

September 2006

EMPOWERMENT
ZONE AND
ENTERPRISE
COMMUNITY
PROGRAM

Survey of Round I
Federal Enterprise
Communities



G A O

Accountability * Integrity * Reliability



Survey of Round I Federal Enterprise Communities

This document presents the results of GAO's survey of federal Enterprise Communities (EC) that were designated in the first round of the Empowerment Zone and Enterprise Community program in 1994.¹ Round I ECs received \$2.95 million in program grants and businesses in the ECs could use a program tax-exempt bond. The purpose of our survey was to collect data describing how Round I ECs implemented the program. Questionnaire items covered the types of governance structures ECs established, number of programs they implemented, usage of the program tax-exempt bond, and perceptions of factors influencing changes observed in poverty, unemployment, and economic growth in the ECs. We administered an e-mail survey to officials from the 60 Round I ECs—33 urban and 27 rural—that were still in operation as of June 2005 and did not receive additional designations under the Empowerment Zone or Renewal Community programs.² We chose to exclude ECs that received subsequent designations, because we did not want their responses to be influenced by the benefits received under the additional designations. We created two versions of the questionnaire, one for urban ECs and another for rural ECs, to tailor items to urban or rural sites. For example, the urban version contained questions about the Enhanced EC designation, which was not asked of rural sites since the Enhanced EC designation was not applicable for rural areas.³

We e-mailed the questionnaire to each EC on August 25, 2005; collection of survey data ended on December 20, 2005. We gave participants the option to respond via e-mail, fax, or post-mail. Fifty-eight ECs returned the survey for a response rate of 97 percent; the response rate for rural ECs was 100 percent and the response rate of urban ECs was 94 percent. We did not attempt to verify the respondents' answers against an independent source

¹One urban EC was no longer in operation as of June 2005. There were two additional rounds of designation under the Empowerment Zone and Enterprise Community program in 1998 and 2002. Communities designated in subsequent rounds of the program received a smaller amount of federal funding and more tax benefits.

²The Renewal Community program, initiated in 2000, had objectives similar to the Empowerment Zone and Enterprise Community program. Communities received Renewal Community designations in 2002, which offered them an expanded package of tax benefits.

³Four urban ECs also received Enhanced EC designations, which provided them with some Economic Development Initiative grants and Section 108 Loan Guarantees, which could be used for certain economic development or revitalization projects. One of the Enhanced ECs received a subsequent designation and was not included in our sample.

of information; however, we used two techniques to verify the reliability of questionnaire items. First, we used in-depth interviewing techniques to evaluate the answers of pretest participants, and interviewers judged that all the respondents' answers to the questions were based on reliable information. Second, for the items that asked about changes to poverty, unemployment, and economic growth in the EC, we asked respondents to provide a source of data for their response. Responses to these questions that did not include a data source were excluded from our analysis of those items. A more detailed discussion of our scope and methodology and a discussion of the survey results are contained in our report, *Empowerment Zone and Enterprise Community Program: Improvements Occurred in Communities, but the Effect of the Program Is Unclear*. Clicking on the following link will provide access to this report ([GAO-06-727](#)). We conducted our survey work from March 2005 through April 2006 in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards.



U.S. Government Accountability Office

Survey of Federal Enterprise Communities and Enhanced Enterprise Communities

Introduction

In response to a Congressional mandate, the Government Accountability Office (GAO) is conducting a study of the Round I Empowerment Zone and Enterprise Community program. As part of this study, GAO is surveying all Round I Enterprise Communities that did not subsequently receive a Round II or Round III Empowerment Zone or Renewal Community Designation.

The purpose of this survey is to obtain descriptive information about how designees implemented their programs and changes they observed in their Enterprise Communities. Results of the survey will be used in our report to the Congress and will help them understand how the program was implemented and what effect it had on the designated communities.

How to Complete the Survey

Completing the survey should take no longer than 45 minutes. You may want to talk with others in your Enterprise Community/Enhanced Enterprise Community who are familiar with these topics in order to provide us with the most accurate information possible about your site. You may complete the survey in Microsoft Word and e-mail it to us, or you may print it out and fax or mail it to us. Please return your survey **within 2 weeks** of receipt.

To complete the survey electronically:

1. Save this document to your computer's hard drive in Microsoft Word.
2. Using the Microsoft Word document, fill out the survey. Save the document before closing it.
3. Return the completed survey as an attachment to ECSurvey@gao.gov.

To complete a paper copy of the survey, save the survey to your hard drive, print it out, and complete it. You may fax the survey to (404) 679-2021 or mail it to:

[GAO staff name here]
U.S. Government Accountability Office
2635 Century Parkway, Suite 700
Atlanta, GA 30345

If you would like a stamped business reply envelope, or if you have any questions, please contact *[GAO staff name here]* (staff phone number and e-mail address here) or *[GAO staff name here]* (staff phone number and e-mail address here).

How to Use the Electronic Survey

1. For each question, click on the gray-shaded answer box () or check box ()
2. To change a check box () response, click on the box. The response will disappear.
3. Do not "unlock" this document, as doing so will erase your answers.
4. Save your document often so that you do not lose any answers.

Thank you for taking the time to fill out this important survey. Your responses will make a difference.

GOVERNANCE AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

1. Which of the following best describes the entity that managed your Enterprise Community (EC) program? (n=58)

- A nonprofit organization that existed prior to the EC designation **13.8% (8)**
- A nonprofit specifically created for the EC **27.6% (16)**
- A part of the city, county, or other local government **55.2% (32)**
- Other, *please describe (Click on the gray answer box and type. The answer box will expand):* **3.4% (2)**

2. Before your community received the EC designation, did EC residents do any of the following?

- a. Attend listening sessions about the EC program (n=58) **96.6% (56)** Yes .. **3.4% (2)** No
- b. Generate ideas for EC activities (n=57) **98.2% (56)** Yes .. **1.8% (1)** No
- c. Establish EC priorities (n=57) **98.2% (56)** Yes... **1.8% (1)** No
- d. Write the strategic plan (n=57)..... **77.2% (44)** Yes... **22.8% (13)** No
- e. Gather information on community needs from residents (n=58) .. **91.4% (53)** Yes... **8.6% (5)** No
- f. Disseminate EC program information to residents (n=56) **91.1% (51)** Yes... **8.9% (5)** No
- g. Other, *please describe: (n=57)* **1.8% (1)** Yes..... **98.2% (56)** No

3. Which of the following participated in the strategic planning process for your EC?

- a. City government (n=54) 96.3% (52) Yes ... 0 No | 3.7% (2) NA
- b. County government (n=52) 80.8% (42) Yes ... 11.5% (6) No | 7.7% (4) NA
- c. State government (n=52) 69.2% (36) Yes ... 26.9% (14) No | 3.8% (2) NA
- d. Regional government (n=46)..... 41.3% (19) Yes ... 30.4% (14) No | 28.3% (13) NA
- e. Elected officials (n=54) 100% (54) Yes 0 No | 0 NA
- f. Local colleges or universities (n=51)..... 84.3% (43) Yes ... 13.7% (7) No | 2.0% (1) NA
- g. Local development corporations (n=52) 80.8% (42) Yes ... 9.6% (5) No | 9.6% (5) NA
- h. Residents of the EC (n=58) 100% (58) Yes 0 No | 0 NA
- i. Private businesses (n=53)..... 88.7% (47) Yes ... 9.4% (5) No | 1.9% (1) NA
- j. Community-based organizations (n=57)..... 100% (57) Yes 0 No | 0 NA
- k. Religious organizations (n=50) 86.0% (43) Yes ... 14.0% (7) No | 0 NA
- l. Neighborhood associations (n=53)..... 81.1% (43) Yes ... 7.5% (4) No | 11.3% (6) NA
- m. Parent-teacher organizations (n=41)* Yes No | NA
- n. Other, *please describe*: (n=56) 5.4% (3) Yes 87.5% (49) No | 7.1% (4) NA

4. After your community received the EC designation, did EC residents do any of the following?

- a. Attend listening sessions about the EC program (n=54)..... 92.6% (50) Yes... 7.4% (4) No
- b. Generate ideas for EC activities (n=58)..... 96.6% (56) Yes... 3.4% (2) No
- c. Establish EC priorities (n=58) 89.7% (52) Yes... 10.3% (6) No
- d. Participate on the EC governing board (n=58)..... 98.3% (57) Yes... 1.7% (1) No
- e. Gather information on community needs from residents (n=55).... 89.1% (49) Yes... 10.9% (6) No
- f. Disseminate EC program information to residents (n=56)..... 96.4% (54) Yes... 3.6% (2) No
- g. Implement EC activities (n=56)..... 92.9% (52) Yes... 7.1% (4) No
- h. Other, *please describe*:(n=57) 1.8% (1) Yes 98.2% (56) No

5. After your community received the EC designation, which of the following participated in implementing the strategic plan?

a. City government (n=54)	96.3% (52) Yes 1.9% (1) No		1.9% (1) NA
b. County government (n=51)	74.5% (38) Yes 13.7% (7) No		11.8% (6) NA
c. State government (n=53)	66.0% (35) Yes 30.2% (16) No		3.8% (2) NA
d. Regional government (n=45).....	40.0% (18) Yes 31.1% (14) No		28.9% (13) NA
e. Elected officials (n=55)	98.2% (54) Yes 1.8% (1) No		0 NA
f. Local colleges or universities (n=53).....	84.9% (45) Yes 15.1% (8) No		0 NA
g. Local development corporations (n=50)	84.0% (42) Yes 6.0% (3) No		10.0% (5) NA
h. Residents of the EC (n=56)	98.2% (55) Yes 1.8% (1) No		0 NA
i. Private businesses (n=51).....	88.2% (45) Yes 9.8% (5) No		2.0% (1) NA
j. Community-based organizations (n=56).....	98.2% (55) Yes 0 No		1.8% (1) NA
k. Religious organizations (n=47)	72.3% (34) Yes 25.5% (12) No		2.1% (1) NA
l. Neighborhood associations (n=50).....	72.0% (36) Yes 18.0% (9) No		10.0% (5) NA
m. Parent-teacher organizations (n=41)*	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		<input type="checkbox"/> NA
n. Other, please describe: (n=56).....	3.6% (2) Yes 92.9% (52) No		3.6% (2) NA

IMPLEMENTATION AND SUSTAINABILITY

6. Since designation in 1994, how many activities did your EC implement? (Activities are actions taken to implement your strategic plan.)

_____ activities **Mean = 48.94 St. Dev. = 44.04 (n=51)**

7. Of the activities your EC implemented, how many were still operating as of December 2004?

_____ activities **Mean =18.19 St. Dev. = 23.08 (n=52)**

No EC implemented activities are still in operation. → *SKIP to Question 10*

8. In your opinion, how many of the activities in Question 7 will be operating 2 years from now?

_____ activities **Mean = 17.85 St. Dev. = 22.48 (n=47)**

No activities will be in operation. → *SKIP to Question 10*

9. Please provide two examples of activities that will be in operation 2 years from now.

10. In your opinion, how helpful were the following EC program components to accomplishing your strategic plan goals?

	Not at all helpful	A little helpful	Somewhat helpful	Very helpful	Extremely helpful	Don't know
a. EC grant funds (n=56)	1.8% (1)	1.8% (1)	8.9% (5)	17.9% (10)	69.6% (39)	0
b. Bonus points in other federal programs (n=56)	5.4% (3)	7.1% (4)	17.9% (10)	30.4% (17)	35.7% (20)	3.6% (2)
c. Earmarked federal grants and loans (n=56)	10.7% (6)	5.4% (3)	12.5% (7)	30.4% (17)	32.1% (18)	8.9% (5)
d. "Enterprise Zone" facility bonds (n=55)	47.3% (26)	7.3% (4)	1.8% (1)	5.5% (3)	1.8% (1)	36.4% (20)
e. Regulatory waivers (n=55)	29.1% (16)	12.7% (7)	14.5% (8)	12.7% (7)	9.1% (5)	21.8% (12)

11. Did your EC use the EC grant to leverage additional funds? (Leveraged funds are other federal and nonfederal dollars attracted using the EC grant.) (n=57)

- Additional funds were leveraged. 100% (57)
- Additional funds were not leveraged. 0 → SKIP to Question 14

12. Did your EC obtain leveraged funds for the following types of activities?

- a. Capital improvements (*for example, land, improvements to land, design, permits, acquisition of real property, construction of new structures; initial furnishings; and selected equipment like ambulances, fire fighting equipment, or library collections*) (n=56) **94.6% (53)** Yes...**5.4% (3)** No
- b. Social services (*for example, job training and placement, education, mental/physical health care, child care, financial management programs*) (n=56) **92.9% (52)** Yes...**7.1% (4)** No
- c. Funding for businesses (*for example, entrepreneurial training, loan funds, micro-lending programs*) (n=57) **87.7% (50)** Yes...**12.3% (7)** No
- d. Organizational development (*for example, leadership development, citizen participation, board training*) (n=57) **61.4% (35)** Yes...**38.6% (22)** No
- e. Administrative costs (*for example, salaries and benefits, rent, other operating costs*) (n=56)..... **69.6% (39)** Yes...**30.4% (17)** No

13. Did any of your sources of leveraged funds require that you use EC funding to match their funding? (n=56)

- Yes **42.9% (24)**
- No **57.1% (32)**

USE OF “ENTERPRISE ZONE” FACILITY BOND

14. At any time between 1994 and 2004, did your local government issue a federal “Enterprise Zone” Facility Bond? *(State and local governments could issue Enterprise Zone Facility Bonds in ECs to make loans at lower interest rates to Enterprise Zone Businesses to finance Qualified Zone Property. A business qualified as an Enterprise Zone Business if it was located and actively conducted business in an EC, employed residents of an EC, and had its employees perform services in the EC.) (n=57)*

Bond was issued. **3.5% (2)** → *SKIP to Question 16*

Bond was not issued. **71.9% (41)**

--

Don't know. **24.6% (14)** → *SKIP to Question 17*



15. (If bond not issued) What were reasons that the “Enterprise Zone” Facility Bond was not used?

→ *SKIP to Question 17*

16. (If bond was issued) Was more than one “Enterprise Zone” Facility Bond issued? (n=2)

More than one bond was issued. **0**

Only one bond was issued. **100% (2)**

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT (HUD) AND YOUR EC

Note: 31 urban sites completed the survey.

17. Did HUD headquarters or local office staff assist your EC with any of the following?

- a. Provide information on other funding opportunities (n=29) **96.6% (28)** Yes...**3.4% (1)** No
- b. Provide program information (for example, guidebooks pamphlets, web-based information) (n=29) **96.6% (28)** Yes...**3.4% (1)** No
- c. Hold conferences on the EZ/EC program (n=28)..... **71.4% (20)** Yes...**28.6% (8)** No
- d. Sponsor trainings (for example, effective strategic planning, economic development promotion, future designation application) on the EZ/EC program (n=29) **55.2% (16)** Yes...**44.8% (13)** No
- e. Attend 50 percent or more of board meetings (n=28) **25.0% (7)** Yes.....**75.0% (21)** No
- f. Provide technical assistance for reporting in the Performance Measurement System (PERMS) (n=28) **82.1% (23)** Yes...**17.9% (5)** No
- g. Provide other technical assistance, please describe: (n=29)..... **10.3% (3)** Yes.....**89.7% (26)** No

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (USDA) AND YOUR EC

Note: 27 rural sites completed the survey.

17. Did HUD headquarters or local office staff assist your EC with any of the following?

- a. Provide information on other funding opportunities (n=27) **100% (27)** Yes.... **0** No
- b. Provide program information (for example, guidebooks pamphlets, web-based information) (n=27) **100% (27)** Yes.... **0** No
- c. Hold conferences on the EZ/EC program (n=26)..... **92.3% (24)** Yes...**7.7% (2)** No
- d. Sponsor trainings (for example, effective strategic planning, economic development promotion, future designation application) on the EZ/EC program (n=27) **92.6% (25)** Yes...**7.4% (2)** No
- e. Attend 50 percent or more of board meetings (n=27) **70.4% (19)** Yes...**29.6% (8)** No
- f. Provide technical assistance for reporting in the Benchmarking Management System (BMS) (n=27)..... **100% (27)** Yes.... **0** No
- g. Provide other technical assistance, please describe: (n=27)..... **29.6% (8)** Yes.....**70.4% (19)** No

CHANGES IN THE EC

The following questions seek information on changes that have occurred in the EC and affect the EC.

18. What data are available that describe changes in the poverty rate of EC residents?

19. According to the data described in Question 18, did the poverty rate of EC residents show a net increase, no net change, or net decrease between 1994 and 2004? (n=49)

- Large net increase **0**
- Some net increase **16.3% (8)**
- No net change **16.3% (8)** → *SKIP to Question 21*
- Some net decrease **53.1% (26)** → *SKIP to Question 22*
- Large net decrease **14.3% (7)** → *SKIP to Question 22*

Responses to questions 20 and 22 were used in conjunction with Census data for reporting purposes; therefore, results are presented separately at the end of this document.

20. If the poverty rate increased, in your opinion, were any of the following contributing factors?

- a. Decrease in the number of area jobs Yes No
- b. Decrease in the number of area jobs with benefits Yes No
- c. Loss of existing social services (for example, child care, programs for the homeless, substance abuse treatment) Yes No
- d. Loss of existing adult educational services (for example, job training, ESL classes, GED classes) Yes No
- e. Increased housing costs Yes No
- f. Increased utility costs Yes No
- g. Out-migration of residents with middle or high incomes Yes No
- h. In-migration of residents with low incomes Yes No
- i. In-migration of residents with limited job skills Yes No
- j. In-migration of residents with limited English language skills .. Yes No
- k. Increase in area crime rate Yes No
- l. Welfare reform Yes No
- m. Other → Please describe: Yes No

→ SKIP to Question 23

21. If the poverty rate showed no net change, in your opinion, what were the contributing factors?

→ SKIP to Question 23

22. If the poverty rate decreased, in your opinion, were any of the following contributing factors?

- a. Increase in the number of area jobs Yes..... No
- b. Increase in the number of area jobs with benefits Yes..... No
- c. Increase in social services (*for example, child care, programs for the homeless, substance abuse treatment*)..... Yes..... No
- d. Increase in adult educational services (*for example, job training, ESL classes, GED classes*) Yes..... No
- e. Decreased housing costs Yes..... No
- f. Decreased utility costs..... Yes..... No
- g. Increased homeownership Yes..... No
- h. In-migration of residents with middle or high incomes..... Yes..... No
- i. Out-migration of residents with low incomes Yes..... No
- j. Decrease in area crime rate..... Yes..... No
- k. Physical improvements made in area neighborhoods..... Yes..... No
- l. Welfare reform Yes..... No
- m. Other → *Please describe:* Yes..... No

23. What data are available that describe changes in the unemployment rate of EC residents?

24. According to the data described in Question 23, did the unemployment rate of EC residents show a net increase, no net change, or net decrease between 1994 and 2004? (n=49)

- Large net increase **0**
- Some net increase **14.3% (7)**
- No net change **12.2% (6)** → *SKIP to Question 26*
- Some net decrease **55.1% (27)** → *SKIP to Question 27*
- Large net decrease **18.4% (9)** → *SKIP to Question 27*

Responses to questions 25 and 27 were used in conjunction with Census data for reporting purposes; therefore, results are presented separately at the end of this document.

25. If the unemployment rate increased, in your opinion, were any of the following contributing factors?

- a. Decrease in the number of area jobs Yes No
- b. Decrease in the number of area jobs with benefits Yes No
- c. Increase in the number of jobs requiring skills that EC residents did not have Yes No
- d. Loss of existing social services (for example, child care, programs for the homeless, substance abuse treatment) Yes No
- e. Loss of existing adult educational services (for example, job training, ESL classes, GED classes) Yes No
- f. In-migration of unemployed residents Yes No
- g. Out-migration of employed residents Yes No
- h. In-migration of residents with limited job skills Yes No
- i. In-migration of residents with limited English language skills.. Yes No
- j. Other → Please describe: Yes No

→ SKIP to Question 28

26. If the unemployment rate showed no net change, in your opinion, what were the contributing factors?

→ SKIP to Question 28

27. If the unemployment rate decreased, in your opinion, were any of the following contributing factors?

- a. Increase in the number of area jobs Yes..... No
- b. Increase in the number of jobs with benefits..... Yes..... No
- c. Increased skill level of area residents Yes..... No
- d. Increase in social services (*for example, child care, programs for the homeless, substance abuse treatment*)..... Yes..... No
- e. Increase in adult educational services (*for example, job training, ESL classes, GED classes*)..... Yes..... No
- f. Out-migration of unemployed residents..... Yes..... No
- g. In-migration of employed residents..... Yes..... No
- h. In-migration of residents with job skills..... Yes..... No
- i. Other → *Please describe:* Yes..... No

28. We define economic growth to include increases in new businesses, business expansion, and job creation in an area. What data are available that describe changes in the economic growth of your EC?

29. According to the data described in Question 28, did your EC experience a net increase in economic growth, no net change, or a net decrease in economic growth between 1994 and 2004? (n=39)

- Large net increase **20.5% (8)**
- Some net increase **51.3% (20)**
- No net change **12.8% (5)** → *SKIP to Question 31*
- Some net decrease **15.4% (6)** → *SKIP to Question 32*
- Large net decrease **0** → *SKIP to Question 32*

Responses to questions 30 and 32 were used in conjunction with Claritas data for reporting purposes; therefore, results are presented separately at the end of this document.

30. If economic growth increased, in your opinion, were any of the following contributing factors?

- a. Increase in the number of new area businesses Yes No
- b. Expansion of existing area businesses Yes No
- c. Increase in financial assistance for area businesses (*for example, loan funds, facility bonds, micro-lending programs*) Yes No
- d. Increase in technical assistance for area businesses (*for, example, entrepreneurial training programs, a one-stop capital shop, business consulting services*) Yes No
- e. Availability of tax benefits (*federal, state, local*) Yes No
- f. Favorable state tax rates Yes No
- g. Favorable local tax rates Yes No
- h. Improved local infrastructure Yes No
- i. Physical improvements made in area neighborhoods Yes No
- j. Decrease in area crime rate Yes No
- k. Increased availability of low-cost commercial space in area Yes No
- l. Increased skill level of area residents Yes No
- m. National economic trends Yes No
- n. Other → *Please describe:* Yes No

→ SKIP to Question 33

31. If economic growth in your EC showed no net change, in your opinion, what were the contributing factors?

→ SKIP to Question 33

32. If economic growth decreased, were any of the following contributing factors?

- a. Decrease in the number of new area businesses Yes..... No
- b. Downsizing of existing area businesses Yes..... No
- c. Decrease in financial assistance for area businesses (*for example, loan funds, facility bonds, microlending programs*) Yes..... No
- d. Decrease in technical assistance for area businesses (*for example, entrepreneurial training programs, a one-stop capital shop, business consulting services*) Yes..... No
- e. Unfavorable state tax rates..... Yes..... No
- f. Unfavorable local tax rates..... Yes..... No
- g. Deteriorating local infrastructure..... Yes..... No
- h. Increased physical deterioration in area neighborhoods..... Yes..... No
- i. Increase in area crime rate..... Yes..... No
- j. Decreased availability of low-cost commercial space in area Yes..... No
- k. Decreased skill level of area residents..... Yes..... No
- l. National economic trends Yes..... No
- m. Other → *Please describe:* Yes..... No

33. In your opinion, did your EC play a role in the changes in poverty, unemployment, and economic growth you indicated in Questions 19, 24, and 29? (n=55)

- EC played a role. **87.3% (48)**
- EC did not play a role. **12.7% (7)**

34. In your opinion, why or why didn't your EC play a role in the changes you described in poverty, unemployment, and economic growth?

ABOUT YOUR EC

35. How many employees did your EC have on

- a. December 31, 1995?(n=49) **Mean=1.6 St. Dev.=3.6** full-time employees _____ part-time employees
 - b. December 31, 1999?(n=49) **Mean=2.7 St. Dev.=5.5** full-time employees _____ part-time employees
 - c. December 31, 2004?(n=46) **Mean=1.6 St. Dev.=2.4** full-time employees _____ part-time employees
- Note: The response rate for part-time employees was low; therefore data are not reported.*

36. How many board members did your EC have on

- a. December 31, 1995?(n=50) **Mean=17.8 St. Dev.=11.2** members
- b. December 31, 1999?(n=51) **Mean=16.9 St. Dev.=9.4** members
- c. December 31, 2004?(n=52) **Mean=13.0 St. Dev.=8.5** members

37. We define administrative costs as general costs associated with administering a program, such as program operating costs and the salaries and benefits of those who work on the EC. What amount of the EC grant was used for EC administrative costs? (If no EC grant money was used for administrative costs, enter "0.")

\$ _____ Mean = \$355,069 St. Dev. = \$513,125 (n=50)

38. In 1994, which designation did your community seek when applying to the Empowerment Zone/Enterprise Community program? (n=55)

- Empowerment Zone **34.5% (19)**
- Enterprise Community **65.5% (36)**

39. In 1998, did your EC apply for a Round II Empowerment Zone designation? (n=54)

- Applied **57.4% (31)**
- Did not apply **42.6% (23)**

40. In 2000, did your EC apply for a Round III Empowerment Zone designation? (n=53)

- Applied **18.9% (10)**
- Did not apply **81.1% (43)**

41. In 2000, did your EC apply for a Renewal Community designation? (n=53)

- Applied **15.1% (8)**
- Did not apply **84.9% (45)**

42. From 1994 to 2004, were any external evaluations of your EC conducted by outside researchers? (n=52)

- Yes **40.4% (21)**
- No **59.6% (31)**

43. Are you an Enterprise Community (EC) or an Enhanced Enterprise Community (EEC)? (n=30)

- Enterprise Community → *SKIP to Question 50*
- Enhanced Enterprise Community

Note: The response rate for question 43 was low; therefore data are not reported. However, the three sites with EEC designations correctly responded to this item and no sites indicated they had EEC designation when they did not.

44. (For EEC) Did your EEC receive Economic Development Initiative grants provided under the federal Empowerment Zone/Enterprise Community (EZ/EC) program? (n=3)

- Economic Development Initiative grants were received. **100% (3)**
- Economic Development Initiative grants were not received. **0** → *SKIP to Question 47*

45. (If received) How did your EEC use the Economic Development Initiative grants?

46. In your opinion, how helpful were the Economic Development Initiative grants to accomplishing your strategic plan goals? (n=3)

- Extremely helpful **33.3% (1)**
- Very helpful **0**
- Somewhat helpful **66.7% (2)**
- A little helpful **0**
- Not at all helpful **0**

47. Did your EEC receive Section 108 Loan Guarantees provided under the EZ/EC program? (n=3)

- Yes, we received Section 108 Loan Guarantees. **100% (3)**
- No, we did not receive Section 108 Loan Guarantees. **0** → *SKIP to Question 50*

48. (If received) How did your EEC use the Section 108 Loan Guarantees?

49. In your opinion, how helpful were the Section 108 Loan Guarantees to accomplishing your strategic plan goals? (n=3)

- Extremely helpful **33.3% (1)**
- Very helpful **0**
- Somewhat helpful **66.7% (2)**
- A little helpful **0**
- Not at all helpful **0**

PARTICIPANT CONTACT INFORMATION

50. Who is completing this questionnaire?

Name

Title

Name of Enterprise Community (EC) or Enhanced Enterprise Community (EEC)

Address

City, State, Zipcode

(Area Code) Phone Number

E-mail Address

51. For how many years have you held your current position at this EC/EEC? (n=54)

_____ years **Mean = 7.7 St. Dev. = 6.5 (n=54)**

52. What are the responsibilities of your position relative to the EC/EEC?

53. Before you, how many people have held this position with the EC/EEC? (n=55)

_____ people **Mean = 1.35 St. Dev. = 1.6 (n=55)**

54. Is there anything else you would like to tell us about the Empowerment Zone/Enterprise Community program or this survey?

Note: The following frequencies are based on $n = 1$, which is the number of ECs in which Census data showed an increase in poverty and where the respondent answered Question 19 with “large net increase” or “some net increase”.

20. If the poverty rate increased, in your opinion, were any of the following contributing factors?

- a. Decrease in the number of area jobs 1 Yes 0 No
- b. Decrease in the number of area jobs with benefits 1 Yes 0 No
- c. Loss of existing social services (for example, child care, programs for the homeless, substance abuse treatment) 0 Yes 1 No
- d. Loss of existing adult educational services (for example, job training, ESL classes, GED classes) 0 Yes 1 No
- e. Increased housing costs 1 Yes 0 No
- f. Increased utility costs 1 Yes 0 No
- g. Out-migration of residents with middle or high incomes 1 Yes 0 No
- h. In-migration of residents with low incomes 0 Yes 1 No
- i. In-migration of residents with limited job skills 0 Yes 1 No
- j. In-migration of residents with limited English language skills.. 0 Yes 1 No
- k. Increase in area crime rate 0 Yes 1 No
- l. Welfare reform 0 Yes 1 No
- m. Other → Please describe: 1 Yes 0 No

Note: The following frequencies are based on $n = 28$, which is the number of ECs in which Census data showed a decrease in poverty and where the respondent answered Question 19 with “large net decrease” or “some net decrease.” Data for items with a response rate less than 70% are not reported.

22. If the poverty rate decreased, in your opinion, were any of the following contributing factors?

- a. Increase in the number of area jobs 25 Yes 1 No
- b. Increase in the number of area jobs with benefits 23 Yes 1 No
- c. Increase in social services (for example, child care, programs for the homeless, substance abuse treatment) 18 Yes 4 No
- d. Increase in adult educational services (for example, job training, ESL classes, GED classes) 19 Yes 3 No
- e. Decreased housing costs 2 Yes 18 No
- f. Decreased utility costs Yes No
- g. Increased homeownership 16 Yes 9 No
- h. In-migration of residents with middle or high incomes..... 14 Yes 11 No
- i. Out-migration of residents with low incomes 4 Yes 16 No
- j. Decrease in area crime rate..... 10 Yes 11 No
- k. Physical improvements made in area neighborhoods..... 22 Yes 2 No
- l. Welfare reform Yes No
- m. Other → Please describe: 3 Yes 23 No

Note: The following frequencies are based on $n = 4$, which is the number of ECs in which Census data showed an increase in unemployment and where the respondent answered Question 24 with “large net increase” or “some net increase.”

25. If the unemployment rate increased, in your opinion, were any of the following contributing factors?

- a. Decrease in the number of area jobs 3 Yes 1 No
- b. Decrease in the number of area jobs with benefits 3 Yes 1 No
- c. Increase in the number of jobs requiring skills that EC residents did not have 3 Yes 1 No
- d. Loss of existing social services (for example, child care, programs for the homeless, substance abuse treatment) 1 Yes 3 No
- e. Loss of existing adult educational services (for example, job training, ESL classes, GED classes) 0 Yes 4 No
- f. In-migration of unemployed residents 1 Yes 3 No
- g. Out-migration of employed residents 2 Yes 2 No
- h. In-migration of residents with limited job skills..... 2 Yes 2 No
- i. In-migration of residents with limited English language skills.. 1 Yes 3 No
- j. Other → Please describe: 1 Yes 3 No

Note: The following frequencies are based on $n = 26$, which is the number of ECs in which Census data showed a decrease in unemployment and where the respondent answered Question 24 with “large net decrease” or “some net decrease.” Data for items with a response rate less than 70% are not reported.

27. If the unemployment rate decreased, in your opinion, were any of the following contributing factors?

- a. Increase in the number of area jobs 24 Yes 1 No
- b. Increase in the number of jobs with benefits 21 Yes 2 No
- c. Increased skill level of area residents 16 Yes 6 No
- d. Increase in social services (for example, child care, programs for the homeless, substance abuse treatment) 15 Yes 6 No
- e. Increase in adult educational services (for example, job training, ESL classes, GED classes)..... 17 Yes 5 No
- f. Out-migration of unemployed residents..... Yes..... No
- g. In-migration of employed residents..... 11 Yes 8 No
- h. In-migration of residents with job skills Yes..... No
- i. Other → Please describe: 2 Yes 21 No

Note: The following frequencies are based on $n = 23$, which is the number of ECs in which Claritas data showed an increase in the number of jobs or the number of businesses in the EC and where the respondent answered Question 29 with “large net increase” or “some net increase.”

30. If economic growth increased, in your opinion, were any of the following contributing factors?

- a. Increase in the number of new area businesses 22 Yes 1 No
- b. Expansion of existing area businesses..... 22 Yes 1 No
- c. Increase in financial assistance for area businesses (*for example, loan funds, facility bonds, micro-lending programs*)..... 19 Yes 4 No
- d. Increase in technical assistance for area businesses (*for, example, entrepreneurial training programs, a one-stop capital shop, business consulting services*)..... 21 Yes 2 No
- e. Availability of tax benefits (*federal, state, local*) 13 Yes 9 No
- f. Favorable state tax rates 10 Yes 11 No
- g. Favorable local tax rates 9 Yes 12 No
- h. Improved local infrastructure 19 Yes 4 No
- i. Physical improvements made in area neighborhoods..... 18 Yes 5 No
- j. Decrease in area crime rate..... 9 Yes 12 No
- k. Increased availability of low-cost commercial space in area 12 Yes 9 No
- l. Increased skill level of area residents..... 14 Yes 7 No
- m. National economic trends 13 Yes 7 No
- n. Other → *Please describe:* 4 Yes 19 No

Note: The following frequencies are based on $n = 2$, which is the number of ECs in which Claritas data showed a decrease in the number of jobs or the number of businesses in the EC and where the respondent answered Question 29 with “large net decrease” or “some net decrease.” Data for items with a response rate less than 70% are not reported.

32. If economic growth decreased, were any of the following contributing factors?

- a. Decrease in the number of new area businesses 2 Yes 0 No
- b. Downsizing of existing area businesses 2 Yes 0 No
- c. Decrease in financial assistance for area businesses (*for example, loan funds, facility bonds, microlending programs*)..... Yes..... No
- d. Decrease in technical assistance for area businesses (*for, example, entrepreneurial training programs, a one-stop capital shop, business consulting services*)..... Yes..... No
- e. Unfavorable state tax rates..... 0 Yes 2 No
- f. Unfavorable local tax rates..... 0 Yes 2 No
- g. Deteriorating local infrastructure..... 1 Yes 1 No
- h. Increased physical deterioration in area neighborhoods..... 1 Yes 1 No

- i. Increase in area crime rate..... **1** Yes **1** No
- j. Decreased availability of low-cost commercial space in area.... **1** Yes **1** No
- k. Decreased skill level of area residents..... **0** Yes **2** No
- l. National economic trends..... **1** Yes **1** No
- m. Other → *Please describe:* **0** Yes **2** No

This is a work of the U.S. government and is not subject to copyright protection in the United States. It may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without further permission from GAO. However, because this work may contain copyrighted images or other material, permission from the copyright holder may be necessary if you wish to reproduce this material separately.

GAO's Mission

The Government Accountability Office, the audit, evaluation and investigative arm of Congress, exists to support Congress in meeting its constitutional responsibilities and to help improve the performance and accountability of the federal government for the American people. GAO examines the use of public funds; evaluates federal programs and policies; and provides analyses, recommendations, and other assistance to help Congress make informed oversight, policy, and funding decisions. GAO's commitment to good government is reflected in its core values of accountability, integrity, and reliability.

Obtaining Copies of GAO Reports and Testimony

The fastest and easiest way to obtain copies of GAO documents at no cost is through GAO's Web site (www.gao.gov). Each weekday, GAO posts newly released reports, testimony, and correspondence on its Web site. To have GAO e-mail you a list of newly posted products every afternoon, go to www.gao.gov and select "Subscribe to Updates."

Order by Mail or Phone

The first copy of each printed report is free. Additional copies are \$2 each. A check or money order should be made out to the Superintendent of Documents. GAO also accepts VISA and Mastercard. Orders for 100 or more copies mailed to a single address are discounted 25 percent. Orders should be sent to:

U.S. Government Accountability Office
441 G Street NW, Room LM
Washington, D.C. 20548

To order by Phone: Voice: (202) 512-6000
TDD: (202) 512-2537
Fax: (202) 512-6061

To Report Fraud, Waste, and Abuse in Federal Programs

Contact:

Web site: www.gao.gov/fraudnet/fraudnet.htm

E-mail: fraudnet@gao.gov

Automated answering system: (800) 424-5454 or (202) 512-7470

Congressional Relations

Gloria Jarmon, Managing Director, JarmonG@gao.gov (202) 512-4400
U.S. Government Accountability Office, 441 G Street NW, Room 7125
Washington, D.C. 20548

Public Affairs

Paul Anderson, Managing Director, AndersonP1@gao.gov (202) 512-4800
U.S. Government Accountability Office, 441 G Street NW, Room 7149
Washington, D.C. 20548