

Approved April 8, 1988
Date

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The meeting was called to order by Senator Wint Winter, Jr. at
Chairperson

12:45 ~~a.m.~~/p.m. on March 24, 1988 in room 313-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:

- Senator Paul Feleciano - Excused
- Senator Leroy Hayden - Excused
- Senator Alicia Salisbury - Excused

Committee staff present:

- Bill Edds, Revisor of Statutes' Office
- Lynne Holt, Legislative Research Department
- Mary Allen, Secretary to the Committee

Conferees appearing before the committee:

- Dan Pilcher, National Conference of State Legislatures

The meeting was called to order at 12:45 p.m. by the Chairman, Senator Wint Winter, Jr.

The Chairman called on Dan Pilcher, staff person for economic development for the National Conference of State Legislatures in Denver, to give the Committee an update on state economic development issues with a particular emphasis on export finance and rural development.

Mr. Pilcher told the Committee that when he travels to meetings on economic development, he tells people that if they want a model of how to deal with the problems of economic development, they should look at Kansas. He said that of all of the states, particularly in the high plains, Rocky Mountain and oil patch states, Kansas has clearly been the leader in the process of tackling economic development. He observed that the key to this is the way Kansas depoliticized the issues with everyone getting together behind the Redwood-Krider Report.

Mr. Pilcher said that there are really two major forces which are driving everything that is happening in economic development. One is the effect of the change of technology and the other is international competition. He said that there is a very vulnerable world economy. In 1970, nine percent of the goods that Americans consumed were imported, in 1980, twenty-two percent were imported. In 1960, twenty percent of the goods that we manufactured faced foreign competition and in 1980, seventy percent faced foreign competition. He stated that our average economic growth rate in the 1960's was four percent, in the 1970's was three percent and in the 1980's was two percent. In the 1960's, average unemployment was four percent, in the 1970's and 1980's it is seven percent. The average rate of U.S. productivity growth from 1947 to 1965 was 3.3 percent, from 1977 to 1986, it was 0.9 percent. He observed that this is a tremendous decrease in productivity. He pointed out that since 1960, the Japanese rate has been five times that of the U.S.

Mr. Pilcher stated that manufacturing, as a percent of the gross national product of the U.S., is remaining about the same, but the percent employed in manufacturing is going down. If the U.S. is going to compete in manufacturing in the world market, it is going to be on the basis of innovation technology automation.

Mr. Pilcher discussed the economic development strategy of growth from within and said that Roger Vaughn's book "The Wealth of States" notes that for a state, the average percentage for job growth from firms moving into the state is five percent. The rest of the growth is from starting up businesses and from the expansion of existing firms. He told the Committee about over-all state efforts in economic development. Texas, he said, began a year long process in January by creating an eighteen member Strategic Economic Policy Commission which will present its report in December. Mississippi is also in a similar process to develop a strategic plan. They will not enact any programs until their plan is in place. Oklahoma passed its economic development

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

room 313-S, Statehouse, at 12:45 ~~xxx~~ p.m. on March 24, 1988

package last year, Oklahoma Futures, which is the equivalent to Kansas Inc. Iowa is interested in some sort of "over-arching" economic development strategic planning agency such as Kansas Inc. as is North Dakota. Oregon has a Joint Trade and Economic Development Committee which has done a good job dealing with the bits and pieces such as the capital market and infrastructure at the local level, but it does not have an overall strategy. Mr. Pilcher pointed out that Oregon has a diverse geographical situation. In Oregon, their lottery money was going in to state wide programs but they passed some bills last year which take the state lottery money and gives it to localities to develop regional local economic development strategies. California and Connecticut are trying to develop over-all strategic plans. Massachusetts is a state which has put forth an effort, through the use of high quality consulting, to look at a region which is distressed. Mr. Pilcher stated that so many states have a two state economy, urban areas which do well and rural areas which are either agricultural, oil and gas, natural resources etc. which are in terrible straits. One major challenge for a state is that over all the state may be doing well but the state has geographical, industry specific areas which are not doing well. He said that the challenge to the states is the equity issue in economic development so that parts of a state are not left behind.

Mr. Pilcher discussed rural development. He said that Minnesota created the Greater Minnesota Corporation which is a quasi-public body. It will create six regional revolving loan funds for economic development. They will work through higher education institutions around the state so there will be money for business start-ups and expansions. He stated that in general, the states have been addressing the issues of (1.) retraining people who are out of the farm to move into other things; (2.) financial aid to localities; (3.) state funds for local infrastructure development; and (4.) entrepreneurship - helping people in small towns start up businesses who have not been business people before.

Mr. Pilcher told the Committee about an operation in St. Paul, Minnesota, called Women's Economic Development Corporation (WEDCO), headed by Katherine Keeley. The women who organized this corporation went to banks to request that the banks entertain the loan applications of the clients with whom WEDCO has worked to develop businesses including their business plans. He observed that WEDCO has had great success.

Mr. Pilcher stated that the NCSL has a conference coming up in mid April in Chicago which will deal with the issues of entrepreneurship, self employment for low income displaced homemakers, displaced farmers, factory workers, people on welfare and the unemployed. He suggested that the Committee might want to consider having Ms. Keeley of WEDCO address the Joint Committee on Economic Development during the Interim. He said that the NCSL Denver office has assembled a list of what all of the states are doing in self employment projects. This will be available as a policy report in the spring, after the Chicago meeting. He observed that twenty-five percent of small business owners are women.

Mr. Pilcher discussed the 1987 NCSL Survey on Economic Development (Attachment I). Rural development was studied with such question areas as aid to localities, retraining, entrepreneurship, diversification, agri-production and farm management techniques. He discussed the area of rural marketing, particularly specialized agricultural products. He noted that in California, the state has a matching agricultural grant program. The state will put up a certain amount of money if the specialized agriculture product association, such as the orange association or the walnut association, will put up a matching amount. The money is being used pretty successfully in terms of international marketing and exporting, he said.

Mr. Pilcher discussed the value added question - if one is producing an agricultural product, how can one add more value in-state rather than ship it somewhere else. He observed that the State of Louisiana lands more seafood than any other state in the U.S. but it is not processed there. He discussed telecommunications as they relate to rural development and observed that Iowa has a public-private statewide telecommunications system that will reach out to 435 communities. This system will deliver information about the state's economic development programs and will have continuing education up to and including master level education.

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT,
room 313-S, Statehouse, at 12:45 ~~am~~/p.m. on March 24, 1988.

Mr. Pilcher told the Committee of the efforts of Mississippi to promote exports of catfish. He observed that in 1982 or 1983, Congress passed a bill to foster the creation of export trading companies. Competing firms can now band together to export their products overseas. The Mississippi Catfish Producers Association created such an export trading company which has been pretty successful. They have found some major markets in Europe for their product.

Mr. Pilcher observed that more than half of the states have passed export finance programs since 1983 or 1984. Of those states, there are probably two or three which are really operating their programs. The Louisiana, Tennessee, Nevada, Wisconsin, Oklahoma and Texas programs were all to be bond funded but the programs in those states did not develop. He stated that in only two states, California and Minnesota, was a direct state appropriation put up for an export finance program. A lot of states tried to go through a bond funded program. In California the initial state appropriation was \$2 million. Last year another million was added and another million was added this year. In the two and a half years since it has been in operation, the California working capital guarantee program has guaranteed \$9.1 million in fifty-three guarantees. The total value of the export transactions has been \$38 million and this has affected 1,159 jobs. The program works by guaranteeing a portion of the larger export transactions. The program also counsels export businesses and helps them work with banks in securing loans. Twenty transactions for a total of \$8.4 million have been given only this kind of help, with the state not guaranteeing anything. Mr. Pilcher said that in the State of Washington, they have an Export Assistance Center which only does such things as counseling and paper work.

Mr. Pilcher pointed out that many states never got their bond financing off the ground. He observed that in Illinois it took about three years to get its export bond program "up and running". He suggested that the Committee look at the Illinois program but that it should also look at the appropriation route if Kansas wants to consider an export finance program. He stated that in California, they charge a fee of one percent of the amount they guarantee. They have a \$3 million fund, plus the interest it earns, plus the money they receive from the fee guarantee. This makes a \$3.5 million fund. Of all the deals in which they are involved, only one has gone "sour" for a value of \$285,000.00. They think that they are going to recover most, if not all, of that amount. He suggested that during the Interim, the Committee should have someone come from California to discuss that program for they have hired experienced people with real backgrounds in export financing. He said that in California, they have to have a three to one reserve ratio, so at any point, their \$3.5 million is supporting about \$10 million in exports. He pointed out that over the period of a year that could be \$30 million to \$40 million in exports.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:35 p.m. by the Chairman.

GUEST LIST

<u>NAME</u>	<u>REPRESENTING</u>
Dan Pilcher	NCSL-DENVER
Harold Pitts	
Harold Puddis	KDOC
Judy Krueger	SBA
Charles Wane	Kansas Inc.
Ann Patterson	KDOC
Debbie Zabel	IPPBR, Univ. of Ks.

1987 STATE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SURVEY RESULTS

By

Dan Pilcher
Program Director

and

Barbara Puls
Research Analyst

Economic Development Program

National Conference of State Legislatures
1050 Seventeenth Street, Suite 2100
Denver CO 80265
(303) 623-7800

January 1988

INTRODUCTION

In conducting its second annual economic development survey, NCSL was primarily interested in compiling the most significant legislation enacted in the states in 1987. Focusing on only one legislative session, however, will not give a clear perspective as to what have been the relevant trends in a state's economic development activity. For this reason, NCSL gathered information about actions states have taken on economic development in prior years. In addition, NCSL wanted to determine what economic development proposals legislatures anticipate considering during 1988 or the next biennial legislative session. Actions take by the executive branch are not included in this survey.

Survey questionnaires were mailed to key legislative staff who work on economic development issues or to the directors of legislative research offices, both partisan and non-partisan. The following legislatures have not yet responded to the survey: Alabama, Alaska, Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, Montana, New Mexico, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Virginia, Vermont, and West Virginia

I. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION

	ADOPTED LEGISLATION DURING			EXPECT TO CONSIDER IN
	Pre-1981	1981-1986	1987 or last session	1988 or next session
A. SMALL AND NEW BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT				
-Set-asides: goals	KY MI MN	IN IA MI TX NY MN	IA MI TX	IN NJ TX
-Set-asides: percentage	CT LA MN	IN IA MI NJ TX MN	IA MI TX	TX
-Business incubators	UT GA	KS OH IA MI NJ CT NC AR LA NY MO	MA IA TX OK	WA IN KS MI NJ TX
-Advanced technology centers	GA FL MI	UT NE AR WA KS AZ OH IA NJ CT CO NC MO NY ME WI	MA AZ CO KS IA TX OK AR NY	TX
-Research and development	GA FL	UT NE NY WA IN KS AZ OH IA NJ ND CT TX NC OK AR LA MO WI MN	WI KS AZ IA NJ ND CT SD TX AR NY OK MN	MI CO TX
-Procurement assistance	GA MI	UT SC FL AZ OH IA MI CT NY WI MN	AZ IA NJ SD OK	UT MA WI CO
-Managerial/technical assistance	GA FL MI	UT NY KS IN OH IA MI ND CT TX NC ME AR NV MO WI MN	IA SD MN	MA CO

-In-state preference laws	UT FL AZ ND	OH IA MI NJ ND TX NV LA SC OK WI	IA TX NV	TX
-Nonprofit/government competition	_____	WA AZ MI	WA__	WA OH MI CO LA NY
-Small business advocacy office	GA CT AR NY	NE NH WA IN KS FL OH IA NJ TX NC MO WI MN	MA WA	MI NJ

B. TARGETED SMALL BUSINESS

Pre-1981	1981-1986	1987 or last session	1988 or next session
----------	-----------	----------------------------	----------------------------

1. MINORITY-OWNED BUSINESSES

-Set-asides: goals	KS MI NY MN	WA KY IN FL IA MI NJ TX LA SC OK MN	WI RI IA MI TX SC OK	WI KS NJ TX SC OK
-Set-asides: percentage	MI MN	WA FL OH IA MI NJ CT LA SC MN	RI IA OK LA SC	SC OK
-Advocacy office	OH NY	LA WA KY IN FL OH CT NC MO	MA OK	CO

2. FEMALE-OWNED BUSINESSES

-Set-asides: goals	MI NY MN	LA WA KS IA MI NJ SC MN	IA MI SC	KS NJ SC
-Set-asides: percentage	MI CT MN	WA IA MI NJ CT LA SC MN	IA LA SC	SC
-Advocacy office	NY	SC WA CT NC LA	WI NC	MA CO NC

C. LOW-INCOME ENTREPRENEURSHIP PROGRAMS	Pre-1981	1981-1986	1987 or last session	1988 or next session
---	----------	-----------	----------------------	----------------------

1. TARGETING WELFARE RECIPIENTS

-Loans	RI__	___	IA__	___
-Entrepreneurial training	___	FL OH MN	IA NY	___

2. TARGETING UNEMPLOYED

-Loans	___	___	WI IA NY	MA__
-Entrepreneurial training	___	FL MI	MA IA NY	MA OH

3. OTHER TARGET GROUPS (i.e. displaced homemakers, youth, disabled, etc.)

-Loans	___	ME MN	UT IA	NJ__
-Entrepreneurial training	___	FL MN	IA NY	MA OH NJ

D. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE	Pre-1981	1981-1986	1987 or last session	1988 or next session
-------------------------	----------	-----------	----------------------	----------------------

-Loans/loan guarantees	RI KY MI NJ CT LA NY ME	ME WA IN FL OH IA MI NJ ND CT CO NC AR WY MO SC NY WI MN	UT WI AZ IA ND SD CO TX MO NY OK MN	MA WI NJ
------------------------	-------------------------------	--	--	-------------

-Grants	MI NJ CO NY	AR WA IN OH IA MI NJ NC WY NY ME MN	WI RI AZ IA NC NY OK MN	WI NJ
---------	----------------	--	-------------------------------	-------

-Interest subsidies	MI NJ CT	UT WY IN OH IA MI NJ ND NY MN	WI IA MN	WI
---------------------	----------	--	----------	----

1. VENTURE/SEED CAPITAL

-Loans/loan guarantees	MI NJ CT	UT NE KS OH IA MI	MA IA TX ND SD OK	MA WA KY NJ
------------------------	----------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------

		CT NC AR WY NY MN	MN	CO SC
-Grants	MI NJ	UT OH IA NC AR NV WY LA MN	IA NC OK MN	
-Interest subsidies/below market	MI NJ NY	UT WY OH IA MI NJ NY MN	IA SD NY MN	WA KY NJ
-Using public pension funds for economic development purposes	MI__	WY OH IA NY WI	MA__	LA OK
-Industrial revenue/general obligation bonds	UT NE RI OH MI NJ ND CT SD LA SC ME	UT WA KY OH IA MI ND AR NV NH NY ME WI MN	MA WI RI KS TX NV NH OK MN	OK__
-Tax incentives for industrial recruitment	RI MI SD LA SC NY	UT RI WA OH IA ND TX AR WY LA MO NY OK WI MN	UT NE RI WA ND TX NC OK	UT MA WA
E. EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING	Pre-1981	1981-1986	1987 or last session	1988 or next session
-Plant-closing legislation	MA__	MO ME WI	UT	MA WA MI NJ CT NC MN
-Assist worker buy-outs		CT NY WI	MI	WA NJ
-Allow employee stock ownership plans	RI	MI NJ NY WI		WA CT MN

-Job training, retraining	GA MA RI IN MI CT SC	UT NE RI KY IN FL IA MI NJ ND CT CO TX NV MO NY ME WI MN	KY OH IA MI CO TX NV NY ME MN	MA WA KS MI NJ NC MN
---------------------------	----------------------------	--	--	-------------------------------

F. INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Pre-1981	1981-1986	1987 or last session	1988 or next session
----------	-----------	----------------------------	----------------------------

-Establishment of foreign trade office/agency	GA MI NC AR MO NY	MA RI WA IN KS OH IA NJ CT CO TX NH OK WI MN	RI KY AZ IA ND CO NV OK MN	CO OK
---	----------------------	--	----------------------------------	-------

-Export financing programs	SC	WA IA MI CT CO NV LA ME WI MN	IA NV NY OK	MA WI WA IN KS FL NJ MO OK
----------------------------	----	--	----------------	--

-Overseas office representation	GA FL MI NC MO SC NY	RI WA KY IN KS OH IA MI CT OK WI	RI AZ IA CO NV OK	MA NJ OK MN
---------------------------------	----------------------------	---	----------------------	----------------

-Allow state involvement in export trading companies	_____	WA OH IA ND NY	_____	MA MO OK
--	-------	-------------------	-------	-------------

-Foreign Sales Corps. (FSCs)	_____	LA__	NC NV NY	MA RI WA CT NC
------------------------------	-------	------	----------	----------------------

G. RURAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Pre-1981	1981-1986	1987 or last session	1988 or next session
----------	-----------	----------------------------	----------------------------

-Diversification of agri-production and farm management techniques	GA MI	NE IA MI ND SD CO TX NC AR WI MN	IA TX OK	SC__
--	-------	---	----------	------

-Incentives for re-use of agricultural buildings and other facilities	_____	_____	IA__	MA MI
-Aid to distressed local governments in rural areas	_____	WA AZ CO TX NV MN	WA CO TX ME MN	WA OH MI
-Programs to assist farmers in financial trouble	MI__	NE IN KS OH IA MI ND SD TX NC LA MO SC WI MN	WI OH IA MI NJ ND CO TX NC MO SC MN	WA OH MI NJ SC
-Education or employment training for ex-farmers	_____	NE IN KS IA MI SD SC WI MN	IA MI SC MN	MI__

H. STRUCTURE

	Pre-1981	1981-1986	1987 or last session	1988 or next session
-Establish economic development board/commission	RI OH MI ND SD TX NC AR SC	UT GA WA IN KS AZ OH IA MI ND NV WY LA MO WI MN	ND SD CO OK MN	MA__
-Establish public-private partnerships	GA RI ME	WA KY IN KS AZ IA CT WI MN	AZ IA CO OK	MA__
-Establish legislative committee on economic development	UT MI CT SD TX NY	GA RI WA IN KS OH IA NJ ND NC NV WY SC OK WI MN	IA ND CT SD CO NC AR NH LA ME	UT NC

-Establish/modify state agencies dealing with economic development

RI	KY	NH	UT	WA	KY	KY	AZ	ND	MA	NJ
NY			IN	KS	AZ	TX	NC	NY	CO	WY
			OH	IA	MI	OK	ME	MN	LA	OK
			ND	TX	NC					
			NV	MO	OK					
			WI	MN						

I. RELATED POLICY INITIATIVES

	Pre-1981	1981-1986	1987 or last session	1988 or next session
-Environmental/regulatory reform	GA RI MI	UT RI WA FL AZ MI TX WI MN	UT WI IA CT TX	MI CO TX
-Worker compensation reform	FL NJ	UT GA RI WA OH MI CT TX AR WY LA OK ME WI MN	UT MA WI KY AZ MI TX NC	UT OH IN TX NC OK ME MN
-Unemployment compensation reform	UT MI	UT GA RI KY OH MI NJ CT TX NH MO WI MN	UT WI MI TX NC MN	IN LA TX
-Tax changes due to economic development concerns	WI RI KS NJ ND	UT RI WA KS IA MI NJ ND NV SC WI MN	UT NE WI RI KS NJ ND CO TX NC NV OK MN	GA MA KS TX AR LA
-Education reform	FL__	UT GA WA KY FL IA MI CT CO TX NC AR NV NH MO SC ME WI	UT IN FL IA MI ND TX NV	UT FL MI TX LA
-Public infrastructure development	MI NC NY	UT GA NV WA AZ MI NJ CT CO TX NC MO WI	FL CT CO NC NH SC NY MN	FL CO OK

-Tourism development

FL NJ SD	MO WA IA	GA WI RI	UT MA
NC	IN OH MI	KS IA MI	MI NC
	ND CT CO	ND CO TX	AR NY
	TX NC NV	NC NV MO	
	NH LA MO	OK ME	
	ME WI MN		

J. MISCELLANEOUS

-State early warning system for ailing firms

MA__	CT WI	NY ME	WA NJ MN
------	-------	-------	-------------

-Establish enterprise zones

GA__	RI KY IN	KY AZ OH	UT MA
	KS FL OH	CO TX	WA TX
	MI NJ CT	NC MO ME	NC
	CO TX AR		
	NV LA MO		
	NY OK MN		

II. STATE INFORMATION

A. Please rate the importance of economic development as an issue in your state (circle the appropriate response).

1	2	3	4	5
Very important				Not important

UT NE MA WI	WA IN FL AZ	NJ NH
RI KY KS IA	OH CT AR WY	
MI ND SD CO	MN	
TX NC ME NV		
LA MO SC NY		
OK		

B. What factors influence the importance of economic development as an issue in your state (please check all that apply)?

1. Economic decline (unemployment, general recession, etc.)

UT NE MA WI RI WA KY IN KS FL OH IA MI ND SD CO TX NC AR NV WY LA MO SC
NY OK MN

2. Decline in state tax revenues

UT RI WA KY KS FL MI ND CO TX AR NV WY LA MO SC NY OK

3. Decline in federal economic development support

UT MA RI WA KY KS MI NJ ND NC AR ME MN

4. Particular political party or government branch in state

NE WI IA CO NC MN

5. Reliance on mature industries

UT MA WI RI WA KY IN KS OH IA ND CT TX NC SC NY ME MN

6. Loss of business to other states/countries

UT NE MA WI RI WA KY KS FL OH MI NJ NC LA MO SC NY ME MN

D. 1. Were additional funds appropriated for economic development in the last legislative session?

_____ Yes _____ No

UT	GA	WI	NE	MA	OH
RI	KY	IN	AR	NH	LA
KS	FL	AZ			
IA	MI	NJ			
ND	CT	SD			
CO	TX	NC			
NY	OK	ME			
NV	WY	MO			
SC	MN				

2. If so, for which categories were the funds targeted?

o Small and new business development

UT WI RI KY KS IA NJ ND CT TX NC NV WY MD NY OK

o Financial assistance

UT WI KY IN IA MI NC WY NY OK

o Employment and training

WI RI KY IA MI NV MO NY ME

o International trade

UT KY IN KS AZ IA NJ ND CO NC NV MO NY OK MN

o Rural economic development

UT AZ IA MI TX NC SC ME MN

3. What funding sources were used to finance expansion of economic development activities?

o State general funds

UT NE GA MA WI RI WA KY IN KS FL AZ NJ ND CT SD CO NC AR NV WY MO NY OK
ME MN

o Increased fee or tax

SD TX

o New fee or tax

RI KS TX

o Federal funds

UT KY IN KS AR NH MN

o Lottery

KS IA

E. 1. In addition to the legislature, which entities within and outside of state government have been active on economic development matters?

o Governor's office

UT NE GA MA WI RI WA KY IN KS FL AZ OH IA MI NJ ND CT SD CO TX NC OK ME
AR NV NH WY MO SC NY MN

o State executive agency

UT NE GA MA WI RI WA KY IN KS FL AZ OH IA MI NJ ND CT SD CO TX NC AR NV
NH LA MO ME MN

o Business associations

UT NE GA WI RI KY IN KS AZ OH IA MI NJ ND CT CO NC NH WY LA NY OK MN

o Quasi-public agency

NE MA WI RI IN KS CT CO NC WY NY ME M

o State colleges and universities

UT NE GA WI RI KS AZ OH IA MI NJ ND CT SD TX NC AR NV LA MO SC NY OK MN

o Corporations

NE GA WI RI KS OH ND AR

o Organized labor

WI RI ND OK

F. 1. Has your state set formal goals for economic development policies?

_____ Yes	_____ No
UT NE GA	AZ MI AR
MA RI WA	NH WY MO
KY IN KS	MN
FL OH IA	
NJ ND CT	
SD CO TX	
NC NY OK	
ME NV LA	
SC	

2. If yes, please indicate the goals of your state's economic development policies.

o Job creation

UT NE GA MA RI WA KY IN KS OH IA NJ ND CT SD CO TX NC NV LA SC NY OK

o Job retention

UT NE RI WA KY IN KS OH IA NJ ND CT SD TX NC NY OK

o Economic diversification

UT NE GA RI WA KS OH IA ND CT SD CO TX NC NV LA NY OK

o Enhancement of tax base

UT RI KS OH IA NJ ND CT SD CO TX NC NV OK

o Economic advancement of targeted industries

UT NE RI WA KY OH IA CT TX NCV LA OK

o Creating an entrepreneurial climate

UT GA RI WA KS OH NJ ND CT NC LA SC OK

o Encouraging businesses to relocate in your state

UT NE GA MA RI WA KY IN KS OH ND CT SD CO TX NC NV LA SC NY OK

o Supporting existing businesses or mature industries

UT NE RI KY IN KS OH ND CT SD TX NC NY OK

o Encourage new business development (entrepreneurship)

UT NE GA RI WA KY KS OH IA NJ ND CT SD CO NC NY OK

G. 1. Are any particular economic sectors or geographical regions suffering in your state at present?

_____ Yes	_____ No
UT NE GA	RI AZ NH
MA WI WA	
KY IN KS	
FL OH IA	
MI NJ ND	
CT SD CO	
TX NC AR	
NV WY LA	
MO SC NY	
OK ME MN	

2. If yes, please indicate the economic sectors that are suffering.

o Agriculture

UT GA WA KY IN KS FL OH IA MI ND CT SD CO TX NC AR NV WY LA MD SC OK ME MN

o Construction

KY ND CO TX WY LA

o Fisheries

FL NJ SC

o Forestry

KY WA AR WY

o High technology

TX

o Manufacturing

UT NE MA KY IN OH IA MI NJ CT LA SC NY ME

o Mining

UT KY KS OH MI CO NV WY MO MN

o Oil and gas

UT KS OH ND CO TX AR WY LA OK

o Service industries

MI LA WY

o Small businesses

NE KS IA MI SD TX WY LA

o Textiles

GA MA NJ SC NY ME

o Tourism

H. 1. Has your state engaged in any interstate or intrastate efforts to address state economic problems (i.e. regional leaders' conferences, economic research units, etc.)?

_____ Yes	_____ No
UT NE WI RI	IN AZ MI
WA KS OH IA	NJ CT SD
ND TX NC NV	CO NH WY
SC NY MN	LA OK ME

I. 1. Does the legislature have any interim studies on economic development issues planned or underway in 1987?

_____ Yes	_____ No
UT NE GA OH	WI IN FL
MA WA KS IA	AZ MI SD
NJ ND CT CO	NH WY LA
TX NC AR NV	MO SC OK
NY ME MN	

J. 1. Has a performance audit or legislative program review been conducted on the state's economic development initiatives?

_____ Yes	_____ No
UT WI WA IN	NE GA MA RI
KS FL IA ME	AZ OH MI NJ
MN	ND CT SD CO
	TX NC NV WY
	LA MO SC NY
	OK