

Droff, Josselin; Paloyo, Alfredo R.

Working Paper

Assessing the Regional Economic Impacts of Defense Activities – A Survey of Methods

Ruhr Economic Papers, No. 417

Provided in Cooperation with:

RWI – Leibniz-Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung, Essen

Suggested Citation: Droff, Josselin; Paloyo, Alfredo R. (2013) : Assessing the Regional Economic Impacts of Defense Activities – A Survey of Methods, Ruhr Economic Papers, No. 417, ISBN 978-3-86788-472-3, Rheinisch-Westfälisches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung (RWI), Essen,
<https://doi.org/10.4419/86788472>

This Version is available at:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10419/77086>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



RUHR

ECONOMIC PAPERS

Josselin Droff
Alfredo R. Paloyo

Assessing the Regional Economic Impacts of Defense Activities

A Survey of Methods

Imprint

Ruhr Economic Papers

Published by

Ruhr-Universität Bochum (RUB), Department of Economics
Universitätsstr. 150, 44801 Bochum, Germany

Technische Universität Dortmund, Department of Economic and Social Sciences
Vogelpothsweg 87, 44227 Dortmund, Germany

Universität Duisburg-Essen, Department of Economics
Universitätsstr. 12, 45117 Essen, Germany

Rheinisch-Westfälisches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung (RWI)
Hohenzollernstr. 1-3, 45128 Essen, Germany

Editors

Prof. Dr. Thomas K. Bauer
RUB, Department of Economics, Empirical Economics
Phone: +49 (0) 234/3 22 83 41, e-mail: thomas.bauer@rub.de

Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Leininger
Technische Universität Dortmund, Department of Economic and Social Sciences
Economics – Microeconomics
Phone: +49 (0) 231/7 55-3297, email: W.Leininger@wiso.uni-dortmund.de

Prof. Dr. Volker Clausen
University of Duisburg-Essen, Department of Economics
International Economics
Phone: +49 (0) 201/1 83-3655, e-mail: vclausen@vwl.uni-due.de

Prof. Dr. Christoph M. Schmidt
RWI, Phone: +49 (0) 201/81 49-227, e-mail: christoph.schmidt@rwi-essen.de

Editorial Office

Joachim Schmidt
RWI, Phone: +49 (0) 201/81 49-292, e-mail: joachim.schmidt@rwi-essen.de

Ruhr Economic Papers #417

Responsible Editor: Christoph M. Schmidt

All rights reserved. Bochum, Dortmund, Duisburg, Essen, Germany, 2013

ISSN 1864-4872 (online) – ISBN 978-3-86788-472-3

The working papers published in the Series constitute work in progress circulated to stimulate discussion and critical comments. Views expressed represent exclusively the authors' own opinions and do not necessarily reflect those of the editors.

Ruhr Economic Papers #417

Josselin Droff and Alfredo R. Paloyo

**Assessing the Regional Economic Impacts
of Defense Activities**

A Survey of Methods

Bibliografische Informationen der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek

Die Deutsche Bibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über:
<http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.4419/86788472>

ISSN 1864-4872 (online)

ISBN 978-3-86788-472-3

Josselin Droff and Alfredo R. Paloyo¹

Assessing the Regional Economic Impacts of Defense Activities – A Survey of Methods

Abstract

Defense activities exercised in a specific region may alter the region's economic performances. An accurate assessment of the potential economic impacts of defense activities within a specific area is therefore a valuable undertaking, especially for regional planners who may want to prepare for changes. The variety in the methodological landscape, counting, among others, input-output models, economic base models, Keynesian regional multipliers, fixed-effects estimators, and case-study approaches inspired by geography, sociology, or political science may pose a dilemma. In this paper, we detail the historical and theoretical background of each method, as well as select exemplary cases where these methods were successfully or inappropriately applied. By examining old and "new" methods based on the extant literature in regional economics, we aim to construct a methodological typology that could be extremely valuable to all stakeholders.

JEL Classification: O18, R11, R15

Keywords: Defense activities; public planning; regional impact methods

June 2013

¹ Josselin Droff, Université de Bretagne Occidentale (UBO); Alfredo R. Paloyo, RWI. – The authors would like to acknowledge the suggestions of Cindy Williams and Julien Malizard, and the editorial assistance from Radmila Natividad. – Corresponding author: Josselin Droff, Université de Bretagne Occidentale, 12 rue de Kergoat Bât. B, CS 93837, 29238 Brest CEDEX 3, France, E-Mail: josselin.droff@laposte.net.

INTRODUCTION

In this survey, defense activities are broadly defined to pertain to all economic activities related to military matters. These include—but are not limited to—spending on military personnel and bases, defense equipment supplied by industries (both public and private), and other relevant spending (e.g., maintenance and other operating expenses). From a regional and economic perspective, defense activities are usually exogenous expenditures for regions and often occur regularly for extended periods. Defense activities enable the State to assume its role as the provider of national defense, which is one of the traditional activities of government. Although rather liberal and encompassing, such a general definition is also pragmatic in an ambitious survey covering various geographic, temporal, and methodological contexts.

The defense sector's size and influence have varied over time, depending on strategic, economic, and ideological considerations. Throughout history, the type of defense provided has changed and these changes have played a role in the process of regional development [Law 1983]. The US process of Base Realignments and Closures³ (BRACs) is among the most emblematic changes in a nation's defense strategy; it also illustrates the stakes involved in the assessment of its regional economic impact. The reasons for closing military facilities are varied, but the typical primary objective is to save on costs. Other considerations concern changes in military priorities. For instance, many bases or facilities have simply lost their strategic importance as a consequence of the dissipation of the Cold War and the advent of the modern war, sometimes called "new war" (e.g., asymmetrical warfare, multipolar threats, terrorism, and regional conflicts) [Kaldor 1999].

In the United States, this reform started in the 1960s, after World War II. Within the span of a few years, the US Department of Defense had shut down more than 60 military facilities [Collins 2008, 3]. By 1988, an additional 32 facilities were scheduled for shutdown, as well as 54 others for realignment within six years. In 1991, 73 more facilities were scheduled for closure. The Clinton Administration (1993–2001), under severe pressure to reduce military spending, released a list of an additional 50 facilities scheduled for closure in 1993. The fourth round of closures was announced in 1995, which included 77 facilities, with a projected direct employment loss of about 71,000 jobs [Warf 1997].

Such a realignment process is not an American exception. In Germany, in 2001, the Federal Ministry of Defense proposed a closure or drawdown of 177 bases within the period 2003–2011 [Paloyo et al. 2010a and 2010b]. In France, it was decided that from a total of 471 sites, 83 of its military sites will be closed and 33 will be moved, while, at the same time, the size of its armed forces (including both military and civilian personnel) will decrease by about 20 percent, starting from 2009 to 2016 [Droff, forthcoming]. In Sweden, 24 military bases were

³ Base realignments involve the movement of military and civilian personnel among military facilities.

closed and the number of employees in the armed forces decreased by 50 percent during the period between 1995 and 2005 [Andersson et al. 2007].

For a variety of reasons, defense activities in a particular region may affect the economic performance of the region itself and its periphery. Changes in these activities are a potential source of disruption for which a regional planner may want to prepare. An accurate assessment of the potential economic impacts of defense activities within a specific area is therefore an important undertaking. We contemplate a scenario where a public planner wants to assess the economic impact of defense activities. The heterogeneity in methods and in institutional settings amplifies the need for a broad-based survey that regional scientists and planners would find useful. In a democracy, this would be useful in increasing accountability in government, as independent auditors may themselves apply the available tools to examine whether promised benefits of, say, the presence of a military base were oversold or whether the expected costs of base closures were underestimated. In this sense, a survey can provide a preliminary framework for policymakers to identify which impact-evaluation methods work best under specific circumstances, cognizant of the relative costs and benefits of using one strategy over the others.

We identify two specific characteristics of the “defense activity–economic performance” nexus which raise public policy concerns. First, from a local perspective, it is useful to determine the extent to which a local economy’s economic performance hinges on the development of defense activities in the region. In many parts of the world, defense activities are often an important component of the local economy [Braddon 1995]. Consider, for example, closing a military base in an isolated region where it is the major employer (sometimes, even the exclusive employer, as in the case of *plateau d’Albion*, a former nuclear ballistic missile site in France, which was closed in 1996) [Laganier and Gastaud 1996]. Second, quantifying the impact of defense activities is crucial when policymakers are contemplating an adjustment to the national defense strategy. In terms of scheduling, for example, military bases that are more detached from the local economy—and, hence, are less likely to disrupt it—may be closed first in a recession, to be followed by the more systemic military facilities when the general economic environment has improved.

Despite the obvious need for credible and extensive information, past research has been limited in its coverage of outcome variables of interest and there is no consensus yet on the best approach to estimate costs and benefits. Thus far, the regional economics literature has focused on estimating the impact of military bases on employment and income. Very few studies have expanded the scope to include other socioeconomic indicators, such as tax revenue and crime rates [Paloyo et al. 2010a, 2010b]. Moreover, even if the regional scientist knows what to assess, the methodological landscape is also varied, including, among others, input–output models,

economic base models, Keynesian regional multipliers, fixed-effects estimators, and many case-study approaches.

In this paper, we aim to construct a methodological typology based on the extant literature in regional economics, covering both old and “new” methods. The chronology of the evolution of methods in the literature is used as a guide. We detail the historical and theoretical background of each method, as well as select exemplary cases where these methods were successfully or inappropriately applied. The latter may happen, for example, when researchers are applying the method beyond its limits and drawing conclusions not implied by the underlying model. Moreover, institutional limits may also play a role, such as the unavailability of required data or where administrative structures or boundaries make the application of a “turn-key model” impossible or misleading.

The paper is divided into five sections. The first three sections present the methods for assessing regional impacts of defense activities that have so far been dominant in the defense economics literature, i.e., input–output models (Section 1), economic-base models (Section 2), and regional Keynesian-multiplier models (Section 3). The subsequent section focuses on econometric regional modeling and its application to defense activities (Section 4). The final section presents regional case studies with a focus on the monographic methodology used (Section 5). We conclude with some policy recommendations suggested by results found in both the regional and the defense economics strands of the literature.

1. INPUT–OUTPUT MODELS

1.1 BASICS OF INPUT–OUTPUT MODELS

Input–output models (IOMs) have been the workhorse model in the literature since the seminal work of Leontief [1936, 1951] and Isard [1951, 1960]. At the national or regional level, IOMs quantify the interdependencies between production and consumption among different sectors of the economy, thus making them particularly powerful tools for the study of the effects of demand-driven changes in the economy.

The so-called “technology matrix” in IOMs characterizes the linkages between the various sectors of a given economy. Such interdependencies are called backward linkages (or use of inputs) and forward linkages (or use of outputs). For example, agriculture has minimal backward linkages, since much of its input comes from the agricultural sector itself (e.g., the use of organic fertilizers or seeds). Forward linkages are significant in, for instance, the chemical industry, since its products are typically used further in the manufacturing process. The main assumption of IOMs is that any good or service in the economy is used for final consumption by (1) households or the government, (2) exported, or (3) employed as an input in the production of further goods and services in the economy (including the sector that produced it).

In a basic IOM, the economy is made of up n branches with constant returns to scale. If we call X_j the total output of a branch j and IC_{ij} the intermediate consumption of the branch j , the accounting equality in the economy is:

$$X_j = \sum_{j=1}^n IC_{ij} + Y_j;$$

$$X_j = \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}X_j + Y_j;$$

$$a_{ij} = \frac{IC_{ij}}{X_j},$$

where a_{ij} is the technical coefficient or the part of good i that branch j needs to produce one unit of good j and Y_j is the total consumption of output j . In matrix notation, the relationship above can be rewritten as follows:

$$X = A \times X + Y \Leftrightarrow X = (I - A)^{-1}Y,$$

where $(I - A)^{-1}$ is the Leontief inverse matrix [Miller and Blair 1985]. In the short run, with a constant technical coefficient, a variation in the exogenous demand (e.g., government expenditure, household consumption, or investment) will induce a variation in the total output calculated using the Leontief inverse matrix. Ultimately, we have, $k = \Delta X / \Delta Y$, where k is the regional multiplier of the IOM [Martin 2010].

1.2 IOMS APPLIED TO DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

The early work of Moore and Petersen [1955] incorporated government expenditure (including defense expenditure) in an IOM for the state of Utah. Another study by Leontief and Hoffenberg [1963] estimated the effect of a change in the structure of final demand caused by military cutbacks on the industrial distribution of the labor force for the country as a whole, but the explicit analysis of military expenditure needed to wait for Leontief-type intra-national models, as they showed how the impact of defense cutbacks on the local economy might be measured.

The model of Leontief et al. [1965] rigorously measured “peace dividends” at the regional level, which are “the impact of the hypothetical shift from military to civilian demand not only in inter-industrial, but also in inter-regional terms.” In the model, the US was subdivided into 19 regions. The results showed that a decrease of about 20 percent in defense expenditure should be counterbalanced with an increase of about 1.8 percent in nonmilitary demand. Interestingly, the model presented an illustrated map of the regions most affected in terms of both employment and income (the first three “impacted built regions” were California, “Colorado–New Mexico,” and “Arizona–Nevada–Utah”).

IOMs have also been developed to explicitly study the regional effects of defense expenditures. A more localized study was conducted by Isard and Langford [1969] simulating the impact of Vietnam War expenditure on the Philadelphia economy; Warf and Cox [1989] studied the metropolitan area of New York City; and Hughes, Holland, and Wandschneider [1991] examined the state of Washington, which hosted naval shipyards, aircraft industries, and other military facilities. Hughes, Holland, and Wandschneider [1991] estimated that in the 1980s, about 6.3 percent of the total employment of the state (military jobs excluded) was supported by the military complex. Those indirect and induced jobs were mostly in services provided to households, naval shipbuilding, and the aerospace industry. In the US, IOMs have progressively been standardized to be considered as “turn-key” models (see, for example, Kriesel and Gilbreath [1994] or Warf [1997] for such “direct” applications).

IOMs have also been applied in the UK. In the early 1970s, calculations made with such models found that “the relevant multiplier for jobs on defense contracts in industry was about 2.3 (1.3 indirect jobs for every direct one)” [Stone 1973]. In a study about the Devonport Dockyard, Bishop [1992] concluded that “local supply linkages were important but primarily involved services.” Several years later, Bishop et al. [2000] would set up an IOM to exactly measure those linkages. Asteris et al. [2007] meanwhile studied the naval base of Portsmouth that hosted 60 percent of the Navy and hired about 8,000 employees (both military and civilian). They showed that between 2003 and 2004, “the respective values of the output and employment multipliers generated were 1.55 and 1.44. Overall, maritime defence was responsible for 6% of total sub-regional employment and more than 5% of sub-regional output.”

In an ensuing study by the Center for Local and Regional Economic Analysis of the University of Portsmouth [2007], it was shown that the Portsmouth Naval Base (PNB) supports about 35,000 jobs in the region (comprising roughly 8 percent of total regional employment), of which about 24,300 are directly related to the PNB and the Ministry of Defense, while the rest is the result of economic linkages via household and supply-chain expenditures. Moreover, the model allowed the authors to estimate defense-related employment variations in response to changes in naval activity.

The Fraser of Allander Institute [2009] also used an IOM to assess the local economic impacts of BAE Systems Surface Ships on Glasgow, Portsmouth, and Bristol. They noted that the BAE’s 3,404 employees in Glasgow supported an additional 2,312 jobs in Scotland between 2008 and 2009, while both Portsmouth’s 3,099 and Bristol’s 198 supported 3,218 and a staggering 3,259 additional jobs across the UK, respectively.

In France, Aben [1981a] estimated the part of employment generated by defense activities. He discovered that defense settlements helped regions with economic difficulties in the 1970s. Fas [1999] measured the impact of the professionalization of the French army on the

Languedoc-Roussillon economy. The results of her study showed that the reform had a positive effect on the economy, since one franc spent by the French army within the region led to an increase of about 1.54 franc of the regional product. Meanwhile, Catin and Nicolini [2005] built an IOM based on the intermediate consumption of the DCN Toulon (*Direction des Constructions Navales*), a French military shipyard in Toulon, south of France. They estimated an income multiplier of 1.23 and an employment multiplier of about 1.2. They compared the values of their multipliers with the results of Fas [1999] and attributed the lower values to the shipyard itself (the shipyard imported 75 percent of its intermediate products) and to the size of the assessed area (the Var area is smaller than the region of Languedoc-Roussillon).

1.3 LIMITS OF THE MODEL

Although such models are considered to be fit for regional studies, they also have limits. First, many economists consider the assumption of linearity of the production function to be rather restrictive, that is to say, “it implies a strict proportional relationship between input coefficients and output. This may be regarded as being acceptable in some producing industries but it is more questionable in the household sector, where income coefficients are average propensities, employment coefficients reflect average labour productivity rates and household consumption is determined by average expenditure patterns” [West 1995].

Second, even if IOMs are often considered to be *the models*, they clearly do not account very well for business links and networks, i.e., technological and pecuniary externalities, “that may be of economic significance, such as the transmission of knowledge and informal cooperation” [Bishop et al. 2000], the latter of which is related to the difficulty of incorporating technical progress in the model with changes in the technical coefficients. Moreover, in IOMs, pecuniary externalities are not considered. Such models focus on linkages between firms and sectors, but the use of fixed technical coefficients means that IOMs do not capture changes in purchasing or selling patterns that might be expected over time.

Third, since IOMs were initially developed to analyze industrial economies with an emphasis on manufacturing, their application does not appear to be as effective in contemporary economies, where services play an important role.

Fourth, the use of IOMs may not be technically possible or financially worthwhile for assessing economic activities at regional levels. These models require detailed data, which are not typically immediately available at a disaggregated level (e.g., in France, cross-industry accounting does not exist at the subnational level [Fas 1999]). In this sense, “the principal obstacle to input-output analysis is the lack of quality input-output tables at a local or regional level” [Bishop et al. 2000], and building such a model often requires a significant investment [Martin 2010]. Alternative approaches to build IO tables are, of course, available, but they are

generally considered to be inferior to the quality of survey-generated IO tables available in national accounting [Richardson 1985]. Parai et al. [1996] also admit “that alternative analytical approaches to IOMs are often required.” Among these approaches are nonsurvey methods.

This reflects the substantial data requirements of the technique and the prohibitive cost of data collection to build the matrix of technical coefficients, which then has to be regularly updated to reflect changes in the structure of the underlying economy.

2. ECONOMIC-BASE MODELS

2.1 BASICS OF ECONOMIC-BASE MODELS

Beginning with the work of Sombart [Krumme 1968], economic-base models have been used to assess the effect of exogenous expenditure on a given area on various scales (city, local community, region, and sometimes even country). These models aim at identifying and assessing what proportion of regional output or employment is dependent on exogenous expenditure. In these models, base activities influence the development of the area with a consequent effect on nonbase activities [Hoyt 1954, 1961; Tiebout 1962].

The theory separates the economy into two components: (1) activities that satisfy demands from outside the region (the “export base”), and (2) activities that mainly supply goods and services to local residents. In such models, the economic output of an area is divided into output sold outside the area and output absorbed internally [Sirkin 1959]. Basic activities are often identified as export activities [North 1955] (e.g., industries and tourism) and governmental activities. In EBMs, nonbase activities are local (e.g., services to households) [Hoyt 1943].

Following Fujita, Krugman, and Venables [1999], Y is the total regional income and X is the income from base activities (exogenous). A share α is spent locally in the regional economy in nonbase products. Thus, if we consider several cycles of local expenditure and λ is the basic income regional multiplier, then

$$Y = \frac{1}{1-\alpha}X \Leftrightarrow Y = \lambda X \text{ with } \lambda = \frac{1}{1-\alpha}.$$

In most cases, data on income are not available. EBMs are instead implemented using data on employment. Following Camagni [1992], the economic base model in terms of employment can be written as follows:

$$E_t = E_b + E_{nb},$$

where E_t is the total employment, E_b is the basic employment, and E_{nb} is the nonbase employment within a region. If we first assume E_b to be constant in the short run,

$$\begin{aligned} E_b &= \bar{E}_b \\ E_{nb} &= zE_t, \end{aligned}$$

with z defined as the share of nonbase employment in total employment within the region ($0 < z < 1$). By substitution, we can write

$$E_t = \bar{E}_b \frac{1}{1-z}.$$

If the demand for basic goods (such as defense activities) increases, the resulting change in basic employment leads to a change in both nonbase and total employments:

$$\Delta E_t = \Delta \bar{E}_b \frac{1}{1-z}.$$

Finally, the basic multiplier λ_E of employment can be written as follows: $\lambda_E = 1/(1-z)$.

Studies using EBMs, assuming the constancy of the base multiplier, give results such as “an increase of one job in the economic base leads to an increase of λ_E jobs in the total employment within region.” On this basis, more refined models with population growth [Hoyt 1961], the role of export [Tiebout 1962], or time-series analysis with lag variables [Czamanski 1965] can be found in the existing literature.

2.2 THE ECONOMIC-BASE THEORY APPLIED TO DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

In the case of California, Hansen and Tiebout [1963] estimated regional and sectoral employment multipliers with an in-house model explicitly inspired by an EBM. “The level of economic activity within a regional economy can be viewed as a function of forces operating within and without that economy. By and large, the external forces give rise to greater fluctuations in the level of economic activity...federal spending, especially in defense leads to significant changes in output and employment.” We refer to Hansen and Tiebout [1963, 417] for details on the different employment multipliers varying among sectors and regions in California.

In the case of Hawaii, Sasaki [1963] showed that “an increase in the number of people employed in the defense sector of 100 employees will lead to a further increase in total employment in Hawaii of 28 employees.” Hence, the estimated employment multiplier is 1.28. He used a time series with lag variables in his model, and concluded that “the effect of an increase or decrease in defense spending on the overall economy is mostly felt within one year from the time the initial change occurs.”

Weiss and Gooding [1968], on the other hand, built a disaggregated EBM applied to the Portsmouth, New Hampshire area where defense facilities are located (e.g., an air force base [AFB] and a naval shipyard). The results of their study suggested that in such a small region, “a loss of [a] private export job would have a more severe impact than a loss of an equal number of jobs in a government defense manufacturing facility, and that closing or reducing the size of a nonmanufacturing base will have a less serious impact than either.” Considering three main sectors of export activity, they calculated the following employment multipliers: $k_1 = 1.8$ for the private-export industry, $k_2 = 1.6$ for the manufacturing defense base, and $k_3 = 1.4$ for the AFB.

These are similar to the multipliers in an IOM, although the calculations are derived from an EBM instead.

Since the economy under study is small and rather open, “second-round import leakages” tend to reduce the size of the employment multiplier. Private export activity has a greater multiplier effect than the military base, which is quite self-sufficient and relatively cut off from the local community. For example, the multiplier for the shipyard is greater than the one for the AFB because its workforce is primarily composed of civilians, and it “provides minimal retail and service facilities for its personnel.” The authors argue that (1) the shipyard inputs are mainly specialized intermediate goods purchased outside the region, (2) about 20 percent of the shipyard employees live outside the Portsmouth region, and lastly, (3) workers of the shipyard have probably different spending habits due to their higher wages (e.g., higher propensity to import, save, or spend money outside the area).

In the case of Arizona, Billings [1970] found a total impact of defense activities of 114,639 jobs and an economic base multiplier of employment of about 1.71 for military personnel. He compared the latter multiplier with a calculated IO employment multiplier and found a very small difference between the two values.

Again in the US, Erickson [1977] assessed the Badger Army Ammunition Plant in Wisconsin, focusing on activity levels in 1974. He included the distances of the ten principal urban centers surrounding the ammunition plant. It appeared that “most of the plant’s income-generating potential was concentrated in the immediately surrounding communities. Income generated in other communities approximately within the mean commuting distance falls to the range of seven to nine cents per dollar of direct regional income resulting from the plant.” The author concluded that “operating levels of the installation produce little community income-generating potential.” The study suggested that for plants purchasing few regional inputs, the “local procurement impacts will be restricted primarily to incidental purchasing in the nearest communities, while the vast majority of purchases of semi-manufactured goods and utilities will occur in both adjacent and distant metropolitan areas.”

Le Nouail, De Penanros, and Sauvin [1995] meanwhile estimated the direct, indirect, and induced employment of the military shipyard of Brest, France and its surrounding naval base. According to the authors, in 1995, every one direct job in the naval complex in Brest supported 1.5 jobs elsewhere in the region. They estimated the total employment depending on naval activities to be about 34,000, with about 22,600 direct jobs and 11,400 both indirect and induced jobs.

Again in France, Catin and Nicolini [2005] estimated an economic-base multiplier for the region of Toulon. They found that in 1998, with a supplier’s dependence rate between 30 to 45 percent, about one job in the shipyard (total of 3,424) created two jobs in the local economy.

Finally, not to be excluded in this broad survey are the regional studies of INSEE (French National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies), whose own methodologies are very much inspired by the economic-base theory (see Laganier and Gastaud [1996], Timotéo [2008, 2009], Bouffin and Dhune [2009], Kubiak and Serre [2009, 2010a, 2010b], and Panafieu and Brefort [2009]).

2.3 LIMITS OF THE MODEL

First, to build an EBM, regional scientists must accurately classify what activities are in the economic base and what are not. Making such a dichotomy is not easy in modern economies because many activities are both locally consumed and exported out of the assessed area (e.g., medical care and university teaching). For more details on how to define the “economic base,” we refer the reader to Fusao [1980], Dion [1987], and Laurent [2005]. In general, however, some level of arbitrariness is often required. On this, see, for instance, an illustration of the French case with the impact of naval activities in Brest [Boncoeur and Tanguy 1997].

Second, economic-base theory assumes that the income from the economic-base sector drives the income from the nonbase sector. However, EBMs, in practice, have focused on employment. Because of unavailable data, researchers have settled on estimating the employment multiplier instead of the income multiplier for which the theory was developed [Weiss and Gooding 1968].

Third, the most commonly used version of an EBM often assumed local services to be locally consumed. However, due to the increasing role of services in the economy of today, such an assumption is not relevant. Services are often part of exports and do influence economic development [Hansen 1990].

Fourth, the dichotomy between base and nonbase activities can lead to a falsely vertical conception of regional activity. For example, nonbase activities are often considered less productive and often totally dependent on base activities (which are assumed to be “productive”). But such assumptions are not accurate, since many activities are exogenous expenditures and do not depend on the current base. Furthermore, nonbase activities sometimes drive regional economic development (e.g., retiree pensions) [Davezies 2008].

Fifth, EBM models are often used to make forecasts in the medium term. But one should not forget that they are mere static models which do not incorporate structural elements, such as firm productivity, interindustrial relations, or consumer taste [Polese and Shearmur 2005]. More cautiously, results from an EBM should be interpreted only in the very short term.

Finally, the base and nonbase distinction is conceptually untenable when one tries to apply it not to a region in isolation but to the economy as a whole. “For the world as a whole, all goods are sold ‘locally,’ and all income is also spent locally, that is, the fundamental equation of

the economic base model becomes 0/0 which is not a very helpful result” [Fujita, Krugman, and Venables 1999].

Despite all of these limitations, one has to consider that from a practical point of view, the model remains helpful in the case of smaller regions which are less diversified [Hustedde et al, 2005; Dion 1987]. It is also generally less expensive than an IOM to operationalize.

3. REGIONAL KEYNESIAN MULTIPLIER MODELS

3.1 BASICS OF REGIONAL KEYNESIAN MULTIPLIER MODELS

Regional multiplier models (RMMs) go back to the work of Kahn [1931] and Keynes [1936]. The basic Keynesian model is based on the idea that part of the initial income injection will be spent in the region, which will generate additional income in that region. Part of the additional income is again spent in the region, and so the process continues. An increase in the regional aggregate demand facilitates, in turn, a supply-side response. In their basic version, those models are relatively simple, mainly static, and involve very little econometrics.

The main advantage of this approach is that it allows us to measure the effect on production and income of an initial injection of resources in the regional economy without the need for a regional technology matrix required in input-output models [Garrabe 2008]. In RMMs, the autonomous demand represents all the expenditure exogenous from the region. In this static framework, variations in the autonomous (exogenous) demand cause a multiplier effect on the regional income. Formally, with Y the regional income generated by an exogenous expenditure G and $n \rightarrow +\infty$:

$$Y = G + \beta G + \beta^2 G + \dots + \beta^n G$$

$$\Delta Y = \frac{G}{1 - \beta}$$

$$k = \frac{1}{1 - \beta}$$

where k is the regional multiplier; β is the share of each monetary unit spent in the region ($0 \leq \beta < 1$).

The initial expenditure is never totally spent in the region due to the leakages that reduce the multiplier effect. In the literature, those leakages are placed in two categories: (1) imports of goods and services and (2) tax and social contributions. Those kinds of leakages are incorporated in the RMM with two other specific parameters. Thus, Archibald [1967] set up a modified multiplier (k_A) which incorporates the effect of taxes and imports:

$$k_A = \frac{1}{1 - (\beta - m)(1 - t)}$$

where β is as previously defined, m is the marginal propensity to import⁴, and t is the regional propensity to tax (i.e., an estimate of the regional tax burden). Brown [1967] completed the model with the introduction of the public redistribution:

$$k_B = \frac{1}{1 - \beta(1 - m - t_i)(1 - t_d - u)},$$

where t_i is the indirect regional propensity to tax and t_d the direct regional propensity to tax. The parameter u is a leakage, as it models unemployment benefits lost due to the increase of income resulting from the multiplier effect.⁵

3.2 RMM APPLIED TO DEFENSE ACTIVITIES

RMMs are typically used in assessing localized nonmilitary activities, especially those that are well-defined and spatially limited. For example, it has been applied to assess medical facilities [Moore 1974], teaching activities [Wilson and Raymond 1973], nuclear plants [McGuire, 1983], or a particular population, such as retirees within a region [Vollet and Roussel 2007]. Although such models are less commonly used in the case of defense activities, some studies may be cited. We present here some examples inspired by the RMM framework in a static perspective.

In the UK, Greenwood and Short [1973] used an RMM in the case study of the Moray Air Stations. Short, Stone, and Greenwood [1974] used it in the case of the Clyde Submarine Base. In the latter study, the authors noted that a “local employment multiplier of 1.25 (one indirect job for every four direct defense jobs) may be appropriate for estimating aggregate installations-related defense employment.” According to them, the multiplier effect was lower than in some other (nondefense) study areas probably for two reasons. First, military forces do not permanently reside in the region and therefore tend to spend a lower proportion of their income there. Second, some military consumption is internal to the base and more related to the internal military supply chain than to the regional economy.

Bishop [1992] concluded that the local income multiplier is between 1.1 and 1.4. His estimate of a multiplier of about 1.23 based on the major dockyard of Devon and Cornwall is within this range, and corresponds to one indirect job being generated by about 4.3 direct jobs. In an RAF base in Chivenor, Bishop [1994] determined that about 1,264 jobs were either directly or indirectly generated by the base, which constitutes 4.5 percent of local employment. His estimate of 1.32 as the job multiplier in this case is close to previous estimates.

For Sète in the south of France, Aben [1981b] found that “one franc spent to provide goods and services to the regiment yields to garrison town an amount between 1.04 and 1.22.” In addition, “a military job leads to a number of civil jobs between 0.6 and 0.98 in the local

⁴ In practice, the “average propensity to import” is more commonly estimated.

⁵ More detailed models have been proposed. See Greig [1971] for a discussion of the multiplier or Sinclair and Sutcliffe [1983] for an overview of the various multipliers found in the regional literature.

economy.” The method is based on an accurate survey of the regiment’s consuming habits combined with data from local governing bodies.

Meanwhile, for the years 1986 to 1987, Rioux and Schofield [1990] showed that the “CFB Esquimalt generated between \$391.5 million and \$440 million in income” and about 14,400 to 16,600 jobs, which constitutes 14.4 to 16.6 percent of total employment in the local economy. The authors used economic-base concepts to calculate the average propensity to locally consume. As such, the model represents a mixture of both the EBM and the RMM approaches.

3.3 LIMITS OF THE MODEL

RMMs have limitations partly due to the lack of data at regional levels. The first is in the estimation of the leakages. Incorrect values for m , t_i , t_d , and u will automatically result in the wrong multiplier and will systematically bias the effect of defense activity. Some nonsurvey methods have been proposed to estimate m (see, for example, Fas [1999] or Poffet [1989]). However, the estimation of the other parameters without the use of survey methods is still very difficult, as this involves knowing precisely the population to be assessed in order to know the structure of their consumption. Such a survey is sometimes highly complicated to set up or impossible to realize (e.g., in the case of defense activities, having access to the spending structure and geographic organization of a private defense firm is a real challenge).

The second limitation is the increasing complexity related to the reliability of the model. To make the model more reliable, more statistical information is required, and this leads to a complicated RMM which may not make its application common. For example, a more complicated model will require an increase in management costs, as experts with the necessary skills will be needed to use the model and to update it further (although, to be fair, that any increase in complexity will necessitate an increase in operational costs applies also to the other methods described in this survey). These limits related to the increasing complexity partly explain the fact that most scholarly works using RMM basically examined the ratio between indirect and direct income or jobs.

Finally, if the RMM framework appears to provide a tractable approach for use in situations involving defense activities, it is necessary to caution against the simplistic application of multiplier values estimated in some studies to cases of defense activities elsewhere [Rioux and Schofield 1990]. Thus, it would be inappropriate to use the findings of a particular study as a basis for another location. Clearly, every facility and every community has its own particular spending characteristics. In the case of military bases, for example, the local impact will depend on base operations and the size of the community to which the base is located. In this respect, survey methods are clearly a recommended way to estimate the basic parameters of RMMs.

4. REGIONAL ECONOMETRIC MODELS

Econometric models developed to assess defense activities at the regional level appeared first in the US in the beginning of the 1970s to examine the economic consequences of a settlement in Vietnam [Klein 1968; Klein and Mori 1973]. Since then, different models have been proposed, tested, and discussed. Some of them have become increasingly sophisticated. In this survey, we distinguish three main families in regional econometric models (REMs).

In the first family, the national economy is modeled to analyze the impact of regional defense expenditure. Examples of such studies are those of Crow [1970] and Dunne and Smith [1984]. With national results from Klein and Mori [1970], Crow [1970] used a nationally-linked regional model to analyze the impact of alternative military expenditure policies on the Northeast Corridor regions in the US. The author built a forecasting model for the region which enabled him to simulate (1) the existing policies compared with a “peace solution” (budget cuts offset by increased civilian expenditure and lower tax rates) and (2) a “military solution” (high defense budgets with high taxes and interest rates). Dunne and Smith [1984], on the other hand, had a hybrid approach: integrating an IOM with econometric techniques. Their disaggregated model (40 industries, 49 categories of consumption, five categories of government expenditure, and four categories of capital expenditure) estimated the degree of concentration of UK defense expenditure in certain key industries and subregions.

In the second group, the models explicitly incorporate defense expenditure in a regional setting. As Braddon [1995, 503] explained, a satellite type of regional model was initially employed, “drawing heavily upon national econometric models.” Such models aim at establishing a best-fit association between variables. “Models of this kind comprise a large number of interdependent equations in which each variable determined by the model is a function of other specified endogenous variables, exogenous variables, and error terms.” Each equation takes the form:

$$x_{it} = f(x_{jt}, y_{kt}, e_t),$$

where x_{it} is the i^{th} endogenous variable in period t , x_{jt} is the j^{th} endogenous variable in period t , y_{kt} is the k^{th} exogenous variable in period t , and e_t is the error term at period t .

This second group of econometric models has focused its attention at the regional level with two types of approaches. First, there is a Keynesian approach, where initial changes are attributable to an increase in aggregate demand, which in turn facilitates a supply-side response. In these models, regional economic activity is divided into its component parts, with each key economic activity being modeled separately (e.g., investment, employment, and output). Second, there is an input-output approach with the analysis of interindustrial relations. Both of these approaches allow us to estimate the impact of an exogenous shock to the region’s economy.

Examples of such studies are those of Glickman [1971], Burton and Dyckman [1965], Klein and Glickman [1977], and Nicolini [2003].

In the third group of REMs, the models are more heterogeneous and are focused specifically on defense activities. “In this group of models, Rowley and Stenberg [1993, 3] note that a study examining the 1960s found that when direct reduction of employment due to base closure was at least 5 percent of the community's population, the closure reduced overall employment in the community.” Given that few examined communities reached this threshold, they concluded that there was little effect of base closure on local employment. The study concluded positively on how communities coped with base closures. The minimal change in the unemployment rate found by the authors was probably due to a combination of transfer of military personnel (rather than its introduction into the local labor pool) and significant efforts made to relocate civilian personnel (in the regional economy or elsewhere).

In the US, Mehay and Solnick [1990] performed an econometric assessment of military expenditure at the regional level in the medium term (1976–1985), with a focus on growth and industrial employment. The results of their study show that military expenditure positively impacts the regional growth, however, only investment expenditure is positively affected by the disaggregation of such an expenditure.

Rowley and Stenberg [1993] meanwhile examined “economic changes in selected counties where one or more military bases closed during the 1960s, 1970s, and early 1980s.” The authors compared metropolitan and nonmetropolitan counties where bases closed with their national means. The results show that the job loss is offset for about two-thirds of base-closing counties, and that nonmetropolitan counties are more affected by base closings than the metropolitan ones, employment growth is higher in metropolitan counties than in nonmetropolitan ones, and real income growth is weaker in nonmetropolitan counties than in metropolitan ones.

Parai et al. [1996], on the other hand, conducted a study that assessed the impact of 44 Canadian military bases on their regional environment using a framework that incorporated economic-base concepts with econometrics. The authors expanded the original EBM by including demographic impacts, grants, and housing-demand impacts. Thus, the model “gives an approximate indication of the magnitude of the impacts which the base has on its host community.” They found that bases that are located in large host communities tend to have a small impact on the local economy. Conversely, bases in small host communities have a large impact because of the small size of local economy. In between, a range of impacts are observed, depending on the size of base activities relative to the host community.

In the US, Krizan [1998] found that “base closures are negatively correlated with establishment net growth rates, though slightly less so in small communities.” In addition,

workers' employment prospects improve because retired personnel who settle in the area increase the demand for goods and services. He also reports that the reallocation of factors of production when bases downsize is not that significant. This is because a base closure somehow reduces the establishment birth rate, so factors do not have to be reallocated.

Again in the US, Hooker and Knetter [1997] focused on the relationship between defense procurement spending and employment growth rate across states. They found no significant relationship between military procurement spending and the variation in employment growth. Moreover, procurement cuts only reduced national employment growth rate by "about one tenth of a percentage point." Finally, they found a nonlinear relationship between the variables, suggesting that large negative procurement shocks cause proportionally larger decreases in employment growth rate. They suggest that the use of linear relationships between military expenditures and short-run economic activities probably "underestimate the impact of defense drawdown when the drawdown is concentrated in time or space." Subsequently, Hooker and Knetter [2001] analyzed the effect on employment and personal income resulting from the closure of military bases during 1971 and 1974 at the county level. They found both employment and income multipliers less than 1. Moreover, they showed that "employment costs are limited to the direct job loss associated with military transfers out of the region and per capita income is little affected by closures on average."

Meanwhile, Poppert and Herzog [2003] examined the indirect effect of military installations on county-level private employment. They focused on special cases of the base closure under several rounds of the BRAC process. In the long run, they find that the BRACs increased employment, likely due to the BRAC-related federal assistance packages. In the medium term, they observe positive indirect employment effects, attributed to the self-sufficient nature of military bases and the composition of the civilian workforce. Land and infrastructure conversion from military to civilian use entailed indirect effects on private employment as well, and such effects are dependent on how rapidly the assets are transferred to their new civilian owners.

In Sweden, Andersson et al. [2007] made use of a data set of 31 municipalities covering the period 1983–1998. They noted that "a closure of a base has not had any significant impact on the subsequent average income growth rate nor the net migration rate in the affected municipalities." To explain their results, the authors postulated that the former employees at the military bases have found new employment within the region (in the private or the local public sector). Their analysis suggests a kind of resiliency of the local labor market after an exogenous shock. As such, they argue that the need for a public policy for compensating affected communities is not obvious.

In Germany, Paloyo et al. [2010a] studied 298 communities for the period 2003–2007. They found that base closures have had no significant socioeconomic impact on the surrounding communities. Such results are due to the small size of German bases and the economic autonomy of most bases. Furthermore, a number of former bases were rapidly reused for civilian purposes (e.g., hospital complex and tourist attraction). Such development projects presumably induced a substantial increase in tax revenue. In a further study [Paloyo et al. 2010b], the authors estimated the impact of the base closures in Germany on the intensity of criminal activity surrounding 298 military bases for the period 2003–2007. Confirming existing findings in the literature on the determinants of crime, their results indicated that the base closures had no effect on the criminal activity surrounding the bases. The results strongly suggested “that base closures or the reallocation of military personnel across bases will have no effect on the crime level in the communities affected.”

5. CASES STUDIES AND MONOGRAPHIC APPROACHES

5.1 BASICS OF THE CASE-STUDY APPROACH

In this survey, we define a research monograph as the study of a specific phenomenon limited to a given area. This methodology is typically characterized by data collection, fieldwork with direct observations, and sometimes interviews with local key informants. A research monograph aims at fully presenting and describing features of the phenomenon that economic modeling and econometric estimations, with their emphasis on averages, may fail to take into account. Such a methodology is more attuned to describing qualitative features of a specific case, and may contribute to a better understanding of the phenomenon in question.

Examples of this are the works of Breheny [1988], which collected papers related to the regional impact of defense activities, Paukert and Richards [1991], which focused on the labor-market impact related to changes in defense activities, and De Penanros [1995], which collected papers related to defense conversion with a regional focus.

Since the literature that have employed such a method is vast (as there are many case studies), we propose here a short analytical framework to understand what we can learn from monographic studies about the impact of defense activities on their regional surrounding communities. We also describe the limitations of such a methodology.

5.2 WHAT CAN WE LEARN FROM CASE STUDIES IN ASSESSING DEFENSE ACTIVITIES?

Due to a complex nexus of historical, strategic, and economic reasons, military expenditure is unevenly distributed among and between national economies and regions [Short 1981; Lovering 1991; Atkinson 1993] as are the income and employment effects [Southwood 1985].

Defense activities structure, and sometimes create, microspatial patterns, such as cities [Bateman and Riley 1987; Jovanic 2001]. Aside from these, however, they also structure macrospatial patterns. In fact, the work of regional researchers shows they tend to agglomerate and make specific spatial patterns (e.g., “Gunbelts” in the US [Markusen et al. 1991], “island of prosperity” in the UK [Lovering and Boddy 1988; Law 1983]). Conversely, those kinds of activities also artificially “divide” countries [Boddy 1988; Bishop and Wiseman 1999] with the creation of ex nihilo “military enclaves” [Markusen and Park 1993].

Defense activities deeply influence the structure of regional economies because defense activities contribute to regional income and skills. For example, during the 1970s and 1980s, in most Western countries, many regions benefited from economic consequences of increasing defense expenditure (e.g., Southwest of France, South of Germany, Southwest of England). Unsurprisingly, those effects depend on the size of the military complex and defense facilities. Case-study approaches are relatively abundant in this literature.

In the US, research by Malecki [1981] and Markusen [1984] has pointed to the importance of military expenditure in underwriting regional growth in high-technology industries. In Canada, other regional studies have been conducted with consequent data related to defense industries in the case of Quebec [Belanger 1990, 1993]. Similarly, in the UK, most of the studies conducted pointed to the importance of the military’s outlay of money and goods in subsidizing regional growth, also especially in high-technology industries (e.g., Todd [1980]). The effect goes beyond the quantitative aspects of defense expenditure and underlines the qualitative ones suggesting that “the regions within a country which are able to capture the new technology are most likely to be able to maintain relatively high incomes and high levels of employment” [Law 1983, 182–83]. The role played by military expenditure in development policies has also been discussed [Stein 1985] (see the work of Lovering [1985] for an interesting case study of the Bristol subregion compared with South Wales).

Nonetheless, defense activities sometimes weaken regional economies. For example, some case studies of “one-company towns” revealed that the defense industry sometimes dominated labor markets with a “lock-in effect.” Some examples of this are the “shipyard towns,” such as Barrow-in-Furness in the UK with the Vickers Trident Submarine Works [Grimes 1987], Plymouth with the naval base [Gripaios and Gripaios 1994], and Mare Island in California, USA with the former naval base [Schneider and Patton 1988]. This sole dependence on the defense infrastructure may prevent the diversification of regional economies. In the case of Plymouth, for example, Bishop [1988] argued that defense spending was an important factor in the strength of the retail trade in the city in contrast to the fairly underdeveloped business service sector. Schneider and Patton [1988] reached the same conclusion for the county of Vallejo in California.

Such economic dependence has led to the extensive study of defense conversion following defense cutbacks at the beginning of the 1990s [Fontanel 1994]. Following Gansler [1995, 70–71], defense conversion can be defined as all initiatives that “include changes in the economic base where the major employer was a defense firm or a defense facility, the restructuring of a formerly defense-dominated corporation, or the reorientation, at plant level, of the facility or the work force.”

In line with the conversion topics, case studies often focused on how regional and local communities monitored the withdrawal of the army or the military cutbacks and their consequences on the regional economy. For example, in Europe, in response to the strong dependence of some European regions, the literature naturally focused on the defense conversion process, such as in 1992, when the European Commission studied regions’ dependence on defense activities in a comparative perspective [Commission of the European Communities 1992].

Various case studies also covered the conversion of military bases and regional resilience. In the US, Lynch [1970] examined 12 communities making the transition, i.e., before and after a base closure; MacKinnon [1978] studied the economic progress of seven communities located near air force bases that closed in the mid-1960s; Dardia et al. [1996] presented three regional case studies in California; Soden et al. [2005] proposed three case studies in New Mexico; and Bradshaw [1999] examined the impact of the Castle Air Force Base closure in California. In the UK, Braddon and Dowdall [1996] reported on the restructuring of the regional defense industrial base in the case of the South West. See De Penaros [1995] for a more thorough discussion.

5.3 BENEFITS AND LIMITS OF CASE STUDIES

Case studies might be very useful for the public planner. First, they establish details and qualitative elements that a more standardized model cannot uncover (e.g., the key role of local actors, strategic and political sides of military settlements, and changes in military technology). Moreover, as they are close to ethnographic methods, they are a very useful tool to describe local consequences of big transitions (e.g., the transition to the post-Soviet era and the end of the Cold War, the transition to a market-oriented approach in armament production for some countries, such as France, or the role of the State in defense conversion [De Penaros and Serfati 2000]).

Case studies also provide useful information on the dynamism of regional economies in response to changes in defense expenditure flows. Due to their typical emphasis on qualitative analysis, such studies often provide information pertaining to the relationship between actors in a bottom-up movement. From a practical point of view, with relatively little time spent in the field, they can bring useful information to decision makers.

Though monographs provide a useful learning exercise about the range of impacts to be expected at the regional level in various dimensions with an emphasis on its qualitative aspects, they are “idiosyncratic,” i.e., related to the place they have been set up. Their results are contingent on the place and time of the study. They cannot be expected to generate outcomes that are universally relevant.

Moreover, they are dated, as we note that most of the case studies that have been published are set around the time the USSR disbanded. As a result, they do not distinguish military activities from civilian activities. Such a “package” is not relevant today because of both the specialization of the armed forces (i.e., professional armies) and the unbundling of military activities, especially in defense support (e.g., outsourcing and public-private partnerships).

Keeping in mind the limits mentioned above, we can make some recommendations on when a case study might be appropriate. Case studies might be useful *ex ante*, when regional practitioners start assessing the defense activities of a region (for example, those facing defense cutbacks). Indeed, the fieldwork associated with case studies leads to a better knowledge of the relation between regions and defense activities. As a consequence, the location of empirical data is facilitated, which is a crucial condition to go further in assessing the defense dependence of a region.

Case studies might also be useful *ex post*. For example, when cutbacks, base closures, or troop withdrawal have occurred, regions need defense reconversion and facility conversion. A research monograph could be advantageous in identifying the factors contributing to the success or failure in the local redevelopment of former defense sites.

CONCLUSION

In defense-dependent regions, defense cutbacks, base closures, or downsizing of defense facilities could potentially affect regional economic activity. As a result, regional policymakers often try to assess, and possibly mitigate, the economic impact of defense drawdowns and intensifications.

This rise and fall of interest on this topic is related to macrophenomena that have an impact on regional economies. For example, studies assessing defense activities were numerous right after the Cold War (see Braddon [1995]). The current context of cutbacks in defense expenditure—partly caused by the sovereign debt crisis and more generally by public deficits—also stimulates many regional studies about defense activities and their economic contribution to regional development.

As such, we believe that it is useful to review the past literature to fully account for the varied potential ways one could undertake such an analysis for the benefit of both policymakers and stakeholders. When we speak about regional policy and regional assessment studies, we

typically speak about public (i.e., tax-raised) money. Indeed, an overall view with a cost-benefit orientation might be useful for transparent governance and accountability.

In this perspective, we examined the most widely used methods found in the academic literature to assess the regional impact of defense activities. Because the literature in assessing the regional impact of defense activities has since quite evolved, our survey provides a helpful tool for local public institutions facing nonlocal decisions related to defense activities. It may be seen as a practical guide—a sort of “tool kit”—which we hope will be useful to those interested in assessing defense activities in their surrounding environment (e.g., city and regional authorities).

To date, there is no current standard method for analyzing the impact of defense activities on regional economies. There is also an abundance of nonacademic work on the topic, which typically features the lack of any clear theoretical framework. This conspicuous gap does not help policymakers at all. This problem is partly caused by methodological difficulties, such as the lack of knowledge about military institutions and the available data, or the lack of expertise on regional statistical analysis.

In aid of policymakers and other researchers, we presented a methodological typology based on the literature in regional economics. A listing of these studies is presented in the appendix. In order to identify and clarify the different models existing in the literature, we detailed the historical and theoretical background of each method, as well as selected exemplary cases where these methods were applied.

Broadly, we have identified five methodological approaches in the literature thus far: input–output models, economic-base models, regional multiplier models, econometric models, as well as case studies or monographs. Each method has its own strengths and weaknesses, and we believe that only in combination can they provide a full picture that is of most use to policymakers and the affected communities.

References

- Aben, Jacques. 1981a. "Défense et aménagement du territoire." *Cahiers du Séminaire Charles Gide*, XV, Université de Montpellier. 115–144.
- Aben, Jacques. 1981b. "Défense et activité locale, le cas de l'économie sétoise." *Revue de l'Économie Méridionale*, No. 116:41–52.
- Andersson, Linda, Johan Lundberg, and Magnus. Sjöström. 2007. "Regional Effects of Military Base Closures: The Case of Sweden." *Defence and Peace Economics*, Vol. 18, No. 1:87–97.
- Asteris, Michael, Jeff Grainger, David Clark, and Shabar Jaffry. 2007. "Analysing Defense Dependency: The Impact of the Royal Navy on a Sub-Regional Economy." *Defence and Peace Economics*, Vol. 8, No. 1:53–73.
- Atkinson, Robert D. 1993. "Defense Spending Cuts and Regional Economic Impact: An Overview." *Economic Geography*, Vol. 69, No. 2:107–122.
- Bateman, Michael. 1987. *The Geography of Defence*, edited by Raymond Riley. New York: Barnes & Noble Imports.
- Belanger, Yves. 1990. "Le développement économique régional canadien face à l'intégration continentale de l'industrie de la défense." *Cahiers de géographie du Québec*, Vol. 34, No. 93:315–331.
- Belanger, Yves. 1993. "La région de Montréal face au déclin des dépenses militaires." *Cahiers de géographie du Québec*, Vol. 37, No. 102:493–514.
- Billings, R. Bruce. 1970. "Regional Defense Impact—A Case Study Comparison of Measurement Techniques." *Journal of Regional Science*, Vol. 10, No. 2:199–216.
- Bishop, Paul. 1988. "Dependence and Diversification in the Local Economy of Plymouth." *Local Economy*, Vol. 3, No. 3:169–176.
- Bishop, Paul. 1992. *The Impact of Devonport Dockyard/Naval Base on the Economy of Devon and Cornwall*, mimeo, South West Economic Research Centre, University of Plymouth.
- Bishop, Paul. 1994. "The Economic Impact of RAF Chivenor." *Defense Analysis*, Vol. 10, No. 1:55–66.
- Bishop, Paul, Steven Brand, and Eric Mcvittie. 2000. "The Use of Input-Output Models in Local Impact Analysis." *Local Economy*, Vol. 15, No. 3:238–250.
- Bishop, Paul, and Nick Wiseman. 1999. "The North-South Divide in the UK Defence Sector." *Regional Studies*, Vol. 33, No. 9:829–841.
- Boddy, Martin. 1988. "Defence Spending and the North-South Divide." *Town and Country Planning*, Vol. 57:16–17.
- Boncoeur, Jean, and Patrick Tanguy. 1997. "Les emplois induits par la 'base' économique brestoise." *Cahiers Economiques de Bretagne*, Vol. 42, No. 2 :1–15.

- Bouffin, Sandrine, and Marielle Dhune. 2009. "La base aérienne 217 et le 1er groupe logistique du commissariat de l'armée de terre en Essonne: Des activités aux effets limités sur l'emploi local." *INSEE Ile-de France*, No. 35 (December).
- Braddon, Derek. 1995. "The Regional Impact of Defense Expenditure." In Todd Sandler and Keith Hartley's *Handbook of Defense Economics*. 491–522. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Braddon, Derek, and Paul Dowdall. 1996. "Flexible Networks and the Restructuring of the Regional Defence Industrial Base: The Case of South West England." *Defence and Peace Economics*, Vol. 7, No. 1:47–59.
- Bradshaw, Ted K. 1999. "Communities Not Fazed. Why Military Base Closures May Not Be Catastrophic." *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Vol. 65, No. 2: 193–206.
- Breheny, Michael J., ed. 1988. *Defence Expenditure and Regional Development*. London and New York: Mansell Publishing Ltd. and Alexandrine Press.
- Brown, A. J. 1967. "The 'Green Paper' on the Development Areas." *National Institute Economic Review*, No. 40:26–33.
- Burton, Richard, and John W. Dyckman. 1965. "Defense Expenditures in Forecasts of California's Economic Growth." *Western Economic Journal*, Vol. 3, No. 2:133–141.
- Camagni, Roberto. 1992. *Economia urbana: Principi e modelli teorici*. Rome: La Nuova Italia Scientifica.
- Catin, Maurice, and Veronique Nicolini. 2005. "Les effets multiplicateurs des dépenses militaires de la DCN Toulon sur l'économie Varoise." *Revue d'Economie Régionale et Urbaine*, No. 4:451–480.
- Center for Local and Regional Economic Analysis. 2007. *Socio-economic Impact Assessment of Portsmouth Naval Base*. Portsmouth: Portsmouth Business School and University of Portsmouth.
- Collins, Mark Edward Jr. 2008. "The Economic Impact of Base Realignment and Closure on Local Communities," thesis, Master of Public Policy, Georgetown Public Policy Institute, Georgetown University.
- Commission of the European Communities. 1992. *The Economic and Social Impact of Reductions in Defence Spending and Military Forces on the Regions of the Community*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Crow, R. T. 1970. "Military Expenditure and the Economic Growth of the Northeast Corridor." In *Adjustments of the US Economy to Reductions in Military Spending*, edited by Bernard Udis. Washington DC: United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.
- Czamanski, Stanislaw. 1965. "A Method of Forecasting Metropolitan Growth by Means of Distributed Lag Analysis." *Journal of Regional Science*, Vol. 6, No. 1:35–50.
- Dardia, Michael, Kevin F. McCarthy, Jesse Malkin, and Georges Vernez. 1996. *The Effects of Military Base Closures on Local Communities: A Short-Term Perspective*, report sponsored by the Office of the Secretary of Defense under RAND's National Defense Research Institute, California.

- Davezies, Laurent. 2008. *La République et ses territoires: La circulation invisible des richesses*. Paris: Seuil.
- De Penanros, Roland. 1995. *Reconversion des industries d'armement*. Paris: La Documentation française.
- De Penanros, Roland, and Claude Serfati. 2000. "Regional Conversion under Conditions of Defense Industry Centralization: The French Case." *International Regional Science Review*, Vol. 23, No. 1:66–80.
- Dion, Yves. 1987. "Le multiplicateur régional appliqué à un espace de petite dimension," PhD dissertation in Economics, University of Bordeaux 1.
- Droff, Josselin. Forthcoming. "The Economic and Spatial Sides of Defence Support." In Renaud Bellais's *Evolving Boundaries of Defense, of the Contributions to Conflict Management, Peace Economics and Development* series, edited by Manas Chatterji. Warrington: Emerald Publishing.
- Dunne, J. Paul, and Ron P. Smith. 1984. "The Economic Consequences of Reduced UK Military Expenditures." *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, Vol. 8, No. 3:297–310.
- Erickson, Rodney A. 1977. "Sub-regional Impact Multipliers: Income Spread Effects from a Major Defense Installation." *Economic Geography*, Vol. 53, No. 3:283–294.
- Fas, Catherine. 1999. "Méthode d'évaluation économique des projets régionaux: Une nouvelle approche appliquée à la professionnalisation des armées," PhD dissertation in Economics, University of Montpellier I.
- Fontanel, Jacques. 1994. *La conversion économique du secteur militaire*. Paris: Economica.
- Fraser of Allander Institute. 2009. *The Economic Impact of BAE Systems Surface Ships (Formerly BVT Surface Fleet)*, report prepared for the BAE systems, University of Strathclyde, November, Scotland, 17.
- Fujita, Masahisa, Paul Krugman, and Anthony J. Venables. 1999. *The Spatial Economy*. London and Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Fusao, Mano. 1980. "Base économique et multiplicateur régional," PhD dissertation in Economics, University of Aix-Marseille, 148.
- Gansler, Jacques S. 1995. *Defense Conversion*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Garrabe, Michel. 2008. "La valeur d'activité totale d'une opération de développement local: Les multiplicateurs territoriaux: théorie et application," paper, University of Montpellier.
- Glickman, Norman J. 1971. "An Econometric Model for the Philadelphia Region." *Journal of Regional Science*, Vol. 11, No. 1:15–32.
- Greenwood, David, and John Short. 1973. "Military Installations and Local Economies—A Case Study: The Moray Air Stations." *Aberdeen Studies in Defence Economics*, No. 4, Department of Political Economy (Defence Studies), University of Aberdeen, 30.
- Greig, Michael A. 1971. "Regional Multiplier Effects in the U.K: A Comment." *Oxford Economic Papers*, Vol. 23, No. 2:277–284.

- Grime, Keith. 1987. "The Evolution of a Naval Shipbuilding Firm in a Small Economy: Vickers at Barrow-in-Furness." In Michael Bateman's *The Geography of Defence*, edited by Raymond Riley. 141–170. New York: Barnes & Noble Imports.
- Gripaios, Peter, and Rose Gripaios. 1994. "The Impact of Defence Cuts: The Case of Redundancy in Plymouth." *Geography*, Vol. 79, No. 1:32–41.
- Hansen, Niles. 1990. "Do Producer Services Induce Regional Economic Development?" *Journal of Regional Science*, Vol. 30, No. 4:455–476.
- Hansen, W. Lee, and Charles Mills Tiebout. 1963. "An Intersectoral Flows Analysis of the California Economy." *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 45, No. 4:409–418.
- Hooker, Mark A., and Michael M. Knetter. 1997. "The Effects of Military Spending on Economic Activity: Evidence from State Procurement Spending." *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, Vol. 29, No. 3:400–421.
- Hooker, Mark A., and Michael M. Knetter. 2001. "Measuring the Economic Effects of Military Base Closures." *Economic Inquiry*, Vol. 39, No. 4:583–598.
- Hoyt, Homer. 1943. "The Economic Background of a City is the Foundation of the Master Plan." *National Real Estate Journal*, August.
- Hoyt, Homer. 1954. "Homer Hoyt on Development of Economic Base Concept." *Land Economics*, Vol. 30, No. 2:182–186.
- Hoyt, Homer. 1961. "The Utility of the Economic Base Method in Calculating Urban Growth." *Land Economics*, Vol. 37, No. 1:51–58.
- Hughes, David, David Holland, and Philip Wandschneider. 1991. "The Impact of Changes in Military Expenditures on the Washington State Economy." *Review of Regional Studies*, Vol. 21, No. 3:311–327.
- Hustedde, Ron J., Ron Shaffer, and Glen Pulver. 2005. *Community Economic Analysis: A How to Manual*, first edition, 1984 (revised May). Ames, IA: North Central Regional Center for Rural Development, Iowa State University.
- Isard, Walter. 1951. "Interregional and Regional Input-Output Analysis: A Model of a Space Economy." *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 33, No. 4:318–328.
- Isard, Walter. 1960. *Methods of Regional Analysis*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Isard, Walter, and Thomas W. Langford. 1969. "Impact of Vietnam War Expenditures on the Philadelphia Economy." *Papers of the Regional Science Association*, Vol. 23:217–265.
- Jovanovic, Miroslav N. 2001. *Geography of Production and Economic Integration*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Kahn, Richard F. 1931. "The Relation of Home Investment to Unemployment." *Economic Journal*, Vol. 41, No. 162:173–198.
- Kaldor, Mary. 1999. *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Keynes, John Maynard. 1936. *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*. New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers & Distributors Ltd.
- Klein, Lawrence R. 1968. "Economic Consequences of Vietnam Peace." *Wharton Quarterly*, Summer, 20–23.
- Klein, Lawrence R., and Norman J. Glickman. 1977. "Econometric Model-Building at Regional Level." *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, Vol. 7, No. 1–2:3–23.
- Klein, Lawrence R., and Kei Mori. 1970. "The Impact of Disarmament on Aggregate Economic Activity: An Econometric Analysis." In *Adjustments of the US Economy to Reductions in Military Spending*, edited by Bernard Udis. Washington DC: United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.
- Klein, Lawrence R., and Kei Mori. 1973. "The Impact of Disarmament on Aggregate Economic Activity: An Econometric Analysis." In *The Economic Consequences of Reduced Military Spending*, edited by Bernard Udis. Boulder, CO: University of Colorado Press.
- Kriesel, Warren, and Gina L. Gilbreath. 1994. "Community Impact from a Temporary Military Deployment: The Case of Fort Stewart, GA." *Southern Journal of Rural Sociology*, Vol. 10, No. 1:37–54.
- Krizan, Cornell John. 1998. "Localized Effects of California's Military Bases Realignments: Evidence from Multi-Sector Longitudinal MicroData," *Bureau of the Census Working Paper*, Center for Economic Studies discussion paper, Vol. 98, No. 19, Center for Economic Studies, US Department of Commerce, and Bureau of the Census, 44.
- Krumme, Gunter. 1968. "Werner Sombart and the Economic Base Concept." *Land Economics*, Vol. 44, No. 1:112–116.
- Kubiak, Yann, and Olivier Serre. 2009. "Départ du 13ème RDP: Un impact géographiquement très localisé." *INSEE Lorraine*, No. 186, October.
- Kubiak, Yann, and Olivier Serre. 2010a. "Restructurations militaires dans la zone d'emploi de Metz: Une évaluation pour la reconversion des personnels." *INSEE Lorraine*, No. 203, January.
- Kubiak, Yann, and Olivier Serre. 2010b. "Évaluation de l'impact des restructurations militaires sur l'espace résidentiel de l'agglomération messine." *INSEE Lorraine*, No. 215, April.
- Laganier, Jean, and Eliane Gastaud. 1996. "L'impact économique des installations militaires du plateau d'Albion." *Sud Information Economique PACA*, Vol. 63.
- Laurent, L. 2005. "Economie locale: forces d'entraînement et d'accompagnement." In Jean-Charles Lollier, Lionel Prigent, and Hervé Thouement's *Les nouveaux facteurs d'attractivité dans le jeu de la mondialisation*. 173–89. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.
- Law, Christopher M. 1983. "The Defence Sector in British Regional Development." *Geoforum*, Vol. 14, No. 2: 169–184.

- Le Nouail, Marie-Noelle, Roland de Penanros, and Thierry Sauvin. 1995. "Activités militaires et expériences de diversification dans la région brestoise." In *Reconversion des industries d'armement*, edited by Roland de Penanros. Paris: La Documentation française..
- Leontieff, Wassily. 1936. "Quantitative Input and Output Relations in the Economic Systems of the United States." *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 18, No. 3:105–125.
- Leontieff, Wassily. 1951. *The Structure of the American Economy, 1919–1939*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Leontieff, Wassily, and M. Hoffenberg. 1963. "Input-Output Analysis of Disarmament Impacts." In *Disarmament and the Economy*, edited by Emile Benoit and Kenneth Boulding. New York: Harper & Row.
- Leontieff, Wassily, Alison Morgan, Karen Polenske, David Simpson, and Edward Tower. 1965. "The Economic Impact—Industrial and Regional—of an Arms Cut." *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 47, No. 3 (August):217–241.
- Lovering, John. 1985. "Regional Intervention, Defence Industries and the Structuring of Space in Britain: The Case of Bristol and South Wales." *Environment and Planning—D: Society and Space*, Vol. 3, No. 1:85–107.
- Lovering, John. 1991. "The Changing Geography of the Military Industry in Britain." *Regional Studies*, Vol. 25, No. 4:279–293.
- Lovering, John, and Martin Boddy. 1988. "The Geography of Military Industry in Britain." *Area*, Vol. 20, No. 1:41–51.
- Lynch, John E. 1970. *Local Economic Development after Military Base Closures*. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- MacKinnon, David A. 1978. "Military Base Closures: Long Range Economic Effects and the Implications for Industrial Development." *AIDC Journal*, Vol. 13, No. 3:7–41.
- Malecki, Edward J. 1981. "Government-funded R&D: Some Regional Economic Implications." *Professional Geographer*, Vol. 33, No. 1:72–82.
- Markusen, Ann R. 1984. "Defense Spending and the Geography of High-Tech Industries." *Working Paper*; No. 423, May, Institute of Urban and Regional Development, University of California, Berkeley.
- Markusen, Ann R., Peter Hall, Scott Campbell, and Sabina Deitrick. 1991. *The Rise of the Gunbelt: The Military Remapping of Industrial America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Markusen, Ann R., and Sam Ock Park. 1993. "The State as Industrial Locator and District Builder: The Case of Changwon, South Korea." *Economic Geography*, Vol. 69, No. 2:157–181.
- Martin, Jean Christophe 2010. "Impacts économiques d'une politique de réduction des émissions de gaz à effet de serre de la région Aquitaine," PhD dissertation, Université de Bordeaux IV.
- McGuire, Alistair J. 1983. "The Regional Income and Employment Impacts of Nuclear Power Stations." *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 30, No. 3:264–274.

- Mehay, Stephen L., and Loren M. Solnick. 1990. "Defense Spending and State Economic Growth." *Journal of Regional Science*, Vol. 30, No. 4:447–487.
- Miller, Ronald E., and Peter D. Blair. 1985. *Input-Output Analysis, Foundations and Extensions*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Moore, Craig. 1974. "The Impact of Public Institutions on Regional Income: Upstate Medical Center as a Case." *Economic Geography*, Vol. 50, No. 2:124–129.
- Moore, Fredrick T., and James W. Petersen. 1955. "An Interindustry Model of Utah." *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 37, No. 4:368–383.
- Nicolini, Veronique. 2003. "L'effet des dépenses militaires sur les économies régionales et nationale," PhD dissertation in Economics, CRERI, Université de Toulon et du Var.
- Paloyo, Alfredo R., Colin Vance, and Matthias Vorell. 2010a. "The Regional Economic Effects of Military Base Realignment and Closures in Germany." *Defence and Peace Economics*, Vol. 21, No. 5–6:567–579.
- Paloyo, Alfredo R., Colin Vance, and Matthias Vorell. 2010b. "Local Determinants of Crime: Do Military Bases Matter?" *Ruhr Economic Paper*, No. 211, <http://ideas.repec.org/p/rwi/repape/0211.html>.
- Panafieu, Nicolas, and Mickaël Bréfort. 2009. "La base aérienne 112: Un effet limité sur l'activité économique." *Insee Flash Champagne—Ardenne*, No. 104, June.
- Parai, Louis, B. Solomon, and Tracey Wait. 1996. "Assessing the Socio-Economic Impacts of Military Installations on Their Host Communities." *Defence and Peace Economics*, Vol. 7, No. 1:7–19.
- Paukert, Liba, and Peter James Richards, eds. 1991. *Defence Expenditure, Industrial Conversion and Local Employment*. Geneva: International Labour Office, 228.
- Poffet, Gerard. 1989. "Les méthodes de mesure du multiplicateur régional et leur degré d'application au contexte Suisse." *Revue d'Economie Régionale et Urbaine*, No. 5:753–779.
- Polèse, Mario, and Richard Shearmur. 2005. *Economie urbaine et régionale: Introduction à la géographie économique*, second edition. Paris: Economica.
- Poppert, Patrick E., and Henry W. Herzog Jr. 2003. "Force Reduction, Base Closure, and the Indirect Effects of Military Installations on Local Employment Growth." *Journal of Regional Science*, Vol. 43, No. 3:459–481.
- Richardson, Harry W. 1985. "Input-Output and Economic Base Multipliers: Looking Backward and Forward." *Journal of Regional Science*, Vol. 25, No. 4:607–661.
- Rioux, J. J. M., and J. A. Schofield. 1990. "Economic Impact of a Military Base on Its Surrounding Economy: The Case of CFB Esquimalt Victoria British Columbia." *Canadian Journal of Regional Science*, Vol. 13, No. 1:47–61.
- Rowley, Thomas D., and Peter L. Stenberg. 1993. *A Comparison of Military Base Closures: Metro and Nonmetro Counties, 1961–90*, Agriculture and Rural Economy Division, Economic Research Service, US Department of Agriculture. Staff Report No. AGES 9307.

- Sasaki, Kyohei. 1963. "Military Expenditures and the Employment Multiplier in Hawaii." *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 45, No. 3:298-304.
- Schneider, Judy, and Wendy Patton. 1988. "Urban and Regional Effects of Military Spending: A Case Study of Vallejo, California and Mare Island Shipyard." In *Defence Expenditure and Regional Development*, edited by Michael J. Breheny. Oxfordshire: Alexandrine Press, 173-187.
- Short, John. 1981. "Defence Spending in the UK Regions." *Regional Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 2:101-110.
- Short, John, Timothy Stone, and David Greenwood. 1974. "Military Installations and Local Economies, A Case Study: The Clyde Submarine Base." *Aberdeen Studies in Defence Economics*, Vol. 5, Department of Political Economy (Defence Studies), University of Aberdeen.
- Sinclair, M. Thea, and Charles M. S. Sutcliffe. 1983. "Injection Leakages, Trade Repercussions and the Regional Income Multiplier: An Extension." *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 30, No. 3:275-286.
- Sirkin, Gerald. 1959. "The Theory of the Regional Economic Base." *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 41, No. 4:426-429.
- Soden, Dennis L., David A. Schauer, Brent McCune, David Coronado, and Janet S. Conary. 2005. "Military Installations in Regional Economies: The Impact of Three Bases in the Paso del Norte Region." *Applied Research in Economic Development*, Vol. 2, No. 2:65-83.
- Southwood, P. 1985. "The UK Defence Industry." *Peace Research Reports 8*, School of Peace Studies, University of Bradford.
- Stein, Jay M. 1985. "Militarism as a Domestic Planning Issue." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Vol. 9, No. 3:341-351.
- Stone, Timothy. 1973. "Analysing the Regional Aspect of Defence Spending: A Survey." *ASIDES*, No. 3:21-22.
- Tiebout, Charles Mills. 1962. *The Community Economic Base Study*. New York: Committee for Economic Development.
- Timotéo, Joachim. 2008. "L'impact économique du Centre national d'aguerrissement en montagne de Barcelonnette," *INSEE Paca*, No. 24, March.
- Timotéo, Joachim. 2009. "L'impact économique du Centre national d'aguerrissement en montagne de Briançon," *INSEE Paca*, No. 25, May.
- Todd, D. 1980. "The Defence Sector in Regional Development." *Area*, Vol. 12, No. 2:115-121.
- Vollet, Dominique, and Veronique Roussel. 2007. "Les retraités: Quel impact socio-économique sur les territoires? Illustration à partir de la zone de Bourganeuf dans la Creuse." *Régions et développement*, No. 26: 207-223.
- Warf, Barney. 1997. "The Geopolitics/Geoconomics of Military Base Closures in the USA." *Political Geography*, Vol. 16, No. 7:541-563.

- Warf, Barney, and Joseph C. Cox. 1989. "Military Prime Contract and Taxes in the New York Metropolitan Region: A Short-Run Analysis." *Regional Studies*, Vol. 23, No. 3:241–251.
- Weiss, Steven J., and Edwin C. Gooding. 1968. "Estimation of Differential Employment Multipliers in a Small Regional Economy." *Land Economics*, Vol. 44, No. 2 (May):235–244.
- West, Guy R. 1995. "Comparison of Input-Output, Input-Output Econometric and Computable General Equilibrium Impact." *Economic Systems Research*, Vol. 7, No. 2:209–228.
- Wilson, J. Holton, and Richard Raymond. 1973. "The Economic Impact of a University upon the Local Community." *Annals of Regional Science*, Vol. 7, No. 2:130–143.

Appendix

Table 1: Summary of the main models found in the literature

Framework and selected papers	Strengths	Weaknesses	Principal Requirements
IOM			
Asteris et al. 2007; Bishop et al. 2000; Catin and Nicolini 2005; Fas 1999; Grainger et al. 2007; Hughes, Holland, and Wandschneider 1991; Isard and Langford 1969; Leontief et al. 1965; Warf and Cox 1989	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Divided view of the regional economy - Pervasiveness in economic literature - Precise identification of economic sectors that drive the results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Has difficulties taking into account changes in technology (technology matrix) - Building the regional table is time-consuming - If the model is employed when a regional table does not exist, sensitive assumptions are often needed to build a regional table. - High cost to update the table 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Access to regional tables, either to be generated or taking what is already available - If generating a new table, consistent accounting between districts is necessary, although this may not be available.
EBM			
Billings 1970; Boncouer and Tanguy 1997; Catin and Nicolini 2005; Erickson 1977; Hansen and Tiebout 1963; Laganier and Gastaud 1996; Le Nouail, De Penanros, and Sauvin 1995; Sasaki 1963; Tiebout 1963; Weiss and Gooding 1968	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Low in cost - Well-regarded in the literature - Likely more applicable in smaller and more specialized economies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The model needs conventions or rules, since the way the modeler defines base and nonbase activities is often subjective. - The distinction between base and nonbase activities is often difficult to make in modern economies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assessing a small, well-defined area, particularly on variables such as employment and income - Focusing on income if data exist; if not, employment is the default fallback option
RMM			
Aben 1981b; Bishop 1992; Greenwood and Short 1973; Rioux and Schofield 1990; Short, Stone, and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Multiplier framework allows the estimation of the broader impact of defense expenditure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The estimation of the basic parameters in the model often requires econometric investigation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Calculating marginal propensities to consume and other such parameters may be complicated. In practice, the "average propensity to import" is more

Greenwood 1974	- Relatively easier way to compute full employment impacts		commonly estimated. - Appropriate regional accounting methods are necessary to compute the marginal propensity to import, among other parameters.
EM			
Burton and Dyckman 1965; Glickman 1971; Klein and Glickman 1977; Mehay and Solnick; 1990; Nicolini 2003; Rowley and Stenberg 1993	- Flexible with the outcome variable of interest, such as crime and educational outcomes	- Typically used only for ex-post analysis	- An assortment of data requirements necessary to estimate the model - Econometrics may not be the easiest subject to explain to a policymaker, hence, partnerships with research institutes and universities may be necessary.
Monograph/Case study (Selection of papers or books)			
Belanger 1990; Bradshaw 1999; Breheny 1988; Dardia et al. 1996; De Penanros 1995; Lovering 1985, 1988, 1991; Lynch 1970; MacKinnon 1978; Markusen 1984; Paukert and Richards 1991; Schneider and Patton 1988; Soden et al. 2005	- Qualitative view of problems and changes often hidden by more formal models - Could be taken as a preliminary step toward a more formal assessment (e.g., with another model, such as an EBM or IOM, or using econometrics) - Allows the identification of key institutions and individuals	- Idiosyncratic - Can deemphasize generalized effects and concentrate too much on the specific case without general applicability	- Making many interviews in various places for an in-depth view of the problem - Good knowledge of the region at the beginning of the study (in order to avoid the waste of finances) - Illustrating the case study with data about employment or income (e.g., share of defense-dependent employment, nature of firm activities in the region)

Source: Authors' representation (2013).