisfied with the work that they are able to perform, but I would like to see an increase in the types of services that they are able to provide. In lieu of that, I need help in dealing with the State print shop in explaining what it is I need. I am not familiar with the technical side of what they do and find it confusing to explain or understand what they need from me to perform a job. |
| 96 | At EDU , there is a computer to submit copy request- It is super easy to do!! Staff very helpfull and offer excellent solutions to any problems I have!!! |
| 97 | The only problem with our center is that we need to give them 2 weeks notice for large projects and sometimes we do not have that long of a notice to get the projects out. |
| 98 | There are times that due to the shop having other orders come in, my order is set aside, even if it was there some time ahead of the higher priority order. Now, if the other order is indeed more important, I do not mind, but if it is something like the newsletter or items for the fair, my deadline is still missed. I would like to see that happen less and put more emphesis on first in first out (except for truely important items, such as information requested by the customers of ODOT - items such as manuals or highway contract related things; or safety related matters). |
| 108 | We have had very good levels of service from our print shop as well as that of state printing. Joe Tucker and his staff have been very accommodating to requests and have went out of their way to ensure our needs are being met. |
| 110 | I really haven't used the State Printing Service lately so I believe other users would have a better opinion. |
| 112 | In the past our Department had a few concerns over quality and timeliness issues, but the Copy Center this year has really provided us with excellent graphic design support in the past year. They have also been extremely helpful in processing last-minute requests and meeting very tight deadlines. |
| 113 | The in-house copy center is great but needs to be able to offer more of the services that the Main center can do. |
| 117 | I have always had excellent customer service from the Office of State Printing and have never had any problems with jobs that I have submitted. |
| 123 | The problem that I am having is NOT with print shop/copy center. It is with my printing coordinator. In Sept. '01, I submitted quite a few jobs to Printing Services and I have received the worst service that I have seen in over 10 years. All of my jobs have been late, or I haven't seen a blueline and the job has been out there for 2 months. I'm certain that all the jobs submitted were contract jobs 10-15 days. I feel that my coordinator has neglected to perform his job as my representative. I am just very displeased. |
| 124 | The ODH print center is excellent. We are very pleased with the quality of work and the timeliness. |
| 126 | The dept of Public Safety Copy Center is always ready and willing to accomdate my needs. I never have to wait as long as they tell me. Randy and Mary are First Class People! |
| 128 | The staff has been great at completing projects and contacting me with questions and when deadline cannot be met. |
| 131 | The staff at the Riffe print shop are very accommodating. |
| 132 | The people in the print shop are very knowledgeable and seem to be service oriented. Although I am a fairly new employee, they have made my requests/questions appear normal and have been more than capable of handling these requests. Would hope that the 2 week notice request for large printing jobs could be improved upon. |

**Please include any additional comments concerning the Office of State Printing or individual print shop/copy center that you feel are valuable to this survey.**

| Resp. No. | Additional Comments |
|---|---|
| 134 | I use the Office of State Printing when the ODH copy shop can not meet a deadline, or when the job is extremely large. I use the Office of State Printing when I need a job bound and/or counted and bundled. |
| 138 | In uncontrolable situations, the print shop has always been a pleasure to woork with as they have handle last minute requests. |
| 140 | Several jobs I recently submitted to the Office of State Printing were completed professionally, on-time, with staff offering suggestions when spec's couldn't exactly be met. It was a VERY pleasurable experience. I appreciated their dedication to my job. |
| 141 | Treat customers as if they have a choice about where to buy printing and make them feel you are pleased to have their business. Staff is always courteous but I have a sence that the work I bring is an inconvenience |
| 144 | I had a bad experience in getting printing done for the State Fair this year with the Office of State printing. It was not delivered on time and it ended up being a real inconvenience. If I could chose I wouldn't go that route again. However, we HAD to go through State Printing for what we had to get done. |
| 145 | I really haven't used the Office of State Printing, because my experience with the ODOT section proved to be frustrating. I understand that they have made improvements, but I am still gun-shy. Before I came to this position, I had used services in the Riffe Tower, and found them to be very helpful, professional, and customer-focused. |
| 146 | I am happy with the service received from Office of State Printing and ODPS Printing Services. |
| 147 | I miss the wonderful working relationship our department had with Denise Evans, my printing rep for 16 years. I can't speak highly enough about the great work Karen does at ODNR's copy center. |
| 148 | I have never been given the run around from the DMS (Dept of Ed. print shop/copy center. They have always priovided excellent services. The can do more now that ever before and I enjoy working with them. |
| 153 | We love having our copy center in the Riffe and for the most part they do a very good job in meeting our needs. We have a much more difficult time when jobs are sent to Surface Rd. We would have a very hard time opperating efficiently without the Copy Center and the staff. They help us get jobs done accurately and quickly |
| 158 | I am very thankful for all the hardwork that all the printing shops undertake daily as they are consumed with countless requests for jobs to be done. |
| 162 | The Quick Copy Center has always printed our Final Orders and Regulations most satisfactorily. The Print Shop did an excellent job of creating and printing our letterheads and envelopes. To date we have not had any other opportunity to use their services. |
| 170 | I am the Printing Coordinator for BWC. We do not use State Printings' services with the exception of two existing contracts and the printing of standard # 10 envelopes.(I have been informed that the existing contracts that we have through DAS will be handled @ BWC when the contracts are up). Thank You |
| 173 | The accessibility of the print center is very important. |
| 175 | Copy center should not accept jobs without checking the authorized signature. |
| 177 | Deliver dates not being met on orders place through State Printing. |
| 181 | I think the quality of service and the products of both State Printing and our own print shop/copy center have vastly improved the last few years. They have added several talented and skilled staff who are a joy to work with. |
| 182 | The Office of State Printing needs to only charge for amount of impressions. (i.e.,An 11 x 17, two sided camera ready, they charge us for 4 - 8.5 x 11 instead of 2, because that's the way it's always been! I don't want to pay double the impressions because that's the way it's always been. They only run two impressions, I should only be billed for two impressions. |

**Please include any additional comments concerning the Office of State Printing or individual print shop/copy center that you feel are valuable to this survey.**

| Resp. No. | Additional Comments |
|---|---|
| 186 | Office of State printing needs to speed up the turn around time. Also masters and one copy of the photo ready art work should be returned to the agency requesting the job |
| 187 | I find the cost element for state printing often exceeds what an oustide vendor can do. Projects are prioiritized and therefore you can get "bumped". |
| 189 | This survey is comparing DAS State Printing's inhouse copy center with the individual agencies' copy centers....for ODPS, jobs are routed to production points (inhouse or DAS) based on quantities. The manner in which the survey is worded actually make the surveyee choose which copy center they want to use, when in reality the production points need to (and do!) work together to meet demand. Alone, neither ODPS Printing OR DAS could meet ODPS print demand...it takes both agencies. |
| 191 | Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to complete this survey. I think many of DOH employee frustrations with the copy center can be linked directly to our own internal process. |
| 192 | They need to inform me when one of my job is going to be late rather than me having to call and find out where my job is and why it is late. |
| 193 | Our agency prefers us to use State printing when possible, first. The downfall is taking so long to get things, and not following through on the delivery date, or the second one, promised. Copy center is very good and very efficient. |
| 195 | Most times we are happy with the service we get. At times it would be nice to have a local printer so you could deal face-to-face, but understand need to go where the best price is offered. |
| 197 | Having a copy facility in the same office tower is a huge convenience. I like being able to take a draft project up to the copy center, walk through it with the personel there and have them assist or suggest the best way to get the project to completion and to look its best. |
| 200 | We are very happy with our print/shop copy center. Our needs are always met in a timely manner. |
| 208 | I am not currently the person who requests the job. My main objective is to assist those who are using the services to understand and complete the forms required. The main objective is to ensure all monies are encumbered and the purchasing guidelines have been followed. In this capacity I actually back up our main contact person. So I am removed from frequent contact. |
| 214 | I want to give credit to Brian & Jeni from the Riffe Center and Nancy P., Renee and Crawford from State Printing for being very helpful and professional at all times. They are a wonderful group to work with. I have been working with printing for the past 13 years and I have never had a problem or complaint. |
| 219 | Lower costs should be the primary goal of the Center. Failure in this area prompts me to research alternatives. If I have a short deadline, I have no problem using DAS if I have to copy over 5000 impressions. |
| 221 | i personally have had no problem with copy center in the department she is always upfront and professional no matter how small or difficult the job even during the times that not much time is given to complete a jobs. the following comments are for state printing: 1. for some jobs it is more cost effective to go outside and have jobs completed 2. be able to compare prices for same service through outside vendors but because of state rule this is not possible 3. if state printing cannot meet deadline state printing staff should contact customer personally in a timely manner and explain give enough time for customer to make decision to go somewhere else or cancel job 4. allow office that do not use these services often to purchase equipment that will handle large quanity jobs instead of making it mandatory that the job be sent to state printing 5. customer service and satisfaction should always be first 6. provide estimates before starting job |
| 223 | Though I submitted some negative reponses, I want to add that Diane Ford is incredible. She has been extremely helpful and willing to do beyond what was asked of her. |
| 225 | The analists I have dealt with have all been a pleasure to work with. They are helpful and patient with questions, even though they tend to use industry terms most users are unfamiliar with. |

**Please include any additional comments concerning the Office of State Printing or individual print shop/copy center that you feel are valuable to this survey.**

| Resp. No. | Additional Comments |
|---|---|
| 226 | I don't mind using the print shop if I felt the product was worthy of the state of Ohio. The product needs to be very professional to be acceptable nowadays. |
| 230 | My experience with the Office of State Printing has been wonderful! Print jobs in-house have been questionable, although I personally haven't used it very often. When bids are sent outside of State Printing, the jobs have been done poorly but because the outside company gives the lowest bid, there is nothing we can do. |
| 235 | Therese Gallego does a great job!! |
| 236 | Our print shop staff are always professional & helpful. |
| 237 | The Riffe Center Staff - Brian and Jenny are great assets! |
| 242 | We have a division special projects staff person who works with our graphics and printing offices to get our job requests done, so I don't know the process at all. |
| 243 | The Community Development Division (CDD) Program Offices use State Printing quite often; however, as the Deputy Director's Office which oversees the CDD Program Offices we rarely use State Printing. |
| 245 | The manager of the print shop in the Rhodes Tower (Amy?) is terrific! She is very helpful and professional. She tries to help, even when we have unreasonable deadlines, and explains why they can't meet a deadline if it's a problem. They often have the job finished before the requested date. |
| 248 | Our individual print shop is doing a great job! |
| 259 | A good tracking system for paper deliveries would be great. Thanks. |
| 260 | I feel a loyality to the old printing group. I don't have anything against state printing but we had a good printing group before state printing came in. |
| 266 | The employees at the Main Copy Center at Surface Road are always available, responsive and eager to make my job work out for me. The only reason I marked "Unsure" on question #12 is that I am very used to working with outside printers who can offer much input into my printed pieces, including design, paper selection, etc. I have a higher level of trust with an outside printer that my materials will be printed perfectly and delivered on time with no headache of calling to ask why I haven't received something. Concerning State Printing... I very much dislike the processes that I have to go through to secure a printer for a printed piece. I know from experience that I can request quotes, receive them back and send my job to a printer within a couple of days. With the red tape of State Printing, it can take weeks. It is very inefficient. Plus there is no give and take in which I can talk directly with a printer to discuss ways to make my piece better. By the time State Printing secures a printer, I can't make changes anyway because the contract and price have |
| 268 | Survey worded in such a way that it is difficult to know just what you are asking - |
| 269 | Some of the rules that State Printing has to opperate under are part of the problem with State Printing (i.e. jobs only open to minority businesses). I also had some difficulty in communication with my State Printing contact - I would think that we were on the same page, but would later find out that we weren't. My experience with State Printing is that you have to allow for a lot of extra time for the process and you give up the ability to make choices surrounding the project. |

# Appendix F

## *APPENDIX F*

A comprehensive cost model calculating and comparing the normalized cost per impression for each copy center included in the study was developed. The methodology used to develop this cost model is as follows:

- Distributed a standard data collection form to collect a variety of cost data.
- Collected cost information for fiscal years 1999, 2000, 2001 and various supporting and/or source documents so that data accuracy and consistency could be verified. Fiscal year 2001 data was used in the analysis, with 1999 and 2000 providing reference trends.
- Determined relevant comparable cost elements between copy centers to provide for accurate "normalized" cost information
- Developed cost model, using an Excel spreadsheet, which calculates a normalized per impression cost for each copy center.

The elements of the cost model include both operating expenses and overhead costs. These elements are defined as follows:

| **Operating Expenses** | **Definition** |
|---|---|
| Paper | Paper expense was calculated as the average per sheet cost of an 8½x11 sheet of white paper X number of impressions per fiscal year. (This assumes single-sided copies were produced in the copy center, as a comparative base). |
| Other Material | Other material expenses include toner, ink, staples, binder stripes, supplies, uniforms, etc. |
| Outside Services | Outside services included any expenses associated with activities performed/supplied by outside sources. |
| Payroll (including benefits) | Payroll (including benefit) expenses represented the personnel costs of a copy center. Percent allocations were made where required to accommodate payroll costs associated with staff not assigned to a copy center full time. |
| Maintenance Expense | Maintenance expenses were those established in the equipment |

| | |
|---|---|
| | maintenance contracts. These contracts varied between copy centers with some a flat monthly fee and others that included variable click charges and consumables (e.g. toner) |
| Click Charges | Click charges are a per impression charge paid to the equipment manufacturer. Click charges were calculated based upon supplied volume data. Any click charges involved in maintenance agreements were removed from of the click charge calculation. |
| Depreciation | Depreciation was calculated using the straight-line method over the specific equipment's useful life. Useful life was based upon industry estimates as follows:<br>▪ Black & White Copier 5 years<br>▪ Color Copier 3 years<br>▪ Offset Printer 10 years<br>▪ All other equipment 5 years |
| Interest | Interest expenses represent the financing costs associated with capital equipment leases. |
| **Overhead Costs** | **Definition** |
| Rent | Rent was either the actual amount paid for the space housing the copy center or an overhead allocation charge from the copy center's respective agency. |
| Utilities | Utility costs included electrical, gas and telephone. Utility costs were included in the rent of some copy centers, as practiced by individual agency. |
| Maintenance | Maintenance overhead cost related to the physical upkeep and repair to the building housing the copy center. In most cases, maintenance was included in rent. |

| | |
|---|---|
| MIS Charge | MIS charges were based on the number of network connections located in the copy center. The Department of Administrative Services established annual network connection charge of $2,665 was used in the cost model. |
| Management Charges | Management charges were the estimated percent allocation of management's payroll (including benefits) costs for the time related to administration of the copy center. |

Please note that the per impression costs developed with this cost model may be different than internally develop costs. We believe the per impression costs developed with this model represent accurate normalized costs across the copy centers. The information presented for the Department of Education copy center is a reflection of the costs incurred prior to the Office of State Printing assuming responsibility for oversight of the operation.

Our summary cost analysis is presented below. Copy centers included in the summary are: Office of State Printing (OSP), Department of Public Safety (ODPS), Department of Transportation (DOT), Department of Education (DOE), Department of Development (DOD), Bureau of Workers' Compensation (BWC), and Department of Health (DOH).

| | OSP | ODPS | DOT | DOE | DOD | BWC | DOH | Agency Copy Centers Combined |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Paper** | $537,496 | $77,271 | $106,145 | $29,679 | $36,583 | $64,323 | $15,759 | $329,760 |
| **Other Materials** | $44,728 | $88,006 | $36,120 | $31,803 | $7,159 | $45,500 | $18,700 | $227,288 |
| **Outside Services** | $5,436 | $2,170 | $16,378 | $0 | $3,859 | $0 | $0 | $22,407 |
| **Payroll With Benefits** | $1,383,919 | $261,401 | $300,023 | $79,320 | $110,842 | $296,888 | $38,997 | $1,087,471 |
| **Maintenance Agreements** | $541,579 | $68,946 | $113,569 | $72,860 | $22,050 | $113,047 | $42,486 | $432,958 |
| **Click Charges** | $180,993 | $199,772 | $36,858 | $27,464 | $42,904 | $35,617 | $37,877 | $380,492 |
| **Depreciation** | $490,174 | $178,307 | $29,565 | $84,052 | $43,240 | $153,301 | $97,601 | $586,066 |
| **Interest** | $59,192 | $0 | $0 | $10,659 | $2,563 | $36,436 | $16,733 | $66,391 |
| **Overhead Costs** | $317,988 | $75,048 | $25,077 | $43,740 | $34,498 | $250,149 | $13,196 | $441,708 |
| **Total Cost of Production** | $3,561,505 | $950,921 | $663,735 | $379,577 | $303,698 | $995,261 | $281,349 | $3,574,541 |
| **Total Volume (Impressions)** | 116,846,876 | 16,798,101 | 22,113,556 | 6,183,193 | 7,155,441 | 14,293,980 | 3,699,330 | 70,243,601 |
| **Cost per Impression** | $0.0305 | $0.0566 | $0.0300 | $0.0614 | $0.0424 | $0.0696 | $0.0761 | $0.0509 |
| **Ranking** | **2** | **4** | **1** | **5** | **3** | **6** | **7** | |

# Appendix G

# PLANTE & MORAN, LLP

## THE OFFICE OF STATE PRINTING: ASSESSMENT OF STATE COPY CENTERS PROJECT REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (#0A02002)

---

## STATUTORY ANALYSIS


PREPARED BY:

THE LAW FIRM OF

BRICKER & ECKLER LLP

100 SOUTH THIRD STREET
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43215
(614) 227-2300


DECEMBER, 2001

# PLANTE & MORAN, LLP

## THE OFFICE OF STATE PRINTING: ASSESSMENT OF STATE COPY CENTERS PROJECT REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL (#0A02002)

---

## STATUTORY ANALYSIS


PREPARED BY:

THE LAW FIRM OF

BRICKER & ECKLER LLP

100 SOUTH THIRD STREET
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43215
(614) 227-2300


DECEMBER, 2001

**BRICKER & ECKLER LLP**

MEMORANDUM

TO: Plante and Moran, LLP

FROM: Luther L. Liggett, Jr., Gregory T. Parks, Doug Shevelow

DATE: Thursday, December 06, 2001

RE: Outline of Law Authorizing ODAS, Office of State Printing

---

I. Authority and Scope for public printing:

A. The Department of Administrative Services (ODAS) shall have supervision of all public printing through the Division of State Printing. R.C. 125.31. Ohio Admin. Code 5101-9-54 (E) (1).

B. State printing not specifically covered by R.C. Chapter 125 shall be subject to such sections wherever practical. Whether the printing in question is authorized by law or resolution of the General Assembly, ODAS shall administer the printing. R.C. 125.76.

C. ODAS still manages the printing even though the federal government is paying for the printing for the state agency involved. OAG 91-055.

D. Web Site For ODAS Office of State Printing:

http://www.state.oh.us/das/gsd/prt/prt.html

II. Restrictions Upon Division of State Printing:

A. Exceptions. ODAS does not supervise printing for the following (1 through 5 via R.C. 125.31)

1. General Assembly (but see R.C. 125.47 and R.C. 101.52—Section V herein)
2. Ohio Arts Council;
3. Capital Square Review and Advisory Board;

4. Bureau of Workers' Compensation; and

5. State-supported institutions of higher learning (colleges and universities).

6. State-wide elected office holders: Attorney General, Auditor of State, Secretary of State, Treasurer of State. R.C. 125.041.

B. Printing needs of the Ohio Dept. of Human Services (ODHS) are "coordinated through the bureau of general services." Ohio Admin. Code 5101-9-54 (E) (2).

III. Bypassing ODAS for printing needs

A. State agencies may bypass ODAS for procurements, including printing, but only in special circumstances where the requesting agency is particularly qualified, or in an emergency. Ohio Admin. Code 123:5-1-03 (A).

B. ODAS must give permission before a state agency may procure its own printing. Ohio Admin. Code 123:5-1-03 (C).

IV. Public Policy: Public printing services were first centralized and subjected to competitive bidding to combat abuses and protect the public treasury. *Buchanan Bridge Co. v. Campbell* (1899), 60 Ohio St. 406, 420, 42 W.L.B. 99, 54 N.E. 372.

V. Relationships

A. ODAS may procure printing services on behalf of the General Assembly. R.C. 125.47. Also see Section II herein.

1. The General Assembly may procure printing services from ODAS. R.C. 101.52.
2. If the General Assembly procures printing services from ODAS, there shall be a contract between the two parties to that effect. R.C. 101.523.

B. Neither ODAS nor any other state agency may perform printing or office reproduction for political subdivisions. R.C. 125.45.

C. Relationship With Elected State Officials: ODAS "shall not use its authority to curtail the release of public information by any elected state official" R.C. 125.31 (B).

VI. Duties of Division of State Printing

A. Approval of Printing Requests; Budgeting

1. ODAS must approve all printing requests made by all state entities except the General Assembly, then execute the approved printing request. R.C. 125.42 (A).

2. ODAS shall set annual budgets for all state entities for all printing mandated by law, except for the General Assembly and the courts. R.C. 125.42 (B).

B. "Office Reproduction Services" (copiers)

1. ODAS shall maintain facilities to perform office reproduction services for all state entities except the bureau of workers' compensation. ODAS may give permission to state entities to "perform such services outside the central facility". R.C. 125.45.

2. Details (R.C. 125.45)

a) Office reproduction services shall be limited to sheets no larger than 17-in. by 22-in.

b) Ordinary orders (no multiple pages) are limited to 5,000 "press impressions".

c) Multi-page orders are limited to 1,000 "production copies".

d) Multi-page orders involving an emergency or hardship may be between 5,000 and 10,000 press impressions.

C. Binding: ODAS shall provide binding services. R.C. 125.68.

D. Accounting: ODAS shall keep detailed accounts of its printing, reproduction, and binding work. R.C. 125.44.

E. Paper Quality: ODAS shall fix the kind, weight, and quality of all paper used in public printing, and purchase accordingly when supplying paper used in public printing. R.C. 125.32.

F. Paper Inspection: ODAS shall examine each shipment of paper received by the state for compliance with specifications. R.C. 125.37.

G. Proof sheets and Indexes: ODAS shall examine and correct proof sheets and prepare indexes as necessary. ODAS shall ensure that quantity of printing ordered matches what is produced, and that the order is delivered to the proper department. R.C. 125.43.

VII. Procurement of Outside Printing Services by ODAS

A. Bidding:

1. Public Notice: Proposals for state printing shall comply with the state's general provisions for notice on public bids in R.C. 125.07 and R.C. 125.08. R.C. 125.48.

2. Bid Detail: Bid proposals for state printing shall clearly identify pricing and work product. R.C. 125.49.

3. Rejection of First Bids: If ODAS believes there has been collusion among bidders, or that the bids are too high, it may reject all bids and readvertise. R.C. 125.52.

4. Rejection of Second Bids: Upon the second bid letting, if ODAS again believes there has been collusion among bidders, or that the bids are too high, it may reject all bids and contract with any contractor it wishes that has filed an appropriate bond. R.C. 125.53.

5. Open Market Purchasing: If ODAS deems it proper to reject bids, it may purchase paper on the open market. R.C. 125.36.

6. Proper Facilities Required

a) Contractors may perform multiple classes of printing, but ODAS may decline to award a contract if in its opinion a contractor does not have the proper facilities for performing the work expeditiously. R.C. 125.54.

b) When the bidder for printing services, in the opinion of ODAS, does not have the appropriate technical capabilities for the proposed work, the burden is upon the bidder to demonstrate that its capabilities do meet the specifications. *Columbus Bank Book Co. v. Maloon* (1963), 116 Ohio App. 393, 22 O.O.2d 227, 188 N.E. 2d 431.

7. Identical Low Bids: If two bidders bid identically and are deemed lowest and responsible for a class of printing, ODAS will award to one or more bidders "as it deems best." R.C. 125.55.

8. Award of Contract

a) Printing and paper contracts will be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder. All contracts shall have a fixed completion date. R.C. 125.51.

b) Non-profit agencies for the severely handicapped must pay its disabled or handicapped employees prevailing wage rates when performing printing contracts for the Office of State Printing. OAG 90-098.

B. Internet Reverse Auctions

1. ODAS' internet reverse auction process, in which offerors submit bids on specific contracts in an open environment, is applicable to printing services. R.C. 125.072.

2. When to use an internet reverse auction for printing services is entirely at the discretion of the Director of ODAS, in accordance with rules developed by the Director. R.C. 125.072.

C. Performance Bonds

1. Performance Bond for Paper Supply: ODAS may require a performance bond for paper supply contracts. If required, a bid proposal without a performance bond will not be considered. R.C. 125.38.

2. Paper Supply Bond Forfeiture: If a paper supply vendor defaults on a bonded contract, the vendor shall be liable for the state's costs in obtaining substitute performance. R.C. 125.39.

3. Performance Bond for Printing Services: ODAS may require a performance bond for printing contracts. If required, a bid proposal without a performance bond will not be considered. R.C. 125.50.

D. Performance Standards for Printing Contracts

1. Penalties for Default: If a contractor "fails to execute the work required by the contract in a proper manner with reasonable promptness" ODAS may contract with another person. ODAS may establish a daily "penalty" charge for late orders in the invitation to bid. R.C. 125.58.

2. Delay: Failure to promptly execute an order will subject a contractor's bond to forfeiture. R.C. 125.71.

E. Definitions Used in Printing Procurement (R.C. 125.01)

1. Products: materials, supplies, goods, and wares

2. Ohio products: at least 25% of manufactured cost produced in Ohio

3. Purchase: to buy, rent, lease or otherwise acquire. Includes soliciting and administration of contracts.

4. Supplies: includes but not limited to equipment, materials, insurance and other tangible assets, excluding permanent interests in land.

5. Competitive selection: competitive sealed bidding under R.C. 125.07, competitive sealed proposal under R.C. 125.071, or reverse auction under R.C. 125.072.

F. Classes of State Printing and Contracts for Printing (R.C. 125.47)

1. First Class:

a) bills, laws, resolutions

b) 1972 H 442 did not remove the printing of session laws and appropriation acts from first class to third class printing. OAG 72-120.

2. Second Class: journals and bulletins of the general assembly, reports, communications

3. Third Class:

a) Items ordered by the general assembly, executive department, or elected officials to be printed in pamphlet form or to be bound.

b) In third class printing, a pamphlet is a printed booklet w/ more than two leaves or four pages (stitched or otherwise bound); otherwise a pamphlet is a printed booklet w/more that four leaves or eight pages bound. 1941 OAG 3556.

4. Fourth Class: Blanks, circulars and other work.

5. Classes within Contracts: Printing for first and second class work shall be let in separate contracts. Printing for third and fourth class work may be let in one or more contracts.

G. In-State Printing Requirement (R.C. 125.56)

1. All printing under ODAS must be performed in the state.

2. *Exception*: printing contracts requiring special security paper of a unique nature may be performed out-of-state if:

a) the in-state price exceeds the out-of-state price by more than 5 percent; or

b) a disproportionately inferior product would result from printing in-state.

H. Furnishing of Paper: The state may furnish the paper on state printing contracts. R.C. 125.57.

**Table of Contents**
**For Attachments to**
**Memorandum of Law, Outline of Law Authorizing ODAS, Office of State Printing**

Page

1. R.C. 125.041 ..... 12
2. R.C. 125.072 ..... 13
3. R.C. 125.31 ..... 14
4. R.C. 125.32 ..... 15
5. R.C. 125.36 ..... 16
6. R.C. 125.37 ..... 17
7. R.C. 125.38 ..... 18
8. R.C. 125.39 ..... 19
9. R.C. 125.42 ..... 20
10. R.C. 125.43 ..... 21
11. R.C. 125.44 ..... 22
12. R.C. 125.45 ..... 23
13. R.C. 125.47 ..... 24
14. R.C. 125.48 ..... 25
15. R.C. 125.49 ..... 26
16. R.C. 125.50 ..... 27
17. R.C. 125.51 ..... 28
18. R.C. 125.52 ..... 29
19. R.C. 125.53 ..... 30
20. R.C. 125.54 ..... 31
21. R.C. 125.55 ..... 32
22. R.C. 125.56 ..... 33
23. R.C. 125.57 ..... 34
24. R.C. 125.58 ..... 35
25. R.C. 125.71 ..... 36
26. R.C. 125.76 ..... 37
27. Ohio Admin. Code 123:5-1-03 ..... 38
28. Ohio Admin. Code 5101-9-54 ..... 40

29. 1941 OAG 3556 .....45
30. OAG 72-120 .....49
31. OAG 90-098 .....52
32. OAG 91-055 .....65
33. *Buchanan Bridge Co. v. Campbell (6)* .....70
34. *Columbus Bank Book Co. v Maloon (4)* .....77
35. ODAS State Printing Brochure .....81

R.C. § 125.041

BALDWIN'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED
TITLE I. STATE GOVERNMENT
CHAPTER 125. DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES--OFFICE SERVICES POWERS AND DUTIES

Current through 124th G.A., 2001 Files 1 to 12, and 17 to 22, apv. 6/6/01

125.041 POWERS OF ATTORNEY GENERAL, AUDITOR OF STATE, SECRETARY OF STATE, AND TREASURER OF STATE

Nothing in > sections 125.02, > 125.03 to > 125.08, > 125.12 to > 125.16, > 125.31 to > 125.76, or > 125.831 of the Revised Code shall be construed as limiting the attorney general, auditor of state, secretary of state, or treasurer of state in any of the following:

(A) Purchases for less than the dollar amounts for the purchase of supplies or services determined pursuant to division (D) of > section 125.05 of the Revised Code;

(B) Purchases that equal or exceed the dollar amounts for the purchase of supplies or services determined pursuant to division (D) of > section 125.05 of the Revised Code with the approval of the controlling board, if that approval is required by > section 127.16 of the Revised Code;

(C) The final determination of the nature or quantity making any purchase of supplies or services to be purchased pursuant to > section 125.06 of the Revised Code;

(D) The final determination and disposal of excess and surplus supplies;

(E) The inventory of state property;

(F) The purchase of printing;

(G) The fleet management program.

R.C. § 125.072 Purchase of services or supplies via reverse auction on internet.

(A) As used in this section:

(1) "Internet" means the international computer network of both federal and nonfederal interoperable packet switched data networks, including the graphical subnetwork called the world wide web.

(2) "Reverse auction" means a purchasing process in which offerors submit bids in competing to sell services or supplies in an open environment via the internet.

(B) Whenever the director of administrative services determines that the use of a reverse auction is advantageous to the state, the director, in accordance with rules the director shall adopt, may purchase services or supplies by reverse auction.

(C) The director, by rule, may authorize a state agency that is authorized to purchase services or supplies directly to purchase them by reverse auction in the same manner as this section and the rules adopted under this section authorize the director to do so.

HISTORY: 149 v H 120. Eff 10-26-2001.

The provisions of § 3 of HB 120 (149 v --) read as follows:
SECTION 3. Not later than twelve months after the effective date of this act, the Department of Administrative Services shall report to the committees of the House of Representatives and Senate with jurisdiction over legislation dealing with state purchasing regarding the effect of reverse auctions on purchases from Ohio businesses, including minority and female business enterprises.

R.C. § 125.31

BALDWIN'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED
TITLE I. STATE GOVERNMENT
CHAPTER 125. DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES--OFFICE SERVICES
STATE PRINTING

Current through 124th G.A., 2001 Files 1 to 12, and 17 to 22, apv. 6/6/01

125.31 SUPERVISION OF PUBLIC PRINTING; EXCEPTION

(A) The department of administrative services shall have supervision of all public printing except as follows:

(1) Printing for the general assembly shall be the sole responsibility of the clerk of the senate and the clerk of the house of representatives unless the clerk of the senate or the clerk of the house of representatives chooses either of the options specified in > section 101.523 or > 101.524 of the Revised Code.

(2) Printing for the Ohio arts council shall be under the supervision of the council.

(3) Printing for the capitol square review and advisory board shall be under the supervision of the board.

(4) Printing for the bureau of workers' compensation shall be under the supervision of the administrator of workers' compensation unless the administrator requests the department to supervise printing for the bureau.

(5) Printing for state-supported institutions of higher education shall be under the supervision of the department of purchasing of each such institution or the department or officer within each institution that performs the functions of a department of purchasing.

(B) The department of administrative services shall determine, except as otherwise specifically provided by law, the number of copies to be printed of each publication or document, the source of reproduction, the manner of binding, quality of paper, the general kind, size, and spacing of type to be used in all reports, publications, bulletins, documents, or pamphlets printed at public expense.

The department shall not use its authority to curtail the release of public information by any elected state official.

(C) For the purposes of sections 125.31 to > 125.76 of the Revised Code, all functions, powers, and duties assigned to the department of administrative services are considered to be assigned to the division of state printing within the department of administrative services.

R.C. § 125.32

BALDWIN'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED
TITLE I. STATE GOVERNMENT
CHAPTER 125. DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES--OFFICE SERVICES
STATE PRINTING

Current through 124th G.A., 2001 Files 1 to 12, and 17 to 22, apv. 6/6/01

125.32 DEPARTMENT SHALL FIX AMOUNT AND GRADE OF PAPER USED

The department of administrative services shall fix the kind, weight, and quality of all paper used in public printing and if supplied by the state shall cause the same to be purchased pursuant to > section 125.07 of the Revised Code.

R.C. § 125.36

BALDWIN'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED
TITLE I. STATE GOVERNMENT
CHAPTER 125. DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES--OFFICE SERVICES
STATE PRINTING

Current through 124th G.A., 2001 Files 1 to 12, and 17 to 22, apv. 6/6/01

125.36 DEPARTMENT MAY PURCHASE IN OPEN MARKET

If the department of administrative services is of the opinion that any bids should be rejected in the interest of the state, it may purchase the various kinds of paper required at the lowest price for which such paper can be obtained in the open market.

R.C. § 125.37

BALDWIN'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED
TITLE I. STATE GOVERNMENT
CHAPTER 125. DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES--OFFICE SERVICES
STATE PRINTING

Current through 124th G.A., 2001 Files 1 to 12, and 17 to 22, apv. 6/6/01

125.37 DEPARTMENT SHALL EXAMINE PAPER

The department of administrative services shall examine each shipment of paper received by the state under a contract or purchase, and ascertain whether it is in accordance with the contract or terms of purchase.

R.C. § 125.38

BALDWIN'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED
TITLE I. STATE GOVERNMENT
CHAPTER 125. DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES--OFFICE SERVICES
STATE PRINTING

Current through 124th G.A., 2001 Files 1 to 12, and 17 to 22, apv. 6/6/01

125.38 BOND SHALL ACCOMPANY PROPOSAL

If such a bond is required by the department of administrative services, a proposal for a term contract for paper shall be accompanied by a bond to the state, executed by the bidder, with either one corporate or two personal sureties, satisfactory to the department, conditioned for the performance of the contract awarded the bidder, and for the payment to the state, by the bidder, as liquidated damages, of any excess of cost over the bid of such bidder which the state may be obliged to pay for such paper by reason of the failure of the bidder to complete the contract. This bond shall be void if no contract is awarded to the bidder, and no bid unaccompanied by such bond shall be entertained by the department.

R.C. § 125.39

BALDWIN'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED
TITLE I. STATE GOVERNMENT
CHAPTER 125. DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES--OFFICE SERVICES
STATE PRINTING

Current through 124th G.A., 2001 Files 1 to 12, and 17 to 22, apv. 6/6/01

125.39 FORFEITURE OF BOND

If the contractor fails to furnish paper according to the terms of the contract, the department of administrative services shall purchase the required paper on the open market after notifying the contractor in writing of such action, and the cost in excess of the contract shall be collected from the contractor or the posted bond, if a bond was provided.

R.C. § 125.42

BALDWIN'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED
TITLE I. STATE GOVERNMENT
CHAPTER 125. DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES--OFFICE SERVICES
STATE PRINTING

Current through 124th G.A., 2001 Files 1 to 12, and 17 to 22, apv. 6/6/01

125.42 APPROVAL BY DEPARTMENT BEFORE PUBLICATION; EXCEPTION; DELIVERY OF PRINTED MATTER; SETTING MAXIMUM COST

(A) No officer, board, or commission, except the clerk of the senate and the clerk of the house of representatives, shall print or cause to be printed at the public expense, any report, bulletin, document, or pamphlet, unless such report, bulletin, document, or pamphlet is first submitted to, and the printing thereof approved by, the department of administrative services. If such department approves the printing, it shall determine the form of such printing and the number of copies.

If such approval is given, the department shall cause the same to be printed and bound as provided by > sections 125.47 to > 125.56 of the Revised Code, except as otherwise provided by > section 125.45 of the Revised Code; and when printed, such publications or forms shall be delivered to the ordering officer, board, commission, or department, or sold at a price not to exceed the total cost.

(B) The department of administrative services annually shall set a maximum cost per page and a maximum total cost for the printing by any board, commission, council, or other public body of the state of any annual report or any other report that it is required by law to produce. No board, commission, council, or other public body of the state shall expend or incur the expenditure of any amount in excess of these maximum amounts without the prior approval of the department. This division does not apply to the general assembly or any court.

R.C. § 125.43

BALDWIN'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED
TITLE I. STATE GOVERNMENT
CHAPTER 125. DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES--OFFICE SERVICES
STATE PRINTING

Current through 124th G.A., 2001 Files 1 to 12, and 17 to 22, apv. 6/6/01

125.43 CORRECTION OF PROOF SHEETS AND PREPARATION OF INDEXES

The department of administrative services shall examine and correct the proof sheets of the printing for the state, and see that the work is executed in accordance with law, and when necessary, prepare indexes for the public documents. The printing of all publications approved by the department of administrative services shall be ordered through it and it shall see that the number of copies ordered is received from the printer and delivered to the proper department.

R.C. § 125.44

BALDWIN'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED
TITLE I. STATE GOVERNMENT
CHAPTER 125. DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES--OFFICE SERVICES
STATE PRINTING

Current through 124th G.A., 2001 Files 1 to 12, and 17 to 22, apv. 6/6/01

125.44 AUDIT AND RECORD OF ACCOUNTS

The department of administrative services shall keep detailed accounts of all state office reproduction services, printing and binding.

R.C. § 125.45

BALDWIN'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED
TITLE I. STATE GOVERNMENT
CHAPTER 125. DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES--OFFICE SERVICES
STATE PRINTING

Current through 124th G.A., 2001 Files 1 to 12, and 17 to 22, apv. 6/6/01

125.45 OFFICE REPRODUCTION SERVICES

The department of administrative services shall maintain facilities to perform office reproduction services for all boards, commissions, or departments except for the bureau of workers' compensation. Upon written application to the department of administrative services, permission may be granted to a board, commission, or department to perform such services outside the central facility and such permission shall state the extent of the services which the department, board, or commission shall perform.

Office reproduction services using stencils, masters, or plates are restricted to duplicating equipment not larger than seventeen by twenty-two inches. Not to exceed five thousand press impressions shall be produced of any such order except that up to one thousand production copies may be produced of any item consisting of multiple pages and except that over five thousand, but not more than ten thousand, press impressions may be produced if the director of administrative services determines that there is an emergency due to the timing of service delivery or another factor that may cause financial hardship to the state.

Nothing in this section precludes the bureau from entering into a contract with the department of administrative services for the department to perform office reproduction services for the bureau.

Neither the department nor any other state agency shall perform printing or office reproduction services for political subdivisions.

R.C. § 125.47

BALDWIN'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED
TITLE I. STATE GOVERNMENT
CHAPTER 125. DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES--OFFICE SERVICES
STATE PRINTING

Current through 124th G.A., 2001 Files 1 to 12, and 17 to 22, apv. 6/6/01

125.47 CLASSES OF STATE PRINTING; CONTRACTS FOR PRINTING

The printing for the state shall be divided into four classes and, except as otherwise provided in this section, each class shall be let in separate contracts as follows:

(A) First Class. Bills for the two houses of the general assembly, resolutions and other matters ordered by either of them to be printed in bill form, general and local laws, joint resolutions;

(B) Second Class. The journals and bulletins of the senate and house of representatives, and reports, communications, and other documents which form part of the journals;

(C) Third class. Reports, communications, and other documents ordered by the general assembly, or either house thereof, or by the executive department or elective state officers to be printed in pamphlet form or required to be bound, not including the laws, joint resolutions, and journals of the senate and house of representatives;

(D) Fourth class. Blanks, circulars, and other work for the use of the executive departments, and elective state officers, not including those to be printed in pamphlet form or required to be bound.

The printing for the third and fourth classes may be let in one or more contracts, as the director of administrative services requires.

The director of administrative services may let a contract for printing of the first or second class, or for printing of the third class insofar as it involves reports, communications, or other documents ordered by the general assembly or either house thereof, only if, and then only to the extent that, either (1) the director and the clerk of the senate or the clerk of the house of representatives have agreed upon terms for the clerk's participation in the public printing services provided by the department of administrative services or (2) the clerk of the senate or clerk of the house of representatives has requested the director of administrative services to let a contract for printing.

R.C. § 125.48

BALDWIN'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED
TITLE I. STATE GOVERNMENT
CHAPTER 125. DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES--OFFICE SERVICES
STATE PRINTING

Current through 124th G.A., 2001 Files 1 to 12, and 17 to 22, apv. 6/6/01

125.48 NOTICE FOR PROPOSALS FOR STATE PRINTING

The department of administrative services shall give notice pursuant to > sections 125.07 and > 125.08 of the Revised Code that sealed proposals will be received at its office for executing classes one, two, three, and four of public printing, including the necessary binding,. [sic]

R.C. § 125.49

BALDWIN'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED
TITLE I. STATE GOVERNMENT
CHAPTER 125. DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES--OFFICE SERVICES
STATE PRINTING

Current through 124th G.A., 2001 Files 1 to 12, and 17 to 22, apv. 6/6/01

125.49 CONTENTS OF BID PROPOSALS

Each proposal for state printing shall state specifically the price at which the bidder will undertake to do the work in the classes of printing, including the necessary binding covered by such proposal.

R.C. § 125.50

BALDWIN'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED
TITLE I. STATE GOVERNMENT
CHAPTER 125. DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES--OFFICE SERVICES
STATE PRINTING

Current through 124th G.A., 2001 Files 1 to 12, and 17 to 22, apv. 6/6/01

125.50 BOND OF BIDDER

If such a bond is required by the department of administrative services, a proposal for a state printing term contract shall be accompanied by a bond to the state in a sum specified in the invitation to bid, satisfactory to the department, executed by the bidder, with one corporate or two personal sureties to the satisfaction of the department of administrative services, conditioned for the faithful performance of such classes of printing as may be awarded the bidder, and for the payment by the bidder to the state as liquidated damages of any excess of cost over the bid, which the state may be obliged to pay for such work by failure to complete the contract. A bid unaccompanied by such bond shall not be considered, and such bond shall be void if no contract is awarded the bidder.

R.C. § 125.51

BALDWIN'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED
TITLE I. STATE GOVERNMENT
CHAPTER 125. DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES--OFFICE SERVICES
STATE PRINTING

Current through 124th G.A., 2001 Files 1 to 12, and 17 to 22, apv. 6/6/01

125.51 OPENING OF BIDS; CONTRACT TO LOWEST RESPONSIBLE BIDDER

After careful examination and computation of each proposal, within thirty days the department of administrative services shall award the contract for such printing to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, in accordance with > section 9.312 of the Revised Code, having proper facilities to insure prompt performance of the work. No contract shall be awarded unless it contains an agreement for the completion of the work within the time fixed by the department, but the time so fixed may be extended if deemed in the best interest of the state.

R.C. § 125.52

BALDWIN'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED
TITLE I. STATE GOVERNMENT
CHAPTER 125. DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES--OFFICE SERVICES
STATE PRINTING

Current through 124th G.A., 2001 Files 1 to 12, and 17 to 22, apv. 6/6/01

125.52 FIRST REJECTION OF BIDS

If the department of administrative services is of the opinion that there was collusion between the bidders or that the lowest responsive and responsible bids are too high, it may reject any or all bids and readvertise, pursuant to > sections 125.07 and > 125.08 of the Revised Code, the classes of printing not awarded.

R.C. § 125.53

BALDWIN'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED
TITLE I. STATE GOVERNMENT
CHAPTER 125. DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES--OFFICE SERVICES
STATE PRINTING

Current through 124th G.A., 2001 Files 1 to 12, and 17 to 22, apv. 6/6/01

125.53 REJECTION OF BIDS AFTER SECOND ADVERTISEMENT

If the department of administrative services advertises a second time for proposals for state printing, and it is of the opinion that there was collusion among the bidders or that the bids are too high, it may reject any or all such bids if it deems it is for the best interests of the state, and enter into a contract with any person who files a bond for the execution of the classes not awarded.

R.C. § 125.54

BALDWIN'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED
TITLE I. STATE GOVERNMENT
CHAPTER 125. DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES--OFFICE SERVICES
STATE PRINTING

Current through 124th G.A., 2001 Files 1 to 12, and 17 to 22, apv. 6/6/01

125.54 SAME PERSON MAY BECOME CONTRACTOR FOR TWO OR MORE CLASSES

> Sections 125.43 to > 125.76 of the Revised Code do not prevent the same person from becoming a contractor for two or more classes of printing, if he is the lowest responsive and responsible bidder, but the department of administrative services shall not be required to award more than one class of printing to the same person or firm if in its opinion such person or firm has not the proper facilities for doing the work expeditiously, and that it will be for the best interest of the state to have the different classes of printing done by separate contractors; provided that no contract for any class or part thereof shall be awarded except to the lowest responsive and responsible bidder in accordance with > section 9.312 of the Revised Code.

R.C. § 125.55

BALDWIN'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED
TITLE I. STATE GOVERNMENT
CHAPTER 125. DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES--OFFICE SERVICES
STATE PRINTING

Current through 124th G.A., 2001 Files 1 to 12, and 17 to 22, apv. 6/6/01

125.55 AWARDING OF CERTAIN CONTRACTS

If two or more persons or firms bid the same for a class of printing, and such persons or firms are the lowest responsive and responsible bidders for such class, the department of administrative services shall award the contract to one or more of such bidders as it deems best. If the proposal of one bidder is lower on composition and that of another is lower on presswork and that of another is lower on binding operations for the same class of printing, the department shall award the contract for such class to the lowest responsive and responsible aggregate bidder, in accordance with > section 9.312 of the Revised Code, with proper facilities based on the work of the same class of printing for the preceding year.

R.C. § 125.56

BALDWIN'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED
TITLE I. STATE GOVERNMENT
CHAPTER 125. DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES--OFFICE SERVICES
STATE PRINTING

Current through 124th G.A., 2001 Files 1 to 12, and 17 to 22, apv. 6/6/01

125.56 PRINTING TO BE DONE WITHIN STATE; EXCEPTION FOR SPECIAL PAPER

(A) Except as provided in division (B) of this section, all printing under > sections 125.43 to > 125.76 of the Revised Code, shall be executed pursuant to > section 125.11 of the Revised Code.

(B) Division (A) of this section does not apply to printing contracts requiring special, security paper of a unique nature if compliance with division (A) will result in an excessive price for the product or acquiring a disproportionately inferior product.

(C) As used in this section, "excessive price" means a price that exceeds by more than five per cent the lowest price submitted on a non-Ohio bid.

R.C. § 125.57

BALDWIN'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED
TITLE I. STATE GOVERNMENT
CHAPTER 125. DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES--OFFICE SERVICES
STATE PRINTING

Current through 124th G.A., 2001 Files 1 to 12, and 17 to 22, apv. 6/6/01

125.57 STATE MAY FURNISH PAPER TO CONTRACTORS

The paper for state printing may be furnished by the state upon the requisition of the department of administrative services. If the state furnishes the paper the department shall deliver to each contractor available paper for the printing he is required to execute and receive from him a receipt therefor. Paper not used in state printing shall be returned to the paper warehouse. The printer shall be charged full value and handling costs for paper which has been wasted or converted to another use. Each shipment of paper shall be accounted for on the printing invoice for the order that the paper was furnished. No invoice shall be approved unless the paper account is correct.

R.C. § 125.58

BALDWIN'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED
TITLE I. STATE GOVERNMENT
CHAPTER 125. DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES--OFFICE SERVICES
STATE PRINTING

Current through 124th G.A., 2001 Files 1 to 12, and 17 to 22, apv. 6/6/01

125.58 FAILURE TO EXECUTE CONTRACT; PENALTY FOR LATE ORDERS

The department of administrative services shall promptly notify each successful bidder of the acceptance of the bidder's proposal for state printing. If such bidder fails to execute the contract because of death or other cause, or if the bidder fails to execute the work required by the contract in a proper manner and with reasonable promptness, or the contract is abandoned, or its execution is temporarily suspended, the department may enter into a contract with another person for the prompt execution of the work for the lowest price which may be obtained. Before any work is relet in consequence of the misconduct or default of the contractor, the department shall give the contractor written notice thereof. The department of administrative services may set a daily penalty charge for late orders, provided the penalty schedule and amount are stated in the invitation to bid for the printing.

R.C. § 125.71

BALDWIN'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED
TITLE I. STATE GOVERNMENT
CHAPTER 125. DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES--OFFICE SERVICES
STATE PRINTING

Current through 124th G.A., 2001 Files 1 to 12, and 17 to 22, apv. 6/6/01

125.71 DEADLINE FOR CERTAIN PRINTING AND BINDING

All contractors for printing shall promptly execute the orders issued to them by the general assembly and the executive officers of the state. For failure to comply with this section, the bond of a contractor may be forfeited, but for good cause shown by him, the department of administrative services may amend the orders.

R.C. § 125.76

BALDWIN'S OHIO REVISED CODE ANNOTATED
TITLE I. STATE GOVERNMENT
CHAPTER 125. DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES--OFFICE SERVICES
STATE PRINTING

Current through 124th G.A., 2001 Files 1 to 12, and 17 to 22, apv. 6/6/01

125.76 CERTAIN PROVISIONS MAY APPLY

All printing and binding for the state, not authorized by sections 125.43 to 125.71 or > section 3345.10 of the Revised Code, except for maps and printing that is the sole responsibility of the clerk of the senate or the clerk of the house of representatives, shall be subject to such sections so far as practical, and whether provided for by law or resolution of the general assembly the department of administrative services shall advertise for proposals and let contracts therefor as provided in such sections.

OAC 123:5-1-03

BALDWIN'S OHIO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE
123. DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES
123:5. DIVISION OF OFFICE SERVICES
CHAPTER 123:5-1. STATE PURCHASING AND BID PROCEDURES; OHIO PREFERENCE

Rules and Appendices are current through June 30, 2001

123:5-1-03 PERMIT TO MAKE PURCHASES WHEN IMPRACTICAL THROUGH THE DEPARTMENT

(A) No state agency other than those excepted in > sections 125.02, > 125.021, > 125.04 and > 125.041 of the Revised Code shall procure or purchase any supplies or services, except in accordance with > section 125.05 of the Revised Code. When the department of administrative services determines that it is not possible or not advantageous for the department to make the purchase, the department shall grant the agency a release and permit to make the purchase. Factors to consider for issuance of a release and permit include, but are not limited to, the following:

(1) The demonstrated ability of the agency in terms of procurement knowledge and any specialized knowledge pertinent to the procurement covered by the release;

(2) The past professional experience of the agency in exercising similar authority and the degree and quality of professional analysis demonstrated and documented by the agency seeking to undertake the acquisition;

(3) The degree of economy and efficiency to be achieved in meeting the state's requirements if authority is delegated;

(4) The available resources of the department to exercise the authority if it is not delegated; and

(5) The ability of the department to complete the purchase pursuant to competitive bidding statutes;

(B) Every release and permit shall be filed with the agency to whom it is issued and one copy shall be filed with department of administrative services.

(C) An agency shall not proceed with the purchase until the department has granted a release and permit. Whenever a release and permit has been granted, the requesting agency must purchase the supplies or services pursuant to competitive selection requirements or with

controlling board approval unless the controlling board determines that such approval is not required.

(D) When an emergency condition exists in the procurement of supplies or services and it is not practical for the agency to make such acquisitions by or through the department, such items may be purchased pursuant to > rule 123:5-1-04 of the Administrative Code.

OAC 5101-9-54

BALDWIN'S OHIO ADMINISTRATIVE CODE
5101. DEPARTMENT OF JOB AND FAMILY SERVICES
CHAPTER 5101-9. ODHS INTERNAL PROCEDURES

Rules are current through June 30, 2001

5101-9-54 SPECIAL PROCUREMENTS

Several types of procurements have unique requirements for processing. Those requirements are set forth in this rule.

(A) Automatic data processing (ADP) preapproval.

(1) If the proposed contract is for ADP services, the contract manager must contact management information services (MIS) bureau of budget and planning (BBP). In addition, the contract manager must submit a written request for preapproval to the BBP. The request must be signed by the contract manager's deputy director; for those units reporting to the director, the request must be signed by the director or director's designee. MIS/BBP will then request preapproval of the activity from the department of administrative services. Requirements for preapproval requests are as follow:

(a) Description--a detailed description of the data processing services to be purchased.

(b) Long-range plan reference--the request must be in the long-range plan. The page number of the plan should be referenced. If the item is not in the long-range plan, the requesting work unit (RWU) must update the plan's needs justification (explanation of procurement need). This update should be submitted with the request. The RWU should allow for additional processing time if the requested service is not already in the long-range plan.

(c) Need justification--include a discussion of why and/or how the requested services are required.

(d) Documentation of competitive pricing--the RWU must justify selecting a particular vendor and document how competitive bidding was achieved. If the request is sole source, the justification must clearly define why competitive bidding could not be utilized.

(2) Once MIS/BBP has determined that the above requirements have been met, the request will be submitted to the department of administrative services (DAS) for a preapproval number. In approximately two to four weeks, DAS will issue a preapproval number (for those contracts requiring controlling board approval) to verify that the request meets preapproval requirements. Once the preapproval number is issued, the ODHS 2529 "Request for Contract"

process may begin. No contracts requiring preapproval will be released by the office of legal services until the preapproval number is issued. For those contracts requiring controlling board approval, the contract manager must notify MIS/BBP of the receipt of controlling board approval in order to activate the preapproval number in the central accounting system (CAS).

(B) Telecommunications

(1) All requests for the purchase or lease of telecommunications equipment or services must be prior approved by telecommunications management of the Ohio department of administrative services.

(2) Requests for prior approval and subsequent purchase or lease of telecommunications (e.g. telephones) equipment or services must be processed through the ODHS, office services section. Requests for prior approval and subsequent purchase or lease of computer-related telecommunications equipment or services must be processed through MIS/BBP.

(3) All requests for the purchase or lease of telecommunications equipment or services, which are not competitively bid through the Ohio department of administrative services, shall be processed in accordance with the procurement procedures in > rules 5101-9-50 to > 5101-9-58 of the Administrative Code for personal services contracts and in accordance with the provisions of this rule.

(C) Insurance.

(1) Pursuant to > sections 125.03 to > 125.06 of the Revised Code, the Ohio department of administrative services shall make purchases of insurance policies covering employees of ODHS except when a release and permit has been issued by DAS to ODHS to directly secure a contract of insurance.

(2) Requests for the purchase of insurance on behalf of employees of ODHS are coordinated through bureau of accounting. Therefore, all requests for insurance shall be made in accordance with procedures established by bureau of accounting.

(D) Leases of real estate.

(1) For purposes of this rule "lease(s)" shall include a lease, a lease/purchase, a lease with option to purchase, a rental agreement, and any similar contract or combination thereof.

(2) Pursuant to > section 127.16 of the Revised Code, ODHS may not use state money that has been appropriated to it directly for the lease of real estate from a particular supplier (other than a state agency) if the lease would amount to seventy-five thousand dollars or more when combined with both the amount of all disbursements during the fiscal year for real estate leases made by ODHS; and the amount of all outstanding encumbrances for leases made by ODHS, unless the lease is competitively bid or approved by the controlling board.

However, if the amount of such lease, when combined with all other such leases the agency has made from the supplier plus disbursement and outstanding encumbrances during the fiscal year will amount to one hundred thousand dollars or more, it must be competitively bid or approved by at least five members of the controlling board.

(3) All requests for leases, which are not competitively bid through the Ohio department of administrative services, shall be processed in accordance with the procurement procedures contained in > rules 5101-9-50 to > 5101-9-58 of the Administrative Code for personal services contracts and in accordance with the provisions of this rule.

(E) Printing.

(1) Pursuant to > section 125.31 of the Revised Code, the Ohio department of administrative services shall supervise public printing.

(2) Printing needs for ODHS are coordinated through the bureau of general services. Therefore, all requests for printing shall be made in accordance with procedures established by the bureau of general services.

(F) Membership fees.

(1) Individual and departmental memberships in organizations are allowable at the discretion of the employee's deputy director, when the membership is to the benefit of the agency. Additionally, federal regulations state that the organization must not be substantially engaged in lobbying activities.

(2) If the membership fee includes any services received from the organization, as defined in > rule 5101-9-50 of the Administrative Code, the membership can only be obtained by following the personal services contract procedures in > rule 5101-9-56 of the Administrative Code.

(3) If no services are included in the membership fee, the following two forms must be submitted to the appropriate deputy director.

(a) The ODHS 2501 "Request for Membership in Association, Club, Society, or Professional Organization". This form requires:

(i) A statement verifying that the membership fee includes no services.

(ii) A detailed explanation of the memberships [sic] benefit to the agency.

(b) The ODHS 2725 "Services/Supplies/Equipment Requisition".

(G) The Revised Code grants special preferences to specified suppliers. ODHS should make purchases from these suppliers when appropriate.

(H) Purchases from Ohio industries for the handicapped.

(1) Pursuant to > section 4115.34 of the Revised Code, ODHS shall purchase, to the extent a product or service can be made or performed by a sheltered workshop, the product or service from the Ohio industries for the handicapped, inc. (OIH) or any other qualified nonprofit agency for the severely handicapped.

(2) For purchases of supplies, services, or materials made through OIH or any other agency for the severely handicapped qualified through > sections 4115.31 to > 4115.35 of the Revised Code, ODHS need not comply with state competitive bid procedures.

(3) Requests for purchase of supplies, services or materials from OIH shall be processed in accordance with the procurement procedures contained in > rules 5101-9-50 to > 5101-9-58 of the Administrative Code for personal services contracts and in accordance with the provisions of this rule. The purchase of data processing services from OIH must be coordinated through MIS/BBP; all other purchases shall be processed as provided in this rule.

(I) Purchases from Ohio penal industries.

(1) Pursuant to > section 5120.27 of the Revised Code, the Ohio department of rehabilitation and correction has established the Ohio penal industries (OPI) which provides for the purchase of certain goods and services by state agencies.

(2) To the extent appropriate goods and services are available from OPI, ODHS shall make necessary purchases from OPI. The purchase of data processing services from OPI must be coordinated through MIS/BBP.

(J) Both state law and ODHS policies restrict the purchases of services for the specific services identified in this [sic] paragraphs (J)(1) to (J)(3) of this rule.

(1) Purchase of services from media and public relations consultants.

(a) The services of media or public relations consultants, including the production of pamphlets, posters, video or audio materials, and similar services, shall be coordinated with the office of communications. No RWU may procure the services of media or public relations consultants without the prior written approval of the office of communications.

(b) Once the RWU has secured prior written approval of the office of communications, the request for a personal services contract for a media or public relations consultant shall be processed in accordance with the procurement procedures contained in > rules 5101-9-50 to >

5101-9-59 of the Administrative Code for personal services contracts and in accordance with the provisions of this rule.

(2) The services of court reporters may be secured only through the office of legal services. No RWU may independently procure court reporter services. Any RWU needing the services of a court reporter shall arrange for such services through the office of legal services.

(3) The purchase or provision of legal representation of ODHS is secured through the office of the attorney general. However, in some situations, certain types of legal consultation may be secured directly by ODHS. Any services of an attorney or other legal professional shall be arranged solely through the ODHS office of legal services.

(K) All contracts related to medicaid third party liability identification or collection must follow the requirements specified in the "HSFA > [FN1] State Medicaid Manual, Part II," section 2975 (see transmittal no. 55 issued January 1988). When requesting a medicaid third party liability identification or collection contract, the contract manager shall attach a signed statement to the ODHS 2529 indicating that these requirements have been followed.

(L) Contracts between ODHS and regional agents and local distributor for the distribution of food through the temporary emergency food assistance program shall also be subject to the requirements of the rules in 5101:4 of the Administrative Code.

# 1941 OAG 3556



entitled to compensation under the Workmen's Compensation Act."

Wherefore, in specific answer to your inquiry, it is my opinion that employees of the state highway department who may be injured while being transported in state highway trucks from the state highway garage to various places in the county to work on highways or during a like return trip to the state highway garage are injured in the course of their employment. If the other facts and circumstances meet all other requirements of the law the injured employes would be entitled to participate in the State Insurance Fund.

Respectfully,

THOMAS J. HERBERT,
Attorney General.

---

3556

PAMPHLET — PRINTED BOOKLET — MORE THAN TWO LEAVES OR FOUR PAGES — FOUR OR MORE LEAVES OR EIGHT OR MORE PAGES — STITCHED OR OTHERWISE BOUND TOGETHER — CONTRACT, STATE PRINTING.

SYLLABUS:

*A pamphlet within the meaning of Section 754, General Code, is a printed booklet consisting of more than two leaves or four pages, stitched or otherwise bound together, and generally speaking it is a printed booklet consisting of four or more leaves or eight or more pages, stitched or otherwise bound together.*

Columbus, Ohio, March 14, 1941.

Mr. C. J. Stark, Superintendent, Division of Purchases and Printing, Department of Finance,
Columbus, Ohio.

Dear Sir:

I have your request for my opinion which reads as follows:

"The question has been raised as to what constitutes a pamphlet under Sec. 755 to 769 inclusive of the General Code

4

applying to blanket contracts for printing to be placed by the State.

The particular question pertains to the Third Class of printing which is prescribed as 'Reports, communications and other documents ordered by the General Assembly, or either house thereof or by the executive departments or elective State officers to be printed in pamphlet form.'

It is our understanding that an opinion was rendered some years back by a former Attorney General that a pamphlet consisted of eight pages or more. This is the interpretation that has been followed by this Division for a number of years in classifying and distributing printing jobs.

An opinion by you on this matter is solicited."

The section of the General Code particularly bearing on your question is Section 754, which reads as follows:

"The printing for the state shall be divided into six classes and each class shall be let in separate contracts as follows:

First Class. Bills for the two houses of the General Assembly, resolutions and other matters ordered by such houses or either of them to be printed in bill form, general and local laws, and joint resolutions.

Second Class. The journals of the senate and house of representatives, and reports, communications and other documents which form part of the journals.

Third Class. Reports, communications and other documents ordered by the general assembly or either house thereof, or by the executive department or elective state officers to be printed in pamphlet form.

General and local laws and joint resolutions.

Fourth Class. Blanks, circulars and other work for the use of the executive departments, and elective state officers, not including those to be printed in pamphlet form.

Fifth Class. The bulletins of the agricultural commission.

Sixth Class. The report of the secretary of state, auditor of state, the 'Ohio general statistics,' reports and opinions of the attorney general, and all matter ordered by the general assembly or either branch thereof, other than contained in the third class, and other reports and documents required to be bound not including the laws, joint resolutions and journals of the senate and house of representatives.

The printing for the sixth class may be let in one or more contracts, as the director of finance in his discretion may require."

The opinion to which you refer is probably Opinion No. 330, render-

ed under date of August 31, 1911, by the Honorable Timothy S. Hogan, and reported at page 932, Annual Report of the Attorney General, 1911-1912, Vol. II. After quoting in part Section 754, General Code, as it then existed, the then Attorney General said as follows at page 933:

> "A 'pamphlet' is described by Webster's dictionary as 'a small book consisting of a sheet, or a few sheets, of paper, stitched together, but not bound.' And by Century dictionary, 'a printed work consisting of a few sheets of paper attached together, but not bound; now, in a restricted or technical sense, eight or more pages of printed matter *** stitched or sewed with or without a thin paper wrapper or cover'."

Three fundamental rules of statutory interpretation and construction are apposite to the resolution of your question. First, generally speaking, the "words of a statute, in common use or other than terms of art or science, will be construed in their ordinary acceptation and significance and with the meaning commonly attributed to them." Second, definitions of words and phrases by lexicographers "may be used as an aid in determining the scope of such words in statutes — especially where the term has never received any construction by the courts." (See 37 O.Jur. 539, 542) And third, administrative interpretation of a given law, while not conclusive, is, if long continued, to be reckoned with most seriously and is not to be disregarded and set aside unless judicial construction makes it imperative so to do. (Industrial Commission of Ohio, et al v. Brown, 92 O.S. 309, 110 N.E. 744, L.R.A. 1916 B, 1277 (1915); The Industrial Commission v. Cross, et al., 104 O.S. 561, 136 N.E. 283 (1922).

Among those skilled in a knowledge of the meaning of words, the word pamphlet means a book "of relatively *few sheets*, fastened together but not bound, and with or without a paper cover" (see the New Century Dictionary) or, as defined by Webster, "a book of a *few sheets* of printed matter, of formerly of manuscript, commonly with a paper cover." The word few, of course, means a small number — more than two.

Legal definitions of pamphlet are found in Bouvier's Law Dictionary and in 46 C.J. 1171. Bouvier's definition is:

> "A small book usually printed in octavo form *and stitched.*" (Emphasis mine),

while in 46 Corpus Juris, 1171, the word in question is defined:

> "A publication; usually a small book, bound in paper covers,

ordinarily printed in octavo form, and stitched."

As defined by the New Century dictionary, the word octavo means "page size of a book in which each leaf is one-eighth of a whole sheet of paper; a volume of this size." That is to say, as pointed out in the opinion of the Attorney General of 1911-1912, above quoted from, a pamphlet generally means a booklet of four leaves or eight pages.

Not only is this meaning given by lexicographers, but I am informed that it is the definition generally prevalent in the printing trade.

But even if this were not true, since I am informed that from the time of the rendition of the opinion of 1911-1912, supra, or even before that time, the construction here placed on the word pamphlet, as used in Section 754, supra, is the one that has been followed by the officers and employees of the state in making contracts with printers for the kinds of reports, communications and other documents mentioned in what is called the "Third Class" enumerated in said section, such long continued administrative interpretation may not be lightly disregarded and should be departed from only for the most compelling reasons.

Moreover, it will be noted that the Legislature has carefully differentiated among what it calls "bills," "journals," "pamphlets," "bulletins" and that kind of reports and opinions mentioned in the "Sixth Class" which are clearly bound books. An examination of any standard dictionary will disclose that what is commonly designated as a "leaflet" or "folder" is as different from a pamphlet as is a book. For example, the Century dictionary defines the word "leaflet" as "a small flat or folded sheet of printed matter as for distribution," while the definition of a "folder" is "a folded printed sheet as a circular or timetable." It is my information that both leaflets and folders are commonly designated as flat work.

In view of the foregoing, and upon authorities cited and for the reasons given, it is my opinion that:

A pamphlet within the meaning of Section 754, General Code, is a printed booklet consisting of more than two leaves or four pages, stitched or otherwise bound together, and that generally speaking it is a printed booklet consisting of four or more leaves or eight or more pages, stitched or otherwise bound together.

Respectfully,

THOMAS J. HERBERT,
Attorney General.

## OPINION NO. 72-120

**Syllabus:**

Amended Substitute House Bill No. 442, which became effective on September 22, 1972, did not remove the printing of the session laws and the appropriation acts from the first class to the third class of state printing as defined by R.C. 125.47.

---

To: Ted W. Brown, Sec. of State, Columbus, Ohio
By: William J. Brown, Attorney General, December 18, 1972

You have asked my opinion as to whether the printing of the session laws and the appropriation acts, which is required by statute to be done after the conclusion of each session of the General Assembly, falls within the first class, or within the third class, of the statutory provisions for state printing.

The classes of printing for which contracts are to be let by the state are enumerated in R.C. 125.47, which reads as follows:

> The printing for the state shall be divided into four classes and each class shall be let in separate contracts as follows:
>
> (A) First Class. Bills for the two houses of the general assembly, resolutions and other matters ordered by either of them to be printed in bill form, general and local laws, joint resolutions;
>
> (B) Second Class. The journals and bulletins of the senate and house of representatives, and reports, communications, and other documents which form part of the journals;
>
> (C) Third Class. Reports, communications, and other documents ordered by the general assembly, or either house thereof, or by the executive department or elective state officers to be printed in pamphlet form or required to be bound, not including the laws, joint resolutions, and journals of the senate and house of representatives;
>
> (D) Fourth Class. Blanks, circulars, and other work for the use of the executive departments, and elective state officers, not including those to be printed in pamphlet form or required to be bound.
>
> The printing for the third and fourth classes may be let in one or more contracts, as the director of finance requires.

Generally speaking, the printing of the acts of the General Assembly is done in three stages: (1) immediately after introduction by a member, the "original bill" is printed in form for consideration by the members of the two houses (R.C. 101.51); (2) after passage and before enrollment in the office of Secretary of State, the bills are printed as "pamphlet laws" for prompt distribution to

the members of the Assembly and to such others as have immediate need for them (R.C. 101.52 and 149.09); and (3) at the close of the session, all laws enacted during its course are delivered by the clerks of the Senate and the House to the Director of the Legislative Service Commission for codification and preparation of an index, and they are then printed in bound volumes as "session laws" to be distributed by the Secretary of State (R.C. 103.13, 103.131 and 149.-091). At the same time, the appropriation acts are published by the Secretary of State in separate bound volumes. R.C. 149.092.

Of those sections of the Revised Code to which I have just referred, Sections 149.091 and 149.092 have newly been enacted, and Sections 101.52 and 149.09 have been amended, by Amended Substitute House Bill No. 442, which became effective September 22, 1972.

The intent behind these changes appears to have been to do away with a certain amount of delay and waste which occurred under prior provisions covering printing of the session laws. You state that, in your view, the intent of the General Assembly in Amended Substitute House Bill No. 442 was, among other things, to remove the printing of the session laws from the first class of state printing, which must be let as a single contract, to the third class, under which the various jobs may be let as separate contracts by the Department of Finance, subject to the directions of the particular state department which wishes to have the material printed. R.C. 125.47, 125.48 and 125.51; Opinion No. 5092, Opinions of the Attorney General for 1955.

I agree with your conclusion that the General Assembly, in enacting Amended Substitute House Bill No. 442, intended to eliminate the waste and delay to which you have referred. That seems obvious from the face of the Bill itself. Previously R.C. 103.14 required the Legislative Service Commission to prepare section headings for the session laws, and to submit them to the Secretary of State within 30 days after the Assembly had adjourned sine die. The delay occasioned by this step is no longer present for the new law repeals R.C. 103.14. Furthermore, R.C. 149.09 formerly required that 2000 copies of the session laws and 500 copies of the appropriation acts should be printed and bound. Under the new law that Section has been amended, and it now deals only with the distribution of the pamphlet laws by the Secretary of State during the course of the session. The two new Sections, R.C. 149.091 and 149.092, now provide that a maximum of only 900 copies of the session laws and 300 copies of the appropriation laws shall be published and distributed by the Secretary of State. In addition, R.C. 149.091 specifically provides how the Secretary of State shall distribute over 500 of the 900 bound copies of the session laws. There is, therefore, no longer any great danger of an accumulation of excess copies, and the Secretary of State has it within his power to obviate any further unnecessary accumulation, since he is authorized to publish and distribute only 900 copies of the session laws and 300 copies of the appropriation acts as a maximum.

I cannot, however, agree with your further conclusion that Amended Substitute House Bill No. 442 removed the printing of the session laws and appropriation acts from the first class to the third class of public printing, as provided by R.C. 125.47. That Section directs that all printing of the first class be let by the Department of Finance in a single annual contract, whereas third class printing can be let in as many separate contracts as may be required by the nature of the particular jobs. In Opinion No. 5092, supra, my predecessor said:

> It must be remembered that the director of the department of finance acts only as the agent of the various state departments and as such he must be subject to their directions at all times as to the matter which they desire to have printed, and as to the form in which they wish to have it printed. * * *

The interpretation of Amended Substitute House Bill No. 442 which you suggest would, therefore, afford even further protection against waste and delay by removing the printing of the session laws from the first class, and would, as you note, permit additional savings to be realized by opening the bidding to all printers who wish to be considered.

There is no doubt that the General Assembly could have taken this added precaution, but I am unable to find anything in the language of Amended Substitute House Bill No. 442 to indicate that it intended to do so. On the contrary, the failure of the Assembly to alter the specific definition of the third class in R.C. 125.47 convinces me that there was no intent to remove the printing of the session laws from the first class. As already set forth above, that Section describes the third class in the following language:

> (C) Third Class. Reports, communications, and other documents ordered by the general assembly, or either house thereof, or by the executive department or elective state officers to be printed in pamphlet form or required to be bound, <u>not including the laws, joint resolutions, and journals of the senate and house of representatives</u>;
>
> * * * * * * * * *.
>
> (Emphasis added.)

Consequently, the specific exclusion of the printing of the laws from the third class still remains in effect.

Your letter refers to nothing in the language of Amended Substitute House Bill No. 442 which would lead to a contrary conclusion. The only possibility of such an argument rests on the use of the word "publish" in the new Sections, R.C. 149.091 and 149.092, which now require the Secretary of State to "publish and distribute" the session laws and the appropriation acts, whereas R.C. 149.09, in its previous form, simply required the Secretary to "distribute" the session laws. I can see no merit in this argument, since the Secretary of State has always had the responsibility of publishing the session laws. Former R.C. 111.09 provided that copies of all laws enacted during the session, together with an index,

> * * * shall be furnished by the secretary of state to the printer along with instructions concerning the printing of the session laws * * *.

As has already been noted above, Amended Substitute House Bill No. 442 completely repealed R.C. 111.09. The addition of the word "publish" in R.C. 149.091 and 149.092 does nothing more than retain the Secretary's previously existing responsibility for publication of the session laws.

In specific answer to your request it is my opinion, and you are so advised, that Amended Substitute House Bill No. 442, which became effective on September 22, 1972, did not remove the printing of the session laws and the appropriation acts from the first class to the third class of state printing as defined by R.C. 125.47.

1990 Ohio Op. Atty. Gen. No. 90-098
Office of the Attorney General
State of Ohio

Opinion No. 90-098
December 28, 1990

SYLLABUS:

1. A qualified nonprofit agency for the severely handicapped, as defined in > R.C. 4115.31(B), is required to pay its disabled or handicapped employees prevailing rates of wages for painting services that those employees perform pursuant to the terms of state use law contracts.

2. A qualified nonprofit agency for the severely handicapped, as defined in > R.C. 4115.31(B), is required to pay its disabled or handicapped employees prevailing rates of wages for printing services that those employees perform for the State of Ohio pursuant to the terms of state use law contracts.

3. Pursuant to > R.C. 4115.33, the State Use Committee, in the exercise of a reasonable discretion, may determine that the cost of painting and printing services purchased by state agencies and local overnments pursuant to state use law contracts when prevailing rates of wages are paid for those services makes them unsuitable for inclusion on the Committee's procurement list.

John M. Connelly
Chairman
State Use Committee
Rehabilitation Services Commission
400 East Campus View Boulevard
Columbus, Ohio 43235-4604

Dear Chairman Connelly:

You have requested my opinion regarding the application of Ohio's prevailing wage rate law, > R.C. 4115.03-.16, to painting and printing contracts that are, pursuant to the state use law, > R.C. 4115.31-.35, negotiated and entered into between sheltered workshops for the disabled or handicapped, and the various governmental agencies and entities that are subject to the use law's provisions. In particular, you wish to know whether prevailing rates of wages, as determined by the Department of Industrial Relations, see > R.C. 4115.04; > R.C. 4115.05, must be paid to persons who, being employed by such workshops, provide painting and printing services pursuant to the terms of state use law contracts that those workshops maintain with the foregoing governmental agencies and entities.

I commence my analysis of your question with a brief review and explanation of the state use law and its operation. The state use law, the provisions of which appear at > R.C. 4115.31-.35, was enacted by the General Assembly in 1976 in order to "improve employment opportunities for blind and severely handicapped individuals." 1975-1976 Ohio Laws, Part I, 916 (Am.S.B. 430, eff. Aug. 13, 1976 (preamble)). As a general matter, that objective is accomplished by a requirement that state agencies and certain political subdivisions and instrumentalities of the state purchase products and services, whenever possible, from qualified nonprofit agencies for the severely handicapped. > R.C. 4115.32 creates the State Committee for the Purchase of Products and Services of the Severely Handicapped (hereinafter State Use Committee), and > R.C. 4115.33 enumerates the specific duties and responsibilities of the Committee. > R.C. 4115.33(A) provides, in part, that the State Use Committee "shall determine the price of all products manufactured and services provided by the severely handicapped and offered for sale to state agencies, political subdivisions, or instrumentalities of the state that the [C]ommittee determines are suitable for use," and, further, "shall revise the prices in accordance with changing cost factors and adopt rules regarding specifications, time of delivery, authorizing a central nonprofit corporation to facilitate the distribution of orders among the participating qualified nonprofit agencies, and relevant matters of procedure necessary to carry out the purposes of [> R.C. 4115.31-.35]." > (FN1) See > R.C. 4115.35 (the qualified nonprofit agencies for the severely handicapped that are certified by the State Use Committee shall create a nonprofit corporation to carry out the intent of > R.C. 4115.31-.35, and such corporation "shall assume the responsibility for dissemination of information, preparation of reports, and the development of an approved catalogue of products and services which can be supplied by the qualified nonprofit agencies to be purchased by state agencies, political subdivisions, or instrumentalities of the state"). > R.C. 4115.33(B) requires the State Use Committee to approve and distribute to all purchasing officers of state agencies, political subdivisions, andinstrumentalities of the state a publication developed by the central nonprofit corporation referred to in > R.C. 4115.33(A), "which shall list all products and services produced by any qualified nonprofit agency that the [C]ommittee determines are suitable for procurement" pursuant to > R.C. 4115.33(A).

The obligation of state agencies, political subdivisions, and instrumentalities of the state to purchase from qualified nonprofit agencies for the severely handicapped the products and services contained in the foregoing procurement list appears in > R.C. 4115.34(A) as follows:

If any state agency, political subdivision, or instrumentality of the state intends to procure any product or service, it shall determine whether the product or service is on the procurement list published pursuant to > section 4115.33 of the Revised Code; and it shall, in accordance with rules of the state committee for the purchase of products and services of the severely handicapped, procure such product or service at the price established by the committee from a qualified nonprofit agency, if the product or service is on the procurement list and is available within the period required by that agency, notwithstanding any law requiring the purchase of products and services on a competitive bid basis. > Sections 4115.31 to > 4115.35 of the Revised Code do not apply in any cases where the products or services are available for procurement from any state agency, political subdivision, or instrumentality of the state and

procurement therefrom is required under any law in effect on the effective date upon original enactment of this section.

Pursuant to > R.C. 4115.34(A), therefore, a state agency, political subdivision, or instrumentality of the state that intends to procure any product or service must first determine whether the product or service in question is on the procurement list that has been approved and distributed by the State Use Committee. If the product or service does appear on the list, and is available within the time period required by the purchaser, then it must procure the product or service from the appropriate qualified nonprofit agency for the severely handicapped. Further, purchases from the list are to be made notwithstanding any law requiring that the purchase of such products be made on a competitive bid basis. See also > R.C. 4115.34(C) (reiterating that any competitive bidding requirements and procedures otherwise established under state law need not be utilized in the case of purchases of products and services on the procurement list from qualified nonprofit agencies for the severely handicapped).

Finally, > R.C. 4115.31 defines several terms as they are used in > R.C. 4115.31-.35. As pertains herein, > R.C. 4115.31 states the following:

(B) "Qualified nonprofit agency for the severely handicapped" means an agency:

(1) Organized under the laws of the United States or this state, operated in the interest of severely handicapped individuals, and no part of the net income of which inures to the benefit of any shareholder or other individual;

(2) Which is certified as a sheltered workshop or work activity center by the wage and hour division of the United States department of labor;

(3) Which complies with the applicable occupational health and safety standards required by the laws of the United States or of this state;

(4) Which in the manufacture of products and in the provision of services, whether or not procured under > sections 4115.31 to > 4115.35 of the Revised Code, the qualified work shop must employ, during the fiscal year of commodity production or service provision, the severely handicapped at a quota not less than seventy-five per cent of the total man hours of direct labor on all production, whether or not government-related.

....

(D) "Political subdivision" means a county, township, village, school district, or special purpose district.

(E) "Instrumentality of the state" means any board, commission, authority, public corporation, college, university, or other educational institution, or any other entity supported in whole or in part by funds appropriated by the general assembly. > (FN2) (Footnote added.)

See also 1985 Op. Att'y Gen. No. 85-089 at 2-368 (the term "state agency," as used in > R.C. 4115.34(A), is appropriately understood as designating a "governmental body or unit that exercises a function of state government on behalf of the state"). Cf. > R.C. 1.60 (as used in R.C. Title I (state government), "state agency," except as otherwise provided in such title, means "every organized body, office, or agency established by the laws of the state for the exercise of any function of state government").

According to your letter, Ohio Industries for the Handicapped, the central nonprofit corporation that has been organized pursuant to > R.C. 4115.35 to facilitate and implement the purposes of the state use law, has been working with both the State Use Committee and sheltered workshops operated by qualified nonprofit agencies for the severely handicapped "to develop new employment training opportunities for persons with disabilities." As a result of those efforts, sheltered workshops are now employing and training disabled persons in many different occupations or areas of work, two of which are the fields of painting and printing. Pursuant to > R.C. 4115.34(A), those sheltered workshops are also entering into contracts to perform painting services for various state agencies, and the other units of state and local government that are enumerated in > R.C. 4115.31(D) and (E). Those workshops are also entering into contracts, again, pursuant to > R.C. 4115.34(A), to furnish printing services to the State of Ohio. To the extent that the work performed by sheltered workshop employees in accordance with the terms of the foregoing painting contracts may constitute the construction of a public improvement for purposes of > R.C. 4115.10, you wish to know whether such employees must be paid prevailing rates of wages for such work as is determined by the Department of Industrial Relations under > R.C. 4115.04 and > R.C. 4115.05. You also wish to know whether prevailing rates of wages must be paid to sheltered workshop employees who are engaged in performing printing services for the State of Ohio insofar as > R.C. 125.48 provides that the prevailing wage rate law is applicable to all state printing contracts that are entered into under R.C. Chapter 125. > R.C. 125.48(B).

I shall consider first whether prevailing rates of wages must be paid to sheltered workshop employees who perform painting services pursuant to the terms of state use law contracts. Resolution of that question requires that I address, inter alia, the specific terms of several provisions of Ohio's prevailing wage rate law, which comprises > R.C. 4115.03-.16. > R.C. 4115.10 generally prohibits payment of less than the prevailing rate of wages to employees on certain public improvement projects. Thus, > R.C. 4115.10(A) reads, in pertinent part, as follows:

No person, firm, corporation, or public authority that constructs a public improvement with its own forces the total overall project cost of which is fairly estimated to be more than four thousand dollars shall violate the wage provisions of > sections 4115.03 to > 4115.16 of the Revised Code, or suffer, permit, or require any employee to work for less than the rate of wages so fixed, or violate the provisions of > section 4115.07 of the Revised Code.

In turn, > R.C. 4115.05 states that the prevailing rate of wages paid to laborers, workmen, or mechanics upon public works "shall not be less at any time during the life of a contract for the

public work than the prevailing rate of wages then payable in the same trade or occupation in the locality where such public work is being performed," and that every such contract "shall contain a provision that each laborer, workman, or mechanic, employed by such contractor, subcontractor, or other person about or upon such public work, shall be paid the prevailing rate of wages provided [herein]." > R.C. 4115.04 further directs the Department of Industrial Relations to determine, in accordance with the terms of > R.C. 4115.05, the prevailing rate of wages to be paid to each class of employees that is engaged in constructing a particular public improvement.

By their express terms, therefore, > R.C. 4115.04, > R.C. 4115.05, and > R.C. 4115.10 require payment of prevailing rates of wages to every individual employed by any person, firm, corporation, or public authority that undertakes the construction of a public improvement the total overall project cost of which is fairly estimated to be more than four thousand dollars. Definitional provisions that appear in > R.C. 4115.03 provide further guidance with respect to what constitutes construction of a public improvement for purposes of that requirement. > R.C. 4115.03 thus states, in pertinent part, as follows:

(B) "Construction" means any construction, reconstruction, improvement, enlargement, alteration, repair, painting, or decorating, of any public improvement the total overall project cost of which is fairly estimated to be more than four thousand dollars and performed by other than full-time employees who have completed their probationary periods in the classified service of a public authority.

(C) "Public improvement" includes all buildings, roads, streets, alleys, sewers, ditches, sewage disposal plants, water works, and all other structures or works constructed by a public authority of the state or any political subdivision thereof or by any person who, pursuant to a contract with a public authority, constructs any structure for a public authority of the state or a political subdivision thereof. (Emphasis added.)

Finally, > R.C. 4115.03(A) states, in part, that the term "[p]ublic authority" means any "officer, board, or commission of the state, or any political subdivision of the state, authorized to enter into a contract for the construction of a public improvement or to construct the same by the direct employment of labor, or any institution supported in whole or in part by public funds." > (FN3)

In this instance, therefore, whether prevailing rates of wages shall be paid to sheltered workshop employees will depend, in part, upon whether the painting services those employees perform constitute "construction" of a "public improvement," as those terms are defined in > R.C. 4115.03(B) and (C). > R.C. 4115.03(B) includes within its definition of "[c]onstruction" not only the initial construction of a public improvement, but also any "painting" thereof. Thus, painting services that are performed by sheltered workshop employees qualify thereunder as "construction." > R.C. 4115.03(C) further defines a "[p] ublic improvement" as any such construction that occurs "pursuant to a contract with a public authority," and that is undertaken "for a public authority." Such painting services are, in fact, the subject of contracts that, pursuant

to > R.C. 4115.34(A), have been negotiated between qualified nonprofit agencies for the severely handicapped and state agencies, political subdivisions, and other instrumentalities of the state. Clearly, the foregoing governmental bodies are "[p]ublic authorit[ies]," as defined in > R.C. 4115.03(A), and it is further undisputed that it is for their benefit, and on their behalf, that those painting services are being performed. See generally 1987 Op. Att'y Gen. No. 87-007 at 2-34 and 2-35 (discussing several factors that, inter alia, may be considered in determining whether particular construction is, for purposes of > R.C. 4115.03(C), undertaken "for a public authority").

It follows, therefore, that painting services performed by sheltered workshop employees pursuant to the terms of state use law contracts constitute "construction" of a "public improvement" as understood by > R.C. 4115.03(B) and > R.C. 4115.03(C) respectively. Accordingly, I conclude that such employees are to be paid prevailing rates of wages for such work as is determined by the Department of Industrial Relations under > R.C. 4115.04 and > R.C. 4115.05. See generally > State ex rel. Celebrezze v. Board of County Commissioners of Allen County, 32 Ohio St.3d 24, 27, 512 N.E.2d 332, 335 (1987) ("it is a cardinal rule of construction that where a statute is clear and unambiguous, there is 'no occasion to resort to the other means of interpretation,' 'DDD' quoting from > Slingluff v. Weaver, 66 Ohio St. 621, 64 N.E. 574 (1902) (syllabus, paragraph two)).

A similar conclusion follows with respect to your question about state use law contracts for printing services that are to be furnished to the State of Ohio. You have asked whether prevailing rates of wages must be paid by a qualified nonprofit agency for the severely handicapped to its disabled or handicapped employees that perform those printing services, insofar as > R.C. 125.48 states that the prevailing wage rate provisions that appear in > R.C. 4115.03-.99 are applicable to all printing contracts entered into under R.C. Chapter 125. > R.C. 125.48(B). In that regard, > R.C. 125.31-.76 address the awarding of contracts by the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) for most public printing that is performed for the State of Ohio. Thus, > R.C. 125.31 states that, except for printing for the General Assembly and state-supported institutions of higher education, DAS "shall have supervision of all public printing." > R.C. 125.47 further segregates all public printing for the State of Ohio into four classes, and provides that each such class "shall be let in separate contracts" as thereafter delineated in > R.C. 125.47(A)-(D). > R.C. 125.48 imposes a requirement upon DAS to solicit bid proposals for all such printing contracts, > R.C. 125.48(A), and further makes the prevailing wage rate law applicable to those contracts, > R.C. 125.48(B). > R.C. 125.48 thus reads as follows:

(A) Biennially, between the first day of June and the first day of August, the department of administrative services shall give notice pursuant to > sections 125.07 and > 125.08 of the Revised Code that sealed proposals will be received at its office for executing the several classes of public printing, including the necessary binding for the term of two years from the first Monday of October next ensuing for classes one and two printing, and terms not to exceed two years for classes three and four.

(B) The department of administrative services, before giving notice that sealed proposals for executing the several classes of public printing will be received, shall have the department of industrial relations determine the prevailing rate of wages of printing tradesmen in the state by locality. Such schedule of wages shall be attached to and made a part of the specifications for such printing and shall be printed upon the bidding blanks. > Sections 4115.03 to > 4115.99 of the Revised Code are applicable to all printing contracts entered into under Chapter 125. of the Revised Code. (Emphasis added.)

> R.C. 125.07, to which > R.C. 125.48(A) refers, provides, in pertinent part, that all equipment, materials, supplies, and services purchased by DAS shall be purchased through competitive bidding, "except where such equipment, materials, supplies, or services are purchased pursuant to [> R.C. 4115.31-.35] or where the amount of such purchase is five thousand dollars or less." Thus, although state use law contracts for public printing for the State of Ohio come under the supervision of and are to be awarded through DAS in accordance with the provisions of > R.C. 125.31-.76, such contracts are, pursuant to the foregoing language of > R.C. 125.07(A), specifically exempt from the competitive bidding procedures of R.C. Chapter 125 that would otherwise apply thereto. See also > R.C. 4115.34(A); > R.C. 4115.34(C).

Given the language of > R.C. 125.48(B) that the prevailing wage rate provisions of > R.C. 4115.03-.99 are applicable to all printing contracts entered into under R.C. Chapter 125, it follows that prevailing rates of wages must be paid to disabled or handicapped employees of qualified nonprofit agencies for the severely handicapped that supply printing services to the State of Ohio pursuant to the terms of state use law contracts. Accordingly, I conclude that a qualified nonprofit agency for the severely handicapped, as defined in > R.C. 4115.31(B), is required to pay its disabled or handicapped employees prevailing rates of wages for printing services that those employees perform for the State of Ohio pursuant to the terms of state use law contracts. > (FN4)

In reaching the foregoing conclusions, I am aware that legislation at both the federal and state level generally authorizes, in the appropriate circumstances, payment of less than the statutorily-prescribed minimum wage to disabled or handicapped employees. The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, 52 Stat. 1060 (1938), > 29 U.S.C.A. §§ 201-> 219 (1978 and Supp.1990), as amended, establishes minimum wage levels and maximum hour limits for employees in a wide range of industries and occupations. > 29 U.S.C.A. § 206 (minimum wage); > 29 U.S.C.A. § 207 (maximum hours). Certain exemptions from compliance with the minimum wage directives of > § 206 are found in > 29 U.S.C.A. §§ 213 and > 214. As pertains herein, > 29 U.S.C.A. § 214 (Supp.1990) permits payment of less than the minimum wage, inter alia, to handicapped workers, > § 214(c). Further, pursuant to > 29 U.S.C.A. § 214(c), the Secretary of Labor has recently adopted new regulations that authorize payment of less than the statutorily-prescribed minimum wage to individuals whose earning or productive capacity is impaired by physical or mental disabilities. Those regulations appear at Title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 525 (employment of workers with disabilities under special certificates).

The Ohio General Assembly has similarly enacted legislation, the provisions of which appear in R.C. Chapter 4111, that establishes minimum wage rates for certain Ohio employers

and employees. > R.C. 4111.02. Ohio law also authorizes payment of less than the minimum wage, as required by > R.C. 4111.02, to handicapped or disabled employees. > R.C. 4111.06. See also 5 Ohio Admin. Code Chapter 4101:9-1.

According to your letter, sheltered workshops in Ohio that participate in the state use law program, in accordance with the directive that appears in > R.C. 4115.31(B)(2), have been certified by the Wage and Hour Division of the United States Department of Labor pursuant to > 29 U.S.C.A. § 214(c) to pay less than the minimum wage to their disabled and handicapped employees. See also 5 > Ohio Admin. Code 4101:9-1-01(B) ("[a] special license is required to employ handicapped individuals at less than the state minimum wage and until a state license is issued or a federal certificate is obtained a workshop or individual employer has no authority to pay its covered handicapped employees less than the minimum wage"). That a qualified nonprofit agency for the severely handicapped may be certified by the appropriate federal and state authorities to pay its employees less than the minimum wage does not, however, alter the fact that the Ohio prevailing wage rate law is, by its express terms, and without qualification, applicable to the services performed pursuant to the state use law contracts at issue here. Indeed, the single compliance exception explicitly set forth within the state use law itself is that pertaining to the competitive bidding requirements and procedures that otherwise apply to contracts for the purchase of goods and services by state governmental entities. See > R.C. 4115.34(A); > R.C. 4115.34(C). The state use law does not further except the parties to state use law contracts from complying with the terms of Ohio's prevailing wage rate law. Had the General Assembly intended to permit payment of less than prevailing rates of wages to disabled or handicapped employees who furnish labor and other services pursuant to the terms of state use law contracts, it could have made an express statement addressed thereto within the Revised Code, as it has already done in the case of the minimum wage exemption that appears in > R.C. 4111.06. Absent a specific directive to that effect from the General Assembly, I cannot, on the basis of the general minimum wage exemptions described in > 29 U.S.C.A. § 214(c) and > R.C. 4111.06, read such an exception into either the state use law or the prevailing wage rate law.

You have also asked whether a conflict may be presented by a requirement that qualified nonprofit agencies for the severely handicapped pay these particular employees prevailing rates of wages pursuant to state law when those agencies have already been certified by the Wage and Hour Division of the United States Department of Labor to pay their employees less than the federal minimum wage; and, if so, which level of pay should be considered controlling. The existence of an actual conflict between the prevailing rates of wages requirements of R.C. Chapter 4115 and the minimum wage exemptions of > 29 U.S.C.A. § 214(c) would appear to raise the issue of whether the state law requirements are preempted by the federal law authorizations. In that regard, the > United States Constitution, art. VI, cl. 2, provides in part that, "[t]his Constitution, and the Laws of the United States which shall be made in Pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land." Thus, it has been a longstanding principle of law that when state and federal law, and administrative rules and regulations promulgated pursuant thereto, address similar areas of concern, and are found to conflict in their particular pronouncements, the state law provisions are superseded by the federal enactments. See, e.g., >

Jones v. Rath Packing Co., 430 U.S. 519 (1977) (a state may not enact food labelling requirements that do not permit reasonable weight variations in accuracy resulting from moisture loss during distribution because the state law conflicts with the goal of the federal law to facilitate value comparisons); > City of Burbank v. Lockheed Air Terminal, Inc., 411 U.S. 624 (1973) (local government may not regulate aviation in a manner contrary to the national scheme of regulation simply in order to comport with local preferences); > Campbell v. Hussey, 368 U.S. 297 (1961) (Georgia law that had superseded federal requirements pertaining to the labelling of tobacco products invalidated); 1973 Op. Att'y Gen. No. 73-117 at 2-447 ("[f]ormer Attorneys General have advised that certain [state] statutes conflicted with federal enactments, and therefore were superseded to the extent they were inconsistent"). Whether the enforcement of a state or local law is precluded by a federal enactment on the same subject turns on "[t]he nature of the power exerted by Congress, the object sought to be attained, and the character of the obligations imposed by the law," and whether, under the circumstances of the particular case, the state law "stands as an obstacle to the accomplishment and execution of the full purposes and objectives of Congress." > Hines v. Davidowitz, 312 U.S. 52, 67, 70 (1941). State law is preempted by federal law whenever the two schemes inevitably conflict so as to make compliance with both federal and state regulations a physical impossibility or whenever Congress has manifested an intent, express or implied, to displace state regulation in a specific area. > Florida Lime and Avocado Growers, Inc. v. Paul, 373 U.S. 132 (1963); > Northern States Power Co. v. State of Minnesota, 447 F.2d 1143 (8th Cir.1971), aff'd, > 405 U.S. 1035 (1972). See also > Hayfield Northern Railroad Company, Inc. v. Chicago and North Western Transportation Company, 467 U.S. 622 (1984); > Capital Cities Cable, Inc. v. Crisp, 467 U.S. 691 (1984).

In this instance, I do not perceive a conflict between a requirement that qualified nonprofit agencies for the severely handicapped pay these employees prevailing rates of wages under Ohio law and the fact that those agencies are also certified by the federal government pursuant to > 29 U.S.C.A. § 214(c) to pay their employees less than the federal minimum wage. Certainly, the authorizations that appear in > 29 U.S.C.A. § 214(c) > (FN5) with respect to individuals whose earning or productive capacity is impaired by physical or mental deficiencies permit a qualified nonprofit agency for the severely handicapped to pay its disabled employees less than the federal minimum wage. It does not follow, however, that an agency that is granted such an authorization under > § 214(c) is thereby mandatorily obligated to pay its disabled or handicapped employees less than the minimum wage in all circumstances, and without regard to higher wage rates that may be prescribed by other state or federal legislation. Rather, the authorizations set forth in > § 214(c) simply make available to qualifying employers an exemption from compliance with the federal minimum wage requirements in order to enhance the financial feasibility of hiring disabled workers. Whether a qualifying employer that has availed himself of that exemption actually pays some or all of his disabled employees less than the minimum wage is ultimately left to the employer's discretion. Accordingly, the permissive and discretionary character of the authorizations provided by > 29 U.S.C.A. § 214(c) tends to refute the notion that there is a conflict between those authorizations and the requirements of Ohio's prevailing wage rate law sufficient to warrant preemption of the Ohio law's application in this particular situation. Additionally, my examination of the minimum wage provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 discloses nothing therein that evidences an unmistakable intent on the part of Congress to displace application of a state law that, in the appropriate

circumstances, requires payment of prevailing rates of wages to disabled or handicapped individuals by an employer that has been authorized under > 29 U.S.C.A. § 214(c) to pay its employees less than the federal minimum wage. Cf. > 29 U.S.C.A. § 218(a) ("[n]o provision of this chapter or of any order thereunder shall excuse noncompliance with any Federal or State law or municipal ordinance establishing a minimum wage higher than the minimum wage established under this chapter"); > Cosme Nieves v. Deshler, 786 F.2d 445, 452 (1st Cir.1986), cert. denied, > 479 U.S. 824 (1986) ("> Section 218(a) simply makes clear that the FLSA does not preempt any existing state law that establishes a higher minimum wage...than the federal statute"). See generally > Siuslaw Concrete Const. v. Washington Department of Transportation, 784 F.2d 952 (9th Cir.1986) (holding that a contractor who was required
by state statute to pay a minimum wage rate for nonapprentice trainees on federally funded highway construction project higher than that allowed under federal statutes and regulations failed to establish federal intent to occupy the field to the exclusion of any state regulation, or that the state statute was an obstacle to the accomplishment of federal purposes so as to render the state statute preempted by the federal law and regulations). Absent clear and unambiguous evidence to that effect, I must conclude that application of the prevailing rates of wages requirements of > R.C. 4115.03-.16 to qualified nonprofit agencies for the severely handicapped that employ disabled or handicapped individuals who perform painting or printing services pursuant to the terms of state use law contracts is not foreclosed or otherwise preempted by the fact that such agencies have been authorized by the Wage and Hour Division of the United States Department of Labor, pursuant to > 29 U.S.C.A. § 214(c), to pay their employees less than the federal minimum wage prescribed by > 29 U.S.C.A. § 206.

Given the conclusion that a qualified nonprofit agency for the severely handicapped is required to pay its disabled or handicapped employees prevailing rates of wages for painting or printing services that those employees perform pursuant to the terms of state use law contracts, you have further asked whether the agency must pay those employees the full amount of such wage rates as determined and fixed by the Department of Industrial Relations under > R.C. 4115.04, or whether the agency may pay those employees a lesser, proportionate amount of those specific wage rates, which will be calculated to correspond to the diminished productive capacities of those employees. Your question is prompted by the fact that the productive capacities of disabled or handicapped employees, particularly while they are still in training, are usually less than those of able-bodied individuals who are engaged in the same type of work. While I recognize the practical logic inherent in the latter approach, I am constrained to advise you that an employing agency may not elect to pay those employees rates of wages that are less than the prevailing rates established by the Department of Industrial Relations under > R.C. 4115.04. Again, I discern nothing within the provisions of either the prevailing wage rate law or the state use law that grants such an option, either expressly or by implication, to an employer of handicapped or disabled individuals.

Finally, I consider it important to reiterate the particular responsibilities conferred upon the State Use Committee by > R.C. 4115.33 with respect to the pricing of services rendered by qualified nonprofit agencies for the severely handicapped for purposes of including those services on the Committee's procurement list. > R.C. 4115.33(A) provides that the State Use

Committee shall determine the price of all products manufactured and services provided by the severely handicapped and offered for sale to state agencies, political subdivisions, or instrumentalities of the state that the Committee determines are suitable for use thereby. The price of a particular product or service is, accordingly, an essential factor that must be examined and evaluated by the State Use Committee in deciding whether such product or service shall be included on the procurement list. The language of > R.C. 4115.33 also makes it clear that whether a particular product or service is included on that list is left to the discretion of the State Use Committee. In the exercise of that discretion, however, the Committee must act reasonably lest the Committee's decisions in that regard be susceptible to the charge that they reflect an abuse of discretion and are unlawful. See generally > Jewett v. Valley Railway Co., 34 Ohio St. 601, 608 (1878) (where statutory authority to perform an act is granted, and there is no provision governing the manner in which the act is to be performed, the act may be performed in any reasonable manner). The payment of prevailing rates of wages to the disabled or handicapped employees who perform the painting and printing services at issue here will certainly have a significant bearing upon the actual price that state and local government entities will have to pay for those services under state use law contracts. Mindful of the budget constraints that daily confront state and local governments, the State Use Committee may be compelled to conclude that the price of those services when prevailing rates of wages are paid cannot be reasonably accommodated within the budgets of most state agencies and political subdivisions, thus rendering those services unsuitable for inclusion on the Committee's procurement list.

It is, therefore, my opinion, and you are advised that:

1. A qualified nonprofit agency for the severely handicapped, as defined in > R.C. 4115.31(B), is required to pay its disabled or handicapped employees prevailing rates of wages for painting services that those employees perform pursuant to the terms of state use law contracts.

2. A qualified nonprofit agency for the severely handicapped, as defined in > R.C. 4115.31(B), is required to pay its disabled or handicapped employees prevailing rates of wages for printing services that those employees perform for the State of Ohio pursuant to the terms of state use law contracts.

3. Pursuant to > R.C. 4115.33, the State Use Committee, in the exercise of a reasonable discretion, may determine that the cost of painting and printing services purchased by state agencies and local governments pursuant to state use law contracts when prevailing rates of wages are paid for those services makes them unsuitable for inclusion on the Committee's procurement list.

Respectfully,

Anthony J. Celebrezze, Jr.

Attorney General

> (FN1) Such rules have been adopted by the State Use Committee, and appear at 6 Ohio Admin. Code Chapters 4115-1 through 4115-7.

> (FN2) The Ohio state use law is modeled, in part, upon its federal law analogue, popularly known as the Wagner-O'Day Act, 52 Stat. 1196 (1938), > 41 U.S.C.A. §§ 46-> 48(c) (1987), as amended. See > R.C. 4115.33(C).

> (FN3) The Davis-Bacon Act, 46 Stat. 1494 (1931), > 40 U.S.C.A. §§ 276a-> 276a-7 (1986 and Supp.1989), as amended, similarly requires payment of prevailing rates of wages to laborers and mechanics employed in the construction, repair, or alteration of public buildings or public works of the United States or the District of Columbia pursuant to a contract in excess of two thousand dollars. See > 40 U.S.C.A. § 276a(a).

> (FN4) In your request letter and subsequent correspondence you question whether 1978 Op. Att'y Gen. No. 78-033 and 1977 Op. Att'y Gen. No. 77-076 might nonetheless support the opposite conclusion that a qualified nonprofit agency for the severely handicapped is not required to pay its disabled or handicapped employees prevailing rates of wages for painting and printing services that those employees perform pursuant to the terms of state use law contracts. In Op. No. 78-033 my predecessor determined, inter alia, that a board of education is not required to pay prevailing rates of wages to vocational education students who, as part of the approved vocational education curriculum, work on construction projects for the benefit of the school district or private third parties. In reaching that conclusion my predecessor stated that the prevailing rates of wages requirement of > R.C. 4115.04 and > R.C. 4115.05 applied only to employees who could be classified as "mechanics" or "laborers" insofar as the two latter terms specifically appear in both > R.C. 4115.04 and > R.C. 4115.05. Relying upon his previous statements on this point in Op. No. 77-076, he then reasoned as follows:

In 1977 Op. Att'y Gen. No. 77-076, I concluded that "[a]n individual practicing a particular trade or occupation qualifies as a laborer, workman or mechanic, as those terms are used in > R.C. 4115.04 and > R.C. 4115.05, if members of the same trade or occupation are paid wages pursuant to the terms of a collective bargaining agreement or an understanding between employers and bona fide labor organizations." It is my opinion that a vocational education student does not qualify as a mechanic or laborer under this definition. A vocational education student is not practicing a particular trade or occupation other than that of student. While the student does perform many of the functions of the workman or laborer, the scope of his performance is limited to the approved curriculum and the duration of the course.
Op. No. 78-033 at 2-82 and 2-83.

Similarly, you suggest that because they are often being trained in the work they are performing, or are otherwise learning new skills that will eventually lead to more gainful employment, disabled or handicapped workshop employees should be viewed in the same sense as were the vocational education students in Op. No. 78-033, and not as "mechanics" or "laborers," for purposes of applying the prevailing rates of wages requirements of R.C. Chapter 4115. I must, however, respectfully decline the opportunity to extend and apply the reasoning and conclusions of Op. No. 78-033 and Op. No. 77-076 to the present situation. In that regard I am not persuaded that a reasonable statutory basis exists for recognizing a general exception to

R.C. Chapter 4115's prevailing rates of wages requirements in the case of employees who are engaged in the construction of a public improvement for a public authority as part of a larger skills training program and who, unlike the vocational education students in Op. No. 78-033, expect, and are entitled to receive, recompense for whatever work they perform. First, no such exception is to be found in the express language of any of the individual provisions of R.C. Chapter 4115. I also find it difficult to infer such an exception from either the references in > R.C. 4115.04 and > R.C. 4115.05 to "mechanics" and "laborers," or the statements in Op. No. 77-076 regarding the meaning to be accorded those two terms in the case of employees who perform work of a professional or technical nature.

> (FN5) > 29 U.S.C.A. § 214(c) reads, in pertinent part, as follows:

(1) The Secretary, to the extent necessary to prevent curtailment of opportunities for employment, shall by regulation or order provide for the employment, under special certificates, of individuals (including individuals employed in agriculture) whose earning or productive capacity is impaired by age, physical or mental deficiency, or injury, at wages which are--

(A) lower than the minimum wage applicable under > section 206 of this title,

(B) commensurate with those paid to nonhandicapped workers, employed in the vicinity in which the individuals under the certificates are employed, for essentially the same type, quality, and quantity of work, and

(C) related to the individual's productivity.

(2) The Secretary shall not issue a certificate under paragraph (1) unless the employer provides written assurances to the Secretary that--

(A) in the case of individuals paid on an hourly rate basis, wages paid in accordance with paragraph (1) will be reviewed by the employer at periodic intervals at least once every six months, and

(B) wages paid in accordance with paragraph (1) will be adjusted by the employer at periodic intervals, at least once each year, to reflect changes in the prevailing wage paid to experienced nonhandicapped individuals employed in the locality for essentially the same type of work.

The language of > R.C. 4111.06, which authorizes payment of less than the state minimum wage to disabled employees, is similar to that of > 29 U.S.C.A. § 214(c).

1991 Ohio Op. Atty. Gen. No. 91-055
Office of the Attorney General
State of Ohio

Opinion No. 91-055
December 31, 1991

SYLLABUS:

1. Pursuant to > R.C. 125.31, the Department of Administrative Services shall supervise printing performed for the Legal Rights Service, notwithstanding that the entire cost of that printing is paid for with federal moneys allotted to the State of Ohio under > 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 6042 (Supp. pamphlet 1991) and 10803 (Pamphlet 1991).

2. Pursuant to > R.C. 125.42, the Administrator of the Legal Rights Service shall not print or cause to be printed at the public expense any report, bulletin, document, or pamphlet unless the item to be printed is first submitted to, and the printing thereof approved by, the Department of Administrative Services, notwithstanding that the entire cost of that printing is paid for with federal moneys allotted to the State of Ohio under > 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 6042 (Supp. pamphlet 1991) and 10803 (Pamphlet 1991).

Carolyn S. Knight
Executive Director
Ohio Legal Rights Service
8 East Long Street, Fifth Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43266-0523

Dear Executive Director Knight:

You have requested my opinion whether > R.C. 125.31 and > 125.42 apply to the Legal Rights Service in connection with printing services that are paid for with funds allotted to the State of Ohio by the United States Department of Health and Human Services. > R.C. 125.31-.76 address the awarding of contracts by the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) for most public printing. > R.C. 125.31 states in that regard that, except for printing for the General Assembly and state-supported institutions of higher education, DAS "shall have supervision of all public printing." > R.C. 125.31 further provides that, except as otherwise specifically provided by law, DAS shall determine the "number of copies which shall be printed of each publication or document, the source of reproduction, the manner of binding, quality of paper, the general kind, size, and spacing of type to be used in all reports, publications, bulletins, documents, or pamphlets printed at public expense."

In order that DAS may properly fulfill its responsibilities under the foregoing provision, > R.C. 125.42, the second statute to which your letter refers, requires every officer, board,

commission, or department of state government to receive the approval of DAS prior to undertaking any printing at public expense. > R.C. 125.42 reads as follows:

No officer, board, or commission, except the clerk of the senate and the executive secretary of the house of representatives as to first and second class printing, shall print or cause to be printed at the public expense, any report, bulletin, document, or pamphlet, unless such report, bulletin, document, or pamphlet is first submitted to, and the printing thereof approved by, the department of administrative services. If such department approves the printing, it shall determine the form of such printing and the number of copies.

If such approval is given, the department shall cause the same to be printed and bound as provided by > sections 125.47 to > 125.56 of the Revised Code, except as otherwise provided by > section 125.45 of the Revised Code; and when printed, such publications or forms shall be delivered to the ordering officer, board, commission, or department, or sold at a price not to exceed the total cost.

Pursuant to > R.C. 125.42, therefore, no officer, board, or commission within state government, subject to the two exceptions therein noted, shall print or cause to be printed at the public expense any report, bulletin, document, or pamphlet unless such item is first submitted to and its printing is approved by DAS.

You wish to know whether > R.C. 125.31 and > R.C. 125.42 apply to printing performed for the Legal Rights Service when that printing is paid for with moneys that have been alloted to the State of Ohio by the federal government and thereafter included within the Service's operating budget by the Ohio General Assembly. Created in 1974, see 1974 Ohio Laws, Part II 248, 269 (Am.Sub.S.B. 336, eff., in part, Sept. 30, 1974), the primary mission of the Legal Rights Service is to protect and advocate the rights of mentally ill and mentally retarded or developmentally disabled persons. See > R.C. 5123.60(A); 1986 Op.Att'y Gen. No. 86-091 at 2-515. As pertains herein, > R.C. 5123.60(F)(6) authorizes the Administrator of the Legal Rights Service to "[e]nter into contracts and make such expenditures as are necessary for the efficient operation of the legal rights service." Reasonably implicit in the general contracting authority thus conferred by > R.C. 5123.60(F)(6) upon the Administrator is the power to contract and pay for printing services, provided such services are necessary for the efficient operation of the Legal Rights Service. For the purpose of this opinion I shall presume that the printing services in question are so necessary, and that you are, accordingly, acting within the scope of your statutory authority in securing and paying for those services.

Federal Funding of the Legal Rights Service

According to your letter, the Legal Rights Service pays for all services rendered with moneys allotted to the State of Ohio pursuant to > 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 6041-> 6043 (Supp. pamphlet 1991) and §§ 10803-10805 (Pamphlet 1991). Those sections of > Title 42 (public health and welfare) appear within the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963, 77 Stat. 282 (1963), > 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 6000-> 6083 (Supp. pamphlet

1991), as amended, and the Protection and Advocacy for Mentally Ill Individuals Act of 1986, 100 Stat. 478 (1986), > 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 10801-> 10851 (Pamphlet 1991), as amended, respectively. Among other things, those Acts provide for allotments of federal moneys to support a system in each state to protect and advocate the various legal rights of persons who are developmentally disabled, > 42 U.S.C.A. § 6041, or mentally ill, > 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 10801(b); 10803. A state becomes eligible for those moneys once it has established protection and advocacy systems that conform to the requirements set forth in > 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 6042(a) and > 10805. The Secretary of Health and Human Services allots and distributes those moneys to the individual states in accordance with the formulae set forth in > 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 6042(b) and > 10822. See also > 42 U.S.C.A. § 6043 (authorizing the specific amounts of money to be appropriated by Congress for allotments under > § 6042); § 10827 (authorizing the specific amounts of money to be appropriated by Congress for allotments under § 10803).

The Legal Rights Service functions as the protection and advocacy system to which Ohio's share of the moneys allotted under > 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 6042 and > 10803 is channeled. You further explain that those moneys are "deposited with the state treasurer," and that "[s]eparate account funds are set up with the state accounting system and separate line items are established in the state budget" for those moneys. Thus, for the biennium just concluded, the General Assembly appropriated a total of $2,261,648 from those funds to Legal Rights Service. See Am.Sub.H.B. 111, 118th Gen.A. (1989) (eff., in part, July 1, 1989) (section 67, uncodified).

Exceptions to > R.C. 125.31
and > R.C. 125.42

> R.C. 125.31 and > R.C. 125.42 do, in fact, make certain express exceptions to the application and coverage of their specific provisions. > R.C. 125.31 directs the Department of Administrative Services to supervise all public printing, except printing for the General Assembly and state-supported institutions of higher education. > R.C. 125.31 directs the clerk of the Senate and the executive secretary of the House of Representatives to supervise printing for the General Assembly. Supervision of printing for state-supported institutions of higher education is the responsibility of the department of purchasing of each such institution, or the department or officer within the institution that performs the functions of a department of purchasing. Id. > R.C. 125.42 provides that no officer, board, or commission shall print or cause to be printed at the public expense any report, bulletin, document, or pamphlet unless such item is submitted to, and its printing is approved by, DAS. > R.C. 125.42 excepts from that submission and approval requirement the clerk of the Senate and the executive secretary of the House of Representatives as to first and second class printing. > (FN1)

With respect to the application of > R.C. 125.31 and > R.C. 125.42, and the duties and responsibilities thereby imposed, no exceptions other than those just described are expressly mentioned in either of those statutes. In particular, neither section makes an exception to its application or requirements when the cost of the public printing in question is paid for with federal funds. Moreover, absent a clear and unequivocal expression on the part of the General Assembly recognizing such an exception in > R.C. 125.31 or > R.C. 125.42, it may not otherwise be implied. See generally > Scheu v. State of Ohio, 83 Ohio St. 146, 157-58, 93 N.E. 969, 972

(1910) ("we must observe the rule that an exception to the provisions of a statute not suggested by any of its terms should not be introduced by construction from considerations of mere convenience"); > Morris Coal Co. v. Donley, 73 Ohio St. 298, 76 N.E. 945 (1906) (syllabus, paragraph one) (same); > Siegfried v. Everhart, 55 Ohio App. 351, 353, 9 N.E.2d 891, 892 (Summit County 1936) ("[t]he general rule is that where the Legislature has made no exception to the positive terms of a statute, the presumption is that it intended to make none, and in such case it is not the province of a court to introduce an exception by construction"); 1935 Op.Att'y Gen. No. 3989, vol. I, p. 209, at 214.

It follows, therefore, that, pursuant to > R.C. 125.31, the Department of Administrative Services shall supervise printing performed for the Legal Rights Service, notwithstanding that the entire cost of that printing is paid for with federal moneys allotted to the State of Ohio under > 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 6042 and > 10803. Pursuant to > R.C. 125.42, the Administrator of the Legal Rights Service shall not print or cause to be printed at the public expense any report, bulletin, document, or pamphlet unless the item to be printed is first submitted to, and the printing thereof approved by, the Department of Administrative Services, notwithstanding that the entire cost of that printing is paid for with federal moneys allotted to the State of Ohio under > 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 6042 and > 10803. > (FN2) Accord, 1988 Op.Att'y Gen. No. 88-007 (the Bureau of Disability Determination is required to comply with the terms of > R.C. 126.30, the prompt payment law, with respect to all purchases, leases, or acquisitions of equipment, materials, goods, supplies, or services, notwithstanding that the Bureau's budget is funded by the federal government).

Based upon the foregoing, it is my opinion, and you are advised that:

1. Pursuant to > R.C. 125.31, the Department of Administrative Services shall supervise printing performed for the Legal Rights Service, notwithstanding that the entire cost of that printing is paid for with federal moneys allotted to the State of Ohio under > 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 6042 (Supp. pamphlet 1991) and 10803 (Pamphlet 1991).

2. Pursuant to > R.C. 125.42, the Administrator of the Legal Rights Service shall not print or cause to be printed at the public expense any report, bulletin, document, or pamphlet unless the item to be printed is first submitted to, and the printing thereof approved by, the Department of Administrative Services, notwithstanding that the entire cost of that printing is paid for with federal moneys allotted to the State of Ohio under > 42 U.S.C.A. §§ 6042 (Supp. pamphlet 1991) and 10803 (Pamphlet 1991).

Respectfully,

Lee Fisher

Attorney General

> (FN1) First class printing comprises bills for the two houses of the General Assembly, resolutions and other matters ordered by either of them to be printed in bill form, general and

local laws, and joint resolutions. > R.C. 125.47(A). Second class printing comprises journals and bulletins of the Senate and House of Representatives, and reports, communications, and other documents which form part of the journals. > R.C. 125.47(B).

> (FN2) This conclusion is also compatible with 1916 Op.Att'y Gen. No. 1418, vol. I, p. 556, to which you have referred in your letter. That opinion addressed the question whether G.C. 173-2, the statutory predecessor of > R.C. 125.42, required the secretary of a county conservancy district to submit the proposed printing of reports by the district's engineers to the commissioners of public printing (now the Department of Administrative Services) for their approval. Answering that question in the negative, 1916 Op. No. 1418 concluded in its syllabus that "[o]nly such reports as are to be paid for by funds out of the state treasury are required to be submitted to the commissioners of public printing for approval before publication under [G.C. 173-2]." In this instance the federal moneys that the Legal Rights Service uses to cover the costs of its printing are initially deposited in the state treasury, following their allotment to the State of Ohio by the Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services. Thereafter, the General Assembly makes an appropriation from those moneys to the Legal Rights Service, which is authorized to expend those funds in a reasonable manner in accordance with its statutory mission. It follows, therefore, that the federal moneys here used by the Service to pay for the printing in question are paid out of the state treasury.

> 60 Ohio St. 406

42 W.L.B. 99, 54 N.E. 372

BUCHANAN BRIDGE CO.
v.
CAMPBELL et al., Commissioners.

Supreme Court of Ohio.

June 13, 1899.

Error to circuit court, Fulton county.

Action by the Buchanan Bridge Company against Campbell and others, county commissioners of Fulton county. From affirmance of a judgment of dismissal, plaintiff brings error. Affirmed.

The amended petition filed by the bridge company in the court of common pleas is as follows: 'Now comes the plaintiff, and, by leave of the court first duly granted to file its amended petition herein, says: The said plaintiff, the Buchanan Bridge Company, is a corporation duly created and existing under the laws of Ohio, and having its home office and principal place of business at Bellefontaine, in the county of Logan, in said state. (1) The said plaintiff, as and for its first cause of action against the said defendants, the board of county commissioners of the county of Fulton, in the state of Ohio, say: That on or about the 1st day of November, A. D. 1894, the said plaintiff company, at the special instance and request of the defendant board of county commissioners of Fulton county, in the state of Ohio, sold and delivered to the said defendant board, free on board of cars at and in the village of Morenci, in the state of Michigan, all of the iron and steel material of and for the support of a bridge, and consisting of eight steel piles, seven inches in diameter and twenty feet long, and weighing eighty pounds to the foot in length, in all twelve thousand eight hundred pounds, of the value of three and one-half cents per pound, also eight caps of and for said piles, two steel beams, also sway rods, bolts, and nuts for the proper fastening and holding in place of said material in their designed use, and all weighing two thousand eight hundred and twenty-seven pounds, of the value of three and sixty-five one-hundredths cents per pound, making the sum of five hundred and fifty-three dollars and five cents; and at the same time and place, at the like instance and request of the said defendant board, the said plaintiff company sold and delivered to the said defendant board, free on board of cars, all the material of and for the superstructure of a ninety-foot span high truss bridge, of fourteen feet clear roadway, of the kind and style manufactured by the said plaintiff company, and all in conformity to plans and specifications thereof exhibited by said plaintiff company to said defendant board, and of the fair market value, as and when so delivered, of the sum of eleven hundred and forty-seven dollars and fifty cents, in consideration whereof the said defendant

board promised to pay said plaintiff company, within a reasonable time thereafter, so much as the said several lots and quantities of material were then and there reasonably worth. That immediately upon the said delivery of the said materials the said defendant board paid the freight charges thereon, which should have been paid by plaintiff company, amounting to the sum of forty-two dollars, and no more, and thereupon the said defendant board took all and singular the said materials from the said cars at the said village of Morenci, in the state of Michigan, and brought the same to the state of Ohio, and to the said county of Fulton, and there appropriated and used the same in and about the erection and construction of the substructure and superstructure, respectively, of a county bridge upon a public highway, to wit, a county road of and in the said Fulton county, and not within any municipality therein; and on or about the 3d day of December, A. D. 1894, the bridge so by the defendant board constructed was by the said board thrown open to, and hath ever since said date been used by, the general public, as and constituting a part of the said public highway, and was and is appropriate and necessary to and in the use of said highway, which is much traveled by the public. That the county commissioners of said county, prior to purchasing and ordering from the Buchanan Bridge Company of the materials aforesaid, did not give any public notice for public letting of the contract for furnishing either material or labor for either the substructure or superstructure, or both, of the said bridge so to be built; and said commissioners never caused any memoranda or minute concerning said purchase or order for said bridge material to be entered on the county commissioners' journal, and no plans, specifications, or estimates were made by the county surveyor, or other civil engineer or architect, at the instance of the county commissioners, for the said proposed bridge, and no contract for said bridge was ever submitted to the joint action of the county commissioners, county auditor, and county surveyor for approval by them, or a majority of them, nor the prosecuting attorney of the county for his approval. That the said the Buchanan Bridge Company having as aforesaid in good faith delivered to the defendants the said bridge materials as aforesaid pursuant to its said purchase, order, and request, and said materials having been accepted and received by defendant, and taken by it from Morenci, Michigan, and used by said defendant county board, in the construction of the bridge aforesaid, upon the completion of the said bridge by the defendant board out of and with the said materials so as aforesaid furnished by plaintiff, the commissioners of said county, at the request of said the Buchanan Bridge Company, plaintiff, signed and delivered to it two (2) certain warrants or orders, in the form customarily used by defendant, to the auditor of said county, directing the said auditor to issue or draw his warrant or warrants on the treasurer of said county for the payment of the same, or the price of the materials agreed upon between the said
the Buchanan Bridge Company and said defendant board, less the sum of $42 which had been advanced and paid by the defendant board as freight charges as aforesaid upon said materials. Said auditor was by the said orders aforesaid directed to issue his warrant or warrants to the said treasurer on January 1, 1895, at which time it was understood and agreed between the parties that said bridge materials were to be paid for as aforesaid. That after the issuing of said orders by the county commissioners, and prior to January 1, 1895, at which date the same were to be paid by the issue of warrants directly upon the county treasurer by said county auditor, an action was begun in this court by the prosecuting attorney of said county against the commissioners of said county, the auditor and treasurer of said county, the Buchanan Bridge Company, and others, seeking to enjoin, and for the purpose of enjoining, payment for said bridge materials, and the issue of any warrant by the county auditor upon the county treasurer of said county in payment of

the aforesaid orders so issued by said county commissioners as aforesaid, for the reason that said county commissioners had not procured any plans or specifications to be made for said bridge, or any estimate of its cost, and had not advertised for bids or sealed proposals for the furnishing of materials therefor, or the work of constructing the same, and had not caused any contract for the same to be submitted to the prosecuting attorney of the county for his approval, whereupon a temporary injunction or restraining order was issued, restraining or enjoining the payment of said orders, and enjoining the said auditor from issuing his warrant upon the treasurer of said county to pay the same, and said treasurer from paying said warrant, and enjoining the said county commissioners from allowing or issuing any warrants for the payment of said bridge material. Said cause came on for final hearing in this court at its June term, 1895, and said temporary injunction was by the decree and judgment of this court made perpetual, whereupon an appeal was taken in said cause to the circuit court of said county by this plaintiff; and upon the final hearing of said cause in said circuit court at its November term, 1895, a like judgment and decree was rendered by said circuit court, except that the injunction decreed by said circuit court, and its judgment in said cause, was expressly made and rendered without prejudice to the right of plaintiff to bring its action against the defendant board as upon an implied contract for the recovery of so much as the said bridge materials, when and where delivered to and received by defendant, were reasonably worth. That after the rendition of said judgment and decree by the said circuit court, to wit, on March 2, 1896, the plaintiff duly presented its said claim in writing for compensation for said bridge materials to the said defendant board of county commissioners for allowance and payment, and then and there demanded from said defendant that the same be allowed as a valid claim against said county, and be ordered paid out of the proper funds of said county; but the defendant wholly refused and declined to allow or pay the said claim, or any part thereof. That a reasonable time of and for the payment of the said sums of money hath long since elapsed, yet the said defendant board, though often requested, hath not paid the said sums, nor any part of any or either thereof, save and except only the said freight charges; and there is now due and owing from said defendant board to the said plaintiff, by reason of the premises, and for the said materials so as aforesaid sold and delivered, the full sum of sixteen hundred and fifty-eight dollars and fifty-five cents ($1,658.55), and interest hereon from and after the 1st day of January, A. D. 1895, at the rate of six per cent. per annum. Said bridge materials have been in use by defendants in said bridge ever since December 1, 1894, and the value of the use of the same is fully five hundred dollars ($500) per year, and more. That notwithstanding the refusal of said defendant board to allow plaintiff's said claim for compensation for said bridge materials, and order payment of the same, said defendants still insist on retaining and using said bridge materials, and give out and assert that they will retain, hold, and keep said bridge materials, and continue to use the same in said bridge, and that they will not pay plaintiff any compensation therefor, or allow their claim for the reasonable value of said materials, or for any amount of compensation whatever. Plaintiff therefore prays judgment against the said defendant board of county commissioners of Fulton county for the sum of sixteen hundred and fifty-eight and fifty-five one-hundredths dollars ($1,658.55), and interest thereon at the rate of six per cent. per annum; and they further pray that in the event the court should find that they are not entitled to recover from the defendant the said sum prayed for, or the fair or reasonable value of said bridge material, that the court order and direct that the said defendants, upon the surrender of said orders issued by the said county commissioners by plaintiff, return and deliver back to plaintiff the said bridge materials, placing the same on board of cars at Morenci, Michigan, where the same were

delivered to defendant, and in a good and suitable condition; that plaintiff may have suitable and just compensation for the use of said bridge for the time the same was used by defendant; and for all proper and equitable relief in the premises.'

To this petition the county commissioners demurred on the ground that said petition does not state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action in favor of the plaintiff and against the county commissioners, defendant. The court of common pleas sustained the demurrer, and, the plaintiff not desiring to plead further, dismissed the petition, and rendered final judgment against the bridge company. The circuit court affirmed the judgment, and thereupon the bridge company filed its petition in error in this court, seeking to reverse the judgment of the courts below.

Syllabus by the Court

A contract made by county commissioners for the purchase and erection of a bridge, in violation or disregard of the statutes on that subject, is void, and no recovery can be had against the county for the value of such bridge. Courts will leave the parties to such unlawful transaction where they have placed themselves, and will refuse to grant relief to either party.

[54 N.E. 374] W. W. Touvelle and James Hunt, for plaintiff in error.

W. H. Fuller, Pros. Atty., W. H. Handy, and John Q. Files, for defendants in error.

BURKET, J. (after stating the facts).

This case has been ably argued, both orally and on briefs, and many cases cited to the effect, on part of plaintiff in error, that a recovery may be had against a city or county as upon an implied contract, independent of any statute, for value received and retained by such city or county; and on part of the defendant in error, to the effect that, when the transaction is in violation or disregard of a statute in a material matter, no recovery can be had. We have no disposition to review or attempt to reconcile these cases. We regard them as having been correctly decided under the statutes and rules of decision in the particular locality, and under the peculiar circumstances of the respective cases. Whatever the rule may be elsewhere, in this state the public policy, as indicated by our constitution, statutes, and decided cases, is that, to bind the state, a county, or city for supplies of any kind, the purchase must be substantially in conformity to the statute on that subject, and that contracts made in violation or disregard of such statutes are void,--not merely voidable,--and that courts will not lend their aid to enforce such a contract, directly or indirectly, but will leave the parties where they have placed themselves. If the contract is executory, no action can be maintained to enforce it; and, if executed on one side, no recovery can be had against the party on the other side. Experience has shown that this policy

is necessary to prevent abuses, and protect the public treasury from depletion by unscrupulous public officers. The abuses as to public printing had become so fiagrant as to induce section 2 of article 15 to be inserted into the present constitution of this state. That section is as follows: 'The printing of the laws, journals, bills, legislative documents and papers for each branch of the general assembly, with the printing required for the executive and other departments of state, shall be let, on contract, to the lowest responsible bidder, by such executive officers, and in such manner, as shall be prescribed by law.' In line with the spirit of this section, statutes have been passed providing for the public letting of contracts after advertisement by municipalities, and providing that contracts not so let shall be void; and this court has construed those statutes as absolving municipalities from all obligations as to contracts made, work done, or supplies furnished in violation or disregard of such statutes. > City of Lancaster v. Miller, 58 Ohio St. 558, 51 N. E. 52; > McCloud v. City of Columbus, 54 Ohio St. 439, 44 N. E. 95; > State v. Yeatman, 22 Ohio St. 546.

The manner of purchasing, contracting for, and erecting a bridge by county commissioners, is regulated and controlled by statute, and nothing is left to inference. Section 795, Rev. St., requires that, before entering into a contract for the substructure of a bridge, the commissioners shall make or procure some competent architect or civil engineer to make full, complete, and accurate plans therefor, working plans, accurate bills, showing the exact amount of all different kinds of materials to be used, and also complete specifications of the work to be done, and a full, accurate, and complete estimate of each item of expense, and the aggregate cost of the whole; but the commissioners may receive from bidders on iron substructures the necessary plans and specifications therefor. Section 796 requires the commissioners to determine the length and width of the superstructure of a bridge, whether the same shall be single or double track, and requires them to advertise for proposals for performing the labor and furnishing the materials necessary in the erection of the bridge, and they may cause plans and specifications to be prepared or not, at their option; and they may receive bids or plans and specifications proposed by others, but in such case it must be stated whether there is any patent right upon such plan, or any part thereof. In the advertisement for the proposals, the commissioners are required to invite bidders to bid for all or any part of the work or materials, and to state the time and place when and where the bids will be opened; and at that time and place the bids must be publicly opened and read, and the contract awarded to the lowest and best bidder,
and the plans and specifications upon which the contract is awarded must be made a part of the contract, and kept on file in the office of the county auditor. Section 797 requires that the plans, drawings, representations, bills of materials, specifications of work, and estimates as to the bridge, shall [54 N.E. 375] be submitted to the county commissioners, auditor, and surveyor of the county, and, if approved by a majority of them, a copy thereof shall be deposited with the auditor, and safely kept in his office. Section 798 requires that after the approval of such plans and specifications, etc., the county auditor shall give public notice in two of the principal papers of the county of the time and place when and where sealed proposals will be received for performing the labor and furnishing the materials necessary for the erection of such bridge, and making a contract therefor, which notice shall be published weekly for four consecutive weeks next preceding the day named for the making of such contract. But, when the estimated cost of a bridge is less than $1,000, no public letting is necessary. Section 799 requires the commissioners

to award the contract for the substructure of a bridge to the lowest bidder who will give a good and sufficient bond for the faithful performance of his contract. All contracts exceeding $1,000 in amount are required to be submitted by the commissioners to the prosecuting attorney before any work is done or materials furnished, and if found by him to be in accordance with the law on that subject, and his certificate to that effect is indorsed thereon, then the contract shall have full force and effect; otherwise, it shall be null and void.

Section 800 provides that no contract for a bridge or bridge substructure shall be made at a price in excess of the estimates so required to be made. Section 850 requires a full record of the board to be kept by its clerk, to be signed by the commissioners, and certified by the president and clerk of the board, and to be received in evidence in all courts of this state. By section 853 the commissioners are authorized at any regular or special session to make any necessary order or contract in relation to the building of any public bridge. Section 878 requires that it shall be essential to the validity of every contract entered into by the commissioners, or order made by them, that the same has been assented to at a regular or special session, and entered in the minutes of their proceedings by the auditor. Section 894 provides that no claim against the county shall be paid otherwise than upon the allowance of the county commissioners upon the warrant of the county auditor, except when the amount is fixed by law, or is authorized to be fixed by some other person or tribunal; but in no case are the commissioners allowed to disburse any public money. Section 1024 makes it the duty of the auditor to issue warrants on the county treasurer, whenever the proper order or voucher is presented therefor.

To make a valid contract of sale by the bridge company to the county commissioners, and a valid contract of purchase of a bridge exceeding $1,000 by the commissioners, it is essential that the foregoing provisions of the statute should be substantially complied with. This was not done. The bridge in question amounted to over $1,000. One paragraph of the amended petition is fatal to the validity of the contract in question, viz.: 'That the county commissioners of said county, prior to purchasing and ordering from the Buchanan Bridge Company of the materials aforesaid, did not give any public notice for public letting of the contract for furnishing either material or labor for either the substructure or superstructure, or both, of the said bridge so to be built, and said commissioners never caused any memoranda or minute concerning said purchase or order for said bridge material to be entered on the county commissioners' journal, and no plans, specifications, or estimates were made by the county surveyor, or other civil engineer or architect, at the instance of the county commissioners, for the said proposed bridge, and no contract for said bridge was ever submitted to the joint action of the county commissioners, county auditor, and county surveyor for approval by them, or a majority of them, nor to the prosecuting attorney of the county for his approval.' Whether or not said pretended purchase of the bridge was made at a regular or special session does not clearly appear, but it would seem that, if it had been made at any session, that fact would have been averred, followed by an averment that the auditor, through mistake or otherwise, failed to make a record of the action in fact had by the commissioners. As the amended petition stands, it must be construed as conceding that the commissioners were not in either regular or special session when the supposed contract was made.

No notice of the proposed letting was published; no record of the contract was entered in the minutes of the commissioners by the auditor; no plans or specifications were ever made, approved, or deposited with the auditor; no contract was ever submitted by the commissioners to

the prosecuting attorney for his approval, and none was ever approved by him. These omissions are fatal to the validity of the contract, and, by force of the above-cited sections of the statute, the contract is totally void, and imposed no obligation on either party to it. The statutes are notice to the world as to the extent of the powers of the commissioners, and the bridge company is bound by that notice. It knew, and was bound to know, that the commissioners had no power to thus enter into a contract, and that a contract thus attempted to be entered into would be null and void, and would not bind either party. It is necessary to so construe the statutes, in order to prevent the evils which induced the enactment of them. If such statutes could be evaded, there would always be found some public servants who would be ready and willing to join in transactions detrimental to the public, but favorable to themselves or some favored friend; and, if public officers should be ever so honest, some persistent agent or salesman would impose upon them, and obtain [54 N.E. 376] more out of the public treasury than is justly due. When the provisions of the statute are followed, and all is done openly and publicly, the public interests are best conserved, and even then there is often complaint to the effect that some one has been favored.

The plaintiff, seeing that the contract must be held to be void, seeks to recover on the ground that the commissioners received and retained the bridge, and promised to pay what it is reasonably worth. The amended petition pleads an express contract, and where there is a subsisting express contract the recovery must be had thereon, and an action cannot be had in such case upon an implied contract. But it is urged that, the express contract being void, the case is the same as if no contract had been made, and as if the commissioners had received and retained the bridge without an express contract. The answer to this is that the commissioners have no power to bind the county in that way, and to allow such a course to be pursued would permit the evasion of the statutes. The contention in this case is not as to the amount to be paid for the bridge, but whether the county shall pay at all. To say that the commissioners accepted the bridge, and retained it, and promised to pay what it is reasonably worth, does not aid the plaintiff. The commissioners cannot purchase supplies upon the reasonably worth plan, and no one is permitted to deal with them on that plan. The statute is the only authority and guide for both parties. In this case both parties have acted in disregard of the statute, and the court will leave them where they have placed themselves, and refuse to aid either. Judgment affirmed.

> 116 Ohio App. 393

188 N.E.2d 431, 22 O.O.2d 227

COLUMBUS BLANK BOOK CO., Appellee,
v.
MALOON, Dir., et al., Appellants (Two cases).

Court of Appeals of Ohio, Tenth District, Franklin County.

[188 N.E.2d 432] Vorys, Sater, Seymour & Pease and John C. Elam, Columbus, for appellee.

Mark McElroy and William B. Saxbe, Attys. Gen., and Theodore R. Saker, Columbus, for appellants John E. Hull, State Purchasing Agent, and James H. Maloon, Director of Department of Finance.

Power, Griffith, Jones & Bell, Columbus, for appellant F. J. Heer Printing Co.

PER CURIAM.

This is an appeal on questions of law and fact from a judgment of the Common Pleas Court prohibiting the appellants Maloon and Hull from proceeding in the award of a public contract to appellant The F. J. Heer Printing Company, and ordering them to award the contract to appellee.

By leave of court, amended and additional pleadings have been filed and the case has been submitted upon the full proceedings before the Common Pleas Court and additional evidence presented in this court.

On July 2, 1962, the Department of Finance gave public notice in the newspapers, and on September 21, 1962, issued invitations to bid on contracts for First Class and Second Class state printing as defined by Section 125.47, Revised Code. Bid proposals were received from appellant The F. J. Heer Printing Company and from appellee. On October 22 the bids were opened and the appellee was the low bidder. Various investigations and discussions occurred, but no acceptance was issued. On November 30 an application was presented to the State Controlling Board for permission to award the contracts without competitive bidding. Permission was granted, and on the same day a notice of award was sent to The F. J. Heer Printing Company.

The first question is the legal effect of the board's action. The minutes state:

'November 30, 1962

'At 2:15 p. m. on Friday, November 30, 1962 the Sundry Claims Board meeting was interrupted to consider Controlling Board Request No. 776-from the Ohio Senate over the signature of Thomas Bateman, Clerk of the Senate for permission to purchase, without competitive bidding contract for printing First and Second Class printing as described in R.C. § 125.47.

'Request was presented by Mr. Maloon and Mr. Stanley.

'Vote on the request was as follows:

'Chairman, Mr. Stanley--Yes

'Rep. Fisher--Yes

'Senator Deddens--No

'General Goble--Yes

'Mr. Furnier--Yes

'Request was approved to purchase without competitive bidding.'

> [1] No statement is made that an emergency existed, nor are any facts or reasons stated from which it could be implied. On all the evidence before us, it is our conclusion that no emergency was shown, and the board's action was invalid.

> [2] The next point is to consider the nature and legal effect of the notice sent to the Heer printing company on November[188 N.E.2d 433] 30 by Hull, the superintendent of purchases, pursuant to instructions from the Director of Finance. This notice states:

'In accordance with the decision of the State Controlling Board of this day, your proposal dated October 22, 1962, in response to [bid invitation] * * * has been accepted at the prices quoted therein.' (Emphasis added.)

It is our conclusion that this notice was not intended and did not operate as an acceptance of the Heer bid proposal which had been made in response to the invitation to bid pursuant to the competitive bidding procedures. Rather it was a by-passing of those procedures, and an attempt to award new contracts without competitive bidding under the authority of the Controlling Board action. Since we have concluded that the board's action in this case is invalid, it follows that the award based on that action is equally invalid.

What then is the status of the bid proposals of the two companies, which were submitted under the invitation of September 21? In compliance with the public notice requirement of Section 125.48, Revised Code, the department caused publication to be made on July 2 in proper newspapers. These notices established the time for receipt of bids as August 20. Under Section 125.14, Revised Code, invitations to bid must be sent at least fifteen days preceding that date (or about August 4). No such invitations were sent. Later, invitations were sent on September 21. These changed and extended the time for receipt to
October 22. However, no public notice was given of this extension of time. Further, under Section 125.51, Revised Code, bids are required to be opened within two days after the date set for receipt. There are thus several obvious discrepancies. The court has doubt as to the validity of these proceedings. However, none of the parties has questioned them.

We have stated that the notice of November 30 to Heer did not constitute an acceptance under the invitations to bid. Assuming the invitations and bid proposals to have been validly made, their status is now simply that of bids received and opened but without as yet any acceptance of either bid.

> [3] Appellee's demand is that the director be ordered to award the contracts to it. To be entitled to an order requiring a public official to do a specific act, it must be shown there is a clear legal duty to so act. In our opinion, appellee has failed to show such a duty.

> [4] It was incumbent upon appellee to show that it was 'the lowest responsible bidder having proper facilities.' The evidence shows that appellee relies primarily upon the ATF photo composition process of printing. This process does not meet statutory specifications for First Class printing (bills and resolutions) required under Section 101.51 of the Revised Code, and related sections.

With respect to both First Class and Second Class printing, the evidence shows that appellee's use of the ATF process has been very limited. On the evidence, appellee did not have such equipment at the time the bids were received. Much of the equipment it now has was acquired since December 1, 1962. While other enterprises are apparently using the process successfully, appellee's experience on large commercial type contract work is negligible. Appellee does appear to have a good staff. Various officials have at various times expressed their opinions as to appellee's capability to perform. However, it is not clear that those opinions took into account the statutory specifications as we hold them to be. There were also statements at various times of an intent to award the contracts to appellee. There is no evidence of an entry on the department journal pursuant to Section 121.21, Revised Code, nor of any other finding or determination that was ever formalized in any was. Statements of intent and probable conduct as of any particular
time do not necessarily establish what will actually happen when action is taken.

[188 N.E.2d 434] > [5] On the evidence, and considering the legal meaning of 'responsible bidder having proper facilities,' we cannot say that there is a clear obligation to award these contracts to appellee. The question for this court is whether there is now a clear

legal obligation to award the contracts to appellee, and not whether appellee can or should be awarded the contracts.

> [6] Further, as stated above, no bid proposal submitted under the invitations to bid has yet been accepted, and no notice of award has yet been made. Judicial notice is taken of the change in state personnel. Further investigation may still be made by the officials concerned, and all bids might yet be rejected as too high. This court cannot order the acceptance of a bid which has not yet been rejected.

> [7] Two observations should be made. It is for the Legislature and not a court to determine whether the specifications in Section 101.51, Revised Code, are in the best interests of the General Assembly and the public, or whether they are unnecessarily restrictive. Secondly, the court is aware that it has placed heavy pressure on all concerned, including itself, in order to expedite this litigation. The needs of the General Assembly create a situation which justifies extraordinary burdens. We ask that if any party intends to file for reconsideration, any such application be made promptly so that a final entry can be filed as soon as possible.

There being no clear legal right to the relief demanded, the prayer for an order requiring the awarding of the contracts is denied.

Judgment accordingly.

DUFFY, P. J., and BRYANT and DUFFEY, JJ., concur.

BRYANT, Judge (concurring).

I wish to add these comments:

(1) There appear to have been some violations of the law as to competitive bidding in that, (a) bidding was not in fact closed on August 20, 1962, the date set for closing in the legal advertisement; (b) bids were not awarded in two days after the final date for filing bids; (c) invitations were not mailed out
fifteen days prior to August 20, 1962 (actually on September 21, 1962).

(2) There appears to have been no reliance on the journal of the department. It has been the law of this state for many years that all state departments shall keep such a journal and such journal, like the journal of a court, is controlling.

(3) There appears never to have been any certificate of the Director of Finance that the funds needed for this contract were appropriated, were unexpended and unencumbered, and, therefore, available for expenditure. I am totally unimpressed with the agrument that this step is merely routine.

# Appendix H

LAW OFFICES
BRICKER & ECKLER LLP
100 SOUTH THIRD STREET
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43215-4291
TELEPHONE (614) 227-2300
FAX (614) 227-2390
EMAIL: INFO@BRICKER.COM
INTERNET HOME PAGE: HTTP://WWW.BRICKER.COM

JOHN W. BRICKER (1893-1986)
JOHN ECKLER (1913-1994)

RICHARD D. ROGOVIN
EDWARD A. MATTO
MICHAEL F. SULLIVAN
SALLY W. BLOOMFIELD
NICHOLAS A. PITTNER
RICHARD F. KANE
JOHN F. BIRATH, JR.
MICHAEL S. HOLMAN
RICHARD C. SIMPSON
JOHN P. BEAVERS
DAVID G. BAKER
JERRY E. NATHAN
MARSHALL L. LERNER
RANDOLPH C. WISEMAN
DONALD R. KELLER
KAREN MUELLER MOORE
STEVEN R. KERBER
CHARLES H. WALKER
GORDON W. JOHNSTON
DAVID A. ROGERS
CHARLES H. WATERMAN III
MICHAEL K. GIRE
JAMES A. RUTLEDGE
DAVID C. SPIALTER
RANDALL E. MOORE
JOHN W. COOK III
CHARLES H. McCREARY III
JAMES P. BURNES
ELISABETH A. SQUEGLIA
KENNETH C. JOHNSON
MICHAEL E. FLOWERS
MARK A. ENGEL
DAVID K. CONRAD
RICHARD S. LOVERING
REBECCA C. PRINCEHORN
DIANE M. SIGNORACCI
LUTHER L. LIGGETT, JR.
MARTHA POST BAXTER
GRETCHEN A. McBEATH
CRAIG A. HADDOX
WILLIAM T. CONARD II
ROBERT C. RAFFERTY
JERRY ORMES ALLEN
QUINTIN F. LINDSMITH
JOYCE B. LINK
H. RANDY BANK
ANNE MARIE SFERRA VORYS
CATHERINE M. BALLARD
GORDON F. LITT
L. BRENT MILLER
SUE WYSKIVER YOUNT
JAMES J. HUGHES III
ANDREW A. FOLKERTH
FRANK L. MERRILL
KURTIS A. TUNNELL
MARK C. POMEROY
BETSY A. SWIFT
JACK ROSATI, JR.
SUSAN E. GEARY
THOMAS R. BROWNLEE, JR.
LAURIE A. BRIGGS
JAMES F. FLYNN
PRICE D. FINLEY
HARRY WRIGHT IV
DREW H. CAMPBELL
STEPHEN C. GRAY
T. EARL LeVERE
FAITH M. WILLIAMS

STEPHEN INTIHAR
KAREN D. SMITH

WENDI R. HUNTLEY
MARTHA E. HORVITZ
ELIZABETH A. PRESTON
KIMBERLY J. BROWN
WARREN I. GRODY
AMY STRAKER BARTEMES
JAMES G. PETRIE
JULIANA M. FARIS
CHRISTINE A. BRICKER
CHRISTINE M. POTH
JULIA L. DORRIAN
LAURA G. ANTHONY
SUSAN L. OPPENHEIMER
KATHERINE SPIES GIUMENTI
NELSON M. REID
BOBBIE S. SPRADER
ELIZABETH H. WATTS
MAUREEN P. TAYLOR
EMMETT M. KELLY
ALEXANDER M. BROWN
JENNIFER A. GOAZIOU
GREGORY T. PARKS
ALEJANDRO E. ALMAGUER
JAMES S. GRAY
JEPHTHA J. PAUL
JOHN F. FURNISS
JENNIFER L. WEINFELD
BETH A. BRENGARTNER
DAVID P. SUICH
ALLEN R. KILLWORTH
JAMES P. SCHUCK
JEFFREY R. BENNETT
MIRANDA C. MOTTER
MARK E. EVANS
TERRENCE O'DONNELL
G. SAMUEL WAMPLER*
STEPHEN L. HEBENSTREIT
JAMES R. BERENDSEN
THEODORE J. GALLAGHER
MARIA J. ARMSTRONG
MARY G. MENKEDICK
MATTHEW L. STOUT
ERICA A. HORNE
STEPHANIE L. QUIGG

OF COUNSEL
JAMES J. HUGHES
JOHN C. ROSENBERGER
THOMAS R. SANT
JOSEPH P. RATH
ROBERT H. KATZ
KIMBALL H. CAREY
SUSAN B. GREENBERGER
DIANE RICHARDS BREY
SYLVIA LYNN GILLIS
THOMAS J. O'BRIEN

RETIRED
BRUCE G. LYNN
RICHARD C. PICKETT
WILLIAM H. LEIGHNER
JAMES S. MONAHAN
ELBERT J. KRAM
*Admitted in California only

April 4, 2002

**VIA EMAIL & REGULAR U. S. MAIL**
Christine E. Andrysiak
Plante & Moran, LLP
27400 Northwestern Highway
Southfield, MI 48037-0307

Re: State of Ohio Copy Center Assessment Project

Dear Christine:

At present, individual state administrative agencies operate independent copy centers for their own document reproduction needs. You asked us to determine if the Ohio Department of Administrative Services (ODAS) has the statutory authority to assume management and oversight of these independent agency copy centers. We believe it does. However, this may not be a realistic possibility given "turf" issues or the passage of past time.

ODAS has the authority to supervise all public printing and copy services, with limited exceptions. R.C. 125.31, Ohio Admin. Code 5101-9-54 (E) (1). ODAS may, however, grant permission to state boards, commissions, and departments to perform office reproduction services "outside the central facility". R. C. § 125.45. We believe that the independent copy centers about which you inquire have been created under authority of this rule.

Please note that the statute reads "permission may be granted", and includes no express provision for revocation of the permission. R. C. § 125.45. However, administrative agencies generally have inherent authority to reconsider their own decisions since the power to decide in the first instance carries with it the power to reconsider. *Hal Artz Lincoln-Mercury, Inc. v. Ford Motor Co.* (1986), 28 Ohio St. 3d. 20, 502 N.E. 2d 590. An administrative agency's implied power to modify decisions is the necessary counterpart of its underlying authority to grant and deny applications. In *re Cleveland Clinic Foundation* (1994), 94 Ohio App. 3d 348 at 352, 640 N.E. 2d 900 at 902-903.

It then follows that ODAS has the authority to reconsider its earlier grant of permission for any state agency to maintain its own independent copy center. Of course if permission was never obtained, no reconsideration would be necessary.

Please be aware that this opinion does not transfer to state entities over which ODAS does not have original authority. These entities include the General Assembly, Ohio Arts Council, Capitol Review and Advisory Board, Bureau of Workers' Compensation, State colleges and universities, and state-wide elective office holders (Attorney General, Auditor, Secretary of State, and Treasurer). R.C. 125.31, R.C. 125.041.

Should you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Luther L. Liggett, Jr.
lliggett@bricker.com
(614) 227-2399

Doug Shevelow, Law Clerk
dshevelow@bricker.com
(614) 227-4803

DS/ljh

# Appendix I

## *APPENDIX I*

The Office of State Printing currently provides an all inclusive per impression rate for its services. This means that all customers pay the same rate regardless of the complexity of their given job. (e.g. a customer requiring spiral binding pays the same rate as a customer requiring simple copying with any finishing provided).

Following are some suggested pricing recommendations.

Source: 2001/2002 Printimage International Bindery & Finishing Study

| **Service** | **Recommended Price Range** | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | |
| Cutting | $4.50 Minimum, $3.81 Setup, $47.77 Hourly | | |
| Folding | Right Angle - $18.26 Minimum, $15.84 Setup and $54.67 hourly rate | | |
| | Parallel - $9.53 Minimum, $7.99 Setup, and $48.26 Hourly rate | | |
| Stitching | Off-Line: .052 per staple; Saddle: .087 per staple | | |
| Shrink Wrapping | $.41-.49 | | |
| Scoring | $25.34 for 500 - $116.21 for 5,000 and greater | | |
| Manual Collating and gathering | $39.56 hourly rate or $29.71 average charge | | |
| Laminating (per square foot) | $3.04 matte, $2.68 gloss, $2.83 low luster | | |
| Mounting (per square foot) | $5.29 gator, $4.41 foam, $3.30 poster board, $6.50 sintra | | |
| GBC Binding | ¼" GBC $1.50 (25-50) | $1.31 (100-250) | $1.15 (500+) |
| | ½" GBC $2.05 (25-50) | $1.78 (100-250) | $1.62(500+) |
| | ¾" GBC $2.61 (25-50) | $2.29 (100-250) | $2.09 (500+) |
| | 1"GBC $3.19 (25-50) | $2.77 (100-250) | $2.56 (500+) |
| Drilling | $8.22 1M sheets | | |