Date of Hearing: April 29, 2009

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON JOBS, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND THE ECONOMY
V. Manuel Perez, Chair
AB 1139 (J. Pérez) – As Amended: April 13, 2009

SUBJECT: Enterprise Zone Hiring Credits

SUMMARY: Revises credit eligibility, calculation, redemption and reporting of the hiring credit, under the Personal Income Tax and the Corporate Tax, for businesses located in enterprise zones. Specifically, this bill:

1) Modifies the definition of "qualified wages" to mean:

   a) That portion of wages paid or incurred by the taxpayer during the taxable year to a qualified employee that does not exceed ___ percent of minimum wage; or

   b) That portion of wages paid or incurred during a taxable year to a qualified aircraft employee in the Long Beach Enterprise Zone that does not exceed 202% of minimum wage; or

   c) That portion of wages paid or incurred by the taxpayer during the taxable year that does not exceed ___ percent of the minimum wage for a qualified employee that works for a qualified employer for at least 35 hours a week, and for whom the taxpayer pays at least 80% of any of the following:

      i) Health care coverage that meets the minimum requirements set forth in Chapter 2.2 of Division 2 of the Health and Safety Code;

      ii) A group insurance policy, as defined, that covers hospital, surgical, and medical care expenses, provided that the out of pocket costs for enrollees of health care service plans providing benefits under a preferred provider organization policy;

      iii) Any Taft-Hartley health and welfare fund or any other lawful collective bargaining agreement that provides for health and welfare coverage for collective bargaining unit or other employees thereby covered;

      iv) Any employer-sponsored group health plan meeting the requirements of the federal Employee Income Security Act of 1974, provided it meets the benefits required under sub clause (I) or (II) of this clause;

      v) A multiple employer welfare agreement established, as specified, provided that its benefits have not changed after January 1, 2004, or that it meets the benefits required under sub clause (I) or (II) of this clause;

      vi) Coverage provided under the Public Employees' Medical and Hospital Care Act (Part 5 (commencing with Section 22850) of Division 5 of Title 2 of the Government Code), provided it meets the benefits required under sub clause (I) or (II) of this clause or is otherwise collectively bargained; (VII) Health coverage provided by the University of California to students of the University of California who are also employed by the University of California.

2) Provides that for the purposes of meeting the requirements of (b) (ii) above, a health care service plan does not include Medicare supplement, vision-only, dental-only, or specified disease insurance that pays benefits on a fixed benefit, cash-payment-only basis.

3) Requires applications for a hiring credit certification be submitted to the certifying agency within 21 days of the commencement of employment.

4) Deletes targeted employment areas as an eligible category for the issuance of hiring credits.

5) Provides annual reporting requirements on tax payers for each employee who has been certified as eligible for the hiring credit to include:

   a) The total wages or other compensation paid to the qualified employee.

   b) The total type of work performed by the qualified employee.

   c) The length of employment of the qualified employee.

   d) Any benefits provided by the tax payer to the qualified employee.

6) Authorizes a certifying agency to refuse to issue a certification for a subsequently hired employee is the tax payer has failed to report the specified information.

7) Delete the hiring credit eligibility reference to the now defunct Aid to Families with Dependent Children and replace it with the federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families.

8) Delete the hiring credit eligibility reference to the now defunct federal Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) to the Workforce Investment Act.

9) Delete the hiring credit eligibility reference to the now defunct Greater Avenues for Independence Act of 1985 and replace it with the federal California Work Opportunity and Responsibility to Kids Act.

10) Specifies that changes in this act become effective on January 1, 2010.

EXISTING LAW

1) Establishes the Enterprise Zone Program, administered by the Department of Housing and Community Development (HCD) to stimulate business and industrial growth and create jobs in depressed areas of the state. A maximum of 42 EZs are authorized at any one time. Designations are for a period of 15-years, HCD, however, is authorized to approve one five-year extension for EZs designated prior to January 1, 1990.

2) Requires applications in response to enterprise zone designation solicitations after January 1, 2007 be ranked based on their economic development strategy and implementation plan, including to the extent of the strategy: sets reasonable and measurable benchmarks, goals, and objectives; identifies local resources, incentives, and programs; provides for the attraction of private investment; includes regional and community-based partnerships; and addresses hiring and retention of unemployed or underemployed residents or low-income individuals. Further, EZ's designated prior to January 1, 2007, are required to update their goals and objectives through an amendment in their Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with HCD, as specified,

3) Requires EZs to biannually report to HCD on their progress in meeting the goals and objectives identified in their implementing MOU.

4) Authorizes an income tax credit for hiring certain "qualified employees." Qualified employees include only those individuals who meet all of the following:

   a) The employee provides service to an employer where at least 90% of those services within a taxable year are directly related to the conduct of a taxpayers business or trade located in an enterprise zone;

   b) The employee performs at least 50% of their service for the taxpayer during the taxable year in an enterprise zone; and

   c) The employee is hired after the date of the enterprise zone designation.

5) Provides that in addition to the requirements detailed in (5) above, a qualified employee is required to also meet one of over a dozen specific categories of individuals who immediately preceding employment were:

   a) Eligible for services under the federal JTPA, or its successor;

   b) Eligible to be a voluntary or mandatory registrant under GAIN, or its successor;

   c) An economically disadvantaged individual 14 years or older;

   d) A dislocated worker, as specified;

   e) A disabled individual who is eligible for, enrolled in, or has completed a state rehabilitation plan;

   f) A service-connected disabled veteran, veteran of Vietnam, or veteran who has been recently separated from military service;

   g) An ex-offender, as specified;

   h) Eligible to receive specified social services benefits, including Federal Supplemental Security Income benefits, Aid to Families with Dependent Children, food stamps, or state and local general assistance;

i) A member of a federally recognized Indian tribe, band, or other group of Native American descent;

j) A member of a targeted group, as defined by the Internal Revenue Service for the purposes of the Work Opportunity Tax Credit, which includes a qualified IV-A recipient, a qualified veteran, a qualified ex-felon, a high-risk youth, a vocational rehabilitation referral, a qualified summer youth employee, a qualified food stamp recipient, a qualified Supplemental Security Income recipient, or a long-term family assistance recipient; or,

k) A resident of a targeted employment area, as specified.

6) Requires "qualified employees" to be retained in employment for a minimum of 270 days in order to qualify for hiring credit vouchering. The value of the hiring credit incentive totals 50% of the employees' wages in the first year, 40% in the second, 30% in the third, 20% in the fourth, and 10% in the fifth year. Although employees can be paid more, the maximum wage rate used to calculate the credit is 150% of minimum wage. Aircraft manufacturers in Long Beach may calculate the credit based on 202% of minimum wage. The maximum value of the credit per employee is approximately $40,000 over five years. The hiring credit may only be applied to offset tax liability attributable to revenues received from activities located within the EZ where the employee is primarily working.

FISCAL EFFECT: Unknown

COMMENTS:

1) Author's intent: According to the author, AB 1139 seeks to enact meaningful reforms to California's enterprise zone program to ensure that California maximizes its investment in the program through incentivizing employers to provide quality employment in genuinely economically challenged areas. It is crucial for California during this current fiscal crisis to ensure that tax credit dollars are working to achieve our goals.

   Further, the author states, that while the enterprise zone program is intended to address the competitive disadvantages faced by businesses located in communities plagued by unemployment, crime, and poverty, the program's current statutory construct fails to benefit workers living in these same communities. Currently the program does nothing to incentivize employers to provide quality jobs to workers in need of tax revenue derived from income expenditure. In order for the program to work for employers and employees alike, it is imperative that the program be revamped to better ensure that employers benefiting from enterprise zone tax breaks provide quality jobs to their employees.

   In addition, the author states that, AB 1139 lifts the curtain on how the enterprise zone tax credits are being earned by employers by requiring that employers reaping the benefits of the tax credits provide data to certifying agencies which will then be reported to the Department of HCD so that such data may be annually reported to the Legislature. The author believes that current law does not impose any reporting requirements on employers estimated to garner approximately $500 million in tax benefits via the enterprise zone program per year.

   The author also states that, this revenue neutral bill will incentivize employers by rewarding employers with larger tax benefits for their full time benefited employees. Additionally the bill reduces (but does not eliminate) the tax benefit for part-time and non-benefited employees. reduces the time period for retro-vouchering and amends the Targeted Employment Area eligibility criterion.

2) Unclear policy change: Existing law specifies that the value of the hiring credit is to be based on the total amount of wages paid to employee. For a wage rate, statute limits the calculation to 150% of minimum wage, except for certain credits authorized in the Long Beach Enterprise Zone.

   AB 1139 proposes to modify the calculation of the hiring credit by deleting the current threshold of 150% of minimum. The bill would, instead, establish two new and yet to be identified percentage thresholds. Information in the author's statement indicates that the author's intent is to "increase the tax credit for employers of full time workers who provide health benefits to their employees and decrease the amount of the tax credit for part time and non-benefited employees."

   Without having more specific information, however, it is difficult to determine the potential impact of the proposed changes. As an example, the author may be intending to keep the lower threshold at or near the current level. In this case, the impact may be minimal. On the other hand, to the extent that the threshold is deeply reduced for workers with no or limited health care benefits, the reduced value of the credit could affect the financial viability of businesses currently using the program.

   Given the state's current unemployment rate of over 11%, with some enterprise zone areas having unemployment rates of over 20%, understanding the value of the wage rate differential could be the difference between encouraging a positive social good (quality jobs) and significantly eliminating the ability of a business to access the hiring credit and bring on another employee.

3) Revenue neutral: Questions have arisen as to whether this bill is revenue neutral. According to the bill's fiscal key the bill may be passed by a majority vote, which generally indicates that in the opinion of the Legislative Counsel, the impact of implementing the bill does not result in higher revenues being generated. However, in this case, the revenue estimate is unclear based on the remaining blank percentage wage rates. The sponsor has indicated that the author is awaiting a letter from the Franchise Tax Board before filling in the blanks in the bill.

4) Cost of health care: Health care costs have been rising for several decades. Expenditures in the U.S. on health care surpassed $2 trillion in 2006, almost three times the $714 billion spent in 1990, and over eight times the $253 billion spent in 1980. In 2006, U.S. health care spending was about $7,026 per resident and accounted for 16% of the nation's gross domestic product.

   Total health care expenditures grew at an annual rate of 6.7 percent in 2006, a slower rate than recent years, yet still outpacing inflation and the growth in national income. Although Americans clearly benefit from an increase the availability of health care, the recent rapid cost growth, coupled with an overall economic slowdown and rising federal deficit, is placing great strains on the nation's health care delivery systems, including private employer-sponsored health insurance coverage.

According to a Families USA study in 2008, California workers face some of the highest health care costs in the nation. Over the past eight years (2000 through 2007), family health insurance premiums rose five times more quickly than median earnings. In addition, the study found:

a) Health insurance premiums for California's working families skyrocketed over the last eight years, increasing by 95.8 percent from 2000 to 2007 while medium income rose by only 19.3%.

b) For family health coverage in California, the average annual premium (employer and worker share of premiums combined) rose from $6,227 to $12,194, an increase of $5,967.

c) For family health coverage in the state, the employer's portion of annual premiums rose from $4,683 to $8,938 (a difference of $4,256), while the worker's portion rose from $1,544 to $3,256 (a difference of $1,712).

In addition to higher premiums, working families faced higher out-of-pocket health care costs, such as deductibles, co-payments, and costs for services that were not covered by their insurance plans. As a result, health care costs are absorbing an ever-larger portion of family budgets.

AB 1139 proposes to use the enterprise zone hiring credit as a new incentive for encouraging businesses located in an enterprise zone to fund worker health care benefits. Proponents of the measure state that the current program does nothing to encourage quality jobs. Opponents of the bill question whether eliminating or significantly curtailing the use of hiring credits to businesses trying to provide jobs in lower income communities is an appropriate trade-off for a new health care tax credit.

5) California's EZ programs: Existing law authorizes the creation of up to 42 enterprise zones based on a statutory list of criteria related to poverty and economic dislocation. In addition to the Enterprise Zone Program, existing law also authorizes the establishment of two Manufacturing Enhancement Areas, one Targeted Tax Area, and eight Local Agency Military Base Recovery Areas. Collectively, these business incentive areas are referred to as geographically-targeted economic development areas (G-TEDA).

The G-TEDA programs are based on the economic principle that targeting significant incentives to lower income communities allows these communities to more effectively compete for new businesses and retain existing businesses, which results in increased tax revenues, less reliance on social services, and lower public safety costs. Residents and businesses also directly benefit from these more sustainable economic conditions through improved neighborhoods, business expansion, and job creation.

Under the G-TEDA programs, businesses and other entities located within the area are eligible for a variety of local and state incentives. Local government incentives can include writing down the costs of development, funding related infrastructure improvements, providing job training to prospective employees, or establishing streamlined processes for obtaining permits. The state also offers a number of incentives, including: tax credits, special tax provisions, priority notification in the sale of state surplus lands, access to certain Brownfield clean-up programs, and preferential treatment for state contracts.

Enterprise zones are located in portions of more than 54 Assembly Districts and more than 35 Senate Districts. Enterprise zones range in size from one square mile to 70 square miles and in geographic locations ranging from Eureka and Shasta Valley near the Oregon border to San Diego and Calexico along the Mexican border. Below is a chart comparing the state tax incentives offered to businesses located in a G-TEDA.

Comparison of State Tax Benefits by Targeted Area

	Hiring Credit	Longer NOL[1] Carry- Forward Period	Sales and Use Tax Credit	Accelerated Depreciation	Lender Interest Deduction
Enterprise Zone	X	X	X	X	X
Manufacturing Enhancement Zone	X				
Targeted Tax Area	X	X	X	X	
Local Agency Military Base Recovery Area	X	X	X	X	
Source: Legislative Analyst's Office					

By far, the largest G-TEDA business incentive is the income tax credit given for hiring certain targeted employment populations. According to the Franchise Tax Board (FTB), in 2006, businesses located within a G-TEDA claimed 4,851 credits worth over $230 million in hiring and sales and use tax credits. Of the 4,851 hiring and sales and use credits claimed by all taxpayers located in a G-TEDA, 4,440 were claimed by businesses located in an enterprise zone. Below is a chart summarizing total G-TEDA credits claimed in the 2004-2006 tax years.

Comparison of Total G-TEDA Credits Claimed in 2004 to 2006 Tax Years

	Number of Credits Claimed on Corporate Taxes	Value of Credits Claimed on Bank and Corporate Taxes (thousands)	Number of Credits Claimed on Personal Income Taxes	Value of Credits Claimed on Personal Income (thousands)
2004 Total G-TEDA Credits	3,256	$218,726	5,054	$130,080
2005 Total G-TEDA Credits	4,325	$216,416	8,270	$146,02443
2006 Total G-TEDA Credits	4,851	$230,751	9,973	$154,926
Source: Franchise Tax Board				

[1] NOL= Net Operating Loss

Below is a chart comparing the use of individual credits under each of the G-TEDA programs for the 2006 tax year.

Comparison of Individual G-TEDA Credits Claimed in 2006				
	Hiring Credit (millions)	Sales and Use Tax Credit (millions)	Business Expense Deduction (millions)	
			Amount of deduction	Estimated Tax Impact
Total EZ Credits	$ 177.4	$ 39.7	$ 4.5	$ 0.3
Total LAMBRA Credits	$0.7	$ 0.6	/a	/a
Total MEA Credits	/a	---	---	---
Total TTA Credits	$ 4.4	$0.2	/a	/a
Source: Estimated by Franchise Tax Board /a = less than $50,000 --- not applicable				

Based on an analysis of FTB data from the 2000 tax year, the LAO found that approximately 60% of the hiring credits are filed by small and medium-sized businesses – businesses with assets under $5 million. However, approximately 65% of the total value of the credits claimed are from businesses with assets over $1 billion. Similarly, approximately 50% of the total value of the credits claimed went to companies with receipts of over $1 billion.

6) G-TEDA Reforms in 2005: In the winter of 2005, the Assembly Committees on Revenue and Taxation, and Jobs, Economic Development, and the Economy (JEDE) held a series of hearings on the G-TEDA programs. A summary of these hearings, including background materials, is available on the JEDE Committee website at www.assembly.ca.gov.

During the course of these hearings, the Committees reviewed current and best practices related to designation, management and monitoring, and use of business incentives available through the G-TEDA programs. As a result of these hearings, JEDE developed a list of 47 recommendations on how to improve the overall G-TEDA programs and drafted AB 1550 (Arambula and Karnette), Chapter 718, Statutes of 2006. Key reforms in AB 1550 include:

a) Requiring EZ applications be ranked based on their economic development strategy and implementation plan, including to the extent the strategy does the following: sets reasonable and measurable benchmarks, goals, and objectives; identifies local resources, incentives, and programs; provides for the attraction of private investment; includes regional and community-based partnerships; and, addresses hiring and retention of unemployed or underemployed residents or low-income individuals.

b) Requiring G-TEDAs to biennially report to HCD on their progress in meeting the goals and objectives identified in their implementing MOU. G-TEDAs designated prior to January 1, 2007, are required to update their goals and objectives by April 15, 2008, and meet the annual reporting requirements by October 1, 2009.

c) Adding a new audit element that requires the review of an EZ's administrative support and whether financial commitments made in the G-TEDA application and MOU have been kept. The bill also made similar conforming changes in the MEA, TTA, and LAMBRA audit requirements.

7) Establishing employee eligibility: Existing law authorizes the establishment of a TEA as a means for encouraging businesses within an enterprise zone to hire new workers that live in and around the enterprise zone. TEAs are designated by the enterprise zone based on the most current U.S. Census data and can include areas both within and adjacent to the enterprise zone. None of the other categories of eligible employee provide a nexus to the community where the enterprise zone is located. It is estimated that between 80% and 90% of hiring credit vouchers use the TEA designation for qualifying employees.

The high usage of the TEA designation is related to a number of factors. One of the most significant advantages of the TEA over qualifying an employee under the other nine criteria is the employer's ability to easily access the appropriate documentation for submitting the voucher application. As an example, to demonstrate that an employee qualifies as a resident of a TEA an employer has the option of submitting a copy of the employee's driver's license or state identification card.

In order to demonstrate that an employee qualifies for the other eligibility categories, employers have to ask employees to provide them with copies of sometimes very personal documents, including, but not limited to, bankruptcy documents, physicians statements, letters from parole, and public assistance records or printouts. Some employers have voiced concerns over asking employees questions about their eligibility other than being a resident of a TEA.

8) Vouchering Employees: In order for a business to claim a hiring credit for an employee, the business must obtain a voucher from a local enterprise zone administrator certifying the employee hired meets specified criteria. As discussed above, employers are responsible for gathering the appropriate documentation to substantiate their claim that the employee being vouchered meets the statutory and regulatory requirements. Once vouchered, an employer can claim the hiring credit on their tax returns filed with FTB.

Currently, an employer is not statutorily limited by when they must file the voucher application with the enterprise zone administrator for certification. AB 1139 proposes to require that voucher applications are filed within 21 days of the employee being hired. Opponents of the bill state that this requirement is too onerous, especially for small and medium size businesses that do not have specialized human resource staff. Supporters of the bill have stated that by eliminating the ability of employers to voucher employees, well after they have been hired, will better focus the hiring credit toward the creation of new jobs.

9) What is being measured and reported: When taxpayer dollars are being expended it is important that there is clear reporting of the use and impacts of these expenditures and/or forgone funding. Prior to the enactment of AB 1550, reporting of zone activities involved an annual report based on questions submitted to the enterprise zone by HCD. The depth and specifics of these reports varied from enterprise zone to enterprise zone.

With the enactment of AB 1550, the reporting requirements and the consequences for not meeting measurable goals and objectives in a zone's MOU with HCD were increased. Further, having each zone's MOU more accurately reflect specific outcomes increases the effectiveness of the existing audit provisions. HCD is also required to provide a report every five years that evaluates the effect of the enterprise zone program on employment, investment and income, and on state and local tax revenues. In January 2008, HCD also began requiring enterprises zones to make monthly reports on their vouchering activities.

In claiming tax credits, taxpayers are required to submit a specified tax form when filing their returns. From these forms FTB is required to provide the Legislature and HCD information on how businesses are claiming credits. The charts in comment 4 were developed with information provided by FTB.

AB 1139 proposes to further expand the reporting requirements in the bill by requiring employers to annually report on each vouchered employee. The report would include, among other items, the total wages paid to the qualified employee, the type of work performed, their length of employment, and whether the employee received benefits. Some, but not all of this information is required to be provided to FTB when the employer claims the credit. Having the employer report to the enterprise zone administrator may be a more transparent method for reporting.

10) Overall effect of the bill: Supporters of AB 1139 believe that the existing enterprise zone program provides hundreds of millions of dollars per year in tax credits for employers but does not do anything for employees. In AB 1139 the sponsors, International Longshore and Warehouse Union, seek to incentivize employers to provide quality jobs to all eligible workers, by entitling employers to a higher tax credit for full time benefited employees. As California and the nation face these times of economic straits it is imperative that California gets the biggest return possible on its tax benefit investment. Finally, AB 1139 will also relieve the current burden on local government that forced to shoulder the weight of the uninsured worker, by incentivizing employers to provide health benefits.

Opponents of the measure, including local governments and business organizations, believe that given the current economic times, that implementation of AB 1139 would be destabilizing to local communities that are already under great duress. Some enterprise zone managers believe that the full impact of the bill will result in a drastic reduction in the number of hiring credit vouchers that are issued rather than reform the system. The elimination of the TEA, without first addressing the documentation problems of the other qualifying employee categories is particularly problematic. Finally, while providing health care is a laudable goal, realistically, a majority of small and medium size businesses cannot afford to provide health benefits and the problems of the uninsured and underinsured should not be specially borne by lower income communities.

11) Related legislation from 2007-08 legislative session:

a) AB 121 (Maze) and AB 2709 (Maze): These bills would have established a separate category of employee eligibility under the California Enterprise Zone Program's hiring income tax credit program to include a person who was a former foster care recipient. Status: Held in Assembly Committee on Revenue and Taxation during the 2007-08 Session.

b) AB 579 (Swanson): This bill would have extended the official term of the designation of a LAMBRA from eight to 15 years, except that the term may be for 20 years if the Department of Housing and Community Development determines that certain conditions exist in year five. Status: Held in Assembly Committee on Appropriations during the 2007-08 legislative session.

c) AB 1550 (Arambula): This bill would have made a number of significant changes to the management and oversight of the G-TEDA programs. This bill is the result of extensive oversight hearings by JEDE and Revenue and Taxation, as well as, extended discussions with stakeholder groups. Status: Signed by the Governor, Chapter 718, Statutes of 2006.

d) AB 1766 (Dymally): This bill would have made a number of significant changes in G-TEDA Program including streamlining the selection criteria, authorizing noncontiguous zones, extending certain zone designations, and tightening up of the TEA. Status: Held on the Senate Floor in the 2005-06 Session.

e) AB 2589 (Runner): This bill would have authorized a business to use credits generated in an EZ to offset taxes attributable to the business from any EZ. Status: Held in the Assembly Committee of Revenue and Taxation in 2005-06 Session.

f) SB 1008 (Duchney): This bill would have made a number of significant changes in G-TEDA Program including streamlining the selection criteria, authorizing noncontiguous zones, extending certain zone designations, and tightening up of the TEA. Status: Held in the Assembly Committee on Jobs, Economic Development, and the Economy in 2005-06 Session.

g) SB 341 (Lowenthal): This bill would have expanded the ways in which a local government applying for an enterprise zone designation after October 1, 2007, may meet the requirements of California Environmental Quality Act and eliminates the ability of these jurisdictions to limit subsequent environmental reviews based on the contents of the initial CEQA documents. Status: Signed by the Governor, Chapter 643, Statutes of 2007.

h) SB 763 (Lowenthal): This bill would have expanded HCD's fee authority for the purpose of offsetting the cost of administering the geographically-targeted economic development area programs. Status: Signed by the Governor, Chapter 634, Statutes of 2006.

12) Re-referral of legislation: Should AB 1139 be recommended "do pass" from the Assembly Committee on Jobs, Economic Development, and the Economy, this measure will be referred to the Assembly Committee on Revenue and Taxation for additional consideration of the taxation-related portions of this measure.

REGISTERED SUPPORT / OPPOSITION:

Support

International Longshore and Warehouse Union (sponsor)
Amalgamated Transit Union
California Conference of Machinists
California Labor Federation/ AFLCIO
California Teamsters Public Affairs Council
UNITE HERE!

United Food and Commercial Workers Union, Western States Council
Women's Policy Institute Economic Justice Team

Opposition

10 letters from Individuals
Ace Parking
Acme Auto Headlining Co.
Acoustics Metal Studs and Drywall
ADH Denim, Inc
Alliage, Inc.
Alliantgroup, LP
Amazon Consultants
Antelope Valley Chambers of Commerce
Asbestos Instant Response, Inc.
AVACO Textiles, Inc.
Baja's Produce, Inc.
Barbosa Cabinets Inc
Baskin Robbins
Berberian Design and Cabinets
Blum & Clark Accounting Firm
Boos & Associates
Brassuer Inc.
Bryant Rubber Corp.
C & I Tax Consultants
CalChamber
Calexico County Enterprise Zone
California Aerospace Technology Association
California Association for Local Economic Development
California Association of Enterprise Zones
California Bankers Association
California Business Properties Association
California Employment Opportunity Network
California Grocers Association
California Independent Grocers Association
California Manufacturers & Technology Association
California Retailers Association
California Taxpayers Association
Capital Credit Consulting, LLC
Casa Leaders, Inc.
Caterpillar Inc.
Certified Laboratories, Inc.
Choon Taik Lim, CPA, Inc
Chung and Company, LLC
Cinder Block, Inc.
City of Calexico
City of Chula Vista
City of Eureka
City of Long Beach
City of Manteca
City of Oroville
City of Pittsburg
City of Sacramento
City of San Bernardino Economic Development Agency
City of Wheatland
City of Yreka
Coachella Valley Enterprise Zone
Community Bank of the Bay
Compete Consulting, LLC
Con J. Franke Electric, Inc.
Contractors Wardrobe, Inc.
County of Siskiyou
County of Tulare
Cozad Trailer Sales, LLC
Crystal Casino
Cunico
CustomEyes Optometry
Dairy Institute
Del Monte Foods
Delphis,Inc. dba Burger King
Dependable Highway Express
Diamond Diesel Service Inc.
Dickson Testing Company. Inc.
Disney
DiTomaso Incentive Group
Dougherty & Company
Eby Cnstruction, Inc.
Economic Development Corporation of Oxnard
ELLS CPA's and Business Advisors
Embroidery Industries, Inc.
Encore Tax Consulting Group, Inc.
ENY Textiles, Inc.
Epsilon Systems Solutions, Inc.
Evapco West
Fine Discounts #1, Inc.
First Capitol Consulting, Inc.
Foreston Trends
Gallina, LLP
Gate City Beverage Distributors
Global Immigration Law Group
Great Fresno Area Chamber of Commerce
Guess?, Inc.
Guilbert Tex, Inc.
Harbor Distributing, LLC
Homexx International
Hromiko & Associates, LLC
Imperial County Board of Supervisors
IndigoSportswear Inc.
International Beauty Network, Inc
International Component Technology
Jacobs Pine Consulting, Inc. Tax Incentive Specialist
JC Industries
Jilllson & Roberts
Joseph Gallo Farms

Kagome Inc.
KAOS Management, Inc.
Kohl's
Krost Baumgarten Kniss & Guerrero
L & T Meat Company
Labhart Milles Consulting Group, Inc.
Land Concern Landscape Architecture
Land Design Consultants, Inc.
Long Beach Area Chamber of Commerce
Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce
Los Angeles Cold Storage Company
Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation
Los Angeles Northeast Valley Enterprise Zone
Madera Economic Development Commission
Marcus & Millichap
Marza Consulting
Merced County Board of Supervisors
Merced Regional Enterprise Zone
Metal Supply Inc.
Mira California
Modesto Chamber of Commerce
Moon & Bong Chang Medical Clinic
MSI Metal Supply, Inc.
National Federation of Independent Busness (NFIB)
Nibbi Brothers Associates, Inc.
Ole Clothing, Inc.
Oroville Enterprise Zone
Otay Mesa Chamber of Commerce
Oxnard Chamber of Commerce
Pacific Alloy Casting Co. Inc
Pacific Credit Group
Pacific Gas & Electric
Pacific Lift and Equipment
Pacific Real Estate
Palm Desert Chamber of Commerce
Paragon Textiles, Inc
Pasadena Enterprise Zone
Professional Finishing
Professional Solutions Group LLC
R. W. Zant Company
Rivera & Jamjian, LLP
Ryan, Inc.
Samiyatex
San Bernardino Area Chamber of Commerce
San Bernardino Board of Supervisors
San Bernardino Downtown Business Association, Inc.
San Diego Chamber of Commerce
San Diego Leather, Inc.
San Fernando Greater Valley Chamber of Commerce
San Francisco Center for Economic Development
San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership (SGVEP)
San Ysidro Chamber of Commerce
Sandicast
Sempra Energy
Service Connection, Inc.
Shafter Enterprise Zone #23
Shamloo & Company AT&C
Shilpark Paint Corp.
Siderman, Yampolsky Dental Corporation
Sierra Cheese Manufacturing Co., Inc.
Siskiyou County Board of Supervisors
Siskiyou Enterprise Zone
Southwest Airlines
Space Age Control
Stanislaus Economic Development and Workforce Alliance
Star Fisheries, Inc
State Farm
Summit Bank
Tactical Assault Gear
Targeted Management Company, Inc.
Tax-Tax Group, Inc.
Tenacore Holdings Inc.
TGR Geotechnical, Inc.
The Enterprise Zone Company
The National City Chamber
The Vally Economic Alliance
Title & Company, LLP
Troll Systems
Tulare County Targeted Tax Area
Ultimate Beauty Companies
United Leather, Inc.
Unity Forest Products
Universal Tax Services
Urban Industries Embroidery
Vermont Outlet,Inc.
Villa Sorriso Restaurant
Wakecraft Boats, Inc.
Walton Management Services, Inc.
Watsco, Inc.
Wencentive Corporation
Western Growers
Windsor Mortgage and Capital
Woods Maintenance Services, Inc.
Young Electric Sign Company (YESCO)
Yuba Sutter Economic Development Corporation
Yuba-Sutter Enterprise Zone
Z & S Electronics, Inc.

Analysis Prepared by: Toni Symonds / J., E.D. & E. / (916) 319-2090