

Economic Contribution of the Los Angeles Community College District

*Analysis of Investment Effectiveness
and Economic Growth*

Volume 2: Detailed Results

by

**Entry Level of Education
And Gender**

**Prepared by:
M. Henry Robison, PhD and
Kjell A. Christophersen, PhD**



INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this volume is to present results of the economic impact analysis in detail by gender and level of education. It is kept as a separate volume intended for limited distribution only, however, because this effort is not about gender differences *per se*. The study is about the overall economic impacts generated by community and technical colleges. As such, the Main Report and short Executive Summary both present results without reference to gender differences.

Nevertheless, it is important to present all results for the sake of completeness, not just consolidated ones, so long as users remain prudent in their use and distribution. Results should not be used, for example, to further any political agendas. Other studies about gender differences address such questions better and in greater detail. The purpose of this volume is simply to provide pertinent information should specific questions arise.

On the data entry side, gender is an important variable that helps characterize the student body profile. These profile data are linked to national and state statistical databases which are already broken out by gender differences. The student body profile, to a large extent, drives the magnitude of results which are presented in detail in this volume and in a consolidated fashion in the Main Report and Executive Summary. Literature references for databases and parameters are listed in the Main Volume and in conjunction with the summary tables in this volume.

DETAILED TABLES

TABLE 1: HIGHER INCOME

Statistics indicate that income is highly correlated with education. As education milestones are achieved, students move into higher levels of average income. Higher incomes (also known as *private benefits*) of students are summarized in **Table 1**. Note that these figures reflect the cumulative achievements of *all* students in each category.

Table 1: Higher Annual Income Based on Achievements, Aggregate¹

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
< HS/GED	\$20,659,291	\$20,834,006	\$41,493,297
HS/GED equivalent	\$6,185,571	\$6,236,990	\$12,422,561
One year post HS or less	\$68,784,433	\$89,997,029	\$158,781,462
Two years post HS or less	\$46,126,852	\$62,950,159	\$109,077,010
> Associate Degree	\$1,138,230	\$1,584,572	\$2,722,802
TOTAL	\$142,894,377	\$181,602,755	\$324,497,132

1. Numbers reflect aggregate totals for all students in each category.

Source: Adapted from U.S. Census Bureau, Housing and Household Economic Statistics Division; U.S. Census Bureau, Income Surveys Branch/HHES Division, "Median for 4-Person Families, by State" (October 2003); U.S. Census Bureau, Table P-3. Race and Hispanic Origin of People by Mean Income and Sex: 1947 to 2000 (September 2002); U.S. Census Bureau, Table P-18. Educational Attainment—People 25 Years Old and Over by Mean Income and Sex: 1991 to 2000 (September 2002).

TABLES 2 – 7: REDUCED MEDICAL COSTS

In general, statistics show a positive correlation between higher education and improved health habits. The following tables show calculated reductions in medical costs as a function of adding higher education, linked to the demographic profile of the student body. As above, these figures are in the aggregate.

The improved health of students generates savings in three measurable ways: 1) lower absenteeism from work (**Tables 2 and 3**); 2) reduced smoking (**Tables 4 and 5**), and; 3) reduced alcohol abuse (**Tables 6 and 7**).

Table 2: Number of Days Reduced Absenteeism per Year, Aggregate^{1,2}

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
< HS/GED	2,763	7,057	9,820
HS/GED equivalent	205	523	728
One year post HS or less	5,086	16,186	21,272
Two years post HS or less	2,524	7,660	10,184
> Associate Degree	53	156	209
TOTAL	10,631	31,582	42,213

1. Numbers may not add due to rounding.

2. Results adjusted for out-migration, but not attrition over time. Out-of-state attrition applied in Table 19.

Source: Adapted from Bureau of Labor Statistics, Current Population Survey, Table 46. Absences from work of employed full-time wage and salary workers by age and sex; U.S. Census Bureau, Table P-3. Race and Hispanic Origin of People by Mean Income and Sex: 1947 to 2000.

Table 3: Employer Savings from Reduced Absenteeism per Year, Aggregate¹

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
< HS/GED	\$366,689	\$624,816	\$991,506
HS/GED equivalent	\$34,585	\$59,053	\$93,638
One year post HS or less	\$921,248	\$2,007,412	\$2,928,660
Two years post HS or less	\$524,999	\$1,136,429	\$1,661,428
> Associate Degree	\$12,697	\$27,862	\$40,559
TOTAL	\$1,860,218	\$3,855,572	\$5,715,790

1. Lost income based on the implicit assumption that the typical work year comprises 260 full-work days.

Source: Adapted from data supplied by Bureau of Labor Statistics and U.S. Census Bureau. See also Table 2.

Table 4: Fewer Smokers, Aggregate¹

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
< HS/GED	90	67	157
HS/GED equivalent	<10	<10	<10
One year post HS or less	596	468	1,064
Two years post HS or less	249	209	458
> Associate Degree	149	134	283
TOTAL	1,090	881	1,971

1. Results adjusted for out-migration, but not attrition over time. Out-of-state attrition applied in Table 19.

Source: Adapted from Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Health Statistics, Table 60. Current cigarette smoking by persons 18 years of age and over in *Health, United States, 2004* (Hyattsville, MD, 2004); National Center for Health Statistics, Table 61: Age-adjusted prevalence of current cigarette smoking, in *Health, United States, 2004* (Hyattsville, MD, 2004); Questionnaire supplements: hypertension (1974), smoking (1979), alcohol and health practices (1983), health promotion and disease prevention (1985, 1990-91), cancer control and cancer epidemiology (1992), and year 2000 objectives (1993-95). Data starting in 1997 obtained from the family core and sample adult questionnaires.

Table 5: Medical Savings from Reduced Smoking per Year, Aggregate

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
< HS/GED	\$269,542	\$201,397	\$470,939
HS/GED equivalent	\$16,992	\$12,883	\$29,875
One year post HS or less	\$1,788,831	\$1,402,906	\$3,191,736
Two years post HS or less	\$747,099	\$626,577	\$1,373,676
> Associate Degree	\$447,227	\$400,502	\$847,728
TOTAL	\$3,269,691	\$2,644,264	\$5,913,954

Source: Adapted from Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Table 2: Annual smoking-attributable economic costs for adults and infants - United States, 1995-1999, in "Annual Smoking-Attributable Mortality, Years of Potential Life Lost, and Economic Costs - United States, 1995-1999" (*MMWR Weekly* 51(4), April 12, 2002): 300-3. See also Table 4.

Table 6: Fewer Alcohol Abusers, Aggregate^{1,2}

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
< HS/GED	21	18	39
HS/GED equivalent	<10	<10	<10
One year post HS or less	153	122	274
Two years post HS or less	73	53	126
> Associate Degree	13	<10	22
TOTAL	260	203	463

1. Numbers may not add due to rounding.

2. Results adjusted for out-migration, but not attrition over time. Out-of-state attrition applied in Table 19.

Source: Adapted from National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, Percent reporting alcohol use in the past year by age group and demographic characteristics: NHSDA, 1994-97 (August 1999); National Institute on Drug Abuse and the National Institute of Alcohol and Alcoholism, *The Economic Costs of Alcohol and Drug Abuse in the United States – 1992* (Bethesda, MD: Department of Health and Human Services, National Institute of Health, May 1998); Thomas Nephew and others, eds., *Surveillance Report #55: Apparent Per Capita Alcohol Consumption: National, State and Regional Trends, 1977-98* (Rockville, MD: National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, 2000).

Table 7: Medical Savings from Reduced Alcohol Abuse per Year, Aggregate

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
< HS/GED	\$146,468	\$123,795	\$270,263
HS/GED equivalent	\$9,502	\$7,889	\$17,391
One year post HS or less	\$1,069,110	\$851,336	\$1,920,447
Two years post HS or less	\$508,381	\$373,497	\$881,878
> Associate Degree	\$89,583	\$62,648	\$152,231
TOTAL	\$1,823,044	\$1,419,165	\$3,242,209

Source: Adapted from National Institute on Drug Abuse and the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, *The Economic Costs of Alcohol and Drug Abuse in the United States, 1992* (Bethesda, MD: Department of Health and Human Services, National Institute of Health, May 1998). See also Table 6.

TABLES 8 – 11: REDUCED INCARCERATION COSTS

Tables 8 through 11 relate probabilities of incarceration to education levels – incarceration drops on a sliding scale as education levels rise (linked to the demographic profile of the student body). As above, results are in the aggregate – they are not on an individual basis.

Three types of crime-related expenses are identified: 1) incarceration, including prosecution, imprisonment, and reform (Tables 8 and 9); 2) victim costs (Table 10), and; 3) productivity gained as a result of time spent working rather than in jail or prison (Table 11).

Table 8: Fewer Incarcerated, Aggregate^{1,2}

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
< HS/GED	99	22	121
HS/GED equivalent	<10	<10	<10
One year post HS or less	599	124	723
Two years post HS or less	224	42	267
> Associate Degree	34	<10	40
TOTAL	963	195	1,158

1. Numbers may not add due to rounding.

2. Results adjusted for out-migration, but not attrition over time. Out-of-state attrition applied in Table 19.

Source: Adapted from Allen J. Beck and Paige M. Harrison, *Prisoners in 2000* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, August 2001); National Center for Education Statistics, *Literacy Behind Prison Walls* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, October 1994); National Institute for Literacy, *Correctional Educational Facts*; Sandra Kerka, *Prison Literacy Programs*. ERIC Digest No. 159; Stephen J. Steurer, Linda Smith, and Alice Tracy, "Three State Recidivism Study" (Lanham, MD: Correctional Education Association, September 2001); Thomas P. Bonczar and Alan J. Beck, *Lifetime Likelihood of Going to State or Federal Prison* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, March 1997); U.S. Census Bureau, Table 1. Educational Attainment of the Population 15 Years and Over, by Age, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin in *Educational Attainment in the United States March 2000* (December 2000).

Table 9: Annual Savings from Reduced Incarceration, Aggregate

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
< HS/GED	\$707,750	\$154,490	\$862,239
HS/GED equivalent	\$43,257	\$9,297	\$52,555
One year post HS or less	\$4,280,995	\$884,741	\$5,165,737
Two years post HS or less	\$1,602,832	\$302,353	\$1,905,185
> Associate Degree	\$245,168	\$43,348	\$288,516
TOTAL	\$6,880,002	\$1,394,229	\$8,274,231

Source: Adapted from U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics Bulletin, Table 1 in "Justice Expenditures and Employment in the United States, 2001" (May 2004). Paige M. Harrison and Allan J. Beck, "Number of persons held in state or federal prison or in local jails, 1995-2004" (Bureau of Justice Statistics, National Prisoner Statistics, April 24, 2005); Timothy Hughes, et al, "State prison admissions 2001: Sentence length by offense and admission type" (Bureau of Justice Statistics, National Corrections Reporting Program 2001, May 7, 2004); Bureau of Justice Statistics, Survey of Inmates in Local Jails, 2002, "Length of sentence and time expected to be served of inmates sentenced to jail, by offense, 2002" (July 5, 2004).

Table 10: Annual Crime Victim Savings, Aggregate

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
< HS/GED	\$227,014	\$49,553	\$276,567
HS/GED equivalent	\$13,875	\$2,982	\$16,857
One year post HS or less	\$1,373,149	\$283,785	\$1,656,934
Two years post HS or less	\$514,116	\$96,981	\$611,097
> Associate Degree	\$78,639	\$13,904	\$92,543
TOTAL	\$2,206,793	\$447,206	\$2,653,999

Source: Adapted from D. A. Anderson, "The Aggregate Burden of Crime" (*Journal of Law and Economics* XLII 2, October 1999): 611-642; Ted R. Miller, Mark A. Cohen, and Brian Wiersema, *Victim Costs and Consequences: A New Look* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, January 1996). See also Table 8.

Table 11: Annual Productivity Gained, Aggregate

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
< HS/GED	\$353,725	\$51,155	\$404,880
HS/GED equivalent	\$27,356	\$3,927	\$31,283
One year post HS or less	\$2,890,342	\$410,351	\$3,300,693
Two years post HS or less	\$1,229,975	\$167,736	\$1,397,711
> Associate Degree	\$216,105	\$28,895	\$245,000
TOTAL	\$4,717,504	\$662,064	\$5,379,567

Source: Adapted from Correctional Education Association, National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Census Bureau, and U.S. Department of Justice. See also Table 8.

TABLES 12 – 15: REDUCED WELFARE AND UNEMPLOYMENT

Higher education is statistically associated with lower welfare (Tables 12 and 13) and unemployment (Tables 14 and 15). The higher the education level, the less likely it is for an individual to apply for welfare and/or unemployment assistance (as above, these data are linked to the demographic profile of the student body). Results reflect the aggregate student body and are dependent on the cumulative achievements of students during the analysis year.

Table 12: Fewer People on Welfare, Aggregate^{1,2}

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
< HS/GED	132	351	482
HS/GED equivalent	<10	20	28
One year post HS or less	641	1,709	2,350
Two years post HS or less	175	468	643
> Associate Degree	22	58	80
TOTAL	977	2,606	3,583

1. Numbers may not add due to rounding.

2. Results adjusted for out-migration, but not attrition over time. Out-of-state attrition applied in Table 19.

Source: Adapted from Committee on Ways and Means, *2000 Ways and Means Green Book*, 17th ed. (Washington D.C.: U.S. House of Representatives, October 2000); Health Care Financing Administration, *A Profile of Medicaid: Chartbook 2000* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, September 2000); Robert Rector, *Means-Tested Welfare Spending: Past and Future Growth* (Heritage Foundation, March 2001); Social Security Bulletin, *Annual Statistical Supplement, 2000* (December 2002); Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) Program, Table 12: Percent distribution of TANF adult recipients by race and Table 17: Percent distribution of TANF adult recipients by educational level in *"Characteristics and Financial Circumstances of TANF Recipients"* (Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, May 1999); U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division, Table ST-EST2002-01 - State Population Estimates (December 2002).

Table 13: Annual Community Welfare Savings, Aggregate

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
< HS/GED	\$231,520	\$617,475	\$848,995
HS/GED equivalent	\$13,211	\$35,234	\$48,444
One year post HS or less	\$1,127,868	\$3,008,077	\$4,135,945
Two years post HS or less	\$308,638	\$823,153	\$1,131,791
> Associate Degree	\$38,322	\$102,207	\$140,529
TOTAL	\$1,719,559	\$4,586,145	\$6,305,704

Source: Adapted from Social Security Online, Annual Statistical Supplement, 2004, Table 9.G2: Average monthly number of families and recipients of Temporary Assistance for Needy Families and total amount of assistance, by state or other area, 2003; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, 2003 Data Compendium; U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Indicators of Welfare Dependence: Annual Report to Congress, 2003.

Table 14: Fewer People on Unemployment, Aggregate^{1,2}

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
< HS/GED	30	46	77
HS/GED equivalent	<10	<10	<10
One year post HS or less	197	301	498
Two years post HS or less	63	100	163
> Associate Degree	37	59	96
TOTAL	329	509	838

1. Numbers may not add due to rounding.

2. Results adjusted for out-migration, but not attrition over time. Out-of-state attrition applied in Table 19.

Source: Adapted from U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Current Population Survey.

Table 15: Annual Unemployment Savings, Aggregate

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
< HS/GED	\$37,636	\$57,620	\$95,256
HS/GED equivalent	\$2,359	\$3,609	\$5,968
One year post HS or less	\$245,102	\$374,499	\$619,601
Two years post HS or less	\$77,829	\$124,554	\$202,383
> Associate Degree	\$46,045	\$72,918	\$118,963
TOTAL	\$408,971	\$633,200	\$1,042,172

Source: Adapted from U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, Unemployment Insurance Data Summary.

TABLES 16 – 18: SUMMARY TABLES

Summary tables show aggregate totals of all values presented in **Tables 1** through **15** (**Table 16**), as well as annualized values per CHE (**Table 17**) and per student (**Table 18**). Numbers in the last column of **Table 16** also appear in **Table 3.4** of the Main Report. Weighted averages in **Tables 17** are reproduced in **Table 3.9**.

Table 16: Summary of Annual Impacts

	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
Higher income	\$142,894,377	\$181,602,755	\$324,497,132
Absenteeism Savings	\$1,860,218	\$3,855,572	\$5,715,790
Medical Cost Savings	\$5,092,734	\$4,063,429	\$9,156,163
Incarceration Savings	\$6,880,002	\$1,394,229	\$8,274,231
Crime Victim Savings	\$2,206,793	\$447,206	\$2,653,999
Add Prod. (fewer incarceration.)	\$4,717,504	\$662,064	\$5,379,567
Welfare Savings	\$1,719,559	\$4,586,145	\$6,305,704
Unemployment Savings	\$408,971	\$633,200	\$1,042,172
TOTAL	\$165,780,159	\$197,244,600	\$363,024,758

Source: See Tables 1 through 15.

Table 17: Annual Impacts per Credit Hour Equivalent

	MALE	FEMALE	WGHTD AVG
Higher income	\$ 230	\$ 195	\$ 209
Absenteeism Savings	\$ 3	\$ 4	\$ 4
Medical Cost Savings	\$ 8	\$ 4	\$ 6
Incarceration Savings	\$ 11	\$ 2	\$ 5
Crime Victim Savings	\$ 4	\$ 0	\$ 2
Add Prod. (fewer incarceration.)	\$ 8	\$ 1	\$ 3
Welfare Savings	\$ 3	\$ 5	\$ 4
Unemployment Savings	\$ 1	\$ 1	\$ 1
Source:	\$ 267	\$ 212	\$ 234

Source: See Table 2.4 in Volume 1: Main Report and Table 16 in this report.

Table 18: Annual Impacts per Student

	MALE	FEMALE	WGHTD AVG
Higher income	\$ 1,753	\$ 1,491	\$ 1,596
Absenteeism Savings	\$ 23	\$ 32	\$ 28
Medical Cost Savings	\$ 62	\$ 33	\$ 45
Incarceration Savings	\$ 84	\$ 11	\$ 41
Crime Victim Savings	\$ 27	\$ 4	\$ 13
Add Prod. (fewer incarceration.)	\$ 58	\$ 5	\$ 26
Welfare Savings	\$ 21	\$ 38	\$ 31
Unemployment Savings	\$ 5	\$ 5	\$ 5
TOTAL	\$ 2,034	\$ 1,620	\$ 1,786

Source: See Table 2.3 in Volume 1: Main Report and Table 16 in this report.

TABLES 19 – 20: TAXPAYER PERSPECTIVES

Tables 19 and 20 provide data needed for computing the investment analysis results presented in the Main Report. In Table 19, every other column (higher taxes and avoided costs) provides data needed for the narrow taxpayer perspective. Remaining columns provide data needed for the broad taxpayer perspective. Table 20 provides detailed calculations on labor and non-labor income added to the state economy as a result of higher student income. Total income growth figures feed into the first column of Table 19.

Table 19: Cumulative Impact Over Time (\$ Thousands)

Year	INCOME		HEALTH				CRIME				WELFARE/UNEMPLOYMENT					
	Increase in Income	Added Taxes	Reduced Absent.	Avoided Cost	Medical Saving	Avoided Cost	Incarceration	Avoided Cost	Victims	Avoided Cost	Product. Gained	Avoided Cost	Reduced Welfare	Avoided Cost	Reduced Unempl.	Avoided Cost
0	\$138,459	\$20,542	\$5,716	\$708	\$9,156	\$549	\$8,274	\$6,619	\$2,654	\$0	\$5,380	\$1,166	\$6,306	\$1,009	\$1,042	\$0
1	\$191,543	\$28,417	\$5,671	\$703	\$9,057	\$543	\$8,184	\$6,547	\$2,625	\$0	\$5,337	\$1,156	\$6,237	\$998	\$1,029	\$0
2	\$296,971	\$44,058	\$5,626	\$697	\$8,958	\$537	\$8,095	\$6,476	\$2,597	\$0	\$5,295	\$1,147	\$6,169	\$987	\$1,016	\$0
3	\$324,705	\$48,173	\$5,581	\$692	\$8,861	\$532	\$8,007	\$6,406	\$2,568	\$0	\$5,253	\$1,138	\$6,102	\$976	\$1,003	\$0
4	\$353,517	\$52,447	\$5,537	\$686	\$8,764	\$526	\$7,920	\$6,336	\$2,540	\$0	\$5,211	\$1,129	\$6,036	\$966	\$990	\$0
5	\$383,306	\$56,867	\$5,493	\$681	\$8,669	\$520	\$7,834	\$6,267	\$2,513	\$0	\$5,170	\$1,120	\$5,970	\$955	\$977	\$0
6	\$413,955	\$61,414	\$5,450	\$675	\$8,575	\$514	\$7,749	\$6,199	\$2,486	\$0	\$5,129	\$1,111	\$5,905	\$945	\$964	\$0
7	\$445,331	\$66,069	\$5,407	\$670	\$8,482	\$509	\$7,665	\$6,132	\$2,458	\$0	\$5,089	\$1,103	\$5,841	\$935	\$952	\$0
8	\$477,290	\$70,810	\$5,364	\$665	\$8,389	\$503	\$7,581	\$6,065	\$2,432	\$0	\$5,049	\$1,094	\$5,778	\$924	\$940	\$0
9	\$509,672	\$75,615	\$5,322	\$659	\$8,298	\$498	\$7,499	\$5,999	\$2,405	\$0	\$5,009	\$1,085	\$5,715	\$914	\$928	\$0
10	\$542,310	\$80,457	\$5,280	\$654	\$8,208	\$492	\$7,417	\$5,934	\$2,379	\$0	\$4,969	\$1,077	\$5,653	\$904	\$916	\$0
11	\$575,021	\$85,310	\$5,238	\$649	\$8,119	\$487	\$7,337	\$5,869	\$2,353	\$0	\$4,930	\$1,068	\$5,591	\$895	\$904	\$0
12	\$607,618	\$90,146	\$5,197	\$644	\$8,030	\$482	\$7,257	\$5,806	\$2,328	\$0	\$4,891	\$1,060	\$5,530	\$885	\$892	\$0
13	\$639,904	\$94,936	\$5,156	\$639	\$7,943	\$477	\$7,178	\$5,742	\$2,302	\$0	\$4,852	\$1,051	\$5,470	\$875	\$881	\$0
14	\$671,680	\$99,650	\$5,115	\$634	\$7,857	\$471	\$7,100	\$5,680	\$2,277	\$0	\$4,814	\$1,043	\$5,411	\$866	\$870	\$0
15	\$702,741	\$104,258	\$5,074	\$629	\$7,771	\$466	\$7,023	\$5,618	\$2,253	\$0	\$4,776	\$1,035	\$5,352	\$856	\$859	\$0
16	\$732,883	\$108,730	\$5,034	\$624	\$7,687	\$461	\$6,946	\$5,557	\$2,228	\$0	\$4,738	\$1,027	\$5,294	\$847	\$848	\$0
17	\$761,903	\$113,035	\$4,994	\$619	\$7,603	\$456	\$6,871	\$5,497	\$2,204	\$0	\$4,701	\$1,018	\$5,236	\$838	\$837	\$0
18	\$789,601	\$117,144	\$4,955	\$614	\$7,521	\$451	\$6,796	\$5,437	\$2,180	\$0	\$4,664	\$1,010	\$5,179	\$829	\$826	\$0
19	\$815,784	\$121,029	\$4,916	\$609	\$7,439	\$446	\$6,722	\$5,378	\$2,156	\$0	\$4,627	\$1,002	\$5,123	\$820	\$815	\$0
20	\$840,267	\$124,661	\$4,877	\$604	\$7,358	\$441	\$6,649	\$5,319	\$2,133	\$0	\$4,590	\$994	\$5,067	\$811	\$805	\$0
21	\$862,876	\$128,015	\$4,838	\$599	\$7,278	\$437	\$6,577	\$5,262	\$2,110	\$0	\$4,554	\$987	\$5,012	\$802	\$794	\$0
22	\$883,447	\$131,067	\$4,800	\$595	\$7,199	\$432	\$6,505	\$5,204	\$2,087	\$0	\$4,518	\$979	\$4,958	\$793	\$784	\$0
23	\$901,832	\$133,795	\$4,762	\$590	\$7,121	\$427	\$6,435	\$5,148	\$2,064	\$0	\$4,482	\$971	\$4,904	\$785	\$774	\$0
24	\$917,901	\$136,179	\$4,725	\$585	\$7,043	\$423	\$6,365	\$5,092	\$2,042	\$0	\$4,447	\$963	\$4,851	\$776	\$764	\$0
25	\$931,539	\$138,202	\$4,687	\$581	\$6,967	\$418	\$6,296	\$5,036	\$2,019	\$0	\$4,412	\$956	\$4,798	\$768	\$754	\$0
26	\$942,651	\$139,851	\$4,650	\$576	\$6,891	\$413	\$6,227	\$4,982	\$1,997	\$0	\$4,377	\$948	\$4,746	\$759	\$745	\$0
27	\$951,163	\$141,114	\$4,613	\$572	\$6,816	\$409	\$6,159	\$4,928	\$1,976	\$0	\$4,342	\$941	\$4,694	\$751	\$735	\$0
28	\$957,020	\$141,983	\$4,577	\$567	\$6,742	\$405	\$6,092	\$4,874	\$1,954	\$0	\$4,308	\$933	\$4,643	\$743	\$726	\$0
29	\$960,192	\$142,453	\$4,541	\$563	\$6,669	\$400	\$6,026	\$4,821	\$1,933	\$0	\$4,274	\$926	\$4,593	\$735	\$716	\$0
30	\$960,667	\$142,524	\$4,505	\$558	\$6,596	\$396	\$5,961	\$4,769	\$1,912	\$0	\$4,240	\$919	\$4,543	\$727	\$707	\$0
31	\$958,457	\$142,196	\$4,469	\$554	\$6,524	\$391	\$5,896	\$4,717	\$1,891	\$0	\$4,206	\$911	\$4,493	\$719	\$698	\$0
32	\$953,596	\$141,475	\$4,434	\$549	\$6,453	\$387	\$5,832	\$4,665	\$1,871	\$0	\$4,173	\$904	\$4,444	\$711	\$689	\$0
33	\$946,138	\$140,368	\$4,399	\$545	\$6,383	\$383	\$5,768	\$4,615	\$1,850	\$0	\$4,140	\$897	\$4,396	\$703	\$680	\$0
34	\$936,156	\$138,887	\$4,364	\$541	\$6,314	\$379	\$5,706	\$4,565	\$1,830	\$0	\$4,107	\$890	\$4,348	\$696	\$672	\$0
35	\$923,745	\$137,046	\$4,330	\$536	\$6,245	\$375	\$5,644	\$4,515	\$1,810	\$0	\$4,075	\$883	\$4,301	\$688	\$663	\$0
36	\$909,014	\$134,861	\$4,295	\$532	\$6,177	\$371	\$5,582	\$4,466	\$1,791	\$0	\$4,043	\$876	\$4,254	\$681	\$654	\$0
PV	\$12,035,790	\$1,785,619	\$102,414	\$12,689	\$157,916	\$9,475	\$142,705	\$114,164	\$45,773	\$0	\$96,389	\$20,884	\$108,754	\$17,401	\$17,533	\$0
Net Alt Ed¹	(\$3,894,286)	(\$577,753)	(\$33,137)	(\$4,106)	(\$51,095)	(\$3,066)	(\$46,174)	(\$36,939)	(\$14,810)	\$0	(\$31,188)	(\$6,757)	(\$35,188)	(\$5,630)	(\$5,673)	\$0
Net Shutdown¹	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
PV Net Benefits	\$8,141,504	\$1,207,866	\$69,277	\$8,583	\$106,821	\$6,409	\$96,532	\$77,225	\$30,963	\$0	\$65,202	\$14,127	\$73,566	\$11,771	\$11,860	\$0

1. These refer to the alternative education variable ("Net Alt. Ed.") and shutdown point ("Shutdown"). See Appendices 2 and 3 in Volume 1: Main Report for more details.

Source: Adapted from data supplied by the U.S. Department of Commerce, Regional Economic Information System (CA and SA series). See also Tables 1 through 15.

Table 20: Income Calculations, Taxpayer Perspectives (\$ Thousands)

Year	Labor Income Growth ¹	Net of Attrition	Indirect Labor Income	Non-Labor Income Growth	TOTAL Income Growth	% Reduction ²	NET Income Growth
0	\$71,997	\$70,557	\$24,254	\$43,648	\$138,459	32%	\$93,659
1	\$100,344	\$97,608	\$33,552	\$60,383	\$191,543	32%	\$129,568
2	\$156,736	\$151,333	\$52,020	\$93,618	\$296,971	32%	\$200,883
3	\$172,653	\$165,466	\$56,878	\$102,361	\$324,705	32%	\$219,643
4	\$189,376	\$180,148	\$61,925	\$111,444	\$353,517	32%	\$239,133
5	\$206,867	\$195,328	\$67,143	\$120,834	\$383,306	32%	\$259,284
6	\$225,076	\$210,947	\$72,512	\$130,496	\$413,955	32%	\$280,016
7	\$243,943	\$226,936	\$78,008	\$140,387	\$445,331	32%	\$301,240
8	\$263,402	\$243,221	\$83,606	\$150,462	\$477,290	32%	\$322,858
9	\$283,373	\$259,723	\$89,279	\$160,671	\$509,672	32%	\$344,763
10	\$303,770	\$276,355	\$94,996	\$170,959	\$542,310	32%	\$366,840
11	\$324,497	\$293,024	\$100,726	\$181,271	\$575,021	32%	\$388,968
12	\$345,452	\$309,635	\$106,436	\$191,547	\$607,618	32%	\$411,018
13	\$366,524	\$326,088	\$112,091	\$201,725	\$639,904	32%	\$432,857
14	\$387,597	\$342,280	\$117,657	\$211,742	\$671,680	32%	\$454,352
15	\$408,549	\$358,109	\$123,098	\$221,534	\$702,741	32%	\$475,363
16	\$429,253	\$373,469	\$128,378	\$231,036	\$732,883	32%	\$495,752
17	\$449,582	\$388,257	\$133,461	\$240,184	\$761,903	32%	\$515,382
18	\$469,405	\$402,372	\$138,313	\$248,916	\$789,601	32%	\$534,119
19	\$488,591	\$415,714	\$142,900	\$257,170	\$815,784	32%	\$551,830
20	\$507,012	\$428,191	\$147,189	\$264,888	\$840,267	32%	\$568,391
21	\$524,540	\$439,712	\$151,149	\$272,015	\$862,876	32%	\$583,685
22	\$541,055	\$450,194	\$154,752	\$278,500	\$883,447	32%	\$597,600
23	\$556,438	\$459,564	\$157,973	\$284,296	\$901,832	32%	\$610,037
24	\$570,581	\$467,752	\$160,788	\$289,362	\$917,901	32%	\$620,906
25	\$583,382	\$474,702	\$163,176	\$293,661	\$931,539	32%	\$630,131
26	\$594,748	\$480,364	\$165,123	\$297,164	\$942,651	32%	\$637,648
27	\$604,599	\$484,702	\$166,614	\$299,847	\$951,163	32%	\$643,406
28	\$612,864	\$487,687	\$167,640	\$301,694	\$957,020	32%	\$647,368
29	\$619,486	\$489,303	\$168,196	\$302,693	\$960,192	32%	\$649,513
30	\$624,420	\$489,545	\$168,279	\$302,843	\$960,667	32%	\$649,835
31	\$627,634	\$488,419	\$167,892	\$302,147	\$958,457	32%	\$648,340
32	\$629,113	\$485,942	\$167,040	\$300,614	\$953,596	32%	\$645,052
33	\$628,853	\$482,141	\$165,734	\$298,263	\$946,138	32%	\$640,007
34	\$626,864	\$477,055	\$163,985	\$295,116	\$936,156	32%	\$633,255
35	\$623,171	\$470,730	\$161,811	\$291,204	\$923,745	32%	\$624,859
36	\$617,812	\$463,223	\$159,231	\$286,560	\$909,014	32%	\$614,895

1. This column shows annual higher income achieved by the student body as a result of their education.

2. Reduction factors include the alternative education variable and shutdown variable used to estimate the level of education possible absent state and local government support. See Appendices 2 and 3 in Volume 1: Main Report for more information.

Source: Adapted from data supplied by the U.S. Department of Commerce, Regional Economic Information System (CA and SA series). See also Tables 1 through 15.