THE SPATIAL ALLOCATION OF PENNSYLVANIA'S MAJOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Prepared by:
Todd Behr
C.A.Christofides
and
Pats Neelakantan
The Business Economics Research Group
East Stroudsburg University

A Background Paper funded by
the Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy
in support of the larger project,
Back to Prosperity: A Competitive Agenda for Renewing Pennsylvania

December 2003

** The views expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect those of either the trustees, officers, and staff members of the Brookings Institution. This background paper has also not been subject to a formal peer review process.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development (DCED) was created by Act 1996-58, which merged the Departments of Community Affairs and Commerce and has as its primary objective to promote and encourage the welfare of Pennsylvania business, industry and commerce. To achieve these objectives, DCED development programs award grants and loans directly to business or supply funds to regional service providers to support local business promotion.

The Business Economics Research Group of East Stroudsburg University (BERG) has been directed by the Brookings Institution to study the spatial allocation of seven major grant and loan DCED programs among the various municipalities of Pennsylvania for the fiscal years 1998-2003. The study is primarily a fact-gathering project that involves the collection and organization of statistical data describing the allocation of DCED funds among various types of municipalities in the Commonwealth. The effectiveness of DCED programs was studied in a detailed report funded by the Center for Rural Pennsylvania in 2001. The study, "A Retrospective of Pennsylvania's Economic Development Programs" by Christofides, Behr and Neelakantan evaluated the effects of DCED programs on the income, employment and business growth of the 67 counties in Pennsylvania and ranked these programs in terms of effectiveness. The present study is not concerned with the economic effects but rather the geographical allocation and spatial distribution characteristics of the seven major program funds. The unique challenge of this study is the emphasis on sub-county geographical units such as cities, boroughs and townships. This adds considerably to the complexity of the fund allocation process because the number of relevant local government units increases from 67 to 2,567!

The report contains the following sections:

Section 1 Program Description: Brief descriptions of the selected programs

Section 2 Definition of Municipalities and Local Government Units: A list of the various types of local government units as defined by the Manual of the Pennsylvania Department of General Services.

Section 3 Outline of the Methodological Process and Problems: An account of the various data sources, the problems encountered and resolved and the fact gathering procedure.

Section 4 Findings and Results, Observations, and Conclusions: Brief notes on the summary tables containing statistical information describing the allocation of

major program funds among the various municipalities. A discussion of the allocation patterns, and a summary and listing of the most significant results.

Section 5 Statistical Appendices: There are three statistical appendices, the first consisting of summary statistics, the second includes detailed tables describing the allocation of program funds and the third classifies the various municipalities and their shares of DCED funds.

Section 1: Program Description

The Business Economics Research Group of ESU has proposed to study the spatial allocation of seven major DCED program funds among the various municipalities of Pennsylvania for the fiscal years 1998-2003.

Program Selection Criteria: The programs were selected for the following reasons:

a. They were all part of a group of business and job development programs selected by the Pennsylvania Legislative Budget and Finance Committee for evaluation as part of the year 2000 audit of DCED programs. The audit information and results provided data on the perceived effectiveness of these programs and on the relative efficiency of distributing program funds to eligible business. Thus the audit report provided performance reviews for these programs and collected data on their timeliness and outcomes.
b. The programs selected were primarily designated as economic development rather than community development programs (even though the two may be often related). Community Development Programs are discussed in some detail in a Performance Audit Report published by the Legislative Budget and Finance Committee in 1998.
c. Based on information provided by the Department of Community and Economic Development regarding the rankings of development programs in terms of total dollars, the programs selected by the BERG study are indeed significant and are among the largest 16 programs (out of a total of 132 DCED programs ranked). The largest program listed (PEDFA) was not selected because it is not funded by DCED. Instead, the Pennsylvania Economic Development Financing Authority provides business funding through the issuing of bonds and the selling of these bonds to private investors. Thus PEDFA funds are not provided by tax dollars but by private investors.
d. A few relatively significant programs such as Small Business Development Centers were not included in the present study because their spatial characteristics were difficult to identify. In other words, the location of the centers does not always coincide with the location of the recipient business firms.
e. One uniquely different program that was included in the present study was the ISRP. The Industrial Sites Reuse Program provides funds for removing environmental contamination from industrial sites and returning blighted land back to productive use. The benefits of ISRP probably far exceed the cost of cleanup and there are no mandated performance measures for this program other than the total number of sites cleaned. It is therefore difficult to determine the economic impact of such programs on the employment and income of a region.

The following section discusses the seven major DCED programs, their objectives, their relative importance, a brief history of their performance and their individual characteristics.

1. Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority

PIDA was enacted in 1955 to reduce unemployment in certain areas of the state by promoting economic development projects through low interest loans to local, non-profit industrial development corporations. These loan programs apply to eligible businesses that create or retain jobs in Pennsylvania or directly toward the development of industrial parks. PIDA programs were by far the largest development programs we studied. In addition, a recent study by Christofides, Behr and Neelakantan, has determined that PIDA programs were the most significant contributors to the growth of county employment and also a significant contributor to business formation. According to the Legislative Budget and Finance Committee Audit report (2000), PIDA programs were responsible for creating or retaining 70,697 jobs in Pennsylvania since 1983.

2. Infrastructure Development Program

IDP was initiated in 1996 to create grants and loans for public and private infrastructure improvements. Grants are only for publicly owned infrastructure improvements. Grant-to-loans are grants to an applicant who in turn must make a loan to a developer for infrastructure improvements in targeted communities on privately owned properties. Loans are for infrastructure improvements on private properties in non-targeted communities. According to the Legislative Budget and Finance Committee Audit Report (2000), IDP loan and grant programs have contributed to the creation or retention of over 50,000 jobs in Pennsylvania since 1996. In terms of total dollars, IDP grants and loans ranked fourth among all DCED programs (about 6% of total development expenditures).

3. Opportunity Grant Program

OGP, or OPP Grant, was initiated through the Job Enhancement Act of 1996 to secure job-creating economic development opportunities and the expansion or preservation of existing industries in Pennsylvania. From its inception through fiscal year 1999 OGP awarded 275 grants totaling $93.6 million to business locating or expanding in Pennsylvania. The recipients of such grants range in diversity from municipalities to industrial development authorities and private companies who will use the grant funds for job training, construction of infrastructure, the purchase of machinery and equipment, site preparation and other job-

creating activities. During the first three years it was estimated that over 100,000 jobs would be either created or retained by OGP.

4. Small Business First

The SBF program was created by the Job Enhancement Act of 1996 which established a fund by transferring all monies from the Capital Loan Fund, the Air Quality Improvement Fund, the Storage Tank Loan Fund and the Recycling Initiative Development Account into the SBF Fund. During the first three years, over $60 million of loans were issued by the Fund.

The Fund provides low interest loans to small business for pollution prevention, export financing and community economic development activities. Only small businesses employing less than 100 workers are eligible for these loans.

It was anticipated that from 1996 to 1999 over 15,000 jobs would be either created or retained by SBF programs.

5. Customized Job Training

The Customized Job Training Act of 1985 created the CJT program to meet the needs new and existing business in the state by improving the skills of workers and helping develop skills of certain target groups of unemployed persons. The ultimate objectives of CJT are to improve employment opportunities, increase wages and help job-retention. The training network consists of 14 state universities and 15 community colleges as well as the Pennsylvania College of Technology. Free training is implemented by WEDnetPA and it is provided to manufacturing and technology-based businesses in the state. Over $100 million of funds were appropriated for CJT for fiscal years 1997-2000 and over 100,000 workers have participated.

CJT programs have been found to be effective in generating job growth, income growth and business growth in most Pennsylvania counties from 1987 to 1999. Overall, CJT programs have provided high returns and significant economic impact but have also being criticized for helping larger firms instead of smaller and that they have provided more funds to urban than rural areas. In a study of DCED programs by Christofides, Behr and Neelakantan, it was found that between 1987 and 1999, 79.2% of all CJT grants were received by urban counties in Pennsylvania.

6. Machinery and Equipment Loan Fund

MELF was established in 1988 to provide loans to Pennsylvania-based businesses for the purpose of purchasing or upgrading existing machinery and equipment. The ultimate objective of the fund is to improve productivity and competitiveness of businesses in the state, which leads to increased wages and economic growth. MELF participants were awarded loans amounting to approximately $125 million for the years 1987-1999. The fifth largest DCED program in terms of dollars during that period. MELF was also found to be a significant contributor to the business growth in Pennsylvania. Based on projections by the Legislative, Budget and Finance Committee, MELF loans were expected to contribute to the creation of 4,500 new jobs and the retention of almost 10,000 jobs for the years 1996-1999. The majority of companies receiving MELF loans rated the program as highly effective in creating and retaining jobs.

7. Industrial Sites Reuse Program

ISRP was established in 1995 as part of the Land Recycling and Environmental Remediation Act, to provide grants and loans to foster the cleanup of environmental contamination in industrial sites. The program provides grants to both municipalities and local economic development agencies who propose to clean up industrial sites. During the first five years of operation, over $50 million were appropriated to the program. Performance measures are difficult to define and success difficult to measure and no mandated performance measures are established in legislation or regulation. DCED simply defines performance in terms of the number of sites assessed or remediated in a particular year.

Section 2: Definition of Municipalities and Local Government Units

According to the Pennsylvania Manual of the Department of General Services, there are 56 cities, 963 boroughs, 91 1st class townships and 1457 2nd class townships in the Commonwealth (There are 12 municipalities with no designated municipal classification). The number of local government units has remained fairly stable during the past few decades. There are four types of municipalities in Pennsylvania: counties, cities, boroughs and townships. Each type of municipality is further divided into classes. There are nine classes of counties, four classes of cities and two classes of townships; boroughs are not classified.

The current study attempts to determine the allocation of major DCED program funds according to the residence of the recipients in the following types of municipalities:

1. 2nd Class Townships: There are 1547 second class townships in Pennsylvania. These are primarily rural areas with a total population of 5,117,696 or about 42% of the entire state population.
2. 1st Class Townships: The 91 first class townships are urban areas located around the state's metropolitan centers with a population of 1,489,454, representing 12% of the state population.
3. Boroughs: Boroughs are distinguished by a "weak mayor" form of government which was the most common way of governing municipalities in the 19th century. There are 963 boroughs in Pennsylvania ranging from just a few residents to towns of considerable size. The total population of Pennsylvania boroughs is 2,550,959 which is 21% of the state.
4. Third Class Cities: The 53 cities in Pennsylvania classified as third class range from small towns of 800 residents to large cities such as Allentown with over 100,000 residents. There are a total of 1,170,705 people residing in these small and large urban areas which represents about 10% of the state population.
5. Second Class A Cities: There is only one second class A city which is Scranton with a population of 76,415.
6. Second Class Cities: Pittsburgh is the only city classified as second class and there are 334,563 people living in the second largest city of the state.
7. First Class Cities: The only first class city is Philadelphia, which is the largest city of Pennsylvania with 1,517,550.

Note: There are 12 municipalities listed as "no classification". These are simply part of another municipality that crosses county lines. The United States Census Bureau simply lists such areas as separate municipalities for coding purposes. Fortunately these municipalities represent a very negligible part of the total population and also of the total dollars so their "no classification" does not affect the findings, results and conclusions of the study.

Section 3: Outline of the Methodological Process and Problems

We used data from two sources. We obtained the program data from the Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development, and we acquired the FIPS codes, 2000 Census population data and the municipality classification for each municipality from the Center for Rural Pennsylvania.

We began our study by collecting data from the Department of Community and Economic Development's Investment Tracker program. This is a web-based electronic data retrieval system

that allows users to select from a menu of options to choose data by county, by program, by date, and by applicant. The data is valid from July 1, 1998 through the current fiscal year.
After submitting a request, Investment Tracker returns an electronic spreadsheet. The data in each row is for a specific applicant and consists of the site county, the name of the applicant, the project, the site city, the number of existing jobs, the number of jobs the applicant believes will be created, and the dollar amount of the project.

However, because we intended to trace the allocation of program dollars to individual municipalities, and because we intended to calculate per capita amounts, we had to merge the Investment Tracker data with municipal FIPS codes and population data from the United States Census Bureau. The problem is that Investment Tracker does not give the program recipient's municipal class. In addition, in some instances Investment Tracker does not give the name of the recipient's municipality. This is understandable in those situations when the program dollars were allocated to a countywide authority, and fortunately those instances were relatively uncommon. After linking the DCED data with the Census data on a case-by-case basis (i.e. separately for each recipient), we found that we were unable to process 377 of the 2466 individual records. In 61 instances the name of the municipality was not given, and in 316 instances a municipality's name was given, but we were unable to identify the municipality class. For example, although Investment Tracker may have been identified Bethlehem as the site city for a particular applicant, it was not clear whether the recipient was located in Bethlehem City or Bethlehem Township. We discussed our data problems with DCED officials who informed us that county validation and integrity checks began in late 1999, and that many of the data gaps we encountered are associated with 1998.

We also asked the officials how complete the Investment Tracker data is, particularly with regard to the programs we were analyzing, and they told us that the data is complete and up to date, although slight differences may exist between approved, authorized and expended dollars. These differences are primarily due to timing considerations associated with processing loans and grants. In response to our request for the missing data, within a month the officials sent us an extensive spreadsheet that filled in most of our data gaps. As noted in the statistical appendix the DCED was unable to identify the municipal class of only 37 applicants. This accounted for approximately $8.5 million dollars (mostly confined to the CJT program), which represented less than one per cent of all program dollars for our study.

Another problem is that the data we received from the DCED identifies the site of the applicant, which may or may not be the location of the actual development project. We assume that the location of the applicant most likely will be the same as the development project, and to the extent they differ, that they vary in a random way across municipal classifications in a way that does not affect our overall results.

We also encountered a slight problem with the Census data. Since the DCED data is for the 1998 through 2003 state fiscal year period, we decided to use population data from the 2000 Census in constructing the per capita program dollar tables. However, because some municipalities cross county boundaries, the Census assigns part of its population to different counties. For example, since Bethlehem City is located in Northampton and Lehigh counties, the Census assigns a population of 52,300 to Northampton County and 19,029 to Lehigh County. The Center for Rural Population, which sent us the FIPS codes, population, and the municipal classifications for each municipality, identified 12 of these cases. For each case, the largest population component was assigned to a particular municipal class, while the smallest population component was left as unclassified given their trivial amounts. Table 1: Population Statistics lists the 12 cases along with their populations.

Finally, we encountered two additional problems that did not affect our ability to determine the spatial distribution of DCED funds, although they did make it difficult to interpret the results. The first problem is that the DCED administers many programs that appear to overlap. For example, the Opportunity Grant Program, the PIDA Program, and the Small Business First Program provide funds for the acquisition of land and buildings. As another example, the Opportunity Grant Program, the Small Business First Program and the Machinery and Equipment Loan Program provide financing for acquisitions of machinery and equipment. Although there are probably legitimate reasons for some of these apparent duplications, one wonders if it may be possible to reduce some of the overlap.

The second problem is that many of the programs require the use of various types of economic development organizations to initiate a request for funds, either for itself, or on behalf of a business. A large number of these organizations operate in the state, and once again, there appears to be considerable duplication of services, which makes it difficult to understand how the spatial distribution of funds developed over time.

Special Acknowledgement

We would like to note that this is the second time that we have asked DCED officials to help us collect and interpret data, and that in both cases we were very impressed with their efficiency, expertise, and willingness to help. Our first experience was when we were working on a grant for the Center for Rural Pennsylvania, A Retrospective of Pennsylvania's Economic Development Programs, which was published by the Center in November 2001. We examined the distribution of program dollars for 1987 through 1999 across Pennsylvania's 67 counties and estimated their effectiveness in contributing to economic development. For that study we first had to identify the

appropriate officials to contact, and we spent many days pursuing various unprofitable leads. After reaching the parties with the necessary expertise we were sent a printed data file that we had to use to build our own computerized data bank. In addition, that data was relatively crude and only tracked the amount of a program's dollars that went to a specific county.

Since that time the DCED has made remarkable strides in computerizing their data. Researchers can easily access the data by computer, and build their own data file, depending on their interests. Their website also identifies contacts who are able to direct researchers to the appropriate officials. Finally, as mentioned above, the officials were very helpful in quickly eliminating our data gaps and in meeting with us to discuss problems of data methodology. This is remarkable given the recent change in administrations and noting that many of our requests came at the same time that the DCED was trying to prepare for the state budget.

Also, we would like to offer special thanks to Jonathan Johnson, Senior Policy Analyst, for the Center for Rural Pennsylvania for his insight, guidance and help in acquiring data.
Finally we wish to thank Mark Muro of the Brookings Institution and Steve Herzenberg of the Keystone Research Center for their helpful comments on an earlier draft of this report.

Section 4: Findings and Results, Observations, and Conclusions

A. Findings and Results

There are four tables summarizing:

1. The geographical distribution of the population of Pennsylvania among the seven municipality designations described in the previous section. The single largest category is that of 2nd class townships which has both the largest number of units (1457) and also the largest number of residents (5,117,696). Based on the Brookings definition of "rural" it seems that 42% of the state population reside in these 2nd class townships with the remaining 58% being basically urban. Table 1 on the following page provides considerable detail on how population is distributed among the various types of municipalities but also how the population of each municipality category is distributed within each category, the average size of each municipality and the degree of dispersion.

Table 1
Population Statistics

	2nd Class Twp	First Class Twp	Borough	3rd Class City	2nd Class A City	2nd Class City	1st Class City	**No classification	All
Mean	3512	16368	2649	22089	76415	334563	1517550	1976	4762
Median	1930	13456	1338	12608	N/A	N/A	N/A	81	1863
Mode	2974	#N/A	848	#N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	#N/A	848
Standard Deviation	4932.1	14729.2	3727.6	22974.4	N/A	N/A	N/A	5411.4	31347.7
Kurtosis	31.4	4.5	24.4	5.5	N/A	N/A	N/A	11.5	2110.6
Skewness	4.6	1.8	4.0	2.3	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.4	44.2
Range	58420	81470	38420	105833	N/A	N/A	N/A	19029	1517550
Minimum	14	351	0*	799	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0
Maximum	58434	81821	38420	106632	N/A	N/A	N/A	19029	1517550
Sum	5117696	1489454	2550959	1170705	76415	334563	1517550	23712	12281054
Count	1457	91	963	53	1	1	1	12	2579
Coefficient of Variation	1.40	0.90	1.41	1.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.74	6.58
Muni Class Pop as a % of State Pop	42%	12%	21%	10%	1%	3%	12%	0%	100%

*S.N.P.J. Borough in Lawrence County's population is listed as 0.

** No Classification – The following municipalities cross county lines, and for coding purposes the United States Census Bureau separates the municipality into two data categories. For example, Bethlehem City is located in Lehigh and Northampton counties. Consequently, part of Bethlehem City's population is recorded in the 3rd class city category, and part is recorded as belonging to no municipal class. Because these amounts are trivial, we made no attempt to combine the different categories.

County		Population
ALLEGH	McDonald borough (pt.)	415
ALLEGH	Trafford borough (pt.)	31
BEAVER	Ellwood City borough (pt.)	732
BERKS	Adamstown borough (pt.)	2
BLAIR	Tunnelhill borough (pt.)	118
BUCKS	Telford borough (pt.)	2211
CLARIO	Emlenton borough (pt.)	10
CLEARF	Falls Creek borough (pt.)	44
COLUMB	Ashland borough (pt.)	0
FAYETT	Seven Springs borough (pt.)	1
FRANKL	Shippensburg borough (pt.)	1119
LEHIGH	Bethlehem city (pt.)	19029
	Total Population	23712

2. Table 2 summarizes the dollar distribution of the seven major development programs among the different municipalities for the fiscal years 1998-2003.

Table 2
Dollar Distribution of Selected DCED Programs by Municipal Classification

	2nd Class Twp	1st Class Twp	Borough	3rd Class City	2nd Class A City	2nd Class City	1st Class City	No Classification	ALL
CJT	29602930	5827022	16424554	14219409	921812	3748487	3253692	5387809	79385715
IDP Grant	60672398	6036700	25852718	35449249	500000	12998100	2556750		144065915
IDP Loan	363510					700000			1063510
ISRP 2	249049	182309	326395	104287			28950		890990
ISRP 4	707325	149655	1582442	2839255		568563	3195881	43594	9086715
MELF	21344528	2898000	13051618	9815275	800000	2200000	4699500		54808921
OPP Grant	76990315	4109000	32007207	16590000	350000	16920000	8160000	900000	156026522
PIDA – IP	19238497	2250000	4275357	1750000					27513854
PIDA – Loans	107932528	15301007	46050740	40849073	3226000	5420467	41952038	893820	261625673
PIDA – Multi	10089994		3368168	8469126	1750000	7295744	4999752		35972784
SBF	36320999	5425197	31648492	12368445	1000000	1182500	3442689	1347500	92735822
SBF – DC	400000		200000						600000
TOTAL	363912073	42178890	174787691	142454119	8547812	51033861	72289252	8572723	863776421

The largest program in the group is the Pennsylvania Industrial Development Authority (PIDA) fund, which provides low interest loans for the development of industrial parks and the construction of multi-tenant spec buildings. Almost 40% of the $863,776,421 reported as the total dollars, was funded by PIDA. The second largest program in the group was the Opportunity Grant Program, which allocated $156,026,522 to businesses locating or expanding in Pennsylvania to promote job-creating activities such as the construction of infrastructure, job-training, the purchase of machinery etc. Other large programs were the Infrastructure Development Program (IDP), Small Business First (SBF) and the Customized Job Training program.

3. Table 3 expresses the spatial allocation of program funds among the various municipalities as percentages of the total dollars for each program and for all the programs in total.

Table 3
Percentage Distribution of Selected DCED Program Dollars by Municipal Classification

	2nd Class Twp	1st Class Twp	Borough	3rd Class City	2nd Class A City	2nd Class City	1st Class City	No Classification	ALL
CJT	37%	7%	21%	18%	1%	5%	4%	7%	100%
IDP Grant	42%	4%	18%	25%	0%	9%	2%	0%	100%
IDP Loan	34%	0%	0%	0%	0%	66%	0%	0%	100%
ISRP 2	28%	20%	37%	12%	0%	0%	3%	0%	100%
ISRP 4	8%	2%	17%	31%	0%	6%	35%	0%	100%
MELF	39%	5%	24%	18%	1%	4%	9%	0%	100%
OPP Grant	49%	3%	21%	11%	0%	11%	5%	1%	100%
PIDA - IP	70%	8%	16%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
PIDA – Loans	41%	6%	18%	16%	1%	2%	16%	0%	100%
PIDA – Multi	28%	0%	9%	24%	5%	20%	14%	0%	100%
SBF	39%	6%	34%	13%	1%	1%	4%	1%	100%
SBF - DC	67%	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
ALL	42%	5%	20%	16%	1%	6%	8%	1%	100%
% of state population	42%	12%	21%	10%	1%	3%	12%	0%	100%

The most striking observation is that 2nd class townships, the primarily rural areas with 42% of the total state population, received 42% of the total dollars from DCED! This is either the result of extraordinary planning or simply a remarkable coincidence. The selected DCED programs have the following distributions:

- CJT programs allocated 37% to 2nd class townships and 63% to 1st class townships, boroughs and cities.
- IDP Grants and Loans: Approximately 40% to 2nd class townships and 60% to 1st class townships, boroughs and cities.
- ISRP: Approximately 10% to 2nd class townships and 90% to 1st class townships, boroughs and cities.
- MELF: 39% to 2nd class townships and 61% to 1st class townships, boroughs and cities.
- OPP Grant: 49% to 2nd class townships and 51% to 1st class townships, boroughs and cities.
- PIDA: Approximately 42% to 2nd class townships and 58% to 1st class townships, boroughs and cities.
- SBF: 40% to 2nd class townships and 60% to 1st class townships, boroughs and cities.

At first glance Table 3 seems to indicate that the greater percentage of development dollars are allocated to urban areas but this perception appears to change considerably when the program dollars are expressed on a per capita basis.

4. The per capita distribution of the selected DCED program dollars is summarized in Table

Table 4
Per Capita Distribution of Selected DCED Program Dollars by Municipal Classification

	2nd Class Twp	1st Class Twp	Borough	3rd Class City	2nd Class A City	2nd Class City	1st Class City	No Classification	ALL
CJT	$ 5.78	$ 3.91	$ 6.44	$ 12.15	$ 12.06	$ 11.20	$ 2.14	N/A*	$ 6.46
IDP Grant	$ 11.86	$ 4.05	$ 10.13	$ 30.28	$ 6.54	$ 38.85	$ 1.68	N/A*	$ 11.73
IDP Loan	$ 0.07	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2.09	$ -	N/A*	$ 0.09
ISRP 2	$ 0.05	$ 0.12	$ 0.13	$ 0.09	$ -	$ -	$ 0.02	N/A*	$ 0.07
ISRP 4	$ 0.14	$ 0.10	$ 0.62	$ 2.43	$ -	$ 1.70	$ 2.11	N/A*	$ 0.74
MELF	$ 4.17	$ 1.95	$ 5.12	$ 8.38	$ 10.47	$ 6.58	$ 3.10	N/A*	$ 4.46
OPP Grant	$ 15.04	$ 2.76	$ 12.55	$ 14.17	$ 4.58	$ 50.57	$ 5.38	N/A*	$ 12.70
PIDA - IP	$ 3.76	$ 1.51	$ 1.68	$ 1.49	$ -	$ -	$ -	N/A*	$ 2.24
PIDA – Loans	$ 21.09	$ 10.27	$ 18.05	$ 34.89	$ 42.22	$ 16.20	$ 27.64	N/A*	$ 21.30
PIDA – Multi	$ 1.97	$ -	$ 1.32	$ 7.23	$ 22.90	$ 21.81	$ 3.29	N/A*	$ 2.93
SBF	$ 7.10	$ 3.64	$ 12.41	$ 10.56	$ 13.09	$ 3.53	$ 2.27	N/A*	$ 7.55
SBF - DC	$ 0.08	$ -	$ 0.08	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	N/A*	$ 0.05
ALL	$ 71.11	$ 28.32	$ 68.52	$ 121.68	$ 111.86	$ 152.54	$ 47.64	N/A*	$ 70.33

N/A* The per capita distribution of program dollars could not be determined for the no classification category. Since the municipality was not identified in the DCED data set, it was not possible to determine the population size and per capita amounts for this category.

There seemed to be no consistent distribution patterns in the program funds per resident. In fact the per capita allocation to the 2nd class townships appeared to be very close to the overall per capita average for the entire state. However, the per capita distribution among the remaining municipalities showed considerable variation. The following section presents some examples from Table 4:

All Programs: $71.11 per 2nd class township resident, state average $70.33

Low $28.32 first class townships

High $152.54 second class city (Pittsburgh)

CJT : $5.78 per 2nd class township resident, state average $6.46

Low $2.14 first class city (Philadelphia)

High $12.15 third class cities

IDP Grant : $11.86 per 2nd class township resident, state average $11.73

Low $1.68 first class city (Philadelphia)

High $38.85 second class city (Pittsburgh)

MELF : $4.17 per 2nd class township resident, state average $4.46

Low $1.95 first class townships

High $10.47 second class A city (Scranton)

OPP Grant : $15.04 per 2nd class township resident, state average $12.70

Low $2.76 first class townships

High $50.57 second class city (Pittsburgh)

PIDA IP : $3.76 per 2nd class township resident, state average $2.24

Low $0 for first and second class cities

High $1.68 for boroughs

PIDA Loans : $21.09 per 2nd class township resident, state average $21.30

Low $10.27 for first class townships

High $42.22 for second class A city (Scranton)

PIDA M-T : $1.97 per 2nd class township resident, state average $2.93

Low $0 for first class townships

High $22.90 for second class A city (Scranton)

SBF : $7.10 per 2nd class township resident, state average $7.55

Low $2.27 first class city (Philadelphia)

High $13.09 second class A city (Scranton)

The statistical appendix contains detailed information on all the individual DCED programs and the allocation of such funds for the period of study 1998-2003. In the appendix there is statistical information on the seven types of municipalities in terms of dollars received by their residents from the DCED programs during the same period.

The four summary tables presented in the main report are derived from the statistical appendix and express the statistical information on population, program dollars, relative shares and on a per-capita basis.

B. Observations

The following table revises Table 4 to show the per capita distribution of program dollars across municipal classifications. For example, the final row indicates that based on population, 2nd class townships as well as boroughs received approximately the state average of DCED funds; 1st class townships and Philadelphia received less than the state average, and Scranton, 3rd class cities and Pittsburgh received more than the state average. At the extremes, 1st class townships received 40%, and Pittsburgh 217% of the state average. The existence of such wide dispersion is difficult to explain.

Table 4A
Per Capita Distribution of Selected DCED Program Dollars by Municipal Classification: As Percent of Statewide Average

	2nd Class Twp	1st Class Twp	Borough	3rd Class City	2nd Class A City Scranton	2nd Class City Pittsburgh	1st Class City Philadelphia
CJT	89%	61%	100%	188%	187%	173%	33%
IDP (combined)	101%	34%	86%	256%	55%	346%	14%
ISRP (combined)	23%	27%	92%	309%	0%	209%	262%
MELF	93%	44%	115%	188%	235%	147%	69%
OPP Grant	118%	22%	99%	112%	36%	398%	42%
PIDA (combined)	101%	45%	80%	165%	246%	144%	117%
SBF (combined)	94%	48%	164%	139%	172%	47%	30%
ALL	101%	40%	97%	173%	159%	217%	68%

The unequal distribution of funds among relatively urban municipalities persists for all the programs examined. Unfortunately, without additional information it is not possible to explain why such an uneven distribution exists. However, it is possible that the distribution is purely random. The programs we studied have clear legislative mandates. Thus, the Industrial Sites Reuse Program (ISRP) targets contaminated industrial areas, and it should not be surprising that cities receive a

large percentage of these funds as a result. Other programs target or give preferential treatment to Keystone Opportunity Zones, distressed areas, manufacturing and so forth. If so, then the low percentage of funding going to 1st class townships may mean that, on average, they have high employment, retail rather than manufacturing enterprises, few or no brownfield areas, etc. Therefore, if the supply of DCED funds exceeds the demand for these funds, the spatial distribution of funds could primarily reflect the random distribution of project needs across the state. The same outcome could also occur if the demand for funds exceeds the supply, and if the DCED passively accepts most requests. In either of these cases the high percentage of funds going to Pittsburgh relative to 1st class townships would indicate that Pittsburgh's needs are much larger than that of 1st class townships. This possibility was recognized in the audit report published by the Legislative Budget and Finance Committee in 2000, which noted that the DCED frequently runs out of funds before it can accommodate all legitimate requests for funding.

Another possibility is that the distribution of funds reflects the economic development service delivery system in the state. Many of the programs either require or allow that the application for funds be processed through an industrial authority or corporation, area loan organization, local development district, municipal authority or similar organization. Thus, Pittsburgh and 1st class cities may have the same need for funds, but for a variety of reasons the development organizations in the Pittsburgh area are simply more efficient and aggressive in submitting requests for funds for their area compared to their counterparts in 1st class townships.

In contrast to the above, suppose that the demand for funds exceeds the supply and that, instead of randomly distributing funds, the DCED has to eliminate applications based on some other criteria. It may be that political considerations play some role in this case. A request for funds for a project supported by a powerful politician may have a better than average chance of gaining approval. Assuming political interference is minor or nonexistent, whenever the demand for funds exceeds the supply, the DCED could use either efficiency or equity criteria to select from a pool of potential applicants. Using efficiency criteria, the DCED would pick projects that would have the greatest economic impact in cleaning up the environment, creating or retaining jobs, improving the quality of

the workforce, and generating income. If so, an area's infrastructure, workforce quality, population density, synergy effects among businesses and similar factors would probably weigh heavily in the decision. Presumably an attempt would be made to generate the greatest multiplier effect for the funding. In addition, creating the largest income from a project would generate the most tax revenues, all else the same.

One problem with efficiency criteria is that many distressed areas desperately in need of help would probably lack funding. If so, the DCED could allocate funds on the basis of equity considerations. For example, it may seem fair to some to distribute funds evenly across the state on the assumption that the programs are funded by all of the state's taxpayers. Or, it may seem fair to some to sacrifice a certain amount of efficiency to help distressed areas. For example, the PIDA loan program offers more dollars and at lower interest rates the higher an area's unemployment rate. Clearly, the program attempts to manipulate the demand for funds to help distressed areas. As another illustration, the Opportunity Grant program requires less job creation or retention for severally distressed economic counties and communities than for areas with healthier economies.
Since a trade-off usually frequently exits between efficiency and equity, it would be interesting to determine if this is true for DCED programs, and if so, to examine its magnitude.

To conclude we believe that the spatial distribution of DCED funding probably results from a variety of factors, but without additional information it is impossible to weight the impact of each. Ideally one would need municipal, county and state information on taxes, population characteristics, workforce composition and quality, wages and earned incomes, industry mix and infrastructure, as well as information on the state's economic development service delivery system. One would also need to have detailed information on the selection criteria that the DCED uses for each program. Finally, one would need more information on administration and legislative intentions.

C. Conclusions

The spatial allocation of major DCED program funds among the various municipalities of Pennsylvania for the fiscal years 1998-2003 has been statistically documented and reported in the appendix.

The selection of the major programs was based on relative magnitude and program effectiveness as determined by previous studies and the Performance Audit Report of the Pennsylvania Legislative and Budget Committee.

The various municipality types of Pennsylvania were defined and grouped by the Pennsylvania Manual of the Department of General Services.

Data was collected from the Pennsylvania Department of Community and Economic Development, the United States Census Bureau and The Center for Rural Pennsylvania.

Second class townships had 42% of the state population and also received 42% of the selected DCED program dollars. Since DCED program funds are not allocated based on population distribution patterns, this finding is simply an extraordinary coincidence.

The allocation of DCED funds among the various relatively urban municipalities was very uneven. First class townships and first class cities (Philadelphia) received considerably fewer dollars per capita (only 40% and 68% of the state average). At the other extreme, second class cities (Pittsburgh), third class cities and Scranton were the biggest beneficiaries, receiving disproportionately greater DCED dollars per capita. Pittsburgh received 217% of the state average, Scranton 159% and third class cities 173%!

The observed distribution patterns may be explained by the tendency of certain development programs to favor high unemployment areas and predominantly manufacturing industries (brown-

field areas). This could explain why 1st class townships with lower unemployment rates and service and retail trade industries, receive much lower amounts of DCED dollars than other municipalities.

Another possible explanation for the observed distribution patterns, may be the great diversity of delivery systems throughout the state. Certain types of delivery systems could be more aggressive or more efficient in submitting requests for funds for their areas. An interesting future study could be the examination of the relationship between delivery systems and spatial allocation patterns of development funds.

Finally, it may be possible that the allocation of DCED funds could be greatly influenced by political "pockets" of power, which may reside in certain types of municipalities. This hypothesis may be difficult to confirm without a more detailed investigation.

APPENDIX A: SUMMARY TABLES

NOTES

1. DCED PROGRAM DATA IS FOR PENNSYLVANIA'S FISCAL YEARS 1998-2003.
2. ALL VALUES ARE WEIGHTED BY THE COUNT OR POPULATION FOR THAT CATEGORY.

Table 1
Population Statistics by Municipal Classification

	2nd Class Twp	First Class Twp	Borough	3rd Class City	2nd Class A City	2nd Class City	1st Class City	**No classification	All
Mean	3512	16368	2649	22089	76415	334563	1517550	1976	4762
Median	1930	13456	1338	12608	N/A	N/A	N/A	81	1863
Mode	2974	#N/A	848	#N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	#N/A	848
Standard Deviation	4932.1	14729.2	3727.6	22974.4	N/A	N/A	N/A	5411.4	31347.7
Kurtosis	31.4	4.5	24.4	5.5	N/A	N/A	N/A	11.5	2110.6
Skewness	4.6	1.8	4.0	2.3	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.4	44.2
Range	58420	81470	38420	105833	N/A	N/A	N/A	19029	1517550
Minimum	14	351	0*	799	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0
Maximum	58434	81821	38420	106632	N/A	N/A	N/A	19029	1517550
Sum	5117696	1489454	2550959	1170705	76415	334563	1517550	23712	12281054
Count	1457	91	963	53	1	1	1	12	2579
Coefficient of Variation	1.40	0.90	1.41	1.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.74	6.58
Muni Class Pop as a % of State Pop	42%	12%	21%	10%	1%	3%	12%	0%	100%

*S.N.P.J. Borough in Lawrence County's population is listed as 0.

** No Classification – The following municipalities cross county lines, and for coding purposes the United States Census Bureau separates the municipality into two data categories. For example, Bethlehem City is located in Lehigh and Northampton counties. Consequently, part of Bethlehem City's population is recorded in the 3rd class city category, and part is recorded as belonging to no municipal class. Because these amounts are trivial, we made no attempt to combine the different categories.

County		Population
ALLEGH	McDonald borough (pt.)	415
ALLEGH	Trafford borough (pt.)	31
BEAVER	Ellwood City borough (pt.)	732
BERKS	Adamstown borough (pt.)	2
BLAIR	Tunnelhill borough (pt.)	118
BUCKS	Telford borough (pt.)	2211
CLARIO	Emlenton borough (pt.)	10
CLEARF	Falls Creek borough (pt.)	44
COLUMB	Ashland borough (pt.)	0
FAYETT	Seven Springs borough (pt.)	1
FRANKL	Shippensburg borough (pt.)	1119
LEHIGH	Bethlehem city (pt.)	19029
	Total Population	23712

Table 2
Dollar Distribution of Selected DCED Programs by Municipal Classification

	2nd Class Twp	1st Class Twp	Borough	3rd Class City	2nd Class A City	2nd Class City	1st Class City	No Classification	ALL
CJT	29602930	5827022	16424554	14219409	921812	3748487	3253692	5387809	79385715
IDP Grant	60672398	6036700	25852718	35449249	500000	12998100	2556750		144065915
IDP Loan	363510					700000			1063510
ISRP 2	249049	182309	326395	104287			28950		890990
ISRP 4	707325	149655	1582442	2839255		568563	3195881	43594	9086715
MELF	21344528	2898000	13051618	9815275	800000	2200000	4699500		54808921
OPP Grant	76990315	4109000	32007207	16590000	350000	16920000	8160000	900000	156026522
PIDA - IP	19238497	2250000	4275357	1750000					27513854
PIDA - Loans	107932528	15301007	46050740	40849073	3226000	5420467	41952038	893820	261625673
PIDA - Multi	10089994		3368168	8469126	1750000	7295744	4999752		35972784
SBF	36320999	5425197	31648492	12368445	1000000	1182500	3442689	1347500	92735822
SBF - DC	400000		200000						600000
TOTAL	363912073	42178890	174787691	142454119	8547812	51033861	72289252	8572723	863776421

Table 3
Percentage Distribution of Selected DCED Program Dollars by Municipal Classification

	2nd Class Twp	1st Class Twp	Borough	3rd Class City	2nd Class A City	2nd Class City	1st Class City	No Classification	ALL
CJT	37%	7%	21%	18%	1%	5%	4%	7%	100%
IDP Grant	42%	4%	18%	25%	0%	9%	2%	0%	100%
IDP Loan	34%	0%	0%	0%	0%	66%	0%	0%	100%
ISRP 2	28%	20%	37%	12%	0%	0%	3%	0%	100%
ISRP 4	8%	2%	17%	31%	0%	6%	35%	0%	100%
MELF	39%	5%	24%	18%	1%	4%	9%	0%	100%
OPP Grant	49%	3%	21%	11%	0%	11%	5%	1%	100%
PIDA - IP	70%	8%	16%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
PIDA - Loans	41%	6%	18%	16%	1%	2%	16%	0%	100%
PIDA - Multi	28%	0%	9%	24%	5%	20%	14%	0%	100%
SBF	39%	6%	34%	13%	1%	1%	4%	1%	100%
SBF - DC	67%	0%	33%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
ALL	42%	5%	20%	16%	1%	6%	8%	1%	100%

Table 4
Per Capita Distribution of Selected DCED Program Dollars by Municipal Classification

	2nd Class Twp	1st Class Twp	Borough	3rd Class City	2nd Class A City	2nd Class City	1st Class City	No Classification	ALL
CJT	$ 5.78	$ 3.91	$ 6.44	$ 12.15	$ 12.06	$ 11.20	$ 2.14	N/A*	$ 6.46
IDP Grant	$ 11.86	$ 4.05	$ 10.13	$ 30.28	$ 6.54	$ 38.85	$ 1.68	N/A*	$ 11.73
IDP Loan	$ 0.07	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ 2.09	$ -	N/A*	$ 0.09
ISRP 2	$ 0.05	$ 0.12	$ 0.13	$ 0.09	$ -	$ -	$ 0.02	N/A*	$ 0.07
ISRP 4	$ 0.14	$ 0.10	$ 0.62	$ 2.43	$ -	$ 1.70	$ 2.11	N/A*	$ 0.74
MELF	$ 4.17	$ 1.95	$ 5.12	$ 8.38	$ 10.47	$ 6.58	$ 3.10	N/A*	$ 4.46
OPP Grant	$ 15.04	$ 2.76	$ 12.55	$ 14.17	$ 4.58	$ 50.57	$ 5.38	N/A*	$ 12.70
PIDA – IP	$ 3.76	$ 1.51	$ 1.68	$ 1.49	$ -	$ -	$ -	N/A*	$ 2.24
PIDA - Loans	$ 21.09	$ 10.27	$ 18.05	$ 34.89	$ 42.22	$ 16.20	$ 27.64	N/A*	$ 21.30
PIDA - Multi	$ 1.97	$ -	$ 1.32	$ 7.23	$ 22.90	$ 21.81	$ 3.29	N/A*	$ 2.93
SBF	$ 7.10	$ 3.64	$ 12.41	$ 10.56	$ 13.09	$ 3.53	$ 2.27	N/A*	$ 7.55
SBF – DC	$ 0.08	$ -	$ 0.08	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	N/A*	$ 0.05
ALL	$ 71.11	$ 28.32	$ 68.52	$ 121.68	$ 111.86	$ 152.54	$ 47.64	N/A*	$ 70.33

N/A* The per capita distribution of program dollars could not be determined for the no classification category. Since the municipality was not identified in the DCED data set, it was not possible to determine the population size and per capita amounts for this category.

Table 1B
Population by Municipal Class – City/NonCity Classification

	2nd Class Twp	1st Class Twp	Borough	All Cities	No Classification	ALL
Population	5117696	1489454	2550959	3099233	23712	12281054

Table 2B
Dollar Distribution of Selected DCED Programs by City/Noncity Classification

	2nd Class Twp	1st Class Twp	Borough	All Cities	No Classification	ALL
CJT	29602930	5827022	16424554	22143400	5387809	79385715
IDP Grant	60672398	6036700	25852718	51504099		144065915
IDP Loan	363510			700000		1063510
ISRP 2	249049	182309	326395	133237		890990
ISRP 4	707325	149655	1582442	6603699	43594	9086715
MELF	21344528	2898000	13051618	17514775		54808921
OPP Grant	76990315	4109000	32007207	42020000	900000	156026522
PIDA - IP	19238497	2250000	4275357	1750000		27513854
PIDA - Loans	107932528	15301007	46050740	91447578	893820	261625673
PIDA - Multi	10089994		3368168	22514622		35972784
SBF	36320999	5425197	31648492	17993634	1347500	92735822
SBF - DC	400000		200000	0		600000
TOTAL	363912073	42178890	174787691	274325044	8572723	863776421

Table 3B
Percentage Distribution of Selected DCED Program Dollars by City/NonCity Classification

	2nd Class Twp	1st Class Twp	Borough	All Cities	No Classification	ALL
CJT	37%	7%	21%	28%	7%	100%
IDP Grant	42%	4%	18%	36%	0%	100%
IDP Loan	34%	0%	0%	66%	0%	100%
ISRP 2	28%	20%	37%	15%	0%	100%
ISRP 4	8%	2%	17%	73%	0%	100%
MELF	39%	5%	24%	32%	0%	100%
OPP Grant	49%	3%	21%	27%	1%	100%
PIDA - IP	70%	8%	16%	6%	0%	100%
PIDA - Loans	41%	6%	18%	35%	0%	100%
PIDA - Multi	28%	0%	9%	63%	0%	100%
SBF	39%	6%	34%	19%	1%	100%
SBF - DC	67%	0%	33%	0%	0%	100%
TOTAL	42%	5%	20%	32%	1%	100%

Table 4B
Per Capita Distribution of Selected DCED Program Dollars by City/Noncity Classification

	2nd Class Twp	1st Class Twp	Borough	All Cities	No Classification	ALL
CJT	$5.78	$3.91	$6.44	$7.14	N/A	$6.46
IDP Grant	$11.86	$4.05	$10.13	$16.62	N/A	$11.73
IDP Loan	$0.07	$0.00	$0.00	$0.23	N/A	$0.09
ISRP 2	$0.05	$0.12	$0.13	$0.04	N/A	$0.07
ISRP 4	$0.14	$0.10	$0.62	$2.13	N/A	$0.74
MELF	$4.17	$1.95	$5.12	$5.65	N/A	$4.46
OPP Grant	$15.04	$2.76	$12.55	$13.56	N/A	$12.70
PIDA - IP	$3.76	$1.51	$1.68	$0.56	N/A	$2.24
PIDA - Loans	$21.09	$10.27	$18.05	$29.51	N/A	$21.30
PIDA - Multi	$1.97	$0.00	$1.32	$7.26	N/A	$2.93
SBF	$7.10	$3.64	$12.41	$5.81	N/A	$7.55
SBF - DC	$0.08	$0.00	$0.08	$0.00	N/A	$0.05
TOTAL	$71.11	$28.32	$68.52	$88.51	N/A	$70.33

APPENDIX B: DETAILED STATISTICS BY PROGRAM

ALL PROGRAMS

	2nd Class Twp	1st Class Twp	Borough	3rd Class City	2nd Class A City	2nd Class City	1st Class City	No Classification	ALL
Mean	372098	342918	281462	341617	388537	573414	403851	231695	350274
Median	200000	200000	200000	200000	200000	250000	250000	150000	200000
Mode	200000	200000	200000	200000	200000	500000	200000	100000	200000
Standard Deviation	552995	391262	337627	426645	491811	662431	422678	299735	473011
Kurtosis	201.0	2.2	6.4	5.0	4.2	4.5	1.6	16.1	151.9
Skewness	10.4	1.7	2.5	2.2	2.2	2.0	1.5	3.6	7.6
Range	11998500	1876314	1991948	2495950	1725000	3496250	1742125	1679000	11998500
Minimum	1500	8000	8052	4050	25000	3750	7875	21000	1500
Maximum	12000000	1884314	2000000	2500000	1750000	3500000	1750000	1700000	12000000
Sum	363912073	42178890	174787691	142454119	8547812	51033861	72289252	8572723	863776421
Count	978	123	621	417	22	89	179	37	2466
Coefficient of Variation	1.49	1.14	1.20	1.25	1.27	1.16	1.05	1.29	1.35
Muni Class $ as a % of Total Program $	42.1%	4.9%	20.2%	16.5%	1.0%	5.9%	8.4%	1.0%	100.0%

CJT PROGRAM

	2nd Class Twp	1st Class Twp	Borough	3rd Class City	2nd Class A City	2nd Class City	1st Class City	No Classification	ALL
Mean	153383	208108	130354	161584	131687	416499	216913	224492	162012
Median	100000	100000	100000	100000	100000	224998	109965	100000	100000
Mode	100000	100000	100000	100000	#N/A	#N/A	250000	100000	100000
Standard Deviation	200103	378342	141464	209437	131555	613780	249190	354020	229111
Kurtosis	40.6	15.5	15.0	13.4	3.1	7.4	7.3	13.9	29.3
Skewness	5.3	3.8	3.4	3.5	1.7	2.6	2.5	3.5	4.8
Range	1991000	1876314	991948	1175000	375000	1974000	976462	1679000	1992000
Minimum	9000	8000	8052	15000	25000	26000	23538	21000	8000
Maximum	2000000	1884314	1000000	1190000	400000	2000000	1000000	1700000	2000000
Sum	29602930	5827022	16424554	14219409	921812	3748487	3253692	5387809	79385715
Count	193	28	126	88	7	9	15	24	490
Coefficient of Variation	1.30	1.82	1.09	1.30	1.00	1.47	1.15	1.58	1.41
Muni Class$ as a % of Total Program $	37.3%	7.3%	20.7%	17.9%	1.2%	4.7%	4.1%	6.8%	100.0%

IDP GRANT PROGRAM

	2nd Class Twp	1st Class Twp	Borough	3rd Class City	2nd Class A City	2nd Class City	1st Class City	No Classification	ALL
Mean	583388	754588	646318	708985	500000	1181645	639188		660853
Median	500000	850000	572205	590000		1250000	650000		500000
Mode	1250000	1000000	1250000	1250000		1250000	#N/A		1250000
Standard Deviation	417755	434046	391397	513666		843158	327454		477407
Kurtosis	1.1	-1.9	-1.0	2.7		-1.0	-2.1		2.3
Skewness	1.1	-0.2	0.5	1.4		0.5	-0.1		1.3
Range	2220000	1074300	1244000	2440000		2312000	743250		2470000
Minimum	30000	175700	94000	60000		188000	256750		30000
Maximum	2250000	1250000	1338000	2500000		2500000	1000000		2500000
Sum	60672398	6036700	25852718	35449249	500000	12998100	2556750		144065915
Count	104	8	40	50	1	11	4		218
Coefficient of Variation	0.72	0.58	0.61	0.72	0.00	0.71	0.51		0.72
Muni Class $ as a % of Total Program $	42.1%	4.2%	17.9%	24.6%	0.3%	9.0%	1.8%		100.0%

IDP LOAN PROGRAM

	2nd Class Twp	1st Class Twp	Borough	3rd Class City	2nd Class A City	2nd Class City	1st Class City	No Classification	ALL
Mean	363510					700000			531755
Median									531755
Mode									#N/A
Standard Deviation									237934.3608
Kurtosis									#DIV/0!
Skewness									#DIV/0!
Range	0					0			336490
Minimum									363510
Maximum									700000
Sum	363510					700000			1063510
Count	1					1			2
Coefficient of Variation									0.447451102
Muni Class$ as a % of Total Program $	34.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	65.8%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%

ISRP ASSESSMENT ACT 2 PROGRAM

	2nd Class Twp	1st Class Twp	Borough	3rd Class City	2nd Class A City	2nd Class	First Class City	No Classification	ALL
Mean	62262	91155	65279	34762			28950		59399
Median	60662	91155	37736	22162					42574
Mode	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A					#N/A
Standard Deviation	29636	11296	54053	25175					38441
Kurtosis	-4.0	#DIV/0!	-2.8	#DIV/0!					-1.1
Skewness	0.2	#DIV/0!	0.5	1.7					0.5
Range	62775	15975	120011	45375					120011
Minimum	32475	83167	10020	18375					10020
Maximum	95250	99142	130031	63750					130031
Sum	249049	182309	326395	104287			28950		890990
Count	4	2	5	3			1		15
Coefficient. Of Variation	0.48	0.12	0.83	0.72			0.00		0.65
Muni Class $ as a % of Total Program $	28.0%	20.5%	36.6%	11.7%			3.2%		100.0%

ISRP ASSESSMENT ACT 4 PROGRAM

	2nd Class Twp	1st Class Twp	Borough	3rd Class City	2nd Class A City	2nd Class City	1st Class City	No Classification	ALL
Mean	64302	49885	79122	76737		63174	81946	43594	75723
Median	48750	57000	61213	60000		69649	72123		66000
Mode	#N/A	#N/A	#N/A	200000		#N/A	8625		30000
Standard Deviation	57596	29723	51816	56063		49507	64062		56682
Kurtosis	0.28	#DIV/0!	-1.07	0.04		0.57	6.24		3.19
Skewness	0.87	-1.02	0.61	1.06		0.82	1.92		1.39
Range	184160	58155	154095	195950		157500	335424		341799
Minimum	1500	17250	19530	4050		3750	7875		1500
Maximum	185660	75405	173625	200000		161250	343299		343299
Sum	707325	149655	1582442	2839255		568563	3195881	43594	9086715
Count	11	3	20	37		9	39	1	120
Coefficient of Variation	0.90	0.60	0.65	0.73		0.78	0.78	0.00	0.75
Muni Class $ as a % of Total Program $	7.8%	1.6%	17.4%	31.2%	0.0%	6.3%	35.2%	0.5%	100.0%

MELF PROGRAM

	2nd Class Twp	1st Class Twp	Borough	3rd Class City	2nd Class A City	2nd Class City	1st Class City	No Classification	ALL
Mean	395269	362250	372903	363529	400000	440000	391625		383279
Median	425000	350000	400000	400000	400000	500000	400000		400000
Mode	500000	500000	500000	500000	#N/A	500000	500000		500000
Standard Deviation	120780	140917	134456	127021	141421	134164	114031		125160
Kurtosis	-1.0	0.2	-1.4	-1.1	#DIV/0!	5.0	-1.4		-1.1
Skewness	-0.7	-0.7	-0.4	-0.4	#DIV/0!	-2.2	-0.5		-0.6
Range	350000	400000	362651	400000	200000	300000	300000		400000
Minimum	150000	100000	137349	100000	300000	200000	200000		100000
Maximum	500000	500000	500000	500000	500000	500000	500000		500000
Sum	21344528	2898000	13051618	9815275	800000	2200000	4699500		54808921
Count	54	8	35	27	2	5	12	0	143
Coefficient of Variation	0.31	0.39	0.36	0.35	0.35	0.30	0.29		0.33
Muni Class $ as a % of Total Program $	38.9%	5.3%	23.8%	17.9%	1.5%	4.0%	8.6%		100.0%

OPP GRANT PROGRAM

	2nd Class Twp	1st Class Twp	Borough	3rd Class City	2nd Class A City	2nd Class City	1st Class City	No Classification	ALL
Mean	381140	228278	258123	281186	175000	483429	272000	450000	330565
Median	200000	100000	150000	150000	175000	200000	200000	450000	175000
Mode	100000	100000	50000	150000	#N/A	100000	100000	#N/A	100000
Standard Deviation	925240	327299	330714	378800	176777	665037	231582	70711	675303
Kurtosis	125.3	5.5	8.7	9.5	#DIV/0!	12.1	2.7	#DIV/0!	191.4
Skewness	10.3	2.5	2.7	3.0	#DIV/0!	3.1	1.7	#DIV/0!	11.8
Range	11975000	1170000	1985000	1985000	250000	3480000	975000	100000	11985000
Minimum	25000	30000	15000	15000	50000	20000	25000	400000	15000
Maximum	12000000	1200000	2000000	2000000	300000	3500000	1000000	500000	12000000
Sum	76990315	4109000	32007207	16590000	350000	16920000	8160000	900000	156026522
Count	202	18	124	59	2	35	30	2	472
Coefficient of Variation	2.43	1.43	1.28	1.35	1.01	1.38	0.85	0.16	2.04
Muni Class $ as a % of Total Program $	49.3%	2.6%	20.5%	10.6%	0.2%	10.8%	5.2%	0.6%	100.0%

PIDA – INDUSTRIAL PARK PROGRAM

	2nd Class Twp	1st Class Twp	Borough	3rd Class City	2nd Class A City	2nd Class City	1st Class City	No Classification	ALL
Mean	1012552	1125000	855071	1750000	0	0	0	0	1019032
Median	1180000	1125000	640000	1750000					1180000
Mode	1250000	#N/A	1750000						1250000
Standard Deviation	491460	176777	850245						553399
Kurtosis	-0.9	#DIV/0!	-3.1						-1.0
Skewness	-0.1	#DIV/0!	0.3						-0.2
Range	1601086	250000	1725000	0	0	0	0	0	1725000
Minimum	148914	1000000	25000						25000
Maximum	1750000	1250000	1750000						1750000
Sum	19238497	2250000	4275357	1750000					27513854
Count	19	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	27
Coefficient of Variation	0.49	0.16	0.99	0.00					0.54
Muni Class $ as a % of Total Program $	69.9%	8.2%	15.5%	6.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%

PIDA LOAN PROGRAM

	2nd Class Twp	1st Class Twp	Borough	3rd Class City	2nd Class A City	2nd Class City	1st Class City	No Classification	ALL
Mean	760088	765050	780521	742710	1075333	774352	822589	446910	771757
Median	650971	615125	640000	579874	960000	547155	700000	446910	640000
Mode	1250000	1250000	1250000	1750000	#N/A	#N/A	1250000	#N/A	1250000
Standard Deviation	472884	397062	480345	537178	625032	516384	455185	281301	477298
Kurtosis	-0.8	-1.8	-0.9	-0.6	#DIV/0!	1.2	-0.6	#DIV/0!	-0.7
Skewness	0.5	0.2	0.7	0.8	0.8	1.4	0.6	#DIV/0!	0.6
Range	1654010	1068450	1587847	1646134	1234000	1419350	1540000	397820	1654010
Minimum	95990	251550	162153	103866	516000	330650	210000	248000	95990
Maximum	1750000	1320000	1750000	1750000	1750000	1750000	1750000	645820	1750000
Sum	107932528	15301007	46050740	40849073	3226000	5420467	41952038	893820	261625673
Count	142	20	59	55	3	7	51	2	339
Coefficient of Variation	0.62	0.52	0.62	0.72	0.58	0.67	0.55	0.63	0.62
Muni Class $ as a % of Total Program $	41.3%	5.8%	17.6%	15.6%	1.2%	2.1%	16.0%	0.3%	100.0%

PIDA – MULTI PROGRAM

	2nd Class Twp	1st Class Twp	Borough	3rd Class City	2nd Class A City	2nd Class City	1st Class City	No Classification	ALL
Mean	1008999		842042	1209875	1750000	1215957	999950		1090084
Median	1010000		750000	1000000		1163397	1250000		1006794
Mode	1750000		#N/A	1750000		1750000	1250000		1750000
Standard Deviation	648501		522845	522938		475724	456324		536011
Kurtosis	-1.7		-1.6	-2.4		-1.7	-1.0		-1.3
Skewness	-0.1		0.7	0.1		0.0	-0.8		-0.1
Range	1686094		1149968	1190000		1162050	1100248		1686094
Minimum	63906		359100	560000		587950	339752		63906
Maximum	1750000		1509068	1750000		1750000	1440000		1750000
Sum	10089994		3368168	8469126	1750000	7295744	4999752		35972784
Count	10		4	7	1	6	5		33
Coefficient of Variation	0.64	#DIV/0!	0.62	0.43	0.00	0.39	0.46		0.49
Muni Class $ as a % of Total Program $	28.0%	0.0%	9.4%	23.5%	4.9%	20.3%	13.9%	0.0%	100.0%

ALL PIDA PROGRAMS COMBINED

	2nd Class Twp	1st Class Twp	Borough	3rd Class City	2nd Class A City	2nd Class City	1st Class City	All Cities	No Classification	All
Mean	802696.02	797773.05	789621.54	810606.33	1244000	978170.08	838424.82	850825	446910	814817.82
Standard Error	37639	84032	61320	70611	305875	146793	60667	44425	198910	24894
Median	724564	756850	640000	628800	1355000	881000	723427	705107.5	446910	680000
Mode	1250000	1250000	1250000	1750000	1750000	1750000	1250000	1750000	N/A	1750000
Standard Deviation	492192	394143	505661	560457	611749	529271	453989	518078	281301	497260
Kurtosis	-0.9	-1.8	-1.0	-1.0	-3.5	-1.3	-0.8	-1.0	N/A	-0.9
Skewness	0.4	0.0	0.6	0.6	-0.4	0.5	0.5	0.5	N/A	0.5
Range	1686094	1068450	1725000	1646134	1234000	1419350	1540000	1646134	397820	1725000
Minimum	63906	251550	25000	103866	516000	330650	210000	103866	248000	25000
Maximum	1750000	1320000	1750000	1750000	1750000	1750000	1750000	1750000	645820	1750000
Sum	137261019	17551007	53694265	51068199	4976000	12716211	46951790	115712200	893820	325112311
Count	171	22	68	63	4	13	56	136	2	399
Coefficient of Variation	0.61	0.49	0.64	0.69	0.49	0.54	0.54	0.61	0.63	0.61
Muni Class $ as a % of Total Program $	42.2%	5.4%	16.5%	15.7%	1.5%	3.9%	14.4%	35.6%	0.3%	100.0%
Per Capita	$26.82	$11.78	$21.05	$43.62	$65.12	$38.01	$30.94	$37.34	$37.69	$26.47

SBF PROGRAM

	2nd Class Twp	1st Class Twp	Borough	3rd Class City	2nd Class A City	2nd Class City	1st Class City	No Classification	ALL
Mean	153903	159565	156676	137427	166667	197083	156486	168438	153536
Median	197919	200000	200000	146250	200000	200000	164500	185000	199375
Mode	200000	200000	200000	200000	200000	200000	200000	200000	200000
Standard Deviation	54453	50852	55148	60911	51640	7144	47258	39572	55181
Kurtosis	-1.0	-1.4	-0.9	-1.4	-1.9	6.0	-0.8	-0.7	-1.0
Skewness	-0.7	-0.6	-0.8	-0.3	-1.0	-2.4	-0.6	-0.9	-0.7
Range	175000	132111	178000	180750	100000	17500	149561	100000	180750
Minimum	25000	67889	22000	19250	100000	182500	50439	100000	19250
Maximum	200000	200000	200000	200000	200000	200000	200000	200000	200000
Sum	36320999	5425197	31648492	12368445	1000000	1182500	3442689	1347500	92735822
Count	236	34	202	90	6	6	22	8	604
Coefficient of Variation	0.35	0.32	0.35	0.44	0.31	0.04	0.30	0.23	0.36
Muni Class $ as a % of Total Program $	39.2%	5.9%	34.1%	13.3%	1.1%	1.3%	3.7%	1.5%	100.0%

SBF – DC PROGRAM

	2nd Class Twp	1st Class Twp	Borough	3rd Class City	2nd Class A City	2nd Class City	1st Class City	No Classification	ALL
Mean	200000		200000						200000
Median	200000								200000
Mode	200000								200000
Standard Deviation	0								0
Kurtosis	#DIV/0!								#DIV/0!
Skewness	#DIV/0!								#DIV/0!
Range	0								0
Minimum	200000								200000
Maximum	200000								200000
Sum	400000		200000						600000
Count	2		1						3
Coefficient of Variation	0								
Muni Class $ as a % of Total Program $	66.7%	0.0%	33.3%						100.0%

APPENDIX C: DETAILED STATISTICS BY MUNICIPAL CLASS

2nd CLASS TOWNSHIPS

	CJT	IDP Grant	IDP Loan	ISRP 2	ISRP 4	MELF	Opp Grant
Mean	153383	583388	363510	62262	64302	395269	381140
Median	100000	500000		60662	48750	425000	200000
Mode	100000	1250000		#N/A	#N/A	500000	100000
Standard Deviation	200103	417755		29636	57596	120780	925240
Kurtosis	41	1		-4	0	-1	125
Skewness	5	1		0	1	-1	10
Range	1991000	2220000	0	62775	184160	350000	11975000
Minimum	9000	30000		32475	1500	150000	25000
Maximum	2000000	2250000		95250	185660	500000	12000000
Sum	29602930	60672398	363510	249049	707325	21344528	76990315
Count	193	104	1	4	11	54	202
Coefficient of Variation	1.30	0.72		0.48	0.90	0.31	2.43
Total 2nd Class Twp $ as a % of Program $ for All Muni Classes	37.3%	42.1%		28.0%	7.8%	38.9%	49.3%
Individual Program $ for 2nd Class Twp as a % of Total Program $ for 2nd Class Twp	8.1%	16.7%	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	5.9%	21.2%

2nd CLASS TOWNSHIPS (continued)

	PIDA – IP	PIDA Loans	PIDA Multi	SBF	SBF - DC	Total
Mean	1012552	760088	1008999	153903	200000	372098
Median	1180000	650971	1010000	197919	200000	
Mode	1250000	1250000	1750000	200000	200000	
Standard Deviation	491460	472884	648501	54453	0	
Kurtosis	-1	-1	-2	-1	#DIV/0!	
Skewness	0	1	0	-1	#DIV/0!	
Range	1601086	1654010	1686094	175000	0	
Minimum	148914	95990	63906	25000	200000	
Maximum	1750000	1750000	1750000	200000	200000	
Sum	19238497	107932528	10089994	36320999	400000	363912073
Count	19	142	10	236	2	978
Coefficient of Variation	0.49	0.62	0.64	0.35	0.00	
Total 2nd Class Twp $ as a % of Program $ for All Muni Classes	69.9%	41.3%	28.0%	39.2%	67%	
Individual Program $ for 2nd Class Twp as a % of Total Program $ for 2nd Class Twp	5.3%	29.7%	2.8%	10.0%	0.1%	100.0%

1st CLASS TOWNSHIPS

	CJT	IDP Grant	IDP Loan	ISRP 2	ISRP 4	MELF	Opp Grant
Mean	208108	754588		91155	49885	362250	228278
Median	100000	850000		91155	57000	350000	100000
Mode	100000	1000000		#N/A	#N/A	500000	100000
Standard Deviation	378342	434046		11296	29723	140917	327299
Kurtosis	15	-2		#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	0	6
Skewness	4	0		#DIV/0!	-1	-1	3
Range	1876314	1074300		15975	58155	400000	1170000
Minimum	8000	175700		83167	17250	100000	30000
Maximum	1884314	1250000		99142	75405	500000	1200000
Sum	5827022	6036700		182309	149655	2898000	4109000
Count	28	8		2	3	8	18
Coefficient of Variation	1.82	0.58		0.12	0.60	0.39	1.43
Total 1st Class Twp $ as a % of Program $ for All Muni Classes	7.3%	4.2%		20.5%	1.6%	5.3%	2.6%
Individual Program $ for 1st Class Twp as a % of Total Program $ for 1st Class Twp	13.8%	14.3%	0.0%	0.4%	0.4%	6.9%	9.7%

1st CLASS TOWNSHIPS (continued)

	PIDA – IP	PIDA Loans	PIDA Multi	SBF	SBF - DC	Total
Mean	1125000	765050		159565		342918
Median	1125000	615125		200000		
Mode	#N/A	1250000		200000		
Standard Deviation	176777	397062		50852		
Kurtosis	#DIV/0!	-2		-1		
Skewness	#DIV/0!	0		-1		
Range	250000	1068450		132111		
Minimum	1000000	251550		67889		
Maximum	1250000	1320000		200000		
Sum	2250000	15301007		5425197		42178890
Count	2	20		34		123
Coeff of Var	0.16	0.52	#DIV/0!	0.32		
Total 1st Class Twp $ as a % of Program $ for All Muni Classes	8.2%	5.8%	0.0%	5.9%	0%	
Individual Program $ for 1st Class Twp as a % of Total Program $ for 1st Class Twp	5.3%	36.3%	0.0%	12.9%	0.0%	100.0%

BOROUGHS

	CJT	IDP Grant	IDP Loan	ISRP 2	ISRP 4	MELF	Opp Grant
Mean	130354	646318		65279	79122	372903	258122.64
Median	100000	572205		37736	61213	400000	150000
Mode	100000	1250000		#N/A	#N/A	500000	50000
Standard Deviation	141464	391397		54053	51816	134456	330714.32
Kurtosis	15.0	-1.0		-2.8	-1.1	-1.4	8.7
Skewness	3.4	0.5		0.5	0.6	-0.4	2.7
Range	991948	1244000		120011	154095	362651	1985000
Minimum	8052	94000		10020	19530	137349	15000
Maximum	1000000	1338000		130031	173625	500000	2000000
Sum	16424554	25852718		326395	1582442	13051618	32007207
Count	126	40		5	20	35	124
Coeff of Var	1.09	0.61		0.83	0.65	0.36	1.28
Total Borough $ as a % of Program $ for All Muni Classes	20.7%	17.9%		36.6%	17.4%	23.8%	20.5%
Individual Program $ for Boroughs as a % of Total Program $ for Boroughs	9.4%	14.8%	0.0%	0.2%	0.9%	7.5%	18.3%

BOROUGHS (continued)

	PIDA - IP	PIDA Loans	PIDA Multi	SBF	SBF - DC	Total
Mean	855071	780521	842042	156676	200000	281462
Median	640000	640000	750000	200000		
Mode	1750000	1250000	#N/A	200000		
Standard Deviation	850245.3	480344.7	522844.8	55148.0		
Kurtosis	-3.1	-0.9	-1.6	-0.9		
Skewness	0.2973139	0.6582987	0.6906136	-0.7885486		
Range	1725000	1587847	1149968	178000		
Minimum	25000	162153	359100	22000		
Maximum	1750000	1750000	1509068	200000		
Sum	4275357	46050740	3368168	31648492	200000	174787691
Count	5	59	4	202	1	621
Coeff of Var	0.99	0.62	0.62	0.35		
Total Borough $ as a % of Program $ for All Muni Classes	15.5%	17.6%	9.4%	34.1%	33%	
Individual Program $ for Boroughs as a % of Total Program $ for Boroughs	2.4%	26.3%	1.9%	18.1%	0.1%	100.0%

3rd CLASS CITIES

	CJT	IDP Grant	IDP Loan	ISRP 2	ISRP 4	MELF	Opp Grant
Mean	161584	708985		34762	76737	363529	281186
Median	100000	590000		22162	60000	400000	150000
Mode	100000	1250000		#N/A	200000	500000	150000
Standard Deviation	209437	513666		25175	56063	127021	378800
Kurtosis	13.4	2.7		#DIV/0!	0.0	-1.1	9.5
Skewness	3.5	1.4		1.7	1.1	-0.4	3.0
Range	1175000	2440000		45375	195950	400000	1985000
Minimum	15000	60000		18375	4050	100000	15000
Maximum	1190000	2500000		63750	200000	500000	2000000
Sum	14219409	35449249		104287	2839255	9815275	16590000
Count	88	50		3	37	27	59
Coeff of Var	1.30	0.72		0.72	0.73	0.35	1.35
Total 3rd Class City $ as a % of Program $ for All Muni Classes	17.9%	24.6%		11.7%	31.2%	17.9%	10.6%
Individual Program $ for 3rd Class Cities as a % of Total Program $ for 3rd Class Cities	10.0%	24.9%	0.0%	0.1%	2.0%	6.9%	11.6%

3rd CLASS CITIES (continued)

	PIDA - IP	PIDA Loans	PIDA Multi	SBF	SBF - DC	Total
Mean	1750000	742710	1209875	137427		341617
Median	1750000	579874	1000000	146250		
Mode		1750000	1750000	200000		
Standard Deviation		537178	522938	60911		
Kurtosis		-0.6	-2.4	-1.4		
Skewness		0.8	0.1	-0.3		
Range	0	1646134	1190000	180750		
Minimum		103866	560000	19250		
Maximum		1750000	1750000	200000		
Sum	1750000	40849073	8469126	12368445		142454119
Count	1	55	7	90		417
Coeff of Var	0.00	0.72	0.43	0.44		
Total 3rd Class City $ as a % of Program $ for All Muni Classes	6.4%	15.6%	23.5%	13.3%		
Individual Program $ for 3rd Class Cities as a % of Total Program $ for 3rd Class Cities	1.2%	28.7%	5.9%	8.7%	0.0%	100.0%

2nd CLASS A CITY - SCRANTON

	CJT	IDP Grant	IDP Loan	ISRP 2	ISRP 4	MELF	Opp Grant
Mean	131687	500000				400000	175000
Median	100000					400000	175000
Mode	#N/A					#N/A	#N/A
Standard Deviation	131555.28					141421.36	176776.7
Kurtosis	3.08					#N/A	#N/A
Skewness	1.75					#N/A	#N/A
Range	375000					200000	250000
Minimum	25000					300000	50000
Maximum	400000					500000	300000
Sum	921812	500000				800000	350000
Count	7	1				2	2
Coefficient of Variation	1.00	0.00				0.35	1.01
Total 2nc Class A City $ as a % of Program $ for All Muni Classes	1.2%	0.3%			0.0%	1.5%	0.2%
Individual Program $ for 2nd Class A Cities as a % of Total Program $ for 2nd Class A Cities	10.8%	5.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.4%	4.1%

2nd CLASS A CITY – SCRANTON (continued)

	PIDA - IP	PIDA Loans	PIDA Multi	SBF	SBF - DC	Total
Mean	0	1075333	1750000	166667		388537
Median		960000		200000		
Mode		#N/A		200000		
Standard Deviation		625032.27		51639.778		
Kurtosis		#DIV/0!		-1.88		
Skewness		0.80		-0.97		
Range	0	1234000		100000		
Minimum		516000		100000		
Maximum		1750000		200000		
Sum		3226000	1750000	1000000		8547812
Count	0	3	1	6		22
Coefficient of Variation		0.58	0.00	0.31		
Total 2nc Class A City $ as a % of Program $ for All Muni Classes	0.0%	1.2%	4.9%	1.1%		
Individual Program $ for 2nd Class A Cities as a % of Total Program $ for 2nd Class A Cities	0.0%	37.7%	20.5%	11.7%	0.0%	100.0%

2nd CLASS CITY – PITTSBURGH

	CJT	IDP Grant	IDP Loan	ISRP 2	ISRP 4	MELF	Opp Grant
Mean	416499	1181645	700000		63174	440000	483429
Median	224998	1250000			69649	500000	200000
Mode	#N/A	1250000			#N/A	500000	100000
Standard Deviation	613780.46	843158.44			49506.816	134164.08	665037.34
Kurtosis	7.4	-1.0			0.6	5.0	12.1
Skewness	2.6	0.5			0.8	-2.2	3.1
Range	1974000	2312000	0		157500	300000	3480000
Minimum	26000	188000			3750	200000	20000
Maximum	2000000	2500000			161250	500000	3500000
Sum	3748487	12998100	700000		568563	2200000	16920000
Count	9	11	1		9	5	35
Coefficient of Variation	1.47	0.71			0.78	0.30	1.38
Total 2nd Class City $ as a % of Program $ for All Muni Classes	4.7%	9.0%			6.3%	4.0%	10.8%
Individual Program $ for 2nd Class City as a % of Total Program $ for 2nd Class City	7.3%	25.5%	1.4%	0.0%	1.1%	4.3%	33.2%

2nd CLASS CITY – PITTSBURGH (continued)

	PIDA - IP	PIDA Loans	PIDA Multi	SBF	SBF - DC	Total
Mean	0	774352	1215957	197083		573414
Median		547155	1163397	200000		
Mode		#N/A	1750000	200000		
Standard Deviation		516384.01	475724.07	7144.3451		
Kurtosis		1.2	-1.7	6.0		
Skewness		1.4	0.0	-2.4		
Range	0	1419350	1162050	17500		
Minimum		330650	587950	182500		
Maximum		1750000	1750000	200000		
Sum		5420467	7295744	1182500		51033861
Count	0	7	6	6		89
Coefficient of Variation		0.67	0.39	0.04		
Total 2nd Class City $ as a % of Program $ for All Muni Classes	0.0%	2.1%	20.3%	1.3%		
Individual Program $ for 2nd Class City as a % of Total Program $ for 2nd Class City	0.0%	10.6%	14.3%	2.3%	0.0%	100.0%

1st CLASS CITY – PHILADELPHIA

	CJT	IDP Grant	IDP Loan	ISRP 2	ISRP 4	MELF	Opp Grant
Mean	216912.8	639187.5		28950	81945.667	391625	272000
Median	109965	650000			72123	400000	200000
Mode	250000	#N/A			8625	500000	100000
Standard Deviation	249190	327454			64062	114031	231582
Kurtosis	7.3	-2.1			6.2	-1.4	2.7
Skewness	2.5	-0.1			1.9	-0.5	1.7
Range	976462	743250			335424	300000	975000
Minimum	23538	256750			7875	200000	25000
Maximum	1000000	1000000			343299	500000	1000000
Sum	3253692	2556750		28950	3195881	4699500	8160000
Count	15	4		1	39	12	30
Coefficient of Variation	1.15	0.51		0.00	0.78	0.29	0.85
Total 1st Class City $ as a % of Program $ for All Muni Classes	4.1%	1.8%		3.2%	35.2%	8.6%	5.2%
Individual Program $ for 1st Class City as a % of Total Program $ for 1st Class City	4.5%	3.5%	0.0%	0.0%	4.4%	6.5%	11.3%

1st CLASS CITY – PHILADELPHIA (continued)

	PIDA - IP	PIDA Loans	PIDA Multi	SBF	SBF - DC	Total
Mean	0	822588.98	999950.4	156485.86		403851
Median		700000	1250000	164500		
Mode		1250000	1250000	200000		
Standard Deviation		455185	456324	47258		
Kurtosis		-0.6	-1.0	-0.8		
Skewness		0.6	-0.8	-0.6		
Range	0	1540000	1100248	149561		
Minimum		210000	339752	50439		
Maximum		1750000	1440000	200000		
Sum		41952038	4999752	3442689		72289252
Count	0	51	5	22		179
Coefficient of Variation		0.55	0.46	0.30		
Total 1st Class City $ as a % of Program $ for All Muni Classes	0.0%	16.0%	13.9%	3.7%		
Individual Program $ for 1st Class City as a % of Total Program $ for 1st Class City	0.0%	58.0%	6.9%	4.8%	0.0%	100.0%

NON-CLASSIFIED DATA –
MUNICIPAL CLASS WAS NOT IDENTIFIED IN THE DCED DATA SET

	CJT	IDP Grant	IDP Loan	ISRP 2	ISRP 4	MELF	Opp Grant
Mean	224492				43594		450000
Median	100000						450000
Mode	100000						#N/A
Standard Deviation	354020						70711
Kurtosis	13.9						#N/A
Skewness	3.5						#N/A
Range	1679000						100000
Minimum	21000						400000
Maximum	1700000						500000
Sum	5387809				43594		900000
Count	24				1	0	2
Coefficient of Variation	1.6				0.0		0.2
Total No Muni Classification $ as a % of Program $ for All Muni Classes	6.8%				0.5%		0.6%
Individual Program $ for No Classification Muni as a % of Total Program $ for No Classification Muni	62.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	10.5%

NON-CLASSIFIED DATA –
MUNICIPAL CLASS WAS NOT IDENTIFIED IN THE DCED DATA SET (continued)

	PIDA - IP	PIDA Loans	PIDA Multi	SBF	SBF - DC	Total
Mean	0	446910		168438		231695
Median		446910		185000		
Mode		#N/A		200000		
Standard Deviation		281301		39572		
Kurtosis		#DIV/0!		-0.7		
Skewness		#DIV/0!		-0.9		
Range	0	397820		100000		
Minimum		248000		100000		
Maximum		645820		200000		
Sum		893820		1347500		8572723
Count	0	2		8		37
Coefficient of Variation		0.6		0.2		
Total No Muni Classification $ as a % of Program $ for All Muni Classes	0.0%	0.3%	0.0%	1.5%		
Individual Program $ for No Classification Muni as a % of Total Program $ for No Classification Muni	0.0%	10.4%	0.0%	15.7%	0.0%	100.0%

DATA FOR ALL MUNICIPALITIES

	CJT	IDP Grant	IDP Loan	ISRP 2	ISRP 4	MELF	Opp Grant
Mean	162012	660853	531755	59399	75723	383279	330565
Median	100000	500000	531755	42574	66000	400000	175000
Mode	100000	1250000	#N/A	#N/A	30000	500000	100000
Standard Deviation	229111	477407	237934	38441	56682	125160	675303
Kurtosis	29	2	#DIV/0!	-1	3	-1	191
Skewness	5	1	#DIV/0!	0	1	-1	12
Range	1992000	2470000	336490	120011	341799	400000	11985000
Minimum	8000	30000	363510	10020	1500	100000	15000
Maximum	2000000	2500000	700000	130031	343299	500000	12000000
Sum	79385715	144065915	1063510	890990	9086715	54808921	156026522
Count	490	218	2	15	120	143	472
Coefficient of Variation	1.41	0.72	0.45	0.65	0.75	0.33	2.04
Program $ as a % of All $	9.2%	16.7%	0.1%	0.1%	1.1%	6.3%	18.1%

DATA FOR ALL MUNICIPALITIES (continued)

	PIDA - IP	PIDA Loans	PIDA Multi	SBF	SBF - DC	Total
Mean	1019032	771757	1090084	153536	200000	350274
Median	1180000	640000	1006794	199375	200000	
Mode	1250000	1250000	1750000	200000	200000	
Standard Deviation	553399	477298	536011	55181	0	
Kurtosis	-1	-1	-1	-1	#DIV/0!	
Skewness	0	1	0	-1	#DIV/0!	
Range	1725000	1654010	1686094	180750	0	
Minimum	25000	95990	63906	19250	200000	
Maximum	1750000	1750000	1750000	200000	200000	
Sum	27513854	261625673	35972784	92735822	600000	863776421
Count	27	339	33	604	3	2466
Coefficient of Variation	0.54	0.62	0.49	0.36		
Program $ as a % of All $	3.2%	30.3%	4.2%	10.7%	0.1%	100.0%