WHY

• ImagiNE Nebraska Act passed in 2020 – Replaced Nebraska Advantage Act
• Two data bills on previous incentive. Some new data included, but is it enough?
• Never enough data for what you want to do
• Opportunity to influence what data is collected early in a program’s life
HOW

• Simulate planning for our ideal evaluation

• Review all potential sources of metrics/questions to answer including:
  • Legislative Audit Act
  • LR 444 Report (Interim study 2015)
  • Goals Written Into the Act
  • Legislative History - Supporters’ testable claims
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Category</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Participant Data Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Fiscal Impact</td>
<td>Audit Act/LR444</td>
<td>Impact on budgets of local governments</td>
<td>Local Sales tax refunds, Property tax exemptions, Property valuations/levys, Tax District, project addresses/parcels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting’s Claims</td>
<td>Growth to reduce property tax burden</td>
<td>New Jobs, Property tax payments, Tax District, project addresses/parcels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting’s Claims</td>
<td>Increased property values reduce stress on city sales tax</td>
<td>Local sales tax refunds, Property valuations/levys, Tax District, project addresses/parcels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting’s Claims</td>
<td>Capital investment helps with prop taxes</td>
<td>Investment amounts, property valuations/levys, tax district, project address/parcels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supporting’s Claims</td>
<td>Gothenburg lowered their levy because of incentivized company</td>
<td>Investment amounts, property valuations/levys, tax district, project address/parcels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATIONS

• “But-for”
• Investment
• Property Valuation
• Jobs (2 recommendations)
• Workforce Development
RECs. — “But-for”

Companies Should Answer two questions related to location decisionmaking

1. Were sites outside of the state seriously considered for location or expansion?
2. Were incentives for this activity offered by other states or considered by the company?
REC. – Investment

COMPANY CREATED “CHART OF ACCOUNTS” ORGANIZED AS THEY SEE FIT, CAN REPORT ITEMS AS PART NUMBERS

- Cat: 12230-000-000-10
- Mitsubishi 299P335010

- Cat: 199400 1436
- Mitsubishi LT-XL51R385

- Cat: 370-00010
- Mitsubishi LE-7A

- Computer Fan
- Tire Curing Press
- Stage 1 Rocket Engine
Companies should report investments by IRS asset class designations (IRS Pub. 946)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>IRS Cat.</th>
<th>Amt.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitsubishi 299P335010</td>
<td>00.11</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitsubishi LT-XL51R385</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitsubishi LE-7A</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Companies should provide the most recent parcel valuations and levy rates when they apply

Jackson St. Books, Omaha  
Susan’s Books and Gifts, Aurora
Companies should report incentivized employee occupations using BLS Standard Occupational Classification Designations.
**WAGE REPORT UI-11W**

File at dol.nebraska.gov/UIConnect

---

**THIS DOCUMENT MUST BE FILED WITH THE COMBINED TAX REPORT - UI-11T**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Security Number</th>
<th>* Worker Name</th>
<th>* Gross Wages paid each quarter</th>
<th>Hours Paid in this quarter</th>
<th>Primary Job Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total of This Page

Total of All Pages

---

* Print Preparer’s Name

---

* Email Address

---

* Phone

---

* Date
Companies should report where recruited employees were living when the credit eligible recruitment activities occurred.
Companies should report the type of training provided to employees when using tax credits to reimburse training expenses, as is required for the workforce training loan program.
RECEPTION - LB 1150

- “But-for”
- Investment
- Property Valuation

- Jobs (Occupations)
- Jobs (Recruited Location)
- Workforce Development
Pennsylvania Brewers’ Tax Credit

November 3, 2022
PA Tax Credit Review Process

Required by statute: 4-5 tax credit reviews published each January

5-year rotating cycle, currently in year 5

Office makes 2 types of recommendations to improve effectiveness

- Only time we make recommendations
- Specific: credit levels, reporting requirements, administration
- General: what are you trying to accomplish? | is this the best approach?

Some success over past 4 years

- 2 credits eliminated: Jobs Creation and Mobile Telecom Broadband Investment
- 3 tax credits modified (e.g., annual cap increased)
Brewer’s Tax Credit: How it Works

**Goal:** Encourage malt-brewed beverage manufacturing location/expansion

Credit equal to qualifying capital expenditures placed in service during year

- Used for manufacture or sale of malt and brewed beverages
- Dollar-for-dollar | limit is $200k per brewer | NO size or production limit

**Annual credit cap = $5 million | applied to malt beverage tax liability**

- Tax generates ~$23 million per annum
- Tax rate = $2.48 per barrel | 8 cents per gallon | 1 cent per pint
- Rate same since 1947 | inflation adjusted = $32.12 per barrel

**Credits must be used within 4 years or they expire**

- Significant constraint for small brewers | discourages participation
- Credits cannot be sold or transferred
## Number of US Craft Beer Brewers Surges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Craft Brewers</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbrewers</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>2,684</td>
<td>1,917</td>
<td>1,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tap Rooms</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3,091</td>
<td>3,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brew Pubs</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>1,941</td>
<td>3,171</td>
<td>3,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,758</td>
<td>4,803</td>
<td>8,419</td>
<td>9,124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Large/Non-Craft Brewer  | --   | 44   | 111  | 129  |

Source: Brewers Association for Small and Independent Craft Brewers.

- **Regional Brewer**: annual production from 15k to 6 million barrels
- **Microbrewer**: produce <15k barrels per year, >75% sales is off-site
- **Taproom**: sells >25% beer on site, no significant food sales
- **Brew Pub**: sells >25% beer on site, has significant food sales
### PA Craft Beer Production Dominates Regional Competition (2021)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pennsylvania</th>
<th>New York</th>
<th>New Jersey</th>
<th>Maryland</th>
<th>Ohio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Craft Brewers</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>485</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per 100k adults</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrels Produced (000s)</td>
<td>3,245</td>
<td>1,309</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>1,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gallons per adult</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Annual impacts. Adults are age 21 or older.
Source: Brewers Association for Small and Independent Craft Brewers.
State Beer Excise Tax - Dollars per Gallon

PA excise tax very low
Only MO, WI, WY lower
CO and OR same rate

PA use tax collected on beverages sold to consumers
tax base = 25% of retail purchase price
6.0% * 25% = 1.5%

43 states also levy general sales tax

Source: Tax Foundation
### Table 2.1
**Brewers' Tax Credit Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved Applicants</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorized&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$2.7</td>
<td>$7.0</td>
<td>$3.1</td>
<td>$11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awarded&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>$1.9</td>
<td>$4.9</td>
<td>$2.6</td>
<td>$2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Award</td>
<td>$78,030</td>
<td>$98,520</td>
<td>$91,120</td>
<td>$76,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exclude Max Out</td>
<td>$53,630</td>
<td>$59,050</td>
<td>$62,720</td>
<td>$49,050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dollars in millions, except for Average Award. Exclude Max Out excludes firms claiming max credit.
1 Credit authorized by DOR based on validated expenditures.
2 Credit awarded by DOR after the application of the individual and program caps.
Source: Pennsylvania Department of Revenue.

- Surge in 2018 then drop off
- Small brewers cannot use credits
- Plenty of room under $5m ceiling
- Best measure of avg tax credit excludes large brewers where tax credit is a windfall
- Equal to average qualifying investment
Half of Tax Credit Likely a Windfall to Large Brewers

Table 2.2
Brewers’ Tax Credit by Credit Award

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200k</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100k to $199k</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50k to $99k</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10k to $49k</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$10k</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.64</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dollars in millions.
Source: Pennsylvania Department of Revenue.

same large brewers claim $200k every year

generally able to use within 4 year lifetime

most tax credits will never be used
More Than Half of Tax Credits Will Expire Unused

Table 2.4
Ability to Claim Tax Credit Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Awards</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>$4.9</td>
<td>$2.6</td>
<td>$2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Able to Use Same Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>$1.1</td>
<td>$1.0</td>
<td>$0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Able to Use in 2-4 Years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>$0.5</td>
<td>$0.4</td>
<td>$0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>More Than 4 Years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>$3.4</td>
<td>$1.3</td>
<td>$0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Dollars in millions.
Source: Pennsylvania Department of Revenue.

Underutilized
495 independent craft brewers
511 total brewers

Large brewers investing far more than $200k each year

Very small start up brewers cannot generate enough malt beverage tax liability to use within window.
Recommendations

Limit tax credit to small and very small brewers using annual production
- Clear windfall to large brewers | does not impact location/expansion decisions
- Should it be tied to qualifying investment (which is “lumpy”)?
- What is best method to improve cash flow for start-up firms?

Base tax credit on something other than malt beverage excise tax
- Insufficient tax liability to provide a meaningful subsidy
- 1,000 barrels @ $2.48 = $2,480 tax credit

Limit consecutive number of years that can be claimed
- Should not be an on-going subsidy
- Many small brewers continue to claim every year even though they cannot use it
Questions?

Presentation posted on the IFO website

http://www.ifo.state.pa.us

Follow the IFO on Twitter

@ind_fisc_office
Study on Effectiveness of Vermont Incentive Programs in Attracting New Workers

Presented by:
Deanna Kimball
PFM Group Consulting LLC

November 3, 2022
### Vermont’s Worker-Focused Incentive Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Established</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>Awards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Remote Worker Grant Program</strong></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Remote workers</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>Up to $10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Worker Relocation Incentive Program</strong></td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Relocating workers</td>
<td>$670,000</td>
<td>Base up to $5,000; enhanced up to $7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Relocating Employee Incentive Program</strong></td>
<td>2021</td>
<td>Remote and relocating workers</td>
<td>$480,000; $130,000 for remote</td>
<td>Base up to $5,000; enhanced up to $7,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation Criteria

Structural Effectiveness

- Are particular incentive structures more likely to influence decisions to relocate? If so, which are most cost effective?
- Can programs be better structured to incentivize relocating individuals to move to economically disadvantaged parts of the state?
- Should certain compensable expenses be reimbursable to the state? Should grants be contingent upon a particular duration of residence?

Fiscal & Economic Impacts

- Were recipients’ decisions to move to Vermont materially influenced or caused by the grant programs?
- Does credible evidence exist regarding benefits of similar programs in other jurisdictions?
- What is the scope of net gains to the Vermont economy?
- What is the ROI to the state, whether through direct tax payments or other indirect financial benefits?
Key Study Activities

Assessment of Incentive Effectiveness

- Survey of Grant Recipients
- Benchmarking Analysis
- Subject Matter Expert & Stakeholder Interviews
- Economic & Fiscal Impact Analysis
Incentive Structure: Findings and Recommendations

Are particular incentive structures more likely to influence decisions to relocate? If so, which are most cost effective?

• Incentives are most effective when part of holistic economic development strategies that take multiple factors into account and work with other initiatives to address them.

Can programs be better structured to incentivize relocating individuals to move to economically disadvantaged parts of the state?

• An incentive may be more successful if structured to work in concert with other efforts to address challenges associated with living and working in economically disadvantaged areas.

Should certain compensable expenses be reimbursable to the state? Should grants be contingent upon a particular duration of residence?

• The effort/resources required to enforce reimbursement of certain expenses would likely not be worthwhile, given the overall size of the programs.
• It is common to place contingencies upon duration of residence – but this, too, comes with administrative costs.
Estimating the “Material Influence” of Incentives

- Incentives are unlikely to be the sole factor in decisions to relocate.
- However, analysis suggests incentives were an important factor for a substantial share of grantees and may have been the tipping point for some workers considering multiple locations.

“Important” or “Very Important” Factors in Recipient Relocation Decisions
“Material Influence” and Estimated Impact on Outcomes

• IMPLAN was used to estimate the magnitude and distribution of economic impacts and to measure direct, indirect and induced effects.

• Because grants are targeted toward and paid directly to households, only the creation of new household income – and the impacts from spending this income – were considered in the economic impact analysis.

• It is not possible to definitively determine how influential programs are on individual relocation decisions – and survey findings were limited to being able to draw some inferences about the relative influence of the incentive and the impact on desired policy outcomes.

• Findings from the survey and stakeholder interviews related to level of incentive influence were used to adjust downward the economic and fiscal impact calculation estimates.

• Instead of assuming that all outcomes can or should be connected to the incentives, outcomes were adjusted to reflect the fact that incentives are not fully responsible for relocation decisions and therefore are not fully responsible for associated outcomes.
Estimating Fiscal and Economic Impacts

- Based on a **representative scenario** for estimating likely impacts, cumulative New Remote Worker Grant Program revenues exceed grant costs in Year 1, and cumulative New Worker Relocation Incentive Program revenues exceed grant costs by Year 2.

### New Remote Worker Grant Program

- **Budget:** $0.5 million
- **Permanent Employment Impact:** 65 jobs
- **Annual Economic Output:** $9.5 million
- **Annual State Tax Revenue:** $0.5 million

### New Worker Relocation Incentive Program

- **Budget:** $0.7 million
- **Permanent Employment Impact:** 49 jobs
- **Annual Economic Output:** $7.4 million
- **Annual State Tax Revenue:** $0.4 million
Key Takeaways for State and Local Governments

• The new “work from home environment” is here to stay – and the prevalence of worker-focused incentives is likely to continue growing.
• Analysis indicates that worker-focused incentive programs provide a strong return on investment for communities choosing to implement them.
• When considering worker-focused incentives:

  - Embrace what makes your community unique... but also strive to address the factors that may make relocation difficult
  - Market incentive as one tool among many in your economic development toolkit – and prioritize collaboration to maximize impact
  - To allow for meaningful evaluation later, clearly define the goals of your program from the start
  - Strive for consistency and simplicity in program design
New York City Independent Budget Office’s Evaluation: 
NYC Industrial Program

Elizabeth Brown

NCSL & Pew Charitable Trust’s 
Roundtable on Evaluating Economic Development Tax Incentives 
November 3, 2022
Local Law Requires IBO:

• Describe the tax expenditure and its goals.

• Evaluate: Is it effective? Is it meeting its goals?

• Is it still relevant? Align with current policy goals?

• Recommendations for future evaluation, including whether alternative methods of data collection would allow for better analysis.
Industrial Program Overview

• Tax incentives to lower the cost of constructing, renovating and owning industrial facilities.

• To preserve and promote the industrial sector in order to create living wage jobs
  • Diversify the city economy and support advanced manufactures

• Cost $31.5 million in fiscal year 2019.

• 200 projects benefitting in fiscal year 2019.
How it Works

• Discretionary
  • Eligibility criteria
  • Board considers: Inducement + capital investment + job goal + cost-benefit analysis

• Program Benefits…
  • Sales tax exemption on construction materials (1-2 years)
  • Waiver of mortgage recording tax (largely one-time)
  • Property tax savings through discounted payments in lieu of tax (25 years)

• …With strings
  • Recapture – first 10 years of benefit
  • Compliance and reporting
DATA AND METHODOLOGY
Data & Methodology

• Sources: IDA, Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages (2000-2018), NYC Finance Department

• Is the program advancing job opportunities\creating living wage jobs? In what sectors?
  • Match recipients with QCEW
  • Track employment and wages in project firms before and after receiving benefit.
    • Compare with stated employment goals at application

  • Compare with program beneficiaries industry trends
    • Rejected applications does not work
    • Propensity score matching – not enough data + application process
    • Comparison to similar firms – no longitudinal QCEW database

• At what cost to the city?
Methodology for Matching Project with Employment Data

• Matched project firms with QCEW by FEIN
  • This includes 81 projects for which IBO found alternative/additional FEINs

• Matched by BBL for developer firms to identify tenant employment.

• Of the 345 projects supplied by the IDA:
  • 320 (including firms with multiple projects) could be matched by FEIN with the QCEW data.
    • This means at least some employment data was found between 2000-2018

  • 25 projects could not be matched in any year in the QCEW data.
    • 11 were development deals. OK because will match by location.
    • Of the remaining 14, two were closed in 2018 and 2019 may not have employment data yet and one project likely never had any employment.
Program Participation
Fewer Projects Entering Program in Recent Years
200 Projects Receiving Benefits in 2019
Evaluation Findings
Most Firms Small, Already Doing Business in NYC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size at Project Start</th>
<th>Average # Employees</th>
<th>Median # Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Projects</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm Size at Project Start</th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
<th>Share of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 20 Employees</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 99 Employees</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 to 499 Employees</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 or More Employees</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Most Firms Expanding Before Benefit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Annual Employment Change 3 Years Before Assistance</th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
<th>Share of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expanding (&gt;3% growth)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable (-3% loss to 3% growth)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting (&lt;-3% loss or more)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>145</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Just Over Half of Projects Expanded Post-Assistance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Change Project Start to 3 Years After Completion</th>
<th># Projects</th>
<th>% Projects</th>
<th>Average Jobs +/-</th>
<th>Median Jobs +/-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expanded (&gt;3% growth)</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable (-3% loss to 3% growth)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted (&lt;-3% loss or more)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>-34</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>128</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
About 1/3 Met Goal After Three Years Complete

- Average 3-year job creation goal at application is 22 jobs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Share Met or Exceeded Goal</th>
<th>Three Years After Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Wholesale Trade Firms, Greatest Share Expanding

- Manufacturing: Expanding (>3% growth)
- Wholesale Trade: Stable (-3% loss to 3% growth)
- Other: Contracting (<-3% loss or more)
- Construction: Expanding (>3% growth)
- Transportation and Warehousing: Stable (-3% loss to 3% growth)
- Retail Trade: Expanding (>3% growth)
Citywide Manufacturing and Wholesale Trade Employment Contract During Study Period

![Graph showing the number of jobs in Citywide Manufacturing and Wholesale Trade from 2000 to 2018. The graph indicates a decline in manufacturing jobs and a relatively stable number of wholesale trade jobs.]
Average Wage for Project Firms After Assistance
Within Sectors, Average Project Wage Often Lower than Sector Average
Program Cost
Property Tax Greatest Share of Expenditure

NOTES: DOF records were missing about 20 percent of the PILOT amount data each year for 2000 to 2005. Therefore, property tax savings in those years are understated. Totals are net estimated ICIP benefit if applicable.
Conclusions
Summary of Evaluation Findings

• Is program meeting its goal to create living wage jobs in New York City?
  • 54 percent of firms expanded three years after completion compared to project start. Another 9 percent stable.
  • Main sectors served by program contracting during the study period.
  • Most participants expanding *before* assistance.
  • Average wage of project firms can be lower than sector average, but still a living/”good” wage.

• Is it helping to diversify the city economy and preserve industrial space?
  • Fewer firms participating in more recent years.