

Issue Brief for Congress

Received through the CRS Web

Economic Development Administration: Overview and Issues

Updated December 16, 2002

Bruce K. Mulock
Government and Finance Division

CONTENTS

SUMMARY

MOST RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

EDA's Creation and History

- EDA's Creation

- EDA's History

Agency Structure

Major EDA Programs

Brownfield-Related Activities

Difficulties in Measuring Performance: Does EDA Work?

- GAO Report: Results Are Hard to Prove

- Rutgers Study: EDA Program Said to Produce Positive Results, But Questions Remain

105th Congress: Major Reauthorization

Activity in the 107th Congress

- Appropriations for FY2002

- Appropriations for FY2003

- EDA and the Terrorist Attacks

CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS, REPORTS, AND DOCUMENTS

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

Economic Development Administration: Overview and Issues

SUMMARY

The Economic Development Administration (EDA), targeted for elimination or major “reinvention” early in the 104th Congress, gained a new lease on life in the waning days of the 105th. Having been kept alive via appropriations bills since its last authorizing legislation expired in 1982, the EDA was reauthorized for 5 years by P.L. 105-393.

While EDA’s organizational structure, strategies, and programs have undergone substantial changes during its 37-year history, its overall mission remains much the same as originally envisioned: to provide grants for infrastructure development, business incentives, and other forms of assistance to help communities alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in economically distressed areas and regions.

EDA has been roundly criticized during much of its existence for investing public money in “questionable” projects. Despite continuing opposition from small-government and tax-reduction groups, this small agency — by Washington’s standards — appears to have changed its image in the past few years. Although critics remain, EDA convinced a growing number of Members and observers that it has rectified a number of shortcomings and is effectively serving an important economic development role.

The Economic Development Administration and Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1998 (P.L. 105-393) included a number of important provisions, and it endorsed numerous administrative reforms undertaken by

EDA, such as efforts to target assistance to the most distressed areas and encourage greater regional cooperation in economic development.

On the appropriations front, EDA has experienced a tumultuous appropriations history over the past decade. Last year was typical. For FY2002, the Administration requested a substantial reduction (\$76 million, or 17%) in EDA’s overall funding. The House set funding for FY2002 at the Administration’s requested level, i.e., \$30.6 million for Salaries and Expenses (S&E) and \$335 million for Economic Development Assistance Programs (EDAP), for a total EDA appropriation of \$365.6 million. The Senate Appropriations Committee recommended slightly more — \$371.6 million. The conference agreement provided \$30.6 million for S&E and \$335 million for EDAP, for a total FY2002 appropriation of \$365.6 million.

For FY2003, the Administration is requesting total appropriation of \$349.9 million for EDA. More specifically, it is requesting \$317.2 million for EDAP, which represents a net \$17.8 million decrease from FY2002. Meanwhile, in the absence of an enacted appropriation, EDA programs are operating at FY2002 levels under a Continuing Appropriation (H.J.Res. 124) that funds federal agencies through January 11, 2003.

In light of the September 11th terrorist attack on New York City, it is worth noting that the EDA has provided grants and other assistance to the stricken area.



MOST RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

For FY2003, the Administration is requesting a total appropriation of \$349.9 million for EDA, a reduction of \$15.7 million or 4.3% from FY2002. More specifically, it is requesting \$317.2 million for Economic Development Assistance Programs (EDAP), which represents a net \$17.8 million decrease from FY2002. Program decreases are requested for: Public Works, \$17.9 million; Planning, \$1.7 million; and Technical Assistance, \$.665 million. Additional funding in the amount of \$2.5 million is requested for the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program (TAA). The request of \$32.7 million for Salaries & Expenses (S&E) represents a \$2.1 million increase over the FY2002 appropriation.

Appropriation Committee hearings were held throughout February, March and April. The Senate Appropriations Committee reported out its CJS appropriations bill (S. 2778; S.Rept. 107-218) on July 24, 2002. For FY2003, the Senate bill recommended \$366.2 million for EDA, \$335 million for EDAP, and \$31.2 million for S&E. Meanwhile, in the absence of an enacted appropriation, EDA programs are operating at FY2002 levels under a Continuing Appropriation (H.J.Res. 124) that funds federal agencies through January 11, 2003.

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

Following a review of EDA's creation, history, and performance, this issue brief provides an overview of the agency's major programs, examines its structure and budget, summarizes the important legislative changes fashioned by the 105th Congress, provides an appropriations history for the 106th Congress, and discusses prospects for the 107th Congress.

EDA's Creation and History

EDA's Creation

Often referred to as a prime example of one of President Lyndon Johnson's Great Society programs, the Economic Development Administration (EDA) — an agency within the Department of Commerce — was created by the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (PWEDA). The Act (P.L. 89-136), had three antecedents worth noting.

First, and foremost, there was a sustained effort by Senator Paul H. Douglas (a former economics professor) and others for special federal aid to economically depressed areas, which reached fruition in 1961. Congress, with the endorsement of the Kennedy Administration, enacted the Area Redevelopment Act (ARA), authorizing \$394 million over the 4-year period 1961-65 for federal aid to areas suffering chronic unemployment. The emphasis in the program was on assisting depressed communities with economic projects having long-term growth potential that would help combat unemployment.

Second, in 1962, Congress authorized \$900 million for the Accelerated Public Works program. The emphasis was on creating jobs through federal public works spending aid to combat the effects of the 1960-61 recession in areas continuing to experience relatively high unemployment. The program was criticized by many as a pump-priming measure that was slow to start and that yielded relatively few benefits for the cost involved.

The third antecedent of the PWEDA was the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC). The Appalachia-aid bill (P.L. 89-4), passed in March 1965, authorized \$1.1 billion for aid to the depressed 12-state Appalachian region. The bill stressed a regional approach to economic development and provided federal aid for construction of “infrastructure” (roads, health facilities, related basic public facilities) needed as the basis for economic growth.

During the debate on the ARC, some Members of Congress made it clear that they wanted for their own districts the same type of program as was being approved for Appalachia. By the end of August 1965, PWEDA was signed into law.

The Act provided \$3.25 billion over the 5 fiscal years 1966-70 for grants and loans for public works, development and technical assistance, and other projects to stimulate long-term and lasting economic growth in areas suffering chronic unemployment. PWEDA relied on three basic approaches:

- ! Encourage economically depressed communities to draft and carry out economic development plans that would help them produce healthy rates of economic growth. Wherever possible, such plans were to be on a regional or multi-county basis.
- ! Assist depressed communities to finance construction of the basic public facilities (such as harbors, sewage plants, access roads, industrial parks) that would make the community attractive to private investment.
- ! Provide special financial aid to private firms to encourage them to build plants and businesses in depressed areas.

EDA’s History

Over the past 3 decades, two different sources have given rise to a series of legislative battles over EDA: efforts by Republican Presidents to abolish the agency and its programs, and by congressional Democrats to make it a vehicle for broader anti-recession programs.

Twice during the Nixon Administration, Congress passed legislation to transform the EDA program into a counter-cyclical program to combat joblessness. President Nixon successfully vetoed the bills. Then, in 1973, President Nixon sought to abolish EDA, proposing that its functions be distributed to other agencies. Congress did not go along with the idea, however, and continued reauthorizing the agency.

In 1976 and 1977, Congress approved the Local Public Works program, which received a total of \$6 billion for counter-cyclical public works projects to be spent by EDA. The first year, the aid was approved over a veto by President Ford; the second year, it was approved

with President Carter's support. Carter later sought to expand EDA's lending power as part of his urban policy. The proposal died in Congress following the election of Ronald Reagan.

Following a period of rejuvenation and increased funding during President Carter's term, both the Reagan and Bush Administrations proposed abolishing the agency, arguing that it was limited in scope, its initiatives — if justified — should be funded by state or local governments, and its financial assistance too often based on political clout rather than on need. EDA's choice of projects seemed to sometimes be at odds with its stated goals of helping distressed areas. As recently as 1994, it awarded a \$500,000 grant to Wofford College in Spartanburg, SC, for an athletic stadium that was used for training by the Carolina Panthers football team.

Prior to enactment of the Economic Development Administration and Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1998, the EDA's programs had last been authorized by Congress in 1980: that authorization expired at the end of FY1982. Both the Reagan and the Bush Administrations proposed abolishing the agency, arguing that it was limited in scope and that its initiatives should be funded by state or local governments, but Congress kept EDA alive through appropriations bills. The Clinton Administration, in contrast, sought to revitalize the agency.

Since 1965, according to EDA, the agency has funded more than 43,000 projects, investing over \$17 billion in more than 8,000 communities. It is estimated that EDA assistance has helped create 4,340,000 jobs, and leveraged more than \$130 billion in private-sector investment.¹

Agency Structure

The EDA, an agency within the Department of Commerce, is headed by the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Economic Development. The agency has six regional directors who are responsible for coordinating with local communities about economic planning and development. EDA has economic development representatives, primarily located away from the regional offices, who are responsible for providing information about the agency's programs and activities. They also assist prospective grantees and borrowers in preparing applications for financial, planning, and technical assistance.

Major EDA Programs

EDA administers programs and provides grants for infrastructure development, business incentives, and other forms of assistance designed to help communities alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment in economically distressed areas and regions. The agency provides assistance to local and state governments as well as to businesses. Major EDA programs include:

¹ U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Economic Development Administration, *Economic Development in the 21st Century: FY2001 Congressional Request*.

Public Works — The Public Works and Economic Development program has traditionally been EDA's largest program. Grants are provided to help distressed communities attract new industry, encourage business expansion, diversify local economies, and generate long-term private jobs. Among the types of projects funded are water and sewer facilities primarily serving industry and commerce; access roads to industrial parks or sites; port improvements; and business incubator facilities. For FY2002, the Administration requested and the conference agreement provided \$250 million, a program reduction of more than \$36 million from FY2001. For FY2003, the Administration is requesting \$232 million, a decrease of nearly \$18 million. The Senate Appropriations Committee recommended \$250 million.

Economic Adjustment — The Economic Adjustment Assistance program assists states and local areas design and implement strategies for facilitating adjustment to changes in their economic situation that cause or threaten to cause serious structural damage to the underlying economic base. Such changes may occur suddenly (Sudden and Severe Economic Dislocation) or over time (Long-Term Economic Deterioration), and result from industrial or corporate restructuring, new federal laws or requirements, reductions in defense expenditures, depletion of natural resources, or natural disasters. The Economic Adjustment Program receives annual appropriations for its Regular Economic Adjustment Programs and Defense Adjustment activities. The funding level requested by the Administration and provided in the conference agreement was \$40.9 million for FY2002. The Administration's request for FY2003 remains unchanged at \$40.9 million. The Senate Appropriations Committee recommended \$40.9 million.

Defense Economic Adjustment — For Defense Economic Adjustment activities (sometimes referred to as Defense Conversion), the agency received \$77.3 million for FY2000. EDA requested and received \$31.5 million for FY2001. This decrease, according to EDA, reflected the continued phase down of defense adjustment activity, particularly base closures. Funding for this program was neither requested by the Administration nor provided in the conference agreement for FY2002. According to the EDA's FY2002 budget submission, the proposed elimination of funding for Defense Adjustment was consistent with the continued phase down of defense adjustment activity, particularly base closures. For FY2003, the Administration is again requesting no funding for this program.

Planning — The Planning Program for Economic Development Districts, Indian Tribes, and Redevelopment Areas provides grants to support the formulation and implementation of economic development programs designed to create or retain full-time permanent jobs and income for the unemployed and underemployed in areas of economic distress. The program supports 320 Economic Development Districts (EDD) and 65 Indian tribes or representative organizations that focus on long-term economic challenges. EDDs are the coordinating entities for a number of other federal and state programs. EDA's Planning, Technical Assistance and Research and Demonstration programs are designed to build the local capacity for comprehensive and collaborative economic development activities. The request for FY2002 was \$24 million. This was the amount provided in the conference agreement. The request for FY2003 is slightly lower, at \$22.3 million. The Senate Appropriations Committee recommended \$24 million.

Revolving Loan Fund (RLF) — The RLF program is designed to assist areas to overcome specific capital market gaps and to encourage greater private sector participation

in economic development. In concert with private lenders, RLF grantees make fixed asset and/or working capital loans to area businesses. Since the program's inception in 1976, the agency has provided initial capital for more than 480 local RLFs. These locally administered funds have made more than 7,200 loans to private businesses and have leveraged over \$1.9 billion in private capital, according to EDA. Upon repayment, principal and interest stay in the community for re-lending and further economic development activity.

Research and Evaluation — Under the Research and Evaluation program, grants and cooperative agreements are awarded (1) to undertake studies that will increase knowledge about emerging economic development issues, the causes of economic distress, and ways to alleviate barriers to economic development; and (2) to measure the performance and effectiveness of economic development programs. For FY2002 the funding level requested and received for the program was \$500,000. The Administration is again seeking \$500,000 for the program for FY2003.

Technical Assistance — Grants awarded under the Local Technical Assistance Program are designed to assist in solving specific economic development problems, respond to developmental opportunities, and build and expand local organizational capacity in distressed areas. The majority of local technical assistance projects focus on technical or market feasibility studies of economic development projects or programs. For FY2002, the conference agreement provided an appropriation of \$9.1 million, the same level as requested by the Administration. For FY2003, the request is for a slightly smaller amount: \$8.4 million. The Senate Appropriations Committee recommended \$9.1 million.

Trade Adjustment Assistance — EDA funds a network of twelve Trade Adjustment Assistance Centers (TAAC) through cooperative agreements. TAACs aid firms in applying for benefits under Chapter 3 of Title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended. Firms affected by import competition may petition for certification of impact. If a firm submits a petition and is certified it may apply for technical assistance in diagnosing its problems and assessing its opportunities. TAAC then helps the firm develop and adjustment proposal which outlines the firm's recovery strategy and any need for implementation technical assistance. The FY2000 appropriation for the program was \$10.5 million. This was the same amount requested by EDA for FY2001, and identical to the amount provided by H.R. 4690. The Senate Appropriations Committee recommended \$24 million for trade adjustment assistance. P.L. 106-553 provided \$10.5 million for FY2001. The agency requested \$10.5 million for FY2002; this was the amount provided in the conference agreement. For FY2003, the Administration has requested \$13 million, an increase of \$2.5 million from the current level. The Senate Appropriations Committee recommended \$10.5 million.

Disaster Mitigation and Economic Recovery — EDA provides post-disaster economic assistance for communities affected by declared natural disasters. The agency's assistance is separate from, yet intended to be a complement to, the disaster relief efforts of Federal Emergency Management Agency and other agencies. The Economic Development Administration (EDA) and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) have forged a partnership to coordinate hazard mitigation programs and disaster preparedness activities designed to help communities become more resistant to natural disasters.

Brownfield-Related Activities²

EDA has a longstanding role in supporting the economic redevelopment of abandoned, idled, and contaminated industrial and commercial sites. It has a substantial history of supporting the Brownfields Initiative of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). Indeed, EDA was the first federal agency to enter into a partnership agreement with EPA—signing a memorandum of understanding (MOU) in 1995. Last year EDA invested \$55 million in 58 brownfield projects; since 1997, it has invested over a quarter of a billion dollars in more than 250 brownfield redevelopment projects.

EDA's various economic development program tools have assisted local governments, nonprofit organizations, and regional Economic Development Districts in overcoming their brownfields revitalization challenges. Under existing statutory authority, EDA provides assistance to brownfields-impacted communities designed to achieve long-term economic revitalization. In assisting with brownfields redevelopment activities, EDA has used a variety of different program tools to address various phases of brownfields redevelopment, including:

- ! Providing targeted planning and technical assistance investments to support market feasibility studies and geographic information system (GIS) inventories of brownfields;
- ! Assisting communities with infrastructure investments to rehabilitate land and building and attract private capital investment that, in turn, creates jobs; and
- ! Making investments to capitalize local revolving loan funds used to provide gap financing in support of local business development.

Difficulties in Measuring Performance: Does EDA Work?

EDA has been working to support economic development and growth for more than 30 years. Through its various programs, the agency has attempted to achieve one principle goal: alleviate the conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions by providing assistance to local and state governments as well as to businesses. Has it worked? Are taxpayers getting their money's worth? Is it deserving of continued funding? Until recently, there did not appear to be any clear-cut answers to these questions. A May 1997 performance evaluation prepared for EDA by a research team headed by Rutgers University gave the agency's Public Works Program high marks.

² From testimony of David A. Sampson, Assistant Secretary for Economic Development, U.S. Department of Commerce, before the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works, March 6, 2002, available at [http://www.osec.doc.gov/eda/HTML/1a_1add_Mar2002PR.htm], visited July 12, 2002. For more information on brownfields, see CRS Issue Brief IB10078, *Superfund and Brownfields in the 107th Congress*, by Mark Reisch.

GAO Report: Results Are Hard to Prove

In 1996, responding to a congressional request, the General Accounting Office published a report (GAO/RCED-96-103, April 1996) about the impact of economic development assistance provided by EDA, the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) and the Appalachian Regional Commission (ARC), and on the “performance ratios” they calculate. Only the first issue is discussed here. Specifically, GAO was asked to review studies that evaluate the impact on economic development of these agencies’ programs.

GAO — despite reviewing the available literature, and requesting that the agencies provide any internal or external studies or other documentation — was unable to find any study that established a strong causal linkage between a positive economic effect and an agency’s economic development assistance.

As GAO made clear in its report, successfully completing studies of this nature would be difficult.

A persuasive study of a program’s impact would require three elements. First, it would have to document that there had been some improvement in the targeted area. Second, it would have to link specific elements in the program to the economic changes. Finally, it would have to measure the growth stemming from other influences on the region’s economy in order to isolate the impact that could be attributed to the economic development program.

Thus, the absence of studies documenting the effectiveness of EDA’s programs does not mean they do not work or are not effective. The lack of evidence, however, underscores an important point to keep in mind regarding virtually all economic development efforts: It is difficult to know what works.

Rutgers Study: EDA Program Said to Produce Positive Results, But Questions Remain

With a grant provided by EDA, a research team led by Rutgers University (prime contractor) evaluated 205 EDA Public Works Program projects that received their last payment in FY1990. Thus, at the time of the research — 6 years later — the projects had been sufficiently established to make their evaluation possible. The evaluation was undertaken using performance measures developed by EDA specifically to evaluate these types of projects. Performance measures primarily involved numbers of various types of jobs created or retained and amounts of private- and public-sector funds leveraged.

The report showed that EDA assistance helped distressed communities create jobs (at a cost of \$3,058 per job), expanded the local tax base (an increase of \$10 for every \$1 of EDA investment), and leveraged private investment (\$10 for every \$1 of EDA investment). Among the report’s major conclusions:

- ! Most of EDA’s public works projects achieved EDA’s objectives of providing communities with the necessary infrastructure to expand their economic base.

- ! Jobs and private investment have occurred in many areas that would not have experienced this without EDA presence.
- ! EDA public-sector economic stimuli create private-sector jobs at high levels of success and low levels of cost.
- ! EDA offices, as an instrument of government, and EDA field representatives who interact with grantees, are well-regarded by the constituencies.

The Rutgers study's estimated effects on growth and job creation are conceptually quite straightforward: it endeavors to examine the direct jobs created by the projects, and also attempts to measure any related businesses that are deemed to have developed. Thus, as noted above, the study satisfies the first of the three elements identified by GAO that are required for a persuasive study of a program's impact., i.e., it documents improvement in the targeted areas. However, the other two elements are absent. And, their absence would tend, other things equal, to overstate the effects of the EDA grants on the projects in question.

To restate and elaborate on the missing elements: First, no account can be taken of the growth that would otherwise have occurred because there is no way to observe what would have happened in an alternative world. Second, by and large the growth is likely to have been at the expense of growth in some other areas — quite likely, ones that are also poor and underdeveloped, and ones that are in near proximity. (It is not necessary to believe, as some do, that virtually all economic development is essentially a zero-sum game, to recognize that something akin to this phenomenon is generally occurring. Also, from a federal policy perspective, it is useful to note there are usually reasons why businesses do not choose to locate in particular places. Normally, one would think that location choices are the result of a reasonably efficient market allocation. To interfere with this allocation, it may be argued, is to obtain a suboptimal allocation of resources.

105th Congress: Major Reauthorization

The Economic Development Administration and Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1998 (S. 2364) passed the Senate by unanimous consent on October 12, 1998, and passed the House under suspension of the rules on October 13th. The Act, signed into law by President Clinton on November 13th, was the first major rewrite of the authorization statutes for the EDA and for the ARC since the 1970s. The following is a summary of the major changes made by the 1998 reauthorization legislation to existing law and current practices:

- ! Establishes an economic development information clearinghouse on the economic development, economic adjustment, disaster, defense conversion and trade adjustment assistance activities of federal, state and local governments. The clearinghouse is also intended to help potential applicants identify potential resources and receive technical information on how to alleviate unemployment.
- ! Consolidates nine separate criteria for public works and economic adjustment grants into three basic distress factors — high unemployment, low income and special need
- ! Limits EDA's share of all grants to 50% (with supplements that may bring the federal share to 80%), with recipients allowed to use cash and in-kind

contributions to reach the cost sharing requirements. (Previously, match rates varied by program. The committees argued that this change was made to reflect the importance of local participation and investment in economic development activities.) Grant recipients are also required to submit regular evaluation reports on all projects for up to 10 years.

- ! Continues previous legislative language that requires approved projects to be part of an overall investment strategy. The new term “comprehensive economic development strategy” serves the purpose of an “overall economic development program” or an “economic adjustment plan” in the Public Works and Economic Development Act. The agency may accept comprehensive plans developed under another federally supported program.
- ! Requires EDA to conduct regular performance evaluations of university centers and economic development districts. University centers will be evaluated to determine which are performing well and deserve continued assistance whereas the district evaluation will focus on management standards, financial accountability and program performance.
- ! Incorporates language regularly used in the agency’s annual appropriations which allows the agency to fund projects on a military or Department of Energy (DOE) installation even if the applicant does not have title to the property or a leasehold interest in the property.
- ! Authorizes appropriation for defense conversion and disaster economic recovery activities including pilot projects for privatization and economic development activities for closed or realigned military or DOE installations. The bill allows the federal share of disaster activities to be up to 100%.

Activity in the 107th Congress

Appropriations for FY2002

For FY2002, the Administration requested a substantial reduction in EDA’s overall funding. While the request included a small increase for S&E, it called for significant reductions in EDAP. Specifically, EDA’s request of \$335 million for EDAP represented a \$76 million decrease from the FY2001 EDAP adjusted appropriation of \$411 million. The agency did *not* request any funding for the Defense Economic Adjustment program, which received \$31.4 million in FY2001. The proposed elimination of funding for this program was consistent with the continued phase-down of defense adjustment activity, particularly base closures, according to EDA’s budget submission. The requested funding level for the Public Works Program was \$250 million, which represented a program reduction of \$36 million from the FY2001 appropriation. The amount requested for the Economic Adjustment Program was \$40.9 million, or \$8.6 million less than it received in FY2001.

The agency’s FY2002 request for funding its other programs reflected only minor changes. EDA requested \$24 million for Planning, \$9.1 million for Technical Assistance, \$500,000 for Research and Evaluation, and \$10.5 million for Trade Adjustment Assistance.

On June 27, 2001, the House CJS Subcommittee marked up and passed by voice vote its CJS appropriation (H.R. 2500), which mirrored the Administration’s request, i.e., \$30.6

million for S&E and \$335 million for EDAP, for a total EDA appropriation of \$365.6 million. The full House Appropriations Committee agreed with the subcommittee's totals and passed the bill on July 10, 2001. The Senate Appropriations Committee recommended slightly more — \$371.6 million.³

Prior to the release of the Administration's FY2002 budget proposal, which reduced funding for EDA, the Council for Urban Economic Development (CUED) and associated national and regional economic development organizations called for an increased appropriation, noting "EDA remains the main (federal) agency devoted to enabling local economic development and has a proven ability to leverage private investment to meet development goals."⁴

CUED praised the agency, stating "EDA has proven to be an effective agency with its impact limited predominately by underfunding," and further noting:⁵

EDA is the main discretionary source for infrastructure development and strategic planning for economic development purposes, and leads other federal agencies in its adherence to the Government Performance Review Act, regulatory reform and leveraging of private sector dollars. EDA funds also have been an important source of local creativity, and the agency, through national technical assistance, has ensured that these innovations and best practices have been disseminated nationwide. The local reputation of regional EDA offices is one of flexibility and good government. As infrastructure remains a critical component of competitive places, a strong EDA is critical to the long-term strength of the U.S. economy.

The conference agreement, reached on November 9, 2001, provided \$30.6 million for S&E and \$335 million for EDAP, for a total FY2002 appropriation of \$365.6 million. The bill was signed into law (P.L. 107-77) on November 28.

Appropriations for FY2003

For FY2003, the Administration is requesting total appropriation of \$349.9 million for EDA. More specifically, it is requesting \$317.2 million for EDAP, which represents a net \$17.8 million decrease from FY2002. Program decreases are requested for: Public Works, \$17.9 million; Planning, \$1.7 million; and Technical Assistance, \$.665 million. Additional funding in the amount of \$2.5 million is requested for the Trade Adjustment Assistance Program (TAA). The request of \$32.7 million for S&E represents a \$2.1 million increase over the FY2002 appropriation. According to the agency's FY2003 congressional request, the S&E increase reflects only adjustment to base increases that included the full cost of the Administration's pension and health benefits proposal.

³ The Senate Appropriations Committee also recommended \$30.6 million for S&E, but recommended \$341 million for EDAP, \$6 million above both the budget request and the House recommendation.

⁴ National Council on Economic Development, *Partnership for Prosperity: A Federal Economic Development Agenda*, February 2001, p. 18.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 17.

The Senate Appropriations Committee reported out its CJS appropriations bill (S. 2778; S.Rept. 107-218) on July 24, 2002. The Committee recommended a total FY2003 appropriation of \$366.2 million, including an appropriation of \$335 million for EDAP. The recommendation was \$17.8 million above the Administration's request and was identical to the FY2002 funding level. More specifically, the Committee recommendation provided funding of \$250 million for public works grants (Title I), \$24 million for planning assistance, \$10.5 million for trade adjustment assistance, \$40.9 million for economic adjustment grants (Title IX), and \$9.1 million for technical assistance.

Meanwhile, in the absence of an enacted appropriation, EDA programs are operating at FY2002 levels under a Continuing Appropriation (H.J.Res. 124) that funds federal agencies through January 11, 2003.

EDA and the Terrorist Attacks

The Economic Development Administration will most certainly have a role to play in the recovery and rebuilding of the World Trade Center site devastated by the September 11th terrorist attacks. Under existing statutory authority, EDA administers disaster program funds through targeted grants to disaster-impacted communities designed to achieve long-term economic recovery.

It appears that several EDA programs fall within the funding purposes enumerated in the emergency supplemental appropriations bill (H.R. 2888) passed by Congress in response to the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. And it appears likely that additional funding will be made available as recovery plans are developed and refined. What exact role EDA will play, however, is currently under active consideration by the Administration and Congress.

In the past, the agency has contributed to disaster response efforts, and it has the statutory authority to assist communities in long-term economic recovery efforts. EDA has participated in over 20 major disaster adjustment efforts since Hurricane Camille in 1969, and has received in excess of \$600 million in supplemental appropriations to deal with disasters since 1992.

Some guidance regarding EDA's role in the economic revitalization of New York City was provided by the recent testimony of David A. Sampson, Assistant Secretary of Economic Development for the Department of Commerce. The following are excerpts of his testimony on November 1, 2001, before the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works:

- ! Under existing statutory authority, EDA administers disaster program funds through targeted grants to disaster-impacted communities designed to achieve long-term economic recovery.
- ! When asked to participate with disaster recovery, EDA has a comprehensive and flexible set of program tools, including: (1) targeted economic recovery planning and technical assistance; (2) revolving loan fund grants to address unmet business financing needs where other financing is insufficient or not available; and (3) infrastructure construction grants to rebuild an environment attractive to private investment for the re-creation of job opportunities.

- ! While [the agency's] program tools are flexible, EDA has a clearly defined target group of those eligible to receive EDA investment dollars. Those eligible include state and local governments, public and private nonprofit organizations, and regional economic development districts. Businesses are not eligible for direct assistance under EDA's major programs.
- ! Were EDA to be assigned a responsibility for a portion of New York economic revitalization and recovery efforts, [the agency] would, as [it] has in past disasters, assemble a special disaster response team comprised of existing headquarters personnel as well as existing personnel from the six regional economic development offices around the country.

CONGRESSIONAL HEARINGS, REPORTS, AND DOCUMENTS

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Appropriations. Subcommittee on the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and Related Agencies. Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary and Related Agencies Appropriations for FY2000. Part 1: Justification of the Budget Estimates. Hearings, 106th Congress, 1st session. Economic Development Administration (p. 75-159). Washington, U. S Govt. Print. Off., 1999. 1878 pp.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Economic Development Partnership Act of 1998. Report to Accompany H.R. 4275. H.Rept. 105-684, Part 1, 105th Congress, 2nd session. August 6, 1998. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1998. 128 pp.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. Subcommittee on Public Building and Economic Development. Reauthorization of the Economic Development Administration and the Appalachian Regional Commission. Hearings, 105th Congress, 1st session. July 10 and 17, 1997. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1998. 258 pp.

U.S. General Accounting Office. Economic Development: Limited Information Exists on the Impact of Assistance Provided by Three Agencies. April 1996. GAO/RCED-96-103 [Washington]. 32 pp.

U.S. General Accounting Office. Economic Development: Multiple Federal Programs Fund Similar Economic Development Activities. September 2000. GAO/RCED/GGD-00-220 [Washington]. 79 pp.

FOR ADDITIONAL READING

A Path to Smarter Economic Development: Reassessing the Federal Role. National Academy of Public Administration, Washington, 1996. 70 p.

Chintz, Ben. *What Role for the Economic Development Administration in the New Economy?* Economic Development Quarterly, v. 9, no. 3, August 1995: 203-206.

Ellen, Ingrid Gould and Amy Ellen Schwartz. *Cautionary Notes for Competitive Cities*. The Brookings Review, v. 18, no. 3, Summer 2000: 44-47.

Hill, Edward W. *Principles for Rethinking the Federal Government's Role in Economic Development*. Economic Development Quarterly, v. 12, no. 4, November 1998: 299-312.

Ota, Alan K. *Assailed Development Agency Retains Enough Hill Support to Win a Five-Year Reprieve*. CQ Weekly, October 17, 1998. p. 2821.

The Effects of State and Local Public Policies on Economic Development. New England Economic Review, Federal Reserve Bank of Boston (whole issue) March/April 1997.

Thornburgh, Dick. *A Path to Smarter Federal Leadership in Economic Development: Learning, Leveraging, and Linking*. Economic Development Quarterly, v. 12, no. 4, November 1998: 291-298.

Wirtz, Ronald A. *Local Economic Development: A Recipe for Stone Soup*. Fedgazette, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, v. 12, no. 2, April 2000: 9-10.