

***ECONOMIC IMPACT OF
SELECTED LIVESTOCK PROCESSING PLANTS
IN MINNESOTA***

Submitted to:

**Agricultural Utilization Research Institute (AURI)
Crookston, Minnesota**

Prepared by:

**Agricultural Marketing Services Division
Minnesota Department of Agriculture
90 West Plato Boulevard
St. Paul, MN 55107**

www.mda.state.mn.us

2002

***ECONOMIC IMPACT OF
LIVESTOCK PROCESSING PLANTS,
MINNESOTA***

1. Austin Pork Processing Plant (Hormel)
2. Fergus Falls Dairy Processing Plant
3. Litchfield Dairy Processing Plant (First District)
4. Windom Beef Processing Plant (PM Global)
5. Zumbrota Dairy Processing Plant
6. Jennie-O Turkey Processing Plants (6 plants)

Prepared by:

**Agricultural Marketing Services Division
Minnesota Department of Agriculture
90 West Plato Boulevard
St. Paul, MN 55107**

www.mda.state.mn.us

2002

ECONOMIC IMPACT OF SELECTED MILK & MEAT PROCESSING PLANTS IN MINNESOTA

Objective

The purpose of this study is to estimate the economic impact of meat/milk processing plants to the state's economy and community vitality. This study will utilize a regional input-output model (IMPLAN) to estimate the output and employment impacts on all production and support industries.

Specifically the study would hope to address the following questions:

- What economic impacts do processing plants have on the state and regional economy?
- Where are the impacts felt and in what sectors?
- What factors contribute to a healthy livestock processing industry?
- Will the decline/gain in livestock production sector have an effect on long-term sustainability of our processing plants?
- Is fixing feedlots with environmental issues worth state support?
- What trends are occurring in meat/milk processing and how is Minnesota's meat/milk processing facilities and farm production posed for the change?

ECONOMIC IMPACT OF SELECTED MILK & MEAT PROCESSING PLANTS IN MINNESOTA

Narrative

Su Ye

Harold Stanislawski

***Agricultural Marketing Services,
Minnesota Department of Agriculture***

The following study of the “Economic Impact of Selected Milk and Meat Processing Plants in Minnesota” is a take-home lesson on the fundamentals of rural agricultural economic dynamics. The study was put together to demonstrate what could be gained as well as lost when livestock processing dynamics change. There are some experts who say that not all is lost when plants close, the reasoning behind that logic is that when a processing plant closes, those employed could relocate and move to other jobs. The problem with this scenario is that those jobs are generally not located in the area where the plants were located. So the rural infrastructure suffers including church, school, retail, housing markets, and animal agriculture infrastructure. However, we all know how quickly things change in this global environment. Minnesota and the nation are in a recession and pink slips are abundant in almost every economic sector. Currently, the state of Minnesota is facing massive deficits and needs every bit of commerce it can find to help balance its financial books.

The study focuses in on three cheese and whey plants, as well as three meat animal processing facilities. The study uses an economic modeling system, IMPLAN, to trace the linkages between the dairy and livestock production and processing sectors, and their impacts on the Minnesota and rural community economy, in which they are located. Input-Output analysis has some limitations because it uses a base year data that may not be most current and has the potential to either under- or over-estimate the impacts. However, this is the best approach available for impact studies. Every effort was made to apply and adjust the plant data to most accurately measure the impacts.

Minnesota Livestock Landscape

The livestock sector in Minnesota is undergoing unprecedented changes. The change involves economic, environmental, and social forces all acting simultaneously. In 1999, the Minnesota legislature initiated a study on Livestock Agriculture called the Generic Environmental Impact Statement (GEIS). The purpose of this study is to develop recommendations to the legislature for policy making in animal agricultural production areas. The study will highlight possible recommendations for adoption in environmental, economic, and social arenas. The dairy industry perhaps is undergoing the most serious change. The state has not seen a new dairy processing plant built in Minnesota since 1968. At the same time, there has been unprecedented growth and new plant construction in the West where cows and labor forces are both abundant. Livestock processing plants will be built where animal populations can maintain and grow. Currently in Minnesota, it appears that conflicting land use such as rural residential, recreational, big vs. small farms, urban encroachment, and environmental land and water sensitivity are all playing a role in livestock growth or decline in various areas.

Many counties have adopted land use planning and feedlot ordinances. The state has adopted its own 7020 rule revisions just signed in October of 2000. It is the logic that good planning and zoning coupled with sound environmental protocols will protect the environment and ensure that farmers and agri-business can re-invest in the state with assurance once the rules and laws are met.

Other states' efforts in meat animal enhancement have grown the local economies. Idaho was not considered a major dairy state 10 years ago. Today that state has surpassed Minnesota in total milk production. Other states such as New Mexico have the potential to do the same. A private group called the Livestock Development Authority (LDA) has been formed to grow jobs and enhance the local economies in Western Minnesota in partnership with communities, local agribusinesses, and animal agriculture. Western Minnesota in recent years has lost population but still remains the most logical viable area for livestock expansion. A 25-county region in Western Minnesota has been targeted for livestock enhancement projects because of the low population, abundant feed sources including mounting supplies of Dried Distillers Grains and soybean meal from the renewable fuels industry. The ethanol expansion in Minnesota alone will add almost double the amount of feed-by-product on the market. The LDA has sought out the support of the region's economic developers in implementing a plan for growth in the region.

The information in this document should help educate the communities on the value of viable processing plants to their communities and their neighboring farms. The information should also aid in what is at stake should we grow or decline.

ECONOMIC IMPACT OF LIVESTOCK PROCESSING PLANTS, MINNESOTA

Report Summaries

- 1. Austin Pork Processing Plant (Hormel)**
- 2. Fergus Falls Dairy Processing Plant**
- 3. Litchfield Dairy Processing Plant (First District)**
- 4. Windom Beef Processing Plant (PM Global)**
- 5. Zumbrota Dairy Processing Plant**
- 6. Jennie-O Turkey Processing Plants (6 plants)**

Prepared by:

**Agricultural Marketing Services Division
Minnesota Department of Agriculture
90 West Plato Boulevard
St. Paul, MN 55107**

www.mda.state.mn.us

2002

Economic Impact of Austin Pork Processing Plant

Summary

1. This economic impact analysis uses the IMPLAN program (an input-output modeling system) to examine Hormel's pork processing plant in Austin, Minnesota. It estimates the plant's total economic contribution, or "multiplier effect", to the local and state economies, especially to the 55-county region, including Becker, Benton, Big Stone, Blue Earth, Brown, Carver, Cass, Clay, Cottonwood, Crow Wing, Dakota, Dodge, Douglas, Faribault, Fillmore, Freeborn, Goodhue, Grant, Hennepin, Jackson, Kanabec, Kandiyohi, Lac Qui Pa, Le Sueur, Lincoln, Lyon, Martin, McLeod, Meeker, Mille Lacs, Morrison, Mower, Murray, Nicollet, Nobles, Olmsted, Otter Tail, Pipestone, Polk, Pope, Redwood, Renville, Rice, Rock, Sherburne, Sibley, Stearns, Steele, Stevens, Todd, Wabasha, Waseca, Watonwan, Winona, and Wright Counties.

The economic impacts are measured to include the direct, indirect, and induced impacts. Direct impact represents the effect on pork production and processing output. Indirect impact represents the effect on all other economic sectors due to purchases by the pork industry to generate the afore-mentioned output. Induced impact represents the effect on all economic sectors due to the expenditures of new income generated by the direct and indirect impacts. Total impact is the sum of direct, indirect and induced impacts. This impact analysis includes the output impact, employment impact, value-added impact, and labor income impact.

2. The analysis is based on three different scenarios:

Scenario 1 – Economic impact of the Austin pork processing plant at current output level.

Scenario 2 – Economic impact at 25% output increment – meaning output either increases or decreases by 25%.

Scenario 3 – Economic impact at 50% output increment – meaning output either increases or decreases by 50%.

3. The economic impacts are summarized as follows:

Scenario 1 (At current output level):

Total economic impact:	\$1,912 million
Total employment impact:	12,220 jobs
Total value-added impact:	\$544 million
Total labor income impact:	\$342 million

Scenario 2 (At 25% output increment):

For a 25% increase or decrease in production output, add or subtract:

Total economic impact:	\$478 million
Total employment impact:	3,055 jobs
Total value-added impact:	\$136 million
Total labor income impact:	\$85 million

Scenario 3 (At 50% output increment):

For a 50% increase or decrease in production output, add or subtract:

Total economic impact:	\$956 million
Total employment impact:	6,110 jobs
Total value-added impact:	\$272 million
Total labor income impact:	\$171 million

Economic Impact of Austin Pork Processing Plant
(Summary Sheet)

Overall Impact	Scenario 1 (Current Output)	Scenario 2 (25% Output Increment)	Scenario 3 (50% Output Increment)
Output Impact <i>(\$ Million)</i>			
Direct	764.4	191.1	382.3
Indirect	860.4	215.1	430.2
Induced	287.5	71.9	143.8
<u>Total</u>	1,912.3	478.1	956.1
Employment Impact <i>(# of jobs)</i>			
Direct	2,897	724	1,448
Indirect	5,590	1397	2,795
Induced	3,734	933	1,867
<u>Total</u>	12,220	3,055	6,110
Value-added Impact <i>(\$ Million)</i>			
Direct	95.5	23.9	47.7
Indirect	276.0	69.0	138.0
Induced	172.5	43.1	86.3
<u>Total</u>	544.0	136.0	272.0
Labor Income Impact <i>(\$ Million)</i>			
Direct	72.2	19.4	38.6
Indirect	163.0	40.8	81.5
Induced	101.7	25.4	50.9
<u>Total</u>	341.9	85.5	170.9

Economic Impact of Fergus Falls Dairy Processing Plant

Summary

1. This economic impact analysis uses the IMPLAN program (an input-output modeling system) to examine the Fergus Falls dairy processing plant. It estimates the plant's total economic contribution, or "multiplier effect", to the local and state economies, especially to the 10-county region, including Becker, Benton, Cass, Clay, Otter Tail, Pope, Stearns, Stevens, Wadena, and Wilkin Counties.

The economic impacts are measured to include the direct, indirect, and induced impacts. Direct impact represents the effect on pork production and processing output. Indirect impact represents the effect on all other economic sectors due to purchases by the pork industry to generate the afore-mentioned output. Induced impact represents the effect on all economic sectors due to the expenditures of new income generated by the direct and indirect impacts. Total impact is the sum of direct, indirect and induced impacts. This impact analysis includes the output impact, employment impact, value-added impact, and labor income impact.

2. The analysis is based on three different scenarios:

Scenario 1 – Economic impact of the Fergus Falls dairy processing plant at current output level.

Scenario 2 – Economic impact at 10% output increment – meaning output either increases or decreases by 10%.

Scenario 3 – Economic impact at 50% output increment – meaning output either increases or decreases by 50%.

3. The economic impacts are summarized as follows:

Scenario 1 (At current output level):

Total economic impact:	\$117 million
Total employment impact:	1,116 jobs
Total value-added impact:	\$34 million
Total labor income impact:	\$21 million

Scenario 2 (At 10% output increment):

For every 10% increase or decrease in production output, add or subtract:

Total economic impact:	\$12 million
Total employment impact:	112 jobs
Total value-added impact:	\$3 million
Total labor income impact:	\$2 million

Scenario 3 (At 50% output increment):

For every 50% increase or decrease in production output, add or subtract:

Total economic impact:	\$59 million
Total employment impact:	558 jobs
Total value-added impact:	\$17 million
Total labor income impact:	\$11 million

Economic Impact of Fergus Falls Dairy Processing Plant
(Summary Sheet)

Overall Impact	Scenario 1 (Current Output)	Scenario 2 (10% Output Increment)	Scenario 3 (50% Output Increment)
Output Impact (\$ Million)			
Direct	43.9	4.4	21.9
Indirect	60.7	6.1	30.4
Induced	12.7	1.3	6.3
<u>Total</u>	117.3	11.7	58.6
Employment Impact (# of jobs)			
Direct	127	13	63
Indirect	765	77	383
Induced	223	22	112
<u>Total</u>	1,116	112	558
Value-added Impact (\$ Million)			
Direct	6.2	0.6	3.1
Indirect	20.0	2.0	10.2
Induced	8.0	0.8	3.8
<u>Total</u>	34.3	3.4	17.2
Labor Income Impact (\$ Million)			
Direct	3.6	0.4	1.8
Indirect	13.3	1.3	6.6
Induced	4.6	0.5	2.3
<u>Total</u>	21.4	2.1	10.7

Economic Impact of Litchfield Dairy Processing Plant

Summary

1. This economic impact analysis uses the IMPLAN program (an input-output modeling system) to examine the Litchfield dairy processing plant. It estimates the plant's total economic contribution, or "multiplier effect", to the local and state economy, especially to the 33-county region, including Aitkin, Anoka, Becker, Benton, Brown, Chippewa, Cottonwood, Crow Wing, Douglas, Houston, Isanti, Kanabec, Kandiyohi, Lac qui Parle, McLeod, Meeker, Mille Lacs, Morrison, Nicollet, Otter Tail, Pine, Pope, Redwood, Renville, Sherburne, Sibley, Stearns, Swift, Todd, Wadena, Watonwan, Wright, and Yellow Medicine Counties.

The economic impacts are measured to include the direct, indirect, and induced impacts. Direct impact represents the effect on dairy production and processing output. Indirect impact represents the effect on all other economic sectors due to purchases by the dairy industry to generate the afore-mentioned output. Induced impact represents the effect on all economic sectors due to the expenditures of new income generated by the direct and indirect impacts. Total impact is the sum of direct, indirect and induced impacts. This impact analysis includes the output impact, employment impact, value-added impact, and labor income impact.

2. The analysis is based on four different scenarios:

Scenario 1 – Economic impact of the Litchfield dairy processing plant at current output level.

Scenario 2 – Economic impact at 10% output increment – meaning output either increases or decreases by 10%.

Scenario 3 – Economic impact at 20% output increment – meaning output either increases or decreases by 20%.

Scenario 4 – Economic impact at 50% output increment – meaning output either increases or decreases by 50%.

3. The economic impacts are summarized as follows:

Scenario 1 (At current output level):

Total economic impact:	\$585 million
Total employment impact:	4,399 jobs
Total value-added impact:	\$181 million
Total labor income impact:	\$113 million

Scenario 2 (At 10% output increment):

For every 10% increase or decrease in production output, add or subtract:

Total economic impact:	\$59 million
Total employment impact:	440 jobs

Total value-added impact: \$18 million
Total labor income impact: \$11 million

Scenario 3 (At 20% output increment):

For every 20% increase or decrease in production output, add or subtract:

Total economic impact: \$117 million
Total employment impact: 880 jobs
Total value-added impact: \$36 million
Total labor income impact: \$23 million

Scenario 4 (At 50% output increment):

For every 50% increase or decrease in production output, add or subtract:

Total economic impact: \$293 million
Total employment impact: 2,200 jobs
Total value-added impact: \$91 million
Total labor income impact: \$57 million

Economic Impact of Litchfield Dairy Processing Plant

(Summary Sheet)

Overall Impact	Scenario 1 (Current Output)	Scenario 2 (10% Output Increment)	Scenario 3 (20% Output Increment)	Scenario 4 (50% Output Increment)
Output Impact <i>(\$ Million)</i>				
Direct	200.1	20.0	40.0	100.0
Indirect	310.8	31.1	62.2	155.4
Induced	74.5	7.4	14.9	37.2
<u>Total</u>	585.3	58.5	117.0	292.6
Employment Impact <i>(# of Jobs)</i>				
Direct	150	15	30	75
Indirect	3,055	306	611	1,528
Induced	1,194	119	239	597
<u>Total</u>	4,399	440	880	2,200
Value-added Impact <i>(\$ Million)</i>				
Direct	28.7	2.9	5.7	14.3
Indirect	109.7	11.0	21.9	54.9
Induced	42.7	4.3	8.5	21.3
<u>Total</u>	181.1	18.1	36.2	90.5
Labor Income Impact <i>(\$ Million)</i>				
Direct	18.1	1.9	3.8	9.5
Indirect	70.0	6.9	13.8	34.5
Induced	25.2	2.5	5.0	12.6
<u>Total</u>	113.3	11.3	22.7	56.6

Economic Impact of Windom Beef Processing Plant

Summary

1. This economic impact analysis uses the IMPLAN program (an input-output modeling system) to examine the beef processing plant in Windom, Minnesota. It estimates the plant's total economic contribution, or "multiplier effect", to the local and state economies, especially to the 47-county region, including Big Stone, Blue Earth, Brown, Carver, Chippewa, Cottonwood, Dakota, Dodge, Faribault, Fillmore, Freeborn, Goodhue, Grant, Hennepin, Houston, Jackson, Kandiyohi, Lac Qui Parle, Le Sueur, Lincoln, Lyon, Martin, McLeod, Meeker, Mower, Murray, Nicollet, Nobles, Olmsted, Pipestone, Pope, Redwood, Renville, Rice, Rock, Scott, Sibley, Stearns, Steele, Swift, Wabasha, Wadena, Waseca, Watonwan, Winona, Wright, Yellow Medicine Counties.

The economic impacts are measured to include the direct, indirect, and induced impacts. Direct impact represents the effect on beef production and processing output. Indirect impact represents the effect on all other economic sectors due to purchases by the beef industry to generate the afore-mentioned output. Induced impact represents the effect on all economic sectors due to the expenditures of new income generated by the direct and indirect impacts. Total impact is the sum of direct, indirect and induced impacts. This impact analysis includes the output impact, employment impact, value-added impact, and labor income impact.

2. The analysis is based on two different scenarios:

Scenario 1 – Economic impact of the Windom beef processing plant at current output level.

Scenario 2 – Economic impact after the proposed plant expansion (or 15.7% increase in output).

3. The economic impacts are summarized as follows:

Scenario 1 (At current output level):

Total economic impact:	\$462 million
Total employment impact:	2,811 jobs
Total value-added impact:	\$130 million
Total labor income impact:	\$83 million

Scenario 2 (After plant expansion):

Total economic impact:	\$538 million
Total employment impact:	3,798 jobs
Total value-added impact:	\$155 million
Total labor income impact:	\$99 million

Economic Impact of Windom Beef Processing Plant
(Summary Sheet)

Overall Impact	Scenario 1 (Current Output)	Scenario 2 (After plant expansion)
Output Impact (\$ Million)		
Direct	186.0	215.2
Indirect	207.1	240.3
Induced	69.2	82.7
<u>Total</u>	462.3	538.2
Employment Impact (# of Jobs)		
Direct	177	672
Indirect	1,752	2,070
Induced	882	1,056
<u>Total</u>	2,811	3,798
Value-added Impact (\$ Million)		
Direct	20.0	23.1
Indirect	68.6	82.5
Induced	41.7	49.9
<u>Total</u>	130.2	155.4
Labor Income Impact (\$ Million)		
Direct	16.5	19.0
Indirect	42.0	50.8
Induced	24.5	29.3
<u>Total</u>	83.0	99.2

Economic Impact of Zumbrota Dairy Processing Plant

Summary

1. This economic impact analysis uses the IMPLAN program (an input-output modeling system) to examine the dairy processing plant in Zumbrota, Minnesota. It estimates the plant's total economic contribution, or "multiplier effect", to the local and state economies, especially to the 7-county region, including Goodhue, Olmsted, Winona, Wabasha, Dodge, Rice, and Steele Counties.

The economic impacts are measured to include the direct, indirect, and induced impacts. Direct impact represents the effect on dairy production and processing output. Indirect impact represents the effect on all other economic sectors due to purchases by the dairy industry to generate the afore-mentioned output. Induced impact represents the effect on all economic sectors due to the expenditures of new income generated by the direct and indirect impacts. Total impact is the sum of direct, indirect and induced impacts. This impact analysis includes the output impact, employment impact, value-added impact, and labor income impact.

2. The analysis is based on four different scenarios:

Scenario 1 – Economic impact of the Zumbrota dairy processing plant at current output level.

Scenario 2 – Economic impact at 10% output increment – meaning output either increases or decreases by 10%.

Scenario 3 – Economic impact at 20% output increment – meaning output either increases or decreases by 20%.

Scenario 4 – Economic impact at 50% output increment – meaning output either increases or decreases by 50%.

3. The economic impacts are summarized as follows:

Scenario 1 (At current output level):

Total economic impact:	\$223 million
Total employment impact:	1,410 jobs
Total value-added impact:	\$55 million
Total labor income impact:	\$35 million

Scenario 2 (At 10% output increment):

For every 10% increase or decrease in production output, add or subtract:

Total economic impact:	\$22 million
Total employment impact:	141 jobs
Total value-added impact:	\$6 million
Total labor income impact:	\$3 million

Scenario 3 (At 20% output increment):

For every 20% increase or decrease in production output, add or subtract:

Total economic impact:	\$45 million
Total employment impact:	282 jobs
Total value-added impact:	\$11 million
Total labor income impact:	\$7 million

Scenario 4 (At 50% output increment):

For every 50% increase or decrease in production output, add or subtract:

Total economic impact:	\$112 million
Total employment impact:	705 jobs
Total value-added impact:	\$28 million
Total labor income impact:	\$17 million

Economic Impact of Zumbrota Dairy Processing Plant (Summary Sheet)

Overall Impact	Scenario 1 (Current Output)	Scenario 2 (10% Output Increment)	Scenario 3 (20% Output Increment)	Scenario 4 (50% Output Increment)
Output Impact (\$ Million)				
Direct	95.3	9.5	19.1	47.6
Indirect	108.6	10.9	21.7	54.3
Induced	19.2	1.9	3.8	9.6
<u>Total</u>	223.2	22.3	44.6	111.6
Employment Impact (# of jobs)				
Direct	243	24	49	122
Indirect	854	85	171	427
Induced	313	31	63	156
<u>Total</u>	1,410	141	282	705
Value-added Impact (\$ Million)				
Direct	12.6	1.3	2.5	6.3
Indirect	30.9	3.1	6.2	15.4
Induced	11.9	1.2	2.4	5.9
<u>Total</u>	55.4	5.5	11.1	27.7
Labor Income Impact (\$ Million)				
Direct	7.3	0.7	1.5	3.6
Indirect	20.3	2.0	4.1	10.2
Induced	7.0	0.7	1.4	3.5
<u>Total</u>	34.6	3.5	6.9	17.3

Economic Impact of Turkey Processing

Jennie-O Turkey Processing Plants, Minnesota

Summary

1. This economic impact analysis uses the IMPLAN program (an input-output modeling system) to examine Jennie-O's six turkey processing plants in various locations in Minnesota. It estimates the plants' total economic contribution, or "multiplier effect", to the local and state economies, especially to the 36-county region, including Aitkin, Becker, Blue Earth, Brown, Chippewa, Clay, Cottonwood, Dodge, Douglas, Fillmore, Hubbard, Jackson, Kandiyohi, Le Sueur, Lyon, Martin, Meeker, Morrison, Olmstead, Ottertail, Pope, Redwood, Renville, Rice, Roseau, Scott, Steele, Sterns, Stone, Swift, Todd, Wadena, Watonwan, Wilkin, Winona, and Yellow Medicine Counties.

The economic impacts are measured to include the direct, indirect, and induced impacts. Direct impact represents the effect on turkey production and processing output. Indirect impact represents the effect on all other economic sectors due to purchases by the turkey industry to generate the afore-mentioned output. Induced impact represents the effect on all economic sectors due to the expenditures of new income generated by the direct and indirect impacts. Total impact is the sum of direct, indirect and induced impacts. This impact analysis includes the output impact, employment impact, value-added impact, and labor income impact.

2. The analysis is based on three different scenarios:

Scenario 1 – Economic impact of Jennie-O's six turkey processing plants at current output levels.

Scenario 2 – Economic impact at 25% output increment – meaning output either increases or decreases by 25%.

Scenario 3 – Economic impact at 50% output increment – meaning output either increases or decreases by 50%.

3. The economic impacts are summarized as follows:

Scenario 1 (At current output level):

Total economic impact:	\$2,080 million
Total employment impact:	16,070 jobs
Total value-added impact:	\$612 million
Total labor income impact:	\$420 million

Scenario 2 (At 25% output increment):

For every 25% increase or decrease in production output, add or subtract:

Total economic impact:	\$520 million
Total employment impact:	4,017 jobs
Total value-added impact:	\$153 million
Total labor income impact:	\$105 million

Scenario 3 (At 50% output increment):

For every 50% increase or decrease in production output, add or subtract:

Total economic impact:	\$1,040 million
Total employment impact:	8,035 jobs
Total value-added impact:	\$306 million
Total labor income impact:	\$210 million

Economic Impact of Jennie-O Turkey Processing Plants, Minnesota
(Summary Sheet)

	Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3
Overall Impact	(Current Output)	(25% Output Increment)	(50% Output Increment)
Output Impact <i>(\$ Million)</i>			
Direct	750.0	187.5	375.0
Indirect	1,042.8	260.7	521.4
Induced	286.9	71.7	143.5
<u>Total</u>	2,079.7	519.9	1,039.9
Employment Impact <i>(# of jobs)</i>			
Direct	5,282	1,321	2,641
Indirect	6,092	1,523	3,046
Induced	4,695	1,174	2,348
<u>Total</u>	16,070	4,017	8,035
Value-added Impact <i>(\$ Million)</i>			
Direct	183.7	45.9	91.9
Indirect	264.1	66.0	132.1
Induced	164.3	41.1	82.2
<u>Total</u>	612.2	153.0	306.1
Labor Income Impact <i>(\$ Million)</i>			
Direct	155.0	38.7	77.5
Indirect	164.4	41.1	82.2
Induced	100.3	25.1	50.2
<u>Total</u>	419.7	104.9	209.8