UCLA Institute for Research on Labor and Employment

Research & Policy Brief

Number 14– April 2013

Business Incubators in Metropolitan Los Angeles: Job Creators or Boondoggles?

Taner Osman, Department of Urban Planning, UCLA

Introduction

Business incubators are a widely used economic development policy tool which aim to nurture and support the development of small, often high-technology oriented firms within local economies. In a short period of time, business incubators have become a very popular mechanism aimed at engendering economic growth in local economies, not only in the US, but also around the world. In 1980, there were only 12 business incubators in the US; by 2006, this number had grown to more than 1,000 (Qian et al. 2011). In this paper, we detail the emergence of business incubators in the US and outline the rationale underlying the wholesale arrival of incubators as an economic development policy tool. We then provide a descriptive account of business incubators in Metropolitan Los Angeles, which outlines where within the region incubators are located, what goals they seek to achieve, what services they provide, and what industries they target. Finally, we draw from a number of studies to examine the impact of business incubators, to determine how successful they are as an economic development policy tool.

Business incubators and their popularity

There is no single definition for a business incubator, but most definitions converge on a very similar idea: business incubators are organizations that seek to boost the development of young companies through a variety of support mechanisms (Hackett and Dilts 2004; Sherman and Chappell 1998; Qian et al. 2011; Economic Development Administration 2011[1]). Incubators typically provide three services. First, they provide office space for new establishments. Second, incubators assist firms with some form of financial capital, and finally, incubators provide support services. These support services are wide-ranging in their scope and include: business support services, such as accounting, marketing, and legal guidance; technical assistance, which refers to industry-specific guidance and resources, including access to certain forms of technology; and finally, networking, whereby young firms are embedded within local industry communities (Hackett and Dilts 2004; Sherman and Chappell 1998; Qian et al. 2011; Economic Development Administration 2011). These services are provided with a view to boosting the survival and growth prospects of firms.

The immediate goal—and a goal common to all incubators—is to support firms during the early, vulnerable stages of their development so that they are able

[1]http://edaincubatortool.org/pdf/Master%20Report_FINALDownloadPDF.pdf

IRLE Institute for Research on Labor and Employment
University of California, Los Angeles

10945 Le Conte Ave. Ste. 2107
Los Angeles CA 90095
Tel: (310) 794-5957
Fax: (310) 794-6403

www.irle.ucla.edu

to grow free from the support and become independent of incubators. Beyond this goal, incubators often can have a broader set of purposes that might include creating jobs within—and thereby developing—local economies, boosting local innovation, and commercializing academic research, in the case of university-operated incubators (Hackett and Dilts 2004; Sherman and Chappell 1998; Qian et al. 2011; Economic Development Administration 2011).

Small firms are targeted by nonprofit incubators for their potential to create jobs, and by privately-operated incubators for their potential to grow into profitable companies. While the Small Business Association defines small firms as those with fewer than 500 employees, business incubators support much smaller firms—firms that typically have a handful of employees, at most. Incubators often support firms that are in the very early stages of their development—firms that may amount to nothing more than a good idea. Business accelerators, on the other hand, which are a form of incubator, tend to target firms at the later stages of their development, that is, firms that are more advanced and on the verge of seeking out external investors for their ideas (Economic Development Administration 2011). Incubators can be general purpose in their orientation, to the extent that they support firms regardless of their industrial specialization. Many incubators, however, are tailored towards serving specific industry sectors, the most commonly served industries are those oriented towards high technology, such as information technology (IT) and biotechnology (Economic Development Administration 2011).

Over the period 1998-2005, the number of business incubators in the U.S. doubled (Knopp 2007). In 2005, it was estimated that business incubators assisted 27,000 start-up companies, creating 100,000 jobs in the process (Qian et al. 2011). However, the validity of these findings is contested, as we will outline below. Business incubators are not only a U.S. phenomenon, however; it is estimated that there are roughly 7,000 incubators throughout the world (Economic Development Administration 2011). As these numbers demonstrate, business incubators have become a favorite economic development policy tool for governments throughout the world.

Today, there are approximately 38 business incubator programs in Southern California[1], scattered across the region's cities. There are 7 incubators in the city of Los Angeles, making Los Angeles home to more incubators in the United States than any other city with the exception of New York City (Qian et al. 2011). As is the case at the national level, the incubators in the region differ in their nature. Some of these organizations are nonprofit entities, while others are private, profit-driven bodies. Some incubators target firms in specific industries, such as clean tech, biotech or information technology. They also differ in the type of services that they provide to firms. Below, we will describe in greater detail the state of business incubators in Southern California.

The Rationale for Business Incubators

Public policy tools to assist small firms have emerged on the basis of evidence that small firms play an important role in job creation in the U.S. economy. According to the Small Business Administration (SBA),[2] small businesses (defined as those that have fewer than 500 employees) represented 99.7% of all employers in the United States in 2007 and employed half of all private sector employees in the country. Over the period 1993-2009, small businesses created 65% of

[1] We define Southern California as the five counties that comprise metropolitan Los Angeles: Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura Counties.

[2] http://web.sba.gov/faqs/faqIndexAll.cfm?areaid=24

all net new jobs in the United States. While these firms play such an important role in adding jobs to the economy, it is important to keep in mind that the creation of new firms is fraught with risk, as evidenced by their low survival rate. The SBA finds that 31% of all new businesses fail within 2 years of their creation, while 50% of enterprises fail within 5 years of their formation. In recognizing both the importance of small firms and the high rate of their failure, business incubators emerged as means to support small firms in their early stages of development. As we will describe below, specific industries have been targeted for support by local governments.

The first business incubator was created in the United States in 1959 in New York State (Qian et al. 2011). However, business incubator programs did not take off as widely-employed economic development policy tools until the 1990s. Of the 38 incubators still in operation in metro Los Angeles today, the oldest was created in 1970; 36 of these 38 have only been in existence since 1990, and all but six have been created in the year 2000 or later.

Business incubators as an economic development policy tool are representative of a sea change in the approach to economic development by local governments. For much of the post-World War II era, economic development efforts in the United States largely focused on what has been labeled "industrial recruitment," or "smokestack chasing." Industrial recruitment is the act of offering financial incentives, often in the form of some form of tax break, either to attract firms to a given location from some other jurisdiction or in a bid to entice a newly created firm or branch plant to locate within a particular locality (Bartik 1991; Eisinger 1989: Markusen and Glasmeier 2008, Blakely 2010: Donahue 1997). Historically, such efforts—ultimately employed to boost local employment levels and economic growth—have enjoyed limited success, at best, and have frequently resulted in local governments giving away millions of dollars for very little return (Bartik 2004: Donahue 1997).

In the 1980s, different ideas about how to boost local economies captured the attention of policy makers (Eisinger 1989). Rather than luring firms from other towns (the merits of which local governments began to question), local governments set about to retain and grow existing firms within their communities in order to develop potential avenues for industrial growth and job creation. The underlying rationale was that local governments should focus their efforts on cultivating their own gardens; rather than poaching existing firms from other states, states set about playing a role in nurturing new industries and assisting existing industries located in their administrations (Eisinger 1989). Knowledge-creating industries and innovation were an especially sought-after commodity as manufacturing employment in the U.S. began to decline in relative terms (Bluestone and Harrison 1981). Recent research reveals that innovative industries, while only accounting for roughly 10% of all jobs in the US economy, can be responsible for the creation of many other jobs through multiplier effects. The wealth generated from one IT job, for example, is thought to account for the creation of five further jobs in local economies (Moretti 2012). At a time when manufacturing employment in the U.S. became a much smaller share of the nation's economy, technology and innovation were buzzwords that became synonymous with prosperity and economic growth. This context created the perfect environment for the emergence of business incubators as a widely-used policy tool.

So-called smokestack-chasing policies still receive the lion's share of local economic development funding (Bartik 2004), but incubators are now part of a wider portfolio of activities pursued by local governments. The case for incubators finds support in studies that show that enterprise development is more sustainable, more cost-effective, and more attuned to community development than its sister economic development strategies of business attraction and business retention/expansion (Economic Development Administration 2011; Markeley and McNamara 1995).

Incubators in Metropolitan Los Angeles

There are currently 38 business incubators in Metropolitan Los Angeles. With 26 of these located within Los Angeles County, this county has, by far, the largest concentration; the remaining incubators are located in Orange (eight), Riverside (two) San Bernardino (one) and Ventura (one) Counties. Appendix I contains a full list of incubators in the region and information about each of them. Within the region's cities, the city of Los Angeles is home to the largest share of incubators (seven). Other significant concentrations of these organizations are found in the cities of Pasadena (five) and Santa Monica (four).

While local governments use incubators as part of their economic development policy efforts, a large share of the incubators in Southern California are privately funded and operated. Of the 38 incubators in the region, 17 are private, for-profit endeavors, representing around 44% of the total. In these organizations, incubators typically take an equity stake in their tenant organizations of around 10%. Twenty incubators in Southern California are nonprofit operations. One organization is a hybrid nonprofit/private collaboration. This marks a difference from national trends, where only 4% of all incubators are for-profit operations and 94% are nonprofit organizations (Knopp 2007).

In total, there are ten incubators in Southern California that are affiliated with universities, comprising 28% of the total. This compares to the national level where 20% of incubators are affiliated with universities. The region's universities that have a hand in some form of incubator include: California State Polytechnic, Pomona; California State University, San Bernardino; California State University, Long Beach; Santa Ana College; The California Institute of Technology; The College of the Canyons; California State University, Fullerton; The University of California Irvine and The University of California, Los Angeles.

As we mentioned above, incubators offer a wide range of assistance to fledgling firms, including businesses services, such as assistance with the compliance of local ordinances and regulations, accounting assistance, business strategy, and financial capital. One of the major services that sets incubators apart from one another is the extent to which they provide office space to new enterprises. In Southern California, 27 of the 38 incubators in the region provide firms with office space.

In terms of the mission or goals of the different incubators, by their very nature, all organizations exist to boost the success of new firms. However, there is a stark difference in the goals of nonprofit compared to private incubators. Private organizations are predominantly interested in growing firms into profitable entities. Private incubators frequently take a stake in the firms they incubate, which means they directly profit from the success of the firms they help to nurture. That said, the goal of private organizations is a little more nuanced than simply making profits.

For example, two organizations observed on their websites that Greater Los Angeles has a problem in that a number of good ideas are created in the region, but the new firms established on the back of these ideas leave the region because Los Angeles. lacks the kind of entrepreneurial DNA that would support these enterprises. In the words of the founders of Launchpad LA, the incubator emerged, "from our frustration with seeing LA companies receive funding from Northern California [venture capitalists] and then choose to relocate their teams" (http://launchpad.la/about). Similarly, Momentum Biosciences emerged:

> "Born out of the frustration of LA-based inventions moving to the more established biotech hubs of San Francisco and San Diego, UCLA and Caltech faculty banded together

> to create a local home for entrepreneurial academics and their new ideas" (http://www.momentum-biosciences.com/).

Nonprofit organizations, it is clear, have goals much broader than simply boosting the prospects of individual firms. Those incubators affiliated with universities tend to concentrate on commercializing academic discoveries. Those affiliated with cities, however, have broader economic development goals on their agendas. The iHub incubator in Coachella Valley, for example, aims to:

> "Diversify the local economy to include Clean Tech Industries…[and] Increase the per capita household income and standard of living within the Coachella Valley and surrounding region" (http://www.cvihub.com/about-cvihub/our-goals/).

It is not uncommon for nonprofit agencies to have as part of their mission growing the local economy within which they are embedded. Many incubators have been formed, in fact, to target and grow specific industries within the region; these industries include transportation technologies, digital media, the high tech industry, clean tech, biotech, and the logistics industry. At the national level, 84% of all incubators cite creating jobs as an objective. 54% of incubators seek to commercialize technology, 48% are established to diversify the local economy, 48% seek to accelerate local industry growth, while 18% seek to revitalize distressed neighborhoods.

Are Incubators a successful economic development policy tool?

As we have documented, incubators have emerged as a widely-used economic development policy tool by local governments, but how successful are they in achieving their economic development objectives? A variety of studies have sought to determine the impact of incubators, and opinions on their success differ widely. According to a 2011 study on behalf of the Economic Development Administration (EDA):

> "incubators are the most effective means of creating jobs – more effective than roads and bridges, industrial parks, commercial buildings, and sewer and water projects….business incubators create jobs at far less cost than do other EDA investments."

However, others have been far less positive about the impact of incubators. Travoletti (2012) writes:

> "there is increasing evidence in the literature that, despite many successful cases and public policies supporting business incubation, most of BIs are not successful at all and serious doubts have emerged about the general effectiveness of business incubation and the advisability of investing public money in it."

Incubators have been assessed from every angle imaginable. In this study, we focus on the outcomes that concern the performance of incubatees and the impact of incubators on local economies. There is a literature that focuses on incubators' level of development, such as their ability to raise capital, their capacity to forge business networks, and their organizational best practices. (For a review of this literature, see Hackett and Dilts, 2004).

In terms of how incubators affect the local economy, there are three primary measures of an incubator's success. First, scholars ask, "what is the rate of survival of firms within incubators?". Second, they ask whether incubators create jobs. Thirdly, "do incubators impact the economic growth of the regions within which they are embedded?". (Sherman and Chappel 1998; Hackett and Dilts 2004: Schwartz 2009). The latter two measures hinge, to a great extent, on the first. After all, if incubators do not engender better survival rates of firms than can be found in the population at large, how can they be effective tools for job creation and regional development? In this section, we explore how the literature has tackled these questions.

Do firms in incubators perform better than the population at large?

> "When considering incubator-incubation impacts, the fundamental research question is 'Does the operationalized incubator-incubation concept make any difference in the survival rates of incubatees?'" (Hackett and Dilts 2004).

For such a simple question, the answer is surprisingly complicated. To answer this question well, we would need to know how a given tenant firm would have performed absent its inclusion in an incubator. Such "what if?" scenarios are notoriously difficult to answer. One way to overcome this challenge would be to compare firms in incubators to a carefully selected control group of firms—firms which share similar characteristics to firms within incubators but that were not included within incubator programs. As we will discuss, it has been very difficult to compare the performance of firms within incubators to the performance of firms who have not entered into an incubator program. This has been reflected in a lack of definitive studies able to answer what would appear to be the core question in the field.

A lack of good data is the main challenge we face in assessing the performance of tenant firms. According to the National Business Incubation Association (NBIA) (2007), "Unfortunately, NBIA has had a difficult time gathering current information on incubator impacts *because many incubation programs don't track the success of their clients and graduates* (author's emphasis)."[3] Beyond the fact that incubators don't track the performance of their incubatees, historically there have been very few datasets which provide the level of detail that would be necessary to craft the sort of control group we outline above. In the United States, for example, there are no freely available datasets that track the location, birth, death, and growth of individual firms, classified by the industry within which they operate. To do this study well would require information on the individuals who create firms, such as their level of experience or the quality of their business plans. Such data do not exist.

Even if good data did exist, there are methodological challenges to analyzing the survival rate of incubatees. Firms within incubators are not selected at random. Their applications to join an incubator are reviewed and screened based on certain criteria. These criteria include, most importantly, the promise of their business idea. Therefore, there is a selection bias associated with the firms that join incubators. Let us assume that firms within incubators have higher rates of survival than the population of firms at large. It may be the case that the selection process of firms that enter incubators weeds out those firms with the best chances of survival, therefore greatly overestimating the impact that an incubator might have on the survival of a given firm.

Related to this point, we do not know how firms might have performed absent their inclusion in the incubator, which, as we describe above, makes the need to compare incubated

[3] http://www.nbia.org/impact/

firms to a carefully selected control group so important (Hackett and Dilts 2004; Sherman and Chapell 1998: Schwartz 2009). Lastly, looking at survival rates of tenants during their stay in an incubator can be misleading since the very purpose of an incubator is to keep firms alive. Comparing firms (which may be on life support) to the survival of firms at large could well be an artificial comparison. Focusing on how firms perform after their graduation, once they are free from support services and free of subsidized office space, seems to be just as compelling a question as looking at the survival of firms within incubators. Yet very little research is dedicated to this later question (Schwartz 2009).

Even beyond the methodological issues outlined above, gauging the effectiveness of incubators based of existing research poses additional challenges since studies of incubators are not directly comparable. Differences exist in the definition of incubators, what constitutes a firm closure, how control groups are determined, if they are used at all, the characteristics of an incubator – whether it is public or privately operated, how much cash it has it its disposal, the types of services it offers – and whether a study measures survival of firms during their tenancy or post graduation. That said, there is a body of findings in this field, which we will now address.

Most studies focus on tenant survival rates. Two commonly-cited studies reach different conclusions about the effectiveness of incubators. Bearse (1998) outlines that practitioner studies typically find survival rates of incubator firms to be around 80%. However, academic studies have not found such success amongst these firms. Roper (1999), in his study of Israeli firms, found that 55% of incubator firms survived through to graduation, while Schwartz (2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011), in his study of German incubators, finds little evidence that incubated firms perform better than their non-incubator counterparts, across a number of measures of performance. On the fact of it, a survival rate of between 55% and 80% sounds respectable, given that 31% of firms in the U.S. fail within two years of their creation. However, beyond the caveats we mention above, we have no idea of how the firms in these studies would have performed absent their inclusion in an incubator (Travoletti, 2012).

Since it is extremely difficult to gauge how firms would have performed had they not entered incubators, as we mention above, it would be ideal to compare the performance of incubatees to a carefully selected control group (Hackett and Dilts 2004; Travoletti 2012; Schwartz 2009). Amazingly, as recently as 2007, the National Business Incubation Association wrote, “the fact is, no one has ever compared the survival of incubated versus non-incubated firms.” Given the rise of incubators as a public policy tool, it is astonishing that there are very few rigorous studies which perform a comparative evaluation of firms in business incubators to non incubated firms. As we suggest, a lack of good data is a large part of the explanation for the lack of rigorous studies in this regard. Although, it must be said: data constraints have been overcome in a variety of other fields.

A series of papers by Michael Schwartz (2008, 2009, 2010, 2011), in which he directly compares the performance of incubated and non-incubated firms in Germany, is a rare exception in this regard. In his 2010 study, he compares the survival rates of 371 start-up firms within 5 publicly funded incubators with the survival rate of a control group of 371 start-ups that did not receive support from any incubator. Schwartz compiled his control group based on four different dimensions: the location, industry, age, and legal form of firms. He found no statistically significant evidence that firms within incubators performed better than firms outside of them. In fact, for three incubators, he found statistically significant evidence that incubated firms survive at lower rates than non-incubated firms. There are clearly limitations to his study—he uses a rather crude approach to constructing his control group—but these limitations are illustrative of the problems of performing good research in this field. However, since one might expect that the incubated firms would be selected on characteristics,

unobservable in the data, that made success likely, his weak-to-negative evidence on the likely impact of incubators may actually be an understatement of how poor the evidence of success really is.

Impacts on job creation and regional growth

If the evidence on the effectiveness of incubators on firm survival is weak, it stands to reason that there is not great evidence of their effect on job creation or regional growth. In so far as job creation is concerned, there are a handful of studies that measure the impact of incubators on job creation. Some studies claim that incubators are responsible for the creation of 100,000 jobs in the U.S. (Qian et al. 2011). Others claim that incubators create employment at a more cost-effective rate than other economic development polices (Hackett and Dilts 2004; Knopp 2007). However, these studies share a common flaw. Markeley and McNamara (1995), for example, claim that business incubators create employment at a cost of $6,580 per job, while the cost of jobs created from location incentives (tax breaks offered to firms to locate within given communities) range from $11,000 to $50,588. These studies assume that any job within a tenant firm would not have been otherwise created, an unrealistic assumption for a number of reasons. First of all, some firms that enter incubators have already been created prior to their inclusion, therefore the incubator is not responsible for the firm's existence. Secondly, since incubators choose those firms with the best prospects of survival, namely, those with the best business plans, it is likely that the firms would have survived in some capacity without the incubator's help. For these reasons, assuming jobs within incubators would not have otherwise existed is an unrealistic assumption.

To our knowledge, there are no studies examining the impact of incubators on regional growth. The closest we can find is a study that found that science parks had no discernible effect on regional economic growth (Luger and Goldstein 1991).

Conclusion

Business incubators have become an important tool in the economic development policy kit of local governments. The number of incubators has exploded, not only in the U.S., but also worldwide over the past 20 years. Metropolitan Los Angeles has shared in the enthusiasm for business incubators. Of all the cities in the U.S., Los Angeles has the second highest number of incubators. A number of claims are made about the potential impact of incubators on local economies. Some nonprofit organizations claim that incubators are able to create jobs, and contribute to the economic development of the regions in which they are embedded. Unfortunately, such claims are not supported by evidence. There are no studies that demonstrate, in a rigorous way, that more jobs are created as a result of business incubators' involvement than would be the case in their absence. We understand the need for local governments to make ambitious claims to support the use of public money in incubator projects. That said, for the long-term health of incubators, and if incubators are to continue to receive public funding, better research must support their existence. This would be important not only to gauge the success of incubators generally, but also to help us discern why it is that firms in some incubators might outperform firms in others. Incubators are the best-placed organizations to gather the appropriate data necessary to perform a compelling analysis of their success.

References

Bartik, T. J. (1991). Who Benefits from State and Local Economic Development Policies?. Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research.

Bartik, T. (2010). "Bringing Jobs to People: How Federal Policy Can Target Job Creation for Economically Distressed Areas." Policy Brief, October. Washington, DC: Hamilton Project, Brookings Institution.

Bearse, P. (1998). A question of evaluation: NBIA's impact assessment of business incubators. *Economic Development Quarterly*, *12*(4), 322–333.

Blakely, E. J. (2002). *Planning Local Economic Development: Theory and Practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bluestone, B., Harrison, B., & Baker, L. (1981). *Corporate flight: the causes and consequences of economic dislocation*. Washington, DC: Progressive Alliance, National Center for Policy Alternatives.

Donahue, J. D. (1997). *Disunited states: what's at stake as Washington fades and the states take the lead*. New York: Basic Books.

Eisinger, P. K. (1988). *The rise of the entrepreneurial state: State and local economic development policy in the United States*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Hackett, S. M., & Dilts, D. M. (2004). A systematic review of business incubation research. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, *29*(1), 55–82.

Knopp, L. (2007). *2006 State of the Business Incubation Industry*. Athens, OH: NBIA Publications.

Luger, M. I. (1991). *Technology in the garden: research parks and regional economic development*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Markley, D. M., & McNamara, K. T. (1995). Economic and fiscal impacts of a business incubator. *Economic Development Quarterly*, *9*(3), 273–278.

Markusen, A., & Glasmeier, A. (2008). Overhauling and revitalizing federal economic development programs. *Economic Development Quarterly*, *22*(2), 83.

Moretti, E. (2012). *The New Geography of Jobs*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt (HMH).

Qian, H., Haynes, K. E., & Riggle, J. D. (2011). Incubation push or business pull? Investigating the geography of US business incubators. *Economic Development Quarterly*, *25*(1), 79–90.

Roper, S. (1999). Israel's Technology Incubators: Repeatable Success or Costly Failure? *Regional Studies-Cambridge and New York*, *33*, 175–180.

Schwartz, M. (2008). *Incubator age and incubation time: Determinants of firm survival after graduation?* IWH-Diskussionspapiere. Retrieved from http://www.econstor.eu/handle/10419/29980

Schwartz, M. (2009). Beyond incubation: an analysis of firm survival and exit dynamics in the post-graduation period. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, *34*(4), 403–421.

Schwartz, M. (2010). A control group study of incubators' impact to promote firm survival. *The Journal of Technology Transfer*, 1–30.

Schwartz, M. (2011). Incubating an Illusion? Long-Term Incubator Firm Performance after Graduation. *Growth and Change*, *42*(4), 491–516.

Sherman, H., & Chappell, D. S. (1998). Methodological challenges in evaluating business incubator outcomes. *Economic Development Quarterly*, *12*(4), 313–321.

Tavoletti, E. (2012). Business Incubators: Effective Infrastructures or Waste of Public Money? Looking for a Theoretical Framework, Guidelines and Criteria. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, 1–21.

Appendix I: Incubators in Metropolitan Los Angeles

Incubator Name	City	County	Industrial Orientation	Private/Public	Office Space?	Year Founded
The Center for Training & Technology Incubation (CTTI)	Pomona	Los Angeles	IT/Biotech	Nonprofit (Cal Poly/Nasa/EDA)	Yes	1998
Alliance for Commercialization of Technology	Redlands	San Bernadino	General	Nonprofit (CSUSB)	No	2002
Amplify	Venice	Los Angeles	General	Private	Yes	2005
Brighthouse- (Not open)	Santa Monica	Los Angeles	General	Private	No	2007
Business Source Center	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	General	Nonprofit (City of LA)	No	1970
Business Technology Center	Altadena	Los Angeles	IT/Biotech	Nonprofit (LA County)	Yes	1998
CALSTART Project Hatchery, Pasadena Incubator	Pasadena	Los Angeles	Green Tech	Nonprofit	Yes	1992
Coachella Valley iHub	Palm Springs	Riverside	Green Tech	Nonprofit (Cities in the Coachella Valley)	Yes	2011
CSULB Regional Technology Center	Long Beach	Los Angeles	General	Nonprofit (CSULB)	Yes	N/A
Digital Media Center	Santa Ana	Orange		Nonprofit (RSCCD, Santa Ana College, the City of Santa Ana, EDA)	Yes	2006
Entretech	Pasadena	Los Angeles	General	Nonprofit (City of Pasadena/Cal Tech)	No	2000
I3 Advanced Technology Incubator	Santa Clarita	Los Angeles	General	Nonprofit	No	2008
idealab!	Pasadena	Los Angeles	General	Private	Yes	1996
K5Launch	Orange County	Orange	General	Private	Yes	2011
LA Cleantech Incubator	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	Green Tech	Nonprofit (City of Los Angeles)	Yes	2011
LaunchpadLA	Santa Monica	Los Angeles	General	Private	Yes	2009
Momentum Biosciences	Culver City	Los Angeles	Biotech	Private	Yes	2005
MuckerLab	Santa Monica	Los Angeles	IT	Private	Yes	2011
NantAccelerator	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	IT	Private	Yes	2011
OCTANe LaunchPAD	Irvine	Orange	Green Tech/Biotech	Nonprofit	No	2002
Originate Labs	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	IT	Private	No	2006
Pasadena BioScience Collaborative	Pasadena	Los Angeles	Biotech	Nonprofit (City of Pasadena)	Yes	2004
Pasadena Enterprise Center	Pasadena	Los Angeles	General	Nonprofit (City of Pasadena)	Yes	1987
PortTechLA	San Pedro	Los Angeles	Green Tech	Nonprofit/Private	Yes	2009
Redondo Beach Information Technology Center	Redondo Beach	Los Angeles	General	Private	Yes	2001
Science, Inc.	Los Angeles	Los Angeles		Private	No	2011
Select University Technologies Inc.	Santa Ana	Orange	General	Private	Yes	2010
SilverlakeHQ	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	General	Private	Yes	2012
South Bay Entrepreneurial Center	Torrance	Los Angeles	General	Nonprofit	Yes	2011
StartEngine	Westwood	Los Angeles	General	Private	Yes	2011
Tech Coast Works	Orange County	Orange	General	Nonprofit (UC Irvine)	Yes	2007
Temecula Valley Entrepreneur's Exchange (TVE2)	Temecula	Riverside	General	Nonprofit (City of Temecula)	Yes	2012
The California NanoSystems Institute Technology Incubator at UCLA	Los Angeles	Los Angeles	Green Tech/Biotech	Nonprofit (UCLA)	Yes	2009
The Hive	Huntington Beach	Orange	General	Private	Yes	2006
UC Irvine Photonic Incubator	Irvine	Orange	Biotech	Nonprofit (UC Irvine)	No	N/A
UpstartLA	Santa Monica	Los Angeles	General	Private	Yes	2011
Ventura Ventures Technology Center	Ventura	Ventura	General	Nonprofit (City of Ventura)	Yes	2009
WIN Opportunities, Inc.	Irvine	Orange	General	Private	No	N/A

Source: These figures were compiled from the National Business Incubation Association, socalteach.com and http://www.buzgate.org/8.0/ca/fh_incubators.html?cb=ibm

Appendix I: Incubators in Metropolitan Los Angeles

Goal	Website
Establish a world class research and development environment	http://www.innovationvillage.org/generalinfo.aspx
To advance commercialization of innovative products and services.	http://www.actsocal.org/
To grow companies and increase the value of the incubators stake in the company	http://www.amplify.la/
To grow companies and increase the value of the incubators stake in the company	http://www.brighth.com/contact.html
Enhance the competitiveness of firms in the City of Los Angeles.	http://www.losangelesworks.org/businessServices/BusinessSourceCenters.cfm
Transferring and commercializing technologies from Federal Laboratories and Universities	http://www3.lacdc.org/CDCWebsite/LABTC/home.aspx
Develop and implement clean, efficient transportation solutions.	http://www.calstart.org/About-us/Who-We-Are/CALSTART-History.aspx
Diversify the local economy/create high paying jobs/increase per capita income	http://www.cvihub.com/
To assist start-up and early-state technology companies grow and prosper.	http://www.csulb.edu/divisions/aa/regional_technology/
Support and promote the growth of innovative digital media technology and its application across industries.	http://www.dmc-works.com/about.html
To grow the high-tech industry along the 134/210 corridor	http://www.entretech.org/
To grow companies and increase the value of the incubators stake in the company	http://www.canyonsecondev.org/i3_overview.shtml
To grow companies and increase the value of the incubators stake in the company	https://angel.co/idealab
To grow companies and increase the value of the incubators stake in the company	http://k5launch.com/about
To accelerate the development of cleantech start-ups in Los Angeles	http://laincubator.org/about/
Retain start-up companies within Southern California	http://launchpad.la/about
Commercialization of university based R&D. Provide an environment to retain inventions in the LA region.	http://www.momentum-biosciences.com/
To grow companies and increase the value of the incubators stake in the company	http://www.muckerlab.com/about/
To grow companies and increase the value of the incubators stake in the company	http://www.nantworks.com/nantaccelerator
Stimulate technology job growth and wealth creation in Orange County	http://www.octaneoc.org/home/launchpad/
To grow companies and increase the value of the incubators stake in the company	http://www.originate.com/
To support the development of the biotech industry	http://www.pasadenabiosci.org/generalinfo.htm
To foster local economic development and job creation	http://www.pasadenaenterprise.org/
To promote industries associated with the port, especially environmental and energy	http://www.porttechla.org/about.asp
N/A	http://www.techcenter.net/building.html#overview
To grow companies and increase the value of the incubators stake in the company	http://science-inc.com/
Commercialize, I think: SUTIMCo is a “product launch” company and it manages joint ventures between universities, investors, and itself.	http://suti.com/about-us
N/A	http://www.slhq.org/
N/A	http://www.thesbec.org/index.htm
To grow companies and increase the value of the incubators stake in the company	http://www.startengine.com/
Commercialization	http://www.techcoastworks.com/
To stimulate job growth and enhance the Riverside County economy	http://www.cityoftemecula.org/Temecula/Businesses/Temecula+Valley+Entrepreneur’s+Exchange.htm
Commercialization and aid start-ups at UCLA	http://www1.cnsi.ucla.edu/staticpages/incubation
To grow companies and increase the value of the incubators stake in the company	http://www.thehivehb.com/
Aid biotech start-ups, create new products, and create new jobs.	http://www.bli.uci.edu/incubator/
To grow companies and increase the value of the incubators stake in the company	http://www.upstart.la/about.html
To boost Ventura County's prospects in the New Economy	http://www.v2tc.com/
To grow companies and increase the value of the incubators stake in the company	http://www.winopp.com/about-us.php