

1980

*Atomic
Energy
C.*

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
DAVIS
SEP 19 1980
Agricultural Economics Library

THE SPATIAL AND TEMPORAL ECONOMIC
IMPACT OF A NUCLEAR ENERGY CENTER -
A METHODOLOGICAL DISCOURSE AND APPLICATION
TO A SOUTHERN REGIONAL SITE

by

Mark S. Henry
Associate Professor
Department of Agricultural Economics
and Rural Sociology

Clemson University
Clemson, South Carolina

*Presented at AAEA meetings, Ux Baum, Champaign,
July 27-30, 1980.*

Introduction

The question of the relative advantages and disadvantages of a cluster of 12 1200 megawatt nuclear electric generating plants in a single geographic area vis a vis geographic dispersal of plants has been the subject of several recent studies. These studies have indicated that nuclear energy centers do not involve technical issues that would inhibit their construction and operation. Indeed, it is the potential savings in construction costs that provide some of the appeal of the NEC relative to dispersal of sites. However, it has been noted that in regard to the NEC concept, "The more difficult issues appear to be institutional and revolve around land use planning, land requisition, taxation and equitable revenue distribution, ownership, and management of NEC's, the legal and regulatory aspects of transmitting electricity across state boundaries, and the roles of the various levels of government in all of the above." [2, p. 1-11].

These institutional issues must be addressed at the regional level where the region of interest is the area to be impacted by the construction and operation of a NEC [3]. The question of the socioeconomic impact of a NEC may be addressed by reference to the now widely used economic-demographic models of large scale construction [see 3, 4, 5 for excellent examples of how these models might be applied to nuclear energy plants]. However, economic-demographic models can only be a starting point for the socioeconomic impact of a NEC. These models forecast population, employment, government revenues and expenditures in a spatial and temporal context. Accordingly, the forecasts provided are vital sources of information to the local political subdivisions that make social overhead capital investment decisions. Better forecasts provide the opportunity for a wiser

investment strategy by public and private decision makers as they respectively attempt to maximize community satisfaction or maximize profits over time.

In summary, the purposes of this paper are to provide a methodology that is generally applicable for the assessment of the regional impact of a NEC, and to apply the methodology to the Anderson County, South Carolina site. Regional impact is defined for these purposes to include the employment, population and income impacts on the region of interest and the spatial allocation of these variables within the study region. Of course, from the perspective of the local policy makers, estimates of revenue and expenditures in the public sector are important considerations. Thus, the public sector analysis needs to be carried out once the economic-demographic impacts are known. Fortunately, there are many fiscal impact models available; a review of some are presented in Burchell and Listokin [6].

The Study Region

Although the proposed NEC would be located in Anderson County, South Carolina, the area impacted by the construction and operation of a NEC goes beyond the county borders. The impact is a 12 county area in South Carolina and Georgia.

The impact area was defined to include the counties of residence for workers that commute to Anderson County, South Carolina. It is assumed that a NEC in Anderson County will draw workers, at least, from those counties that were supplying labor to Anderson County as of 1970. This is a conservative estimate of the size of the regional labor pool for a project as large as a NEC.

The Regional Economic Forecasting Model

The model used to forecast output, employment and income for the region is a nonsurvey input-output (IO) technique developed by Mulkey and Hite[7]. This model may be employed to forecast regional economic activity for any region in the U.S. for which sectoral employment data exist.¹ The model may be employed to forecast both a baseline level of activity for the region (without the NEC) and an impact scenario (the NEC impact). (See the Appendix for model derivation)

The NEC Impact

The NEC impact is estimated in three steps. First, direct employment and income effects from the construction and operation of a NEC are considered. Second, indirect jobs and income generated from material purchases and payrolls during NEC construction and operation are estimated. Third, the spatial distribution of the employment, income and population changes associated with the NEC is estimated for a 12 county impact region.

Estimates of the NEC Impact

Given the final demand vectors (estimated from engineering data [13]), the indirect effects follow from the procedures described below:

$$(1) \Delta X^r = (I - A^r)^{-1} \Delta Y^r$$

$$(2) \Delta I^r = a^r \Delta X^r$$

$$(3) \Delta E^r = p^r \Delta X^r$$

where: ΔX^r = change in regional output vector, nxl,

ΔY^r = change in regional final demand associated with the NEC,
nxl,

1. A note of caution is needed here. Nonsurvey techniques have been subjected to criticism (see Miernyk [26] for a recent example). Moreover, small regions (e.g., one county) have large and unstable import coefficients.

a^r = household row coefficient vector, $1 \times n$, in the regionalized matrix A^r ,

ΔE^r = change in regional employment vector, $n \times 1$,

p^r = productivity (employment/output) ratios vector, $1 \times n$, trended to the forecast year.

A review of prior studies [16-21] led to the assumption of a 35 percent rate of immigration for construction workers and 10 percent for operating and maintenance workers. Indirect workers were assumed to be supplied locally after consideration of the ability of the regional labor force to provide the regional indirect workers (see Henry [29]). Table 1 reveals the 12 county employment impact of the NEC. The population impact is then determined from applying an average family size to immigrating workers (see Henry [29]). Once this region-wide impact is determined, the spatial allocation of the new employees and population follows.

Spatial Allocation Model

The region-wide forecasts of employment and population are next disaggregated to the county, County Census Division and municipal level. This stage of the analysis is likely the most difficult in terms of accuracy but the need for forecasts at the community level are necessary if the fiscal impact of a NEC is to be estimated. County and municipal officials need estimates of the likely change in employment and population in their areas if they are to plan effectively for the provision of public services.

Spatial Allocation of NEC Impact Population, Employment and Income

People moving into the region to work at the NEC will consider two major facets of the particular area they select as a residence. Ceteris

TABLE 1

Local and Non-Local NEC Employment Impacts - 12 County Area

Year	Construction ^a		Operation ^b		Indirect ^c		Sum Project Related: Local ^d		% Projected Lab Force	
	Total	Local	Total	Local	Total	Local	Total	Local	LF	%
1984	800	520	0	0	919	.	1719	1439		
1985	1800	1170	0	0	1859	.	3659	3029	412,313	0.73
1986	3100	2015	0	0	3120	.	6220	5135		
1987	4200	2730	0	0	4038	.	8238	6768		
1988	5400	3510	0	0	5158	.	10558	8668		
1989	5900	3835	0	0	5670	.	11570	9505		
1990	5500	3575	147	132	5040	.	10687	8747	458,749	1.90
1991	5300	3445	221	199	4918	.	10439	8562		
1992	5600	3640	294	265	5306	.	11200	9211		
1993	5650	3677	441	397	5423	.	11514	9497		
1994	5400	3510	515	463	5269	.	11184	9242		
1995	5500	3575	588	529	5491	.	11579	9595	501,744	1.90
1996	5300	3445	735	661	5384	.	11419	9490		
1997	5400	3510	809	728	5569	.	11778	9807		
1998	5800	3770	882	794	6045	.	12727	10609		
1999	5400	3510	1029	926	5774	.	12203	10210		
2000	5300	3445	1103	993	5814	.	12217	10252	542,945	1.90
2001	5600	3640	1176	1058	6269	.	13045	10967		

Continued

TABLE 1

(Continued) Local and Non-Local NEC Employment Impacts -
12 County Area

Year	Construction ^a		Operation ^b		Indirect ^c		Sum Project Related: Local ^d		% Projected Lab Force	LF	%
	Total	Local	Total	Local	Total	Local	Total	Local			
2002	5400	3510	1323	1191	6157	.	12880	10858			
2003	5300	3445	1397	1257	6201	.	12898	10903			
2004	2700	1755	1470	1323	3736	.	7906	6814			
2005	1200	780	1617	1455	2298	.	5115	4533	583,628		0.78
2006	500	325	1764	1588	1736	.	4000	3649			
2007	0	0	1764	1588	1159	.	2923	2747			

^a EBASCO [13] and assumes 65% is locally supplied.

^b Derived from EBASCO [3] and assumes 90% is locally supplied.

^c IO Model Projections: assumes 100% is locally supplied.

^d Baseline employment projection from IO model are multiplied by 1.05 to reflect labor force available.

paribus, it can be expected that people will desire to locate near the site so as to minimize transportation costs.² At the same time, people are likely to be attracted to a place that provides a wide range of private and public goods. Population of a place provides a proxy for the availability of these goods. Gravity models have been employed in economic-demographic impact models to allocate project-related in-movers associated with large scale construction projects of fossil fuel electric generating plants in western North Dakota [25].

Of course, places that are similar in population and distance to site may differ in their attractiveness for a variety of reasons. Housing costs and availability, shopping facilities, etc., may differ enough so that one of these places is preferred by in-movers. Thus, local knowledge of such variables as the local housing market allows some further local judgement to be incorporated into the spatial allocation process [see 24 for a general discussion of the gravity model].

In general, the spatial allocation procedure to be employed is:

$$B_i = W \frac{\alpha \beta}{P_i/D_i}$$

$$A_i = B_i / \sum_{i=1}^n B_i$$

- where:
- B_i = number of movers to place i ,
 - P_i = population of place i ,
 - D_i = distance of place i from the site,
 - W = constant to be empirically estimated,
 - A_i = proportion of immigrants to be allocated to place i ,
 - α = population elasticity to be estimated,

2. When in-movers to Duke Power Company's Catawba Plant were asked to note their reasons for locating in a particular place, "Being close to work" was very important to 53 percent of the in-movers, "Cost of Housing" was very important to 12 percent of the in-movers, "Availability of Housing" was very important to 19 percent of the in-movers, "Quality of Schools" was very important to 6 percent of the in-movers, and "Good Recreation" was very important to 2 percent of the in-movers.

β = distance elasticity to be estimated.

The elasticity measures, α and β are expected to differ for construction in-movers and non-movers to the site and are estimated from Duke Power Company survey data for the Catawba Nuclear Plants in South Carolina.³ Using CCD's as the geographical units, the α and β parameters were found using ordinary least squares: $\log B_i = \gamma + \alpha \log P_i + \beta \log D_i$, where $\gamma = \log W$. Empirical results are summarized in Table 2.

TABLE 2

Gravity Model Estimates for In-movers^a and Non-movers^b for the Catawba Nuclear Plant

	Number of CCD's	γ	α	β	R ²	F- Statistic
In-movers	25	4.12 (3.97)*	.409 (4.12)*	-1.896 (-9.87)*	0.81	50.0*
Non-movers	73	1.56 (1.34)	.545 (5.29)*	-1.322 (-8.28)*	0.59	52.0*

Note: t values are shown in parenthesis

* Statistically significant at the 1% level

^aIn-movers are defined to be employees that have moved their place of residence in order to work at the construction site

^bNon-movers are construction workers from the region that did not move to the site but commute

3. For example, in North Dakota, the distance parameter was -1.5 for construction workers, -2.9 for operating workers, and -1.6 for project related indirect workers [25, p. 72].

In-movers associated with the peak years of impact 1988-2003 will comprise about two percent of the expected labor force. The year 1989 represents the peak construction labor force year with a total of 5,900 workers and 2,065 in-movers. With about 40 additional in-movers for operation, a total of about 2,100 in-movers is expected. Once this immigration has occurred, little additional immigration is expected from the NEC project as these workers are expected to become long-term residents. The additional immigration of operating workers is more than offset by eventual reduction in construction in-movers⁴ (see Table 1). Thus, the problem is to distribute these employees to each of the cities in the region. After the employees have been located, the number of in-movers with families, average family size, and number of school age children, as determined from previous nuclear plant impact studies in the area [15-20], may be used to estimate the total population impact for specific communities. Spatial allocation of income is based on the resulting residential spatial allocation.

Spatial allocation of non-movers is the remaining question in terms of disaggregation of the regional impact of the NEC. Three groups of non-movers are affected by the NEC; construction, operating and indirect workers.

4. It is assumed here that when construction jobs finish that out-migration will result for those workers that moved to the area. However, an equally plausible assumption is that there will not be a wave of out-migration as the NEC construction jobs end. The reason is that the NEC construction jobs may last 15 years rather than 2 to 3 years with other nuclear plant construction. Once a person lives in an area for 15 years, it is quite likely he will remain in the area after the NEC construction phase ends.

Construction

Commuter patterns of non-mover construction workers at other nuclear plants are analyzed using the Duke Power Company survey data. As noted in Table 2 the spatial elasticities are $\alpha = .55$ and $\beta = -1.32$ for non-mover construction workers. The absolute value of the distance elasticity is smaller for non-movers than in-movers, indicating that current residents of the region are willing to commute further to work than in-movers ($\beta = -1.90$). This smaller distance elasticity is expected since residents within commuting distance have social and economic ties to their current places of residence and need not move to the work site whereas in-movers have made the decision to move to the region and are expected to be more strongly affected by the distance parameters as they make their residential decision.

Operating

Operating workforces are expected to be less willing to commute long distances than construction workers since the operators generally have longer term employment than construction workers. Accordingly, it would be expected that the distance elasticity for operating workers would exceed that of construction workers [see footnote 3 for example]. However, the NEC construction phase (18 years) is a long-term construction job and thus the operation and construction workforces can both be expected to behave in a similar fashion with respect to their evaluation of the friction of distance. Thus, the assumption is made that operating and construction commuters will have the same distance elasticity.⁵

5. Further evidence of a high distance elasticity is the expected effect of rising transportation costs on residential location preferences. In the Alonso framework, increases in commuting costs will result in steeper bid price curves for residential users of land and result in location closer into the work site [27, p. 111].

Indirect

The indirect labor force associated with the project is distributed to counties and CCD's according to the distribution of the construction and operating workforces. Table 3 lists the 1980 NEC related employment and income changes for each of the 93 CCD's and 12 counties of the impact region.⁶ NEC population impacts may be estimated by multiplying the in-movers column by 2.41, the average family size.

Summary and Conclusion

The thrust of this research has been to integrate several socioeconomic models (IO, gravity) with various demographic assumptions (immigration patterns, average family size, etc.) based on prior studies to arrive at a framework for estimating the economic impact of a NEC in a rural area of South Carolina. Clearly, there are many areas where improvements could be made given the resources. First, population forecasts with demographic detail for age and sex are desirable for many public decision makers. A cohort-survival model seems appropriate, [see 5]. The IO model needs to be adjusted for changes in technology and relative prices expected during the forecast year [see 28].

Key behavioral assumptions regarding in-movers and commuting patterns may be reconsidered from the perspective of the desirability of living near a NEC. Unfortunately, even very large socioeconomic research budgets may not be sufficient to shed light on the magnitude of parameters such as the percentage of in-movers for a NEC in Anderson County, South Carolina.

6. Tables for each year of the project are available from the author.

Finally, the results of the research show that an NEC in Anderson County will maintain the regional economy at near full employment throughout the construction period. A maximum of about 2,000 workers will immigrate during the construction phase. An associated population change of about 5,000 is expected. The total employment impact represents about two percent of the forecasted regional labor force. These positive economic-demographic expectations would be expected to put upward pressures on real wages in the region and demands for local government services. The smaller CCD's such as Starr in Anderson County would be expected to feel strain on their public services. Starr's population would increase by about 21 percent from 1985 to 1989.⁷ Although this is a large percentage change, it occurs over a four-year period and the area should have time to adjust. In other words, the boom town condition of some energy development towns in the west does not appear to be an appropriate model for a NEC development in Anderson County, South Carolina.

⁷Based on a 1985 projected population of 5084 for Starr CCD and a NEC population change of 1,075 by 1989.

TABLE 3

GRAVITY MODEL ALLOCATING MOVERS, COMPUTERS & DIRECT & INDIRECT INCOME & INDIRECT EMPLOYMENT IN ANCIANSON NEC AREA FOR 1979

GRS	CCD	CCBNO	CO	DIST	NEWMOV	COMMUT	DCCDINC	ICCDINC	ICEDINC	INDENP
1	ANDERSON	1	ANDERSON	12.8	113	226	5964.4	2973.72	8945.1	376
2	ANDERSON NORTH	2	ANDERSON	17.2	47	83	2176.0	1047.48	3253.5	119
3	ANDERSON SOUTH	3	ANDERSON	8.9	183	278	2923.0	4059.49	12172.4	444
4	BELTON	4	ANDERSON	19.8	25	51	1345.5	672.41	2017.9	73
5	BELTON EAST	5	ANDERSON	22.2	10	17	470.4	215.08	705.5	26
6	BELTON WEST	6	ANDERSON	17.6	29	54	1464.2	731.76	2196.0	80
7	BRUSHY CREEK	7	ANDERSON	28.2	13	33	815.1	467.37	1222.5	45
8	FORK	8	ANDERSON	13.3	33	47	1472.2	705.76	2138.0	77
9	HOMEPATH	9	ANDERSON	22.4	22	50	1262.3	610.85	1833.2	69
10	IVA	10	ANDERSON	7.3	156	172	5847.0	2972.56	8770.5	319
11	PELZEP	11	ANDERSON	26.0	14	32	801.6	420.62	1272.3	44
12	PENDELTON EAST	12	ANDERSON	19.8	23	47	1236.2	617.81	1854.1	66
13	PENDELTON WEST	13	ANDERSON	19.6	23	45	1195.3	597.34	1792.6	65
14	STAFF	14	ANDERSON	4.0	466	345	13972.8	6982.66	20954.8	763
15	WILLIAMSTON	15	ANDERSON	24.3	15	34	860.7	430.16	1260.9	45
16	WILLIAMSTON RUR	16	ANDERSON	22.2	16	31	822.6	411.12	1213.8	47
17	ARBEVILLE	17	ARBEVILLE	25.9	19	47	1228.9	614.55	1845.1	67
18	ARBEVILLE	18	ARBEVILLE	14.0	34	52	1519.4	759.70	2278.7	81
19	ARBEVILLE	19	ARBEVILLE	21.8	17	35	914.6	457.76	1371.9	51
20	ARBEVILLE	20	ARBEVILLE	23.8	13	27	695.6	345.15	1047.8	38
21	ARBEVILLE	21	ARBEVILLE	22.0	17	35	915.8	458.69	1370.5	50
22	ARBEVILLE	22	ARBEVILLE	36.4	9	25	597.5	298.65	890.2	33
23	ARBEVILLE	23	ARBEVILLE	39.6	6	18	433.2	216.50	649.7	24
24	ARBEVILLE	24	ARBEVILLE	36.7	8	22	527.9	263.84	791.8	29
25	ARBEVILLE	25	ARBEVILLE	39.4	19	79	1715.6	857.38	2573.0	94
26	ARBEVILLE	26	ARBEVILLE	42.1	10	40	878.8	439.21	1316.0	48
27	ARBEVILLE	27	ARBEVILLE	42.5	10	37	832.0	414.81	1244.8	45
28	ARBEVILLE	28	ARBEVILLE	35.4	19	70	1560.1	779.67	2336.8	85
29	ARBEVILLE	29	ARBEVILLE	49.5	6	24	534.0	266.86	800.8	29
30	ARBEVILLE	30	ARBEVILLE	44.3	7	27	604.7	302.71	906.9	33
31	ARBEVILLE	31	ARBEVILLE	28.7	14	37	891.7	445.63	1337.3	49
32	ARBEVILLE	32	ARBEVILLE	42.3	10	40	881.2	440.38	1321.6	48
33	ARBEVILLE	33	ARBEVILLE	38.8	8	26	600.4	300.07	900.5	33
34	ARBEVILLE	34	ARBEVILLE	48.5	4	13	291.0	145.41	436.4	16
35	ARBEVILLE	35	ARBEVILLE	44.9	7	24	549.1	274.59	823.4	30
36	ARBEVILLE	36	ARBEVILLE	30.3	9	21	527.5	263.81	791.1	29
37	ARBEVILLE	37	ARBEVILLE	45.5	6	21	480.1	240.09	720.1	27
38	ARBEVILLE	38	ARBEVILLE	29.3	10	26	634.3	316.97	951.2	35
39	ARBEVILLE	39	ARBEVILLE	37.0	14	48	1081.5	540.45	1621.9	59
40	ARBEVILLE	40	ARBEVILLE	39.6	5	14	339.6	169.73	509.4	19
41	ARBEVILLE	41	ARBEVILLE	37.0	7	27	513.3	256.65	769.9	28
42	ARBEVILLE	42	ARBEVILLE	34.8	9	25	594.0	296.95	860.8	32
43	ARBEVILLE	43	ARBEVILLE	30.0	13	35	831.9	415.73	1247.6	45
44	ARBEVILLE	44	ARBEVILLE	47.8	3	8	194.0	96.94	290.9	11
45	ARBEVILLE	45	ARBEVILLE	43.7	6	18	420.5	210.15	630.8	23
46	ARBEVILLE	46	ARBEVILLE	30.5	7	26	364.6	197.22	591.8	27
47	ARBEVILLE	47	ARBEVILLE	50.8	7	28	605.1	302.91	909.0	33
48	ARBEVILLE	48	ARBEVILLE	44.0	4	13	325.2	162.52	487.7	17
49	ARBEVILLE	49	ARBEVILLE	40.8	7	21	482.7	241.23	723.9	26
50	ARBEVILLE	50	ARBEVILLE	45.3	3	10	221.0	110.61	331.5	12
51	ARBEVILLE	51	ARBEVILLE	43.7	7	26	567.5	283.60	851.1	31
52	ARBEVILLE	52	ARBEVILLE	41.4	5	16	367.0	183.40	550.4	20
53	ARBEVILLE	53	ARBEVILLE	31.9	9	23	566.4	283.07	852.5	31
54	ARBEVILLE	54	ARBEVILLE	43.2	5	14	332.61	166.22	498.83	18
55	ARBEVILLE	55	ARBEVILLE	41.8	4	18	418.40	209.10	627.50	23
56	ARBEVILLE	56	ARBEVILLE	28.1	8	17	429.63	214.71	644.35	23
57	ARBEVILLE	57	ARBEVILLE	51.1	3	8	186.37	93.14	279.51	10
58	ARBEVILLE	58	ARBEVILLE	39.8	4	10	238.07	118.98	357.05	13
59	ARBEVILLE	59	ARBEVILLE	40.8	3	9	213.92	106.91	320.83	12
60	ARBEVILLE	60	ARBEVILLE	22.1	18	37	955.93	477.73	1431.66	52
61	ARBEVILLE	61	ARBEVILLE	37.8	5	15	357.13	178.48	535.60	20
62	ARBEVILLE	62	ARBEVILLE	24.2	18	42	1066.10	532.79	1599.89	58
63	ARBEVILLE	63	ARBEVILLE	27.8	11	27	664.40	332.04	996.43	36
64	ARBEVILLE	64	ARBEVILLE	20.3	24	49	1284.71	642.04	1926.75	75
65	ARBEVILLE	65	ARBEVILLE	44.9	5	14	331.94	165.99	497.82	18
66	ARBEVILLE	66	ARBEVILLE	41.6	5	17	386.70	193.25	579.95	21
67	ARBEVILLE	67	ARBEVILLE	46.7	4	12	271.58	135.72	407.20	15
68	ARBEVILLE	68	ARBEVILLE	27.5	15	38	935.30	467.42	1402.72	51
69	ARBEVILLE	69	ARBEVILLE	24.2	17	39	954.24	476.88	1431.12	52
70	ARBEVILLE	70	ARBEVILLE	22.0	29	70	1740.07	869.61	2659.68	95
71	ARBEVILLE	71	ARBEVILLE	33.6	13	39	898.36	448.96	1347.32	49
72	ARBEVILLE	72	ARBEVILLE	38.1	5	14	354.52	177.17	501.70	18
73	ARBEVILLE	73	ARBEVILLE	31.1	12	35	787.45	393.53	1180.99	43
74	ARBEVILLE	74	ARBEVILLE	46.5	3	8	194.25	97.00	291.50	11
75	ARBEVILLE	75	ARBEVILLE	29.0	12	30	757.33	378.48	1105.81	40
76	ARBEVILLE	76	ARBEVILLE	42.3	5	14	323.69	161.77	485.46	18
77	ARBEVILLE	77	ARBEVILLE	35.8	9	29	668.92	334.30	1003.22	37
78	ARBEVILLE	78	ARBEVILLE	30.1	11	28	692.75	345.95	1038.20	38
79	ARBEVILLE	79	ARBEVILLE	19.1	19	33	905.77	452.66	1359.43	49
80	ARBEVILLE	80	ARBEVILLE	13.8	33	49	1446.30	722.79	2169.09	79
81	ARBEVILLE	81	ARBEVILLE	18.2	32	64	1691.50	845.13	2536.93	92
82	ARBEVILLE	82	ARBEVILLE	21.8	9	14	404.36	202.18	606.45	22
83	ARBEVILLE	83	ARBEVILLE	18.4	27	53	1411.50	705.60	2117.50	77
84	ARBEVILLE	84	ARBEVILLE	26.4	12	27	694.46	347.06	1043.52	38
85	ARBEVILLE	85	ARBEVILLE	19.4	23	45	1200.90	600.15	1801.05	65
86	ARBEVILLE	86	ARBEVILLE	20.8	20	42	1091.08	545.27	1636.35	60
87	ARBEVILLE	87	ARBEVILLE	27.2	8	16	413.09	206.45	619.54	23
88	ARBEVILLE	88	ARBEVILLE	18.1	20	33	925.52	462.53	1388.05	51
89	ARBEVILLE	89	ARBEVILLE	19.0	38	85	2166.73	1082.83	3249.56	118
90	ARBEVILLE	90	ARBEVILLE	37.3	5	15	312.76	156.10	468.46	17
91	ARBEVILLE	91	ARBEVILLE	28.4	15	34	882.58	441.07	1323.65	48
92	ARBEVILLE	92	ARBEVILLE	29.9	12	31	762.36	380.99	1143.35	42
93	ARBEVILLE	93	ARBEVILLE	28.9	15	42	1014.15	506.82	1520.97	55

Column Explanations:

DIST = CCD Centroid to NEC centroid distance in miles

NEWMOV = Construction + operation employees moving to CCD

COMMUT = Commuters from CCD to NEC site

DCCDINC = Construction + operating income earned by residents of CCD (thousands of 1973 dollars)

ICCDINC = Indirect workers income earned in CCD (thousands of 1973 dollars)

INDENP = DCCDINC + ICCDINC

Appendix

Regionalization of the National IO Model - Procedures Estimating Regional Transactions, Imports and Exports

First, location quotients are calculated for each sector in region (k) using the formula:

$$LQ_{ik} = (E_{ik} / \sum_{i=1}^n E_{ik}) : (\sum_{k=1}^m E_{ik} / \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^m E_{ik}) \quad (1)$$

where E_{ik} is the employment in the i th industry in region k and LQ_{ik} is the location quotient for industry i and region k in a nation with n industries and m regions. The location quotients for each regional industry i are then used to adjust national technical coefficients for that same industry so that:

$$k_{a_{ij}} = a_{ij} \text{ if } LQ_i \geq 1 \quad (2)$$

$$\text{or } k_{a_{ij}} = (a_{ij}) (LQ_i) \text{ if } LQ_i < 1 \quad (3)$$

where $k_{a_{ij}}$ is the adjusted technical coefficient for industry i in region k . In effect, if the regional location quotient for a given industry is less than unity, each coefficient in the row of the national matrix representing that industry is adjusted downward by multiplying industry technical coefficients by the industry location quotient. These new coefficients are then used with regional outputs totals (kx_j) to estimate regional transactions, or:

$$kx_{ij} = (kx_j) (k_{a_{ij}}), \quad i=1 \dots n, \text{ all } j \quad (4)$$

and each estimated transactions element (kx_{ij}) is then adjusted so that: