

Appendix Table 1: Participants in local economic development strategies, 2004, 2009, 2014 (%  
yes)

	2004	2009	2014
City	82	87	86
Chamber of Commerce	62	64	57
County	47	51	54
Economic development corporation	42	43	40
Regional organizations	35	37	38
Private business/industry	39	39	32
Public/private partnership	34	35	33
State government	31	33	37
Citizen advisory board/commission	34	35	26
College/university	30	29	25
Utility	26	20	21
Planning consortia	12	11	8
Ad hoc citizen group	8	12	8
Private or community economic development foundation	10	8	9
Federal government	9	8	6
N	682	834	1174

Source: ICMA Economic development survey of US Cities and Counties, 2004, 2009, 2014

Appendix Table 2: Economic development barriers, 2004, 2009, 2014 (% yes)

	2004	2009	2014
Availability of land	47	49	54
Cost of land	43	50	56
Lack of capital/funding	29	47	63
Lack of building availability (due to space or costs)	37	35	62
Limited number of major employers	26	32	52
Inadequate infrastructure (e.g., no fiber optic cable)	22	26	35
Lack of skilled labor (Applicants do not have the necessary skills)	14	16	45
Environmental regulations	18	21	36
Taxes	14	19	34
Citizen opposition	18	21	22
High cost of housing	16	14	28
Traffic congestion	19	14	21
Distance from major markets	12	15	26
High cost of labor	9	8	23
Lengthy permit process	10	11	19
Lack of political support	8	10	17
Declining market due to loss of population	4	8	15
Poor quality of life (inadequate education, recreation, and arts/cultural programs)	4	5	16
N	682	834	1174

Source: ICMA Economic development survey of US Cities and Counties, 2004, 2009, 2014

Note: ICMA Economic Development Survey 2014 measured economic development barriers on a 4-degree scale (none, low, medium, high). We set none and low equal to no (0), and medium and high equal to yes (1) to match trends from prior years.

Appendix Table 3: Economic development policies, 2004, 2009, 2014 (% yes)

	2004	2009	2014
<b>Traditional business attraction policy</b>			
Promotional and advertising activities	49	51	59
Local government representative calls on prospective companies	45	53	52
Infrastructure improvements	39	52	57
Tax increment financing	34	49	37
Tax abatements	33	43	38
Grants	22	32	39
Free land or land write downs	18	26	22
Tax credits	14	19	27
Special assessment districts	14	24	18
Locally designated enterprise zones	14	24	24
Regulatory flexibility	7	13	27
Relocation assistance	10	13	11
Subsidized buildings	5	8	12
Utility rate reduction	7	7	10
<b>Community development policy</b>			
Zoning/permit assistance	40	62	66
One-stop permit issuance	24	37	57
Job training for low skilled workers	34	34	40
Community development corporation	36	33	27
Small business development center	28	26	39
Revolving loan fund	24	24	25
Training Support	17	23	31
Matching improvement grants (physical upgrades to business properties)	14	21	36
Marketing assistance	17	22	32
Community development loan fund	28	22	18
Management training	11	10	21
Business assistance, loans and grants to support child care	19	9	7
Employee screening	9	10	13
Microenterprise program	9	8	14
Vendor/supplier matching	4	6	11
Executive on loan/mentor	5	7	9
N	682	834	1174

Source: ICMA Economic development survey of US Cities and Counties, 2004, 2009, 2014

Note: ICMA Economic Development Survey 2014 measured economic development policies on a 4-degree scale (none, low, medium, high). We set none and low equal to no (0), and medium and high equal to yes (1) to match trends from prior survey years.