

Economic Development: The Local Perspective Technical Appendix

Max Neiman
Daniel Krimm

Description

In this technical appendix we provide details about the Local Economic Development (LED) Survey, detailed results of the factor analyses for LED activities and LED barriers, and correlation and regression results for the LED policy measures. Appendix A begins with an overview of the survey goals and procedures, followed by a detailed description of methodology used to design and conduct the survey, and quantitative descriptions of the representativeness of the survey sample. The complete survey questions and summary statistics are provided at the end of Appendix A. Appendix B lists the individual factor load scores for each of the items included in the seven activity factors and the four barrier factors. Appendix C shows correlations between LED barriers and LED policy measures, followed by regression results for each of the LED policy measures. These regressions served as the basis for the figures in Chapter 4, simulating the effect on the dependent variable by varying (by one standard deviation) one predictor variable at a time, holding the other predictors constant.

Contents

Appendix A. The 2008 Local Economic Development Survey
Appendix B. Factor Analysis
Appendix C. Correlations and Regression Results for LED Policy Measures



PPIC

PUBLIC POLICY
INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA

Appendix A:

The 2008 Local Economic Development Survey

Overview

The key objective of the Local Economic Development (LED) survey was to measure California cities' efforts to promote economic development, so as to identify policy patterns, to develop policy measures of local economic development activity, and to probe city representatives' views regarding local policy making processes. The complete survey questionnaire is included at the end of this appendix.

The survey targeted local officials from incorporated cities across the state of California. At the time the survey was implemented, there were 478 such municipalities in the state. The web-based survey was conducted over ten weeks from February to April 2008. Online services were provided by SurveyMonkey.com. PPIC conducted the survey in-house, supplementing it by mail, email, and phone calls, to encourage response and to identify alternate respondents. Public officials familiar with their cities' economic development activities were asked about their city's choice of specific policy actions and how those actions were formulated and implemented. The LED survey also contained a variety of items focused on perceptions of effectiveness and relationships between the respective cities and the state of California regarding economic development policy.

The LED survey was complemented by a series of personal interviews and discussions regarding the interplay between state economic development policy and local policies, conducted with local economic development experts, local officials, and state government staff members.

Survey Methodology

Pre-testing

The 2008 LED survey instrument underwent extensive pre-testing with experts and practitioners in the field of economic development. The questionnaire was designed to probe as many features of local policymaking as theory and prior research suggested were relevant. The 2008 LED survey was relatively lengthy compared to previous surveys, which were administered by mail. The typical time to complete the 2008 survey in a single sitting averaged 20 to 30 minutes, as measured by the online tracking system.

Pre-targeting

Respondents included such local officials as heads of local housing departments, senior economic development planners, city managers, assistant city managers, planning department directors, public works directors, redevelopment agency managers, and others. About half of these were members of the California Association for Local Economic Development CALED, and contact information for these and many others was provided by CALED. Others were

located through city web sites, and a few required direct phone calls. During follow-up contacts to outstanding non-respondents, additional alternate respondents were sometimes identified, with a single response accepted for any particular city. Contact information for six of the 478 cities was unavailable.

Survey period/methods/sequence

The survey effort began February 13, 2008 with a letter of invitation to city contacts notifying them of an impending email invitation to participate in the online survey. It continued on February 20, 2008 with a bulk email invitation to complete the survey sent to contacts at 464 cities, and eight additional invitations sent outside the auto-tracking system for a total of 472 out of 478 total cities in the state. Several email addresses returned “bounce messages” indicating that they had not been delivered, and in several of these cases new contacts or corrected email addresses were obtained with phone calls or email to general departmental staff. Several contacts also opted-out from the survey system, precluding subsequent bulk email contact. Some of these cities were captured later, either with the originally targeted respondent or with an alternate.

As many as 20 additional bulk email communications were sent periodically to those contacts that had not completed the survey. A second letter that included an endorsement of the survey by the state Business, Housing and Transportation Agency was sent on March 27, 2008, to 308 remaining contacts that had not completed the survey at that time

On March 31, 2008, we initiated phone calls and direct personal emails to selected non-respondents. Cities were contacted in rough order of their population. Larger populations were given higher priority because smaller cities have typically reflected lower response rates in previous surveys, larger cities are more likely to have dedicated staff for economic development and to be engaged in more of such activities. In addition, many of the state’s smaller, often isolated cities do very little organized economic development or have no individual assigned uniquely to economic development.

For this reason, we expected to find a mild skew toward larger cities in the total sample, and this was indeed the case. For example, we received responses from all four cities in the state with populations greater than 500,000, and we received a significantly lower response rate from cities with population less than 25,000 as compared with cities 25,000 or larger.¹

¹ During this process of direct contacts, and as a result of the March 27 letter, it became apparent that many intended recipients had not received the bulk email messages from the survey system. In all likelihood, many of these messages were interrupted by email spam filters at the cities’ municipal networks, and had not returned bounce messages to indicate such interruption. This is not uncommon with spam filtering generally, and presents a systematic problem for any system-based email communications. Where resources allow, it is recommended to pre-approve all email contacts and to assure “white-listing” in any spam filters operated at the recipient’s end. However, we are not aware of any reason to expect a systematic correlation between email filtering and any other variables of relevance to our analysis, at this time. Also, in some cases the original contact was either no longer present or inappropriate to represent the city in the survey, and a referral to a new contact was sought and usually acquired (though not all such new contacts finally completed the survey).

The survey was closed on April 30, 2008, with usable responses from 259 respondents (54.2%), including a few partial responses that included substantial information although they were not fully completed.

Representative sample

Table A.1 shows the distribution of survey responses according to city population groups and counties. The table indicates that the study sample is generally representative of the cities across the state, with cities under 25,000 in population moderately underrepresented. We also found that the survey sample was widely representative of cities by county.

Table A.1
Distribution of Survey Respondents by Population and by County

| City grouping | Number of cities Total | Number of cities Completed | % cities Completed |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Population 500,000+ | 4 | 4 | 100.0 |
| Population 100,000-500,000 | 58 | 42 | 72.4 |
| Population 50,000-100,000 | 101 | 59 | 58.4 |
| Population 25,000-50,000 | 93 | 54 | 58.1 |
| Population <25,000 | 222 | 100 | 45.0 |
| Counties with one city (10) | 10 | 6 | 60.0 |
| Counties with two cities (8) | 16 | 7 | 43.8 |
| Counties with three cities (3) | 9 | 5 | 55.6 |
| Counties with four cities (4) | 16 | 7 | 43.8 |
| Amador | 5 | 3 | 60.0 |
| Butte | 5 | 2 | 40.0 |
| Napa | 5 | 2 | 40.0 |
| Merced | 6 | 2 | 33.3 |
| Placer | 6 | 5 | 83.3 |
| Humboldt | 7 | 2 | 28.6 |
| Imperial | 7 | 4 | 57.1 |
| Sacramento | 7 | 5 | 71.4 |
| San Joaquin | 7 | 3 | 42.9 |
| San Luis Obispo | 7 | 3 | 42.9 |
| Solano | 7 | 3 | 42.9 |
| Santa Barbara | 8 | 6 | 75.0 |
| Tulare | 8 | 6 | 75.0 |
| Siskiyou | 9 | 7 | 77.8 |
| Sonoma | 9 | 4 | 44.4 |
| Stanislaus | 9 | 5 | 55.6 |
| Ventura | 10 | 6 | 60.0 |

| City grouping | Number of cities Total | Number of cities Completed | % cities Completed |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Kern | 11 | 7 | 63.6 |
| Marin | 11 | 6 | 54.5 |
| Monterey | 12 | 4 | 33.3 |
| Alameda | 14 | 8 | 57.1 |
| Fresno | 15 | 7 | 46.7 |
| Santa Clara | 15 | 6 | 40.0 |
| San Diego | 18 | 10 | 55.6 |
| Contra Costa | 19 | 15 | 78.9 |
| San Mateo | 20 | 10 | 50.0 |
| Riverside | 24 | 12 | 50.0 |
| San Bernardino | 24 | 11 | 45.8 |
| Orange | 34 | 19 | 55.9 |
| Los Angeles | 88 | 51 | 58.0 |
| California total | 478 | 259 | 54.2 |

Table A.2
Statistical Profile of California Cities

| Community Trait (mean values) | All Cities | | | Cities ≥ 25,000 Population | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| | Total (N = 478) | Resp. (N = 259) | Nonresp. (N = 219) | Total (N = 256) | Resp. (N = 159) | Nonresp. (N = 97) |
| % > 65, 2000 | 12.1 | 11.8 | 12.4 | 10.6 | 10.8 | 10.2 |
| % black, 2000 | 3.8 | 4.1 | 3.5 | 5.2 | 5.4 | 5.0 |
| City's age, years, 2008 | 81.0 | 82.0 | 80.0 | 82.9 | 83.6 | 82.0 |
| % change population, 2000-2006 | 12.0 | 12.9 | 11.0 | 13.0 | 13.5 | 12.1 |
| Population, 2000 | 57,976 | 73,457 | 42,102 | 99,828 | 112,520 | 81,868 |
| Population, 2006 | 62,590 | 78,990 | 45,774 | 107,582 | 120,756 | 88,940 |
| % Hispanic or Latino, 2000 | 30.1 | 29.1 | 31.1 | 31.2 | 28.3 | 35.3 |
| % family income ≥ 50K, 2000 | 52.9 | 54.4 | 51.5 | 55.9 | 57.9 | 53.0 |
| % working in area | 12.0 | 12.6 | 11.4 | 12.2 | 12.8 | 11.2 |
| % in manufacturing | 5.1 | 4.9 | 5.3 | 6.0 | 5.6 | 6.5 |
| Median housing value, K\$, 2008 * | 529.5 | 523.2 | 536.6 | 486.2 | 505.8 | 458.0 |
| % owner-occupied housing, 2000 | 62.1 | 62.9 | 61.3 | 61.1 | 62.8 | 58.7 |
| Population density/sq mi, 2000 | 4,069 | 3,889 | 4,253 | 5,096 | 4,554 | 5,863 |
| % below poverty level, 2000 | 12.8 | 12.4 | 13.2 | 11.9 | 11.1 | 13.1 |
| % unemployed, 2000 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.2 | 3.0 | 2.9 | 3.1 |
| % white, 2000 | 66.4 | 66.0 | 66.8 | 62.0 | 63.2 | 60.3 |
| % chg total houses, 2000-2006 ** | 13.3 | 14.7 | 12.0 | 14.6 | 15.5 | 13.4 |
| % bachelor degree or higher, 2000 | 18.1 | 18.1 | 18.1 | 17.8 | 18.9 | 16.4 |

* Median housing value data, All: N=354, Nresp=185, Nnonresp=169; ≥ 25K: N=232, Nresp=145, Nnonresp= 87

** Percent change total houses, All: N=473, Nresp=256, Nnonresp=217; ≥25K: N=251, Nresp=156, Nnonresp=95
SOURCES: U.S. Census, DataQuick.

Table A.2 summarizes selected characteristics of cities in California, compared to our study cities. The data indicate that the profiles of the cities participating in the survey are not markedly different from non-responding cities, although as noted, non-participating cities include disproportionately smaller communities with somewhat lower incomes. If we only consider California cities with estimated 2006 population of 25,000 or more, our study sample has a response rate of 62.1%.

In short, considering the relatively lengthy survey used in this study, the response rate and distribution is well-suited for the subsequent analysis and is representative of California's cities. All in all, the LED respondents represent slightly over 70% of the state's municipal population and over 57% of the state's total estimated 2006 population of 36,457,549.

2008 Local Economic Development Survey

1–9. Local action or policy (please rate each of the following)

| | Not Very Important 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Very Important 5 | We Don't Do This in Our City (NA) | Count N |
|---|----------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------------------|--|------------|
| Low interest loans to businesses (e.g., a locally operated revolving fund) | 3.4% (9) | 4.6% (12) | 12.2% (32) | 9.5% (25) | 13.4% (35) | 56.9% (149) | 262 |
| Financial grants to businesses | 4.2% (11) | 8.0% (21) | 11.9% (31) | 9.2% (24) | 9.6% (25) | 57.1% (149) | 261 |
| Tax increment financing | 1.2% (3) | 5.5% (14) | 10.6% (27) | 15.7% (40) | 33.1% (84) | 33.9% (86) | 254 |
| Rezoning land for commercial use | 4.6% (12) | 8.1% (21) | 24.2% (63) | 27.3% (71) | 23.8% (62) | 11.9% (31) | 260 |
| Streamlining review of all applications for permits | 0.8% (2) | 2.7% (7) | 13.0% (34) | 22.6% (59) | 54.4% (142) | 6.5% (17) | 261 |
| Reducing the cost of licenses | 14.3% (37) | 18.1% (47) | 22.0% (57) | 8.1% (21) | 7.7% (20) | 29.7% (77) | 259 |
| Encouraging industrial parks | 7.7% (20) | 8.1% (21) | 15.4% (40) | 17.0% (44) | 24.7% (64) | 27.0% (70) | 259 |
| Assuring consistency in development rules | 2.7% (7) | 3.5% (9) | 10.8% (28) | 24.6% (64) | 56.2% (146) | 2.3% (6) | 260 |
| Relief from payment of development fees, licenses, permits, etc. (even if long term payback required) | 9.6% (25) | 12.3% (32) | 21.1% (55) | 14.9% (39) | 11.1% (29) | 31.0% (81) | 261 |
| Subsidy or support for employee training | 4.6% (12) | 8.4% (22) | 14.6% (38) | 14.6% (38) | 18.0% (47) | 39.8% (104) | 261 |
| Sales tax rebates to business | 4.6% (12) | 6.5% (17) | 10.0% (26) | 10.0% (26) | 7.7% (20) | 61.2% (159) | 260 |
| Rebates of other taxes (not sales tax) to business | 3.5% (9) | 7.8% (20) | 15.9% (41) | 6.2% (16) | 4.3% (11) | 62.4% (161) | 258 |

| | Not Very Important | | | | Very Important | We Don't Do This in Our City (NA) | Count N |
|---|---------------------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------------------|--|----------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |
| Establishment of local enterprise zones | 5.0% (13) | 3.5% (9) | 7.4% (19) | 6.6% (17) | 22.9% (59) | 54.7% (141) | 258 |
| Promotion of a specific industry or activity or cluster (e.g., high-tech, tourism, film, sports, or health) | 2.3% (6) | 6.9% (18) | 15.3% (40) | 22.2% (58) | 30.3% (79) | 23.0% (60) | 261 |
| Joint ventures with other cities to encourage economic development | 2.7% (7) | 8.5% (22) | 17.3% (45) | 16.2% (42) | 25.0% (65) | 30.4% (79) | 260 |
| Having a single agency to encourage economic development | 7.3% (19) | 6.9% (18) | 12.3% (32) | 21.8% (57) | 37.9% (99) | 13.8% (36) | 261 |
| Issuance of bonds to support development projects | 3.1% (8) | 6.9% (18) | 13.8% (36) | 23.0% (60) | 25.3% (66) | 28.0% (73) | 261 |
| Public improvements to declining areas to stimulate private investment | 1.9% (5) | 3.1% (8) | 10.7% (28) | 28.4% (74) | 42.5% (111) | 13.4% (35) | 261 |
| Formal certification of industrial or business parks | 6.9% (18) | 7.7% (20) | 14.2% (37) | 5.8% (15) | 3.5% (9) | 61.9% (161) | 260 |
| Federal job training programs | 7.7% (20) | 11.6% (30) | 13.5% (35) | 10.8% (28) | 6.9% (18) | 49.4% (128) | 259 |
| Formal membership in an economic development corporation | 6.2% (16) | 8.9% (23) | 18.9% (49) | 15.4% (40) | 18.1% (47) | 32.4% (84) | 259 |
| Providing formal customer service training for city or county staff | 2.3% (6) | 5.7% (15) | 19.5% (51) | 24.5% (64) | 35.6% (93) | 12.3% (32) | 261 |
| Lower operating costs by subsidizing utility rates | 5.7% (15) | 6.9% (18) | 8.4% (22) | 4.2% (11) | 6.1% (16) | 68.7% (180) | 262 |

| | Not Very Important | | | | Very Important | We Don't Do This in Our City (NA) | Count N |
|--|---------------------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------------------|--|----------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |
| Contacting or networking with businesses | 0.8% (2) | 5.0% (13) | 13.4% (35) | 23.4% (61) | 52.1% (136) | 5.4% (14) | 261 |
| Property/site referrals | 1.2% (3) | 5.4% (14) | 10.8% (28) | 30.0% (78) | 44.2% (115) | 8.5% (22) | 260 |
| Community Development Block Grant Programs | 5.7% (15) | 7.7% (20) | 16.5% (43) | 17.6% (46) | 40.2% (105) | 12.3% (32) | 261 |
| Local government assisted advertising and other public relations | 4.6% (12) | 10.3% (27) | 18.0% (47) | 26.4% (69) | 21.1% (55) | 19.5% (51) | 261 |
| Government assembly of land and writing it down for private sector purchase | 3.5% (9) | 7.3% (19) | 13.5% (35) | 19.6% (51) | 16.9% (44) | 39.2% (102) | 260 |
| Subsidizing or amortizing on or off-site infrastructure | 4.2% (11) | 8.1% (21) | 16.6% (43) | 22.4% (58) | 17.4% (45) | 31.3% (81) | 259 |
| Working with private promotional groups, such as Chambers of Commerce | 0.8% (2) | 5.9% (15) | 18.4% (47) | 25.8% (66) | 47.3% (121) | 2.0% (5) | 256 |
| Public acquisition of smaller parcels for clearance and resale as larger parcels | 2.3% (6) | 8.8% (23) | 14.2% (37) | 19.6% (51) | 22.3% (58) | 32.7% (85) | 260 |
| Ombudsman service for businesses | 2.4% (6) | 6.7% (17) | 13.4% (34) | 15.0% (38) | 30.8% (78) | 31.6% (80) | 253 |
| Increasing available space to business by permitting higher densities or higher building heights | 5.5% (14) | 8.2% (21) | 20.7% (53) | 18.4% (47) | 21.1% (54) | 26.2% (67) | 256 |
| Annexation to provide serviced land for new business | 6.6% (17) | 9.7% (25) | 10.5% (27) | 12.1% (31) | 20.6% (53) | 40.5% (104) | 257 |

| | Not Very Important | | | | Very Important | We Don't Do This in Our City (NA) | Count N |
|--|---------------------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------------------|--|----------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |
| A formal arrangement or formal policy to work with public schools to improve education | 3.9% (10) | 7.4% (19) | 17.9% (46) | 14.4% (37) | 17.5% (45) | 38.9% (100) | 257 |
| Loan packaging targeted for business start-ups | 3.9% (10) | 10.9% (28) | 9.7% (25) | 11.3% (29) | 8.2% (21) | 56.0% (144) | 257 |
| Working with local colleges and universities | 6.2% (16) | 10.9% (28) | 17.4% (45) | 18.2% (47) | 29.1% (75) | 18.2% (47) | 258 |
| Working with area's council of governments or area's regional government | 4.2% (11) | 8.5% (22) | 20.1% (52) | 26.6% (69) | 35.9% (93) | 4.6% (12) | 259 |
| Technical assistance for small business | 3.1% (8) | 8.5% (22) | 16.7% (43) | 18.6% (48) | 20.5% (53) | 32.6% (84) | 258 |
| Emphasizing improvement of local amenities (e.g., entertainment, shopping, recreation) | 0.0% (0) | 2.3% (6) | 11.7% (30) | 28.4% (73) | 51.4% (132) | 6.2% (16) | 257 |
| Continuation of military base conversion programs | 5.1% (13) | 3.5% (9) | 1.2% (3) | 3.9% (10) | 7.8% (20) | 78.5% (201) | 256 |
| Targeting city procurement to local businesses; that is, using procurement set-asides | 7.8% (20) | 12.0% (31) | 12.8% (33) | 12.8% (33) | 7.4% (19) | 47.3% (122) | 258 |
| Using a locally operated revolving loan fund to make loans to businesses | 4.3% (11) | 8.9% (23) | 8.2% (21) | 8.6% (22) | 13.6% (35) | 56.4% (145) | 257 |
| Having a local economic development agency that is independent of the Redevelopment Agency | 11.3% (29) | 5.5% (14) | 8.2% (21) | 7.8% (20) | 13.7% (35) | 53.5% (137) | 256 |

| | Not Very Important | | | | Very Important | We Don't Do This in Our City (NA) | Count N |
|--|---------------------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------------------|--|----------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |
| Adopting a formal, overall economic development strategy to guide local policy | 1.2% (3) | 5.5% (14) | 16.0% (41) | 19.5% (50) | 38.3% (98) | 19.5% (50) | 256 |
| Incorporating an economic development element in the city general plan | 3.9% (10) | 4.3% (11) | 14.8% (38) | 20.3% (52) | 33.6% (86) | 23.0% (59) | 256 |
| Establishing foreign trade zone in your city | 11.0% (28) | 5.9% (15) | 4.7% (12) | 4.7% (12) | 7.5% (19) | 66.1% (168) | 254 |
| Participating in state funded grant programs | 4.7% (12) | 4.3% (11) | 15.3% (39) | 23.1% (59) | 42.0% (107) | 10.6% (27) | 255 |
| Establishing a formal "green" policy making new "green" industries and businesses a high priority | 3.9% (10) | 9.3% (24) | 17.1% (44) | 17.1% (44) | 26.7% (69) | 26.0% (67) | 258 |
| Allocating resources or enacting policies to attract or expand "green" or "carbon" friendly industries and businesses | 4.7% (12) | 10.2% (26) | 14.8% (38) | 16.4% (42) | 19.5% (50) | 34.4% (88) | 256 |
| Consolidating all local development programs, including redevelopment into as small a number of steps as possible, including creating one-stop shops | 3.5% (9) | 6.6% (17) | 15.6% (40) | 19.9% (51) | 37.1% (95) | 17.2% (44) | 256 |
| Sponsoring formal, regularly scheduled forums, even with other entities as partners, for such things as promoting venture capital for start-ups or for cultivating industry clusters in your city/county | 2.3% (6) | 13.2% (34) | 13.2% (34) | 12.8% (33) | 16.7% (43) | 41.6% (107) | 257 |

13–14. In thinking about local factors in your city that harm or detract from the business climate in your city, please evaluate each of the following in terms of how much of a deterrent or hindrance that factor is. Assume that “1” means the factor is not at all a problem (things are very good), while “5” indicates that it is a very serious hindrance or problem for your city. If you can’t say or don’t know then check the “Don’t Know” column.

| | Not at all a problem 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Very serious problem 5 | Don't know | Count N |
|--|---------------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| Excessive local taxes | 44.6% (107) | 27.5% (66) | 17.9% (43) | 5.4% (13) | 2.9% (7) | 1.7% (4) | 240 |
| Costly fees enacted by city | 23.0% (55) | 33.1% (79) | 21.3% (51) | 15.1% (36) | 6.3% (15) | 1.3% (3) | 239 |
| Restrictive land use regulations such as zoning and building codes | 20.0% (48) | 29.2% (70) | 28.8% (69) | 14.2% (34) | 7.1% (17) | 0.8% (2) | 240 |
| Burdensome design and aesthetic standards for commercial buildings | 31.3% (75) | 30.8% (74) | 21.3% (51) | 12.5% (30) | 3.3% (8) | 0.8% (2) | 240 |
| Excessive local environmental standards and regulations | 27.6% (66) | 25.1% (60) | 23.8% (57) | 12.1% (29) | 10.0% (24) | 1.3% (3) | 239 |
| Shortage of land for retail commercial development | 22.8% (54) | 14.3% (34) | 16.0% (38) | 16.0% (38) | 29.1% (69) | 1.7% (4) | 237 |
| Opposition from residents to commercial/industrial expansion | 24.2% (57) | 19.5% (46) | 22.9% (54) | 16.1% (38) | 15.3% (36) | 2.1% (5) | 236 |
| Poor quality of local K-12 education system | 36.1% (86) | 17.2% (41) | 17.2% (41) | 13.4% (32) | 13.4% (32) | 2.5% (6) | 238 |
| Inadequate transportation infrastructure | 13.0% (31) | 21.8% (52) | 24.3% (58) | 20.1% (48) | 20.5% (49) | 0.4% (1) | 239 |
| Lack of broadband technology | 32.9% (79) | 27.1% (65) | 17.9% (43) | 9.2% (22) | 7.1% (17) | 5.8% (14) | 240 |
| Lack of affordable housing | 17.1% (41) | 16.3% (39) | 18.8% (45) | 18.3% (44) | 27.9% (67) | 1.7% (4) | 240 |
| Insufficient supply of water or water quality problems | 47.5% (114) | 24.2% (58) | 10.8% (26) | 7.5% (18) | 9.6% (23) | 0.4% (1) | 240 |

| | Not at all a problem | | | | Very serious problem | Don't know | Count |
|---|----------------------|------------|------------|------------|----------------------|------------|-------|
| Shortage of land for industrial development | 22.6% (54) | 11.3% (27) | 16.7% (40) | 25.1% (60) | 22.2% (53) | 2.1% (5) | 239 |
| Lack of local leadership in the area of economic development policy | 36.1% (86) | 24.4% (58) | 18.5% (44) | 11.8% (28) | 8.0% (19) | 1.3% (3) | 238 |
| High energy costs | 12.7% (30) | 23.2% (55) | 30.0% (71) | 17.3% (41) | 14.8% (35) | 2.1% (5) | 237 |
| Lack of workforce with needed skills or lack of workforce training | 18.3% (44) | 22.1% (53) | 24.6% (59) | 23.3% (56) | 9.6% (23) | 2.1% (5) | 240 |
| Absence of a formal, overall economic development strategy in your city | 37.5% (90) | 25.4% (61) | 17.1% (41) | 12.1% (29) | 5.8% (14) | 2.1% (5) | 240 |
| High crime rates or reputation for crime in your city | 56.7% (136) | 16.7% (40) | 11.7% (28) | 7.5% (18) | 6.7% (16) | 0.8% (2) | 240 |
| Traffic congestion | 24.3% (58) | 23.4% (56) | 20.1% (48) | 17.6% (42) | 14.2% (34) | 0.4% (1) | 239 |
| Costly or complicated permitting process | 26.4% (63) | 27.2% (65) | 25.1% (60) | 13.4% (32) | 7.5% (18) | 0.4% (1) | 239 |
| Lack of quality universities and colleges in area or region | 51.3% (120) | 15.0% (35) | 15.0% (35) | 10.7% (25) | 6.4% (15) | 1.7% (4) | 234 |

16. In general, how controversial would you say the use of business incentives are in your community? Please mark one of the following that you believe best applies.

| | Percent | Count |
|--------------------------|---------|-------|
| Not at all controversial | 26.60% | 63 |
| Sometimes controversial | 45.10% | 107 |
| Often controversial | 15.20% | 36 |
| Don't know | 13.10% | 31 |

17–18. Considering the role of various groups and individuals in affecting or influencing economic development policy in your community, how important would you say each of the following is; consider "1" as being "not at all important" and "5" being "very important." Please check the response you think applies for each group/individual.

| | Not At All Important | | | | Very Important | Count N |
|--|---------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------------|--------------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| City staff other than those in economic development or redevelopment (e.g., planning department) | 1.7% (4) | 5.5% (13) | 18.5% (44) | 31.1% (74) | 43.3% (103) | 238 |
| Chamber of Commerce | 5.4% (13) | 22.5% (54) | 29.2% (70) | 23.3% (56) | 19.6% (47) | 240 |
| Redevelopment agency | 14.3% (33) | 4.3% (10) | 8.2% (19) | 23.8% (55) | 49.4% (114) | 231 |
| Economic Development Agency | 19.2% (42) | 9.6% (21) | 12.8% (28) | 19.2% (42) | 39.3% (86) | 219 |
| City Council | 0.0% (0) | 1.3% (3) | 5.5% (13) | 21.8% (52) | 71.4% (170) | 238 |
| Other business groups | 10.0% (24) | 17.2% (41) | 34.7% (83) | 23.8% (57) | 14.2% (34) | 239 |
| City Manger | 1.7% (4) | 2.1% (5) | 6.4% (15) | 25.5% (60) | 64.3% (151) | 235 |
| Mayor | 0.8% (2) | 6.3% (15) | 16.5% (39) | 22.4% (53) | 54.0% (128) | 237 |
| Local newspaper | 11.4% (27) | 26.2% (62) | 30.4% (72) | 20.7% (49) | 11.4% (27) | 237 |
| Environmental/preservationist groups | 16.1% (38) | 25.4% (60) | 30.5% (72) | 17.4% (41) | 10.6% (25) | 236 |
| Neighborhood and residential organizations | 10.1% (24) | 18.9% (45) | 34.5% (82) | 22.3% (53) | 14.3% (34) | 238 |
| Individual, private entrepreneurs | 3.8% (9) | 17.2% (41) | 34.9% (83) | 26.1% (62) | 18.1% (43) | 238 |
| Workforce Investment Board | 46.3% (106) | 19.7% (45) | 19.7% (45) | 8.7% (20) | 5.7% (13) | 229 |
| Area's state legislators | 23.6% (55) | 26.6% (62) | 22.7% (53) | 17.2% (40) | 9.9% (23) | 233 |
| Area's federal representatives | 30.5% (71) | 26.2% (61) | 21.5% (50) | 12.0% (28) | 9.9% (23) | 233 |

| | Not At All Important | | | | Very Important | Count N |
|---|---------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------------|--------------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| State government agencies | 22.6% (53) | 23.0% (54) | 26.0% (61) | 19.6% (46) | 8.9% (21) | 235 |
| Federal government agencies | 30.5% (71) | 26.2% (61) | 21.9% (51) | 14.2% (33) | 7.3% (17) | 233 |
| Local unions | 41.7% (98) | 30.6% (72) | 17.9% (42) | 6.4% (15) | 3.4% (8) | 235 |
| Racial and ethnic organizations/groups | 45.3% (106) | 31.2% (73) | 17.1% (40) | 4.7% (11) | 1.7% (4) | 234 |
| Economic Development Corporation | 34.8% (78) | 17.4% (39) | 23.7% (53) | 12.9% (29) | 11.2% (25) | 224 |

19. Do you believe that competition among communities for business and economic development is a beneficial or harmful feature of the California business climate? Please mark one of the following.

| | Percent | Count |
|----------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Beneficial | 34.40% | 83 |
| Harmful | 32.40% | 78 |
| Don't know/Can't say | 33.20% | 80 |

21. In considering which businesses are helped by your city's policies, would you say that it is new businesses that have received more of the help or has it been existing older businesses? Please check one of the following.

| | Percent | Count |
|---|----------------|--------------|
| New businesses have received more of the help | 46.30% | 111 |
| Existing older businesses have received more of the help | 29.20% | 70 |
| Don't know | 24.60% | 59 |

22. How important in your city is the issue of businesses leaving your city? Is the issue not at all important, somewhat important, important, or very important? Which ONE of the following best applies?

| | Percent | Count |
|----------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Not at all important | 9.20% | 22 |
| Somewhat important | 23.80% | 57 |
| Important | 24.20% | 58 |
| Very Important | 41.70% | 100 |
| Don't know/Can't say | 1.30% | 3 |

23. Do you believe that California's overall business climate is a significant factor influencing the decision of businesses to come to or expand in your community. Yes? No? Don't know? Please check one of the following.

| | Percent | Count |
|--|----------------|--------------|
| Yes, the state's business climate is a significant factor | 69.50% | 166 |
| No, the state's business climate hasn't been a significant factor affecting local business development | 20.50% | 49 |
| Don't know | 10.00% | 24 |

24. In thinking about the things your city does for economic development, to the best of your recollection have these involved at least one significant effort to keep a business from leaving your city? Yes or no?

| | Percent | Count |
|----------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Yes | 67.80% | 162 |
| No | 18.80% | 45 |
| Don't know/Can't say | 13.40% | 32 |

25. Please rank the following three goals in order of their importance in your community. Try to avoid ties. Rank each item below.

| | First | Second | Third | Average | Count |
|---|-------------|------------|-------------|---------|-------|
| Retaining existing business | 57.8% (137) | 26.6% (63) | 15.6% (37) | 1.58 | 237 |
| Attracting businesses from outside the city | 35.7% (85) | 35.3% (84) | 29.0% (69) | 1.93 | 238 |
| Growing new kinds of business or industries | 8.0% (19) | 37.6% (89) | 54.4% (129) | 2.46 | 237 |

26. If you were to evaluate the effects of all the policies your city supports to improve local economic and business conditions and attract or retain business, how much influence do you believe these policies have in affecting the business activity in your city? Which of the following best applies? Please check one of the following

| | Percent | Count |
|---------------------------------|---------|-------|
| Policies have no effect | 0.80% | 2 |
| Policies have minor effect | 32.90% | 79 |
| Policies have important effects | 57.90% | 139 |
| Don't know/Can't say | 8.30% | 20 |

27. Each city pursues a number of visions. However, it is possible that in a city some visions are more or less important. In thinking about the overall direction of land use and development policy in your city, please indicate how important each of the following is as a feature of your city's policies. Choose a number between 1-5 for each of the following, with "1" considered to be "not at all important" and "5" to be "very important."

| | Not at all Important 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | Very Important 5 | Count N |
|--|---------------------------|-----------|------------|------------|---------------------|------------|
| A place to raise families and children | 0.8% (2) | 1.7% (4) | 4.2% (10) | 24.6% (59) | 68.8% (165) | 240 |
| A source of jobs for workers | 2.5% (6) | 9.2% (22) | 22.1% (53) | 34.2% (82) | 32.1% (77) | 240 |

| | Not at all Important | | | | Very Important | Count |
|---|---------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|---------------------------|--------------|
| An environment friendly to all businesses | 1.3% (3) | 8.5% (20) | 19.7% (46) | 35.9% (84) | 34.6% (81) | 234 |
| A community of single family home owners | 5.5% (13) | 15.2% (36) | 29.5% (70) | 29.5% (70) | 20.3% (48) | 237 |
| A source of high quality/high value professional services | 1.7% (4) | 10.5% (25) | 24.3% (58) | 41.4% (99) | 22.2% (53) | 239 |
| A destination for tourists | 18.8% (45) | 20.4% (49) | 17.9% (43) | 19.2% (46) | 23.8% (57) | 240 |
| A recreation and entertainment center | 8.4% (20) | 18.1% (43) | 30.4% (72) | 25.7% (61) | 17.3% (41) | 237 |
| A place of upper status homes and higher income residents | 11.9% (28) | 19.9% (47) | 31.8% (75) | 22.0% (52) | 14.4% (34) | 236 |
| A community that helps to improve the lives of the poor | 12.6% (30) | 23.8% (57) | 38.1% (91) | 15.9% (38) | 9.6% (23) | 239 |
| A retail shopping center | 7.2% (17) | 10.2% (24) | 21.2% (50) | 31.8% (75) | 29.7% (70) | 236 |

28. Does your city formally evaluate its economic development policies and actions for their cost-effectiveness? That is, does the city formally compare whether the benefits outweigh the costs of its economic development policies? Yes? No?

| | Percent | Count |
|----------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Yes | 31.10% | 74 |
| No | 50.00% | 119 |
| Don't know/Can't say | 18.90% | 45 |

29. If you were to make an overall judgment about the importance in YOUR city of increasing the local tax base as compared to reducing unemployment as objectives for your economic development policies, how important would you rate each? Using a scale from 1 to 7, with “1” meaning not at all important and “7” meaning very important, please rate how important increasing the local tax base is and how important reducing unemployment is. Please mark a number for both the tax base and the unemployment items.

| | Not at all Important 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Very Important 7 | Count N |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------------------|------------|
| Increasing the local tax base | 0.9% (2) | 1.3% (3) | 3.4% (8) | 6.0% (14) | 9.4% (22) | 17.0% (40) | 62.1% (146) | 235 |
| Reducing unemployment | 9.1% (21) | 9.1% (21) | 15.9% (37) | 18.5% (43) | 18.5% (43) | 10.8% (25) | 18.1% (42) | 232 |

30. What size business would you say receives the most attention from your city's economic development and redevelopment policies? Please check the business size category that happens to get the most attention in YOUR community.

| | Percent | Count |
|-------------------------|---------|-------|
| Fewer than 25 employees | 39.70% | 93 |
| 25-49 employees | 18.80% | 44 |
| 50-99 employees | 17.50% | 41 |
| 100-199 employees | 13.70% | 32 |
| 200 or more employees | 10.30% | 24 |

31. In thinking about your local efforts to encourage economic development, how would you compare your city's policies with your neighboring local governments? Please check one of the following.

| | Percent | Count |
|---|---------|-------|
| My city does less than its neighboring localities | 24.40% | 58 |
| My city does about the same as its neighboring localities | 32.40% | 77 |

| | Percent | Count |
|--|---------|-------|
| My city does somewhat more than its neighboring localities | 18.50% | 44 |
| My city does much more than its neighboring localities | 18.10% | 43 |
| Don't know; Can't say | 6.70% | 16 |

32. Recognizing that no single sentence can fully describe a city's economic development policy, which one of the following statements would you say best summarizes the way economic development policy has evolved in your community. None of the statements is meant to imply a better policy over the others.

| | Percent | Count |
|--|---------|-------|
| There is no single, overall economic development approach or policy in our jurisdiction; we focus on individual opportunities as they arise. | 54.60% | 130 |
| Our jurisdiction has very recently evolved a policy that is comprehensive, so that projects now have to fit into an overall economic development strategy. | 17.60% | 42 |
| Projects in our community have for a considerable time (at least three years) been strongly guided by an overall strategy of economic development. | 24.40% | 58 |
| Don't know; Can't say. | 3.40% | 8 |

33. For each of the following types of new development, please indicate how likely your jurisdiction would be to provide a general plan change or rezoning or a financial incentive to the developer or builder of the project. Please rank the following categories by choosing a number for each, with 1 indicating "very unlikely" and 7 indicating "very likely."

| | Very Unlikely 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | Very Likely 7 | Count N |
|---------------------------|--------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|------------------|------------|
| Single family residential | 33.2% (79) | 17.6% (42) | 10.5% (25) | 11.8% (28) | 10.9% (26) | 7.1% (17) | 8.8% (21) | 238 |

| | Very Unlikely | | | | | | | Very Likely | Count |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------------|--------------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | N | |
| Multifamily residential | 19.7% (47) | 17.6% (42) | 16.4% (39) | 18.1% (43) | 12.6% (30) | 10.1% (24) | 5.5% (13) | 238 | |
| Light industrial | 17.4% (41) | 9.7% (23) | 15.3% (36) | 16.5% (39) | 14.0% (33) | 14.0% (33) | 13.1% (31) | 236 | |
| Heavy industrial | 36.9% (87) | 15.7% (37) | 13.1% (31) | 12.7% (30) | 9.3% (22) | 6.8% (16) | 5.5% (13) | 236 | |
| Retail | 4.6% (11) | 7.6% (18) | 5.5% (13) | 17.3% (41) | 13.9% (33) | 20.7% (49) | 30.4% (72) | 237 | |
| Office | 9.7% (23) | 11.3% (27) | 10.1% (24) | 18.5% (44) | 16.0% (38) | 19.7% (47) | 14.7% (35) | 238 | |
| Mixed-use development | 4.6% (11) | 5.9% (14) | 6.3% (15) | 10.5% (25) | 19.0% (45) | 24.1% (57) | 29.5% (70) | 237 | |

Appendix B: Factor Analysis

Table B.1
Factor Analysis of Local Economic Development Activities, Items with
Loadings of .450 or Greater on Each of Seven Factors

| | Factor Loading | | Factor Loading |
|--|----------------|---|----------------|
| I. REDEVELOPMENT | | V. INDIRECT ASSISTANCE | |
| Government assembly of land writing it down for private purchase | .735 | Rezoning to commercial use | .610 |
| Public acquisition of smaller parcels resale as larger parcels | .732 | Relief from fees, licenses, permits, etc. | .606 |
| Subsidizing on or off-site infrastructure | .687 | Annexation to provide land for new businesses | .545 |
| Tax increment financing | .608 | Reducing cost of fees, licenses, permits | .534 |
| Public improvements to declining areas to stimulate private investment | .493 | VI. STREAMLINING | |
| Issuance of bonds to support development projects | .487 | Assuring consistency in development rules | .610 |
| II. ECONOMIC SUPPORT | | Streamlining reviews | .569 |
| Membership in economic development corporation | .644 | Working with area's regional governments | .551 |
| Federal job training programs | .608 | Formal customer service training for city staff | .535 |
| Independent Economic Development Agency, independent of RDA | .582 | Consolidating local development programs, including redevelopment | .462 |
| Establish of enterprise zones | .525 | VII. DIRECT ASSISTANCE | |
| Subsidy for employee training | .486 | Low interest loans to business | .832 |
| Joint ventures with other cities to encourage economic development | .483 | Locally operated revolving fund | .767 |
| III. PROMOTIONAL | | Financial grants to business | .580 |
| Working with private promotional groups | .629 | Community Development Block Grant programs | .488 |
| Property site referrals | .602 | | |
| Advertising and other public relations | .592 | | |
| Improving local amenities | .532 | | |
| Ombudsman service for businesses | .523 | | |
| Promoting specific industry, activity, cluster | .523 | | |
| Technical assistance for small business | .471 | | |
| IV. GREEN/HIGH TECH | | | |
| Resources to attract green, carbon friendly industries or businesses | .849 | | |
| Having formal green policy in city | .814 | | |
| Forums for venture capital, start-ups, and industry clusters | .517 | | |
| Working with schools to improve education | .450 | | |

| Results for Varimax, Rotated Solution | | |
|--|-------------------|-----------------------------|
| <u>Factor</u> | <u>Eigenvalue</u> | <u>% Variance Explained</u> |
| I. | 4.2 | 8.6 |
| II. | 4.2 | 8.6 |
| III. | 3.9 | 8.0 |
| IV. | 3.2 | 6.5 |
| V. | 2.8 | 5.7 |
| VI. | 2.7 | 5.5 |
| VII. | 2.6 | 5.3 |
| Total Variance Explained by Factors I-VIII = 48.2% | | |

Table B.2
Factor Analysis of Local Economic Development Barriers, Items with
Loadings of .450 or Greater on Each of Four Factors

| | Factor Loading | | Factor Loading |
|--|----------------|---|----------------|
| I. REGULATIONS | | IV. PLANNING LEADERSHIP | |
| Restrictive land use regulations | .759 | Absence of formal economic development strategy | .777 |
| Burdensome design and aesthetic standards for commercial buildings | .738 | Lack of leadership | .554 |
| Costly fees enacted by the city | .684 | | |
| Costly/complicated permitting processes | .653 | | |
| Excessive environmental standards and regulations | .564 | | |
| Excessive local taxes | .556 | | |
| II. LAND SHORTAGE | | | |
| Shortage of land for retail commercial development | .664 | | |
| Lack of affordable housing | .592 | | |
| Shortage of land for industrial development | .563 | | |
| Opposition from residents | .524 | | |
| III. INFRASTRUCTURE/SKILLS | | | |
| Lack of workforce skills/training | .662 | | |
| High energy costs | .559 | | |
| Lack of broadband technology | .509 | | |
| Poor quality in K-12 education | .476 | | |
| Inadequate transportation infrastructure | .471 | | |

| | | | |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Results for Varimax, Rotated Solution | | | |
| <u>Factor</u> | <u>Eigenvalue</u> | <u>% Variance</u> | <u>Explain</u> |
| I. | 3.086 | 15.429 | |
| II. | 2.110 | 9.786 | |
| III. | 1.957 | 10.551 | |
| IV. | 1.165 | 5.824 | |
| Total Variance Explained 46.254% | | | |

Appendix C: Correlations and Regression Results for LED Policy Measures

Table C.1
Correlations Between Policy Barriers and the LED Policy Measures

| | | Regulatory and Policy Barriers | Infrastructure and Skills Barriers | Lack of Land and Affordable Housing Barriers | Lack of ED Plan or Lack of Leadership Barriers |
|------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| Total LED Policy Score | Pearson Correlation | .317(**) | .419(**) | .000 | .364(**) |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | .000 | .999 | .000 |
| | N | 239 | 239 | 239 | 235 |
| Redevelopment | Pearson Correlation | .206(**) | .294(**) | .047 | .133(*) |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .001 | .000 | .472 | .042 |
| | N | 239 | 239 | 239 | 235 |
| Economic Support | Pearson Correlation | .166(*) | .381(**) | -.077 | .401(**) |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .010 | .000 | .234 | .000 |
| | N | 239 | 239 | 239 | 235 |
| Promotion | Pearson Correlation | .299(**) | .350(**) | .079 | .247(**) |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | .000 | .222 | .000 |
| | N | 239 | 239 | 239 | 235 |
| Green and High Tech | Pearson Correlation | .357(**) | .266(**) | .080 | .168(*) |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | .000 | .218 | .010 |
| | N | 237 | 237 | 237 | 233 |
| Indirect Assistance | Pearson Correlation | .221(**) | .309(**) | -.060 | .292(**) |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .001 | .000 | .355 | .000 |
| | N | 239 | 239 | 239 | 235 |
| Streamlining | Pearson Correlation | .076 | .190(**) | .149(*) | .280(**) |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .243 | .003 | .021 | .000 |
| | N | 239 | 239 | 239 | 235 |
| Direct Assistance | Pearson Correlation | .163(*) | .208(**) | -.100 | .258(**) |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .011 | .001 | .122 | .000 |
| | N | 239 | 239 | 239 | 235 |

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table C.2
Dependent Variable: Total Local Economic Development Score*

| | |
|-------------------------|-------|
| R ² | 0.241 |
| Adjusted R ² | 0.212 |
| F | 9.90 |
| Significance | 0.000 |

| Predictor variable | Beta | Std. Error | Sig. |
|--|-------------|-------------------|-------------|
| Median Household Income, 2000 | -.504 | .000 | .000 |
| City Population (log), 2000 | .234 | .009 | .003 |
| Per-capita State Sales-Tax Revenue (log), 2000 | .128 | .012 | .050 |
| Number of Cities within 5 miles | -.081 | .002 | .323 |
| % owner occupied housing, 2000 | .066 | .001 | .420 |
| % change in total housing, 2000-2007 | .107 | .000 | .074 |
| Central Valley City** | .037 | .033 | .622 |
| Bay Area City | .166 | .039 | .071 |
| LA County City | .107 | .044 | .107 |
| Other Southern California City | .084 | .039 | .332 |
| Perceived Competition | .158 | .004 | .030 |

*The Beta column in this and following tables contain values for the standardized regression coefficients. Beta coefficients are the “weights” associated with a standard deviation change in the predictor variable. In this table, for example, each one standard deviation increase in median household income is associated with a .504 decline in the total economic development score.

**The omitted category used to contrast dummy variable effects was All Other California cities, which refers to cities not located in the Bay Area, Los Angeles County, Other Southern California, or the Central Valley. Imperial County cities were included in the omitted category

Table C.3
Dependent Variable: Redevelopment Score

| | |
|-------------------------|-------|
| R ² | .329 |
| Adjusted R ² | .297 |
| F | 10.20 |
| Significance | .000 |

| Predictor variable | Beta | Std. Error | Sig. |
|--|-------------|-------------------|-------------|
| Median Household Income, 2000 | -.551 | .000 | .000 |
| City Population (log), 2000 | .204 | .458 | .009 |
| Per-capita State Sales-Tax Revenue (log), 2000 | .079 | .589 | .225 |
| Number of Cities within 5 miles | .031 | .090 | .703 |
| % owner occupied housing, 2000 | .106 | .053 | .642 |
| % change in total housing, 2000-2007 | .002 | .018 | .979 |
| Central Valley City | .159 | 1.521 | .046 |
| Bay Area City | .009 | 1.827 | .923 |
| LA County City | .028 | 2.059 | .795 |
| Other Southern California City | -.046 | 1.825 | .614 |
| Perceived Competition | .070 | .197 | .350 |

Table C.4
Dependent Variable: Economic Support Score

| | |
|-------------------------|-------|
| R ² | 0.268 |
| Adjusted R ² | 0.233 |
| F | 7.630 |
| Significance | .000 |

| Predictor variable | Beta | Std. Error | Sig. |
|--|-------------|-------------------|-------------|
| Median Household Income, 2000 | -.375 | .000 | .000 |
| City Population (log), 2000 | .158 | .438 | .051 |
| Per-capita State Sales-Tax Revenue (log), 2000 | -.002 | .563 | .977 |
| Number of Cities within 5 miles | -.090 | .086 | .291 |
| % owner occupied housing, 2000 | -.040 | .053 | .642 |
| % change in total housing, 2000-2007 | .002 | .018 | .979 |
| Central Valley City | .159 | 1.52 | .046 |
| Bay Area City | .009 | 1.827 | .923 |
| LA County City | .028 | 2.059 | .795 |
| Other Southern California City | -.046 | 1.824 | .614 |
| Perceived Competition | .070 | .197 | .350 |

Table C.5
Dependent Variable: Promotional Activity Score

R² .317
Adjusted R² .285
F 9.68
Significance 0.000.

| Predictor variable | Beta | Std. Error | P |
|--|-------------|-------------------|----------|
| Median Household Income, 2000 | -.312 | .000 | .001 |
| City Population (log), 2000 | .431 | .434 | .000 |
| Per-capita State Sales-Tax Revenue (log), 2000 | .262 | .558 | .000 |
| Number of Cities within 5 miles | -.108 | .085 | .193 |
| % owner occupied housing, 2000 | .051 | .052 | .537 |
| % change in total housing, 2000-2007 | .078 | .017 | .192 |
| Central Valley City | -.161 | 1.507 | .038 |
| Bay Area City | -.023 | 1.811 | .801 |
| LA County City | -.092 | 2.040 | .375 |
| Other Southern California City | -.076 | 1.808 | .386 |
| Perceived Competition | .083 | .196 | .256 |

Table C.6
Dependent Variable: Green Policies Score

R² .197
Adjusted R² .158
F 5.10
Significance .000

| Predictor variable | Beta | Std. Error | P |
|--|-------------|-------------------|----------|
| Median Household Income, 2000 | .030 | .000 | .767 |
| City Population (log), 2000 | .183 | .354 | .031 |
| Per-capita State Sales-Tax Revenue (log), 2000 | .138 | .458 | .052 |
| Number of Cities within 5 miles | -.127 | .070 | .159 |
| % owner occupied housing, 2000 | -.156 | .043 | .084 |
| % change in total housing, 2000-2007 | .191 | .014 | .004 |
| Central Valley City | -.124 | 1.224 | .135 |
| Bay Area City | -.001 | 1.472 | .989 |
| LA County City | .040 | 1.666 | .724 |
| Other Southern California City | -.008 | 1.472 | .929 |
| Perceived Competition | .198 | .160 | .013 |

Table C.7
Dependent Variable: Indirect Assistance Score

| | |
|-------------------------|-------|
| R ² | .233 |
| R ² | .233 |
| Adjusted R ² | .196 |
| F | 6.300 |
| Significance | .000 |

| Predictor variable | Beta | Std. Error | P |
|--|-------|------------|------|
| Median Household Income, 2000 | -.468 | .000 | .000 |
| City Population (log), 2000 | .038 | .278 | .647 |
| Per-capita State Sales-Tax Revenue (log), 2000 | .108 | .355 | .122 |
| Number of Cities within 5 miles | -.064 | .054 | .466 |
| % owner occupied housing, 2000 | .195 | .033 | .028 |
| % change in total housing, 2000-2007 | .148 | .011 | .021 |
| Central Valley City | .105 | .959 | .197 |
| Bay Area City | .106 | 1.151 | .282 |
| LA County City | .039 | .296 | .721 |
| Other Southern California City | .047 | 1.148 | .612 |
| Perceived Competition | .101 | .124 | .189 |

Table C. 8
Dependent Variable: Streamlining Score

| | |
|-------------------------|------|
| R ² | .085 |
| Adjusted R ² | .041 |
| F | 1.94 |
| Significance | .036 |

| Predictor variable | Beta | Std. Error | P |
|--|-------|------------|------|
| Median Household Income, 2000 | -.215 | .000 | .046 |
| City Population (log), 2000 | .058 | .304 | .519 |
| Per-capita State Sales-Tax Revenue (log), 2000 | .154 | .391 | .042 |
| Number of Cities within 5 miles | -.093 | .060 | .333 |
| % owner occupied housing, 2000 | .074 | .036 | .440 |
| % change in total housing, 2000-2007 | .064 | .012 | .358 |
| Central Valley City | -.058 | 1.056 | .511 |
| Bay Area City | .032 | 1.269 | .764 |
| LA County City | .134 | 1.429 | .265 |
| Other Southern California City | -.040 | 1.267 | .690 |
| Perceived Competition | .127 | .137 | .133 |

Table C.9
Dependent Variable: Direct Assistance Score

R² .254
Adjusted R² .219
F 7.10
Significance .000

| Predictor variable | Beta | Std. Error | P |
|--|-------------|-------------------|----------|
| Median Household Income, 2000 | -.507 | .000 | .000 |
| City Population (log), 2000 | -.041 | .320 | .626 |
| Per-capita State Sales-Tax Revenue (log), 2000 | -.132 | .412 | .053 |
| Number of Cities within 5 miles | -.025 | .063 | .773 |
| % owner occupied housing, 2000 | -.018 | .038 | .831 |
| % change in total housing, 2000-2007 | .051 | .013 | .424 |
| Central Valley City | -.093 | 1.112 | .249 |
| Bay Area City | .134 | 1.336 | .168 |
| LA County City | .029 | 1.505 | .789 |
| Other Southern California City | -.025 | 1.334 | .788 |
| Perceived Competition | .103 | .144 | .174 |

PUBLIC POLICY INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA

Board of Directors

Walter B. Hewlett, Chair

Director
Center for Computer Assisted Research
in the Humanities

Mark Baldassare

President and Chief Executive Officer
Public Policy Institute of California

Ruben Barrales

President and Chief Executive Officer
San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce

John E. Bryson

Retired Chairman and CEO
Edison International

Gary K. Hart

Former State Senator and
Secretary of Education
State of California

Donna Lucas

Chief Executive Officer
Lucas Public Affairs

Ki Suh Park

Design and Managing Partner
Gruen Associates

Constance L. Rice

Co-Director
The Advancement Project

Thomas C. Sutton

Retired Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
Pacific Life Insurance Company

Raymond L. Watson

Vice Chairman of the Board Emeritus
The Irvine Company

Carol Whiteside

President Emeritus
Great Valley Center

PUBLIC POLICY INSTITUTE OF CALIFORNIA

500 Washington Street, Suite 600
San Francisco, California 94111
phone: 415.291.4400
fax: 415.291.4401

PPIC SACRAMENTO CENTER

Senator Office Building
1121 L Street, Suite 801
Sacramento, California 95814
phone: 916.440.1120
fax: 916.440.1121

www.ppic.org