The Potential Impact of Social Legislation on business activity:

A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

April 2017

Prepared for the

SAN ANTONIO AREA TOURISM COUNCIL

by

The PERRYMAN GROUP

254.751.9595 ⬧ info@perrymangroup.com ⬧ www.PerrymanGroup.com

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

i

Contents

THE PERRYMAN GROUP

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

ii

Executive Summary

- Every year, millions of visitors to Texas spend billions of dollars in the state. The Perryman Group recently estimated that when multiplier effects are considered, the total, indirect benefits of travel and tourism industries include more than **$128.9 billion** in annual gross product and **1.4 million permanent jobs** in Texas (as of 2016). In addition, travel and tourism was found to generate an estimated **$7.0 billion** in yearly State tax revenue and **$3.3 billion** in local tax revenue across the state. The San Antonio area is among the most popular destinations in Texas for travelers; The Perryman Group estimates that travel and tourism generates **$13.3 billion** in annual gross product, **145,500** jobs, and **$127.2** million in tax receipts each year in the local area.

- The Texas legislature is considering action which would restrict bathroom access based on the gender on an individual's birth certificate. Opponents criticize the bill as discriminatory toward transgender persons, and such social policy can have a detrimental effect on tourism by decreasing the attractiveness of an area to event planners and potential visitors.

- The Perryman Group estimated the overall potential losses to the travel and tourism industry in Texas and the San Antonio area associated with the social policy currently under consideration.

- For **Texas**, reductions in travel and tourism activity would likely initially result in a gross product loss of over **$3.3 billion** per year as well as the loss of over **35,600** full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs (based on 2016 levels of activity), with annual losses of **$176.4 million** in State revenue and **$84.3 million** in local fiscal resources. With the law in effect for a period of time, these losses could be expected to rise to over **$5.5 billion** in gross product per year, almost **59,600** jobs, **$295.2 million in annual lost State revenue and $141.1 million** in foregone local fiscal resources.

- For the San Antonio-New Braunfels Metropolitan Statistical Area, the initial impact on business activity was estimated to be a loss of gross product of **$411.8 million** annually as well as a loss of almost **4,650** jobs, with estimated lost tax receipts to local government entities in the area totaling **$11.3 million** per year. At maturity, the losses could be expected to rise to **$689.2 million** in gross product, almost **7,780** jobs, and **$18.9 million** in lost tax receipts to local governments in the area. Even losing a single large convention or event could result in notable losses.

THE PERRYMAN GROUP

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

1

Introduction

Travel and tourism is an important source of economic activity. Every year, millions of visitors to Texas spend billions of dollars in the state. In 2015, the number of person-stays was estimated to exceed 250 million and had been growing steadily for several years.[1] Hundreds of thousands of individuals across Texas are employed in travel-related industries.

The Perryman Group has studied travel and tourism in Texas on a number of occasions and recently estimated that when multiplier effects are considered, the total, indirect benefits of travel and tourism industries include more than **$128.9 billion** in gross product each year and **1.4 million permanent jobs** in Texas. In addition, travel and tourism was found to generate an estimated **$7.0 billion** in State tax revenue and **$3.3 billion** in local tax revenue across the state each year.

The San Antonio area is among the most popular destinations in Texas for travelers. In 2015, person-stays to the area topped 34 million and was rising significantly over time.[2] The area's attractions are numerous, including the San Antonio River Walk, historic missions including the Alamo, museums, theaters, amusement parks, historic Market Square, a vibrant arts scene, and much more. The Perryman Group estimates that travel and tourism generates **$13.3 billion** in annual gross product, **145,500** jobs, and **$127.2 million** in annual tax receipts in the local area.

The Texas legislature is considering action which would restrict bathroom access based on the gender on an individual's birth certificate. Opponents criticize the bill as discriminatory toward transgender persons. The Texas bill has some notable variations from the widely publicized North Carolina law related to bathroom access which was recently modified. While both apply to public schools and universities, government-owned buildings, and public agencies, the Texas proposal would exempt publicly owned venues and convention centers when leased by a private group. The Texas proposal does

---

[1] D.K. Shifflet & Associates, Ltd., "Year-End 2015 Texas Tourism Visitor Profile," Accessed April 3, 2017, https://travel.texas.gov/tti/media/PDFs/2015-Texas_2.pdf, page 8.

[2] D. K. Shifflet & Associates, Ltd., "Year-End 2015 Texas Tourism Regions and MSA Profile: South Texas Plains Region," Accessed April 3, 2017, "https://travel.texas.gov/tti/media/PDFs/2015-South-Texas-Plains_1.pdf, page 35.

The PERRYMAN GROUP

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

2

not apply to privately owned facilities. On the other hand, the Texas bill includes penalties, which were not a part of the original North Carolina statute.

Social policy can have a detrimental effect on tourism by decreasing the attractiveness of an area to event planners and potential visitors. The Perryman Group (TPG) was recently asked by the San Antonio Area Tourism Council to quantify the overall potential losses to the travel and tourism industry in the San Antonio area and Texas associated with the social policy currently under consideration. This report presents the results of TPG's analysis.

THE
PERRYMAN GROUP

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

3

Effects of Social Policy on Travel and Tourism

Regardless of their stated purpose, controversial laws can reduce travel and tourism. Any law with the potential to reduce attendees, for example, can cause professionals who organize conferences and events to avoid that location. In addition, scheduling an event in a location with a law that is considered to be offensive by some groups can be interpreted as support for the policy, and some organizations will choose to avoid locations with controversial laws in order to avoid the appearance of approval of the public policy.

A 2016 survey by Meeting Professionals International and the US Travel Association found that meeting professionals avoid locations with potentially controversial public policies. For example, 23% of meeting professionals indicated that they have avoided locations that have passed a law empowering religious freedom, such as Indiana's Religious Freedom Restoration Act. The largest response was for policies prohibiting universal restroom use; 41% of the meeting professionals surveyed indicated that they have avoided locations with these types of laws.[3]

Critics view laws such as Indiana's Religious Freedom Restoration Act as discriminatory against lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) individuals. In North Carolina, the Public Facilities Privacy and Security Act was recently modified due to mounting economic consequences. North Carolina has lost millions in cancelled conventions and major sporting events, and future losses were expected to be substantial. Recent estimates of losses total in the hundreds of millions.[4]

---

[3] Pofeldt, Elaine, "It's Complicated," The Meeting Professional, October 2016, MPIWeb.org, www.mpiweb.org/docs/default-source/press/social-issues-feature.pdf.

[4] See, for example, Jurney, Corrine, "North Carolina's Bathroom Bill Flushes Away $630 Million in Lost Business," Forbes, Nov. 3, 2016, https://www.forbes.com/sites/corinnejurney/2016/11/03/north-carolinas-bathroom-bill-flushes-away-750-million-in-lost-business/#5b9393d34b59; Glum, Julia, "The HB2, Anti-LGBT Laws Effect: List of Concerts, Events Canceled in North Carolina, Mississippi," International Business Times, April 20, 2016, http://www.ibtimes.com/hb-2-anti-lgbt-laws-effect-list-concerts-events-canceled-north-carolina-mississippi-2356695; and Dalesio, Emery P. and Jonathan Drew, "AP Exclusive: Price Tag of North Carolina's LGBT law: $3.76B" AP, March 27, 2017, http://bigstory.ap.org/article/fa4528580f3e4a01bb68bcb272f1f0f8/ap-exclusive-bathroom-bill-cost-north-carolina-376b.

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

4

If the Texas legislature passes a law viewed as discriminatory against LGBT persons, it is likely that some meetings and events would be canceled and that some leisure travelers will also avoid the state. The resulting reduction in travel and tourism would involve substantial economic costs.

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

5

Potential Economic Losses

Although it is obviously impossible to know with certainty the magnitude of the net effects of the proposed bathroom access policy on travel and tourism in Texas, it is possible to estimate likely direct losses based on actual experience in other areas and reputable surveys of individuals and meeting planners.

Proponents of the legislation have emphasized that he Texas approach, if enacted, would differ in some respects from the law that was recently modified in North Carolina, while opponents maintain that it is the perception of being discriminatory rather than the nuances of the plans that is important. The anecdotal evidence tends to favor the latter view, as both local tourism officials and meeting planners from around the country have emphasized the role of overall perceptions.[5]

Moreover, there is some concern that other proposed measures before the legislature could lead to other forms of discrimination.[6] Nevertheless, the methods used in the present study seek to adjust for such differences and provide a conservative estimate of the potential impact.

Two scenarios are examined with regard to economic impact. The first deals with the initial effects, while the second focuses on losses once the laws have been effect a few years. In all cases, only a minority of travel will be impacted, but the impacts are likely to increase over time. At the outset, some travelers will be unaware of the restrictions or will have made reservations or other commitments that would be difficult to change. Similarly, with regard to conventions and similar events, many groups book facilities years in advance and cannot move venues in the immediate future, but will modify locations in later years. In both instances, both leisure and convention travelers are examined.

---

[5] See for example, Ura, Alexa, "Stadium exemption in "bathroom bill" won't be enough, opponents say," The Texas Tribune, February 16, 2017, https://www.texastribune.org/2017/02/16/texas-bathroom-bill-exemptions-wont-be-enough-opponents-say/; and Mansoor, Sanya, "Texas cities predict dozens of cancelled events if "bathroom bill" passes," The Texas Tribune, March 23, 2017, https://www.texastribune.org/2017/03/23/dozens-national-meeting-planners-may-take-texas-their-list/.
[6] Fikac, Peggy, "Beyond the Bathroom Bill, More Legislation Raises Worries," Houston Chronicle, April 2, 2017, http://www.houstonchronicle.com/news/local/article/Beyond-the-bathroom-bill-more-legislation-raises-11044951.php?t=e6791b7152438d9cbb&cmpid=twitter-premium

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

6

Initial Effects

With regard to the initial impact, TPG made use of a large survey of thousands of leisure travelers recently completed (in 2016) by the research department of the US Travel Association in conjunction with Kantar TNS, one of the leading market research firms in the country as well as other standard travel and economic data. Among other findings, this analysis permits estimates of the minimum losses to other states that could be expected in four states that have recently enacted varying types of similar laws perceived to discriminate against the LBGT community (Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, and Indiana).[7]

This information was used to develop a preliminary estimate of the likely initial effects on Texas given the size of the Texas tourism market relative to these states. Given the diversity of the restrictions in the various states and the fact that the survey measured the effects of individuals who actually changed plans in response to the laws, it is likely that this estimate would be reliable. As an added measure of conservatism, however, TPG used the lower bound of the 95% confidence interval, thus creating a high probability that the effects are understated. The results are also generally consistent with information provided by various tourism executives in the state.[8]

For convention travelers, the analysis was confined to out-of-state participants in events in Texas and based on a survey conducted by the US Travel Association in conjunction with Meeting Professionals International.[9] The results reflected the net proportion of events that were actually moved from the states with restrictive legislation as a result of the concerns. Again, TPG computed the lower bound of the of the 95% confidence interval around this estimate to assure conservatism in the measured impacts.

---

[7]U.S. Travel Association Brief, LGBT Writeup Consumer & Business, July 2016; U.S Travel Association Summer Board Meeting 2016, Travel Bans & Boycotts Research ; Dow, Roger, "Travel Should Be the Bridge—Not the Ammo—in America's Culture Wars," U. S. Travel Association, November 16, 2016, https://www.ustravel.org/news/travel-should-be-bridge%E2%80%94not-ammo%E2%80%94-america%E2%80%99s-culture-wars).

[8] See for example, Ura, Alexa, "Stadium exemption in "bathroom bill" won't be enough, opponents say," The Texas Tribune, February 16, 2017, https://www.texastribune.org/2017/02/16/texas-bathroom-bill-exemptions-wont-be-enough-opponents-say/; and Mansoor, Sanya, "Texas cities predict dozens of cancelled events if "bathroom bill" passes," The Texas Tribune, March 23, 2017, https://www.texastribune.org/2017/03/23/dozens-national-meeting-planners-may-take-texas-their-list/.

[9] Pofeldt, Elaine, "It's Complicated," The Meeting Professional, October 2016, MPIWeb.org, www.mpiweb.org/docs/default-source/press/social-issues-feature.pdf.

THE PERRYMAN GROUP

Longer-Term Effects

For the longer-term effects, TPG estimated leisure travel implications by examining the net effects of those in the traveler's survey who would avoid states with restrictions and the convention losses based on the net group of meeting planners who indicated they would not book meetings in these locales.[10] In both instances, there was some offset from those more likely to visit or book a convention in areas with such restrictions. As in the prior simulations, the lower bound of the 95% confidence interval was employed to determine the inputs. In addition to the factors noted above, the estimates used in the present analysis contain numerous other conservative assumptions which are discussed at length in Appendix B. Results by metropolitan area, congressional district, and Texas Legislative district are provided in Appendix D.

Texas Losses

The Perryman Group estimates that reductions in travel and tourism activity would initially result in a gross product loss of over **$3.3 billion** per year as well as the loss of over **35,600** full-time equivalent (FTE) jobs (based on 2016 levels of activity), with annual losses of **$176.4 million** in State revenue and **$84.3 million** in local fiscal resources.

With the law in effect for a period of time, these losses could be expected to rise to over **$5.5 billion** in annual gross product and almost **59,600** jobs. The yearly losses in State revenue are estimated to be **$295.2 million**, with a **$141.1 million** yearly decrease in local fiscal resources.

---

[10] Pofeldt, Elaine, "It's Complicated," The Meeting Professional, October 2016, MPIWeb.org, www.mpiweb.org/docs/default-source/press/social-issues-feature.pdf.

THE PERRYMAN GROUP

The Annual Economic and Fiscal Impact of Losses in the Tourism Sector Associated with the Proposed Social Policy Legislation Regarding Bathroom Access on Business Activity in Texas Initially and at Maturity
(In Billions of 2016 Dollars and Permanent (FTE) Jobs)

	Initial Annual Impact	Annual Impact at Maturity
Total Expenditures	($6.237)	($10.437)
Gross Product	($3.260)	($5.456)
Personal Income	($2.012)	($3.367)
Retail Sales	($1.382)	($2.313)
Employment (Permanent (FTE) Jobs)	(35,611)	(59,592)
State Tax Revenue	($0.176)	($0.295)
Local Tax Revenues	($0.084)	($0.141)

NOTE: Assumes loss in baseline travel and tourism projections associated with reduced out-of-state visitation and major conventions and events due to passage of a law restricting bathroom usage. Baseline growth in direct activity is projected using the Texas Econometric Model, with the indirect and induced effects being generated within the Texas submodel of the US Multi-Regional Impact Assessment System. Estimated losses are based on recent effects observed in other states adjusted for the size of the tourism and travel market in Texas and surveys of travelers and event planners. The lower bound of the 95% confidence interval was used in the interest of conservatism. See the Appendices for additional detailed results and methodology.

SOURCE: US Multi-Regional Impact Assessment System, The Perryman Group

San Antonio Losses

As a major center for tourism in the state, losses in the San Antonio area would be notable. The Perryman Group allocated losses to San Antonio based on its relative concentration in the tourism industry in Texas. It should be noted that the relative importance of tourism activity to the San Antonio area is about twice that of the state as a whole.

In addition, representative illustrations were provided for the San Antonio area of the impacts of (1) the loss of a major national or international convention and

The Perryman Group

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

9

(2) the potential loss of the 2018 National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) Men's Basketball Championship (commonly known as "The Final Four").

The Perryman Group estimates the initial impact on business activity in the San Antonio-New Braunfels Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) would be a loss of gross product of **$411.9 million** each year as well as a loss of almost **4,650** jobs. The fiscal impact on San Antonio would also be significant, with estimated lost tax receipts totaling **$11.3 million** per year. At maturity, the losses could be expected to rise to **$689.2 million** in annual gross product and almost **7,780** jobs, while lost tax receipts to local governments total **$18.9 million per year** in the San Antonio area.

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

10

The Annual Economic and Fiscal Impact of Losses in the Tourism Sector Associated with the Proposed Social Policy Legislation Regarding Bathroom Access on Business Activity in the San Antonio-New Braunfels Metropolitan Statistical Area Initially and at Maturity

(In Billions of 2016 Dollars and Permanent (FTE) Jobs)

	Initial Annual Impact	Annual Impact at Maturity
Total Expenditures	($0.754)	($1.261)
Gross Product	($0.412)	($0.689)
Personal Income	($0.256)	($0.429)
Retail Sales	($0.186)	($0.311)
Employment (Permanent (FTE) Jobs)	(4,647)	(7,777)
State Tax Revenue	($0.024)	($0.040)
Local Tax Revenues	($0.011)	($0.019)

NOTE: Texas losses previously described allocated to the San Antonio-New Braunfels Metropolitan Statistical Area (Atascosa, Bandera, Bexar, Comal, Guadalupe, Kendall, Medina, and Wilson Counties) based on the concentration of tourism and travel in the area. See the Appendices for additional detailed results and methodology.

SOURCE: US Multi-Regional Impact Assessment System, The Perryman Group

Economic losses (including multiplier effects) from losing representative large convention could be expected to include **$49.6 million** in gross product and **550** person-years of employment. Relocation of the men's Final Four could be expected to cause losses of **$351.6 million** in gross product and about **3,830** person-years of employment. Lost tax receipts would also be substantial, including **$1.4 million** foregone by local government entities due to losing a major convention, with **$9.7 million** lost if the Final Four were relocated.

THE PERRYMAN GROUP

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

11

Potential Economic Impact of the Loss of Representative Events Due to Proposed Social Policy Legislation Regarding Bathroom Access on Business Activity in the San Antonio-New Braunfels Metropolitan Statistical Area
(In Millions of 2016 Dollars and Person-Years of Employment)

Potential Disruption	Total Expenditures	Gross Product	Personal Income	Employment (Person-Years)
Loss of a Single Large Professional Convention	($90.857)	($49.649)	($30.878)	(550)
Loss of 2018 NCAA Men's Basketball Championship Final Four Event	($643.489)	($351.639)	($218.691)	(3,831)

NOTE: This analysis reflects the effects associated with a typical large professional convention with 15,000 plus attendees and 30,000 plus room nights. Examples of such events that are scheduled in the coming years are found in several major Texas cities, including San Antonio. San Antonio is the host for the 2018 NCCA men's basketball final four and championship game. See the Appendices for additional detailed results and methodology.
SOURCE: US Multi-Regional Impact Assessment System, The Perryman Group

Other Considerations

It has been asserted by proponents of the legislation that the adverse impacts constitute less than 0.5% of the state economy. The results of the current study support that contention, as all of the indicators measured are below that threshold. Nonetheless, the losses are quite profound, resulting in billions of dollars foregone output each year and tens of thousands of full-time equivalent jobs.

Moreover, this analysis is limited to the effects on the tourism and travel sector. Other potential negative outcomes are also probable. For example, discriminatory laws of this nature often bring extensive litigation, which compels the use of taxpayer resources for legal fees and related costs. Of much greater consequence are the potential economic development implications. At

THE PERRYMAN GROUP

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

12

least one technology company has cancelled plans to locate in a state with such policies, while numerous others have expressed support for the anti-discrimination position and even filed supporting briefs for that position in pending lawsuits.[11] Similarly, many millennials are opposed to these types of law restrictions, which could impact their location decisions.[12]Thus, although not a part of the scope of the current study, there are issues that extend well beyond tourism which could fundamentally alter the potential growth path of the state.

---

[11] See for example, Jurney, Corrine, "North Carolina's Bathroom Bill Flushes Away $630 Million in Lost Business," Forbes, Nov. 3, 2016, https://www.forbes.com/sites/corinnejurney/2016/11/03/north-carolinas-bathroom-bill-flushes-away-750-million-in-lost-business/#5b9393d34b59; Chmielewski, Dawn, "The 68 companies (including Apple) that are taking North Carolina's anti-LGBT law to court," Recode, July 8, 2016, https://www.recode.net/2016/7/8/12128698/apple-cisco-intel-salesforce-68-companies-north-carolina-anti-lgbt-law-hb2; and Dalesio, Emery P. and Jonathan Drew, "AP Exclusive: Price Tag of North Carolina's LGBT law: $3.76B" AP, March 27, 2017, http://bigstory.ap.org/article/fa4528580f3e4a01bb68bcb272f1f0f8/ap-exclusive-bathroom-bill-cost-north-carolina-376b.

[12] See for example, Crescente, Fernanado, "For Millennials, a consensus on transgender bathroom use," USA Today College, August 17, 2016, http://college.usatoday.com/2016/08/17/millennial-opinion-transgender-bathrooms/.

THE
PERRYMAN GROUP

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

13

Measuring Economic and Fiscal Impacts

Any economic stimulus, whether positive or negative, generates multiplier effects throughout the economy. In this instance, lessened economic activity due to fewer visitors to the state would have a direct impact on the travel and tourism industry, as well as all other sectors as multiplier effects ripple through the economy.

The process for estimating the direct losses associated with the restrictive policy is described within the report, with additional detail in the Appendices. Once the direct stimulus was quantified, the associated multiplier effects were measured using The Perryman Group's input-output assessment model (the US Multi-Regional Impact Assessment System, which is described in further detail in the Appendices to this report) developed by the firm about 35 years ago and consistently maintained and updated since that time. The model has been used in hundreds of analyses for clients ranging from major corporations to government agencies. It uses a variety of data (from surveys, industry information, and other sources) to describe the various goods and services (known as resources or inputs) required to produce another good/service. This process allows for estimation of the total economic impact (including multiplier effects) of the decreased spending due to the proposed restrictive policy. The models used in the current analysis reflects the specific industrial composition and characteristics of the Texas and San Antonio-New Braunfels Metropolitan Statistical Area economies.

These total economic effects are quantified for key measures of business activity:

- **Total expenditures** (or total spending) measure the dollars changing hands as a result of the economic stimulus.
- **Gross product** (or output) is production of goods and services that will come about in each area as a result of the activity. This measure is parallel to the gross domestic product numbers commonly reported by various media outlets and is a subset of total expenditures.
- **Personal income** is dollars that end up in the hands of people in the area; the vast majority of this aggregate derives from the earnings of employees, but payments such as interest and rents are also included.
- **Job gains** are expressed as permanent jobs for ongoing effects or person-years of employment for transitory or cumulative effects. Because some tourism–related jobs are temporary or part-time in nature, results are given on a full-time equivalent basis.

Monetary values were quantified on a constant (2016) basis. See the Appendices to this report for additional information regarding the methods and assumptions used in this analysis.

THE PERRYMAN GROUP

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

14

Conclusion

Travel and tourism are important sources of economic activity in Texas and, in particular, the San Antonio area. Millions of people visit the state for business or pleasure each year, generating billions in economic activity and tax receipts to the State and to local governments.

As the Texas legislature considers public policy to restrict bathroom access based on gender, it is important to consider the costs involved. Reducing travel and tourism would lead to losses across all major industry groups. The Perryman Group estimates that when multiplier effects are included, the state would initially experience annual losses in output (gross product) of over **$6.2 billion** as well as the loss of over **35,600** jobs (based on 2017 levels of activity). Over time, these losses could be expected to rise to over **$5.5 billion** per year in gross product and almost **59,600** jobs. Millions in tax receipts would also be foregone.

With its numerous attractions and high level of tourism and travel, the San Antonio area would be particularly hard hit by restrictive public policy. The initial impact would include an estimated yearly loss in gross product of **$411.8 million** and almost **4,650** jobs, with losses rising to **$689.2 million** annually in gross product and almost **7,780** jobs over time.

Evidence from other states which have passed restrictive public policy indicates that the costs in terms of conventions, sporting events, and entertainment are very real. The research structure in this analysis is conservative in its assessment, but nonetheless reveals that Texas and San Antonio could expect to see substantial economic and fiscal losses if legislation perceived to be discriminatory in nature is enacted.

THE PERRYMAN GROUP

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

15

Appendices

THE
PERRYMAN GROUP

Appendix A: About The Perryman Group

The Perryman Group (TPG) is an economic research and analysis firm based in Waco, Texas. The firm has more than 30 years of experience in assessing the economic impact of corporate expansions, regulatory changes, real estate developments, public policy initiatives, and myriad other factors affecting business activity. TPG has conducted hundreds of impact analyses for local areas, regions, and states throughout the United States. Impact studies have been performed for hundreds of clients including many of the largest corporations in the world, governmental entities at all levels, educational institutions, major health care systems, utilities, and economic development organizations.

Dr. M. Ray Perryman, founder and President of the firm, developed the US Multi-Regional Impact Assessment System (USMRIAS—used in this study) in the early 1980s and has consistently maintained, expanded, and updated it since that time. The model has been used in hundreds of diverse applications and has an excellent reputation for reliability. The Perryman Group has analyzed the economic and fiscal aspects of a broad range of corporate locations, infrastructure projects, mixed-use real estate developments, and regulatory changes.

The Perryman Group has performed a number of studies of economic and fiscal effects of travel and tourism and has analyzed the effects of numerous hotels and convention centers, as well as entertainment venues including amusement parks such as Fiesta Texas, Six Flags, and Sea World as well as racetracks, sports stadiums, and arts venues. The firm has conducted multiple analyses of the economic benefits of travel and tourism in Texas as well as related topics.

The firm has extensive experience in analyzing the economic and fiscal effects of public policy and has also been active in key public policy initiatives concerning economic development and policy in Texas and provided detailed regional forecasts for the state for the past 35 years.

THE PERRYMAN GROUP

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

17

Appendix B: Methods Used

US Multi-Regional Impact Assessment System

The basic modeling technique employed in this study is known as dynamic input-output analysis. This methodology essentially uses extensive survey data, industry information, and a variety of corroborative source materials to create a matrix describing the various goods and services (known as resources or inputs) required to produce one unit (a dollar's worth) of output for a given sector. Once the base information is compiled, it can be mathematically simulated to generate evaluations of the magnitude of successive rounds of activity involved in the overall production process.

There are two essential steps in conducting an input-output analysis once the system is operational. The first major endeavor is to accurately define the levels of direct activity to be evaluated. In the case of a prospective evaluation, it is necessary to first calculate reasonable estimates of the direct activity.

In this instance, estimates of travel and tourism spending maintained by the State were used in developing estimates of total economic activity. Updates to 2016 were based on most recent forecasts from the Texas Econometric Model, described in a subsequent section of this Appendix, which Dr. Perryman developed beginning in the late 1970s. Detailed data series regarding economic activity in key tourism-related segments were utilized in generating local-area estimates.

The methods used to develop the initial preliminary direct impact estimates were described in the report. In addition to the conservative assumptions previously described, it should be noted that these computations also embody additional elements of conservatism.

First, all scenarios are implemented based on estimated tourism volumes for 2016, while they would likely be applied to a larger base in future years. Second, they do not account for any business travel curtailment other than conventions. Third, they do not include any losses in international travel.

Fourth, they do not embody any losses of tourism related expenses for in-state travel. Some of this type of reduction would likely occur as a result of major

The Perryman Group

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

18

concerts leaving the state, as many high-profile performers have declined to appear in states with discriminatory laws in place.[13] Additional reductions would occur when the Texas attendees to major conventions that would otherwise be held in the state are located elsewhere. Numerous medical groups, civil rights groups, and others have decided not to schedule events in states with such enactments, and it is likely that other trade associations and academic groups will take a similar position. Moreover, numerous states are limiting non-essential travel by their employees to areas with discriminatory policies, thus making it difficult to schedule government employee and academic conferences.

Fifth, the scenarios in the current study do not account for the loss of major sports events (other than a representative illustration for San Antonio that is separate from the overall impacts). Many major sports organizations are limiting championships and playoffs in states with restrictions. Texas has been very successful in recent years in attracting such high-profile events. Thus, the scenarios offered in the present study reflect a conservative assessment of the potential effects of so-called "bathroom" legislation.

Once the direct effects are estimated, the second major phase of the analysis is the simulation of the input-output system to measure overall economic effects of these incremental outlays. The present study was conducted within the context of the USMRIAS which was developed and is maintained by The Perryman Group. This model has been used in hundreds of diverse applications across the country and has an excellent reputation for accuracy and credibility. It has been peer-reviewed on numerous occasions. The systems used in the current simulations reflects the unique industrial structure and characteristics of the Texas and San Antonio-New Braunfels MSA economies.

The USMRIAS is somewhat similar in format to the Input-Output Model of the United States and the Regional Input-Output Modeling System, both of which are maintained by the US Department of Commerce. The model developed by TPG, however, incorporates several important enhancements and refinements. Specifically, the expanded system includes (1) comprehensive 500-sector coverage for any county, multi-county, or urban region; (2) calculation of both total expenditures and value-added by industry and region; (3) direct estimation of

---

[13] See for example, Glum, Julia, "The HB2, Anti-LGBT Laws Effect: List of Concerts, Events Canceled in North Carolina, Mississippi," International Business Times, April 20, 2016, http://www.ibtimes.com/hb-2-anti-lgbt-laws-effect-list-concerts-events-canceled-north-carolina-mississippi-2356695.

expenditures for multiple basic input choices (expenditures, output, income, or employment); (4) extensive parameter localization; (5) price adjustments for real and nominal assessments by sectors and areas; (6) measurement of the induced impacts associated with payrolls and consumer spending; (7) embedded modules to estimate multi-sectoral direct spending effects; (8) estimation of retail spending activity by consumers; and (9) comprehensive linkage and integration capabilities with a wide variety of econometric, real estate, occupational, and fiscal impact models. Moreover, the model uses specific local taxing patterns to estimate the fiscal effects of activity on a detailed sectoral basis. The models used for the present investigation have been thoroughly tested for reasonableness and historical reliability.

The impact assessment (input-output) process essentially estimates the amounts of all types of goods and services required to produce one unit (a dollar's worth) of a specific type of output. For purposes of illustrating the nature of the system, it is useful to think of inputs and outputs in dollar (rather than physical) terms. As an example, the construction of a new building will require specific dollar amounts of lumber, glass, concrete, hand tools, architectural services, interior design services, paint, plumbing, and numerous other elements. Each of these suppliers must, in turn, purchase additional dollar amounts of inputs. This process continues through multiple rounds of production, thus generating subsequent increments to business activity. The initial process of building the facility is known as the direct effect. The ensuing transactions in the output chain constitute the indirect effect.

Another pattern that arises in response to any direct economic activity comes from the payroll dollars received by employees at each stage of the production cycle. As workers are compensated, they use some of their income for taxes, savings, and purchases from external markets. A substantial portion, however, is spent locally on food, clothing, health care services, utilities, housing, recreation, and other items. Typical purchasing patterns in the relevant areas are obtained from the *Cost of Living Index (COLI)* maintained by the Council for Community and Economic Research, a privately compiled inter-regional measure which has been widely used for several decades, and the *Consumer Expenditure Survey* of the US Department of Labor. These initial outlays by area residents generate further secondary activity as local providers acquire inputs to meet this consumer demand. These consumer spending impacts are known as the induced effect. The USMRIAS is designed to provide realistic, yet conservative, estimates of these phenomena.

Sources for information used in this process include the Bureau of the Census, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Regional Economic Information System of the US Department of Commerce, and other public and private sources. The pricing data

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

20

are compiled from the US Department of Labor and the US Department of Commerce. The verification and testing procedures make use of extensive public and private sources.

Impacts were measured in constant 2016 dollars to eliminate the effects of inflation.

The USMRIAS generates estimates of the effect on several measures of business activity. The most comprehensive measure of economic activity used in this study is Total Expenditures. This measure incorporates every dollar that changes hands in any transaction. For example, suppose a farmer sells wheat to a miller for $0.50; the miller then sells flour to a baker for $0.75; the baker, in turn, sells bread to a customer for $1.25. The Total Expenditures recorded in this instance would be $2.50, that is, $0.50 + $0.75 + $1.25. This measure is quite broad, but is useful in that (1) it reflects the overall interplay of all industries in the economy, and (2) some key fiscal variables such as sales taxes are linked to aggregate spending.

A second measure of business activity frequently employed in this analysis is that of Gross Product. This indicator represents the regional equivalent of Gross Domestic Product, the most commonly reported statistic regarding national economic performance. In other words, the Gross Product of Texas is the amount of US output that is produced in that state; it is defined as the value of all final goods produced in a given region for a specific period of time. Stated differently, it captures the amount of value-added (gross area product) over intermediate goods and services at each stage of the production process, that is, it eliminates the double counting in the Total Expenditures concept. Using the example above, the Gross Product is $1.25 (the value of the bread) rather than $2.50. Alternatively, it may be viewed as the sum of the value-added by the farmer, $0.50; the miller, $0.25 ($0.75 - $0.50); and the baker, $0.50 ($1.25 - $0.75). The total value-added is, therefore, $1.25, which is equivalent to the final value of the bread. In many industries, the primary component of value-added is the wage and salary payments to employees.

The third gauge of economic activity used in this evaluation is Personal Income. As the name implies, Personal Income is simply the income received by individuals, whether in the form of wages, salaries, interest, dividends, proprietors' profits, or other sources. It may thus be viewed as the segment of overall impacts which flows directly to the citizenry.

The fourth measure, Retail Sales, represents the component of Total Expenditures which occurs in retail outlets (general merchandise stores, automobile dealers and

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

21

service stations, building materials stores, food stores, drugstores, restaurants, and so forth). Retail Sales is a commonly used measure of consumer activity.

The final aggregates used are Permanent Jobs and Person-Years of Employment. The Person-Years of Employment measure reveals the full-time equivalent jobs generated by an activity. It should be noted that, unlike the dollar values described above, Permanent Jobs is a "stock" rather than a "flow." In other words, if an area produces $1 million in output in 2015 and $1 million in 2016, it is appropriate to say that $2 million was achieved in the 2015-2016 period. If the same area has 100 people working in 2015 and 100 in 2016, it only has 100 Permanent Jobs. When a flow of jobs is measured, such as in a construction project or a cumulative assessment over multiple years, it is appropriate to measure employment in Person-Years (a person working for a year). This concept is distinct from Permanent Jobs, which anticipates that the relevant positions will be maintained on a continuing basis. Because the reduction in travel and tourism continues (and typically expands) each year, the Permanent Jobs measure is appropriate for the initial and longer-term portions of the current analysis. For the specific events, the person-years measure is appropriate because the transitory nature of the negative stimulus.

The USMRIAS also includes a fiscal model that provides estimates of State and local tax revenues.

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

22

Texas Econometric Model

Overview

The Texas Econometric Model was developed by Dr. M. Ray Perryman, President and CEO of The Perryman Group (TPG), more than 30 years ago and has been consistently maintained, expanded, and updated since that time. It is formulated in an internally consistent manner and is designed to permit the integration of relevant global, national, state, and local factors into the projection process. It is the result of more than three decades of continuing research in econometrics, economic theory, statistical methods, and key policy issues and behavioral patterns, as well as intensive, ongoing study of all aspects of the global, US, Texas, and Texas metropolitan area economies. It is extensively used by scores of federal and State governmental entities on an ongoing basis, as well as hundreds of major corporations. It is employed in the current analysis to project baseline future travel and tourism effects.

This section describes the forecasting process in a comprehensive manner, focusing on both the modeling and the supplemental analysis. The overall methodology, while certainly not ensuring perfect foresight, permits an enormous body of relevant information to impact the economic outlook in a systematic manner.

Model Logic and Structure

The Texas Econometric Model revolves around a core system which projects output (real and nominal), income (real and nominal), and employment by industry in a simultaneous manner. For purposes of illustration, it is useful to initially consider the employment functions. Essentially, employment within the system is a derived demand relationship obtained from a neo-Classical production function. The expressions are augmented to include dynamic temporal adjustments to changes in relative factor input costs, output and (implicitly) productivity, and technological progress over time. Thus, the typical equation includes output, the relative real cost of labor and capital, dynamic lag structures, and a technological adjustment parameter. The functional form is logarithmic, thus preserving the theoretical consistency with the neo-Classical formulation.

The income segment of the model is divided into wage and non-wage components. The wage equations, like their employment counterparts, are individually estimated at the 3-digit North American Industry Classification System (NAICS) level of aggregation. Hence, income by place of work is measured for

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

23

approximately 90 production categories. The wage equations measure real compensation, with the form of the variable structure differing between "basic" and "non-basic."

The basic industries, comprised primarily of the various components of Mining, Agriculture, and Manufacturing, are export-oriented, i.e., they bring external dollars into the area and form the core of the economy. The production of these sectors typically flows into national and international markets; hence, the labor markets are influenced by conditions in areas beyond the borders of the particular region. Thus, real (inflation-adjusted) wages in the basic industry are expressed as a function of the corresponding national rates, as well as measures of local labor market conditions (the reciprocal of the unemployment rate), dynamic adjustment parameters, and ongoing trends.

The "non-basic" sectors are somewhat different in nature, as the strength of their labor markets is linked to the health of the local export sectors. Consequently, wages in these industries are related to those in the basic segment of the economy. The relationship also includes the local labor market measures contained in the basic wage equations.

Note that compensation rates in the export or "basic" sectors provide a key element of the interaction of the regional economies with national and international market phenomena, while the "non-basic" or local industries are strongly impacted by area production levels. Given the wage and employment equations, multiplicative identities in each industry provide expressions for total compensation; these totals may then be aggregated to determine aggregate wage and salary income. Simple linkage equations are then estimated for the calculation of personal income by place of work.

The non-labor aspects of personal income are modeled at the regional level using straightforward empirical expressions relating to national performance, dynamic responses, and evolving temporal patterns. In some instances (such as dividends, rents, and others) national variables (for example, interest rates) directly enter the forecasting system. These factors have numerous other implicit linkages into the system resulting from their simultaneous interaction with other phenomena in national and international markets which are explicitly included in various expressions.

The output or gross area product expressions are also developed at the 3-digit NAICS level. Regional output for basic industries is linked to national performance in the relevant industries, local and national production in key related sectors,

relative area and national labor costs in the industry, dynamic adjustment parameters, and ongoing changes in industrial interrelationships (driven by technological changes in production processes).

Output in the non-basic sectors is modeled as a function of basic production levels, output in related local support industries (if applicable), dynamic temporal adjustments, and ongoing patterns. The inter-industry linkages are obtained from the input-output (impact assessment) system which is part of the overall integrated modeling structure maintained by The Perryman Group. Note that the dominant component of the econometric system involves the simultaneous estimation and projection of output (real and nominal), income (real and nominal), and employment at a disaggregated industrial level. This process, of necessity, also produces projections of regional price deflators by industry. These values are affected by both national pricing patterns and local cost variations and permit changes in prices to impact other aspects of economic behavior. Income is converted from real to nominal terms using Texas Consumer Price Index, which fluctuates in response to national pricing patterns and unique local phenomena.

Several other components of the model are critical to the forecasting process. The demographic module includes (1) a linkage equation between wage and salary (establishment) employment and household employment, (2) a labor force participation rate function, and (3) a complete population system with endogenous migration. Given household employment, labor force participation (which is a function of economic conditions and evolving patterns of worker preferences), and the working age population, the unemployment rate and level become identities.

The population system uses Census information, fertility rates, and life tables to determine the "natural" changes in population by age group. Migration, the most difficult segment of population dynamics to track, is estimated in relation to relative regional and extra-regional economic conditions over time. Because evolving economic conditions determine migration in the system, population changes are allowed to interact simultaneously with overall economic conditions. Through this process, migration is treated as endogenous to the system, thus allowing population to vary in accordance with relative business performance (particularly employment).

Real retail sales is related to income, interest rates, dynamic adjustments, and patterns in consumer behavior on a store group basis. It is expressed on an inflation-adjusted basis. Inflation at the state level relates to national patterns, indicators of relative economic conditions, and ongoing trends. As noted earlier, prices are endogenous to the system.

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

25

A final significant segment of the forecasting system relates to real estate absorption and activity. The short-term demand for various types of property is determined by underlying economic and demographic factors, with short-term adjustments to reflect the current status of the pertinent building cycle. In some instances, this portion of the forecast requires integration with the Multi-Regional Industry-Occupation System which is maintained by The Perryman Group. This system also allows any employment simulation or forecast from the econometric model to be translated into a highly detailed occupational profile.

The overall Texas Econometric Model contains numerous additional specifications, and individual expressions are modified to reflect alternative lag structures, empirical properties of the estimates, simulation requirements, and similar phenomena. Moreover, it is updated on an ongoing basis as new data releases become available. Nonetheless, the above synopsis offers a basic understanding of the overall structure and underlying logic of the system.

Model Simulation and Multi-Regional Structure

The initial phase of the simulation process is the execution of a standard non-linear algorithm for the state system and that of each of the individual sub-areas. The external assumptions are derived from scenarios developed through national and international models and extensive analysis by The Perryman Group. The US model, which follows the basic structure outlined above, was used to some extent in the current analysis to define the demand for domestically produced goods on a per capita basis.

Once the initial simulations are completed, they are merged into a single system with additive constraints and interregional flows. Using information on minimum regional requirements, import needs, export potential, and locations, it becomes possible to balance the various forecasts into a mathematically consistent set of results. This process is, in effect, a disciplining exercise with regard to the individual regional (including metropolitan and rural) systems. By compelling equilibrium across all regions and sectors, the algorithm ensures that the patterns in state activity are reasonable in light of smaller area dynamics and, conversely, that the regional outlooks are within plausible performance levels for the state as a whole.

The iterative simulation process has the additional property of imposing a global convergence criterion across the entire multi-regional system, with balance being achieved simultaneously on both a sectoral and a geographic basis. This approach is particularly critical on non-linear dynamic systems, as independent simulations of individual systems often yield unstable, non-convergent outcomes.

THE
PERRYMAN GROUP

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

26

It should be noted that the underlying data for the modeling and simulation process are frequently updated and revised by the various public and private entities compiling them. Whenever those modifications to the database occur, they bring corresponding changes to the structural parameter estimates of the various systems and the solutions to the simulation and forecasting system. The multi-regional version of the Texas Econometric Model is re-estimated and simulated with each such data release, thus providing a constantly evolving and current assessment of state and local business activity.

The Final Forecast

The process described above is followed to produce an initial set of projections. Through the comprehensive multi-regional modeling and simulation process, a systematic analysis is generated which accounts for both historical patterns in economic performance and inter-relationships and best available information on the future course of pertinent external factors. While the best available techniques and data are employed in this effort, they are not capable of directly capturing "street sense," i.e., the contemporaneous and often non-quantifiable information that can materially affect economic outcomes. In order to provide a comprehensive approach to the prediction of business conditions, it is necessary to compile and assimilate extensive material regarding current events and factors both across the state of Texas and elsewhere.

This critical aspect of the forecasting methodology includes activities such as (1) daily review of hundreds of financial and business publications and electronic information sites; (2) review of major newspapers and online news sources in the state on a daily basis; (3) dozens of hours of direct telephone interviews with key business and political leaders in all parts of the state; (4) face-to-face discussions with representatives of major industry groups; and (5) frequent site visits to the various regions of the state. The insights arising from this "fact finding" are analyzed and evaluated for their effects on the likely course of the future activity.

Another vital information resource stems from the firm's ongoing interaction with key players in the international, domestic, and state economic scenes. Such activities include visiting with corporate groups on a regular basis and being regularly involved in the policy process at all levels. The firm is also an active participant in many major corporate relocations, economic development initiatives, and regulatory proceedings.

Once organized, this information is carefully assessed and, when appropriate, independently verified. The impact on specific communities and sectors that is

THE PERRYMAN GROUP

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

27

distinct from what is captured by the econometric system is then factored into the forecast analysis. For example, the opening or closing of a major facility, particularly in a relatively small area, can cause a sudden change in business performance that will not be accounted for by either a modeling system based on historical relationships or expected (primarily national and international) factors.

The final step in the forecasting process is the integration of this material into the results in a logical and mathematically consistent manner. In some instances, this task is accomplished through "constant adjustment factors" which augment relevant equations. In other cases, anticipated changes in industrial structure or regulatory parameters are initially simulated within the context of the Multi-Regional Impact Assessment System to estimate their ultimate effects by sector. Those findings are then factored into the simulation as constant adjustments on a distributed temporal basis. Once this scenario is formulated, the extended system is again balanced across regions and sectors through an iterative simulation algorithm analogous to that described in the preceding section.

Appendix C: Detailed Sectoral Results

Texas

	The Estimated Initial Annual Impact of Losses in the Tourism Sector Associated of the Proposed Social Policy Legislation Regarding Bathroom Access on Business Activity in Texas			
Category	Total Expenditures (2016 Dollars)	Gross Product (2016 Dollars)	Personal Income (2016 Dollars)	Employment (Permanent Jobs)
Agriculture	($133,086,454)	($36,337,217)	($23,631,020)	(313)
Mining	($84,140,588)	($19,479,420)	($10,725,516)	(53)
Construction	($112,839,939)	($60,179,224)	($49,591,429)	(587)
Nondurable Manufacturing	($706,779,198)	($196,570,557)	($103,367,469)	(1,471)
Durable Manufacturing	($145,281,162)	($57,305,237)	($36,980,982)	(439)
Transportation and Utilities	($945,098,686)	($544,676,253)	($345,418,066)	(3,742)
Information	($172,637,492)	($102,752,548)	($49,476,937)	(583)
Wholesale Trade	($211,702,845)	($143,245,328)	($82,596,532)	(790)
Retail Trade (including Restaurants)	($1,381,968,482)	($1,018,524,879)	($588,927,925)	(15,637)
FIRE	($808,463,600)	($215,940,525)	($84,084,625)	(744)
Business Services	($213,061,253)	($133,295,125)	($108,734,667)	(1,115)
Health Services	($173,429,497)	($121,422,064)	($102,663,480)	(1,429)
Other Services	($1,148,266,280)	($610,554,487)	($425,914,886)	(8,707)
TOTAL	**($6,236,755,474)**	**($3,260,282,864)**	**($2,012,113,533)**	**(35,611)**
SOURCE: US Multi-Regional Impact Assessment System, The Perryman Group				

The Perryman Group

Category	Total Expenditures (2016 Dollars)	Gross Product (2016 Dollars)	Personal Income (2016 Dollars)	Employment (Permanent Jobs)
The Estimated Annual Impact (at Maturity) of Losses in the Tourism Sector Associated of the Proposed Social Policy Legislation Regarding Bathroom Access on Business Activity in Texas				
Agriculture	($222,708,667)	($60,807,188)	($39,544,467)	(524)
Mining	($140,801,994)	($32,597,124)	($17,948,223)	(88)
Construction	($188,827,875)	($100,704,726)	($82,986,966)	(982)
Nondurable Manufacturing	($1,182,733,839)	($328,943,820)	($172,976,516)	(2,462)
Durable Manufacturing	($243,115,456)	($95,895,357)	($61,884,474)	(735)
Transportation and Utilities	($1,581,540,883)	($911,468,585)	($578,027,248)	(6,262)
Information	($288,893,906)	($171,947,499)	($82,795,374)	(976)
Wholesale Trade	($354,266,395)	($239,708,663)	($138,218,150)	(1,323)
Retail Trade (including Restaurants)	($2,312,604,689)	($1,704,413,264)	($985,519,931)	(26,168)
FIRE	($1,352,893,888)	($361,357,785)	($140,708,346)	(1,245)
Business Services	($356,539,573)	($223,057,860)	($181,958,057)	(1,865)
Health Services	($290,219,258)	($203,189,319)	($171,798,451)	(2,391)
Other Services	($1,921,524,274)	($1,021,710,111)	($712,731,712)	(14,571)
TOTAL	**($10,436,670,697)**	**($5,455,801,301)**	**($3,367,097,915)**	**(59,592)**
SOURCE: US Multi-Regional Impact Assessment System, The Perryman Group				

PERRYMAN GROUP

San Antonio

Category	The Estimated Initial Annual Impact of Losses in the Tourism Sector Associated of the Proposed Social Policy Legislation Regarding Bathroom Access on Business Activity in the San Antonio-New Braunfels Metropolitan Statistical Area			
	Total Expenditures (2016 Dollars)	Gross Product (2016 Dollars)	Personal Income (2016 Dollars)	Employment (Permanent Jobs)
Agriculture	($8,935,136)	($2,334,597)	($1,556,390)	(21)
Mining	($2,483,640)	($594,076)	($291,615)	(2)
Construction	($15,039,475)	($8,026,804)	($6,614,587)	(78)
Nondurable Manufacturing	($67,506,501)	($21,187,808)	($11,421,935)	(175)
Durable Manufacturing	($12,033,006)	($4,888,051)	($3,110,547)	(39)
Transportation and Utilities	($123,918,173)	($71,327,874)	($45,208,607)	(489)
Information	($23,085,813)	($13,733,898)	($6,622,976)	(78)
Wholesale Trade	($20,281,136)	($13,722,889)	($7,912,741)	(76)
Retail Trade (including Restaurants)	($185,578,975)	($136,725,299)	($79,048,194)	(2,100)
FIRE	($92,178,445)	($25,374,268)	($10,692,722)	(95)
Business Services	($25,121,201)	($15,674,958)	($12,786,748)	(131)
Health Services	($22,939,358)	($16,054,817)	($13,574,496)	(189)
Other Services	($154,626,222)	($82,233,644)	($57,313,457)	(1,173)
TOTAL	**($753,727,080)**	**($411,878,984)**	**($256,155,015)**	**(4,647)**
SOURCE: US Multi-Regional Impact Assessment System, The Perryman Group				

PERRYMAN GROUP

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

31

The Estimated Annual Impact (at Maturity) of Losses in the Tourism Sector Associated of the Proposed Social Policy Legislation Regarding Bathroom Access on Business Activity in the San Antonio-New Braunfels Metropolitan Statistical Area			
Category	Total Expenditures (2016 Dollars)	Gross Product (2016 Dollars)	Personal Income (2016 Dollars)	Employment (Permanent Jobs)
Agriculture	($14,952,176)	($3,906,746)	($2,604,484)	(35)
Mining	($4,156,157)	($994,135)	($487,992)	(3)
Construction	($25,167,260)	($13,432,162)	($11,068,938)	(131)
Nondurable Manufacturing	($112,966,289)	($35,455,964)	($19,113,620)	(293)
Durable Manufacturing	($20,136,194)	($8,179,731)	($5,205,231)	(66)
Transportation and Utilities	($207,366,341)	($119,361,027)	($75,652,692)	(819)
Information	($38,632,111)	($22,982,490)	($11,082,978)	(131)
Wholesale Trade	($33,938,726)	($22,964,068)	($13,241,287)	(127)
Retail Trade (including Restaurants)	($310,550,359)	($228,797,960)	($132,280,314)	(3,514)
FIRE	($154,252,653)	($42,461,641)	($17,893,346)	(160)
Business Services	($42,038,156)	($26,230,686)	($21,397,517)	(219)
Health Services	($38,387,032)	($26,866,347)	($22,715,744)	(316)
Other Services	($258,753,605)	($137,610,888)	($95,909,111)	(1,963)
TOTAL	($1,261,297,058)	($689,243,844)	($428,653,255)	(7,777)
SOURCE: US Multi-Regional Impact Assessment System, The Perryman Group			

PERRYMAN GROUP

The Potential Impact of the Loss of a Single Large Professional Convention on Business Activity in the San Antonio-New Braunfels Metropolitan Statistical Area			
Category	Total Expenditures (2016 Dollars)	Gross Product (2016 Dollars)	Personal Income (2016 Dollars)	Employment (Permanent Jobs)
Agriculture	($1,077,075)	($281,421)	($187,613)	(2)
Mining	($299,387)	($71,612)	($35,152)	(0)
Construction	($1,812,915)	($967,581)	($797,347)	(9)
Nondurable Manufacturing	($8,137,486)	($2,554,058)	($1,376,843)	(21)
Durable Manufacturing	($1,450,504)	($589,224)	($374,957)	(5)
Transportation and Utilities	($14,937,560)	($8,598,129)	($5,449,615)	(58)
Information	($2,782,850)	($1,655,535)	($798,358)	(9)
Wholesale Trade	($2,444,764)	($1,654,208)	($953,831)	(9)
Retail Trade (including Restaurants)	($22,370,384)	($16,481,379)	($9,528,765)	(249)
FIRE	($11,111,535)	($3,058,709)	($1,288,941)	(11)
Business Services	($3,028,204)	($1,889,518)	($1,541,362)	(16)
Health Services	($2,765,196)	($1,935,308)	($1,636,320)	(22)
Other Services	($18,639,223)	($9,912,751)	($6,908,779)	(139)
TOTAL	**($90,857,082)**	**($49,649,434)**	**($30,877,884)**	**(550)**

NOTE: This analysis reflects the effects associated with a typical large professional convention with 15,000+ attendees and 30,000+ room nights. Examples of such events that are scheduled in the coming years are found in several major Texas cities, including San Antonio.
SOURCE: US Multi-Regional Impact Assessment System, The Perryman Group

PERRYMAN GROUP

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

33

The Potential Impact of the Loss of the 2018 NCAA Men's Basketball Championship Final Four Event on Business Activity in the San Antonio-New Braunfels Metropolitan Statistical Area			
Category	**Total Expenditures (2016 Dollars)**	**Gross Product (2016 Dollars)**	**Personal Income (2016 Dollars)**	**Employment (Permanent Jobs)**
Agriculture	($7,628,311)	($1,993,146)	($1,328,757)	(17)
Mining	($2,120,391)	($507,188)	($248,964)	(1)
Construction	($12,839,850)	($6,852,830)	($5,647,158)	(65)
Nondurable Manufacturing	($57,633,218)	($18,088,948)	($9,751,400)	(145)
Durable Manufacturing	($10,273,097)	($4,173,141)	($2,655,608)	(33)
Transportation and Utilities	($105,794,301)	($60,895,690)	($38,596,542)	(403)
Information	($19,709,356)	($11,725,222)	($5,654,321)	(65)
Wholesale Trade	($17,314,882)	($11,715,824)	($6,755,449)	(62)
Retail Trade (including Restaurants)	($158,436,793)	($116,728,298)	($67,486,860)	(1,731)
FIRE	($78,696,723)	($21,663,109)	($9,128,839)	(79)
Business Services	($21,447,055)	($13,382,389)	($10,916,600)	(108)
Health Services	($19,584,322)	($13,706,691)	($11,589,134)	(156)
Other Services	($132,011,089)	($70,206,416)	($48,930,975)	(967)
TOTAL	**($643,489,388)**	**($351,638,891)**	**($218,690,608)**	**(3,831)**
SOURCE: US Multi-Regional Impact Assessment System, The Perryman Group				

PERRYMAN GROUP

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

34

Appendix D: Results by Metropolitan Area and Legislative District

Results for Texas Metropolitan Statistical Areas

MSA	The Estimated Initial Annual Impact of Losses in the Tourism Sector Associated with the Proposed Social Policy Legislation Regarding Bathroom Access on Business Activity in Texas: Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) and Rural Texas Results				
	Total Expenditures (2016 Dollars)	Gross Product (2016 Dollars)	Personal Income (2016 Dollars)	Retail Sales (2016 Dollars)	Employment (Permanent Jobs)
Abilene	($42,163,224)	($21,966,982)	($13,448,355)	($10,055,342)	-241
Amarillo	($68,973,833)	($37,403,320)	($23,081,097)	($17,122,967)	-413
Austin-Round Rock	($428,445,450)	($230,850,718)	($142,553,034)	($108,162,178)	-2,627
Beaumont-Port Arthur	($82,359,976)	($44,878,022)	($28,145,698)	($22,534,079)	-507
Brownsville-Harlingen	($87,497,548)	($46,925,278)	($28,988,130)	($20,117,136)	-527
College Station-Bryan	($64,646,911)	($33,713,734)	($20,774,339)	($16,027,939)	-390
Corpus Christi	($126,431,609)	($63,425,793)	($39,171,246)	($29,070,493)	-707
Dallas-Plano-Irving MD*	($1,340,870,774)	($695,048,710)	($426,245,764)	($280,821,607)	-7,490
Fort Worth-Arlington MD*	($603,712,099)	($319,215,249)	($197,257,775)	($133,262,904)	-3,497
El Paso	($30,636,146)	($15,898,911)	($9,699,216)	($6,454,445)	-171
Houston-The Woodlands-Sugar Land	($1,568,199,826)	($782,018,713)	($482,820,900)	($290,906,989)	-8,189
Killeen-Temple	($68,635,713)	($38,430,535)	($23,972,216)	($18,402,331)	-437
Laredo	($52,430,475)	($29,772,489)	($18,513,202)	($14,723,251)	-341
Longview	($45,485,508)	($25,466,279)	($15,917,782)	($12,136,598)	-284
Lubbock	($91,749,190)	($49,366,142)	($30,478,158)	($21,891,646)	-545
McAllen-Edinburg-Mission	($155,567,204)	($86,077,416)	($53,653,034)	($36,948,928)	-972
Midland	($35,567,065)	($19,810,368)	($12,254,479)	($8,945,197)	-213
Odessa	($35,544,853)	($19,363,643)	($12,078,977)	($9,912,098)	-220
San Angelo	($28,911,099)	($14,647,552)	($8,837,037)	($7,253,260)	-164
San Antonio-New Braunfels	($753,727,080)	($411,878,984)	($256,155,015)	($185,578,975)	-4,647
Sherman-Denison	($22,915,996)	($12,521,424)	($7,739,197)	($6,602,815)	-144
Texarkana	($23,254,841)	($13,191,692)	($8,253,332)	($6,456,030)	-148
Tyler	($55,637,506)	($28,745,102)	($17,444,649)	($14,549,200)	-321
Victoria	($24,060,951)	($12,827,670)	($7,972,100)	($6,508,318)	-144
Waco	($7,701,629)	($3,997,118)	($2,444,134)	($1,828,101)	-44
Wichita Falls	($29,839,076)	($16,933,563)	($10,543,982)	($8,788,082)	-198
Rural Area	($361,789,892)	($185,907,458)	($113,670,686)	($86,907,570)	-2,029
TOTAL STATE IMPACT	($6,236,755,474)	($3,260,282,864)	($2,012,113,533)	($1,381,968,482)	-35,611

*Metropolitan Division
SOURCE: US Multi-Regional Impact Assessment System, The Perryman Group

PERRYMAN GROUP

MSA	The Estimated Annual Impact (at Maturity) of Losses in the Tourism Sector Associated with the Proposed Social Policy Legislation Regarding Bathroom Access on Business Activity in Texas: Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) and Rural Texas Results				
	Total Expenditures (2016 Dollars)	Gross Product (2016 Dollars)	Personal Income (2016 Dollars)	Retail Sales (2016 Dollars)	Employment (Permanent Jobs)
Abilene	($70,556,508)	($36,759,843)	($22,504,658)	($16,826,745)	-403
Amarillo	($115,421,742)	($62,591,221)	($38,624,218)	($28,653,805)	-691
Austin-Round Rock	($716,966,393)	($386,308,704)	($238,550,170)	($181,000,046)	-4,396
Beaumont-Port Arthur	($137,822,294)	($75,099,487)	($47,099,391)	($37,708,832)	-848
Brownsville-Harlingen	($146,419,576)	($78,525,393)	($48,509,127)	($33,664,286)	-882
College Station-Bryan	($108,181,013)	($56,417,017)	($34,764,059)	($26,821,369)	-653
Corpus Christi	($211,572,360)	($106,137,578)	($65,549,691)	($48,646,956)	-1,183
Dallas-Plano-Irving MD*	($2,243,831,232)	($1,163,103,882)	($713,285,408)	($469,930,664)	-12,534
Fort Worth-Arlington MD*	($1,010,259,966)	($534,179,102)	($330,093,821)	($223,003,941)	-5,853
El Paso	($51,266,940)	($26,605,452)	($16,230,799)	($10,800,956)	-286
Houston-The Woodlands-Sugar Land	($2,624,246,732)	($1,308,640,658)	($807,959,004)	($486,807,677)	-13,704
Killeen-Temple	($114,855,927)	($64,310,175)	($40,115,429)	($30,794,710)	-731
Laredo	($87,737,864)	($49,821,684)	($30,980,241)	($24,638,087)	-570
Longview	($76,116,062)	($42,615,614)	($26,637,030)	($20,309,547)	-475
Lubbock	($153,534,331)	($82,609,968)	($51,002,561)	($36,633,775)	-913
McAllen-Edinburg-Mission	($260,328,257)	($144,043,108)	($89,783,710)	($61,830,835)	-1,627
Midland	($59,518,406)	($33,150,937)	($20,506,810)	($14,969,013)	-356
Odessa	($59,481,237)	($32,403,382)	($20,213,124)	($16,587,038)	-369
San Angelo	($48,380,224)	($24,511,410)	($14,788,017)	($12,137,704)	-275
San Antonio-New Braunfels	($1,261,297,058)	($689,243,844)	($428,653,255)	($310,550,359)	-7,777
Sherman-Denison	($38,347,936)	($20,953,519)	($12,950,877)	($11,049,240)	-241
Texarkana	($38,914,964)	($22,075,156)	($13,811,237)	($10,803,608)	-247
Tyler	($93,104,552)	($48,102,441)	($29,192,110)	($24,346,827)	-538
Victoria	($40,263,919)	($21,465,995)	($13,340,620)	($10,891,108)	-241
Waco	($12,888,011)	($6,688,831)	($4,090,046)	($3,059,169)	-73
Wichita Falls	($49,933,112)	($28,336,853)	($17,644,442)	($14,706,095)	-331
Rural Areas	($605,424,083)	($311,100,046)	($190,218,058)	($145,432,299)	-3,396
TOTAL STATE IMPACT	($10,436,670,697)	($5,455,801,301)	($3,367,097,915)	($2,312,604,689)	-59,592

*Metropolitan Division
SOURCE: US Multi-Regional Impact Assessment System, The Perryman Group

PERRYMAN GROUP

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

37

Results by Texas House District: Initial Effects

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

38

	The Estimated Initial Annual Impact of Losses in the Tourism Sector Associated with the Proposed Social Policy Legislation Regarding Bathroom Access on Business Activity in Texas: Results by Texas House District				
House	Total Expenditures (2016 Dollars)	Gross Product (2016 Dollars)	Personal Income (2016 Dollars)	Retail Sales (2016 Dollars)	Employment (Permanent Jobs)
1	($25,998,657)	($14,654,947)	($9,157,311)	($7,226,412)	-164
2	($24,749,614)	($13,970,098)	($8,706,704)	($7,203,186)	-159
3	($35,223,172)	($17,790,719)	($10,983,240)	($8,125,618)	-199
4	($24,316,156)	($12,656,044)	($7,770,808)	($6,615,264)	-145
5	($28,263,523)	($14,648,308)	($8,968,980)	($7,477,658)	-165
6	($42,284,504)	($21,846,278)	($13,257,933)	($11,057,392)	-244
7	($40,595,726)	($22,925,707)	($14,333,739)	($10,934,554)	-256
8	($23,274,642)	($12,662,630)	($7,849,711)	($5,998,611)	-143
9	($73,373,223)	($39,750,391)	($24,882,813)	($18,646,553)	-455
10	($169,334,814)	($88,981,558)	($54,643,847)	($43,577,801)	-993
11	($21,444,602)	($11,598,959)	($7,246,052)	($5,958,433)	-134
12	($17,286,202)	($9,149,377)	($5,652,722)	($4,535,677)	-105
13	($29,328,457)	($15,733,868)	($9,748,793)	($7,489,531)	-174
14	($51,559,860)	($26,766,588)	($16,478,840)	($12,630,535)	-310
15	($40,960,383)	($20,718,341)	($12,848,655)	($9,202,229)	-232
16	($40,960,383)	($20,718,341)	($12,848,655)	($9,202,229)	-232
17	($24,574,330)	($12,892,155)	($7,960,443)	($6,297,341)	-143
18	($21,088,280)	($11,769,580)	($7,354,742)	($5,791,121)	-135
19	($21,220,467)	($11,891,317)	($7,374,263)	($6,178,370)	-134
20	($24,496,355)	($13,214,795)	($8,197,193)	($6,582,490)	-150
21	($33,756,597)	($18,456,331)	($11,597,687)	($9,319,262)	-209
22	($40,177,004)	($21,755,030)	($13,665,168)	($10,765,493)	-245
23	($39,257,314)	($20,371,166)	($12,624,343)	($9,048,775)	-228
24	($44,947,735)	($23,522,795)	($14,582,116)	($10,627,754)	-265
25	($22,318,126)	($11,749,587)	($7,331,028)	($6,059,515)	-134
26	($32,631,407)	($15,984,242)	($9,764,492)	($7,656,717)	-178
27	($32,631,407)	($15,984,242)	($9,764,492)	($7,656,717)	-178
28	($32,631,407)	($15,984,242)	($9,764,492)	($7,656,717)	-178
29	($27,029,171)	($14,259,700)	($8,900,683)	($7,294,926)	-162
30	($36,833,649)	($19,412,610)	($12,032,699)	($9,856,854)	-219
31	($32,127,718)	($18,041,201)	($11,271,610)	($8,907,723)	-205
32	($54,233,757)	($27,086,991)	($16,714,535)	($12,155,593)	-300
33	($45,144,304)	($24,182,560)	($15,009,364)	($11,418,497)	-272
34	($56,447,380)	($28,192,582)	($17,396,761)	($12,651,740)	-312
35	($34,787,185)	($18,995,207)	($11,795,570)	($8,149,376)	-214
36	($33,913,651)	($18,764,877)	($11,696,361)	($8,054,866)	-212
37	($36,748,970)	($19,708,617)	($12,175,014)	($8,449,197)	-221
38	($35,873,994)	($19,239,364)	($11,885,133)	($8,248,026)	-216
39	($33,913,651)	($18,764,877)	($11,696,361)	($8,054,866)	-212
40	($33,913,651)	($18,764,877)	($11,696,361)	($8,054,866)	-212
41	($33,913,651)	($18,764,877)	($11,696,361)	($8,054,866)	-212
42	($33,555,504)	($19,054,393)	($11,848,449)	($9,422,881)	-218
43	($27,756,513)	($15,051,299)	($9,374,528)	($7,941,611)	-176
44	($22,116,288)	($11,717,687)	($7,219,451)	($6,154,900)	-135
45	($45,695,188)	($24,274,551)	($14,811,032)	($12,593,536)	-276
46	($50,387,410)	($27,204,038)	($16,806,471)	($12,178,968)	-310

House	Total Expenditures (2016 Dollars)	Gross Product (2016 Dollars)	Personal Income (2016 Dollars)	Retail Sales (2016 Dollars)	Employment (Permanent Jobs)
	The Estimated Initial Annual Impact of Losses in the Tourism Sector Associated with the Proposed Social Policy Legislation Regarding Bathroom Access on Business Activity in Texas: Results by Texas House District				
47	($52,551,287)	($28,372,310)	($17,528,221)	($12,701,991)	-323
48	($52,551,287)	($28,372,310)	($17,528,221)	($12,701,991)	-323
49	($50,696,536)	($27,370,934)	($16,909,578)	($12,253,686)	-311
50	($50,387,410)	($27,204,038)	($16,806,471)	($12,178,968)	-310
51	($52,551,287)	($28,372,310)	($17,528,221)	($12,701,991)	-323
52	($22,380,273)	($12,125,859)	($7,534,691)	($6,521,002)	-139
53	($32,089,462)	($16,979,433)	($10,413,930)	($8,444,771)	-196
54	($29,591,809)	($16,626,856)	($10,379,115)	($7,882,858)	-188
55	($30,879,704)	($17,368,860)	($10,845,330)	($8,224,458)	-196
56	($4,453,230)	($2,281,823)	($1,389,660)	($1,045,136)	-25
57	($25,486,777)	($13,897,345)	($8,597,186)	($6,996,372)	-155
58	($23,954,594)	($13,088,093)	($8,147,873)	($6,545,187)	-145
59	($21,236,842)	($11,678,140)	($7,281,919)	($5,929,930)	-137
60	($28,954,659)	($15,384,857)	($9,476,582)	($8,129,799)	-178
61	($30,178,600)	($16,100,261)	($9,969,623)	($7,326,032)	-182
62	($26,069,541)	($14,210,746)	($8,780,272)	($7,464,342)	-162
63	($37,061,966)	($18,891,270)	($11,519,681)	($8,544,727)	-207
64	($37,061,966)	($18,891,270)	($11,519,681)	($8,544,727)	-207
65	($37,061,966)	($18,891,270)	($11,519,681)	($8,544,727)	-207
66	($46,472,375)	($24,424,440)	($15,094,653)	($11,302,680)	-277
67	($46,472,375)	($24,424,440)	($15,094,653)	($11,302,680)	-277
68	($23,276,338)	($12,664,024)	($7,875,738)	($6,401,358)	-144
69	($30,609,197)	($17,369,297)	($10,815,815)	($8,997,916)	-202
70	($46,472,375)	($24,424,440)	($15,094,653)	($11,302,680)	-277
71	($44,508,660)	($23,313,452)	($14,282,130)	($10,644,227)	-256
72	($37,328,960)	($19,164,455)	($11,631,077)	($9,606,725)	-215
73	($54,820,040)	($28,612,050)	($17,589,750)	($13,439,353)	-329
74	($21,349,478)	($12,083,090)	($7,535,369)	($5,750,197)	-140
75	($6,109,904)	($3,169,739)	($1,933,776)	($1,284,654)	-34
76	($6,109,904)	($3,169,739)	($1,933,776)	($1,284,654)	-34
77	($6,109,904)	($3,169,739)	($1,933,776)	($1,284,654)	-34
78	($6,109,904)	($3,169,739)	($1,933,776)	($1,284,654)	-34
79	($6,109,904)	($3,169,739)	($1,933,776)	($1,284,654)	-34
80	($31,787,226)	($17,793,552)	($11,063,472)	($8,749,437)	-203
81	($39,492,941)	($21,590,364)	($13,456,593)	($11,055,499)	-245
82	($38,551,265)	($21,441,536)	($13,259,037)	($9,668,797)	-231
83	($43,354,384)	($23,511,699)	($14,493,879)	($10,758,203)	-260
84	($54,722,608)	($29,433,535)	($18,170,466)	($13,064,767)	-325
85	($30,035,351)	($15,264,505)	($9,364,801)	($7,707,177)	-171
86	($25,286,169)	($13,521,485)	($8,296,572)	($6,395,872)	-151
87	($53,294,223)	($28,861,816)	($17,856,376)	($13,106,762)	-316
88	($16,441,072)	($8,809,471)	($5,448,052)	($4,795,176)	-99
89	($46,472,375)	($24,424,440)	($15,094,653)	($11,302,680)	-277
90	($49,059,902)	($25,905,380)	($15,999,876)	($10,621,184)	-283
91	($49,059,902)	($25,905,380)	($15,999,876)	($10,621,184)	-283
92	($49,059,902)	($25,905,380)	($15,999,876)	($10,621,184)	-283
93	($49,059,902)	($25,905,380)	($15,999,876)	($10,621,184)	-283

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

40

House	Total Expenditures (2016 Dollars)	Gross Product (2016 Dollars)	Personal Income (2016 Dollars)	Retail Sales (2016 Dollars)	Employment (Permanent Jobs)
94	($49,059,902)	($25,905,380)	($15,999,876)	($10,621,184)	-283
95	($49,059,902)	($25,905,380)	($15,999,876)	($10,621,184)	-283
96	($49,059,902)	($25,905,380)	($15,999,876)	($10,621,184)	-283
97	($49,059,902)	($25,905,380)	($15,999,876)	($10,621,184)	-283
98	($49,059,902)	($25,905,380)	($15,999,876)	($10,621,184)	-283
99	($49,059,902)	($25,905,380)	($15,999,876)	($10,621,184)	-283
100	($54,403,068)	($28,015,775)	($17,144,284)	($9,864,853)	-293
101	($48,520,782)	($25,620,706)	($15,824,054)	($10,504,467)	-280
102	($54,403,068)	($28,015,775)	($17,144,284)	($9,864,853)	-293
103	($54,403,068)	($28,015,775)	($17,144,284)	($9,864,853)	-293
104	($54,403,068)	($28,015,775)	($17,144,284)	($9,864,853)	-293
105	($54,403,068)	($28,015,775)	($17,144,284)	($9,864,853)	-293
106	($37,061,966)	($18,891,270)	($11,519,681)	($8,544,727)	-207
107	($54,403,068)	($28,015,775)	($17,144,284)	($9,864,853)	-293
108	($54,403,068)	($28,015,775)	($17,144,284)	($9,864,853)	-293
109	($54,403,068)	($28,015,775)	($17,144,284)	($9,864,853)	-293
110	($54,403,068)	($28,015,775)	($17,144,284)	($9,864,853)	-293
111	($55,552,429)	($28,607,658)	($17,506,487)	($10,073,266)	-299
112	($54,403,068)	($28,015,775)	($17,144,284)	($9,864,853)	-293
113	($55,552,429)	($28,607,658)	($17,506,487)	($10,073,266)	-299
114	($55,552,429)	($28,607,658)	($17,506,487)	($10,073,266)	-299
115	($55,552,429)	($28,607,658)	($17,506,487)	($10,073,266)	-299
116	($54,876,109)	($29,072,918)	($17,943,246)	($11,985,486)	-318
117	($54,876,109)	($29,072,918)	($17,943,246)	($11,985,486)	-318
118	($54,876,109)	($29,072,918)	($17,943,246)	($11,985,486)	-318
119	($54,876,109)	($29,072,918)	($17,943,246)	($11,985,486)	-318
120	($54,876,109)	($29,072,918)	($17,943,246)	($11,985,486)	-318
121	($54,876,109)	($29,072,918)	($17,943,246)	($11,985,486)	-318
122	($54,876,109)	($29,072,918)	($17,943,246)	($11,985,486)	-318
123	($54,876,109)	($29,072,918)	($17,943,246)	($11,985,486)	-318
124	($54,876,109)	($29,072,918)	($17,943,246)	($11,985,486)	-318
125	($54,876,109)	($29,072,918)	($17,943,246)	($11,985,486)	-318
126	($49,712,033)	($24,635,391)	($15,207,634)	($8,390,197)	-252
127	($49,712,033)	($24,635,391)	($15,207,634)	($8,390,197)	-252
128	($49,712,033)	($24,635,391)	($15,207,634)	($8,390,197)	-252
129	($49,712,033)	($24,635,391)	($15,207,634)	($8,390,197)	-252
130	($49,712,033)	($24,635,391)	($15,207,634)	($8,390,197)	-252
131	($49,712,033)	($24,635,391)	($15,207,634)	($8,390,197)	-252
132	($49,712,033)	($24,635,391)	($15,207,634)	($8,390,197)	-252
133	($49,712,033)	($24,635,391)	($15,207,634)	($8,390,197)	-252
134	($49,712,033)	($24,635,391)	($15,207,634)	($8,390,197)	-252
135	($49,712,033)	($24,635,391)	($15,207,634)	($8,390,197)	-252
136	($22,380,273)	($12,125,859)	($7,534,691)	($6,521,002)	-139
137	($48,528,413)	($24,048,834)	($14,845,547)	($8,190,430)	-246
138	($48,528,413)	($24,048,834)	($14,845,547)	($8,190,430)	-246
139	($48,528,413)	($24,048,834)	($14,845,547)	($8,190,430)	-246
140	($48,528,413)	($24,048,834)	($14,845,547)	($8,190,430)	-246

The Estimated Initial Annual Impact of Losses in the Tourism Sector Associated with the Proposed Social Policy Legislation Regarding Bathroom Access on Business Activity in Texas: Results by Texas House District

THE PERRYMAN GROUP

House	Total Expenditures (2016 Dollars)	Gross Product (2016 Dollars)	Personal Income (2016 Dollars)	Retail Sales (2016 Dollars)	Employment (Permanent Jobs)
The Estimated Initial Annual Impact of Losses in the Tourism Sector Associated with the Proposed Social Policy Legislation Regarding Bathroom Access on Business Activity in Texas: Results by Texas House District				
141	($49,712,033)	($24,635,391)	($15,207,634)	($8,390,197)	-252
142	($49,712,033)	($24,635,391)	($15,207,634)	($8,390,197)	-252
143	($49,712,033)	($24,635,391)	($15,207,634)	($8,390,197)	-252
144	($49,712,033)	($24,635,391)	($15,207,634)	($8,390,197)	-252
145	($49,712,033)	($24,635,391)	($15,207,634)	($8,390,197)	-252
146	($49,712,033)	($24,635,391)	($15,207,634)	($8,390,197)	-252
147	($48,528,413)	($24,048,834)	($14,845,547)	($8,190,430)	-246
148	($48,528,413)	($24,048,834)	($14,845,547)	($8,190,430)	-246
149	($48,528,413)	($24,048,834)	($14,845,547)	($8,190,430)	-246
150	($48,528,413)	($24,048,834)	($14,845,547)	($8,190,430)	-246
TOTAL	($6,236,755,474)	($3,260,282,864)	($2,012,113,533)	($1,381,968,482)	-35,611

NOTE: In cases in which a county was part of more than one district, allocations are based on the percentage of the population residing in a district. This convention is adopted because of a lack of subcounty data sufficient for allocation purposes. In some instances, this approach will result in districts which reflect the same proportion of a large urban county reporting identical results. Allocations reflect district maps as currently defined.
SOURCE: US Multi-Regional Impact Assessment System, The Perryman Group

PERRYMAN GROUP

Results by Texas House District: Effects at Maturity

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

43

House	Total Expenditures (2016 Dollars)
1	($43,506,503)
2	($41,416,338)
3	($58,942,931)
4	($40,690,984)
5	($47,296,561)
6	($70,759,460)
7	($67,933,435)
8	($38,948,099)
9	($122,783,741)
10	($283,367,161)
11	($35,885,686)
12	($28,926,964)
13	($49,078,635)
14	($86,280,964)
15	($68,543,656)
16	($68,543,656)
17	($41,123,015)
18	($35,289,413)
19	($35,510,615)
20	($40,992,530)
21	($56,488,745)
22	($67,232,740)
23	($65,693,719)
24	($75,216,145)
25	($37,347,453)
26	($54,605,837)
27	($54,605,837)
28	($54,605,837)
29	($45,230,979)
30	($61,637,926)
31	($53,762,956)
32	($90,755,500)
33	($75,545,087)
34	($94,459,806)
35	($58,213,345)
36	($56,751,560)
37	($61,496,222)
38	($60,032,026)
39	($56,751,560)
40	($56,751,560)
41	($56,751,560)
42	($56,152,233)
43	($46,448,124)
44	($37,009,695)
45	($76,466,943)
46	($84,318,972)

House	Total Expenditures (2016 Dollars)
47	($87,940,032)
48	($87,940,032)
49	($84,836,266)
50	($84,318,972)
51	($87,940,032)
52	($37,451,450)
53	($53,698,939)
54	($49,519,333)
55	($51,674,514)
56	($7,452,095)
57	($42,649,916)
58	($40,085,941)
59	($35,538,017)
60	($48,453,117)
61	($50,501,276)
62	($43,625,122)
63	($62,019,994)
64	($62,019,994)
65	($62,019,994)
66	($77,767,499)
67	($77,767,499)
68	($38,950,937)
69	($51,221,842)
70	($77,767,499)
71	($74,481,392)
72	($62,466,784)
73	($91,736,595)
74	($35,726,504)
75	($10,224,395)
76	($10,224,395)
77	($10,224,395)
78	($10,224,395)
79	($10,224,395)
80	($53,193,173)
81	($66,088,020)
82	($64,512,207)
83	($72,549,810)
84	($91,573,550)
85	($50,261,561)
86	($42,314,217)
87	($89,183,271)
88	($27,512,711)
89	($77,767,499)
90	($82,097,501)
91	($82,097,501)
92	($82,097,501)
93	($82,097,501)

House	Total Expenditures (2016 Dollars)
94	($82,097,501)
95	($82,097,501)
96	($82,097,501)
97	($82,097,501)
98	($82,097,501)
99	($82,097,501)
100	($91,038,828)
101	($81,195,331)
102	($91,038,828)
103	($91,038,828)
104	($91,038,828)
105	($91,038,828)
106	($62,019,994)
107	($91,038,828)
108	($91,038,828)
109	($91,038,828)
110	($91,038,828)
111	($92,962,183)
112	($91,038,828)
113	($92,962,183)
114	($92,962,183)
115	($92,962,183)
116	($91,830,421)
117	($91,830,421)
118	($91,830,421)
119	($91,830,421)
120	($91,830,421)
121	($91,830,421)
122	($91,830,421)
123	($91,830,421)
124	($91,830,421)
125	($91,830,421)
126	($83,188,787)
127	($83,188,787)
128	($83,188,787)
129	($83,188,787)
130	($83,188,787)
131	($83,188,787)
132	($83,188,787)
133	($83,188,787)
134	($83,188,787)
135	($83,188,787)
136	($37,451,450)
137	($81,208,101)
138	($81,208,101)
139	($81,208,101)
140	($81,208,101)

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

46

House	Total Expenditures (2016 Dollars)
141	($83,188,787)
142	($83,188,787)
143	($83,188,787)
144	($83,188,787)
145	($83,188,787)
146	($83,188,787)
147	($81,208,101)
148	($81,208,101)
149	($81,208,101)
150	($81,208,101)
TOTAL	**($10,436,670,697)**

NOTE: In cases in which a county was part of more than one district, allocations are based on the percentage of the population residing in a district. This c
SOURCE: US Multi-Regional Impact Assessment System, The Perryman Group

PERRYMAN GROUP

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

47

Results by Texas Senate District

The Potential Impact of Social Policy Legislation on Business Activity:
A Case Study of Actions Which Could Adversely Affect Tourism in the San Antonio Area and Texas

48

Senate	Total Expenditures (2016 Dollars)	Gross Product (2016 Dollars)	Personal Income (2016 Dollars)	Retail Sales (2016 Dollars)	Employment (Permanent Jobs)
1	($210,834,281)	($113,826,446)	($70,581,819)	($55,322,846)	-1,284
2	($194,221,636)	($102,085,787)	($62,781,402)	($41,515,372)	-1,099
3	($118,666,522)	($64,637,172)	($40,219,125)	($32,258,886)	-730
4	($199,012,496)	($102,447,753)	($63,750,346)	($45,266,065)	-1,133
5	($143,049,593)	($76,526,891)	($47,401,630)	($38,778,008)	-882
6	($236,723,968)	($117,311,387)	($72,417,305)	($39,953,319)	-1,201
7	($236,723,968)	($117,311,387)	($72,417,305)	($39,953,319)	-1,201
8	($217,864,378)	($114,096,576)	($70,393,690)	($50,616,526)	-1,275
9	($252,262,368)	($132,302,288)	($81,511,950)	($52,188,287)	-1,428
10	($247,995,108)	($130,950,275)	($80,878,497)	($53,689,500)	-1,429
11	($195,618,363)	($100,213,914)	($62,092,067)	($41,760,404)	-1,088
12	($203,913,697)	($105,420,195)	($64,618,762)	($45,875,939)	-1,153
13	($224,009,370)	($110,880,143)	($68,375,494)	($39,308,763)	-1,145
14	($241,874,655)	($130,413,770)	($80,559,366)	($58,527,855)	-1,482
15	($224,887,769)	($111,445,818)	($68,796,439)	($37,955,653)	-1,140
16	($264,352,937)	($136,132,993)	($83,306,733)	($47,934,850)	-1,425
17	($207,223,047)	($102,951,155)	($63,486,049)	($39,015,822)	-1,079
18	($154,684,667)	($79,280,450)	($48,801,727)	($38,283,920)	-879
19	($203,555,935)	($108,726,913)	($67,202,401)	($46,392,470)	-1,199
20	($207,531,288)	($109,125,138)	($67,675,807)	($48,422,619)	-1,222
21	($170,639,286)	($93,704,901)	($58,105,787)	($45,855,668)	-1,071
22	($251,733,544)	($132,634,426)	($81,661,052)	($63,582,471)	-1,479
23	($264,352,937)	($136,132,993)	($83,306,733)	($47,934,850)	-1,425
24	($162,217,835)	($88,065,153)	($54,491,710)	($42,147,421)	-999
25	($238,596,892)	($126,351,937)	($77,792,516)	($56,278,914)	-1,411
26	($255,173,908)	($135,189,070)	($83,436,094)	($55,732,511)	-1,478
27	($161,930,527)	($88,005,316)	($54,579,479)	($38,025,212)	-992
28	($176,754,649)	($94,471,433)	($58,093,560)	($44,398,375)	-1,052
29	($33,412,260)	($17,458,152)	($10,669,978)	($7,245,332)	-189
30	($167,150,840)	($89,821,361)	($55,542,049)	($43,765,612)	-1,023
31	($169,786,749)	($92,361,670)	($57,166,659)	($43,981,693)	-1,020
TOTAL	**($6,236,755,474)**	**($3,260,282,864)**	**($2,012,113,533)**	**($1,381,968,482)**	**-35,611**

The Estimated Initial Annual Impact of Losses in the Tourism Sector Associated with the Proposed Social Policy Legislation Regarding Bathroom Access on Business Activity in Texas: Results by Texas Senate District

NOTE: In cases in which a county was part of more than one district, allocations are based on the percentage of the population residing in a district. This convention is adopted because of a lack of subcounty data sufficient for allocation purposes. In some instances, this approach will result in districts which reflect the same proportion of a large urban county reporting identical results. Allocations reflect district maps as currently defined.
SOURCE: US Multi-Regional Impact Assessment System, The Perryman Group

PERRYMAN GROUP

	The Estimated Annual Impact (at Maturity) of Losses in the Tourism Sector Associated with the Proposed Social Policy Legislation Regarding Bathroom Access on Business Activity in Texas: Results by Texas Senate District				
Senate	Total Expenditures (2016 Dollars)	Gross Product (2016 Dollars)	Personal Income (2016 Dollars)	Retail Sales (2016 Dollars)	Employment (Permanent Jobs)
1	($352,812,928)	($190,478,709)	($118,112,568)	($92,577,996)	-2,148
2	($325,013,105)	($170,831,733)	($105,059,245)	($69,472,384)	-1,839
3	($198,578,158)	($108,164,716)	($67,303,226)	($53,982,455)	-1,222
4	($333,030,194)	($171,437,451)	($106,680,688)	($75,748,843)	-1,896
5	($239,381,117)	($128,061,131)	($79,322,526)	($64,891,642)	-1,476
6	($396,137,079)	($196,310,457)	($121,184,094)	($66,858,422)	-2,009
7	($396,137,079)	($196,310,457)	($121,184,094)	($66,858,422)	-2,009
8	($364,577,187)	($190,930,748)	($117,797,750)	($84,702,377)	-2,134
9	($422,139,247)	($221,396,433)	($136,403,196)	($87,332,583)	-2,390
10	($414,998,357)	($219,133,956)	($135,343,167)	($89,844,733)	-2,391
11	($327,350,406)	($167,699,314)	($103,905,702)	($69,882,423)	-1,821
12	($341,231,930)	($176,411,575)	($108,133,908)	($76,769,416)	-1,929
13	($374,860,300)	($185,548,326)	($114,420,473)	($65,779,814)	-1,915
14	($404,756,309)	($218,236,160)	($134,809,129)	($97,941,302)	-2,480
15	($376,330,225)	($186,494,934)	($115,124,889)	($63,515,501)	-1,908
16	($442,371,769)	($227,806,786)	($139,406,611)	($80,214,825)	-2,385
17	($346,769,840)	($172,279,851)	($106,238,411)	($65,289,603)	-1,806
18	($258,851,407)	($132,668,974)	($81,665,468)	($64,064,828)	-1,471
19	($340,633,246)	($181,945,082)	($112,457,404)	($77,633,784)	-2,007
20	($347,285,656)	($182,611,477)	($113,249,609)	($81,031,064)	-2,045
21	($285,550,083)	($156,807,045)	($97,235,007)	($76,735,494)	-1,792
22	($421,254,306)	($221,952,237)	($136,652,706)	($106,399,765)	-2,475
23	($442,371,769)	($227,806,786)	($139,406,611)	($80,214,825)	-2,385
24	($271,457,512)	($147,369,415)	($91,187,162)	($70,530,062)	-1,672
25	($399,271,256)	($211,439,035)	($130,179,045)	($94,177,893)	-2,361
26	($427,011,458)	($226,227,212)	($139,623,085)	($93,263,535)	-2,473
27	($270,976,727)	($147,269,283)	($91,334,037)	($63,631,902)	-1,661
28	($295,783,613)	($158,089,770)	($97,214,547)	($74,296,839)	-1,760
29	($55,912,527)	($29,214,707)	($17,855,285)	($12,124,436)	-316
30	($279,712,470)	($150,308,277)	($92,944,814)	($73,237,966)	-1,711
31	($284,123,436)	($154,559,263)	($95,663,458)	($73,599,558)	-1,706
TOTAL	($10,436,670,697)	($5,455,801,301)	($3,367,097,915)	($2,312,604,689)	-59,592

NOTE: In cases in which a county was part of more than one district, allocations are based on the percentage of the population residing in a district. This convention is adopted because of a lack of subcounty data sufficient for allocation purposes. In some instances, this approach will result in districts which reflect the same proportion of a large urban county reporting identical results. Allocations reflect district maps as currently defined.
SOURCE: US Multi-Regional Impact Assessment System, The Perryman Group

PERRYMAN GROUP