Economic Impacts of the Biotechnology, Medical Technology, and Pharmaceutical Industries' Spending in New Jersey.

Dr. William F. Mabe, John J. Heldrich Center for Workforce Development
Dr. Michael L. Lahr, Center for Urban Policy Research

Edward J. Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey

March 2011

RUTGERS
Edward J. Bloustein School
of Planning and Public Policy

Pharmaceutical/medical technology and biotechnology companies in New Jersey generate substantial economic impact through capital spending, research and development expenditures, and other operating expenditures. This spending generates direct and indirect economic impacts for New Jersey in the form of employment, income, gross domestic product, and state and local tax revenues.

These impacts were estimated using the state-of-the-art R/ECON™ Input-Output Model at the Center for Urban Policy Research at the Bloustein School of Planning and Public Policy based on data provided by BioNJ and the HealthCare Institute of New Jersey. The R/ECON™ model estimates both the *direct* economic effects of the initial expenditures (in terms of jobs and income) and the *indirect* (or multiplier) effects (in additional jobs and income) of the subsequent economic activity that occurs following the initial expenditures. The model also estimates the tax revenues generated by the combined direct and indirect new economic activity caused by the initial spending.

I. Capital Spending Investment Impacts in New Jersey, 2010

BioNJ and the HealthCare Institute of New Jersey estimate that pharmaceutical/medical technology and biotechnology companies in New Jersey spent a total of $1.51 billion on construction projects in 2010. Projects included research and development facilities, office buildings and production facilities.

In all, the $1.51 billion in investments were estimated to generate as much as:

- A total of 12,712 job-years,[1]
- $754 million in income,
- $1.14 billion in Gross Domestic Product (GDP),
- $208 million in federal tax revenues,
- $38 million in state tax revenues, and
- $41 million in local tax revenues.

Capital spending in 2010 by the pharmaceutical/medical technology and biotechnology industries made a significant contribution to employment. Of the total 12,712 job years that the spending created, 5,365 (about 42 percent of them) will be generated in the construction industry. Other industries with considerable employment impacts include manufacturing (18% or 2,281 job-years), and services (14% or 1,726 job-years).

[1] Note that employment impacts are expressed in "job-years." One job-year is equal to one *full-time* job lasting one year. Thus, the job-year total represents the total jobs either directly or indirectly generated by the projects.

Table 1. Distribution of Employment Generated from Capital Spending, by Industry, 2010

Industry	Number of Jobs Created
Agriculture	16
Agri. Serv., Forestry, & Fish	80
Mining	37
Construction	5365
Manufacturing	2281
Transport. & Public Utilities	418
Wholesale	564
Retail Trade	1579
Finance, Ins., & Real Estate	621
Services	1726
Government	24
Total	12,712

The construction projects added an estimated $1.14 billion in gross domestic product to the New Jersey economy. This figure includes the entire value of all goods and services produced through the capital expenditures, including income and profits. Table 2 below shows the breakdown of the effect on state GDP by industry.

Table 2. Contributions of Pharmaceutical/Medical Technology and Biotechnology Firm Capital Spending on State Gross Domestic Product, 2010

Industry	Gross Domestic Product (in 000 $)
Agriculture	$701.00
Agri. Serv., Forestry, & Fish	$3,461.04
Mining	$4,008.27
Construction	$609,156.81
Manufacturing	$167,305.15
Transport. & Public Utilities	$42,943.34
Wholesale	$42,906.91
Retail Trade	$69,742.84
Finance, Ins., & Real Estate	$84,077.27
Services	$114,467.93
Government	$2,422.19
Total	**$1,141,192.74**

Including personal income taxes, sales taxes, state business taxes, excise taxes and other state taxes, the capital expenditures contributed an estimated $38 million in state taxes,. In addition, the capital expenditures generated an estimated $41 million in local property taxes.

II. Economic Effects of Operations Spending, 2009

BioNJ and the HealthCare Institute of New Jersey estimate that pharmaceutical/medical technology and biotechnology companies in New Jersey had a total of $42.8 billion of operating expenses in 2009. Operating expenses included spending on employment. research and development, and vendors.

In all, the $42.8 billion in operating expenditures were estimated to generate as much as:

- A total of 217,546 job-years
- $17 billion in income,
- $23 billion in Gross Domestic Product (GDP),
- $5.04 billion in federal tax revenues,
- $1.56 billion in state tax revenues, and
- $1.05 billion in local tax revenues.

Operations spending in 2009 by the pharmaceutical/medical technology and biotechnology industries accounted for the employment of 217,546 job-years in New Jersey. Of all 217,546 job years that the spending created, 75,443 (about 35 percent of them) will be generated in the manufacturing industry. Other industries with considerable employment impacts include services (22% or 48,507 job-years), and retail trade (19% or 41,983 job-years).

Table 3. Distribution of Employment by Industry, 2009

Industry	Number of Jobs
Agriculture	387
Agri. Serv., Forestry, & Fish	697
Mining	82
Construction	2,004
Manufacturing	75,443
Transport. & Public Utilities	10,587
Wholesale	20,767
Retail Trade	41,983
Finance, Ins., & Real Estate	14,159
Services	48,507
Government	2,928
Total	217,546

The jobs created fell into a diverse array of occupations. The jobs created were fairly evenly distributed across a wide range of occupations. The greatest percentages of jobs were in the areas of operators, fabricators, and laborers (17.9%) and of administrative support occupations (17.8%). However, many of the jobs created fall into higher wage fields of executive, administrative, and managerial occupations; professional specialty occupations, and marketing and sales occupations.

Table 4. Distribution of Employment by Occupation, 2009

Occupation	Number of Jobs
Executive, administrative, and managerial occupations	26,253
Professional specialty occupations	21,841
Technicians and related support occupations	8,751
Marketing and sales occupations	26,045
Administrative support occupations, including clerical	38,658
Service occupations	26,258
Agriculture, forestry, fishing, and related occupations	1,914
Precision production, craft, and repair occupations	23,695
Production occupations, precision	4,008
Plant and system occupations	1,095
Operators, fabricators, and laborers	39,030
Total	217,546

Operating expenses contributed an estimated $23 billion in gross domestic product to the New Jersey economy. This figure includes the entire value of all goods and services produced as a result of operating expenses, including income and profits. Table 5 below shows the breakdown of the effect on state GDP by industry.

Table 5. Contributions of Pharmaceutical/Medical Technology and Biotechnology Firm Operating Expenses on State Gross Domestic Product, 2009

Industry	State Gross Domestic Product (000 $)
Agriculture	$29,955
Agri. Serv., Forestry, & Fish	$36,505
Mining	$28,046
Construction	$283,095
Manufacturing	$12,445,979
Transport. & Public Utilities	$869,251
Wholesale	$1,610,486
Retail Trade	$1,476,073
Finance, Ins., & Real Estate	$2,661,253
Services	$3,169,340
Government	$182,192
Total	**$22,792,175**

Appendix A:
Input-Output Analysis—
Technical Description and Application

This appendix discusses the history and application of input-output analysis and details the input-output model, called the R/Econ™ I-O model, developed by Rutgers University. This model offers significant advantages in detailing the total economic effects of an activity (such as historic rehabilitation and heritage tourism), including multiplier effects.

Estimating Multipliers

The fundamental issue determining the size of the multiplier effect is the "openness" of regional economies. Regions that are more "open" are those that import their required inputs from other regions. Imports can be thought of as substitutes for local production. Thus, the more a region depends on imported goods and services instead of its own production, the more economic activity leaks away from the local economy. Businesspeople noted this phenomenon and formed local chambers of commerce with the explicit goal of stopping such leakage by instituting a "buy local" policy among their membership. In addition, during the 1970s, as an import invasion was under way, businessmen and union leaders announced a "buy American" policy in the hope of regaining ground lost to international economic competition. Therefore, one of the main goals of regional economic multiplier research has been to discover better ways to estimate the leakage of purchases out of a region or to determine the region's level of self-sufficiency.

The earliest attempts to systematize the procedure for estimating multiplier effects used the economic base model, still in use in many econometric models today. This approach assumes that all economic activities in a region can be divided into two categories: "basic" activities that produce exclusively for export, and region-serving or "local" activities that produce strictly for internal regional consumption. Since this approach is simpler but similar to the approach used by regional input-output analysis, let us explain briefly how multiplier effects are estimated using the economic base approach. If we let **x** be export employment, **l** be local employment, and **t** be total employment, then

$$\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{l}$$

For simplification, we create the ratio **a** as

$$\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{l}/\mathbf{t}$$

so that $\mathbf{l} = \mathbf{at}$

then substituting into the first equation, we obtain

$$\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{at}$$

By bringing all of the terms with t to one side of the equation, we get

$$\mathbf{t} - \mathbf{at} = \mathbf{x} \text{ or } \mathbf{t}\,(1-\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{x}$$

Solving for **t,** we get $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{x}/(1-\mathbf{a})$

Thus, if we know the amount of export-oriented employment, **x,** and the ratio of local to total employment, **a**, we can readily calculate total employment by applying the economic base multiplier, 1/(1-**a**), which is embedded in the above formula. Thus, if 40 percent of all regional employment is used to produce exports, the regional multiplier would be 2.5. The assumption behind this multiplier is that all remaining regional employment is required to support the export employment. Thus, the 2.5 can be decomposed into two parts the direct effect of the exports, which is always 1.0, and the indirect and induced effects, which is the remainder—in this case 1.5. Hence, the multiplier can be read as telling us that for each export-oriented job another 1.5 jobs are needed to support it.

This notion of the multiplier has been extended so that **x** is understood to represent an economic change demanded by an organization or institution outside of an economy—so-called final demand. Such changes can be those effected by government, households, or even by an outside firm. Changes in the economy can therefore be calculated by a minor alteration in the multiplier formula:

$$\Delta \mathbf{t} = \Delta \mathbf{x}/(1-\mathbf{a})$$

The high level of industry aggregation and the rigidity of the economic assumptions that permit the application of the economic base multiplier have caused this approach to be subject to extensive criticism. Most of the discussion has focused on the estimation of the parameter **a**. Estimating this parameter requires that one be able to distinguish those parts of the economy that produce for local consumption from those that do not. Indeed, virtually all industries, even services, sell to customers both inside and outside the region. As a result, regional economists devised an approach by which to measure the *degree* to which each industry is involved in the nonbase activities of the region, better known as the industry's *regional purchase coefficient*. Thus, they expanded the above formulations by calculating for each ***i*** industry

$$\mathbf{l}_i = \mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{d}_i$$

and

$$\mathbf{x}_i = t_i - \mathbf{r}_i \mathbf{d}_i$$

given that $\mathbf{d}_i$ is the total regional demand for industry ***i***'s product. Given the above formulae and data on regional demands by industry, one can calculate an accurate traditional aggregate economic base parameter by the following:

$$\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{l}/\mathbf{t} = \Sigma \mathbf{l}_{ii}/\Sigma \mathbf{t}_i$$

Although accurate, this approach only facilitates the calculation of an aggregate multiplier for the entire region. That is, we cannot determine from this approach what the effects are on the various sectors of an economy. This is despite the fact that one must painstakingly calculate the regional demand as well as the degree to which they each industry is involved in nonbase activity in the region.

As a result, a different approach to multiplier estimation that takes advantage of the detailed demand and trade data was developed. This approach is called input-output analysis.

Regional Input-Output Analysis: A Brief History

The basic framework for input-output analysis originated nearly 250 years ago when François Quesenay published *Tableau Economique* in 1758. Quesenay's "tableau" graphically and numerically portrayed the relationships between sales and purchases of the various industries of an economy. More than a century later, his description was adapted by Leon Walras, who advanced input-output modeling by providing a concise theoretical formulation of an economic system (including consumer purchases and the economic representation of "technology").

It was not until the twentieth century, however, that economists advanced and tested Walras' work. Wassily Leontief greatly simplified Walras's theoretical formulation by applying the Nobel prize-winning assumptions that both technology and trading patterns were fixed over time. These two assumptions meant that the pattern of flows among industries in an area could be considered stable. These assumptions permitted Walras's formulation to use data from a single time period, which generated a great reduction in data requirements.

Although Leontief won the Nobel Prize in 1973, he first used his approach in 1936 when he developed a model of the 1919 and 1929 U.S. economies to estimate the effects of the end of World War I on national employment. Recognition of his work in terms of its wider acceptance and use meant development of a standardized procedure for compiling the requisite data (today's national economic census of industries) and enhanced capability for calculations (i.e., the computer).

The federal government immediately recognized the importance of Leontief's development and has been publishing input-output tables of the U.S. economy since 1939. The most recently published tables are those for 1987. Other nations followed suit. Indeed, the United Nations maintains a bank of tables from most member nations with a uniform accounting scheme.

Framework

Input-output modeling focuses on the interrelationships of sales and purchases among sectors of the economy. Input-output is best understood through its most basic form, the *interindustry transactions table* or matrix. In this table (see Figure 1 for an example), the column industries are consuming sectors (or markets) and the row industries are producing sectors. The content of a matrix cell is the value of shipments that the row industry delivers to the column industry. Conversely, it is the value of shipments that the column industry receives from the row industry. Hence, the interindustry transactions table is a detailed accounting of the disposition of the value of shipments in an economy. Indeed, the detailed accounting of the interindustry transactions at the national level is performed not so much to facilitate calculation of national economic impacts as it is to back out an estimate of the nation's gross domestic product.

Figure 1
Interindustry Transactions Matrix (Values)

	Agriculture	Manufacturing	Services	Other	Final Demand	Total Output
Agriculture	10	65	10	5	10	$100
Manufacturing	40	25	35	75	25	$200
Services	15	5	5	5	90	$120
Other	15	10	50	50	100	$225
Value Added	20	95	20	90		
Total Input	100	200	120	225		

For example, in Figure 1, agriculture, as a producing industry sector, is depicted as selling $65 million of goods to manufacturing. Conversely, the table depicts that the manufacturing industry purchased $65 million of agricultural production. The sum across columns of the interindustry transaction matrix is called the *intermediate outputs vector*. The sum across rows is called the *intermediate inputs vector*.

A single *final demand* column is also included in Figure 1. Final demand, which is outside the square interindustry matrix, includes imports, exports, government purchases, changes in inventory, private investment, and sometimes household purchases.

The *value-added* row, which is also outside the square interindustry matrix, includes wages and salaries, profit-type income, interest, dividends, rents, royalties, capital consumption allowances, and taxes. It is called value added because it is the difference between the total value of the industry's production and the value of the goods and nonlabor services that it requires to produce. Thus, it is the *value* that an industry *adds* to the goods and services it uses as inputs in order to produce output.

The value-added row measures each industry's contribution to wealth accumulation. In a national model, therefore, its sum is better known as the gross domestic product (GDP). At the state level, this is known as the gross state product—a series produced by the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis and published in the Regional Economic Information System. Below the state level, it is known simply as the regional equivalent of the GDP—the gross regional product.

Input-output economic impact modelers now tend to include the household industry within the square interindustry matrix. In this case, the "consuming industry" is the household itself. Its spending is extracted from the final demand column and is appended as a separate column in the interindustry matrix. To maintain a balance, the income of households must be appended as a row. The main income of households is labor income, which is extracted from the value-added row. Modelers tend not to include other sources of household income in the household industry's row. This is not because such income is not attributed to households but rather because much of this other income derives from sources outside of the economy that is being modeled.

The next step in producing input-output multipliers is to calculate the *direct requirements matrix*, which is also called the technology matrix. The calculations are based entirely on data from Figure 1. As shown in Figure 2, the values of the cells in the direct requirements matrix are

derived by dividing each cell in a column of Figure 1, the interindustry transactions matrix, by its column total. For example, the cell for manufacturing's purchases from agriculture is 65/200 = .33. Each cell in a column of the direct requirements matrix shows how many cents of each producing industry's goods and/or services are required to produce one dollar of the consuming industry's production and are called *technical coefficients*. The use of the terms "technology" and "technical" derive from the fact that a column of this matrix represents a recipe for a unit of an industry's production. It, therefore, shows the needs of each industry's production process or "technology."

Figure 2
Direct Requirements Matrix

	Agriculture	Manufacturing	Services	Other
Agriculture	.10	.33	.08	.02
Manufacturing	.40	.13	.29	.33
Services	.15	.03	.04	.02
Other	.15	.05	.42	.22

Next in the process of producing input-output multipliers, the *Leontief Inverse* is calculated. To explain what the Leontief Inverse is, let us temporarily turn to equations. Now, from Figure 1 we know that the sum across both the rows of the square interindustry transactions matrix (**Z**) and the final demand vector (**y**) is equal to vector of production by industry (**x**). That is,

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{Zi} + \mathbf{y}$$

where **i** is a summation vector of ones. Now, we calculate the direct requirements matrix (**A**) by dividing the interindustry transactions matrix by the production vector or

$$\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{ZX}^{-1}$$

where $\mathbf{X}^{-1}$ is a square matrix with inverse of each element in the vector **x** on the diagonal and the rest of the elements equal to zero. Rearranging the above equation yields

$$\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{AX}$$

where **X** is a square matrix with the elements of the vector **x** on the diagonal and zeros elsewhere. Thus,

$$\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{AX})\mathbf{i} + \mathbf{y}$$

or, alternatively,

$$\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{Ax} + \mathbf{y}$$

solving this equation for **x** yields

$$\mathbf{x} = (\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{y}$$

Total Output	=	Total Requirements	*	Final Demand

The Leontief Inverse is the matrix $(\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{A})^{-1}$. It portrays the relationships between final demand and production. This set of relationships is exactly what is needed to identify the economic impacts of an event external to an economy.

Because it does translate the direct economic effects of an event into the total economic effects on the modeled economy, the Leontief Inverse is also called the *total requirements matrix.* The total requirements matrix resulting from the direct requirements matrix in the example is shown in Figure 3.

Figure 3
Total Requirements Matrix

	Agriculture	Manufacturing	Services	Other
Agriculture	1.5	.6	.4	.3
Manufacturing	1.0	1.6	.9	.7
Services	.3	.1	1.2	.1
Other	.5	.3	.8	1.4
Industry Multipliers	.33	2.6	3.3	2.5

In the direct or technical requirements matrix in Figure 2, the technical coefficient for the manufacturing sector's purchase from the agricultural sector was .33, indicating the 33 cents of agricultural products must be directly purchased to produce a dollar's worth of manufacturing products. The same "cell" in Figure 3 has a value of .6. This indicates that for every dollar's worth of product that manufacturing ships out of the economy (i.e., to the government or for export), agriculture will end up increasing its production by 60 cents. The sum of each column in the total requirements matrix is the *output multiplier* for that industry.

Multipliers

A *multiplier* is defined as the system of economic transactions that follow a disturbance in an economy. Any economic disturbance affects an economy in the same way as does a drop of water in a still pond. It creates a large primary "ripple" by causing a *direct* change in the purchasing patterns of affected firms and institutions. The suppliers of the affected firms and institutions must change their purchasing patterns to meet the demands placed upon them by the firms originally affected by the economic disturbance, thereby creating a smaller secondary "ripple." In turn, those who meet the needs of the suppliers must change their purchasing patterns to meet the demands placed upon them by the suppliers of the original firms, and so on; thus, a number of subsequent "ripples" are created in the economy.

The multiplier effect has three components—direct, indirect, and induced effects. Because of the pond analogy, it is also sometimes referred to as the *ripple effect*.

- A *direct effect* (the initial drop causing the ripple effects) is the change in purchases due to a change in economic activity.

- An *indirect effect* is the change in the purchases of suppliers to those economic activities directly experiencing change.

- An *induced effect* is the change in consumer spending that is generated by changes in labor income within the region as a result of the direct and indirect effects of the economic activity. Including households as a column and row in the interindustry matrix allows this effect to be captured.

Extending the Leontief Inverse to pertain not only to relationships between *total* production and final demand of the economy but also to *change*s in each permits its multipliers to be applied to many types of economic impacts. Indeed, in impact analysis the Leontief Inverse lends itself to the drop-in-a-pond analogy discussed earlier. This is because the Leontief Inverse multiplied by a change in final demand can be estimated by a power series. That is,

$$(\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{A})^{-1}\,\Delta\mathbf{y} = \Delta\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{A}\,\Delta\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}\,\Delta\mathbf{y}) + \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}\,\Delta\mathbf{y})) + \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}\,\Delta\mathbf{y}))) + \ldots$$

Assuming that $\Delta\mathbf{y}$—the change in final demand—is the "drop in the pond," then succeeding terms are the ripples. Each "ripple" term is calculated as the previous "pond disturbance" multiplied by the direct requirements matrix. Thus, since each element in the direct requirements matrix is less than one, each ripple term is smaller than its predecessor. Indeed, it has been shown that after calculating about seven of these ripple terms that the power series approximation of impacts very closely estimates those produced by the Leontief Inverse directly.

In impacts analysis practice, $\Delta\mathbf{y}$ is a single column of expenditures with the same number of elements as there are rows or columns in the direct or technical requirements matrix. This set of elements is called an *impact vector*. This term is used because it is the *vector* of numbers that is used to estimate the *economic impacts* of the investment.

There are two types of changes in investments, and consequently economic impacts, generally associated with projects—*one-time impacts* and *recurring impacts*. One-time impacts are impacts that are attributable to an expenditure that occurs once over a limited period of time. For example, the impacts resulting from the construction of a project are one-time impacts. Recurring impacts are impacts that continue permanently as a result of new or expanded ongoing expenditures. The ongoing operation of a new train station, for example, generates recurring impacts to the economy. Examples of changes in economic activity are investments in the preservation of old homes, tourist expenditures, or the expenditures required to run a historical site. Such activities are considered changes in final demand and can be either positive or negative. When the activity is not made in an industry, it is generally not well represented by the input-output model. Nonetheless, the activity can be represented by a special set of elements that are similar to a column of the transactions matrix. This set of elements is called an economic disturbance or impact vector. The latter term is used because it is the vector of numbers that is used to estimate the impacts. In this study, the impact vector is estimated by multiplying one or more economic *translators* by a dollar figure that represents an investment in one or more

projects. The term translator is derived from the fact that such a vector *translates* a dollar amount of an activity into its constituent purchases by industry.

One example of an industry multiplier is shown in Figure 4. In this example, the activity is the preservation of a historic home. The *direct impact* component consists of purchases made specifically for the construction project from the producing industries. The *indirect impact* component consists of expenditures made by producing industries to support the purchases made for this project. Finally, the *induced impact* component focuses on the expenditures made by workers involved in the activity on-site and in the supplying industries.

Figure 4
Components of the Multiplier for the
Historic Rehabilitation of a Single-Family Residence

Direct Impact	Indirect Impact	Induced Impact
Excavation/Construction Labor Concrete Wood Bricks Equipment Finance and Insurance	Production Labor Steel Fabrication Concrete Mixing Factory and Office Expenses Equipment Components	Expenditures by wage earners on-site and in the supplying industries for food, clothing, durable goods, entertainment

Regional Input-Output Analysis

Because of data limitations, regional input-output analysis has some considerations beyond those for the nation. The main considerations concern the depiction of regional technology and the adjustment of the technology to account for interregional trade by industry.

In the regional setting, local technology matrices are not readily available. An accurate region-specific technology matrix requires a survey of a representative sample of organizations for each industry to be depicted in the model. Such surveys are extremely expensive.[2] Because of the expense, regional analysts have tended to use national technology as a surrogate for regional technology. This substitution does not affect the accuracy of the model as long as local industry technology does not vary widely from the nation's average.[3]

Even when local technology varies widely from the nation's average for one or more industries, model accuracy may not be affected much. This is because interregional trade may mitigate the error that would be induced by the technology. That is, in estimating economic impacts via a

[2] The most recent statewide survey-based model was developed for the State of Kansas in 1986 and cost on the order of $60,000 (in 1990 dollars). The development of this model, however, leaned heavily on work done in 1965 for the same state. In addition the model was aggregated to the 35-sector level, making it inappropriate for many possible applications since the industries in the model do not represent the very detailed sectors that are generally analyzed.

[3] Only recently have researchers studied the validity of this assumption. They have found that large urban areas may have technology in some manufacturing industries that differs in a statistically significant way from the national average. As will be discussed in a subsequent paragraph, such differences may be unimportant after accounting for trade patterns.

regional input-output model, national technology must be regionalized by a vector of regional purchase coefficients,[4] **r**, in the following manner:

$$(\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{rA})^{-1}\,\mathbf{r}\cdot\Delta\mathbf{y}$$

or

$$\mathbf{r}\cdot\Delta\mathbf{y} + \mathbf{rA}\,(\mathbf{r}\cdot\Delta\mathbf{y}) + \mathbf{rA}(\mathbf{rA}\,(\mathbf{r}\cdot\Delta\mathbf{y})) + \mathbf{rA}(\mathbf{rA}(\mathbf{rA}\,(\mathbf{r}\cdot\Delta\mathbf{y}))) + \ldots$$

where the vector-matrix product **rA** is an estimate of the region's direct requirements matrix. Thus, if national technology coefficients—which vary widely from their local equivalents—are multiplied by small RPCs, the error transferred to the direct requirements matrices will be relatively small. Indeed, since most manufacturing industries have small RPCs and since technology differences tend to arise due to substitution in the use of manufactured goods, technology differences have generally been found to be minor source error in economic impact measurement. Instead, RPCs and their measurement error due to industry aggregation have been the focus of research on regional input-output model accuracy.

A Comparison of Three Major Regional Economic Impact Models

In the United States there are three major vendors of regional input-output models. They are U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis's (BEA) RIMS II multipliers, Minnesota IMPLAN Group Inc.'s (MIG) IMPLAN Pro model, and CUPR's own REcon™ I–O model. CUPR has had the privilege of using them all. (R/Econ™ I–O builds from the PC I–O model produced by the Regional Science Research Corporation's (RSRC).)

Although the three systems have important similarities, there are also significant differences that should be considered before deciding which system to use in a particular study. This document compares the features of the three systems. Further discussion can be found in Brucker, Hastings, and Latham's article in the Summer 1987 issue of *The Review of Regional Studies* entitled "Regional Input-Output Analysis: A Comparison of Five Ready-Made Model Systems." Since that date, CUPR and MIG have added a significant number of new features to PC I–O (now, R/Econ™ I–O) and IMPLAN, respectively.

Model Accuracy

RIMS II, IMPLAN, and RECON™ I–O all employ input-output (I–O) models for estimating impacts. All three regionalized the U.S. national I–O technology coefficients table at the highest levels of disaggregation (more than 500 industries). Since aggregation of sectors has been shown to be an important source of error in the calculation of impact multipliers, the retention of maximum industrial detail in these regional systems is a positive feature that they share. The systems diverge in their regionalization approaches, however. The difference is in the manner that they estimate regional purchase coefficients (RPCs), which are used to regionalize the

[4] A regional purchase coefficient (RPC) for an industry is the proportion of the region's demand for a good or service that is fulfilled by local production. Thus, each industry's RPC varies between zero (0) and one (1), with one implying that all local demand is fulfilled by local suppliers. As a general rule, agriculture, mining, and manufacturing industries tend to have low RPCs, and both service and construction industries tend to have high RPCs.

technology matrix. An RPC is the proportion of the region's demand for a good or service that is fulfilled by the region's own producers rather than by imports from producers in other areas. Thus, it expresses the proportion of the purchases of the good or service that do not leak out of the region, but rather feed back to its economy, with corresponding multiplier effects. Thus, the accuracy of the RPC is crucial to the accuracy of a regional I–O model, since the regional multiplier effects of a sector vary directly with its RPC.

The techniques for estimating the RPCs used by CUPR and MIG in their models are theoretically more appealing than the location quotient (LQ) approach used in RIMS II. This is because the former two allow for crosshauling of a good or service among regions and the latter does not. Since crosshauling of the same general class of goods or services among regions is quite common, the CUPR-MIG approach should provide better estimates of regional imports and exports. Statistical results reported in Stevens, Treyz, and Lahr (1989) confirm that LQ methods tend to overestimate RPCs. By extension, inaccurate RPCs may lead to inaccurately estimated impact estimates.

Further, the estimating equation used by CUPR to produce RPCs should be more accurate than that used by MIG. The difference between the two approaches is that MIG estimates RPCs at a more aggregated level (two-digit SICs, or about 86 industries) and applies them at a desegregate level (over 500 industries). CUPR both estimates and applies the RPCs at the most detailed industry level. The application of aggregate RPCs can induce as much as 50 percent error in impact estimates (Lahr and Stevens, 2002).

Although both RECON™ I–O and IMPLAN use an RPC-estimating technique that is theoretically sound and update it using the most recent economic data, some practitioners question their accuracy. The reasons for doing so are three-fold. First, the observations currently used to estimate their implemented RPCs are based on 20-years old trade relationships—the Commodity Transportation Survey (CTS) from the 1977 Census of Transportation. Second, the CTS observations are at the state level. Therefore, RPC's estimated for substate areas are extrapolated. Hence, there is the potential that RPCs for counties and metropolitan areas are not as accurate as might be expected. Third, the observed CTS RPCs are only for shipments of goods. The interstate provision of services is unmeasured by the CTS. IMPLAN replies on relationships from the 1977 U.S. Multiregional Input-Output Model that are not clearly documented. RECON™ I–O relies on the same econometric relationships that it does for manufacturing industries but employs expert judgment to construct weight/value ratios (a critical variable in the RPC-estimating equation) for the nonmanufacturing industries.

The fact that BEA creates the RIMS II multipliers gives it the advantage of being constructed from the full set of the most recent regional earnings data available. BEA is the main federal government purveyor of employment and earnings data by detailed industry. It therefore has access to the fully disclosed and disaggregated versions of these data. The other two model systems rely on older data from *County Business Patterns* and Bureau of Labor Statistic's ES202 forms, which have been "improved" by filling-in for any industries that have disclosure problems (this occurs when three or fewer firms exist in an industry or a region).

Model Flexibility

For the typical user, the most apparent differences among the three modeling systems are the level of flexibility they enable and the type of results that they yield. R/Econ™ I–O allows the user to make changes in individual cells of the 515-by-515 technology matrix as well as in the 11 515-sector vectors of region-specific data that are used to produce the regionalized model. The 11 sectors are: output, demand, employment per unit output, labor income per unit output, total value added per unit of output, taxes per unit of output (state and local), nontax value added per unit output, administrative and auxiliary output per unit output, household consumption per unit of labor income, and the RPCs. Te PC I–O model tends to be simple to use. Its User's Guide is straightforward and concise, providing instruction about the proper implementation of the model as well as the interpretation of the model's results.

The software for IMPLAN Pro is Windows-based, and its User's Guide is more formalized. Of the three modeling systems, it is the most user-friendly. The Windows orientation has enabled MIG to provide many more options in IMPLAN without increasing the complexity of use. Like R/Econ™ I–O, IMPLAN's regional data on RPCs, output, labor compensation, industry average margins, and employment can be revised. It does not have complete information on tax revenues other than those from indirect business taxes (excise and sales taxes), and those cannot be altered. Also like R/Econ™, IMPLAN allows users to modify the cells of the 538-by-538 technology matrix. It also permits the user to change and apply price deflators so that dollar figures can be updated from the default year, which may be as many as four years prior to the current year. The plethora of options, which are advantageous to the advanced user, can be extremely confusing to the novice. Although default values are provided for most of the options, the accompanying documentation does not clearly point out which items should get the most attention. Further, the calculations needed to make any requisite changes can be more complex than those needed for the R/Econ™ I–O model. Much of the documentation for the model dwells on technical issues regarding the guts of the model. For example, while one can aggregate the 538-sector impacts to the one- and two-digit SIC level, the current documentation does not discuss that possibility. Instead, the user is advised by the Users Guide to produce an aggregate model to achieve this end. Such a model, as was discussed earlier, is likely to be error ridden.

For a region, RIMS II typically delivers a set of 38-by-471 tables of multipliers for output, earnings, and employment; supplementary multipliers for taxes are available at additional cost. Although the model's documentation is generally excellent, use of RIMS II alone will not provide proper estimates of a region's economic impacts from a change in regional demand. This is because no RPC estimates are supplied with the model. For example, in order to estimate the impacts of rehabilitation, one not only needs to be able to convert the engineering cost estimates into demands for labor as well as for materials and services by industry, but must also be able to estimate the percentage of the labor income, materials, and services which will be provided by the region's households and industries (the RPCs for the demanded goods and services). In most cases, such percentages are difficult to ascertain; however, they are provided in the R/Econ™ I–O and IMPLAN models with simple triggering of an option. Further, it is impossible to change any of the model's parameters if superior data are known. This model ought not to be used for evaluating any project or event where superior data are available or where the evaluation is for a

change in regional demand (a construction project or an event) as opposed to a change in regional supply (the operation of a new establishment).

Model Results

Detailed total economic impacts for about 500 industries can be calculated for jobs, labor income, and output from R/Econ™ I–O and IMPLAN only. These two modeling systems can also provide total impacts as well as impacts at the one- and two-digit industry levels. RIMS II provides total impacts and impacts on only 38 industries for these same three measures. Only the manual for R/Econ™ I–O warns about the problems of interpreting and comparing multipliers and any measures of output, also known as the value of shipments.

As an alternative to the conventional measures and their multipliers, R/Econ™ I–O and IMPLAN provide results on a measure known as "value added." It is the region's contribution to the nation's gross domestic product (GDP) and consists of labor income, nonmonetary labor compensation, proprietors' income, profit-type income, dividends, interest, rents, capital consumption allowances, and taxes paid. It is, thus, the region's production of wealth and is the single best economic measure of the total economic impacts of an economic disturbance.

In addition to impacts in terms of jobs, employee compensation, output, and value added, IMPLAN provides information on impacts in terms of personal income, proprietor income, other property-type income, and indirect business taxes. R/Econ™ I–O breaks out impacts into taxes collected by the local, state, and federal governments. It also provides the jobs impacts in terms of either about 90 or 400 occupations at the users request. It goes a step further by also providing a return-on-investment-type multiplier measure, which compares the total impacts on all of the main measures to the total original expenditure that caused the impacts. Although these latter can be readily calculated by the user using results of the other two modeling systems, they are rarely used in impact analysis despite their obvious value.

In terms of the format of the results, both R/Econ™ I–O and IMPLAN are flexible. On request, they print the results directly or into a file (Excel® 4.0, Lotus 123®, Word® 6.0, tab delimited, or ASCII text). It can also permit previewing of the results on the computer's monitor. Both now offer the option of printing out the job impacts in either or both levels of occupational detail.

RSRC Equation

The equation currently used by RSRC in estimating RPCs is reported in Treyz and Stevens (1985). In this paper, the authors show that they estimated the RPC from the 1977 CTS data by estimating the demands for an industry's production of goods or services that are fulfilled by local suppliers (*LS*) as

$$LS = D^{e(-1/x)}$$

and where for a given industry

$x = \mathrm{k}\, Z_1^{a1} Z_2^{a2}\, \mathrm{P}_j\, Z_j^{aj}$ and D is its total local demand.

Since for a given industry RPC = LS/D then

$$\mathbf{\ln\{-1/[\ln(\ln LS/\ln D)]\} = \ln k + a1 \ln Z1 + a2 \ln Z2 + S_j\, a_j \ln Z_j}$$

which was the equation that was estimated for each industry.

This odd nonlinear form not only yielded high correlations between the estimated and actual values of the RPCs, it also assured that the RPC value ranges strictly between 0 and 1. The results of the empirical implementation of this equation are shown in Treyz and Stevens (1985, table 1). The table shows that total local industry demand ($Z1$), the supply/demand ratio ($Z2$), the weight/value ratio of the good ($Z3$), the region's size in square miles ($Z4$), and the region's average establishment size in terms of employees for the industry compared to the nation's ($Z5$) are the variables that influence the value of the RPC across all regions and industries. The latter of these maintain the least leverage on RPC values.

Because the CTS data are at the state level only, it is important for the purposes of this study that the local industry demand, the supply/demand ratio, and the region's size in square miles are included in the equation. They allow the equation to extrapolate the estimation of RPCs for areas smaller than states. It should also be noted here that the CTS data only cover manufactured goods. Thus, although calculated effectively making them equal to unity via the above equation, RPC estimates for services drop on the weight/value ratios. A very high weight/value ratio like this forces the industry to meet this demand through local production. Hence, it is no surprise that a region's RPC for this sector is often very high (0.89). Similarly, hotels and motels tend to be used by visitors from outside the area. Thus, a weight/value ratio on the order of that for industry production would be expected. Hence, an RPC for this sector is often about 0.25.

The accuracy of CUPR's estimating approach is exemplified best by this last example. Ordinary location quotient approaches would show hotel and motel services serving local residents. Similarly, IMPLAN RPCs are built from data that combine this industry with eating and drinking establishments (among others). The results of such an aggregation process is an RPC that represents neither industry (a value of about 0.50) but which is applied to both. In the end, not only is the CUPR's RPC-estimating approach the most sound, but it is also widely acknowledged by researchers in the field as being state of the art.

Advantages and Limitations of Input-Output Analysis

Input-output modeling is one of the most accepted means for estimating economic impacts. This is because it provides a concise and accurate means for articulating the interrelationships among industries. The models can be quite detailed. For example, the current U.S. model currently has more than 500 industries representing many six-digit North American Industrial Classification System (NAICS) codes. The CUPR's model used in this study has 517 sectors. Further, the industry detail of input-output models provides not only a consistent and systematic approach but also more accurately assesses multiplier effects of changes in economic activity. Research has shown that results from more aggregated economic models can have as much as 50 percent error

inherent in them. Such large errors are generally attributed to poor estimation of regional trade flows resulting from the aggregation process.

Input-output models also can be set up to capture the flows among economic regions. For example, the model used in this study can calculate impacts for a county as well as the total New Jersey state economy.

The limitations of input-output modeling should also be recognized. The approach makes several key assumptions. First, the input-output model approach assumes that there are no economies of scale to production in an industry; that is, the proportion of inputs used in an industry's production process does not change regardless of the level of production. This assumption will not work if the technology matrix depicts an economy of a recessional economy (e.g., 1982) and the analyst is attempting to model activity in a peak economic year (e.g., 1989). In a recession year, the labor-to-output ratio tends to be excessive because firms are generally reluctant to lay off workers when they believe an economic turnaround is about to occur.

A less-restrictive assumption of the input-output approach is that technology is not permitted to change over time. It is less restrictive because the technology matrix in the United States is updated frequently and, in general, production technology does not radically change over short periods.

Finally, the technical coefficients used in most regional models are based on the assumption that production processes are spatially invariant and are well represented by the nation's average technology. In a region as large and diverse as New Jersey, this assumption is likely to hold true.