US Economy Studies
Study Code 229.101

23 June 1969
Preliminary Draft Report

CHARACTERISTICS OF POTENTIAL UNEMPLOYMENT PROBLEMS IN VIETNAM PROCUREMENT REDUCTIONS

by

Bernard Sobin
and
Irving Moder

A preliminary draft of Phase I Report under
Arms Control and Disarmament Agency Contract ACDA/E-168

RESEARCH ANALYSIS CORPORATION
McLean, Virginia 22101

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

CONTENTS

Summary 1

Problem - Approach - Conclusions

Conceptual Elements of the Problem of Employment Adjustments 4

Scope of the Present Report 7

The Survey Data 8

Selection of Local Areas for Study - USTES Survey - Coverage Limitations - Data Quality -

Highlights of the USTES Survey 17

Unemployment Levels after Six Months and Related Statistical Data

Appendixes

A. Sampling Frame Data 82
B. Letter of Transmittal and Questionnaire of USTES Survey 113
C. Tabulation of USTES Survey Numerical Data 121

Figures

1. Unemployment Rate Increases Related to 1968 Work Force 55
2. Layoffs and Unemployment Increments after 18 Months as Percentages of Work Force 62

Tables

1. USTES Data Used in Summary Tables 18
2. Distributions of Numbers of Areas and Unemployed by Unemployment Rates 50
3. Distributions of Numbers of Areas and Unemployed by Unemployment Rate Increase 51
4. Distributions of Number of Areas and Unemployment Increase 18 Months After Assumed Layoffs 54
5. Distributions of Numbers of Areas and Average Unemployment Increases, in Percentage Points 58
6. Distributions of Numbers of Areas and Unemployment Rate Increases, by Increase in Defense-Dependency Ratios 59
7. Characteristics of Work Force at Risk 63

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

SUMMARY

THE PROBLEM

Replacement of Vietnam procurement expenditures with a comparable amount of public and private expenditure could leave the aggregate, national demand for labor unchanged; but it would not necessarily provide jobs for all those laid off in geographic areas where the amount of Vietnam-related employment is particularly high in relation to other, local job opportunities. The purpose of this paper is to supply nation-wide statistical measures of the extent of severe local problems, statistical characteristics of the classes of areas where problems tend to be most serious, and descriptions of the potential problems in particular areas with large unemployment potential.

APPROACH

Broad outlines of the approach were specified in the arrangements under which Research Analysis Corporation undertook the project. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency staff arranged for the Department of Defense (DoD) to supply preliminary information on defense dependency and unemployment rates for local geographic areas. RAC staff, with assistance from DoD staff, used the DoD information to develop a smaller list of 99 for field surveys. The field surveys were managed by the United States Training and Employment Service (USTES) and the questionnaires were filled in by the various state field offices. The questionnaires were prepared by USTES after agreement on their general character by RAC, ACDA, and DoD representatives. They included requests for detailed

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

SUMMARY

THE PROBLEM

Replacement of Vietnam procurement expenditures with a comparable amount of public and private expenditure could leave the aggregate, national demand for labor unchanged; but it would not necessarily provide jobs for all those laid off in geographic areas where the amount of Vietnam-related employment is particularly high in relation to other, local job opportunities. The purpose of this paper is to supply nation-wide statistical measures of the extent of severe local problems, statistical characteristics of the classes of areas where problems tend to be most serious, and descriptions of the potential problems in particular areas with large unemployment potential.

APPROACH

Broad outlines of the approach were specified in the arrangements under which Research Analysis Corporation undertook the project. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency staff arranged for the Department of Defense (DoD) to supply preliminary information on defense dependency and unemployment rates for local geographic areas. RAC staff, with assistance from DoD staff, used the DoD information to develop a smaller list of 99 for field surveys. The field surveys were managed by the United States Training and Employment Service (USTES) and the questionnaires were filled in by the various state field offices. The questionnaires were prepared by USTES after agreement on their general character by RAC, ACDA, and DoD representatives. They included requests for detailed

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

data on Vietnam-related employment and projected effects on local unemployment rates six months after completion of layoffs of stipulated percentages of Vietnam-related employees. This report consists of tabulations of the replies and statistical analyses of the basic tables.

CONCLUSIONS

The data are insufficiently reliable for firm conclusions on the amount of unemployment to be expected for postulated percentages of reduction in Vietnam-related procurement. However, the following conclusions about characteristics of the problem appear justifiable.

(1) The following geographic areas, with others listed in Table 1 of the text, are among those in which postulated reductions in Vietnam-related procurement would either create severe unemployment problems or aggravate problems that are already serious:

Grantsville, West Virginia

Leesville, Louisiana

Rose City, Michigan

Riverbank, California

Centre, Alabama

(2) Six months after assumed layoffs, most areas and most of the absolute numbers of unemployed would be associated with low unemployment rates. Similarly, most areas and most increases in unemployment from 1968 would be associated with relatively small increases from 1962 in unemployment rates.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

(3) Areas with large work forces tend to be able to absorb stipulated percentages of loss of Vietnam procurement with less impact on unemployment rates than areas with smaller work forces.

(4) The 1968 defense-dependency ratio and the increase in defense-dependency ratio between 1965 and 1968 are both factors in explaining unemployment rates six months after postulated percentage loss of Vietnam-related jobs; but the increases in projected unemployment rates are consistently and significantly less than either the 1968 defense-dependency ratio or the increase in that ratio between 1965 and 1968.

(5) The Vietnam-related jobs of the areas of the survey have a percentage of males that does not seem significantly different from the percentage of jobs held by males in the civilian economy as a whole.

(6) Vietnam-related jobs of the area of the survey have a percentage of whites that appears to be somewhat lower than the percentage of jobs held by whites in the civilian economy as a whole.

(7) The survey data available is quite unclear as to the occupations and skill levels of those whose jobs are Vietnam-related, but the information presented has nothing to indicate that the jobs involve unusually high levels of skill or high degrees of specialization of training.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

CONCEPTUAL ELEMENTS OF THE PROBLEM OF EMPLOYMENT ADJUSTMENTS

It has been estimated officially that an ending of Vietnam military activity would ultimately involve reductions in resource use (much of which is not domestic procurement) at a rate of 19 billion dollars per year in 1968 prices.[1] One way to look at the problem of employment adjustments is to estimate the total amount of employment associated with 19 billion dollars and say that this is the amount forwhich an alternative aggregate demand must generate substitute jobs. In 1968 gross private product (gross national product minus wages and salaries of military personnel and of general government civilian employees) was 766.4 billion dollars and was associated with private employment of 65.7 million workers 16 years old and older, which implies an average of 85.7 thousand workers per billion dollars.[2] In general, therefore, 19 billion dollars of contribution to gross private product is associated with an employment that would be about 1.6 million workers directly and indirectly. Since some of the 19 billion dollars of Vietnam expenditure is used for foreign procurement and for pay and allowances of military and civilian personnel of the Department of Defense, the number of private jobs associated with Vietnam procurement may be expected to be less. The upper limit of 1.6 million workers amounts to about 3 percent of the 1968 average labor force.[2]

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

If the number of jobs at issue is interpreted more narrowly, as jobs in industries specializing in defense production, the total number is much smaller. The Census survey of defense products industries for 1968 covered reported employment of only 1.2 million workers for DOD procurement to support both Vietnam and all other DOD programs.3/

The aggregate percentage of the labor force potentially involved by any definition is not large enough for great difficulty in creating an equal number of jobs by some combination of autonomous growth of the economy, tax reduction to permit larger consumer expenditures, and substitution of other Federal expenditure programs for the Vietnam programs. Conceivably, however, there can be considerable difficulty in matching the new jobs to the skill levels, occupational specialties, and geographic locations of those affected by a possible ending of Vietnam hostilities. The economies of some geographic areas may be heavily dependent on production of types of goods procured for Vietnam, and it is conceivable that the kinds of employees engaged in some kinds of Vietnam production would not be suitable for the kinds of job vacancies that might replace such jobs in Vietnam procurement.

Although 19 billion dollars has been estimated as being the portion of military expenditure that is associated with the Vietnam hostilities, there is some ambiguity about which 19 billion dollars. The money spent in Vietnam itself is clearly identifiable as for Vietnam. However, domestic procurement for Vietnam consists largely of kinds of items that were procured before Vietnam and will continue to be procured after Vietnam, though probably in lesser quantity. Where there are several sources of supply for an item, it may not be clear how any procurement reduction will be divided among all sources. The distribution of a procurement reduction need

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

not be in proportion to the amounts of current production that get shipped to Vietnam.

Even where there is only a single source of supply, an ending of Vietnam hostilities would be associated with an uncertain timing of procurement cutbacks. The ending of hostilities may be gradual and the Department of Defense may wish to build stocks of some items to higher levels before assembly lines are closed down. Rebuilding of inventories may be particularly important in cases where forces not in Vietnam have reduced their holdings of authorized equipment allowances in order to supply US forces in combat in Vietnam.

Another factor in procurement reductions is the possibility that US combat involvement in Vietnam may be reduced sharply but with South Vietnamese troops replacing US troops. The procurement reduction associated with withdrawal of US troops could then be offset in part by procurement increases to support the higher level of combat activity by South Vietnamese forces.

The problem may be summarized as follows. Less than 1.6 million private jobs plus jobs of Defense Department military and civilian personnel are associated with Vietnam hostilities. This is not an unmanageable aggregate number but the jobs lost may be largely concentrated in geographic areas, skill levels, and occupations for which ordinary expansions of national job vacancies would be irrevelant. However, the less than 1.6 million private jobs associated with Vietnamese procurement cannot in all cases be separated from jobs associated with other military procurement; and the entire number of Vietnam jobs involved would not be affected immediately for two reasons: (1) procurement may continue to rebuild inventories before closing of assembly lines; and (2) the ending of Vietnamese hostilities may be gradual or may reduce needs of US forces while increasing needs of allied forces.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

SCOPE OF THE PRESENT REPORT

The scope of the present report is constrained by the time available for research and by the forms of data that could be made quickly available. The data were Department of Defense records of geographic distribution of various kinds of Defense procurement and changes in such procurement since 1965 plus a special survey of 99 of these areas by United States Training and Employment Service (USTES) for this project. These data constraints, discussed in more detail in the next section, had the effect of limiting the possible scope of the present report to identification of areas with the most serious potential problems in the event of procurement reductions estimated as arbitrary percentages of current procurement and to description of some characteristics of employees and geographic areas in which serious procurement reductions could occur. The characteristics covered are among those considered significant for analysis of the process of adjustment to any loss of jobs in Vietnam procurement. The present paper does not deal with how any procurement reductions would be distributed among the areas presently dependent on Vietnam procurement; and it does not attempt to estimate any timing of procurement reductions. All analysis is in terms of arbitrary assumptions of 25, 50, and 100 percent reductions, over a standard 12 months period, in Vietnam-related employment.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

THE SURVEY DATA

SELECTION OF LOCAL AREAS FOR STUDY

The basic data used to prepare a local area "sampling frame" for selection of the local areas to be investigated was contained in a table, "Estimated Vietnam Defense Prime Contract & Direct Hire Civilian Employment Impacts." The table was prepared by Messrs. D. F. Bradford and B. Whiting of the Office of Economic Adjustment, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations and Logistics, Department of Defense (DoD).

For each of 249 areas where there were indications that Vietnam-related military items were produced, the table contained the following data:

City and county identification

Population count (as of 1965)

1968 defense employment:

- Total (number of civilian employees)
- Impact (percent of work force)

Increase in defense-dependent employment from June 1965:

- Total (number of civilian employees)
- Impact (percent of work force)
- Contracts (civilian employment at other than military installations)
- Bases (civilian employment at military installations)

Major products (produced) or (military) installations (in the area)

Of the 249 areas listed, 184 were associated with an incremental

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

increase in the defense-dependency employment ratio of two or more percentage points between June 1965 and 1968. Of the remaining 65 areas, all of which had a positive incremental increase in the defense-dependency employment ratio of less than two percentage points, 64 had incremental increases in defense-dependent employment of 1,000 or more and one showed an 800 employee defense-dependent incremental increase. The completeness of coverage was qualified by the statement "The reported or factored employment data accounted for practically all direct hire civilian workers at installations in the United States; practically all prime employment in the United States; and about 10 percent of all subcontract employment."

The sampling frame was constructed by allocating the areas to subsets of the universe of the 249 areas on the basis of their incremental increase in the defense-dependency employment ratio, followed by their total defense-dependency ratio as of 1968, further subdivided by the latest available unemployment rate appropriate to the area under consideration. Geographically, the areas were distributed over the nine Census-defined geographic divisions. The cellular entries consisted of the sum of the defense-dependency rate and the unemployment rate, as a proxy measure of the possible total direct (i.e., neglecting the defense "multiplier" effect) unemployment consequent upon cessation of DoD-generated employment in the area. As an example of the outcome of this classification procedure, in the New England geographic division, there were two of the universe of the 249 areas under the multiple classification of an increase in the defense-dependency ratio of 5.0 through 9.9 percentage points, defense-dependency ratio of 10 percent or more, and

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

unemployment rate of under 3.5 percent. The cellular entries for these areas were 14.6 and 16.9 percent.*

All areas with an incremental increase in the defense-dependency ratio between June 1965 and 1968 of at least 5.0 percentage points, except for those areas where the DoD-generated employment was obviously not for Vietnam-related procurement, e.g., production of aerospace items, Air Force bases, were denoted as eligible for sample selection. The total so identified was 71 areas. Thirty-five additional areas were designated as eligible for the sample, using as criteria for eligibility evidence that Vietnam-related military items were being produced, a substantial area unemployment rate, or a substantial increase in DoD-generated employment. In total, then, this preliminary review procedure resulted in the selection of 106 possible sample area candidates. A final review, made in conjunction with Dr. Paul Downing of DoD, a member of the Economic Information Survey Staff who had additional information on the kinds of defense-related activity in the area, reduced the number of areas selected for the sample to 99.

USTES SURVEY

The Division of Job Market Information and Economic Analysis of USTES under supervision of Mr. Abraham Kuptzin, prepared a questionnaire and a letter of transmittal** to be sent to the regional offices of the Labor Department for distribution to the State employment security agencies and their constituent local offices. The questionnaire was prepared on the

---

*See Appendix A for sampling frame.

**See Appendix B for transmittal letter and questionnaire.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

basis of agreements about the general characteristics among participants in the study at meetings attended by staff of the Council of Economic Advisors (CEA), DoD, Labor Department, and RAC, and presided over by Messrs. Henry Wyner and Dominic Sorrentino, of ACDA, who coordinated the joint efforts in various offices of Government agencies and RAC. Mr. Kuptzin submitted a preliminary draft of the questionnaire to study participants for review, but the final version and the accompanying letter of transmittal was a USTES responsibility.

The field offices could not be told how large or how fast the cutbacks would be in their areas primarily because no one knew. Instead they were asked to respond to a variety of questions about characteristics of employees who might be affected and about various statistical characteristics of the areas under alternative assumptions of 25, 50, and 100 percent cutbacks in Vietnam-related defense employment over a one-year period. The critical questions, however, were the expected effects on work force and on unemployment 6 months after the completion of the postulated layoffs, and characteristics of those laid off.

All tabulating of the returns plus the editing that was feasible was done at RAC. Some guidance as to procedures to be followed was available from discussion of preliminary RAC plans with personnel of ACDA and the Council of Economic Advisors.

COVERAGE LIMITATIONS

The coverage in this survey of defense-generated employment subject to layoffs in the event of curtailment of Vietnam-related military procurement has at least two limitations.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

The first limitation is the underreporting of employees-at-risk in plants of "secondary" suppliers to prime contractors or military installations in two ways. The instructions accompanying the questionnaire stipulated "Information on secondary layoffs should relate only to those establishments which sell parts, supplies or services directly to military installations or directly to firms located in the area which manufacture or assemble material for use by the Armed Forces." Consequently, the reporting of employees-at-risk in secondary supplier plants is limited to accounting only for those employees involved in supplying prime contractors and military installations in the same area as the secondary supplier. Further, by the qualification that "...secondary layoffs should relate only to those establishments which sell ... directly to military installations or directly to firms ... which manufacture or assemble material for use by the Armed Forces," only first-tier secondary suppliers have been considered. No second-, third-, etc., tier secondary supplier employees-at-risk were included in the possible employee layoff counts. The ratios of total secondary layoffs to total direct, or primary, layoffs to be expected under the 100 percent layoff assumption derived from responses to the survey questionnaire for 45 areas where the secondary layoffs were stated explicitly range from 0 to 68 percent with an average of 31 percent. It is likely that field offices omitting explicit references to secondary layoffs in many cases made zero provision for such layoffs in their totals; so that the average ratio of secondary to direct layoffs implicit in the layoff and unemployment estimates for all areas of the survey is less than 31 percent. However, in previous RAC studies of military procurement

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

economic impact, rarely ever did prime contractors' value added account for as much as 50 percent of the value of the military items production. First-, second-, third-, etc., tier secondary suppliers accounted for the remaining 50 odd percent of the value added, and very likely for a similar portion of employment.

A second known limitation in the survey coverage of possible post-Vietnam layoffs is the undercoverage resulting from consideration of employment-at-risk only in plants with 100 or more employees. As a probably extreme indication of the resulting understatement of possible layoffs, the 1963 Census of Manufactures[4] reported that for the industry coded to SIC 3599, Miscellaneous machinery except electrical, 99 percent of the 12,090 establishments coded to this industry each had average employment of less than 100 employees and accounted for 71 percent of the industry's total employment and 66 percent of the value of shipments by the industry. Census Bureau includes SIC 3599 in its defense-related industries classification.[5]

A third kind of undercoverage is the omission of any unemployment generated by loss of spending ability by those losing Vietnam-related jobs. The omission from the questionnaire was deliberate because of difficulty in determining how much those losing jobs would reduce their spending. However, it may actually be important for some areas.

DATA QUALITY

Editing, Consistency Checking, and Adjusting of Replies

Some numerical relationships were used to edit and check the consistency of the responses made by the field offices to the questionnaire,

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

shown in Appendix B.

The primary purpose of the editing and checking was to validate the reasonableness of the numbers shown in relation to each other for Table 1 of this report. Little could be done in the time available to check on the reasonableness of the numbers themselves, except for some gross review. Where possible, members of RAC's Technical Staff assigned to this study estimated missing values and made adjustments to numbers that seemed not to be responsive to the questions asked. These procedures permitted using the answers for 85 of the 99 areas in the sample for Table 1.

The following examples illustrate the methods used by RAC staff to supply missing data and to adjust questionable responses. If no value was entered by USTES respondents for the expected unemployment rate 18 months after the assumed layoffs began, and if the calendar year 1968 average work force was relatively large in relation to the possible defense-related employment layoffs, the RAC editors inserted the 1968 average unemployment rate. If calendar year 1968 average work force, unemployment and unemployment rate estimates were omitted on the survey form as received, and if the numbers shown for the work force and unemployment were in an ascending or descending sequence for June 1965, June 1967 and June 1968, the assumption was made by RAC editors that the 1968 calendar year average value was in the same relation to the value shown for June 1968 as the calendar year 1965 average was to June 1965, and the unemployment rate was a consequent estimate of the estimates so derived. Also, if there seemed to be discrepancies in totals as related to their components, and if the components seemed reasonable in meeting the consistency checks, the

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

total was adjusted. Where the total seemed reasonable, a component was sometimes changed.

Ambiguity of Replies

Of probably greater significance for data quality than the numerical errors disclosed and perhaps generated by the editing procedure are ambiguities created by differing interpretations among respondents and sometimes among questions by a single respondent of how the scope of job coverage should be related to Vietnam. Three levels of scope appear to have been used at different times: (1) defense-related jobs, (2) jobs in production of products used or usable in Vietnam, and (3) the jobs that in the judgment of the field office would be eliminated if the Vietnam hostilities ended. For example, in Section B of the questionnaire, respondents were asked to list firms producing for defense procurement (with a note elsewhere that only establishments with Vietnam-related business be considered in the questionnaire), and then they were asked to state the number of jobs that would be eliminated in the 50 percent layoff assumptions. Some respondents automatically calculated one-half of the particular defense jobs listed; others put down numbers much smaller than one-half for very similar kinds of establishments. As a result, differences among areas in estimates of the number of jobs at risk with Vietnam procurement cutbacks depend on differences in definition as well as differences in area conditions.

A less serious kind of ambiguity occurred in the counting of layoffs. Once an establishment was identified as producing for Vietnam, many respondents automatically considered that a 50 percent layoff assumption

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

implied that 50 percent of the employees would be laid off. Then, if the plant could shift to other work, the questionnaire had provision for "rehiring" of workers by the same plant. Other respondents, however, seemed to consider that a plant which could convert to other production would not lay off any of its employees and entered zeros for the number to be laid off.

Forecasting Errors

Errors of unassessable magnitude occurred in the field office forecasts of unemployment rates six months after completion of the layoffs. The estimating task facing the field offices was extraordinarily difficult. They had to estimate how many of those losing Vietnam-related jobs would out-migrate, retire, or find other jobs and, at least in principle, they had to estimate how many of those finding jobs would do so at the expense of local residents not directly involved in the Vietnam production reductions. Basic to all this was a required knowledge of what job opportunities there already were (which is part of the normal work of a field office) plus knowledge of what new opportunities were likely to appear over the next 18 months (regarding which the office would not necessarily have extensive information immediately at hand). With this formidable task, the field offices were limited to a few days of response time; and they were instructed not to obtain any new data from the establishments involved or from municipal officials.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE USTES SURVEY

A key part of the USTES survey for present purposes is the estimate of unemployment rate in each local area 6 months after completion of layoffs at the postulated 25, 50, and 100 percent of workers-at-risk. The need for government action is clear when the unemployment rate is high and largely attributable to the procurement reduction. This section of the paper includes an identification of areas of high potential unemployment and increases in unemployment; and it presents a statistical analysis of relationships between potential unemployment and other area characteristics described in the USTES survey.

Another important part of the survey is the information on characteristics of the defense production employees who may lose their jobs. This section of the paper describes typical survey comments regarding age, sex, race, skill level, and occupation for employees-at-risk.

UNEMPLOYMENT LEVELS AFTER SIX MONTHS AND RELATED STATISTICAL DATA

Table 1 has the data for 85 geographic areas having reports that were sufficiently complete and internally consistent for use in the statistical analysis. The table has a number of different 3-page sections, each with a different arrangement of the 85 lines of data. The first arrangement is by geographic code. Later arrangements are by size of unemployment rate six months after layoffs or change in unemployment rate and by size of various area characteristics having possible relevance as determining unemployment rate or change in unemployment rate. Frequency distributions, scatter diagrams, and text following Table 1 examine various statistical characteristics of the 85 areas.

Areas of Greatest Potential Unemployment Rate

The most serious unemployment measured by predicted unemployment rate six months after a 50% layoff is in Grantsville, West Virginia, (area code 505).

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 1. USTES DATA USED IN SUMMARY TABLES

	Area Code	Unemployment rate (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	Unemployment rate increase (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	1968 work force (divided by 10)	1968 defense dependency ratio (%)	1965 to 1968 increase in defense dependency ratio (%)	Layoff number in 100% case (divided by 10)	Unemployed after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	Unemployed increase after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	
Bridgeport Area (Conn.)	101	5.2	6.3	8.2	1.0	2.1	4.0	1707013.0	3.9		800	888	1075	1400	171	358	683	C
Burlington Area (Vt.)	102	3.1	3.7	4.4	0.3	0.9	1.6	404510.1	5.0		335	125	150	178	12	36	65	C
Nashua City (N.H.)	103	2.5	6.0	8.0	1.1	4.6	6.6	393014.7	9.7		570	98	236	314	43	81	259	C
N. Dighton City (Mass.)	105	4.4	4.4	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	3020 8.7	5.4		107	133	133	133	0	0	0	C
Norwalk Area (Conn.)	106	3.5	3.7	4.0	0.1	0.3	0.6	537011.5	6.0		225	188	199	215	5	16	32	C
Waterbury Area (Conn.)	107	5.8	6.1	6.9	0.5	0.8	1.3	9070 6.5	5.5		460	526	553	626	45	73	118	C
Boston Area (Mass.)	121	3.2	3.2	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.1	140290 5.5	1.5		12400	4489	4489	4630	0	0	140	C
Lawrence Area (Mass.)	122	4.8	4.8	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	9300 5.2	1.5		385	446	446	446	0	0	0	C
Binghamton Area (N.Y.)	201	3.5	3.5	3.8	0.3	0.3	0.6	12360 7.5	4.9		70	433	433	470	37	37	74	C
Tobyhanna (Pa.)	202	1.7	1.7	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	241016.3	4.9		12	41	41	41	0	0	0	C
New Brunswick (N.J.)	221	4.5	4.6	4.9	0.0	0.0	0.3	28390 2.0	1.0		548	1278	1306	1391	0	0	85	C
Paterson Area (N.J.)	222	4.2	5.0	6.7	0.1	0.9	2.6	55710 4.6	0.8		2590	2340	2786	2733	56	501	1448	C
Philadelphia Area (Pa.)	223	3.4	3.7	4.3	0.3	0.6	1.2	205040 5.3	1.7		2876	6971	7586	8817	615	1230	4260	C
Baraboo (Wisc.)	301	3.5	3.8	4.3	0.0	0.2	0.7	200018.7	18.2		535	70	76	86	0	4	14	C
Crane Area (Ind.)	302	5.0	5.5	7.0	0.5	1.0	2.5	953714.6	6.5		680	477	525	668	48	95	238	C
Eau Claire (Wisc.)	303	4.0	5.5	7.0	0.5	2.0	3.5	2828 9.0	9.0		270	113	156	198	14	57	99	C
Huntington (Ind.)	304	2.6	2.7	2.9	0.1	0.2	0.4	1353 9.0	6.0		100	35	37	39	1	3	5	C
Marion (Ill.)	305	6.5	7.0	8.0	0.0	0.5	1.5	4090 8.0	8.0		28	266	286	327	0	20	61	C
Rose City (Mich.)	306	14.6	14.6	14.7	0.2	0.2	0.3	312 6.7	6.7		18	46	46	46	1	1	1	C
Bloomington (Ill.)	307	2.1	2.1	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	4662 5.1	5.1		110	98	98	98	0	0	0	C
Cadillac (Mich.)	308	7.8	7.9	8.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	1512 4.0	4.0		22	118	119	121	0	2	3	C
Escanaba (Mich.)	310	7.5	7.8	8.2	0.2	0.5	0.9	1122 5.1	4.7		34	84	88	92	2	6	10	C
Indianapolis Area (Ind.)	311	2.1	2.2	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	46410 6.0	2.2		370	975	1021	1067	0	0	0	C
Marysville (Mich.)	312	5.8	5.8	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	3740 2.6	2.3		62	217	217	221	0	0	0	C
Standish (Mich.)	313	7.2	8.0	9.5	0.7	1.5	3.0	26811.6	5.8		16	19	21	25	2	4	8	C
Detroit Area (Mich.)	321	3.0	3.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	165100 1.3	0.5		915	4953	4953	5118	0	0	0	C
Toledo Area (Ohio)	322	3.0	3.1	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	26920 1.6	1.2		400	807	835	861	0	0	27	C

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 1. USTES DATA USED IN SUMMARY TABLES

Area	Code	Unemployment rate (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	Unemployment rate increase (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	1968 work force (divided by 10)	1968 defense dependency ratio (%)	1965 to 1968 increase in defense dependency ratio (%)	Layoff number in 100% case (divided by 10)	Unemployed after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	Unemployed increase after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	
Burlington (Iowa)	401	4.3	8.2	12.0	2.5	6.4	10.2	2820	21.6	15.3	682	121	231	338	71	180	288	C
Ft. Calhoun (Neb.)	402	3.1	3.6	4.1	0.4	0.9	1.4	477	6.4	6.4	29	15	17	20	2	4	7	C
Ft. Leavenworth (Kans.)	403	3.2	3.2	3.3	0.6	0.6	0.7	1415	14.8	2.2	10	45	45	47	8	8	10	C
Ft. Leonard Wood Area (Mo.)	404	5.0	8.0	18.0	0.8	3.8	13.8	920	20.1	8.0	267	46	74	166	7	35	127	C
Grand Island (Neb.)	405	4.0	6.5	10.0	2.1	4.6	8.1	2232	21.8	21.4	400	89	145	223	47	103	181	C
W. Plains (Mo.)	409	5.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	890	8.3	5.5	22	45	45	45	0	0	0	C
Kansas City Area (Mo.)	421	3.9	4.0	4.3	0.1	0.2	0.5	44970	2.5	1.7	1206	1754	1799	1934	45	90	225	C
Columbus Area (Ga.)	501	4.3	4.6	5.4	0.5	0.8	1.6	8360	10.1	5.1	300	359	385	451	42	67	134	C
Darien (Ga.)	502	3.5	3.8	4.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	187	10.0	10.0	15	7	7	8	0	0	0	C
Forest City (N.C.)	504	2.5	2.5	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1802	7.4	7.4	20	45	45	45	0	0	0	C
Grantsville (W. Va.)	505	18.0	20.0	22.0	1.7	3.7	5.7	257	16.7	10.0	15	46	51	57	4	10	15	C
Homerville (Ga.)	506	3.8	3.8	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	236	20.0	16.0	32	9	9	9	0	0	0	C
Jacksonville (N.C.)	507	5.1	5.1	5.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1857	16.9	2.2	0	95	95	95	0	0	0	C
Lumberton (N.C.)	508	6.9	6.9	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	3406	3.4	3.1	20	235	235	238	0	0	3	C
Macon Area (GA.)	509	3.4	4.1	6.0	0.5	1.2	3.1	8990	24.0	6.1	430	306	369	539	45	108	279	C
Radford Area (VA.)	511	2.4	2.4	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	4098	27.3	19.0	462	98	98	98	0	0	0	C
Raeford (N.C.)	512	4.6	4.6	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	634	11.1	7.8	0	29	29	29	0	0	0	C
St. Augustine (Fla.)	513	6.9	7.6	11.4	4.7	5.4	9.2	983	10.0	5.0	80	68	75	112	46	53	90	C
Trion Ga.)	515	0.0	4.1	5.7	0.0	0.4	2.0	827	16.9	9.6	44	0	34	47	0	3	17	C
Wallace (S.C.)	516	6.2	6.3	6.6	0.2	0.3	0.6	1170	8.1	6.5	12	73	74	77	2	4	7	C
Huntington Area (W. Va.)	521	5.9	5.9	5.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	9760	1.8	1.6	15	576	576	566	0	0	0	C
Bristol-Kingsport (Tenn.)	601	4.0	5.1	7.1	.9	2.0	4.0	6448	18.5	9.8	464	258	329	458	58	129	258	C
Centre (Ala.)	602	8.0	10.3	11.3	2.0	4.3	5.3	431	11.2	5.9	89	34	44	49	9	19	23	C
Centreville (Tenn.)	603	4.2	4.7	5.0	0	0	0	333	19.4	8.3	22	14	16	17	0	0	0	C
Columbia (Miss.)	604	7.5	7.6	7.7	0.0	0.1	0.2	789	19.0	12.4	17	59	60	61	0	1	2	C
Ft. Knox Area (Ky.)	605	6.2	7.4	11.3	3.5	4.7	8.6	2230	20.9	7.4	393	138	165	252	78	105	192	C
Ft. Rucker Area (Ala.)	606	4.0	8.5	12.0	1.3	5.8	9.3	1506	31.6	14.6	400	60	128	181	20	87	140	C
Gadsden (Ala.)	607	6.0	6.3	7.4	.4	.7	1.8	3460	5.8	5.5	180	208	218	256	14	24	62	C
Golden (Miss.)	608	5.6	5.6	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	2918	11.3	11.3	75	163	163	163	0	0	0	C

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 1. USTES DATA USED IN SUMMARY TABLES

Area	Code	Unemployment rate (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	Unemployment rate increase (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	1968 work force (divided by 10)	1968 defense dependency ratio (%)	1965 to 1968 increase in defense dependency ratio (%)	Layoff number in 100% case (divided by 10)	Unemployed after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	Unemployed increase after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	
Greenville (Tenn.)	609	7.0	7.5	8.9	.8	1.3	2.7	1864	5.8	5.8	61	130	140	166	15	24	50	C
Huntsville (Ala.)	610	3.7	3.9	4.1	.2	.4	.6	9370	16.3	2.0	145	347	365	384	19	37	56	C
Kosciuski (Miss.)	611	8.6	9.0	10.0	0.8	1.2	2.2	651	5.0	3.3	30	56	59	65	5	8	14	C
Toone (Tenn.)	615	4.2	4.9	6.1	1.7	2.4	3.6	833	7.9	6.3	30	35	41	51	14	20	30	C
Tullahoma Area (Tenn.)	616	3.4	3.4	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.1	1435	34.0	2.2	62	49	49	50	0	0	1	C
Chattanooga Area (Tenn.)	621	3.1	3.2	3.3	0.1	0.2	0.3	14200	2.2	1.9	300	440	454	469	14	28	43	C
Memphis Area (Tenn.)	622	2.6	3.0	3.5	0	0	.5	31630	2.7	.9	350	822	949	1107	0	0	158	C
Batesville (Ark.)	701	8.2	9.1	12.9	3.1	4.0	7.8	828	13.3	13.3	67	68	75	107	26	33	65	C
Beeville (Tex.)	702	5.0	6.2	7.5	2.1	3.3	4.6	6901	1.9	7.5	49	35	43	52	14	23	32	C
Bonham (Tex.)	703	2.0	3.0	5.0	.0	.0	1.4	844	6.0	6.0	86	17	25	42	0	0	12	C
Camden (Ark.)	704	5.3	8.8	14.4	2.8	6.3	11.9	4031	4.1	12.1	187	21	35	58	11	25	48	C
Cuero (Tex.)	705	2.5	2.7	3.0	.0	.0	.2	729	9.3	9.3	15	18	20	22	0	0	1	C
Greenville (Tex.)	706	3.8	4.3	5.4	.5	1.0	2.1	1840	22.5	9.7	230	70	79	99	9	18	39	C
Lawton (Okla.)	707	4.6	4.8	5.6	.2	.4	1.2	2645	18.3	6.4	125	122	127	148	5	11	32	C
Leesville (La.)	708	9.6	14.8	30.0	4.8	10.0	25.2	953	33.0	15.0	334	91	141	286	46	95	240	C
McAlester (Okla)	709	6.1	7.9	11.8	.1	1.9	5.8	1505	22.4	15.1	240	92	119	178	2	29	87	C
Magnolia (Ark.)	710	5.3	6.2	7.9	0.9	1.8	3.5	908	10.9	8.7	67	48	72	74	8	16	32	C
Marshall (Tex.)	711	3.0	3.5	4.0	.4	.9	1.4	1860	16.9	10.2	344	56	65	74	7	17	26	C
Mena (Ark.)	712	6.1	7.3	9.7	1.1	2.3	4.7	450	11.7	9.3	32	27	33	44	5	10	21	C
Mineral Wells (Tex.)	713	3.2	5.3	11.7	.8	2.9	9.3	1311	11.9	6.9	400	42	69	153	10	38	122	C
Post (Tex.)	714	1.5	2.5	3.0	.4	1.4	1.9	284	11.2	9.0	17	4	7	9	1	4	5	C
Shreveport Area (La.)	715	4.5	5.7	10.3	1.3	2.5	7.1	11785	9.7	7.8	1020	530	672	1214	153	295	837	C
Texarkana Area (Tex.)	716	4.4	6.0	10.0	1.9	3.5	7.5	4750	35.6	19.4	1023	209	285	475	90	166	356	C
Waco Tex.)	721	4.2	4.4	4.8	.2	.4	.8	6373	4.0	1.4	199	268	280	306	13	25	51	C
Raton (N. Mex.)	802	6.6	6.8	7.0	0.5	0.7	0.9	505	2.2	2.2	10	33	34	35	3	4	5	C
Grants Pass (Ore.)	901	8.2	8.4	8.5	0.0	0.0	0.1	1326	4.4	2.2	20	109	111	113	0	0	1	C
Riverbank (Cal.)	902	11.0	12.0	13.0	1.4	2.4	3.4	7430	4.3	4.0	170	817	892	966	104	178	253	C
Stockton (Cal.)	903	7.0	7.5	8.2	.4	.9	1.6	12080	7.7	4.7	380	846	906	991	48	109	193	C
San Francisco Area (Cal.)	921	4.0	4.8	5.6	0.0	0.8	1.6	14063	0	4.2	1.0	6450	5625	6750	7875	0	1125	2250	C

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 1. USTES DATA USED IN SUMMARY TABLES
(with alternative sorts each identified by check under appropriate column)

Area Code	Unemployment rate (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	Unemployment rate increase (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	1968 work force (divided by 10)	1968 defense dependency ratio (%)	1965 to 1968 increase in defense dependency ratio (%)	Layoff number in 100% case (divided by 10)	Unemployed after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	Unemployed increase after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	
515	0.0	4.1	5.7	0.0	0.4	2.0	82	16.9	9.6	44	0	34	47	0	3	17	C
714	1.5	2.5	3.0	.4	1.4	1.9	284	11.2	9.0	17	4	7	9	1	4	5	C
202	1.7	1.7	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	2410	16.3	4.9	12	41	41	41	0	0	0	C
703	2.0	3.0	5.0	.0	.0	1.4	844	6.0	6.0	86	17	25	42	0	0	12	C
307	2.1	2.1	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	4662	5.1	5.1	110	98	98	98	0	0	0	C
311	2.1	2.2	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	4641	0	6.0	2.2	370	975	1021	1067	0	0	0 C
511	2.4	2.4	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	4098	27.3	19.0	462	98	98	98	0	0	0	C
103	2.5	6.0	8.0	1.1	4.6	6.6	3930	14.7	9.7	570	98	236	314	43	81	259	C
504	2.5	2.5	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1802	7.4	7.4	20	45	45	45	0	0	0	C
705	2.5	2.7	3.0	.0	.0	.2	729	9.3	9.3	15	18	20	22	0	0	1	C
304	2.6	2.7	2.9	0.1	0.2	0.4	1353	9.0	6.0	100	35	37	39	1	3	5	C
622	2.6	3.0	3.5	0	0	.5	3163	0	2.7	.9	350	822	949	1107	0	0	158 C
321	3.0	3.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1651	00	1.3	0.5	915	4953	4953	5118	0	0	0 C
322	3.0	3.1	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	2692	0	1.6	1.2	400	807	835	861	0	0	27 C
711	3.0	3.5	4.0	.4	.9	1.4	1860	16.9	10.2	344	56	65	74	7	17	26	C
102	3.1	3.7	4.4	0.3	0.9	1.6	4045	10.1	5.0	335	125	150	178	12	36	65	C
402	3.1	3.6	4.1	0.4	0.9	1.4	477	6.4	6.4	29	15	17	20	2	4	7	C
621	3.1	3.2	3.3	0.1	0.2	0.3	1420	0	2.2	1.9	300	440	454	469	14	28	43 C
121	3.2	3.2	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.1	1402	90	5.5	1.5	12400	4489	4489	4630	0	0	140 C
403	3.2	3.2	3.3	0.6	0.6	0.7	1415	14.8	2.2	10	45	45	47	8	8	10	C
713	3.2	5.3	11.7	.8	2.9	9.3	1311	11.9	6.9	400	42	69	153	10	38	122	C
223	3.4	3.7	4.3	0.3	0.6	1.2	2050	40	5.3	1.7	2876	6971	7586	8817	615	1230	4260 C
509	3.4	4.1	6.0	0.5	1.2	3.1	8990	24.0	6.1	430	306	369	539	45	108	279	C
616	3.4	3.4	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.1	1435	34.0	2.2	62	49	49	50	0	0	1	C
106	3.5	3.7	4.0	0.1	0.3	0.6	5370	11.5	6.0	225	188	199	215	5	16	32	C
201	3.5	3.5	3.8	0.3	0.3	0.6	1236	0	7.5	4.9	70	433	433	470	37	37	74 C
301	3.5	3.8	4.3	0.0	0.2	0.7	2000	18.7	18.2	535	70	76	86	0	4	14	C
502	3.5	3.8	4.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1871	0.0	10.0	15	7	7	8	0	0	0	C
610	3.7	3.9	4.1	.2	.4	.6	9370	16.3	2.0	145	347	365	384	19	37	56	C

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 1. USTES DATA USED IN SUMMARY TABLES
(with alternative sorts each identified by check under appropriate column)

Area code	Unemployment rate (%) after 18 months; with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	Unemployment rate increase (%) after 18 months; with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	1968 work force (divided by 10)	1968 defense dependency ratio (%)	1965 to 1968 increase in defense dependency ratio (%)	Layoff number in 100% case (divided by 10)	Unemployed after 18 months; with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	Unemployed increase after 18 months; with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	
506	3.8	3.8	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	2362	0.0	16.0	32	9	9	9	0	0	0	C
706	3.8	4.3	5.4	.5	1.0	2.1	18402	2.5	9.7	230	70	79	99	9	18	39	C
421	3.9	4.0	4.3	0.1	0.2	0.5	4497	0	2.5	1.7	1206	1754	1799	1934	45	90	225	C
303	4.0	5.5	7.0	0.5	2.0	3.5	282	8.0	9.0	270	113	156	198	14	57	99	C
405	4.0	6.5	10.0	2.1	4.6	8.1	22322	1.8	21.4	400	89	145	223	47	103	181	C
601	4.0	5.1	7.1	.9	2.0	4.0	64481	8.5	9.8	464	258	329	458	58	129	258	C
606	4.0	8.5	12.0	1.3	5.8	9.3	15063	1.6	14.6	400	60	128	181	20	87	140	C
921	4.0	4.8	5.6	0.0	0.8	1.6	14063	0	4.2	1.0	6450	5625	6750	7875	0	1125	2250	C
222	4.2	5.0	6.7	0.1	0.9	2.6	5571	0	4.6	0.8	2590	2340	2786	2733	56	501	1448	C
603	4.2	4.7	5.0	0	0	0	3331	9.4	8.3	22	14	16	17	0	0	0	C
615	4.2	4.9	6.1	1.7	2.4	3.6	833	7.9	6.3	30	35	41	51	14	20	30	C
721	4.2	4.4	4.8	.2	.4	.8	6373	4.0	1.4	199	268	280	306	13	25	51	C
401	4.3	8.2	12.0	2.5	6.4	10.2	28202	1.6	15.3	682	121	231	338	71	180	288	C
501	4.3	4.6	5.4	0.5	0.8	1.6	8360	10.1	5.1	300	359	385	451	42	67	134	C
105	4.4	4.4	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	3020	8.7	5.4	107	133	133	133	0	0	0	C
716	4.4	6.0	10.0	1.9	3.5	7.5	47503	5.6	19.4	1023	209	285	475	90	166	356	C
221	4.5	4.6	4.9	0.0	0.0	0.3	28390	2.0	1.0	548	1278	1306	1391	0	0	85	C
715	4.5	5.7	10.3	1.3	2.5	7.1	11785	9.7	7.8	1020	530	672	1214	153	295	837	C
512	4.6	4.6	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	6341	1.1	7.8	0	29	29	29	0	0	0	C
707	4.6	4.8	5.6	.2	.4	1.2	26451	8.3	6.4	125	122	127	148	5	11	32	C
122	4.8	4.8	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	9300	5.2	1.5	385	446	446	446	0	0	0	C
302	5.0	5.5	7.0	0.5	1.0	2.5	95371	4.6	6.5	680	477	525	668	48	95	238	C
404	5.0	8.0	18.0	0.8	3.8	13.8	9202	0.1	8.0	267	46	74	166	7	35	127	C
409	5.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	890	8.3	5.5	22	45	45	45	0	0	0	C
702	5.0	6.2	7.5	2.1	3.3	4.6	6901	1.9	7.5	49	35	43	52	14	23	32	C
507	5.1	5.1	5.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	18571	6.9	2.2	0	95	95	95	0	0	0	C
101	5.2	6.3	8.2	1.0	2.1	4.0	170701	3.0	3.9	800	886	1075	1400	171	358	683	C
704	5.3	8.8	14.4	2.8	6.3	11.9	4031	4.1	12.1	187	21	35	58	11	25	48	C

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 1. USTES DATA USED IN SUMMARY TABLES
(with alternative sorts each identified by check under appropriate column)

Area Code	Unemployment rate (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	Unemployment rate increase (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	1968 work force (divided by 10)	1968 defense dependency ratio (%)	1965 to 1968 increase in defense dependency ratio (%)	Layoff number in 100% case(divided by 10)	Unemployed after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	Unemployed increase after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	
710	5.3	6.2	7.9	0.9	1.8	3.5	9081	0.9	8.7	67	48	72	74	8	16	32	C
608	5.6	5.6	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	2918	11.3	11.3	75	163	163	163	0	0	0	C
107	5.8	6.1	6.9	0.3	0.8	1.3	907	6.5	5.5	460	526	553	626	45	73	118	C
312	5.8	5.8	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	374	2.6	2.3	62	217	217	221	0	0	0	C
521	5.9	5.9	5.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	976	1.8	1.6	15	576	576	566	0	0	0	C
607	6.0	6.3	7.4	.4	.7	1.8	346	5.8	5.5	180	208	218	256	14	24	62	C
709	6.1	7.9	11.8	.1	1.9	5.8	1505	22.4	15.1	240	92	119	178	2	29	87	C
712	6.1	7.3	9.7	1.1	2.3	4.7	450	11.7	9.3	32	27	33	44	5	10	21	C
516	6.2	6.3	6.6	0.2	0.3	0.6	117	0 8.1	6.5	12	73	74	77	2	4	7	C
605	6.2	7.4	11.3	3.5	4.7	8.6	2230	20.9	7.4	393	138	165	252	78	105	192	C
305	6.5	7.0	8.0	0.0	0.5	1.5	409	0 8.0	8.0	28	266	286	327	0	20	61	C
802	6.6	6.8	7.0	0.5	0.7	0.9	505	2.2	2.2	10	33	34	35	3	4	5	C
508	6.9	6.9	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	340	6 3.4	3.1	20	235	235	238	0	0	3	C
513	6.9	7.6	11.4	4.7	5.4	9.2	9831	0.0	5.0	80	68	75	112	46	53	90	C
609	7.0	7.5	8.9	.8	1.3	2.7	186	4 5.8	5.8	61	130	140	166	15	24	50	C
903	7.0	7.5	8.2	.4	.9	1.6	1208	0 7.7	4.7	380	846	906	991	48	109	193	C
313	7.2	8.0	9.5	0.7	1.5	3.0	2681	1.6	5.8	16	19	21	25	2	4	8	C
310	7.5	7.8	8.2	0.2	0.5	0.9	112	2 5.1	4.7	34	84	88	92	2	6	10	C
604	7.5	7.6	7.7	0.0	0.1	0.2	789	19.0	12.4	17	59	60	61	0	1	2	C
308	7.8	7.9	8.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	151	2 4.0	4.0	22	118	119	121	0	2	3	C
602	8.0	10.3	11.3	2.0	4.3	5.3	4311	1.2	5.9	89	34	44	49	9	19	23	C
701	8.2	9.1	12.9	3.1	4.0	7.8	8281	3.3	13.3	67	68	75	107	26	33	65	C
901	8.2	8.4	8.5	0.0	0.0	0.1	132	6 4.4	2.2	20	109	111	113	0	0	1	C
611	8.6	9.0	10.0	0.8	1.2	2.2	65	1 5.0	3.3	30	56	59	65	5	8	14	C
708	9.6	14.8	30.0	4.8	10.0	25.2	9533	3.0	15.0	334	91	141	286	46	95	240	C
902	11.0	12.0	13.0	1.4	2.4	3.4	743	0 4.3	4.0	170	817	892	966	104	178	253	C
306	14.6	14.6	14.7	0.2	0.2	0.3	31	2 6.7	6.7	18	46	46	46	1	1	1	C
505	18.0	20.0	22.0	1.7	3.7	5.7	2571	6.7	10.0	15	46	51	57	4	10	15	C

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 1. USTES DATA USED IN SUMMARY TABLES
(with alternative sorts each identified by check under appropriate column)

Area Code	Unemployment rate (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of			Unemployment rate increase (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of			1968 work force (divided by 10)	1968 defense dependency ratio (%)	1965 to 1968 increase in defense dependency ratio (%)	Layoff number in 100% case (divided by 10)	Unemployed after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10)			Unemployed increase after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10)			
	25%	50%	100%	25%	50%	100%					25%	50%	100%	25%	50%	100%	
202	1.7	1.7	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	241	16.3	4.9	12	41	41	41	0	0	0	C
307	2.1	2.1	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	4662	5.1	5.1	110	98	98	98	0	0	0	C
311	2.1	2.2	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	46410	6.0	2.2	370	975	1021	1067	0	0	0	C
511	2.4	2.4	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	4098	27.3	19.0	462	98	98	98	0	0	0	C
504	2.5	2.5	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1802	7.4	7.4	20	45	45	45	0	0	0	C
714	1.5	2.5	3.0	.4	1.4	1.9	284	11.2	9.0	17	4	7	9	1	4	5	C
304	2.6	2.7	2.9	0.1	0.2	0.4	1353	9.0	6.0	100	35	37	39	1	3	5	C
705	2.5	2.7	3.0	.0	.0	.2	729	9.3	9.3	15	18	20	22	0	0	1	C
321	3.0	3.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	16510	1.3	0.5	915	4953	4953	5118	0	0	0	C
622	2.6	3.0	3.5	0	0	.5	3163	2.7	.9	350	822	949	1107	0	0	158	C
703	2.0	3.0	5.0	.0	.0	1.4	844	6.0	6.0	86	17	25	42	0	0	12	C
322	3.0	3.1	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	2692	1.6	1.2	400	807	835	861	0	0	27	C
121	3.2	3.2	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.1	14029	5.5	1.5	12400	4489	4489	4630	0	0	140	C
403	3.2	3.2	3.3	0.6	0.6	0.7	1415	14.8	2.2	10	45	45	47	8	8	10	C
621	3.1	3.2	3.3	0.1	0.2	0.3	1420	0	2.2	1.9	300	440	454	469	14	28	43	C
616	3.4	3.4	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.1	1435	34.0	2.2	62	49	49	50	0	0	1	C
201	3.5	3.5	3.8	0.3	0.3	0.6	1236	0	7.5	4.9	70	433	433	470	37	37	74	C
711	3.0	3.5	4.0	.4	.9	1.4	1860	16.9	10.2	344	56	65	74	7	17	26	C
402	3.1	3.6	4.1	0.4	0.9	1.4	477	6.4	6.4	29	15	17	20	2	4	7	C
102	3.1	3.7	4.4	0.3	0.9	1.6	4045	10.1	5.0	335	125	150	178	12	36	65	C
106	3.5	3.7	4.0	0.1	0.3	0.6	5370	11.5	6.0	225	188	199	215	5	16	32	C
223	3.4	3.7	4.3	0.3	0.6	1.2	22050	40	5.3	1.7	2876	6971	7586	8817	615	1230	4260	C
301	3.5	3.8	4.3	0.0	0.2	0.7	2000	18.7	18.2	535	70	76	86	0	4	14	C
502	3.5	3.8	4.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1871	0.0	10.0	15	7	7	8	0	0	0	C
506	3.8	3.8	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	2362	0.0	16.0	32	9	9	9	0	0	0	C
610	3.7	3.9	4.1	.2	.4	.6	9370	16.3	2.0	145	347	365	384	19	37	56	C
421	3.9	4.0	4.3	0.1	0.2	0.5	4497	0	2.5	1.7	1206	1754	1799	1934	45	90	225	C
509	3.4	4.1	6.0	0.5	1.2	3.1	8990	24.0	6.1	430	306	369	539	45	108	279	C
515	0.0	4.1	5.7	0.0	0.4	2.0	827	16.9	9.6	44	0	34	47	0	3	17	C

✓

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 1. USTES DATA USED IN SUMMARY TABLES
(with alternative sorts each identified by check under appropriate column)

Area Code	Unemployment rate (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	Unemployment rate increase (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	1968 work force (divided by 10)	1968 defense dependency ratio (%)	1965 to 1968 increase in defense dependency ratio (%)	Layoff number in 100% case (divided by 10)	Unemployed after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	Unemployed increase after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	
706	3.8	4.3	5.4	.5	1.0	2.1	184	22.5	9.7	230	70	79	99	9	18	39	C
105	4.4	4.4	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	3020	8.7	5.4	107	133	133	133	0	0	0	C
721	4.2	4.4	4.8	.2	.4	.8	6373	4.0	1.4	199	268	280	306	13	25	51	C
221	4.5	4.6	4.9	0.0	0.0	0.3	28390	2.0	1.0	548	1278	1306	1391	0	0	85	C
501	4.3	4.6	5.4	0.5	0.8	1.6	8360	10.1	5.1	300	359	385	451	42	67	134	C
512	4.6	4.6	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	634	11.1	7.8	0	29	29	29	0	0	0	C
603	4.2	4.7	5.0	0	0	0	333	19.4	8.3	22	14	16	17	0	0	0	C
122	4.8	4.8	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	9300	5.2	1.5	385	446	446	446	0	0	0	C
707	4.6	4.8	5.6	.2	.4	1.2	2645	18.3	6.4	125	122	127	148	5	11	32	C
921	4.0	4.8	5.6	0.0	0.8	1.6	14063	4.2	1.0	6450	5625	6750	7875	0	1125	2250	C
615	4.2	4.9	6.1	1.7	2.4	3.6	833	7.9	6.3	30	35	41	51	14	20	30	C
222	4.2	5.0	6.7	0.1	0.9	2.6	5571	4.6	0.8	2590	2340	2786	2733	56	501	1448	C
409	5.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	890	8.3	5.5	22	45	45	45	0	0	0	
507	5.1	5.1	5.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1857	16.9	2.2	0	95	95	95	0	0	0	C
601	4.0	5.1	7.1	.9	2.0	4.0	6448	18.5	9.8	464	258	329	458	58	129	258	C
713	3.2	5.3	11.7	.8	2.9	9.3	1311	11.9	6.9	400	42	69	153	10	38	122	C
302	5.0	5.5	7.0	0.5	1.0	2.5	9537	14.6	6.5	680	477	525	668	48	95	238	C
303	4.0	5.5	7.0	0.5	2.0	3.5	2828	9.0	9.0	270	113	156	198	14	57	99	C
608	5.6	5.6	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	2918	11.3	11.3	75	163	163	163	0	0	0	C
715	4.5	5.7	10.3	1.3	2.5	7.1	1178	5	9.7	7.8	1020	530	672	1214	153	295	837	C
312	5.8	5.8	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	3740	2.6	2.3	62	217	217	221	0	0	0	C
521	5.9	5.9	5.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	9760	1.8	1.6	15	576	576	566	0	0	0	C
103	2.5	6.0	8.0	1.1	4.6	6.6	3930	14.7	9.7	570	98	236	314	43	81	259	C
716	4.4	6.0	10.0	1.9	3.5	7.5	4750	35.6	19.4	1023	209	285	475	90	166	356	C
107	5.8	6.1	6.9	0.5	0.8	1.3	9070	6.5	5.5	460	526	553	626	45	73	118	C
702	5.0	6.2	7.5	2.1	3.3	4.6	6901	1.9	7.5	49	35	43	52	14	23	32	C
710	5.3	6.2	7.9	0.9	1.8	3.5	9081	0.9	8.7	67	48	72	74	8	16	32	C
101	5.2	6.3	8.2	1.0	2.1	4.0	17070	13.0	3.9	800	888	1075	1400	171	358	683	C
516	6.2	6.3	6.6	0.2	0.3	0.6	1170	8.1	6.5	12	73	74	77	2	4	7	C

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 1. USTES DATA USED IN SUMMARY TABLES
(with alternative sorts each identified by check under appropriate column)

Area code	Unemployment rate (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	Unemployment rate increase (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	1968 work force (divided by 10)	1968 defense dependency ratio (%)	1965 to 1968 increase in defense dependency ratio (%)	Layoff number in 100% case (divided by 10)	Unemployed after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	Unemployed increase after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	
607	6.0	6.3	7.4	.4	.7	1.8	3460	5.8	5.5	180	208	218	256	14	24	62	C
405	4.0	6.5	10.0	2.1	4.6	8.1	2232	21.8	21.4	400	89	145	223	47	103	181	C
802	6.6	6.8	7.0	0.5	0.7	0.9	505	2.2	2.2	10	33	34	35	3	4	5	C
508	6.9	6.9	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	3406	3.4	3.1	20	235	235	238	0	0	3	C
305	6.5	7.0	8.0	0.0	0.5	1.5	4090	8.0	8.0	28	266	286	327	0	20	61	C
712	6.1	7.3	9.7	1.1	2.3	4.7	450	11.7	9.3	32	27	33	44	5	10	21	C
605	6.2	7.4	11.3	3.5	4.7	8.6	2230	20.9	7.4	393	138	165	252	78	105	192	C
609	7.0	7.5	8.9	.8	1.3	2.7	1864	5.8	5.8	61	130	140	166	15	24	50	C
903	7.0	7.5	8.2	.4	.9	1.6	12080	7.7	4.7	380	846	906	991	48	109	193	C
513	6.9	7.6	11.4	4.7	5.4	9.2	983	10.0	5.0	80	68	75	112	46	53	90	C
604	7.5	7.6	7.7	0.0	0.1	0.2	7891	9.0	12.4	17	59	60	61	0	1	2	C
310	7.5	7.8	8.2	0.2	0.5	0.9	1122	5.1	4.7	34	84	88	92	2	6	10	C
308	7.8	7.9	8.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	1512	4.0	4.0	22	118	119	121	0	2	3	C
709	6.1	7.9	11.8	.1	1.9	5.8	1505	22.4	15.1	240	92	119	178	2	29	87	C
313	7.2	8.0	9.5	0.7	1.5	3.0	2681	1.6	5.8	16	19	21	25	2	4	8	C
404	5.0	8.0	18.0	0.8	3.8	13.8	920	20.1	8.0	267	46	74	166	7	35	127	C
401	4.3	8.2	12.0	2.5	6.4	10.2	2820	21.6	15.3	682	121	231	338	71	180	288	C
901	8.2	8.4	8.5	0.0	0.0	0.1	1326	4.4	2.2	20	109	111	113	0	0	1	C
606	4.0	8.5	12.0	1.3	5.8	9.3	1506	31.6	14.6	400	60	128	181	20	87	140	C
704	5.3	8.8	14.4	2.8	6.3	11.9	403	14.1	12.1	187	21	35	58	11	25	48	C
611	8.6	9.0	10.0	0.8	1.2	2.2	651	5.0	3.3	30	56	59	65	5	8	14	C
701	8.2	9.1	12.9	3.1	4.0	7.8	828	13.3	13.3	67	68	75	107	26	33	65	C
602	8.0	10.3	11.3	2.0	4.3	5.3	431	11.2	5.9	89	34	44	49	9	19	23	C
902	11.0	12.0	13.0	1.4	2.4	3.4	7430	4.3	4.0	170	817	892	966	104	178	253	C
306	14.6	14.6	14.7	0.2	0.2	0.3	312	6.7	6.7	18	46	46	46	1	1	1	C
708	9.6	14.8	30.0	4.8	10.0	25.2	953	33.0	15.0	334	91	141	286	46	95	240	C
505	18.0	20.0	22.0	1.7	3.7	5.7	257	16.7	10.0	15	46	51	57	4	10	15	C

✓

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 1. USTES DATA USED IN SUMMARY TABLES
(with alternative sorts each identified by check under appropriate column)

Area Code	Unemployment rate (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	Unemployment rate increase (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	1968 work force (divided by 10)	1968 defense dependency ratio (%)	1965 to 1968 increase in defense dependency ratio (%)	Layoff number in 100% case(divided by 10)	Unemployed after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	Unemployed increase after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	
202	1.7	1.7	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	2410	16.3	4.9	12	41	41	41	0	0	0	C
307	2.1	2.1	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	4662	5.1	5.1	110	98	98	98	0	0	0	C
311	2.1	2.2	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	46410	6.0	2.2	370	975	1021	1067	0	0	0	C
511	2.4	2.4	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	4098	27.3	19.0	462	98	98	98	0	0	0	C
504	2.5	2.5	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1802	7.4	7.4	20	45	45	45	0	0	0	C
304	2.6	2.7	2.9	0.1	0.2	0.4	1353	9.0	6.0	100	35	37	39	1	3	5	C
714	1.5	2.5	3.0	.4	1.4	1.9	2841	1.2	9.0	17	4	7	9	1	4	5	C
705	2.5	2.7	3.0	.0	.0	.2	729	9.3	9.3	15	18	20	22	0	0	1	C
321	3.0	3.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	16510	0	1.3	0.5	915	4953	4953	5118	0	0	0 C
322	3.0	3.1	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	2692	0	1.6	1.2	400	807	835	861	0	0	27 C
121	3.2	3.2	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.1	14029	0	5.5	1.5	12400	4489	4489	4630	0	0	140 C
403	3.2	3.2	3.3	0.6	0.6	0.7	1415	14.8	2.2	10	45	45	47	8	8	10	C
621	3.1	3.2	3.3	0.1	0.2	0.3	1420	0	2.2	1.9	300	440	454	469	14	28	43 C
622	2.6	3.0	3.5	0	0	.5	3163	0	2.7	.9	350	822	949	1107	0	0	158 C
616	3.4	3.4	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.1	1435	34.0	2.2	62	49	49	50	0	0	1	C
201	3.5	3.5	3.8	0.3	0.3	0.6	1236	0	7.5	4.9	70	433	433	470	37	37	74 C
506	3.8	3.8	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	2362	0.0	16.0	32	9	9	9	0	0	0	C
711	3.0	3.5	4.0	.4	.9	1.4	1860	16.9	10.2	344	56	65	74	7	17	26	C
106	3.5	3.7	4.0	0.1	0.3	0.6	5370	11.5	6.0	225	188	199	215	5	16	32	C
402	3.1	3.6	4.1	0.4	0.9	1.4	477	6.4	6.4	29	15	17	20	2	4	7	C
502	3.5	3.8	4.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	187	10.0	10.0	15	7	7	8	0	0	0	C
610	3.7	3.9	4.1	.2	.4	.6	9370	16.3	2.0	145	347	365	384	19	37	56	C
223	3.4	3.7	4.3	0.3	0.6	1.2	2050	40	5.3	1.7	2876	6971	7586	8817	615	1230	4260 C
301	3.5	3.8	4.3	0.0	0.2	0.7	2000	18.7	18.2	535	70	76	86	0	4	14	C
421	3.9	4.0	4.3	0.1	0.2	0.5	4497	0	2.5	1.7	1206	1754	1799	1934	45	90	225 C
102	3.1	3.7	4.4	0.3	0.9	1.6	4045	10.1	5.0	335	125	150	178	12	36	65	C
105	4.4	4.4	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	302	0	8.7	5.4	107	133	133	133	0	0	0 C
512	4.6	4.6	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	634	11.1	7.8	0	29	29	29	0	0	0	C
721	4.2	4.4	4.8	.2	.4	.8	6373	4.0	1.4	199	268	280	306	13	25	51	C

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 1. USTES DATA USED IN SUMMARY TABLES
(with alternative sorts each identified by check under appropriate column)

Area Code	Unemployment rate (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	Unemployment rate increase (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	1968 work force (divided by 10)	1968 defense dependency ratio (%)	1965 to 1968 increase in defense dependency ratio (%)	Layoff number in 100% case (divided by 10)	Unemployed after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	Unemployed increase after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	
122	4.8	4.8	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	9300	5.2	1.5	385	446	446	446	0	0	0	C
221	4.5	4.6	4.9	0.0	0.0	0.3	28390	2.0	1.0	548	1278	1306	1391	0	0	85	C
703	2.0	3.0	5.0	.0	.0	1.4	844	6.0	6.0	86	17	25	42	0	0	12	C
603	4.2	4.7	5.0	0	0	0	3331	9.4	8.3	22	14	16	17	0	0	0	C
409	5.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	890	8.3	5.5	22	45	45	45	0	0	0	
507	5.1	5.1	5.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	18571	6.9	2.2	0	95	95	95	0	0	0	C
706	3.8	4.3	5.4	.5	1.0	2.1	18402	2.5	9.7	230	70	79	99	9	18	39	C
501	4.3	4.6	5.4	0.5	0.8	1.6	8360	10.1	5.1	300	359	385	451	42	67	134	C
707	4.6	4.8	5.6	.2	.4	1.2	26451	8.3	6.4	125	122	127	148	5	11	32	C
921	4.0	4.8	5.6	0.0	0.8	1.6	14063	4.2	1.0	6450	5625	6750	7875	0	1125	2250	C
608	5.6	5.6	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	2918	11.3	11.3	75	163	163	163	0	0	0	C
515	0.0	4.1	5.7	0.0	0.4	2.0	827	16.9	9.6	44	0	34	47	0	3	17	C
521	5.9	5.9	5.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	9760	1.8	1.6	15	576	576	566	0	0	0	C
312	5.8	5.8	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	3740	2.6	2.3	62	217	217	221	0	0	0	C
509	3.4	4.1	6.0	0.5	1.2	3.1	8990	24.0	6.1	430	306	369	539	45	108	279	C
615	4.2	4.9	6.1	1.7	2.4	3.6	833	7.9	6.3	30	35	41	51	14	20	30	C
516	6.2	6.3	6.6	0.2	0.3	0.6	1170	8.1	6.5	12	73	74	77	2	4	7	C
222	4.2	5.0	6.7	0.1	0.9	2.6	5571	0	4.6	0.8	2590	2340	2786	2733	56	501	1448 C
107	5.8	6.1	6.9	0.5	0.8	1.3	9070	6.5	5.5	460	526	553	626	45	73	118	C
302	5.0	5.5	7.0	0.5	1.0	2.5	9537	14.6	6.5	680	477	525	668	48	95	238	C
303	4.0	5.5	7.0	0.5	2.0	3.5	2828	9.0	9.0	270	113	156	198	14	57	99	C
802	6.6	6.8	7.0	0.5	0.7	0.9	505	2.2	2.2	10	33	34	35	3	4	5	C
508	6.9	6.9	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	3406	3.4	3.1	20	235	235	238	0	0	3	C
601	4.0	5.1	7.1	.9	2.0	4.0	6448	18.5	9.8	464	258	329	458	58	129	258	C
607	6.0	6.3	7.4	.4	.7	1.8	3460	5.8	5.5	180	208	218	256	14	24	62	C
702	5.0	6.2	7.5	2.1	3.3	4.6	690	11.9	7.5	49	35	43	52	14	23	32	C
604	7.5	7.6	7.7	0.0	0.1	0.2	789	19.0	12.4	17	59	60	61	0	1	2	C
710	5.3	6.2	7.9	0.9	1.8	3.5	908	10.9	8.7	67	48	72	74	8	16	32	C
103	2.5	6.0	8.0	1.1	4.6	6.6	3930	14.7	9.7	570	98	236	314	43	81	259	C

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 1. USTES DATA USED IN SUMMARY TABLES
(with alternative sorts each identified by check under appropriate column)

Area code	Unemployment rate (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	Unemployment rate increase (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	1968 work force (divided by 10)	1968 defense dependency ratio (%)	1965 to 1968 increase in defense dependency ratio (%)	Layoff number in 100% case (divided by 10)	Unemployed after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	Unemployed increase after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	
305	6.5	7.0	8.0	0.0	0.5	1.5	4090	8.0	8.0	28	266	286	327	0	20	61	C
308	7.8	7.9	8.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	1512	4.0	4.0	22	118	119	121	0	2	3	C
101	5.2	6.3	8.2	1.0	2.1	4.0	17070	13.0	3.9	800	888	1075	1400	171	358	683	C
903	7.0	7.5	8.2	.4	.9	1.6	12080	7.7	4.7	380	846	906	991	48	109	193	C
310	7.5	7.8	8.2	0.2	0.5	0.9	1122	5.1	4.7	34	84	88	92	2	6	10	C
901	8.2	8.4	8.5	0.0	0.0	0.1	1326	4.4	2.2	20	109	111	113	0	0	1	C
609	7.0	7.5	8.9	.8	1.3	2.7	1864	5.8	5.8	61	130	140	166	15	24	50	C
313	7.2	8.0	9.5	0.7	1.5	3.0	2681	1.6	5.8	16	19	21	25	2	4	8	C
712	6.1	7.3	9.7	1.1	2.3	4.7	4501	1.7	9.3	32	27	33	44	5	10	21	C
716	4.4	6.0	10.0	1.9	3.5	7.5	4750	35.6	19.4	1023	209	285	475	90	166	356	C
405	4.0	6.5	10.0	2.1	4.6	8.1	2232	21.8	21.4	400	89	145	223	47	103	181	C
611	8.6	9.0	10.0	0.8	1.2	2.2	651	5.0	3.3	30	56	59	65	5	8	14	C
715	4.5	5.7	10.3	1.3	2.5	7.1	11785	9.7	7.8	1020	530	672	1214	153	295	837	C
605	6.2	7.4	11.3	3.5	4.7	8.6	2230	20.9	7.4	393	138	165	252	78	105	192	C
602	8.0	10.3	11.3	2.0	4.3	5.3	4311	1.2	5.9	89	34	44	49	9	19	23	C
513	6.9	7.6	11.4	4.7	5.4	9.2	9531	0.0	5.0	80	68	75	112	46	53	90	C
713	3.2	5.3	11.7	.8	2.9	9.3	13111	1.9	6.9	400	42	69	153	10	38	122	C
709	6.1	7.9	11.8	.1	1.9	5.8	15052	2.4	15.1	240	92	119	178	2	29	87	C
401	4.3	8.2	12.0	2.5	6.4	10.2	28202	1.6	15.3	682	121	231	338	71	180	288	C
606	4.0	8.5	12.0	1.3	5.8	9.3	15063	1.6	14.6	400	60	128	181	20	87	140	C
701	8.2	9.1	12.9	3.1	4.0	7.8	8281	3.3	13.3	67	68	75	107	26	33	65	C
902	11.0	12.0	13.0	1.4	2.4	3.4	7430	4.3	4.0	170	817	892	966	104	178	253	C
704	5.3	8.8	14.4	2.8	6.3	11.9	4031	4.1	12.1	187	21	35	58	11	25	48	C
306	14.6	14.6	14.7	0.2	0.2	0.3	312	6.7	6.7	18	46	46	46	1	1	1	C
404	5.0	8.0	18.0	0.8	3.8	13.8	9202	0.1	8.0	267	46	74	166	7	35	127	C
505	18.0	20.0	22.0	1.7	3.7	5.7	2571	6.7	10.0	15	46	51	57	4	10	15	C
708	9.6	14.8	30.0	4.8	10.0	25.2	9533	3.0	15.0	334	91	141	286	46	95	240	C

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 1. USTES DATA USED IN SUMMARY TABLES
(with alternative sorts each identified by check under appropriate column)

Area Code	Unemployment rate (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	Unemployment rate increase (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	1968 work force (divided by 10)	1968 defense dependency ratio (%)	1965 to 1968 increase in defense dependency ratio (%)	Layoff number in 100% case(divided by 10)	Unemployed after 18 months, with layoff assumptions 25%	50%	100%	Unemployed increase after 18 months, with layoff assumptions 25%	50%	100%	
703	2.0	3.0	5.0	.0	.0	1.4	844	6.0	6.0	86	17	25	42	0	0	12	C
705	2.5	2.7	3.0	.0	.0	.2	729	9.3	9.3	15	18	20	22	0	0	1	C
622	2.6	3.0	3.5	0	0	.5	31630	2.7	.9	350	822	949	1107	0	0	158	C
603	4.2	4.7	5.0	0	0	0	333	19.4	8.3	22	14	16	17	0	0	0	C
515	0.0	4.1	5.7	0.0	0.4	2.0	827	16.9	9.6	44	0	34	47	0	3	17	C
202	1.7	1.7	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	2410	16.3	4.9	12	41	41	41	0	0	0	C
307	2.1	2.1	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	4662	5.1	5.1	110	98	98	98	0	0	0	C
311	2.1	2.2	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	46410	6.0	2.2	370	975	1021	1067	0	0	0	C
511	2.4	2.4	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	4098	27.3	19.0	462	98	98	98	0	0	0	C
504	2.5	2.5	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1802	7.4	7.4	20	45	45	45	0	0	0	C
321	3.0	3.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	165100	1.3	0.5	915	4953	4953	5118	0	0	0	C
322	3.0	3.1	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	26920	1.6	1.2	400	807	835	861	0	0	27	C
121	3.2	3.2	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.1	14029	0	5.5	1.5	12400	4489	4489	4630	0	0	140	C
616	3.4	3.4	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.1	14353	4.0	2.2	62	49	49	50	0	0	1	C
301	3.5	3.8	4.3	0.0	0.2	0.7	20001	8.7	18.2	535	70	76	86	0	4	14	C
502	3.5	3.8	4.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1871	0.0	10.0	15	7	7	8	0	0	0	C
506	3.8	3.8	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	2362	0.0	16.0	32	9	9	9	0	0	0	C
921	4.0	4.8	5.6	0.0	0.8	1.6	14063	0	4.2	1.0	6450	5625	6750	7875	0	1125	2250	C
105	4.4	4.4	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	3020	8.7	5.4	107	133	133	133	0	0	0	C
221	4.5	4.6	4.9	0.0	0.0	0.3	2839	0	2.0	1.0	548	1278	1306	1391	0	0	85	C
512	4.6	4.6	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	6341	1.1	7.8	0	29	29	29	0	0	0	C
122	4.8	4.8	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	9300	5.2	1.5	385	446	446	446	0	0	0	C
409	5.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	890	8.3	5.5	22	45	45	45	0	0	0	C
507	5.1	5.1	5.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1857	16.9	2.2	0	95	95	95	0	0	0	C
608	5.6	5.6	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	2918	11.3	11.3	75	163	163	163	0	0	0	C
312	5.8	5.8	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	3740	2.6	2.3	62	217	217	221	0	0	0	C
521	5.9	5.9	5.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	9760	1.8	1.6	15	576	576	566	0	0	0	C
305	6.5	7.0	8.0	0.0	0.5	1.5	4090	8.0	8.0	28	266	286	327	0	20	61	C
508	6.9	6.9	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	3406	3.4	3.1	20	235	235	238	0	0	3	C

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 1. USTES DATA USED IN SUMMARY TABLES
(with alternative sorts each identified by check under appropriate column)

Area Code	Unemployment rate (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	Unemployment rate increase (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	1968 work force (divided by 10)	1968 defense dependency ratio (%)	1965 to 1968 increase in defense dependency ratio (%)	Layoff number in 100% case (divided by 10)	Unemployed after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	Unemployed increase after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	
604	7.5	7.6	7.7	0.0	0.1	0.2	7891	9.0	12.4	17	59	60	61	0	1	2	C
308	7.8	7.9	8.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	1512	4.0	4.0	22	118	119	121	0	2	3	C
901	8.2	8.4	8.5	0.0	0.0	0.1	1326	4.4	2.2	20	109	111	113	0	0	1	C
709	6.1	7.9	11.8	.1	1.9	5.8	1505	22.4	15.1	240	92	119	178	2	29	87	C
304	2.6	2.7	2.9	0.1	0.2	0.4	1353	9.0	6.0	100	35	37	39	1	3	5	C
621	3.1	3.2	3.3	0.1	0.2	0.3	14200	2.2	1.9	300	440	454	469	14	28	43	C
106	3.5	3.7	4.0	0.1	0.3	0.6	5370	11.5	6.0	225	188	199	215	5	16	32	C
421	3.9	4.0	4.3	0.1	0.2	0.5	44970	2.5	1.7	1206	1754	1799	1934	45	90	225	C
222	4.2	5.0	6.7	0.1	0.9	2.6	5571	0	4.6	0.8	2590	2340	2786	2733	56	501	1448	C
721	4.2	4.4	4.8	.2	.4	.8	6373	4.0	1.4	199	268	280	306	13	25	51	C
707	4.6	4.8	5.6	.2	.4	1.2	26451	8.3	6.4	125	122	127	148	5	11	32	C
610	3.7	3.9	4.1	.2	.4	.6	9370	16.3	2.0	145	347	365	384	19	37	56	C
516	6.2	6.3	6.6	0.2	0.3	0.6	1170	8.1	6.5	12	73	74	77	2	4	7	C
310	7.5	7.8	8.2	0.2	0.5	0.9	1122	5.1	4.7	34	84	88	92	2	6	10	C
306	14.6	14.6	14.7	0.2	0.2	0.3	312	6.7	6.7	18	46	46	46	1	1	1	C
102	3.1	3.7	4.4	0.3	0.9	1.6	4045	10.1	5.0	335	125	150	178	12	36	65	C
223	3.4	3.7	4.3	0.3	0.6	1.2	20504	0	5.3	1.7	2876	6971	7586	8817	615	1230	4260	C
201	3.5	3.5	3.8	0.3	0.3	0.6	12360	7.5	4.9	70	433	433	470	37	37	74	C
714	1.5	2.5	3.0	.4	1.4	1.9	2841	1.2	9.0	17	4	7	9	1	4	5	C
711	3.0	3.5	4.0	.4	.9	1.4	1860	16.9	10.2	344	56	65	74	7	17	26	C
607	6.0	6.3	7.4	.4	.7	1.8	3460	5.8	5.5	180	208	218	256	14	24	62	C
903	7.0	7.5	8.2	.4	.9	1.6	12080	7.7	4.7	380	846	906	991	48	109	193	C
402	3.1	3.6	4.1	0.4	0.9	1.4	477	6.4	6.4	29	15	17	20	2	4	7	C
706	3.8	4.3	5.4	.5	1.0	2.1	1840	22.5	9.7	230	70	79	99	9	18	39	C
509	3.4	4.1	6.0	0.5	1.2	3.1	8990	24.0	6.1	430	306	369	539	45	108	279	C
303	4.0	5.5	7.0	0.5	2.0	3.5	2828	9.0	9.0	270	113	156	198	14	57	99	C
501	4.3	4.6	5.4	0.5	0.8	1.6	8360	10.1	5.1	300	359	385	451	42	67	134	C
302	5.0	5.5	7.0	0.5	1.0	2.5	9537	14.6	6.5	680	477	525	668	48	95	238	C
107	5.8	6.1	6.9	0.5	0.8	1.3	9070	6.5	5.5	460	526	553	626	45	73	118	C
802	6.6	6.8	7.0	0.5	0.7	0.9	505	2.2	2.2	10	33	34	35	3	4	5	C

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 1. USTES DATA USED IN SUMMARY TABLES
(with alternative sorts each identified by check under appropriate column)

Area Code	Unemployment rate (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	Unemployment rate increase (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	1968 work force (divided by 10)	1968 defense dependency ratio (%)	1965 to 1968 increase in defense dependency ratio (%)	Layoff number in 100% case (divided by 10)	25%	50%	100%	Unemployed after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	Unemployed increase after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10)
403	3.2	3.2	3.3	0.6	0.6	0.7	1415	14.8	2.2	10	45	45	47	8	8	10	C
313	7.2	8.0	9.5	0.7	1.5	3.0	268	11.6	5.8	16	19	21	25	2	4	8	C
713	3.2	5.3	11.7	.8	2.9	9.3	131	11.9	6.9	400	42	69	153	10	38	122	C
609	7.0	7.5	8.9	.8	1.3	2.7	1864	5.8	5.8	61	130	140	166	15	24	50	C
404	5.0	8.0	18.0	0.8	3.8	13.8	920	20.1	8.0	267	46	74	166	7	35	127	C
611	8.6	9.0	10.0	0.8	1.2	2.2	651	5.0	3.3	30	56	59	65	5	8	14	C
601	4.0	5.1	7.1	.9	2.0	4.0	6448	18.5	9.8	464	258	329	458	58	129	258	C
710	5.3	6.2	7.9	0.9	1.8	3.5	908	10.9	8.7	67	48	72	74	8	16	32	C
101	5.2	6.3	8.2	1.0	2.1	4.0	17070	13.0	3.9	800	888	1075	1400	171	358	683	C
103	2.5	6.0	8.0	1.1	4.6	6.6	3930	14.7	9.7	570	98	236	314	43	81	259	C
712	6.1	7.3	9.7	1.1	2.3	4.7	450	11.7	9.3	32	27	33	44	5	10	21	C
606	4.0	8.5	12.0	1.3	5.8	9.3	1506	31.6	14.6	400	60	128	181	20	87	140	C
715	4.5	5.7	10.3	1.3	2.5	7.1	11785	9.7	7.8	1020	530	672	1214	153	295	837	C
902	11.0	12.0	13.0	1.4	2.4	3.4	7430	4.3	4.0	170	817	892	966	104	178	253	C
615	4.2	4.9	6.1	1.7	2.4	3.6	833	7.9	6.3	30	35	41	51	14	20	30	C
505	18.0	20.0	22.0	1.7	3.7	5.7	257	16.7	10.0	15	46	51	57	4	10	15	C
716	4.4	6.0	10.0	1.9	3.5	7.5	4750	35.6	19.4	1023	209	285	475	90	166	356	C
602	8.0	10.3	11.3	2.0	4.3	5.3	431	11.2	5.9	89	34	44	49	9	19	23	C
405	4.0	6.5	10.0	2.1	4.6	8.1	2232	21.8	21.4	400	89	145	223	47	103	181	C
702	5.0	6.2	7.5	2.1	3.3	4.6	690	11.9	7.5	49	35	43	52	14	23	32	C
401	4.3	8.2	12.0	2.5	6.4	10.2	2820	21.6	15.3	682	121	231	338	71	180	288	C
704	5.3	8.8	14.4	2.8	6.3	11.9	403	14.1	12.1	187	21	35	58	11	25	48	C
701	8.2	9.1	12.9	3.1	4.0	7.8	828	13.3	13.3	67	68	75	107	26	33	65	C
605	6.2	7.4	11.3	3.5	4.7	8.6	2230	20.9	7.4	393	138	165	252	78	105	192	C
513	6.9	7.6	11.4	4.7	5.4	9.2	983	10.0	5.0	80	68	75	112	46	53	90	C
708	9.6	14.8	30.0	4.8	10.0	25.2	953	33.0	15.0	334	91	141	286	46	95	240	C

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 1. USTES DATA USED IN SUMMARY TABLES
(with alternative sorts each identified by check under appropriate column)

Area Code	Unemployment rate (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	Unemployment rate increase (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	1968 work force (divided by 10)	1968 defense dependency ratio (%)	1965 to 1968 increase in defense dependency ratio (%)	Layoff number in 100% case (divided by 10)	Unemployed after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	Unemployed increase after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	
705	2.5	2.7	3.0	.0	.0	.2	729	9.3	9.3	15	18	20	22	0	0	1	C
622	2.6	3.0	3.5	0	0	.5	31630	2.7	.9	350	822	949	1107	0	0	158	C
703	2.0	3.0	5.0	.0	.0	1.4	844	6.0	6.0	86	17	25	42	0	0	12	C
603	4.2	4.7	5.0	0	0	0	333	19.4	8.3	22	14	16	17	0	0	0	C
202	1.7	1.7	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	2410	16.3	4.9	12	41	41	41	0	0	0	C
307	2.1	2.1	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	4662	5.1	5.1	110	98	98	98	0	0	0	C
311	2.1	2.2	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	46410	6.0	2.2	370	975	1021	1067	0	0	0	C
511	2.4	2.4	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	4098	27.3	19.0	462	98	98	98	0	0	0	C
504	2.5	2.5	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1802	7.4	7.4	20	45	45	45	0	0	0	C
321	3.0	3.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	16510	0	1.3	0.5	915	4953	4953	5118	0	0	0	C
322	3.0	3.1	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	2692	0	1.6	1.2	400	807	835	861	0	0	27	C
121	3.2	3.2	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.1	14029	0	5.5	1.5	12400	4489	4489	4630	0	0	140	C
616	3.4	3.4	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.1	1435	34.0	2.2	62	49	49	50	0	0	1	C
506	3.8	3.8	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	236	20.0	16.0	32	9	9	9	0	0	0	C
502	3.5	3.8	4.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	187	10.0	10.0	15	7	7	8	0	0	0	C
105	4.4	4.4	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	3020	8.7	5.4	107	133	133	133	0	0	0	C
512	4.6	4.6	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	634	11.1	7.8	0	29	29	29	0	0	0	C
122	4.8	4.8	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	9300	5.2	1.5	385	446	446	446	0	0	0	C
221	4.5	4.6	4.9	0.0	0.0	0.3	28390	2.0	1.0	548	1278	1306	1391	0	0	85	C
409	5.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	890	8.3	5.5	22	45	45	45	0	0	0	
507	5.1	5.1	5.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1857	16.9	2.2	0	95	95	95	0	0	0	C
608	5.6	5.6	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	2918	11.3	11.3	75	163	163	163	0	0	0	C
521	5.9	5.9	5.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	9760	1.8	1.6	15	576	576	566	0	0	0	C
312	5.8	5.8	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	3740	2.6	2.3	62	217	217	221	0	0	0	C
508	6.9	6.9	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	3406	3.4	3.1	20	235	235	238	0	0	3	C
901	8.2	8.4	8.5	0.0	0.0	0.1	1326	4.4	2.2	20	109	111	113	0	0	1	C
604	7.5	7.6	7.7	0.0	0.1	0.2	789	19.0	12.4	17	59	60	61	0	1	2	C
308	7.8	7.9	8.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	1512	4.0	4.0	22	118	119	121	0	2	3	C
304	2.6	2.7	2.9	0.1	0.2	0.4	1353	9.0	6.0	100	35	37	39	1	3	5	C

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 1. USTES DATA USED IN SUMMARY TABLES
(with alternative sorts each identified by check under appropriate column)

Area	Code	Unemployment rate (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of			Unemployment rate increase (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of			1968 work force (divided by 10)	1968 defense dependency ratio (%)	1965 to 1968 increase in defense dependency ratio (%)	Layoff number in 100% case (divided by 10)				Unemployed after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10)			Unemployed increase after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10)			
		25%	50%	100%	25%	50%	100%				25%	50%	100%		25%	50%	100%				
621	3.1	3.2	3.3	0.1	0.2	0.3	14200	2.2	1.9	300	440	454	469	14	28	43	C			
301	3.5	3.8	4.3	0.0	0.2	0.7	2000	18.7	18.2	535	70	76	86	0	4	14	C			
421	3.9	4.0	4.3	0.1	0.2	0.5	44970	2.5	1.7	1206	1754	1799	1934	45	90	225	C			
306	14.6	14.6	14.7	0.2	0.2	0.3	312	6.7	6.7	18	46	46	46	1	1	1	C			
201	3.5	3.5	3.8	0.3	0.3	0.6	12360	7.5	4.9	70	433	433	470	37	37	74	C			
106	3.5	3.7	4.0	0.1	0.3	0.6	5370	11.5	6.0	225	188	199	215	5	16	32	C			
516	6.2	6.3	6.6	0.2	0.3	0.6	1170	8.1	6.5	12	73	74	77	2	4	7	C			
610	3.7	3.9	4.1	.2	.4	.6	9370	16.3	2.0	145	347	365	384	19	37	56	C			
721	4.2	4.4	4.8	.2	.4	.8	6373	4.0	1.4	199	268	280	306	13	25	51	C			
707	4.6	4.8	5.6	.2	.4	1.2	2645	18.3	6.4	125	122	127	148	5	11	32	C			
515	0.0	4.1	5.7	0.0	0.4	2.0	827	16.9	9.6	44	0	34	47	0	3	17	C			
305	6.5	7.0	8.0	0.0	0.5	1.5	4090	8.0	8.0	28	266	286	327	0	20	61	C			
310	7.5	7.8	8.2	0.2	0.5	0.9	1122	5.1	4.7	34	84	88	92	2	6	10	C			
403	3.2	3.2	3.3	0.6	0.6	0.7	1415	14.8	2.2	10	45	45	47	8	8	10	C			
223	3.4	3.7	4.3	0.3	0.6	1.2	20504	0	5.3	1.7	2876	6971	7586	8817	615	1230	4260	C		
607	6.0	6.3	7.4	.4	.7	1.8	3460	5.8	5.5	180	208	218	256	14	24	62	C			
802	6.6	6.8	7.0	0.5	0.7	0.9	505	2.2	2.2	10	33	34	35	3	4	5	C			
501	4.3	4.6	5.4	0.5	0.8	1.6	8360	10.1	5.1	300	359	385	451	42	67	134	C			
921	4.0	4.8	5.6	0.0	0.8	1.6	14063	0	4.2	1.0	6450	5625	6750	7875	0	1125	2250	C		
107	5.8	6.1	6.9	0.5	0.8	1.3	9070	6.5	5.5	460	526	553	626	45	73	118	C			
711	3.0	3.5	4.0	.4	.9	1.4	1860	16.9	10.2	344	56	65	74	7	17	26	C			
903	7.0	7.5	8.2	.4	.9	1.6	12080	7.7	4.7	380	846	906	991	48	109	193	C			
402	3.1	3.6	4.1	0.4	0.9	1.4	477	6.4	6.4	29	15	17	20	2	4	7	C			
102	3.1	3.7	4.4	0.3	0.9	1.6	4045	10.1	5.0	335	125	150	178	12	36	65	C			
222	4.2	5.0	6.7	0.1	0.9	2.6	55710	4.6	0.8	2590	2340	2786	2733	56	501	1448	C			
706	3.8	4.3	5.4	.5	1.0	2.1	1840	22.5	9.7	230	70	79	99	9	18	39	C			
302	5.0	5.5	7.0	0.5	1.0	2.5	9537	14.6	6.5	680	477	525	668	48	95	238	C			
509	3.4	4.1	6.0	0.5	1.2	3.1	8990	24.0	6.1	430	306	369	539	45	108	279	C			
611	8.6	9.0	10.0	0.8	1.2	2.2	651	5.0	3.3	30	56	59	65	5	8	14	C			

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 1. USTES DATA USED IN SUMMARY TABLES
(with alternative sorts each identified by check under appropriate column)

Area Code	Unemployment rate (%) after 18 months; with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	Unemployment rate increase (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	1968 work force (divided by 10)	1968 defense dependency ratio (%)	1965 to 1968 increase in defense dependency ratio (%)	Layoff number in 100% case(divided by 10)	25%	50%	100%	Unemployed after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	Unemployed increase after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	
609	7.0	7.5	8.9	.8	1.3	2.7	1864	5.8	5.8	61	130	140	166	15	24	50	C			
714	1.5	2.5	3.0	.4	1.4	1.9	284	11.2	9.0	17	4	7	9	1	4	5	C			
313	7.2	8.0	9.5	0.7	1.5	3.0	268	11.6	5.8	16	19	21	25	2	4	8	C			
710	5.3	6.2	7.9	0.9	1.8	3.5	908	10.9	8.7	67	48	72	74	8	16	32	C			
709	6.1	7.9	11.8	.1	1.9	5.8	1505	22.4	15.1	240	92	119	178	2	29	87	C			
303	4.0	5.5	7.0	0.5	2.0	3.5	2828	9.0	9.0	270	113	156	198	14	57	99	C			
601	4.0	5.1	7.1	.9	2.0	4.0	6448	18.5	9.8	464	258	329	458	58	129	258	C			
101	5.2	6.3	8.2	1.0	2.1	4.0	17070	13.0	3.9	800	888	1075	1400	171	358	683	C			
712	6.1	7.3	9.7	1.1	2.3	4.7	450	11.7	9.3	32	27	33	44	5	10	21	C			
615	4.2	4.9	6.1	1.7	2.4	3.6	833	7.9	6.3	30	35	41	51	14	20	30	C			
902	11.0	12.0	13.0	1.4	2.4	3.4	7430	4.3	4.0	170	817	892	966	104	178	253	C			
715	4.5	5.7	10.3	1.3	2.5	7.1	11785	9.7	7.8	1020	530	672	1214	153	295	837	C			
713	3.2	5.3	11.7	.8	2.9	9.3	13111	1.9	6.9	400	42	69	153	10	38	122	C			
702	5.0	6.2	7.5	2.1	3.3	4.6	690	11.9	7.5	49	35	43	52	14	23	32	C			
716	4.4	6.0	10.0	1.9	3.5	7.5	4750	35.6	19.4	1023	209	285	475	90	166	356	C			
505	18.0	20.0	22.0	1.7	3.7	5.7	257	16.7	10.0	15	46	51	57	4	10	15	C			
404	5.0	8.0	18.0	0.8	3.8	13.8	920	20.1	8.0	267	46	74	166	7	35	127	C			
701	8.2	9.1	12.9	3.1	4.0	7.8	828	13.3	13.3	67	68	75	107	26	33	65	C			
602	8.0	10.3	11.3	2.0	4.3	5.3	431	11.2	5.9	89	34	44	49	9	19	23	C			
103	2.5	6.0	8.0	1.1	4.6	6.6	3930	14.7	9.7	570	98	236	314	43	81	259	C			
405	4.0	6.5	10.0	2.1	4.6	8.1	2232	21.8	21.4	400	89	145	223	47	103	181	C			
605	6.2	7.4	11.3	3.5	4.7	8.6	2230	20.9	7.4	393	138	165	252	78	105	192	C			
513	6.9	7.6	11.4	4.7	5.4	9.2	983	10.0	5.0	80	68	75	112	46	53	90	C			
606	4.0	8.5	12.0	1.3	5.8	9.3	1506	31.6	14.6	400	60	128	181	20	87	140	C			
704	5.3	8.8	14.4	2.8	6.3	11.9	403	14.1	12.1	187	21	35	58	11	25	48	C			
401	4.3	8.2	12.0	2.5	6.4	10.2	2820	21.6	15.3	682	121	231	338	71	180	288	C			
708	9.6	14.8	30.0	4.8	10.0	25.2	953	33.0	15.0	334	91	141	286	46	95	240	C			

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 1. USTES DATA USED IN SUMMARY TABLES
(with alternative sorts each identified by check under appropriate column)

Area Code	Unemployment rate (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	Unemployment rate increase (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	1968 work force (divided by 10)	1968 defense dependency ratio (%)	1965 to 1968 increase in defense dependency ratio (%)	Layoff number in 100% case (divided by 10)	Unemployed after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	Unemployed increase after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	
603	4.2	4.7	5.0	0	0	0	333	19.4	8.3	22	14	16	17	0	0	0	C
202	1.7	1.7	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	2410	16.3	4.9	12	41	41	41	0	0	0	C
307	2.1	2.1	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	4662	5.1	5.1	110	98	98	98	0	0	0	C
311	2.1	2.2	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	46410	6.0	2.2	370	975	1021	1067	0	0	0	C
511	2.4	2.4	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	4098	27.3	19.0	462	98	98	98	0	0	0	C
504	2.5	2.5	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1802	7.4	7.4	20	45	45	45	0	0	0	C
321	3.0	3.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	165100	1.3	0.5	915	4953	4953	5118	0	0	0	C
502	3.5	3.8	4.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	187	10.0	10.0	15	7	7	8	0	0	0	C
506	3.8	3.8	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	2362	20.0	16.0	32	9	9	9	0	0	0	C
105	4.4	4.4	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	3020	8.7	5.4	107	133	133	133	0	0	0	C
512	4.6	4.6	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	6341	11.1	7.8	0	29	29	29	0	0	0	C
122	4.8	4.8	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	9300	5.2	1.5	385	446	446	446	0	0	0	C
409	5.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	890	8.3	5.5	22	45	45	45	0	0	0	C
507	5.1	5.1	5.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1857	16.9	2.2	0	95	95	95	0	0	0	C
608	5.6	5.6	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	2918	11.3	11.3	75	163	163	163	0	0	0	C
312	5.8	5.8	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	3740	2.6	2.3	62	217	217	221	0	0	0	C
521	5.9	5.9	5.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	9760	1.8	1.6	15	576	576	566	0	0	0	C
322	3.0	3.1	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	26920	1.6	1.2	400	807	835	861	0	0	27	C
121	3.2	3.2	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.1	140290	5.5	1.5	12400	4489	4489	4630	0	0	140	C
616	3.4	3.4	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.1	1435	34.0	2.2	62	49	49	50	0	0	1	C
508	6.9	6.9	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	3406	3.4	3.1	20	235	235	238	0	0	3	C
901	8.2	8.4	8.5	0.0	0.0	0.1	1326	4.4	2.2	20	109	111	113	0	0	1	C
705	2.5	2.7	3.0	.0	.0	.2	729	9.3	9.3	15	18	20	22	0	0	1	C
604	7.5	7.6	7.7	0.0	0.1	0.2	789	19.0	12.4	17	59	60	61	0	1	2	C
308	7.8	7.9	8.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	1512	4.0	4.0	22	118	119	121	0	2	3	C
221	4.5	4.6	4.9	0.0	0.0	0.3	28390	2.0	1.0	548	1278	1306	1391	0	0	85	C
621	3.1	3.2	3.3	0.1	0.2	0.3	14200	2.2	1.9	300	440	454	469	14	28	43	C
306	14.6	14.6	14.7	0.2	0.2	0.3	312	6.7	6.7	18	46	46	46	1	1	1	C
304	2.6	2.7	2.9	0.1	0.2	0.4	1353	9.0	6.0	100	35	37	39	1	3	5	C

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 1. USTES DATA USED IN SUMMARY TABLES
(with alternative sorts each identified by check under appropriate column)

Area Code	Unemployment rate (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	Unemployment rate increase (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	1968 work force (divided by 10)	1968 defense dependency ratio (%)	1965 to 1968 increase in defense dependency ratio (%)	Layoff number in 100% case(divided by 10)	Unemployed after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	Unemployed increase after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	
622	2.6	3.0	3.5	0	0	.5	31630	2.7	.9	350	822	949	1107	0	0	158	C
421	3.9	4.0	4.3	0.1	0.2	0.5	44970	2.5	1.7	1206	1754	1799	1934	45	90	225	C
610	3.7	3.9	4.1	.2	.4	.6	93701	6.3	2.0	145	347	365	384	19	37	56	C
106	3.5	3.7	4.0	0.1	0.3	0.6	53701	1.5	6.0	225	188	199	215	5	16	32	C
516	6.2	6.3	6.6	0.2	0.3	0.6	1170	8.1	6.5	12	73	74	77	2	4	7	C
201	3.5	3.5	3.8	0.3	0.3	0.6	12360	7.5	4.9	70	433	433	470	37	37	74	C
301	3.5	3.8	4.3	0.0	0.2	0.7	20001	8.7	18.2	535	70	76	86	0	4	14	C
403	3.2	3.2	3.3	0.6	0.6	0.7	14151	4.8	2.2	10	45	45	47	8	8	10	C
721	4.2	4.4	4.8	.2	.4	.8	6373	4.0	1.4	199	268	280	306	13	25	51	C
310	7.5	7.8	8.2	0.2	0.5	0.9	1122	5.1	4.7	34	84	88	92	2	6	10	C
802	6.6	6.8	7.0	0.5	0.7	0.9	505	2.2	2.2	10	33	34	35	3	4	5	C
707	4.6	4.8	5.6	.2	.4	1.2	26451	8.3	6.4	125	122	127	148	5	11	32	C
223	3.4	3.7	4.3	0.3	0.6	1.2	20504	0	5.3	1.7	2876	6971	7586	8817	615	1230	4260 C
107	5.8	6.1	6.9	0.5	0.8	1.3	9070	6.5	5.5	460	526	553	626	45	73	118	C
703	2.0	3.0	5.0	.0	.0	1.4	844	6.0	6.0	86	17	25	42	0	0	12	C
711	3.0	3.5	4.0	.4	.9	1.4	18601	6.9	10.2	344	56	65	74	7	17	26	C
402	3.1	3.6	4.1	0.4	0.9	1.4	477	6.4	6.4	29	15	17	20	2	4	7	C
305	6.5	7.0	8.0	0.0	0.5	1.5	4090	8.0	8.0	28	266	286	327	0	20	61	C
921	4.0	4.8	5.6	0.0	0.8	1.6	14063	0	4.2	1.0	6450	5625	6750	7875	0	1125	2250 C
102	3.1	3.7	4.4	0.3	0.9	1.6	40451	0.1	5.0	335	125	150	178	12	36	65	C
903	7.0	7.5	8.2	.4	.9	1.6	12080	7.7	4.7	380	846	906	991	48	109	193	C
501	4.3	4.6	5.4	0.5	0.8	1.6	83601	0.1	5.1	300	359	385	451	42	67	134	C
607	6.0	6.3	7.4	.4	.7	1.8	3460	5.8	5.5	180	208	218	256	14	24	62	C
714	1.5	2.5	3.0	.4	1.4	1.9	2841	1.2	9.0	17	4	7	9	1	4	5	C
515	0.0	4.1	5.7	0.0	0.4	2.0	8271	6.9	9.6	44	0	34	47	0	3	17	C
706	3.8	4.3	5.4	.5	1.0	2.1	18402	2.5	9.7	230	70	79	99	9	18	39	C
611	8.6	9.0	10.0	0.8	1.2	2.2	651	5.0	3.3	30	56	59	65	5	8	14	C
302	5.0	5.5	7.0	0.5	1.0	2.5	95371	4.6	6.5	680	477	525	668	48	95	238	C
222	4.2	5.0	6.7	0.1	0.9	2.6	55710	4.6	0.8	2590	2340	2786	2733	56	501	1448	C

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 1. USTES DATA USED IN SUMMARY TABLES
(with alternative sorts each identified by check under appropriate column)

Area	Unemployment rate (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	Unemployment rate increase (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	1968 work force (divided by 10)	1968 defense dependency ratio (%)	1965 to 1968 increase in defense dependency ratio (%)	Layoff number in 100% case (divided by 10)	Unemployed after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	Unemployed increase after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	
609	7.0	7.5	8.9	.8	1.3	2.7	1864	5.8	5.8	61	130	140	166	15	24	50	C
313	7.2	8.0	9.5	0.7	1.5	3.0	2681	1.6	5.8	16	19	21	25	2	4	8	C
509	3.4	4.1	6.0	0.5	1.2	3.1	8990	24.0	6.1	430	306	369	539	45	108	279	C
902	11.0	12.0	13.0	1.4	2.4	3.4	7430	4.3	4.0	170	817	892	966	104	178	253	C
303	4.0	5.5	7.0	0.5	2.0	3.5	2828	9.0	9.0	270	113	156	198	14	57	99	C
710	5.3	6.2	7.9	0.9	1.8	3.5	908	10.9	8.7	67	48	72	74	8	16	32	C
615	4.2	4.9	6.1	1.7	2.4	3.6	833	7.9	6.3	30	35	41	51	14	20	30	C
601	4.0	5.1	7.1	.9	2.0	4.0	6448	18.5	9.8	464	258	329	458	58	129	258	C
101	5.2	6.3	8.2	1.0	2.1	4.0	17070	13.0	3.9	800	888	1075	1400	171	358	683	C
702	5.0	6.2	7.5	2.1	3.3	4.6	690	11.9	7.5	49	35	43	52	14	23	32	C
712	6.1	7.3	9.7	1.1	2.3	4.7	450	11.7	9.3	32	27	33	44	5	10	21	C
602	8.0	10.3	11.3	2.0	4.3	5.3	431	11.2	5.9	89	34	44	49	9	19	23	C
505	18.0	20.0	22.0	1.7	3.7	5.7	257	16.7	10.0	15	46	51	57	4	10	15	C
709	6.1	7.9	11.8	.1	1.9	5.8	1505	22.4	15.1	240	92	119	178	2	29	87	C
103	2.5	6.0	8.0	1.1	4.6	6.6	3930	14.7	9.7	570	98	236	314	43	81	259	C
715	4.5	5.7	10.3	1.3	2.5	7.1	11785	9.7	7.8	1020	530	672	1214	153	295	837	C
716	4.4	6.0	10.0	1.9	3.5	7.5	4750	35.6	19.4	1023	209	285	475	90	166	356	C
701	8.2	9.1	12.9	3.1	4.0	7.8	828	13.3	13.3	67	68	75	107	26	33	65	C
405	4.0	6.5	10.0	2.1	4.6	8.1	2232	21.8	21.4	400	89	145	223	47	103	181	C
605	6.2	7.4	11.3	3.5	4.7	8.6	2230	20.9	7.4	393	138	165	252	78	105	192	C
513	6.9	7.6	11.4	4.7	5.4	9.2	983	10.0	5.0	80	68	75	112	46	53	90	C
713	3.2	5.3	11.7	.8	2.9	9.3	1311	11.9	6.9	400	42	69	153	10	38	122	C
606	4.0	8.5	12.0	1.3	5.8	9.3	1506	31.6	14.6	400	60	128	181	20	87	140	C
401	4.3	8.2	12.0	2.5	6.4	10.2	2820	21.6	15.3	682	121	231	338	71	180	288	C
704	5.3	8.8	14.4	2.8	6.3	11.9	403	14.1	12.1	187	21	35	58	11	25	48	C
404	5.0	8.0	18.0	0.8	3.8	13.8	920	20.1	8.0	267	46	74	166	7	35	127	C
708	9.6	14.8	30.0	4.8	10.0	25.2	953	33.0	15.0	334	91	141	286	46	95	240	C

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 1. USTES DATA USED IN SUMMARY TABLES
(with alternative sorts each identified by check under appropriate column)

Area	Code	Unemployment rate (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	Unemployment rate increase (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	1968 work force (divided by 10)	1968 defense dependency ratio (%)	1965 to 1968 increase in defense dependency ratio (%)	Layoff number in 100% case (divided by 10)	Unemployed after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	Unemployed increase after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	
502		3.5	3.8	4.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	187	10.0	10.0	15	7	7	8	0	0	0	C
506		3.8	3.8	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	236	20.0	16.0	32	9	9	9	0	0	0	C
505		18.0	20.0	22.0	1.7	3.7	5.7	257	16.7	10.0	15	46	51	57	4	10	15	C
313		7.2	8.0	9.5	0.7	1.5	3.0	268	11.6	5.8	16	19	21	25	2	4	8	C
714		1.5	2.5	3.0	.4	1.4	1.9	284	11.2	9.0	17	4	7	9	1	4	5	C
306		14.6	14.6	14.7	0.2	0.2	0.3	312	6.7	6.7	18	46	46	46	1	1	1	C
603		4.2	4.7	5.0	0	0	0	333	19.4	8.3	22	14	16	17	0	0	0	C
704		5.3	8.8	14.4	2.8	6.3	11.9	403	14.1	12.1	187	21	35	58	11	25	48	C
602		8.0	10.3	11.3	2.0	4.3	5.3	431	11.2	5.9	89	34	44	49	9	19	23	C
712		6.1	7.3	9.7	1.1	2.3	4.7	450	11.7	9.3	32	27	33	44	5	10	21	C
402		3.1	3.6	4.1	0.4	0.9	1.4	477	6.4	6.4	29	15	17	20	2	4	7	C
802		6.6	6.8	7.0	0.5	0.7	0.9	505	2.2	2.2	10	33	34	35	3	4	5	C
512		4.6	4.6	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	634	11.1	7.8	0	29	29	29	0	0	0	C
611		8.6	9.0	10.0	0.8	1.2	2.2	651	5.0	3.3	30	56	59	65	5	8	14	C
702		5.0	6.2	7.5	2.1	3.3	4.6	690	11.9	7.5	49	35	43	52	14	23	32	C
705		2.5	2.7	3.0	.0	.0	.2	729	9.3	9.3	15	18	20	22	0	0	1	C
604		7.5	7.6	7.7	0.0	0.1	0.2	789	19.0	12.4	17	59	60	61	0	1	2	C
515		0.0	4.1	5.7	0.0	0.4	2.0	827	16.9	9.6	44	0	34	47	0	3	17	C
701		8.2	9.1	12.9	3.1	4.0	7.8	828	13.3	13.3	67	68	75	107	26	33	65	C
615		4.2	4.9	6.1	1.7	2.4	3.6	833	7.9	6.3	30	35	41	51	14	20	30	C
703		2.0	3.0	5.0	.0	.0	1.4	844	6.0	6.0	86	17	25	42	0	0	12	C
409		5.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	890	8.3	5.5	22	45	45	45	0	0	0	
710		5.3	6.2	7.9	0.9	1.8	3.5	908	10.9	8.7	67	48	72	74	8	16	32	C
404		5.0	8.0	18.0	0.8	3.8	13.8	920	20.1	8.0	267	46	74	166	7	35	127	C
708		9.6	14.8	30.0	4.8	10.0	25.2	953	33.0	15.0	334	91	141	286	46	95	240	C
513		6.9	7.6	11.4	4.7	5.4	9.2	983	10.0	5.0	80	68	75	112	46	53	90	C
310		7.5	7.8	8.2	0.2	0.5	0.9	1122	5.1	4.7	34	84	88	92	2	6	10	C
516		6.2	6.3	6.6	0.2	0.3	0.6	1170	8.1	6.5	12	73	74	77	2	4	7	C
713		3.2	5.3	11.7	.8	2.9	9.3	1311	11.9	6.9	400	42	69	153	10	38	122	C

✓

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 1. USTES DATA USED IN SUMMARY TABLES
(with alternative sorts each identified by check under appropriate column)

Area Code	Unemployment rate (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	Unemployment rate increase (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	1968 work force (divided by 10)	1968 defense dependency ratio (%)	1965 to 1968 increase in defense dependency ratio (%)	Layoff number in 100% case (divided by 10)	Unemployed after 18 months, with layoff assumptions 25%	50%	100%	Unemployed increase after 18 months, with layoff assumptions 25%	50%	100%	
901	8.2	8.4	8.5	0.0	0.0	0.1	1326	4.4	2.2	20	109	111	113	0	0	1	C
304	2.6	2.7	2.9	0.1	0.2	0.4	1353	9.0	6.0	100	35	37	39	1	3	5	C
403	3.2	3.2	3.3	0.6	0.6	0.7	1415	14.8	2.2	10	45	45	47	8	8	10	C
616	3.4	3.4	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.1	1435	34.0	2.2	62	49	49	50	0	0	1	C
709	6.1	7.9	11.8	.1	1.9	5.8	1505	22.4	15.1	240	92	119	178	2	29	87	C
606	4.0	8.5	12.0	1.3	5.8	9.3	1506	31.6	14.6	400	60	128	181	20	87	140	C
308	7.8	7.9	8.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	1512	4.0	4.0	22	118	119	121	0	2	3	C
504	2.5	2.5	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1802	7.4	7.4	20	45	45	45	0	0	0	C
706	3.8	4.3	5.4	.5	1.0	2.1	1840	22.5	9.7	230	70	79	99	9	18	39	C
507	5.1	5.1	5.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1857	16.9	2.2	0	95	95	95	0	0	0	C
711	3.0	3.5	4.0	.4	.9	1.4	1860	16.9	10.2	344	56	65	74	7	17	26	C
609	7.0	7.5	8.9	.8	1.3	2.7	1864	5.8	5.8	61	130	140	166	15	24	50	C
301	3.5	3.8	4.3	0.0	0.2	0.7	2000	18.7	18.2	535	70	76	86	0	4	14	C
605	6.2	7.4	11.3	3.5	4.7	8.6	2230	20.9	7.4	393	138	165	252	78	105	192	C
405	4.0	6.5	10.0	2.1	4.6	8.1	2232	21.8	21.4	400	89	145	223	47	103	181	C
202	1.7	1.7	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	2410	16.3	4.9	12	41	41	41	0	0	0	C
707	4.6	4.8	5.6	.2	.4	1.2	2645	18.3	6.4	125	122	127	148	5	11	32	C
401	4.3	8.2	12.0	2.5	6.4	10.2	2820	21.6	15.3	682	121	231	338	71	180	288	C
303	4.0	5.5	7.0	0.5	2.0	3.5	2828	9.0	9.0	270	113	156	198	14	57	99	C
608	5.6	5.6	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	2918	11.3	11.3	75	163	163	163	0	0	0	C
105	4.4	4.4	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	3020	8.7	5.4	107	133	133	133	0	0	0	C
508	6.9	6.9	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	3406	3.4	3.1	20	235	235	238	0	0	3	C
607	6.0	6.3	7.4	.4	.7	1.8	3460	5.8	5.5	180	208	218	256	14	24	62	C
312	5.8	5.8	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	3740	2.6	2.3	62	217	217	221	0	0	0	C
103	2.5	6.0	8.0	1.1	4.6	6.6	3930	14.7	9.7	570	98	236	314	43	81	259	C
102	3.1	3.7	4.4	0.3	0.9	1.6	4045	10.1	5.0	335	125	150	178	12	36	65	C
305	6.5	7.0	8.0	0.0	0.5	1.5	4090	8.0	8.0	28	266	286	327	0	20	61	C
511	2.4	2.4	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	4098	27.3	19.0	462	98	98	98	0	0	0	C

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 1. USTES DATA USED IN SUMMARY TABLES
(with alternative sorts each identified by check under appropriate column)

Area Code	Unemployment rate (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	Unemployment rate increase (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	1968 work force (divided by 10)	1968 defense dependency ratio (%)	1965 to 1968 increase in defense dependency ratio (%)	Layoff number in 100% case (divided by 10)	Unemployed after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	Unemployed increase after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	
307	2.1	2.1	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	4662	5.1	5.1	110	98	98	98	0	0	0	C
716	4.4	6.0	10.0	1.9	3.5	7.5	4750	35.6	19.4	1023	209	285	475	90	166	356	C
106	3.5	3.7	4.0	0.1	0.3	0.6	5370	11.5	6.0	225	188	199	215	5	16	32	C
721	4.2	4.4	4.8	.2	.4	.8	6373	4.0	1.4	199	268	280	306	13	25	51	C
601	4.0	5.1	7.1	.9	2.0	4.0	6448	18.5	9.8	464	258	329	458	58	129	258	C
902	11.0	12.0	13.0	1.4	2.4	3.4	7430	4.3	4.0	170	817	892	966	104	178	253	C
501	4.3	4.6	5.4	0.5	0.8	1.6	8360	10.1	5.1	300	359	385	451	42	67	134	C
509	3.4	4.1	6.0	0.5	1.2	3.1	8990	24.0	6.1	430	306	369	539	45	108	279	C
107	5.8	6.1	6.9	0.5	0.8	1.3	9070	6.5	5.5	460	526	553	626	45	73	118	C
122	4.8	4.8	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	9300	5.2	1.5	385	446	446	446	0	0	0	C
610	3.7	3.9	4.1	.2	.4	.6	9370	16.3	2.0	145	347	365	384	19	37	56	C
302	5.0	5.5	7.0	0.5	1.0	2.5	9537	14.6	6.5	680	477	525	668	48	95	238	C
521	5.9	5.9	5.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	9760	1.8	1.6	15	576	576	566	0	0	0	C
715	4.5	5.7	10.3	1.3	2.5	7.1	11785	9.7	7.8	1020	530	672	1214	153	295	837	C
903	7.0	7.5	8.2	.4	.9	1.6	12080	7.7	4.7	380	846	906	991	48	109	193	C
201	3.5	3.5	3.8	0.3	0.3	0.6	12360	7.5	4.9	70	433	433	470	37	37	74	C
621	3.1	3.2	3.3	0.1	0.2	0.3	14200	2.2	1.9	300	440	454	469	14	28	43	C
101	5.2	6.3	8.2	1.0	2.1	4.0	17070	13.0	3.9	800	888	1075	1400	171	358	683	C
322	3.0	3.1	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	26920	1.6	1.2	400	807	835	861	0	0	27	C
221	4.5	4.6	4.9	0.0	0.0	0.3	28390	2.0	1.0	548	1278	1306	1391	0	0	85	C
622	2.6	3.0	3.5	0	0	.5	31630	2.7	.9	350	822	949	1107	0	0	158	C
421	3.9	4.0	4.3	0.1	0.2	0.5	44970	2.5	1.7	1206	1754	1799	1934	45	90	225	C
311	2.1	2.2	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	46410	6.0	2.2	370	975	1021	1067	0	0	0	C
222	4.2	5.0	6.7	0.1	0.9	2.6	55710	4.6	0.8	2590	2340	2786	2733	56	501	1448	C
121	3.2	3.2	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.1	140290	5.5	1.5	12400	4489	4489	4630	0	0	140	C
921	4.0	4.8	5.6	0.0	0.8	1.6	140630	4.2	1.0	6450	5625	6750	7875	0	1125	2250	C
321	3.0	3.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	165100	1.3	0.5	915	4953	4953	5118	0	0	0	C
223	3.4	3.7	4.3	0.3	0.6	1.2	205040	5.3	1.7	2876	6971	7586	8817	615	1230	4260	C

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 1. USTES DATA USED IN SUMMARY TABLES
(with alternative sorts each identified by check under appropriate column)

Area Code	Unemployment rate (%) after 18 months; with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	Unemployment rate increase (%) after 18 months; with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	1968 work force (divided by 10)	1968 defense dependency ratio (%)	1965 to 1968 increase in defense dependency ratio (%)	Layoff number in 100% case (divided by 10)	Unemployed after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	Unemployed increase after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	
321	3.0	3.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	165100	1.3	0.5	915	4953	4953	5118	0	0	0	C
322	3.0	3.1	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	26920	1.6	1.2	400	807	835	861	0	0	27	C
521	5.9	5.9	5.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	9760	1.8	1.6	15	576	576	566	0	0	0	C
221	4.5	4.6	4.9	0.0	0.0	0.3	28390	2.0	1.0	548	1278	1306	1391	0	0	85	C
621	3.1	3.2	3.3	0.1	0.2	0.3	14200	2.2	1.9	300	440	454	469	14	28	43	C
802	6.6	6.8	7.0	0.5	0.7	0.9	505	2.2	2.2	10	33	34	35	3	4	5	C
421	3.9	4.0	4.3	0.1	0.2	0.5	44970	2.5	1.7	1206	1754	1799	1934	45	90	225	C
312	5.8	5.8	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	3740	2.6	2.3	62	217	217	221	0	0	0	C
622	2.6	3.0	3.5	0	0	.5	31630	2.7	.9	350	822	949	1107	0	0	158	C
508	6.9	6.9	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	3406	3.4	3.1	20	235	235	238	0	0	3	C
308	7.8	7.9	8.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	1512	4.0	4.0	22	118	119	121	0	2	3	C
721	4.2	4.4	4.8	.2	.4	.8	6373	4.0	1.4	199	268	280	306	13	25	51	C
921	4.0	4.8	5.6	0.0	0.8	1.6	140630	4.2	1.0	6450	5625	6750	7875	0	1125	2250	C
902	11.0	12.0	13.0	1.4	2.4	3.4	7430	4.3	4.0	170	817	892	966	104	178	253	C
901	8.2	8.4	8.5	0.0	0.0	0.1	1326	4.4	2.2	20	109	111	113	0	0	1	C
222	4.2	5.0	6.7	0.1	0.9	2.6	55710	4.6	0.8	2590	2340	2786	2733	56	501	1448	C
611	8.6	9.0	10.0	0.8	1.2	2.2	651	5.0	3.3	30	56	59	65	5	8	14	C
307	2.1	2.1	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	4662	5.1	5.1	110	98	98	98	0	0	0	C
310	7.5	7.8	8.2	0.2	0.5	0.9	1122	5.1	4.7	34	84	88	92	2	6	10	C
122	4.8	4.8	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	9300	5.2	1.5	385	446	446	446	0	0	0	C
223	3.4	3.7	4.3	0.3	0.6	1.2	205040	5.3	1.7	2876	6971	7586	8817	615	1230	4260	C
121	3.2	3.2	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.1	140290	5.5	1.5	12400	4489	4489	4630	0	0	140	C
607	6.0	6.3	7.4	.4	.7	1.8	3460	5.8	5.5	180	208	218	256	14	24	62	C
609	7.0	7.5	8.9	.8	1.3	2.7	1864	5.8	5.8	61	130	140	166	15	24	50	C
311	2.1	2.2	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	46410	6.0	2.2	370	975	1021	1067	0	0	0	C
703	2.0	3.0	5.0	.0	.0	1.4	844	6.0	6.0	86	17	25	42	0	0	12	C
402	3.1	3.6	4.1	0.4	0.9	1.4	477	6.4	6.4	29	15	17	20	2	4	7	C
107	5.8	6.1	6.9	0.5	0.8	1.3	9070	6.5	5.5	460	526	553	626	45	73	118	C
306	14.6	14.6	14.7	0.2	0.2	0.3	312	6.7	6.7	18	46	46	46	1	1	1	C

✓

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 1. USTES DATA USED IN SUMMARY TABLES
(with alternative sorts each identified by check under appropriate column)

Area code	Unemployment rate (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	Unemployment rate increase (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	1968 work force (divided by 10)	1968 defense dependency ratio (%)	1965 to 1968 increase in defense dependency ratio (%)	Layoff number in 100% case (divided by 10)	Unemployed after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	Unemployed increase after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	
504	2.5	2.5	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1802	7.4	7.4	20	45	45	45	0	0	0	C
201	3.5	3.5	3.8	0.3	0.3	0.6	12360	7.5	4.9	70	433	433	470	37	37	74	C
903	7.0	7.5	8.2	.4	.9	1.6	12080	7.7	4.7	380	846	906	991	48	109	193	C
615	4.2	4.9	6.1	1.7	2.4	3.6	833	7.9	6.3	30	35	41	51	14	20	30	C
305	6.5	7.0	8.0	0.0	0.5	1.5	4090	8.0	8.0	28	266	286	327	0	20	61	C
516	6.2	6.3	6.6	0.2	0.3	0.6	1170	8.1	6.5	12	73	74	77	2	4	7	C
409	5.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	890	8.3	5.5	22	45	45	45	0	0	0	C
105	4.4	4.4	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	3020	8.7	5.4	107	133	133	133	0	0	0	C
304	2.6	2.7	2.9	0.1	0.2	0.4	1353	9.0	6.0	100	35	37	39	1	3	5	C
303	4.0	5.5	7.0	0.5	2.0	3.5	2828	9.0	9.0	270	113	156	198	14	57	99	C
705	2.5	2.7	3.0	.0	.0	.2	729	9.3	9.3	15	18	20	22	0	0	1	C
715	4.5	5.7	10.3	1.3	2.5	7.1	11785	9.7	7.8	1020	530	672	1214	153	295	837	C
502	3.5	3.8	4.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	187	10.0	10.0	15	7	7	8	0	0	0	C
513	6.9	7.6	11.4	4.7	5.4	9.2	983	10.0	5.0	80	68	75	112	46	53	90	C
102	3.1	3.7	4.4	0.3	0.9	1.6	4045	10.1	5.0	335	125	150	178	12	36	65	C
501	4.3	4.6	5.4	0.5	0.8	1.6	8360	10.1	5.1	300	359	385	451	42	67	134	C
710	5.3	6.2	7.9	0.9	1.8	3.5	908	10.9	8.7	67	48	72	74	8	16	32	C
512	4.6	4.6	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	634	11.1	7.8	0	29	29	29	0	0	0	C
714	1.5	2.5	3.0	.4	1.4	1.9	284	11.2	9.0	17	4	7	9	1	4	5	C
602	8.0	10.3	11.3	2.0	4.3	5.3	431	11.2	5.9	89	34	44	49	9	19	23	C
608	5.6	5.6	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	2918	11.3	11.3	75	163	163	163	0	0	0	C
106	3.5	3.7	4.0	0.1	0.3	0.6	5370	11.5	6.0	225	188	199	215	5	16	32	C
313	7.2	8.0	9.5	0.7	1.5	3.0	268	11.6	5.8	16	19	21	25	2	4	8	C
712	6.1	7.3	9.7	1.1	2.3	4.7	450	11.7	9.3	32	27	33	44	5	10	21	C
702	5.0	6.2	7.5	2.1	3.3	4.6	690	11.9	7.5	49	35	43	52	14	23	32	C
713	3.2	5.3	11.7	.8	2.9	9.3	1311	11.9	6.9	400	42	69	153	10	38	122	C
101	5.2	6.3	8.2	1.0	2.1	4.0	1707	13.0	3.9	800	888	1075	1400	171	358	683	C
701	8.2	9.1	12.9	3.1	4.0	7.8	82	13.3	13.3	67	68	75	107	26	33	65	C
704	5.3	8.8	14.4	2.8	6.3	11.9	403	14.1	12.1	187	21	35	58	11	25	48	C

✓

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 1. USTES DATA USED IN SUMMARY TABLES
(with alternative sorts each identified by check under appropriate column)

Area code	Unemployment rate (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	Unemployment rate increase (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	1968 work force (divided by 10)	1968 defense dependency ratio (%)	1965 to 1968 increase in defense dependency ratio (%)	Layoff number in 100% case (divided by 10)	Unemployed after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	Unemployed increase after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	
302	5.0	5.5	7.0	0.5	1.0	2.5	9537	14.6	6.5	680	477	525	668	48	95	238	C
103	2.5	6.0	8.0	1.1	4.6	6.6	3930	14.7	9.7	570	98	236	314	43	81	259	C
403	3.2	3.2	3.3	0.6	0.6	0.7	1415	14.8	2.2	10	45	45	47	8	8	10	C
202	1.7	1.7	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	2410	16.3	4.9	12	41	41	41	0	0	0	C
610	3.7	3.9	4.1	.2	.4	.6	9370	16.3	2.0	145	347	365	384	19	37	56	C
505	18.0	20.0	22.0	1.7	3.7	5.7	257	16.7	10.0	15	46	51	57	4	10	15	C
507	5.1	5.1	5.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1857	16.9	2.2	0	95	95	95	0	0	0	C
711	3.0	3.5	4.0	.4	.9	1.4	1860	16.9	10.2	344	56	65	74	7	17	26	C
515	0.0	4.1	5.7	0.0	0.4	2.0	827	16.9	9.6	44	0	34	47	0	3	17	C
707	4.6	4.8	5.6	.2	.4	1.2	2645	18.3	6.4	125	122	127	148	5	11	32	C
601	4.0	5.1	7.1	.9	2.0	4.0	6448	18.5	9.8	464	258	329	458	58	129	258	C
301	3.5	3.8	4.3	0.0	0.2	0.7	2000	18.7	18.2	535	70	76	86	0	4	14	C
604	7.5	7.6	7.7	0.0	0.1	0.2	789	19.0	12.4	17	59	60	61	0	1	2	C
603	4.2	4.7	5.0	0	0	0	333	19.4	8.3	22	14	16	17	0	0	0	C
506	3.8	3.8	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	2362	20.0	16.0	32	9	9	9	0	0	0	C
404	5.0	8.0	18.0	0.8	3.8	13.8	9202	20.1	8.0	267	46	74	166	7	35	127	C
605	6.2	7.4	11.3	3.5	4.7	8.6	2230	20.9	7.4	393	138	165	252	78	105	192	C
401	4.3	8.2	12.0	2.5	6.4	10.2	2820	21.6	15.3	682	121	231	338	71	180	288	C
405	4.0	6.5	10.0	2.1	4.6	8.1	2232	21.8	21.4	400	89	145	223	47	103	181	C
709	6.1	7.9	11.8	.1	1.9	5.8	1505	22.4	15.1	240	92	119	178	2	29	87	C
706	3.8	4.3	5.4	.5	1.0	2.1	1840	22.5	9.7	230	70	79	99	9	18	39	C
509	3.4	4.1	6.0	0.5	1.2	3.1	8990	24.0	6.1	430	306	369	539	45	108	279	C
511	2.4	2.4	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	4098	27.3	19.0	462	98	98	98	0	0	0	C
606	4.0	8.5	12.0	1.3	5.8	9.3	1506	31.6	14.6	400	60	128	181	20	87	140	C
708	9.6	14.8	30.0	4.8	10.0	25.2	953	33.0	15.0	334	91	141	286	46	95	240	C
616	3.4	3.4	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.1	1435	34.0	2.2	62	49	49	50	0	0	1	C
716	4.4	6.0	10.0	1.9	3.5	7.5	4750	35.6	19.4	1023	209	285	475	90	166	356	C

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 1. USTES DATA USED IN SUMMARY TABLES
(with alternative sorts each identified by check under appropriate column)

Area	Unemployment rate (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	Unemployment rate increase (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	1968 work force (divided by 10)	1968 defense dependency ratio (%)	1965 to 1968 increase in defense dependency ratio (%)	Layoff number in 100's case (divided by 10)	Unemployed after 18 months, with layoff assumptions 25% (divided by 10)	50%	100%	Unemployed increase after 18 months, with layoff assumptions 25% (divided by 10)	50%	100%	
321	3.0	3.0	3.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	165100	1.3	0.5	915	4953	4953	5118	0	0	0	C
222	4.2	5.0	6.7	0.1	0.9	2.6	55710	4.6	0.8	2590	2340	2786	2733	56	501	1448	C
622	2.6	3.0	3.5	0	0	.5	31630	2.7	.9	350	822	949	1107	0	0	158	C
221	4.5	4.6	4.9	0.0	0.0	0.3	28390	2.0	1.0	548	1278	1306	1391	0	0	85	C
921	4.0	4.8	5.6	0.0	0.8	1.6	140630	4.2	1.0	6450	5625	6750	7875	0	1125	2250	C
322	3.0	3.1	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.1	26920	1.6	1.2	400	807	835	861	0	0	27	C
721	4.2	4.4	4.8	.2	.4	.8	6373	4.0	1.4	199	268	280	306	13	25	51	C
122	4.8	4.8	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	9300	5.2	1.5	385	446	446	446	0	0	0	C
121	3.2	3.2	3.3	0.0	0.0	0.1	140290	5.5	1.5	12400	4489	4489	4630	0	0	140	C
521	5.9	5.9	5.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	9760	1.8	1.6	15	576	576	566	0	0	0	C
421	3.9	4.0	4.3	0.1	0.2	0.5	44970	2.5	1.7	1206	1754	1799	1934	45	90	225	C
223	3.4	3.7	4.3	0.3	0.6	1.2	205040	5.3	1.7	2876	6971	7586	8817	615	1230	4260	C
621	3.1	3.2	3.3	0.1	0.2	0.3	14200	2.2	1.9	300	440	454	469	14	28	43	C
610	3.7	3.9	4.1	.2	.4	.6	9370	16.3	2.0	145	347	365	384	19	37	56	C
802	6.6	6.8	7.0	0.5	0.7	0.9	505	2.2	2.2	10	33	34	35	3	4	5	C
901	8.2	8.4	8.5	0.0	0.0	0.1	1326	4.4	2.2	20	109	111	113	0	0	1	C
403	3.2	3.2	3.3	0.6	0.6	0.7	1415	14.8	2.2	10	45	45	47	8	8	10	C
616	3.4	3.4	3.5	0.0	0.0	0.1	1435	34.0	2.2	62	49	49	50	0	0	1	C
507	5.1	5.1	5.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1857	16.9	2.2	0	95	95	95	0	0	0	C
311	2.1	2.2	2.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	46410	6.0	2.2	370	975	1021	1067	0	0	0	C
312	5.8	5.8	5.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	3740	2.6	2.3	62	217	217	221	0	0	0	C
508	6.9	6.9	7.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	3406	3.4	3.1	20	235	235	238	0	0	3	C
611	8.6	9.0	10.0	0.8	1.2	2.2	651	5.0	3.3	30	56	59	65	5	8	14	C
101	5.2	6.3	8.2	1.0	2.1	4.0	17070	13.0	3.9	800	888	1075	1400	171	358	683	C
308	7.8	7.9	8.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	1512	4.0	4.0	22	118	119	121	0	2	3	C
902	11.0	12.0	13.0	1.4	2.4	3.4	7430	4.3	4.0	170	817	892	966	104	178	253	C
310	7.5	7.8	8.2	0.2	0.5	0.9	1122	5.1	4.7	34	84	88	92	2	6	10	C
903	7.0	7.5	8.2	.4	.9	1.6	12080	7.7	4.7	380	846	906	991	48	109	193	C
202	1.7	1.7	1.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	2410	16.3	4.9	12	41	41	41	0	0	0	C

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 1. USTES DATA USED IN SUMMARY TABLES
(with alternative sorts each identified by check under appropriate column)

Area Code	Unemployment rate (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	Unemployment rate increase (%) after 18 months, with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	1968 work force (divided by 10)	1968 defense dependency ratio (%)	1965 to 1968 increase in defense dependency ratio (%)	Layoff number in 100% case(divided by 10)	Unemployed after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	Unemployed increase after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	
201	3.5	3.5	3.8	0.3	0.3	0.6	12360	7.5	4.9	70	433	433	470	37	37	74	C
513	6.9	7.6	11.4	4.7	5.4	9.2	983	10.0	5.0	80	68	75	112	46	53	90	C
102	3.1	3.7	4.4	0.3	0.9	1.6	4045	10.1	5.0	335	125	150	178	12	36	65	C
307	2.1	2.1	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	4662	5.1	5.1	110	98	98	98	0	0	0	C
501	4.3	4.6	5.4	0.5	0.8	1.6	8360	10.1	5.1	300	359	385	451	42	67	134	C
105	4.4	4.4	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	3020	8.7	5.4	107	133	133	133	0	0	0	C
409	5.0	5.0	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	890	8.3	5.5	22	45	45	45	0	0	0	
607	6.0	6.3	7.4	.4	.7	1.8	3460	5.8	5.5	180	208	218	256	14	24	62	C
107	5.8	6.1	6.9	0.5	0.8	1.3	9070	6.5	5.5	460	526	553	626	45	73	118	C
313	7.2	8.0	9.5	0.7	1.5	3.0	268	11.6	5.8	16	19	21	25	2	4	8	C
609	7.0	7.5	8.9	.8	1.3	2.7	1864	5.8	5.8	61	130	140	166	15	24	50	C
602	8.0	10.3	11.3	2.0	4.3	5.3	431	11.2	5.9	89	34	44	49	9	19	23	C
703	2.0	3.0	5.0	.0	.0	1.4	844	6.0	6.0	86	17	25	42	0	0	12	C
304	2.6	2.7	2.9	0.1	0.2	0.4	1353	9.0	6.0	100	35	37	39	1	3	5	C
106	3.5	3.7	4.0	0.1	0.3	0.6	5370	11.5	6.0	225	188	199	215	5	16	32	C
509	3.4	4.1	6.0	0.5	1.2	3.1	8990	24.0	6.1	430	306	369	539	45	108	279	C
615	4.2	4.9	6.1	1.7	2.4	3.6	833	7.9	6.3	30	35	41	51	14	20	30	C
402	3.1	3.6	4.1	0.4	0.9	1.4	477	6.4	6.4	29	15	17	20	2	4	7	C
707	4.6	4.8	5.6	.2	.4	1.2	2645	18.3	6.4	125	122	127	148	5	11	32	C
516	6.2	6.3	6.6	0.2	0.3	0.6	1170	8.1	6.5	12	73	74	77	2	4	7	C
302	5.0	5.5	7.0	0.5	1.0	2.5	9537	14.6	6.5	680	477	525	668	48	95	238	C
306	14.6	14.6	14.7	0.2	0.2	0.3	312	6.7	6.7	18	46	46	46	1	1	1	C
713	3.2	5.3	11.7	.8	2.9	9.3	1311	11.9	6.9	400	42	69	153	10	38	122	C
504	2.5	2.5	2.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	1802	7.4	7.4	20	45	45	45	0	0	0	C
605	6.2	7.4	11.3	3.5	4.7	8.6	2230	20.9	7.4	393	138	165	252	78	105	192	C
702	5.0	6.2	7.5	2.1	3.3	4.6	690	11.9	7.5	49	35	43	52	14	23	32	C
512	4.6	4.6	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	634	11.1	7.8	0	29	29	29	0	0	0	C
715	4.5	5.7	10.3	1.3	2.5	7.1	1178	5	9.7	7.8	1020	530	672	1214	153	295	837	C
404	5.0	8.0	18.0	0.8	3.8	13.8	920	20.1	8.0	267	46	74	166	7	35	127	C

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 1.— USTES DATA USED IN SUMMARY TABLES
(with alternative sorts each identified by check under appropriate column)

Area	Code	Unemployment rate (%) after 18 months; with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	Unemployment rate increase (%) after 18 months; with layoff assumptions of 25%	50%	100%	1968 work force (divided by 10)	1968 defense dependency ratio (%)	1965 to 1968 increase in defense dependency ratio (%)	Layoff number in 100% case (divided by 10)	Unemployed after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	Unemployed increase after 18 months, with layoff assumptions (divided by 10) 25%	50%	100%	
305	6.5	7.0	8.0	0.0	0.5	1.5	4090	8.0	8.0	28	266	286	327	0	20	61	C
603	4.2	4.7	5.0	0	0	0	333	19.4	8.3	22	14	16	17	U	U	U	C
710	5.3	6.2	7.9	0.9	1.8	3.5	908	10.9	8.7	67	48	72	74	8	16	32	C
714	1.5	2.5	3.0	.4	1.4	1.9	284	11.2	9.0	17	4	7	9	1	4	5	C
303	4.0	5.5	7.0	0.5	2.0	3.5	2828	9.0	9.0	270	113	156	198	14	57	99	C
712	6.1	7.3	9.7	1.1	2.3	4.7	450	11.7	9.3	32	27	33	44	5	10	21	C
705	2.5	2.7	3.0	.0	.0	.2	729	9.3	9.3	15	18	20	22	0	0	1	C
515	0.0	4.1	5.7	0.0	0.4	2.0	827	16.9	9.6	44	0	34	47	0	3	17	C
706	3.8	4.3	5.4	.5	1.0	2.1	1840	22.5	9.7	230	70	79	99	9	18	39	C
103	2.5	6.0	8.0	1.1	4.6	6.6	3930	14.7	9.7	570	98	236	314	43	81	259	C
601	4.0	5.1	7.1	.9	2.0	4.0	6448	18.5	9.8	464	258	329	458	58	129	258	C
502	3.5	3.8	4.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	187	10.0	10.0	15	7	7	8	0	0	0	C
505	18.0	20.0	22.0	1.7	3.7	5.7	257	16.7	10.0	15	46	51	57	4	10	15	C
711	3.0	3.5	4.0	.4	.9	1.4	1860	16.9	10.2	344	56	65	74	7	17	26	C
608	5.6	5.6	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	2918	11.3	11.3	75	163	163	163	0	0	0	C
704	5.3	8.8	14.4	2.8	6.3	11.9	403	14.1	12.1	187	21	35	58	11	25	48	C
604	7.5	7.6	7.7	0.0	0.1	0.2	789	19.0	12.4	17	59	60	61	0	1	2	C
701	8.2	9.1	12.9	3.1	4.0	7.8	828	13.3	13.3	67	68	75	107	26	33	65	C
606	4.0	8.5	12.0	1.3	5.8	9.3	1506	31.6	14.6	400	60	128	181	20	87	140	C
708	9.6	14.8	30.0	4.8	10.0	25.2	953	33.0	15.0	334	91	141	286	46	95	240	C
709	6.1	7.9	11.8	.1	1.9	5.8	1505	22.4	15.1	240	92	119	178	2	29	87	C
401	4.3	8.2	12.0	2.5	6.4	10.2	2820	21.6	15.3	682	121	231	338	71	180	288	C
506	3.8	3.8	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	236	20.0	16.0	32	9	9	9	0	0	0	C
301	3.5	3.8	4.3	0.0	0.2	0.7	2000	18.7	18.2	535	70	76	86	0	4	14	C
511	2.4	2.4	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	4098	27.3	19.0	462	98	98	98	0	0	0	C
716	4.4	6.0	10.0	1.9	3.5	7.5	4750	35.6	19.4	1023	209	285	475	90	166	356	C
405	4.0	6.5	10.0	2.1	4.6	8.1	2232	21.8	21.4	400	89	145	223	47	103	181	C

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

With 25, 50, and 100 percent layoffs of employees judged at risk, the predicted unemployment rates six months later are 18.0, 20,0, and 22.0 percent. However, in this case the defense layoffs would only aggravate an already high level of unemployment. The unemployment rate increases for the three layoff alternatives are only 1.7, 3.7, and 5.7 percent, and the starting base is 16.3 percent. The percentage increases in unemployment involve absolute numbers of only 40, 100, and 150. The very serious unemployment problem in Grantsville is therefore a chronic one relatively independent of Vietnam procurement.

The second most serious unemployment problem for a 50 percent layoff, that of Leesville, Louisiana (geographic code 708), is quite different. The three potential unemployment rates are 9.6, 14.8, and 30.0 percent and the unemployment rate increases associated with the postulated layoffs are contributors to this unemployment, at 4.8, 10.0, and 25.2 percent. The unemployment rate of 4.8 percent before procurement layoffs, though larger than the US average, is dwarfed by the potential increases in unemployment generated by Vietnam procurement reductions. The unemployment increases resulting from procurement reductions are larger than at Grantsville, not only in percentage importance but also in absolute numbers. The three absolute levels of increase in unemployment are 460, 950, and 2,400.

The next three areas ranked by potential unemployment rate six months after the layoffs follow the Grantsville pattern in having moderate increases in unemployment rates on relatively large bases of existing unemployment. Also, except for the case of Riverbank, California (902), where the absolute increases in unemployment are estimated at 1,040, 1,780, and 2,530, they follow the Grantsville pattern of having quite small absolute increases in unemployment.

The sixth-ranked case, Batesville, Arkansas (701), is the second in this ranking to have an unemployment rate increase that is large in relation to the existing amount of unemployment. The predicted unemployment rates of 8.2, 9.1, and 12.9 percent involve increases of 3.1, 4.0, and 7.8 percent. However,

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

here too the absolute unemployment increments are relatively small at 260, 330, and 650

Other areas with substantial contributions of unemployment rate increases to serious predicted levels of unemployment rates include the following: Camden, Arkansas (704), Ft. Rucker Area, Alabama (606), Burlington, Iowa (401), Ft. Leonard Wood Area, Missouri (404), St Augustine, Florida (513), and Ft Knox Area, Kentucky (605). Several of these areas have more than 1,000 potential additions to the unemployed, but none have as many as 3,000 even in the 100 percent layoff case.

Distribution of Areas and Unemployed by Unemployment Rates

Table 2 has aggregate statistics supporting some of the tendencies indicated by the foregoing description of individual cases. The table deals with 85 areas having total unemployment of 422,500, 463,690, and 525,550 six months after the three layoff rate alternatives. For all layoff assumptions, the largest concentration of areas and numbers of unemployed is in the interval of 3.0 to 4.9 percent of unemployment. In the 25 percent layoff alternative, 71 of the 85 areas and 94 percent of the unemployed are associated with area unemployment rates of 6.9 percent or less. The corresponding numbers in the 50 percent layoff alternative are 62 areas and 92 percent of the unemployed. In the 100 percent layoff alternative, the numbers drop to 48 areas and 80 percent of the unemployed associated with unemployment rates of 6.9 percent or less; but raising the range of unemployment rates to 8.9 percent increases the numbers to 65 areas and 90 percent of the unemployed. In general, a relatively small number of areas and small numbers of unemployed are involved in areas with the highest unemployment rates.

Distribution of Areas and Unemployed by Unemployment Rate Increase

Table 3 indicates that there are relatively few areas and unemployed people

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table 2

DISTRIBUTIONS OF NUMBERS OF AREAS AND UNEMPLOYED,
BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATES AFTER 18 MONTHS
(UNDER VARYING ASSUMED LAYOFF RATES OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENT EMPLOYEES)

Unemployment Rate (% of work force)	25% layoff rate		50% layoff rate		100% layoff rate	
	Number of Areas	Unemployed	Number of Areas	Unemployed	Number of Areas	Unemployed
0.0 - 0.9	1	0	0	--	0	--
1.0 - 2.9	11	22,510	8	13,670	6	13,880
3.0 - 4.9	38	332,050	32	325,000	25	268,130
5.0 - 6.9	21	42,770	22	86,030	17	137,950
7.0 - 8.9	10	15,230	16	25,910	17	55,640
9.0 - 10.9	1	910	3	1,780	6	20,460
11.0 - 15.9	2	8,630	3	10,790	11	24,400
16.0 - 20.9	1	460	1	510	1	1,660
21.0 - 25.9	0	--	0	--	1	570
26.0 - 30.9	0	--	0	--	1	2,860
TOTAL	85	422,560	85	463,690	85	525,550

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table 3

DISTRIBUTIONS OF NUMBERS OF AREAS AND UNEMPLOYED,
BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE INCREASE AFTER 18 MONTHS
(UNDER VARYING ASSUMED LAYOFF RATES OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENT EMPLOYEES)

Unemployment Rate Increase (Percentage Points)	25% layoff rate		50% layoff rate		100% layoff rate	
	Number of Areas	Unemployed	Number of Areas	Unemployed	Number of Areas	Unemployed
0.0 - 0.9	67	388,810	54	399,830	40	209,930
1.0 - 2.9	14	30,100	17	46,580	19	235,920
3.0 - 4.9	4	3,650	9	11,180	10	38,070
5.0 - 6.9			4	4,690	4	5,980
7.0 - 8.9			0	--	5	22,710
9.0 - 10.9			1	1,410	4	7,840
11.0 - 15.9					2	2,240
16.0 - 20.9					0	--
21.0 - 25.9					1	2,860
TOTAL	85	422,560	85	463,690	85	525,550

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

associated with the larger increases in unemployment rates. In the 25 percent layoff alternative 81 of the 85 areas have unemployment rate increases of 2.9 percent or less; and those areas account for 99 percent of the unemployment covered by the table. In the 50 percent layoff alternative the number of areas drops only to 71 and the number of unemployed drops only to 96 percent of the total Even in the 100 percent alternative the number of areas with unemployment rate increases of 2.9 percent or less is still 59 of the 85; and the number of unemployed at rates of 2.9 percent or less is still 85 percent of the total. Raising the upper limit of unemployment rate increase to 4.9 percent in the 100 percent layoff alternative brings the number of areas back up to 69 and the number of unemployed to 92 percent of the total. In general, a comparatively small percentage of areas and unemployed covered by the tables have their problems generated primarily by large increases in unemployment rates associated with large unemployment rate increases after procurement reductions. However, if it is the policy of Federal and state governments to alleviate difficulties created by Vietnam procurement reductions, even when the difficulties are atypical, Table 3 still leaves a substantial number of areas and unemployed that might qualify for help, especially in the 100 percent layoff alternative.

Distribution of Areas and Unemployment Increases by Size of Work Force

It has been noted earlier that the procedure for selecting the 99 areas to be studied took virtually all areas known to have increases in defense dependency ratio of 5 percent or more since 1965, a selection of additional areas where the existing unemployment rate seemed capable of being pushed to a serious level by loss of defense business, and a small selection of additional areas in which the defense dependency ratios might not have been very high but in which the base of work force size was large enough to make the

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

absolute magnitude of employment generated by military procurement high

The first two columns of Table 4 supply the resulting distribution of areas by work force size for the 85 areas that, after editing of USTES reports, were found to have satisfactory data. Nearly half of the areas have 1968 work forces of less than 20,000; and raising the upper limit of work force to 49,999 raises the number of included areas to 59 There are four areas with work forces of 1.4 million or more: Boston, Detroit, Philadelphia, and San Francisco. Each of the four had an insufficiently large increment in defense-dependency ratio since 1965 to have been considered in the absence of large absolute levels of defense dependency achieved by 1968.

Table 4 shows the way unemployment increases six months after completion of layoffs are distributed by size of 1968 work force for the areas covered by the table. A striking feature of the table is the estimated ability of the areas with largest work forces to absorb the immediate unemployment generated by the assumed layoffs, particularly in the 25 and 50 percent layoff alternatives. In the 50 percent alternative, however, 3 of the 10 areas with the largest work forces begin to have unemployment increases that are substantial in relation to the unemployment increases for smaller areas. The increases for the three areas amount to percentages of their own work forces in the range of 0 5 to 1.0 percent; and the problem in those three areas more than doubles with a doubling of the layoff rate to 100 percent.

Among areas with work forces of less than 200,000, there appears no tendency at any layoff rate assumption for the unemployment increases to be concentrated in areas of any particular work force size; and the increases in unemployed in particular work force class intervals appears to increase about in proportion to layoff rate assumption.

Figure 1 compares the work force sizes with unemployment increases measured in percentages of work force for the extreme case of 100 percent layoffs.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table 4

DISTRIBUTIONS OF NUMBER OF AREAS AND UNEMPLOYMENT INCREASE
18 MONTHS AFTER ASSUMED LAYOFFS, BY SIZE OF 1968 WORK FORCE
(UNDER VARYING ASSUMED LAYOFF RATES OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENT EMPLOYEES)

1968 Work Force	Number of Areas	Increase in Number of Unemployed 25% layoff rate	50% layoff rate	100% layoff rate
0 - 9,999	26	2,040	3,680	7,950
10,000 - 19,999	15	760	2,360	5,010
20,000 - 29,999	8	2,150	4,600	8,060
30,000 - 39,999	5	570	1,050	3,240
40,000 - 49,999	5	1,020	2,220	4,820
50,000 - 59,999	1	50	160	320
60,000 - 69,999	2	710	1,540	3,090
70,000 - 79,999	1	1,040	1,780	2,530
80,000 - 89,999	2	870	1,750	4,130
90,000 - 99,999	5	1,120	2,050	4,120
100,000 - 149,999	4	2,520	4,690	11,470
150,000 - 199,999	1	1,710	3,580	6,830
200,000 - 249,999	0	--	--	--
250,000 - 299,999	2	0	0	1,120
300,000 - 399,999	1	0	0	1,580
400,000 - 499,999	2	450	900	2,250
500,000 - 599,999	1	560	5,010	14,480
1,402,900	1	0	0	1,400
1,406,300	1	0	11,250	22,500
1,651,000	1	0	0	0
2,050,400	1	6,150	12,300	42,600
TOTAL	85	21,720	58,920	147,500

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library




Figure 1. UNEMPLOYMENT RATE INCREASES* RELATED TO 1968 WORK FORCE

(100 percent layoff assumption)

*Negative increases recorded as zeros.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

The figure indicates that, although many of the areas with small work forces have increases in unemployment that are relatively as small as those of areas with large work forces, the really serious problems appear to be concentrated in areas with work forces of less than 200,000. All of 17 increases of 5 percent or more are in areas with work forces of less than 150,000, with all but one of the 5% or more in areas with work forces of less than 50,000; and all but one of 9 increases of 3.0-4.9 percent are in areas with work forces of less than 100,000.

In general, one may conclude from Table 4 and Figure 1 that the problems of increase in unemployment with the postulated layoffs are less serious in important respects for the areas with the largest work forces than for the other areas. With the 25 percent layoff assumption, the largest areas appear capable of offsetting practically all of the loss of defense employment. In only three of the largest 10 areas does there begin to be any noticeable increase in unemployment when the layoff assumption is raised from 25 to 50 percent. With a rise in the layoff assumption from 50 percent to 100 percent, the absolute size of the increase in unemployment in the largest areas rises more proportionately, to where most of the increase in unemployment is in those largest areas. However, even with the 100 percent layoff assumption, the areas with largest work forces have relatively small increases in unemployment when those increases are measured in percentages of work force A total of 16 unemployment increases of 5 percent or more as percentages of work force are limited to areas with work forces less than 50,000, except for one area with a work force of 118,000 that had an unemployment rate increase amounting to 7.1 percent of the work force; and a total of 26 increases of 3 percent or more are limited to areas with work forces of less than 100,000, except for the 7.1 percent case just noted and one 4.0 percent case with a work force of 171,000.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Significance of Defense Dependency Ratio and Its 1965-1968 Increment

Tables 5 and 6 are designed to indicate the significance of 1968 defense dependency ratio and its increase since 1965 as factors in the USTES estimates of growth of unemployment. The tables also serve to describe the 85 areas with respect to the ratio and its change.

The description of areas in terms of the two sets of ratios is consistent with the procedures for selecting areas to be studied. The principal criterion for selection was increase in defense dependency ratio between 1965 and 1968. Another important criterion was sum of 1968 defense dependency ratio and 1968 unemployment rate, an indication of the potential unemployment problem if the defense business is lost. Finally, a few areas with very large work forces were selected despite comparatively small increases in defense dependency ratio if the absolute numbers of workers in defense production was large. The tables reflect these area selection criteria by predominance of areas with above-average 1968 defense dependency ratios and above average increases in such ratios between 1965 and 1968. The average defense dependency ratio of Table 5 is 11.4 percent; and the average increase in the ratio for Table 6 is 6.9 percent.

Table 5 indicates that the projected increase in unemployment percentage, though rather clearly dependent to some extent on defense dependency ratio, is always considerably less than that ratio. Even the 100 percent layoff case, the increase in unemployment as a percentage of work force is generally less than one-fourth of the defense dependency ratio. There are of course exceptions, a notable one being the simple 33.0 percent defense dependency (for Leesville, Louisiana) with the unemployment percentage increase of 25.2 percent in the 100 percent case

This tendency of unemployment rate increases to be much less than defense dependency in the survey projections reflects two forces: a finding by the field analysts that not all of the defense jobs used to calculate the defense

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table 5

DISTRIBUTIONS OF NUMBER OF AREAS AND AVERAGE UNEMPLOYMENT INCREASES, IN PERCENTAGE POINTS, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (UNDER VARYING ASSUMED LAYOFF RATES OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENT EMPLOYEES)

Defense Dependency ratio (percent)	Number of Areas	Unweighted mean of unemployment percentage points increases*		
		25% layoff rate	50% layoff rate	100% layoff rate
1.0 - 2.9	9	.08	.12	.29
3.0 - 4.9	7	.24	.66	1.26
5.0 - 6.9	13	.28	.48	1.02
7.0 - 8.9	8	.32	.55	.99
9.0 - 10.9	9	.92	1.51	3.01
11.0 - 12.9	9	.80	1.78	3.27
13.0 - 14.9	6	1.52	3.10	5.58
15.0 - 16.9	6	.38	.90	1.62
17.0 - 18.9	3	.37	.87	1.97
19.0 - 20.9	5	.86	1.72	4.52
21.0 - 22.9	4	1.30	3.48	6.55
24.0	1	.50	1.20	3.10
27.3	1	.00	.00	.00
31.6	1	1.30	5.80	9.30
33.0	1	4.80	10.00	25.20
34.0	1	.00	.00	.10
35.6	1	1.90	3.50	7.50
TOTALS	85	.64	1.36	2.73

*Negative increases for individual areas counted as zero.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table 6

DISTRIBUTIONS OF NUMBERS OF AREAS AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATE INCREASES, BY INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIOS (UNDER VARYING ASSUMED LAYOFF RATES OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENT EMPLOYEES)

Increase in defense dependency ratio 1965 to 1968 (percentage points)	Number of Areas	Unemployment rate increases* (percentage points)		
		25% layoff rate	50% layoff rate	100% layoff rate
0.0 - 1.9	13	.06	.24	.62
2.0 - 3.9	11	.28	.45	.79
4.0 - 5.9	17	.72	1.17	1.95
6.0 - 7.9	16	.72	1.27	2.79
8.0 - 9.9	12	.52	1.65	3.65
10.0 - 11.9	4	.52	1.15	1.78
12.0 - 13.9	3	1.97	3.47	6.63
14.0 - 15.9	4	2.18	6.02	12.62
16.0 - 17.9	1	.00	.00	.00
18.0 - 19.9	3	.63	1.23	2.73
21.4	1	2.10	4.60	8.10
TOTALS	85	.64	1.36	2.73

*Decreases in individual areas treated as zero.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

dependency ratio are really at risk and a finding that some of the job losses that would occur would be balanced by increases in job opportunities elsewhere. Table 6 focuses more closely on the jobs that are at risk by substitution of increases in defense dependency ratio between 1965 and 1968 for the 1968 ratio. Necessarily, the jobs at risk with reductions in Vietnam procurement will be a larger percentage of the increases in defense dependency ratio than of the ratio achieved at the end of the 1965-1968 period; and the increase in the ratio is a plausible, rough indicator of the portion of the defense dependency ratio of 1968 that is attributable to Vietnam procurement.

As might be expected, the positive correlation between unemployment rate increase and defense dependency ratio increase is greater than between the former and 1968 defense dependency ratio; and the unemployment rate increases of course represent larger percentages of increase in defense dependency ratios than of 1968 defense dependency ratios. The high correlation between increases in defense dependence and in unemployment makes it possible to assign defense dependency ratios that indicate rough boundaries between unemployment rate increase levels of any desired seriousness. In particular, if one percent is considered a boundary between serious and unimportant increases in unemployment, the table indicates that, at the 25 percent layoff assumption, the unemployment increase problem does not begin to get serious until the 12 percent increase in defense dependency ratio is reached. For 50 and 100 percent layoff assumptions, the criterion would identify the 4 percent level of increase in defense dependency ratio as the critical level. With a seriousness criterion of 3 percent increase in unemployment rate, there seems to be no problem with the 25 percent layoff assumption; and it seems necessary to go to the 12 and 8 percent levels of increase in defense dependency ratio to find serious problems with the 50 and 100 percent layoff assumptions, respectively.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Ability to Compensate for Layoffs

Figure 2 deals more directly than Table 6 with the ability of the area to offset layoffs. The table's increase in defense dependency ratio does not correspond exactly with the percentage of the work force whose jobs are at risk. Some of the increases occurred in defense work clearly not related to Vietnam; and some areas with little increase in defense dependency ratio may be heavily involved in Vietnam. In any case, the respondents to the USTES questionnaire used their own judgment on which defense jobs were at risk, even in the case of the 100 percent layoff assumption. Figure 2, however, deals directly with offset capability by relating unemployment rate increases to personnel assumed to have been laid off in the 100 percent layoff case.

The figure shows some positive correlation between increase in unemployment rate and assumed layoff rate, which was to be expected. It also shows a very well defined tendency for unemployment rate increases to be well below the 45-degree line representing equality of the two percentages. It appears from the figure that combinations of development of new jobs, out-migration and withdrawal from the labor force tend to amount to about half of the numbers of Vietnam procurement jobs that are lost in the 100 percent layoff case.

CHARACTERISTICS OF WORK FORCE AT RISK


Table 7 contains summary information from narrative information on survey forms regarding characteristics of the work force at risk. Data included for each area are the following: (1) number in the area that would be affected by a 50 percent reduct on in activity for Vietnam, (2) the number at the same 50 percent rate that are covered by the narrative comments for the area - ordinarily the same or less,* (3) percent male, (4) percent white (with non-white defined

*In some cases, the entry in (2) was greater than in (1). Usually, the discrepancy could be explained as respondent use of a 100 instead of a 50 percent cutback; and adjustments were made accordingly. Some discrepancies remain and can be explained rationally only as generated by a difference in the time period involved.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Figure 2

LAYOFFS AND UNEMPLOYMENT INCREMENTS AFTER 18 MONTHS
AS PERCENTAGES OF WORK FORCE
(100 percent layoff case)



Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 7 (continued)

Area Name	Area Code	# Affected By Direct Layoffs at 50% Rate	Characteristics of workers assumed subject to layoffs in listed plants					
			# at 50% rate	% Male	% White	Predominating Ages	Skill Level	Occupation
Boston (Mass.) **SMSA	121	37000	3375				Wide Distribution	Assemblers, Production Personnel for Electronic Equip. Shipbuilding & Machinery
Lawrence-Haver Hill (N.H.) **SMSA	122	1425	700	40	95	45 & older for the females	Semi-skilled mostly plus some skilled & professional	Mostly Welders, Fabricators, Stitcher, Bench Worker. Also Engineers, Technician, Draftsmen
Binghampton (N.Y.) **SMSA	201	350	350	67	Nearly All	Younger Workers	Semi-skilled 550 out of 700 reported	
Tobyhanna (Penn.)	202	750	750	95	47	45 or older	Semi - skilled generally	Electronic, Equip. Repairmen, Box & Crate Markers, Motor Repairmen, Helpers, Laborers, Clerical, Machinist
New Brunswick (N.J.)	221	2740	2350		Growing no. Puerto-Ricans	Older workers	Unskilled Semi-skilled Skilled	Packers, Assemblers, Solderer Engineers, Technicians, Clerical
Paterson (N.J.) **SMSA	222	12500	9915	80		Middle Age	Largely professional & technical people and some skilled	Engineers, Technicians, Production Workers with Elec. Textiles, Aircraft Industries

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 7 (continued)

Area Name	Area Code	# Affected By Direct Layoffs at 50% Rate	Characteristics of workers assumed subject to layoffs in listed plants					
			# at 50% rate	% Male	% White	Predominating Ages	Skill Level	Occupation
Phildelphia Area (Pa.)	223	14880	14880	50	90	25-45	Unskilled 40% Semi-skilled 30% Clerical 20% Prof. & Semi-Prof. 10%	Very Varied
Baraboo (Wisc.)	301	2250	2200	65	Majority		Unskilled	Power Plant Laborers
Crane (Ind.)	302	3400	2800	67	98	18-25 - 25% 25-45 - 50% 45 up - 25%	Unskilled 25% Semi-skilled 50% Skilled 25%	Ordnance Workers
Eau Claire (Wisc.)	303	1350	1350	70	50	18-65	Mostly low level skills	Production, Machine Operators, Machine Tenders, Line Inspectors
Huntington (Ind.)	304	500	500	25		Younger workers		Communication, Equipment, Assemblers
Marion (Ill.)	305	150	125					Machine Operators, Assemblers, Inspectors, Ordnance Workers, Electronic Technicians, Mixers, Melters
Rose City (Mich.)1/	306	100	185	100	100	25-45	Semi-skilled	Assemblers, Welders, Spray Painters, Press Operators

1/ Data are for actual experience in late 1968 with 185 laid off workers

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 7 (continued)

Area Name	Area Code	# Affected By Direct Layoffs at 50% Rate	Characteristics of workers assumed subject to layoffs in listed plants					
			# at 50% rate	% Male	% White	Predominating Ages	Skill Level	Occupation
Bloomington (Ill.)	307	650	500				Semi-skilled	
Cadillac (Mich.)	308	115	115	About 65		25-50 M 35-60 F		Metal Working, Machine Opera Sewing Machine Operators (Females)
Clare (Mich.)	309	0				25-46		Production Workers for Airpla Carburetors and Fuel Systems mostly metalworking machine operators
Escanaba (Mich.)	310	150	180	100	100	25-35	Unskilled Semi-skilled	Assemblers, Welders, Spray Painters, Machine Operators (Production)
Indianapolis (Ind.)	311	1490	1490	Majority			Largely skilled	Assemblers Machine Operators Clerical
Marysville (Mich.)	312	175	138	46	90	20-35		Assemblers, Sewing Machine Operators, Material Handlers, Machine Operators, Mold Press Operators, Laborers, Hand Truckers
Standish (Mich.)	313	83	80	Mostly	Nearly All		Semi-skilled	Assemblers
Detroit (Mich.)	321	2700	2700				Maj. unskilled	Production Workers

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 7 (continued)

Area Name	Area Code	# Affected By Direct Layoffs at 50% Rate	Characteristics of workers assumed subject to layoffs in listed plants					
			# at 50% rate	% Male	% White	Predominating Ages	Skill Level	Occupation
Toledo (Ohio)	322	1200	1200	90	88	Under 25		Precision Machine Operators & Production assemblers
Burlington (Iowa)	401	3310	2500	60	95	32-35	Semi-skilled	Component Operators, Load Lin Operators, Explosive Operator
Blair (Neb.)	402	149	150		100			Assemblers
Leavenworth (Kan.)	403	50	50	Mostly		Prime working age group		Maintenance of autos, machine buildings and grounds
Ft. Leonard Wood Area (Mo.)	404	1335	1335			All ages	Unskilled to skilled	Clerical, maintenance workers
Grand Island (Neb.)	405	2000	2000	70	92		Semiskilled 46% Skilled 19% Unskilled 15% Clerical 8% Prof., tech., & managerial 12%	Managerial & Professional 4% Clerical 8% Technicians 7% Production & Service Workers 81%
Hermann (Mo.)	406	0	0					
Kerkhoven (Minn.)	407	(No Defense Production Workers)						
Johnson (Mo.)	408	None	None					
W. Plains (Mo.)	409	110	150				Three skill levels	Welders, Sheetmetal Workers, Brake Operators, Laborers and Assemblers

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 7 (continued)

Area Name	Area Code	# Affected By Direct Layoffs at 50% Rate	Characteristics of workers assumed subject to layoffs in listed plants					
			# at 50% rate	% Male	% White	Predominating Ages	Skill Level	Occupation
Windsow (Mo.)	410	None						
Kansas City Area (Mo.)	421	4242	2248	40	80	Under 22 - 5% 22-44 -60% 45-64 -33% Over 65 - 2%	Unskilled 40% SemiSkilled 50% Skilled 10%	Mostly production workers of a variety
Columbus (Ga.)	501	1500	1530					Textile Workers
Darien (Ga.)	502	85	70	25	60	20-35 F 20-45 M	M-Semi Skilled 90% M-Skilled 10%	Stitchers, Lasting Machine Operators
Fayetteville (N.C.)	503		1850			M 25-55 F 20-35		Laborers
Forest City (N.C.)	504	100	100			M 18-65 F 20-45	Semi Skilled	Machine Operators
Grantsville (W.Va.)	505	75	30	None	100	F 35-55	Semi-Skilled	Sewing Machine Operato
Homerville (Ga.)	506	200	100			Older Workers	Semi-Skilled	Welders, Machine Operators, Packers
Jacksonville (N.C.)	507	None						
Lumberton (N.C.)	508	100	200			18-50	Low Skill Levels	Production Machine Operators

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 7 (continued)

Area Name	Area Code	# Affected By Direct Layoffs at 50% Rate	Characteristics of workers assumed subject to layoffs in listed plants					
			# at 50% rate	% Male	% White	Predominating Ages	Skill Level	Occupation
Macon (Ga.)	509	1850	1850	50	70	Young & old age groups	Semi-skilled Unskilled & Clerical	Laborers, Clerical Workers, Assemblers
Murphy (N.C.)	510							
Radford (Va.)	511	3220	1700	70	90	18-50	Mostly semi-skilled	Powder Operators, Handlers, Packers, Elec. Assemblers, Mach Operators, Motor Winde Inspectors, Seam Seale Sewing Machine Operato
Raeford (N.C.)	512	None	None					
St. Augustine (Fla.)	513	400	400					Mechanics, Electrician Riggers, Solderers, Sh metal Workers, Assemb. Metal Formers, Painter Stampers, Fabricators Radio Repairmen, Inspe tors
Taccoa (Ga.)	514		150	15	10	Under 22 10% 22-45 65% 45-46 20% Over 65 5%	Unskilled 25% Semiskilled 60% Skilled 15%	Welders
Trion (Ga.)	515	225	200	70	30	18-60	Skilled Semi-skilled in equal numbers	Weavers, Loomfixers, Spinners, Twisters, Winders

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 7 (continued)

Area Name	Area Code	# Affected By Direct Layoffs at 50% Rate	Characteristics of workers assumed subject to layoffs in listed plants					
			# at 50% rate	% Male	% White	Predominating Ages	Skill Level	Occupation
Wallace (S.C.)	516	60	120				Little skill	Material Handlers
Huntington (W.Va.)	521	70	70					Inspectors, Packers
Bristol-Kingsport (Tenn)	601	2300	2300	78	96	25-45 95%	900-Professional, Tech. & Skilled 1350 Semi-skilled 50 Laborers	Electrical & Mechanica Assemblers, Mixing operators and maintena mechanics
Centre (Ala.)	602	440	440	10	90	18-60		Sewing Machine Operato related inspectors and others
Centerville (Tenn.)	603	108	108	50	95	All ages	All Skill Levels	
Columbia (Miss.)	604	80	125		90	45-50	Mostly skilled	Sewing Machine Operato Ford related occupatio
Fort Knox Ky.)	605	2275	2500	33		18-45	Unskilled low skills	Mostly service and maintenance personnel
Fort Rucker (Ala.)	606	2000	2000	Mostly		18-60		Aircraft and Engine Mechanics
Gadsden(Ala.)	607	900	850	40	80	18-55		Inspectors F-40 Assemblers F-250, Machi Operators F-180, M-120 Others M-60; F-20, Material Handlers M-80 Box Maker M-60, Handle M-40

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 7 (continued)

Area Name	Area Code	# Affected By Direct Layoffs at 50% Rate	Characteristics of workers assumed subject to layoffs in listed plant					
			# at 50% rate	% Male	% White	Predominating Ages	Skill Level	Occupation
Golden (Miss.)	608	50	140	Mostly F	Mostly White	18-50	Semi-skilled	Sewing Mach. Operato
Greenville (Tenn.)	609	300	300	50	98	25-45 95%	90% semi-skilled	Assemblers, Painte Welders, Press Opera
Huntsville (Ala.)	610	725	725				Semi-skilled	
Kosciusko (Miss.)	611	150	150	Primarily	75	18-55	Majority semi-skilled	Designers, Welders, Metal Finishers, Mach ists, Body Assembler Finishers, Riveters, Upholsterers, Painte Inspectors, Punch Pr Operators
Milan (Ga.)	612	3642	3515	40	60-70	18-65		Machine tools process and clerical
Harriman-Rockwood (Tenn.)	613	(See Note)	No data					
Shawmutt (Ala.)	614	(See Note)	No data					
Toone (Tenn.)	615	149	149	50		18-60	Mostly un-skilled	Processing and relate clerical

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 7 (continued)

Area Name	Area Code	# Affected By Direct Layoffs at 50% Rate	Characteristics of workers assumed subject to layoffs in listed plants					
			# at 50% rate	% Male	% White	Predominating Ages	Skill Level	Occupation
Tullahoma (Tenn.)	616	308	308	56	Substantial Number Negroes	18-60	Semi-skilled skilled	Pressers, Sewing Machine operators, Inspectors
Chattanooga (Tenn.)	621	1400	1400	73	80	22-44	Semi-skilled	Laborers, Chemical Operators, Packagers, Lab Workers
Memphis (Tenn.)	622	1500	1496	62			Semi-skilled Unskilled	Processing, Clerical, and Misc.
Batesville (Ark.)	701	333	333	Mostly Females	Mostly	18-45		Machine Operators and Servicemen
Beeville (Tex.)	702	247	No data					
Bonhan (Tex.)	703	328	100		80	18-45	Semi-skilled	Sewing Machine Operators
Camden (Ark.)	704	975	975	25		18-65		Assemblers
Cuerd (Tex.)	705	75	175	50		40 and over	75% are skilled	Weavers, loom fixers
Greenville (Tex.)	706	1092	1150	Predominantly	Predominantly	18-21 45-60	Mostly semi-skilled - few trainees	Aircraft and Elec. Assemblers

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 7 (continued)

Area Name	Area Code	# Affected By Direct Layoffs at 50% Rate	Characteristics of workers assumed subject to layoffs in listed plants					
			# at 50% rate	% Male	% White	Predominating Ages	Skill Level	Occupation
Lawton (Okla.)	707	625	625	58	40	30-50	Skilled jobs to unskilled	20% office workers 10% skilled painters electricians & plumbers 60% service workers 10% others
Leesville (La.)	708	1370	1370	60			All skill levels but mostly unskilled and lower skills	Service and maintenance personnel, warehousemen, Laundry workers, and office workers
McAlester (Okla.)	709	1200	1220	50	80	20-50	Low to moderate level	75% Ordnance workers 25% other supporting occupations
Magnolia (Ark.)	710	335	335	50	50	18-30		Assemblers
Marshall (Tex.)	711	1500	1575			18-60		Assemblers, Inspectors, Clerical, Professional, Managers, Machinists, Equipment Operators,
Mena (Ark.)	712	170	170		Mostly	40-60		Sewing Machine Operators
Mineral Wells (Tex.)	713	2300	2300			All ages		Helicopter Pilot Trainin School and abroad occupations

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 7 (Continued)

Area Name	Area Code	# Affected By Direct Layoffs at 50% Rate	Characteristics of workers assumed subject to layoffs in listed plants					
			# at 50% rate	% Male	% White	Predominating Ages	Skill Level	Occupation
Post (Tex.)	714	80	82					Sewing Machine Operato and related workers
Shreveport (La.)* LMA	715	4500	4660	60		18-65	Mostly unskilled & semi-skilled	3850 ammo production workers and 510 aircra workers and clerical
Texahana (Tex.)	716	4950	5110	59	52	22-45	Semi-skilled and unskilled	Assembly line producti workers
Wynne (Ark.)	717	150	150	49	100	21-50	25% Skilled 30% semi-skilled 45% unskilled	Boot & Shoe workers
Waco (Tex.)	721	995	995	89	89	22-45	Unskilled semi-skilled	Production workers
Las Vegas (N.M.)	801							
Raton (N.M.)	802	50	60	30	20	18-50		Assemblers, Inspectors Machinist
Grants Pass (Ore.)	901	100	100	20	100	18-65	Varying	Electronic Assemblers
Riverbank (Calif.)	902	820	845	50	Mostly	20-55	Semi-skilled unskilled	Machine Operators Material Handlers Inspectors

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE 7 (continued)

Area Name	Area Code	# Affected By Direct Layoffs at 50% Rate	Characteristics of workers assumed subject to layoffs in listed plants					
			# at 50% rate	% Male	% White	Predominating Ages	Skill Level	Occupation
Stockton (Calif.)	903	1900	1950	Mostly	Large portion - of Mex/American and Negro	20-40	Semi-skilled unskilled	Warehouse men, aircraft body repairmen, sewing machine operators
San Francisco Area,(Calif.) **SMSA	921	10000	9940				Varied	Varied

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

to cover Negros, Indians, Puerto Ricans, and Mexican-Americans without regard to actual skin color), (5) skill level, and (6) occupations. The survey form included a question on education; but this was so generally ignored that no attempt was made to tabulate the few responses.

The data as tabulated is abstracted from the narrative comments on the survey returns; and the interpretation may not always correspond to what respondents intended. The original returns should be consulted for detailed analysis of any particular area. The need to consult the returns themselves is particularly important for the information on skill level and occupation. The abbreviated comments of the table represent in some cases attempts to condense into a few words separate information supplied regarding each of a number of plants in an area; and the respondents were not specifically requested to distinguish between skill level and occupation.

Percent Male

For 58 of the 99 areas, it was possible to define a number, narrow range of numbers, or a phrase with significant quantitative connotations on the percentage of employees that are male. The percentage of male employees in the 58 areas seems about the same or slightly smaller than in total US employment, where the percentage is about 63 percent.[6]

Twenty-seven of the 58 areas had 50-69% males in defense employment at risk. A complete frequency distribution of areas among class intervals of male percentages follows:

90 - 100%	--------	4
70 - 89	--------	11
50 - 69	--------	27
30 - 49	--------	8
10 - 29	--------	6
0 - 9	--------	2
	Total	58

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Percent White

Only 45 of the survey returns had quantitative or nearly quantitative information on racial or national minority status. The white percentage of jobs at risk in these areas tended to be less than the 89 percent average of white jobs in total US civilian employment[7], although 19 of the 45 areas had 90 percent or more of white jobs among those at risk. The mean area of the 45 had 76 percent white jobs; and in 6 of the areas, non-whites were a majority of the employees at risk. A complete frequency distribution of areas among class intervals of white percentages follows.

90 - 100%	--------	19
70 - 89	--------	12
50 - 69	--------	8
30 - 49	--------	4
10 - 29	--------	1
0 - 9	--------	1
	Total	45

Skill Level and Occupation

It is difficult to make summary statements regarding the columns on skill level and occupation. There appears to be some tendency for semi-skilled and unskilled to predominate. Frequently appearing names of occupations are assembler, laborer, office worker, metal working machine operator, sewing machine operator. In general, they appear to be either kinds of work for which there is comparatively small investment in training or types of work used in production of many products other than kinds used for Vietnam. For any particular area that may be of interest as heavily involved in Vietnam procurement, however, more thorough analysis of skill level and occupation is needed than Table 7 permits.

EVALUATION OF SURVEY RESULTS

The paper has so far dealt with characteristics of the survey procedures and then, independently, with highlights of data acquired in the survey.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

However, any conclusions from the data acquired by the survey should not be used before evaluation in the light of characteristics of the survey; and such an evaluation is the purpose of what follows. The major conclusions will first be summarized. Then the major weaknesses will be listed with implications of each weakness for the conclusions stated earlier. Finally, conclusions will be restated to the form considered appropriate for the kind of data used.

Major Conclusions Reached Earlier

Three kinds of conclusions have been reached earlier: (1) names and characteristics of individual areas that seem particularly vulnerable to reductions in Vietnam procurement, (2) statistical characteristics of the employment adjustment problem from a national viewpoint, and (3) some characteristics of the work forces involved in potential layoffs.

Table 1 of the text had sections that list area names and work force and unemployment estimates for each area with various alternative orderings of areas.

Table 7 of the text and the appendix have more details on these areas, and still more detail can be found in copies of the original USTES reports furnished to ACDA. Some of the areas with the largest potential unemployment problems are discussed in the text outside the tables.

Under statistical characteristics of the problem from a national viewpoint, principal conclusions have been as follows: (1) For all layoff assumptions, the largest concentrations of both areas and unemployed are associated with achieved unemployment rates (6 months after completion of layoffs) in the class interval of 3.0-4.9 percent; and relatively few areas and unemployed are associated with much higher unemployment rates; (2) similarly, relatively few areas and an even smaller proportion of unemployed are associated with very high increases in unemployment rates, with unemployment rate increases not exceeding 4.9 percent for 80 percent of the areas and 92 percent of the increase in unemployment; (3) the largest unemployment rate increases are limited to areas with relatively

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

small work forces; (4) projected unemployment rate increases, even in the 100 percent layoff case, tend to be well below the defense dependency ratio and also well below the increase in defense dependency ratio from 1965 to 1968, which suggests some capability to absorb layoffs from reductions of Vietnam procurement; and (5) the absorption capability is further supported by a general tendency for projected increases in unemployment rate to be well below corresponding layoffs due to reductions in Vietnam procurement.

On characteristics of employees at risk, not much could be concluded on a national basis. Some suggested tendencies were as follows: (1) the average survey area has a percent of males in defense employment at risk that is about the same, perhaps a little less, than the national average for the civilian labor force; (2) the percentage of whites in jobs at risk in typical survey areas tends to be somewhat less than the national average; and (3) no great specialization of skills in jobs at risk is apparent.

Survey Limitations and Their Implications for Conclusions Reached Earlier

It has been noted that the Survey by definition covers less than all Vietnam-related employment; and some quantitative background amounting to less than a real estimate of extent of undercoverage has been supplied. Any undercoverage, however, should not significantly affect any of the conclusions regarding characteristics of areas with the most serious problems; and any effect it does have on such conclusions may be considered random. The undercoverage probably does introduce a small bias in favor of understating the volume of layoffs that could occur with a reduction in Vietnam procurement. Even here, however, the understatement of employment at risk is likely to be largely for employment in producing kinds of products that have many applications other than those involved in Vietnam procurement.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

A related but probably more serious source of error in the conclusions may be associated with the handling of unemployment generated by loss of income in defense employment. Instructions to USTES field offices were to omit any such generation of unemployment from the statistics of layoffs over a 12-month period and from projections of unemployment rate six months later. However, in the cases of heaviest dependence on Vietnam-related employment, the effects on employment in service industries and retail trade in the area can be worth considering. In general, therefore, the situations in the worst cases as reported in the surveys may be significantly worse than reported in the event of major procurement reductions.

Editing checks disclosed a number of apparent inconsistencies and gaps, some of which were adjusted in editing according to rules that might have introduced other errors; and, of course, the abstracting of data for Table 7 involved judgment about respondents' meanings that may not always have been accurate. There were enough of such problems encountered in editing to generate some nervousness about the accuracy of tabulations regarding large numbers of lines on Tables 1 and 7; however, they are unlikely to have affected significantly the inferences from frequency distributions and scatter diagrams.

More serious problems from the viewpoint of conclusions drawn from the survey are associated with ambiguities of meaning for estimates of the amounts of employment at risk. Where a plant or Department of Defense installation qualified for inclusion in the survey as Vietnam-related, many of the field offices appeared to consider automatically that all of the jobs there were at risk; other field offices clearly limited the jobs to particular numbers that the field office considered likely to be lost in the event of an end to Vietnam hostilities. They later applied the 100 percent layoff alternative in many cases to small percentages of employment in Vietnam-related production. There

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

was no attempt in the editing to adjust one or the other kind of field office estimate. The resulting errors in all conclusions about amounts and circumstance of loss of Vietnam-related jobs are potentially serious enough to justify considering all the quantitative conclusions only tentative.

A related ambiguity, though not so serious, is indicated by differences among field offices in the definition of layoff. Where a plant produced a civilian-type product (e.g., combat boots), the employees engaged in defense production could in varying times be transferred to production of the same kinds of goods for civilian customers in the same plant. The questionnaire provided for layoffs and then for rehiring in the same plant. Some of the field offices, however, took the position that, where a rapid conversion was possible, the employees engaged in defense work would not actually be laid off. The difference in interpretation did not affect the field office estimates of unemployment rate after 6 months, since the workers involved would have jobs by then under either interpretation; but it did affect the conclusions on the ease with which layoffs can be offset by substitute job opportunities. Considering cases of easy conversion as cases to be omitted in an analysis of ease of adjustment to loss of Vietnam procurement business tends to overstate the significance of any given ratio of defense or Vietnam procurement dependency.

Probably the principal reason for looking at the results of the survey suspiciously is the extraordinary difficulty of the estimating burden placed on the field office personnel. As indicated earlier in this paper, they were given little time and were limited in the sources of information permitted them for dealing with an estimating problem that they might have considered unreasonably difficult even under the best of circumstances.

It is probably plausible to consider that one should rely at least tentatively on conclusions about where problems are most serious; but that conclusions on absolute magnitudes of unemployment that can be generated need to be checked with additional data before becoming bases of Government policy.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

APPENDIX A

SAMPLING FRAME DATA

This Appendix contains the "sampling frame" from which areas eligible for inclusion in the sample of areas to be investigated in the field were identified. There are two tables included. The first, A-1, identifies those areas where there were incremental increases in the defense-dependency ratio of at least 2 percentage points, and the second, A-2, those areas where there were positive incremental increases in the defense-dependency ratio of less than 2 percentage points with increases in defense-dependent employment of at least 800, between June 1965 and 1968. The tables are believed to be self-explanatory.

For an explanation of how areas eligible for inclusion in the sample were designated, see the section "THE SURVEY DATA - SELECTION OF LOCAL AREAS FOR STUDY."

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table A-1

SUM OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY INCREMENT IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, AND BY CENSUS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND AREAS

(Areas with Incremental Increase of Two or More Percentage Points in Defense-Dependency Rate)

Census Geographic Division and Areas	INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO BETWEEN JUNE 1965 and 1968 (PERCENTAGE POINTS)																	
	2.0-4.9									5.0-9.9								
	1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)									1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)								
	2.0-4.9			5.0-9.9			10.0 or more			2.0-4.9			5.0-9.9			10.0 or more		
	Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)		
	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0
New England																		
Nashua City, N.H.																16.9		
Newport (Pt of County), R.I.																	29.7	
Norwalk Area, Conn.																14.6		
Waterbury Area, Conn.														10.6				
N.Dighton City, Mass. a/															14.6			
Burlington (Chittenden) Vt. a/																	14.2	
Portsmouth (Rockingham), N.H.									31.5									
Hartford Area, Conn.							14.9											
Bridgeport Area, Conn.								16.6										
Limestone (Aroostook), Me. b/					13.5													
Rest of County (Fairfield), Conn.	7.1																	
Bennington (Benning), Vt. c/		7.5																
Newport (Sullivan), N.H. b/									14.2									
Pittsfield Area, Mass. a/									17.5									
Lowell Area, Mass.						12.2												
Biddeford (York), Me.		7.9																

Note: Areas' calendar year 1967 average unemployment rates used unless otherwise specified

a/ 1965 unemployment rate used
b/ State average unemployment rate used
c/ 1966 unemployment rate used

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table A-1

SUM OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY INCREMENT IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, AND BY CENSUS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND AREAS

(Areas with Incremental Increase of Two or More Percentage Points in Defense-Dependency Rate)

Census Geographic Division and Areas	INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO BETWEEN JUNE 1965 and 1968 (PERCENTAGE POINTS)									MAJOR PRODUCTS OR INSTALLATIONS
	10.0 or More									
	1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)									
	2.0-4.9			5.0-9.9			10.0 or more			
	Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			
	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	
New England										
Nashua City, N.H.										Electronics
Newport (Pt of County), R.I.										Electronics, Navy
Norwalk Area, Conn.										Aircraft Parts, Electronics
Waterbury Area, Conn.										Ammo Parts
N Dighton City, Mass. a/										Electronics
Burlington (Chittenden) Vt. a/										Guns
Portsmouth (Rockingham), N.H.										Navy and Air Force Bases
Hartford Area, Conn.										Engines and Parts, Weapons
Bridgeport Area, Conn.										Helos, Engines, Electronics
Limestone (Aroostook), Me. b/										Loring AFB
Rest of County (Fairfield), Conn										Electronics, Hardware
Bennington (Benning), Vt. c/										Fuze Parts
Newport (Sullivan), N.H. b/										Shoes
Pittsfield Area, Mass. a/										Missile Guidance
Lowell Area, Mass.										Electronics, Missiles
Biddeford (York), Me.										Guns, Textiles

Note: Areas' calendar year 1967 average unemployment rates used unless otherwise specified

a/ 1965 unemployment rate used
b/ State average unemployment rate used
c/ 1966 unemployment rate used

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table A-1

SUM OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY INCREMENT IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, AND BY CENSUS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND AREAS

(Areas with Incremental Increase of Two or More Percentage Points in Defense-Dependency Rate)

Census Geographic Division and Areas	INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO BETWEEN JUNE 1965 and 1968 (PERCENTAGE POINTS)																	
	2.0-4.9									5.0-9.9								
	1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)									1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)								
	2.0-4.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			5.0-9.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			10.0 or more Unemployment Rate (Percent)			2.0-4.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			5.0-9.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			10.0 or more Unemployment Rate (Percent)		
	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0
Middle Atlantic																		
Binghampton Area, N.Y.				10.8														
Tobyhanna (Monroe), Pa. a/							19.7											
Scranton (Lackawanna), Pa.		8.1																
Chambersburg-Hagerstown Area, Md.				12.1														
Monmouth (Monmouth), N.J.					14.6													
Schenectady Area, N.Y.	7.4																	
Danville Area, Pa.		7.6																

a/ State average unemployment rate used

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table A-1

SUM OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE,
BY INCREMENT IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, AND BY CENSUS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND AREAS

(Areas with Incremental Increase of Two or More Percentage Points in Defense-Dependency Rate)

Census Geographic Division and Areas	INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO BETWEEN JUNE 1965 and 1968 (PERCENTAGE POINTS)									MAJOR PRODUCTS OR INSTALLATIONS
	10.0 or More									
	1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)									
	2.0-4.9			5.0-9.9			10.0 or more			
	Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			
	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	
Middle Atlantic										
Binghampton Area, N.Y.										Electronics, Film, Shoes
Tobyhanna (Monroe), Pa. a/										Army Depot
Scranton (Lackawanna), Pa.										Ammo, Electronics
Chambersburg-Hagerstown Area, Md.										Trucks, Aircraft Parts, Depot
Monmouth (Monmouth), N.J.										Electronics, Army, Navy
Schenectady Area, N.Y.										Nuclear Prop, Generators
Danville Area, Pa										Ammo Parts

a/ State average unemployment rate used.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table A-1

SUM OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE,
BY INCREMENT IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, AND BY CENSUS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND AREAS

(Areas with Incremental Increase of Two or More Percentage Points in Defense-Dependency Rate)

Census Geographic Division and Areas	INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO BETWEEN JUNE 1965 and 1968 (PERCENTAGE POINTS)																	
	2.0-4.9									5.0-9.9								
	1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)									1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)								
	2.0-4.9			5.0-9.9			10.0 or more			2.0-4.9			5.0-9.9			10.0 or more		
	Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)		
	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0
East North Central																		
Baraboo (Sauk), Wisc. a/																		
Eau Claire (Eau Claire), Wisc. a/														12.6				
Marion (Williamson), Ill.															15 4			
Rose City (Oggmaw), Mich															26.1			
Crane Area, Inc. a/																17.8		
Huntington (Huntington), Ind. a/													12.2					
Standish (Arenac), Mich.																		18.9
Bloomington (McLean), Ill.													7.6					
Escanaba (Delta), Mich.						13.5												
Mauston (Juneau), Wisc					13.2													
Richmond (Wayne), Ind. a/				10.3														
Cadillac (Wexford), Mich.			12.1															
Bellevue (Sandusky), Ohio a/	7.2																	
Springfield (Clark), Ohio a/				8.8														
Port Clinton (Ottowa), Ohio a/	7.7																	
Clare (Clare), Mich.			12.8															
Canton (Starke), Ohio	5.7																	
Marysville (St Clair), Mich			9.1															
Indianapolis Area, Ind.				8.3														
South Bend Area, Ind.				9.5														
Rockford Area, Ill.	6.3																	
Defiance (Defiance), Ohio a/	6.4																	
Fostoria (Seneca), Ohio a/	5.2																	
LaCrosse (LaCrosse), Wisc.		7.1																

a/ State average unemployment rates used

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table A-1

SUM OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY INCREMENT IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, AND BY CENSUS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND AREAS

(Areas with Incremental Increase of Two or More Percentage Points in Defense-Dependency Rate)

Census Geographic Division and Areas	INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO BETWEEN JUNE 1965 and 1968 (PERCENTAGE POINTS) — 10.0 or More — 1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)									MAJOR PRODUCTS OR INSTALLATIONS
	2.0-4.9			5.0-9.9			10.0 or more			
	Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			
	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	
East North Central										
Baraboo (Sauk), Wisc. a/								22.3		Badger Ammo Plant
Eau Claire(Eau Claire), Wisc.a/										Ammo Parts
Marion (Williamson), Ill.										Ammo Parts
Rose City (Oggmaw), Mich										Tank Trailers
Crane Area, Inc. a/										Ammo Depot, Auto Parts
Huntington (Huntington), Ind.a/										Electronics
Standish (Arenac), Mich.										Hardware
Bloomington (McLean), Ill.										Ammo Parts, Fuzes
Escanaba (Delta), Mich.										Truck Cranes
Mauston (Juneau), Wisc.										Clothing, Batteries
Richmond (Wayne), Ind. a/										Ammo, Electronics
Cadillac (Wexford), Mich										Materiels Handling, Equipment Hardware
Bellevue (Sandusky), Ohio a/										Cargo Trailers
Springfield (Clark), Ohio a/										Trucks, Ammo Boxes
Port Clinton (Ottowa), Ohio a/										Vehicle Shoes
Clare (Clare), Mich.										Carburetors
Canton (Starke), Ohio										Vehicle Engines
Marysville (St Clair), Mich										Vehicle Parts, Hardware
Indianapolis Area, Ind.										Vehicles, Engines, Army
South Bend Area, Ind.										Jeeps, Trucks, Aerospace
Rockford Area, Ill.										Aircraft Gears, Ammo
Defiance (Defiance), Ohio a/										Ammo Parts
Fostoria (Seneca), Ohio a/										Cranes, Hardware
LaCrosse (LaCrosse), Wisc.										Textile Products

a/ State average unemployment rates used

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table A-1

SUM OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE,
BY INCREMENT IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, AND BY CENSUS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND AREAS

(Areas with Incremental Increase of Two or More Percentage Points in Defense-Dependency Rate)

Census Geographic Division and Areas	INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO BETWEEN JUNE 1965 and 1968 (PERCENTAGE POINTS)																	
	2.0-4.9									5.0-9.9								
	1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)									1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)								
	2.0-4.9			5.0-9.9			10.0 or more			2.0-4.9			5.0-9.9			10.0 or more		
	Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)		
	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0
East North Central																		
Baraboo (Sauk), Wisc. [a]																		
Eau Claire (Eau Claire), Wisc. [a]														12.6				
Marion (Williamson), Ill															15 4			
Rose City (Oggmaw), Mich.															26.1			
Crane Area, Inc. [a]																17.8		
Huntington (Huntington), Ind. [a]													12.2					
Standish (Arenac), Mich.																		18.9
Bloomington (McLean), Ill.													7.6					
Escanaba (Delta), Mich.						13.5												
Mauston (Juneau), Wisc.					13.2													
Richmond (Wayne), Ind. [a]				10.3														
Cadillac (Wexford), Mich.			12.1															
Bellevue (Sandusky), Ohio [a]	7.2																	
Springfield (Clark), Ohio [a]				8.8														
Port Clinton (Ottowa), Ohio [a]	7.7																	
Clare (Clare), Mich.			12.8															
Canton (Starke), Ohio	5.7																	
Marysville (St.Clair), Mich.			9.1															
Indianapolis Area, Ind.				8.3														
South Bend Area, Ind.				9.5														
Rockford Area, Ill.	6.3																	
Defiance (Defiance), Ohio [a]	6.4																	
Fostoria (Seneca), Ohio [a]	5.2																	
LaCrosse (LaCrosse), Wisc.		7.1																

[a] State average unemployment rates used

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table A-1

SUM OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE,
BY INCREMENT IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, AND BY CENSUS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND AREAS

(Areas with Incremental Increase of Two or More Percentage Points in Defense-Dependency Rate)

Census Geographic Division and Areas	INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO BETWEEN JUNE 1965 and 1968 (PERCENTAGE POINTS) — 10.0 or More — 1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)									MAJOR PRODUCTS OR INSTALLATIONS
	2.0-4.9			5.0-9.9			10.0 or more			
	Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			
	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	
West North Central										
Grand Island (Hall), Neb. a/							24 3			Army Ammo Plant
Burlington (Des Moines), Iowa							23.8			Army Ammo Plant
Lawrence (Douglas), Kans. a/							19.2			Army Ammo Plant
Knob Knoster (Johnson), Mo. a/										Whitman AFB
Kerkhoven (Swift), Minn. a/										Ammo Parts
Ft. Leonard Wood Area, Mo. a/										Army Base
Parsons Area, Kans a/										Army Ammo Plant
Grand Forks (Grand Forks), N.D. a/										Air Force Base
Ft Calhoun (Wash), Neb a/										Ammo Parts
W. Plains (Howell), Mo. a/										Truck Bodies
Windsor (Henry), Mo a/										Shoes, Combat Boots
Herman (Gasconade), Mo. a/										Shoes, Combat Boots
Protection (Comanche), Kans. a/										Barbed Wire
Cedar Rapids (Linn), Iowa										Electronics, Food
Madelia (Watonwan), Minn.										Food
Fort Riley Area, Kans a/										Army Installation
Minneapolis Area, Minn.										Ammo, Electronics
St. Louis Area, Mo.										Aircraft, Ammo, Army
Ft. Leavenworth (Ft.Lea), Kans. a/										Army Installation , Leavenworth

a/ State average unemployment rates used

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table A-1

SUM OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE,
BY INCREMENT IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, AND BY CENSUS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND AREAS

(Areas with Incremental Increase of Two or More Percentage Points in Defense-Dependency Rate)

Census Geographic Division and Areas	INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO BETWEEN JUNE 1965 and 1968 (PERCENTAGE POINTS)																			
	2.0-4.9									5.0-9.9										
	1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)									1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)										
	2.0-4.9			5.0-9.9			10.0 or more			2.0-4.9			5.0-9.9			10.0 or more				
	Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)				
	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0		
South Atlantic																				
Radford Area, Va.																				
Homerville (Clinch), Ga																				
Darien (McIntosh), Ga. [a]																				
Grantsville (Calhoun), W. Va.																				
Trion (Chattooga), Ga. [a]																	20.3			
Raeford (Hoke), N.C. [a]																	14.5			
Fayetteville (Cumberland) N C. [a]																	18 1			
Saltville (Smythe), Va. [a]															11.3					
Forest City (Rutherford), N.C. [a]															10.8					
Wallace (Marlboro), S.C. [a]								.								12.8				
Macon Area, Ga.																	26.7			
Taccoa (Stephens), Ga. [a]															10.3					
Columbus Area, Ga. [a]																			14.1	
St. Augustine (St.Johns), Fla. [a]																	12.9			
New Bern Area, N.C. [a]								23.6												
Milledgeville (Baldwin), Ga. [a]	8.2																			
Ft. Walton Area, Fla. [a]								24.0												
Murphy (Cherokee), N.C.							14.8													
Hinesville Area, Ga.							14.7													
Norfolk Area, Va.								20.6												
Charleston Area, S.C.									19.4											
Pensacola Area, Fla. [a]								14.5												
Danville Area, Va. [a]	6.0																			
Newport News Area, Va.								29.4												
Great Falls (Chester), S.C. [a]		8.4																		
Lumberton (Robeson), N.C.			11.4																	
Dahlgren Area, Va. [a]								18.0												
Augusta Area, Ga.					8.7															

[a] State unemployment rate used

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table A-1

SUM OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE,
BY INCREMENT IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, AND BY CENSUS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND AREAS

(Areas with Incremental Increase of Two or More Percentage Points in Defense-Dependency Rate)

Census Geographic Division and Areas	INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO BETWEEN JUNE 1965 and 1968 (PERCENTAGE POINTS)									MAJOR PRODUCTS OR INSTALLATIONS
	10.0 or More									
	1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)									
	2.0-4.9			5.0-9.9			10.0 or more			
	Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			
	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	
South Atlantic										
Radford Area, Va.							30.1			Army Ammo Plant
Homerville (Clinch), Ga.									25.3	Ammo Containers
Darien (McIntosh), Ga. [a]							13.4			Shoes, Combat Boots
Grantsville (Calhoun), W. Va.									30.1	Rubber Rafts
Trion (Chattooga), Ga [a]										Textiles
Raeford (Hoke), N.C. [a]										Parachutes, Textiles
Fayetteville (Cumberland) N C. [a]										Textiles, Base - Ft. Bragg
Saltville (Smythe), Va [a]										Weapons Prog.
Forest City (Rutherford), N.C. [a]										Textiles
Wallace (Marlboro), S.C. [a]										Textiles
Macon Area, Ga.										Ammo Parts, Air Force Base
Taccoa (Stephens), Ga. [a]										Crane Shovels, Boxes
Columbus Area, Ga. [a]										Ft. Benning, Textiles
St. Augustine (St. Johns), Fla. [a]										Aircraft M&R
New Bern Area, N.C. [a]										Cherry Pt. Air Station
Milledgeville (Baldwin), Ga. [a]										Textiles
Ft. Walton Area, Fla. [a]										Eglin Air Force Base and Support
Murphy (Cherokee), N.C.										Textiles
Hinesville Area, Ga.										Ft. Stewart
Norfolk Area, Va.										Ship Repair, Army, Navy
Charleston Area, S.C.										Naval Base and Support
Pensacola Area, Fla. [a]										Naval Air Station
Danville Area, Va. [a]										Apparel
Newport News Area, Va.										Army, Air Force
Great Falls (Chester), S.C. [a]										Textiles
Lumberton (Robeson), N.C.										Sandbags
Dahlgren Area, Va. [a]										Weapons Lab
Augusta Area, Ga.										Ft. Gordon and Support

[a] State unemployment rate used

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table A-1

SUM OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE,
BY INCREMENT IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, AND BY CENSUS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND AREAS

(Areas with Incremental Increase of Two or More Percentage Points in Defense-Dependency Rate)

Census Geographic Division and Areas	INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO BETWEEN JUNE 1965 and 1968 (PERCENTAGE POINTS)																	
	2.0-4.9									5.0-9.9								
	1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)									1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)								
	2.0-4.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			5.0-9.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			10.0 or more Unemployment Rate (Percent)			2.0-4.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			5.0-9.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			10.0 or more Unemployment Rate (Percent)		
	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0
South Atlantic (2)																		
Albany (Dougherty), Ga.				12.7														
Patuxent (St. Marys), Md.							23.3											
Kannapolis (Cabarrus), N.C.	6.2																	
Jacksonville (Onslow), N.C. a/							20.3											
Panama City (Bay), Fla. a/				10.3														
Wheeling Area, W.Va.			7.7															
Baltimore Area, Md.				9.0														

a/ State unemployment rate used

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table A-1

SUM OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY INCREMENT IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, AND BY CENSUS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND AREAS

(Areas with Incremental Increase of Two or More Percentage Points in Defense-Dependency Rate)

Census Geographic Division and Areas	INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO BETWEEN JUNE 1965 and 1968 (PERCENTAGE POINTS) — 10.0 or More — 1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)									MAJOR PRODUCTS OR INSTALLATIONS
	2.0-4.9			5.0-9.9			10.0 or more			
	Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			
	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	
South Atlantic (2)										
Albany (Dougherty), Ga.										Turner Air Force Base
Patuxent (St. Marys), Md.										Navy Test Center
Kannapolis (Cabarrus), N.C.										Textiles
Jacksonville (Onslow), N.C. a/										CAMP LeJeune
Panama City (Bay), Fla. a/										Tyndall Air Force Base
Wheeling Area, W.Va.										Steel Products
Baltimore Area, Md.										Electr, Ships, Army

a/ State unemployment rate used

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table A-1

SUM OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY INCREMENT IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, AND BY CENSUS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND AREAS

(Areas with Incremental Increase of Two or More Percentage Points in Defense-Dependency Rate)

Census Geographic Division and Areas	INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO BETWEEN JUNE 1965 and 1968 (PERCENTAGE POINTS)																	
	2.0-4.9									5.0-9.9								
	1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)									1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)								
	2.0-4.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			5.0-9.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			10.0 or more Unemployment Rate (Percent)			2.0-4.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			5.0-9.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			10.0 or more Unemployment Rate (Percent)		
	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0
East South Central																		
Milan (Gibson), Tenn. a/																		
Ft. Ricker Area, Ala. a/																		
Columbia (Marion), Miss. a/																		
Golden (Tishomingo), Miss. a/																		
Bristol-Kingsport(Sullivan),Tenn																		
Centreville (Hickman), Tenn.																	22.5	
Shawmutt (Chambers)Ala. a/																		29.8
Ft. Knox Area, Ky a/														13.3				
Rockwood (Roane), Tenn.																	25.1	
Toone (Hardeman), Tenn.														10.5				
Centre (Cherokee), Ala.														11.9				
Greeneville (Greene), Tenn.																	16.0	
Gadsden (Etowah), Ala.															15.2			
Canton (Madison), Miss.					12.6									11.1				
Haleyville (Winston), Ala. a/		8.7																
Union City (Obion), Tenn. a/		8.9																
Richmond (Madison), Ky						13.8												
Anniston (Calhoun), Ala.								19.1										
Smyrna (Rutherford), Tenn. a/					10.7													
Selma (Dallas), Ala. a/					11.6													
Ft. Campbell Area, Ky a/					12.9													
Louisville Area, Ky				8.1														
Kosciusko (Attala), Miss.						13.4												
Cleveland Area, Tenn. a/		6.9																
Tullahoma Area, Tenn. a/								38.0										
Huntsville Area, Ala. a/								20.7										
Columbus (Lowndes), Miss. a/		8.4																

a/ State unemployment rate used

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table A-1

SUM OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY INCREMENT IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, AND BY CENSUS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND AREAS

(Areas with Incremental Increase of Two or More Percentage Points in Defense-Dependency Rate)

Census Geographic Division and Areas	INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO BETWEEN JUNE 1965 and 1968 (PERCENTAGE POINTS) — 10.0 or More — 1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)									MAJOR PRODUCTS OR INSTALLATIONS
	2.0-4.9			5.0-9.9			10.0 or more			
	Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			
	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	
East South Central										
Milan (Gibson), Tenn. a/								27.2		Army Ammo Plant
Ft. Ricker Area, Ala. a/								36.0		Aircraft M&R, Base
Columbia (Marion), Miss. a/								23 8		Parachutes
Golden (Tishomingo), Miss. a/								16.1		Apparel
Bristol-Kingsport(Sullivan),Ten										Ammo Electronics
Centreville (Hickman), Tenn.										Clothing
Shawmutt (Chambers)Ala.a/										Textiles
Ft. Knox Area, Ky a/										Army Base and Support
Rockwood (Roane), Tenn										Clothing
Toone (Hardeman), Tenn.										Flares, Ammo
Centre (Cherokee), Ala.										Raincoats
Greeneville (Greene), Tenn.										Bomb Fins
Gadsden (Etowah), Ala.										Ammo Parts, Hardware
Canton (Madison), Miss.										Tractors, Tents
Haleyville (Winston), Ala a/										Trailers
Union City (Obion), Tenn. a/										Ammo Parts, Food
Richmond (Madison), Ky										Blue Grass Depot
Anniston (Calhoun), Ala.										Ft. McClellan
Smyrna (Rutherford), Tenn. a/										Ammo Parts, Air Force Base
Selma (Dallas), Ala. a/										Clothing, Base Support
Ft. Campbell Area, Ky a/										Army Base and Support
Louisville Area, Ky										Govt Ord. Plants
Kosciusko (Attala), Miss.										Automotive Equipment
Cleveland Area, Tenn. a/										Blankets, Cloth
Tullahoma Area, Tenn. a/										Arnold Center, Apparel
Huntsville Area, Ala. a/										Boots, R&D
Columbus (Lowndes), Miss. a/										Textiles, Air Force Base

a/ State unemployment rate used

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table A-1

SUM OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY INCREMENT IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, AND BY CENSUS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND AREAS

(Areas with Incremental Increase of Two or More Percentage Points in Defense-Dependency Rate)

Census Geographic Division and Areas	INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO BETWEEN JUNE 1965 and 1968 (PERCENTAGE POINTS)																	
	2.0-4.9									5.0-9.9								
	1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)									1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)								
	2.0-4.9			5.0-9.9			10.0 or more			2.0-4.9			5.0-9.9			10.0 or more		
	Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)		
	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0
West South Central																		
Texarkana Area, Texas																		
McAlester (Pittsburg), Okla. [a]																		
Leesville (Vernon), La.																		
Batesville (Independence) Ark.																		
Camden (Ouachita), Ark. [a]																		
Wynne (Cross), Ark. [a]																		
Marshall (Harrison), Texas [a]																		
Greenville (Hunt), Texas																25.3		
Cuero (DeWitt), Texas													12.1					
Mena (Polk), Ark. [b]																		17.3
Post (Garza), Texas [a]																14.0		
Magnolia (Columbia), Ark. [b]																	15.2	
Ft. Worth Area, Texas																18.1		
Shreveport Area, La.													12.7					
Beeville (Bee), Texas [a]																14.7		
Mineral Wells (Palo Pinto), Tex [a]																14.7		
Lawton (Comanche), Okla.																	21.8	
Bonham (Fannin), Texas [a]													8.8					
Brownwood (Brown), Texas [a]				8.4														
Kingsville (Gray), Texas [a]	7.6																	
Atlanta (Cass), Texas [a]	6.8																	
Commerce (Ottawa), Okla. [a]		8.1																
Brady (McCulloch), Texas [b]	6.5																	
Rockdale (Milam), Texas [a]													8.8					
San Antonio Area, Texas								17.9										
Del Rio (Val Verde), Texas						14.4												

[a] State average unemployment rates used

[b] 1966 average

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table A-1

SUM OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY INCREMENT IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, AND BY CENSUS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND AREAS

(Areas with Incremental Increase of Two or More Percentage Points in Defense-Dependency Rate)

Census Geographic Division and Areas	INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO BETWEEN JUNE 1965 and 1968 (PERCENTAGE POINTS) — 10.0 or More — 1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE) — 2.0-4.9 — Unemployment Rate (Percent)			5.0-9.9 — Unemployment Rate (Percent)			10.0 or more — Unemployment Rate (Percent)			MAJOR PRODUCTS OR INSTALLATIONS
	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	
West South Central										
Texarkana Area, Texas								39.3		Ammo Plant, Depot
McAlester (Pittsburg), Okla. a/								25.9		Depot
Leesville (Vernon), La.								37.5		Fort Polk
Batesville (Independence) Ark.									19.0	Ammo, Dispensers
Camden (Ouachita), Ark. a/								18.7		Ammo
Wynne (Cross), Ark. a/								25.8		Shoes, Combat Boots
Marshall (Harrison), Texas a/							19.7			Army Ammo Plant
Greenville (Hunt), Texas										Aircraft Mod., Electr.
Cuero (DeWitt), Texas										Textiles
Mena (Polk), Ark. b/										Textiles
Post (Garza), Texas a/										Textiles
Magnolia (Columbia), Ark. b/										Landing Mats, Auto
Ft. Worth Area, Texas										Aircraft, Ammo
Shreveport Area, La.										Ammo Plant, Hardware
Beeville (Bee), Texas a/										Aircraft Repair, NAS
Mineral Wells (Palo Pinto), Tex a/										Camp Wolters
Lawton (Comanche), Okla.										Fort Sill
Bonham (Fannin), Texas a/										Cable, Clothing
Brownwood (Brown), Texas a/										Textiles
Kingsville (Gray), Texas a/										Gun Forgings
Atlanta (Cass), Texas a/										Ammo Boxes
Commerce (Ottawa), Okla. a/										Clothing, Ammo Boxes
Brady (McCulloch), Texas b/										Trailers
Rockdale (Milam), Texas a/										Fabricated Aluminum
San Antonio Area, Texas										Air Force, Army
Del Rio (Val Verde), Texas										Laughlin Air Force Base

a/ State average unemployment rates used

b/ 1966 average

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table A-1

SUM OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE,
BY INCREMENT IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, AND BY CENSUS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND AREAS

(Areas with Incremental Increase of Two or More Percentage Points in Defense-Dependency Rate)

Census Geographic Division and Areas	INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO BETWEEN JUNE 1965 and 1968 (PERCENTAGE POINTS)																	
	2.0-4.9									5.0-9.9								
	1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)									1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)								
	2.0-4.9			5.0-9.9			10.0 or more			2.0-4.9			5.0-9.9			10.0 or more		
	Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)		
	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0
West South Central																		
Dallas Area, Texas				8.0														
Corpus Christi Area, Texas					10.2													
El Paso (El Paso) Texas					10.3													
Longview Area, Texas a/		7.5																
Oklahoma City Area, Okla.				12.6														

a/ 1965 Rate used.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table A-1

SUM OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY INCREMENT IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, AND BY CENSUS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND AREAS

(Areas with Incremental Increase of Two or More Percentage Points in Defense-Dependency Rate)

Census Geographic Division and Areas	INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO BETWEEN JUNE 1965 and 1968 (PERCENTAGE POINTS)									MAJOR PRODUCTS OR INSTALLATIONS
	10.0 or More									
	1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)									
	2.0-4.9			5.0-9.9			10.0 or more			
	Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			
	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	
West South Central										
Dallas Area, Texas										Electronics, Ammo, Service
Corpus Christi Area, Texas										NAS Army Depot
El Paso (El Paso) Texas										Biggs Air Force Base, Army
Longview Area, Texas a/										Bomb Parts
Oklahoma City Area, Okla.										Tinker Air Force Base

a/ 1965 Rate used.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table A-1

SUM OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY INCREMENT IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, AND BY CENSUS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND AREAS

(Areas with Incremental Increase of Two or More Percentage Points in Defense-Dependency Rate)

Census Geographic Division and Areas	INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO BETWEEN JUNE 1965 and 1968 (PERCENTAGE POINTS) — 10.0 or More — 1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)									MAJOR PRODUCTS OR INSTALLATIONS
	2.0-4.9			5.0-9.9			10.0 or more			
	Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			
	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	
Mountain										
Hawthorne (Mineral) Nev. a/									54.0	Navy Ammo Depot.
Great Falls (Cascade) Mont. a/								18.4		Air Force Base Support
Ogden (Weber) Utah a/										Utah Army Depot
Sierra Vista (Cochise) Ariz. a/										Fort Huachuca
Salt Lake and Tooele Area, Utah										Depots, Hill Air Force Base
Colorado Springs (El Paso) Colo.										Air Force, Army
Tucson (Pima) Ariz.										Missiles, Electronics, Air Force Base
Las Vegas (San Miguel) N.Mex.										Parachutes
Raton (Colfax) N.Mex.										Electronics

a/ State unemployment rate used.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table A-1

SUM OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY INCREMENT IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, AND BY CENSUS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND AREAS

(Areas with Incremental Increase of Two or More Percentage Points in Defense-Dependency Rate)

Census Geographic Division and Areas	INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO BETWEEN JUNE 1965 and 1968 (PERCENTAGE POINTS)																	
	2.0-4.9									5.0-9.9								
	1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)									1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)								
	2.0-4.9			5.0-9.9			10.0 or more			2.0-4.9			5.0-9.9			10.0 or more		
	Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)		
	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0
Mountain																		
Hawthorne (Mineral) Nev. a/																		
Great Falls (Cascade) Mont. a/																		
Ogden (Weber) Utah a/																	18.2	
Sierra Vista (Cochise) Ariz. a/																	22.2	
Salt Lake and Tooele Area, Utah								19.2										
Colorado Springs(El Paso) Colo.							16.0											
Tucson (Pima) Ariz.					9.3													
Las Vegas (San Miguel) N.Mex.			15.4															
Raton (Colfax) N.Mex.			9.0															

a/ State unemployment rate used.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table A-1

SUM OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY INCREMENT IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, AND BY CENSUS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND AREAS

(Areas with Incremental Increase of Two or More Percentage Points in Defense-Dependency Rate)

Census Geographic Division and Areas	INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO BETWEEN JUNE 1965 and 1968 (PERCENTAGE POINTS)																	
	2.0-4.9									5.0-9.9								
	1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)									1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)								
	2.0-4.9			5.0-9.9			10.0 or more			2.0-4.9			5.0-9.9			10.0 or more		
	Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)		
	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0
Pacific																		
Kodiak, Alaska																		24.4
Stockton (San Joaquin) Calif.						14.5												
Vallejo Area, Calif.								25.1										
Swanville Sierra Depot Area, Cal. a/								16.7										
Oak Harbor Island, Wash. a/								25.9										
Riverbank (Stanislaus) Calif. a/		9.3																
San Diego (San Diego) Calif.								17.0										
Umatilla (Umatilla) Oregon						11.5												
Anaheim (Orange) Calif.								15.5										
Honolulu (Honolulu) Hawaii							14.7											
Santa Barbara (Santa Bar.) Calif.					12.9													
San Jose (Santa Clara) Calif.								15.7										
Oxnard Pt. Mugu (Ventura) Calif.									16.7									
Tacoma (Pierce) Wash.					9.9													
Grants Pass (Josephine) Oregon			13.1															
Los Angeles (Los Angeles) Calif.					10.3													

a/ State unemployment rate used.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table A-1

SUM OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY INCREMENT IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, AND BY CENSUS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND AREAS

(Areas with Incremental Increase of Two or More Percentage Points in Defense-Dependency Rate)

Census Geographic Division and Areas	INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO BETWEEN JUNE 1965 and 1968 (PERCENTAGE POINTS) — 10.0 or More — 1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)									MAJOR PRODUCTS OR INSTALLATIONS
	2.0-4.9			5.0-9.9			10.0 or more			
	Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			
	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	
Pacific										
Kodiak, Alaska										
Stockton (San Joaquin) Calif.										Diesels, Food, Depots
Vallejo Area, Calif.										Mare Island and Travis
Swanville Sierra Depot Area,Cal. a/										Army Depot
Oak Harbor Island, Wash. a/										Naval Air Station
Riverbank (Stanislaus) Calif. a/										Ammo, Food
San Diego (San Diego) Calif.										Aerospace, Ships, Navy
Umatilla (Umatilla) Oregon										Army Depot
Anaheim (Orange) Calif.										Aerospace, Electronics
Honolulu (Honolulu) Hawaii										Bases and Support
Santa Barbara (Santa Barbara)Calif.										Vandenberg/Support
San Jose (Santa Clara) Calif.										Aerospace, Electronics
Oxnard Pt.Mugu (Ventura) Calif.										Navy, Air Force
Tacoma (Pierce) Wash.										Boats, Army, Air Force
Grants Pass (Josephine) Oregon										Bomb racks, Lumber
Los Angeles (Los Angeles) Calif.										Aerospace, Electronics

a/ State unemployment rate used.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table A-2

SUM OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, AND BY CENSUS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND AREAS

(Areas with Large Incremental Increase in Defense-Dependent Employment but Less Than Two Percentage Points Increase in Rate)

Census Geographic Division and Areas	1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)												INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENT EMPLOYMENT (NUMBER)			MAJOR PRODUCTS OR INSTALLATIONS
	0.0-1.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			2.0-4.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			5.0-9.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			10.0 or More Unemployment Rate (Percent)						
	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Total	Contracts	Bases	
New England																
Boston Area, Mass.							8.8						20,700	20,800	- 100	Electronics, Bases
Worcester (Worcester) Mass.		5.4											3,200	3,200	0	Electronics, Hardware
New Haven Area, Conn.	5.0												2,000	2,000	0	Ammo, Electronics
Lawrence Area, Mass.									10.4				1,400	1,400	0	Electronics, Missiles
Springfield Area, Mass.					6.7								1,300	2,400	-1100	Ammo, Guns, Pumps, etc.

Note: Areas' calendar year 1967 average unemployment rate used unless otherwise specified.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table A-2

SUM OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, AND BY CENSUS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND AREAS

(Areas with Large Incremental Increase in Defense-Dependent Employment but Less Than Two Percentage Points Increase in Rate)

Census Geographic Division and Areas	1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)												INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENT EMPLOYMENT (NUMBER)			MAJOR PRODUCTS OR INSTALLATIONS
	0.0-1.9			2.0-4.9			5.0-9.9			10.0 or More						
	Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)						
	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Total	Contracts	Bases	
Middle Atlantic																
Philadelphia Area, Pa.							8.5						31,800	21,600	10,000	Helos, Electronics, Bases
Pittsburgh Area, Pa.				5.1									14,300	14,200	100	Ship Gear, Ammo
Newark Area, N. J.					6.6								7,400	5,700	1,700	Electronics, G.M., Arsenal
New York City Area, N.Y.		5.3											5,800	18,800	-13,000	Aircraft, Electronics, Ship. Ser.
Paterson Area, N.J.					8.8								4,700	4,700	0	Electronics, Chem.
Buffalo Area, N.Y.					6.3								3,600	3,500	100	Electronics, Aerospace
Rochester Area, N.Y.				4.5									3,300	3,300	0	Electronics, Film
Allentown Area, Pa.	4.0												3,100	3,100	0	Electronics, Guns, Trucks
N.Brunswick (Middlesex) N.J.					6.4								2,800	2,800	0	Electronics, Chem.
Trenton (Mercer) N.J.					7.1								2,500	2,300	200	Electronics, Turbines
York Area, Pa.				5.7									2,400	2,400	0	Vehicles, Ammo Parts
Jersey City (Hudson) N.J.		6.4											1,400	1,300	100	Electronics, Hardware, Service
W.Point (Orange) N.Y. a/													1,200	800	400	Hardware, Base Support
Lancaster (Lancaster) Pa.	3.4						9.6						1,100	1,500	- 400	Fuzes, Electronics
Wilkes-Barre (Luzerne) Pa.		5.7											1,000	1,000	0	Launchers, Electronics
Utica-Rome Area, N.Y.							12.3						700	2,400	- 1,700	Electronics, AF Base

a/ State average unemployment rate used.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table A-2

SUM OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, AND BY CENSUS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND AREAS

(Areas with Large Incremental Increase in Defense-Dependent Employment but Less Than Two Percentage Points Increase in Rate)

Census Geographic Division and Areas	1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)												INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENT EMPLOYMENT (NUMBER)			MAJOR PRODUCTS OR INSTALLATIONS
	0.0-1.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			2.0-4.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			5.0-9.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			10.0 or More Unemployment Rate (Percent)						
	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Total	Contracts	Bases	
East North Central																
Chicago Area, Ill.	4.2												24,500	24,400	100	Ammo, Electronics, Hardware
Detroit Area, Mich.		5.5											7,400	6,500	900	Vehicles, Ammo, Missiles
Cincinnati Area, Ohio				6.3									7,200	7,200	0	Aircraft Engines, Fuzes
Cleveland Area, Ohio	4.4												5,500	5,000	500	Vehicles, Ammo, Aircraft
Milwaukee Area, Wisconsin	4.5												4,300	4,300	0	Ammo, Vehicles, Electronics
Toledo Area, Ohio		5.1											3,200	3,200	0	Jeeps, Engines
Dayton Area, Ohio							10.0						2,900	2,300	600	AF Bases and Support
Ft. Wayne (Allen) Ind.				7.0									2,300	2,300	0	Electronics
Akron Area, Ohio				5.9									1,800	1,800	0	Aerospace, Tires, Wheels
Columbus Area, Ohio				7.2									1,800	400	1,400	Aerospace, Ammo
LaSalle (LaSalle) Ill. a/					7.5								1,500	1,500	0	Ammo, Handling Equipment
Rock Island Area, Ill.							8.5						1,400	400	1,000	Electronics, Arsenal
Grand Rapids Area, Mich.		5.9											1,400	1,400	0	Aircraft Equipment, Electronics
Peoria Area, Ill.	4.6												1,200	1,200	0	Tractors
Evansville Area, Ind.	4.7												1,100	1,100	0	Ammo Parts

a/ 1965.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table A-2

SUM OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, AND BY CENSUS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND AREAS

(Areas with Large Incremental Increase in Defense-Dependent Employment but Less Than Two Percentage Points Increase in Rate)

Census Geographic Division and Areas	1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)												INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENT EMPLOYMENT (NUMBER)			MAJOR PRODUCTS OR INSTALLATIONS
	0.0-1.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			2.0-4.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			5.0-9.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			10.0 or More Unemployment Rate (Percent)						
	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Total	Contracts	Bases	
West North Central																
Kansas City Area, Mo.					6.5								9,800	9,200	600	Ammo Plant, Electronics

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table A-2

SUM OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, AND BY CENSUS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND AREAS

(Areas with Large Incremental Increase in Defense-Dependent Employment but Less Than Two Percentage Points Increase in Rate)

Census Geographic Division and Areas	1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)												INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENT EMPLOYMENT (NUMBER)			MAJOR PRODUCTS OR INSTALLATIONS
	0.0-1.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			2.0-4.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			5.0-9.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			10.0 or More Unemployment Rate (Percent)						
	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Total	Contracts	Bases	
South Atlantic																
Washington, D.C. Area										13.2			19,500	6,100	13,400	R&D, Installations
Atlanta Area, Ga.							8.3						8,700	6,600	2,100	Aircraft, Army, Air Force
St. Petersburg Are, Fla.				4.9									3,900	3,600	300	Electronics, R & D
Miami (Dade) Fla.	5.0												2,400	2,600	- 200	Aircraft, Repair, Airlift
Jacksonville (Duval) Fla.				6.5									2,000	900	1,100	Ship Repair, Navy
Greenville Area, S.C.		5.0											1,900	1,900	0	Aircraft Repair, Textiles
Huntington Area, W.Va.			7.0										1,600	1,600	0	Weapons, Textiles
Columbia Area, S.C.					7.2								1,500	600	900	Ft. Jackson and Support
Wilmington Area, Del.	4.9												1,400	1,100	300	Fuzes, Chemicals, POL
Orlando Area, Fla. a/							10.6						1,300	1,100	200	Missiles, Electronics
Greensboro-Winston Area, N.C.				5.0									1,100	1,100	0	Missiles, Electronics
Richmond Area, Va.				3.9									1,000	100	900	DSA, Army Support
Ft. Lee Area, Va.							8.7						1,000	200	800	Army Base

a/ State unemployment rate used.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table A-2

SUM OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, AND BY CENSUS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND AREAS

(Areas with Large Incremental Increase in Defense-Dependent Employment but Less Than Two Percentage Points Increase in Rate)

Census Geographic Division and Areas	1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)												INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENT EMPLOYMENT (NUMBER)			
	0.0-1.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			2.0-4.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			5.0-9.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			10.0 or More Unemployment Rate (Percent)						
	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Total	Contracts	Bases	MAJOR PRODUCTS OR INSTALLATIONS
East South Central																
Memphis Area, Tenn.				5.8									2,800	2,000	800	Ammo, Textiles, Hardware
Chattanooga Area, Tenn.				5.3									2,700	2,700	0	Army Explosives Plant
Knoxville Area, Tenn.	4.9												1,800	1,800	0	Textiles, Commercial
Lexington (Fayette) Ky.								10.3					1,300	200	1,100	Signal Dep., Parachutes
Montgomery Area, Ala.					8.6								1,100	800	300	Clothing, Base Support

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table A-2

SUM OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, AND BY CENSUS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND AREAS

(Areas with Large Incremental Increase in Defense-Dependent Employment but Less Than Two Percentage Points Increase in Rate)

Census Geographic Division and Areas	1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)												INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENT EMPLOYMENT (NUMBER)			
	0.0-1.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			2.0-4.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			5.0-9.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			10.0 or More Unemployment Rate (Percent)						
	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Total	Contracts	Bases	MAJOR PRODUCTS OR INSTALLATIONS
West South Central																
New Orleans Area, La.		5.4											1,500	1,300	200	Shipping, Ship Repair
Waco (McLennan) Tex. a/					8.7								800	800	0	Bombs, Propellants

a/ Included but total defense employment was less than 1,000.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table A-2

SUM OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, AND BY CENSUS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND AREAS

(Areas with Large Incremental Increase in Defense-Dependent Employment but Less Than Two Percentage Points Increase in Rate)

Census Geographic Division and Areas	1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)												INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENT EMPLOYMENT (NUMBER)			MAJOR PRODUCTS OR INSTALLATIONS
	0.0-1.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			2.0-4.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			5.0-9.9 Unemployment Rate (Percent)			10.0 or More Unemployment Rate (Percent)						
	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Total	Contracts	Bases	
Mountain																
Phoenix (Maricupa) Ariz.					7.1								2,900	3,300	-400	Aerospace, Electronics
Denver, Colo.				6.3									1,000	-400	1,400	Army, Air Force

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table A-2

SUM OF DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY AND UNEMPLOYMENT RATES, BY DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATE, BY UNEMPLOYMENT RATE, AND BY CENSUS GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION AND AREAS

(Areas with Large Incremental Increase in Defense-Dependent Employment but Less Than Two Percentage Points Increase in Rate)

Census Geographic Division and Areas	1968 DEFENSE-DEPENDENCY RATIO (PERCENT OF WORK FORCE)												INCREASE IN DEFENSE-DEPENDENT EMPLOYMENT (NUMBER)			
	0.0-1.9			2.0-4.9			5.0-9.9			10.0 or More						
	Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)			Unemployment Rate (Percent)						
	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Under 3.5	3.5-5.0	Over 5.0	Total	Contracts	Bases	MAJOR PRODUCTS OR INSTALLATIONS
Pacific																
San Francisco Area, Calif.					8.6								13,800	6,200	7,600	Navy, Army, Serv., Ship Rep., Elec.
Seattle Area, Wash.							9.8						4,100	1,900	2,200	Aerospace, Army, Navy /R&D
San Bernardino Area, Calif.									13.4				3,700	5,100	- 1,400	Aerospace, Hardware
Sacramento Area, Calif.									14.7				2,600	- 3,500	6,100	Army Depot, AF Bases
Portland Area, Oregon		5.1											1,500	1,600	- 100	Ship Repair, Hardware
Salinas-Monterey (Monterey) Calif.									11.9				1,100	400	700	Army Bases

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

APPENDIX B

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL AND QUESTIONNAIRE OF USTES SURVEY

This Appendix contains the letter of transmittal form and the questionnaire prepared by, the Office of the Manpower Administrator, U. S. Department of Labor, to the Regional Manpower Administrators stipulating the assumptions to be used and restrictions to be observed in completing the questionnaires on possible impact of post-Vietnam layoffs of defense-procurement-dependent employees. The responses were to be prepared primarily by staff of State employment security agencies and their constituent local offices.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
OFFICE OF THE MANPOWER ADMINISTRATOR
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20210

April 21, 1969

FIELD MEMORANDUM NO. 32-69

TO: ALL REGIONAL MANPOWER ADMINISTRATORS

SUBJECT: Study of Area Labor Force Impact of Post-Vietnam Defense Production Cuts

At the request of the White House, the Cabinet Committee on Economic Policy has called for a study of the potential impact of curtailed defense-related production and activities on employment and unemployment in areas which may be significantly affected by a post-Vietnam cutback. The Department of Defense, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, the Council of Economic Advisors, and the Department of Labor have been requested to cooperate in this project.

Because much of the required information relating to employment and unemployment can be supplied only by the State employment security agencies and their constituent local offices, we must ask their cooperation in this study. Since the problems posed by possible reductions in defense-related employment are of vital concern to those States where employment related to Vietnam hostilities is substantial, the interests of the States will also be served by participation in this project.

The Department of Defense, through its Economic Information Systems, has estimated, for more than 400 areas, the degree of defense-related dependence of area employment. A sample of approximately 100 areas has been selected for the current study. The attached listing shows, by State, the areas in your region, together with the employment data used in estimating the degree of area dependency on defense activities. It should be noted that these data are not predictive or official estimates. They are for official use only by Government employees who need to know this information in connection with the State agency's participation in this survey.

For each of the areas listed, the State agency concerned should furnish the information provided for in Table 1, attached, making the best estimates possible for each item. Two copies of completed Table 1 for each area should be mailed to the national office, Attention: EMJ, not later than May 7, 1969, with one copy to your office This deadline

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

has been established to meet the needs of the Committee for these data. Please emphasize to the States in your region the need to submit Table 1 for each selected area by the May 7 due date, and that as much of the requested information as possible should be provided by that time.

A supply of copies of Table 1 is attached, sufficient to provide one copy to each State, plus five for each area included in the survey. Please forward the appropriate number of copies to each State agency for distribution to each of its areas.

In conducting this study, it is assumed that local offices in the areas listed already have a good knowledge of the activities and employment in those plants in their areas which are engaged in defense production related to the Vietnam hostilities, and have at least general knowledge of the characteristics and skill levels of plant employees. Under no circumstances should contacts with employers be undertaken to provide the information requested. The categories of 25 percent, 50 percent, and 100 percent reductions contained on the table are, of course, for planning purposes only, and should not be interpreted as predictive in any way.

Plant or installation information requested in the table should cover all plants or installations which employ 100 or more workers and are engaged in the fabrication of products directly for use by the military or for prime military contractors. Such products include helicopters, bombs under 1,000 lbs in weight, ground combat materials such as combat vehicles, guns, ammunition, communications equipment and power generating equipment as well as products or services for military use such as clothing, shoes, textiles, food, petroleum and oil products, lubricants, trucks, trailers, small boats, barbed wire, tents and landing mats, and transportation services. Establishments to be omitted from this survey are those engaged in the assembly or manufacture of parts and components of major weapons systems not associated with Vietnam activities, such as Minuteman Missiles, or F-111 aircraft. States also should be instructed to exclude establishments producing basic materials--mines, blast furnaces, and steel mills, etc.--unless they are producing directly for military use

Military installations with 100 or more civilian employees should be included, but members of the Armed Forces should be excluded from any estimates covered by the table. Information on secondary layoffs should relate only to those establishments which sell parts, supplies or services directly to military installations or directly to firms located in the area which manufacture or assemble material for use by the Armed Forces.

The table format in Section C 1 is provided for the convenience of the State agencies in summarizing direct and secondary layoff data anticipated under various assumptions. Best judgment estimates should be provided for these items to the extent that such data are available or

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

can be readily developed from local office records or knowledge of the area. Such data may be summarized in narrative form, in lieu of preparing Section C 1 of this table, if the State agency prefers.

Following this first review, the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, through a special research contract, will undertake more thorough studies, in a relatively small number of areas, covering analyses of the area's economic base, personal characteristics and occupations of persons likely to be laid off, etc. You will be informed of any areas in your region to be covered in this more detailed study.

J. N. Peet
Manpower Administrator

Attachments:
1. Listing of Sample Areas for Survey
2. Report Form Table 1

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
Manpower Administration
Washington, D.C. 20210

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Table 1

Labor Area and State _____ 1/

Date _____

Possible Impact of Post-Vietnam Layoffs

Section A - General Area Work Force Data

Item	Period				
	June '65	June '67	June '68	Cal. Year Averages 1965	1968
1. Work Force					
a. Total Employment					
(1) Nonagricultural Wage & salary employment					
(2) Mfg. Employment					
2. Unemployment					
3. Unemployment rate					

General Instructions for Sections B and C of Table:

Plant or installation information requested in the table should cover all plants or installations which employ 100 or more workers and are engaged in the fabrication of products directly for the military or for prime military contractors. Exclude establishments producing basic materials -- mines, blast furnaces, and steel mills, etc. -- unless they are producing directly for military use. Military installations with 100 or more civilian employees should be included, but members of the Armed Forces should be excluded from any estimates covered by the table.

1/ Counties or other civil divisions comprising labor area

_____

_____

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table 1 - Possible Impact of Post-Vietnam Layoffs--continued

Section B - Possible Effects of a 50 Percent Cutback in Defense-Related Jobs 2/

1. Effect on Total Employment in Plants and Installations

Name of Establishment, Plant or Installation	SIC Code	Defense-Related Products or Activities	Current Employment Mo. ___ Yr. ___ Total	Current Employment Mo. ___ Yr. ___ Defense-Related	Impact of Cutbacks No. of Layoffs Likely	Impact of Cutbacks Skills Most Affected
Total, all Plants & Installations (based on Dept. of Defense Data)	----	------			----	----

2. Comment on characteristics of workers to be laid off -- age, sex, race, skill levels, etc.

2/ Best judgment based on available data in local office.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Section B (continued)

3. In the light of the above comments, and statistical data in Section B 1, and assuming layoffs phased out over 12 months, discuss extent to which workers in defense-related activities can be re-absorbed in other non-defense activities within the same plant or elsewhere in the area, and the number of possible labor force withdrawals, retirements, and migration from the area by six months after end of layoffs.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Table 1 - Possible Effects of Post-Vietnam Layoffs--continued

Section C - Potential Effects of Layoffs Under Varying Assumptions--Provide estimates for each item in this section based on data currently available in local office, assuming layoffs phased over a 12-month period. Work force status of laid-off workers should be as of six months following end of all layoffs

	Reduction in Employment		
	25%	50%	100%
	Numbers of Workers		

1. Workers Affected (Total for all plants and installations in area with 100 or more workers engaged in defense-related activities)

   a. Direct layoffs--Total number affected:
      Status of laid-off Workers:
      (1) Reemployed in same plant
      (2) Reemployed elsewhere in area
      (3) Leave labor force (retire or withdraw)
      (4) Leave area
      (5) Add to unemployed in area

   b. Secondary layoffs (immediate suppliers only)--Total Number Affected:
      Status of laid-off Workers:
      (1) Reemployed in same plant
      (2) Reemployed elsewhere in area
      (3) Leave labor force
      (4) Leave area
      (5) Add to unemployed in area

2. Area unemployment rate at end of 18 months, assuming defense employment cuts of: 25%_____, 50%_____; 100% _____, and taking into consideration the effects of the primary and secondary layoffs shown in Section C 1 of the table. Do not include allowance for secondary effects of layoffs in trade and service in the area except for establishments which are immediate suppliers of those where cutbacks may occur.

3. Discussion and Comments. If possible include indication of extent to which workers laid off may be recent in-migrants to the area or commute to work from outside the labor area.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

APPENDIX C

TABULATION OF USTES SURVEY NUMERICAL DATA

This Appendix contains the numerical data, except for the work force, total employment, nonagricultural wage and salary employment, and unemployment rate reported for June 1965, June 1967, and June 1968, of Section A, General Area Work Force Data and Section C, Potential Effects of Layoffs Under Varying Assumptions, exactly as reported on the completed questionnaires.

NA means not available.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE C-1

SECTION A AND SECTION C DATA OF USTES SURVEY

	Census geographic division and area code	Work Force, 1965 Average	Work Force, 1968 Average	
Bridgeport Area (Conn.)	101	158200	170700	B
Burlington Area (Vt.)	102	31400	40450	B
Nashua City (N.H.)	103	36500	39300	B
Newport (N.H.)	104	19700	21000	B
N. Dighton City (Mass.)	105	28100	30200	B
Norwalk Area (Conn.)	106	46200	53700	B
Waterbury Area (Conn.)	107	83900	90700	B
Boston Area (Mass.)	121	1303300	1402900	B
Lawrence Area (Mass.)	122	89600	93000	B
Binghamton Area (N.Y.)	201	119700	123600	B
Tobyhanna (Pa.)	202	20900	24100	B
New Brunswick (N.J.)	221	252300	283900	B
Paterson Area (N.J.)	222	512800	557100	B
Philadelphia Area (Pa.)	223	1911400	2050400	B
Baraboo (Wisc.)	301	15600	20000	B
Crane Area (Ind.)	302	91225	95370	B
Eau Claire (Wisc.)	303	25081	28284	B
Huntington Ind.)	304	12455	13530	B
Marion (Ill.)	305	37175	40900	B
Rose City Mich.)	306	3100	3125	B
Bloomington (Ill.)	307	39900	46625	B
Cadillac (Mich.)	308	13575	15125	B
Clare (Mich.)	309	3700	4275	B
Escanaba (Mich.)	310	10675	11225	B
Indianapolis Area (Ind.)	311	422300	464100	B
Marysville (Mich.)	312	34500	37400	B
Standish (Mich.)	313	2600	2675	B
Detroit Area (Mich.)	321	1554900	1651000	B
Toledo Area (Ohio)	322	244900	269200	B
Burlington (Iowa)	401	23400	28200	B
Ft. Calhoun (Neb.)	402	4140	4770	B
Ft. Leavenworth (Kans.)	403	12675	14150	B
Ft. Leonard Wood Area (Mo.)	404	7800	9200	B

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE C-1 (continued)

	Census geographic division and area code	Work Force, 1965 Average	Work Force, 1968 Average	
Grand Island (Neb.)	405	15840	22320	B
Herman (Mo.)	406	5570	NA	B
Kerkhoven (Minn.)	407	NA	NA	B
Knob Knoster (Mo.)	408	9410	12160	B
W. Plains (Mo.)	409	7900	NA	B
Windsor (Mo.)	410	7270	NA	B
Kansas City Area (Mo.)	421	414200	449700	B
Columbus Area (Ga.)	501	72500	83600	B
Darien (Ga.)	502	1350	1870	B
Fayetteville (N.C.)	503	44170	55290	B
Forest City (N.C.)	504	17010	18020	B
Grantsville (W. Va.)	505	2560	2570	B
Homerville (Ga.)	506	2080	2360	B
Jacksonville (N.C.)	507	15460	18570	B
Lumberton (N.C.)	508	31480	34060	B
Macon Area (Ga.)	509	80000	89900	B
Murphy (N.C.)	510	5590	7240	B
Radford Area (Va.)	511	30230	40980	B
Raeford (N.C.)	512	6210	6340	B
St. Augustine (Fla.)	513	9870	9830	B
Taccoa (Ga.)	514	8400	9090	B
Trion (Ga.)	515	7610	8270	B
Wallace (S.C.)	516	12900	11700	B
Huntington Area (W. Va.)	521	94000	97600	B
Briston-Kingsport (Tenn.)	601	57280	64480	B
Centre (Ala.)	602	4080	4310	B
Centreville (Tenn.)	603	3610	3330	B
Columbia (Miss.)	604	7340	7890	B
Ft. Knox Area (Ky.)	605	20300	22300	B
Ft. Rucker Area (Ala.)	606	11520	15060	B
Gadsden (Ala.)	607	31900	34600	B
Golden (Miss.)	608	27470	29180	B
Greenville (Tenn.)	609	15670	18640	B

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE C-1 (continued)

	Census geographic division and area code	Work force, 1965 Average	Work force, 1980 Average	
Huntsville (Ala.)	610	95700	93700	B
Kosciuski (Miss.)	611	6540	6510	B
Milan (Tenn.)	612	23230	27310	B
Rockwood (Tenn.)	613	13470	14600	B
Shawmutt (Ala.)	614	14670	16120	B
Toone (Tenn.)	615	7670	8330	B
Tullahoma Area (Tenn.)	616	14720	14350	B
Chattanooga Area (Tenn.)	621	130300	142000	B
Memphis Area (Tenn.)	622	289400	316300	B
Batesville (Ark.)	701	7300	8275	B
Beeville (Tex.)	702	6765	6900	B
Bonham (Tex.)	703	7950	8440	B
Camden (Ark.)	704	1600	4025	B
Cuero (Tex.)	705	7385	7285	B
Greenville (Tex.)	706	16500	18400	B
Lawton (Okla.)	707	22800	26450	B
Leesville (La.)	708	7400	9525	B
McAlester (Okla.)	709	12350	15050	B
Magnolia (Ark.)	710	8450	9075	B
Marshall (Tex.)	711	14975	18600	B
Mena (Ark.)	712	3775	4500	B
Mineral Wells (Tex.)	713	9880	13110	B
Post (Tex.)	714	2865	2835	B
Shreveport Area (La.)	715	107450	117850	B
Texarkana Area (Tex.)	716	38370	47495	B
Wynne (Ark.)	717	6075	6550	B
Waco (Tex.)	721	59240	63730	B
Las Vegas (N. Mex.)	801	6738	6899	B
Raton (N. Mex.)	802	5050	5051	B
Grants Pass (Ore.)	901	12200	13260	B
Riverbank (Cal.)	902	68300	74300	B
Stockton (Cal.)	903	110200	120800	B
San Francisco Area (Cal.)	921	1289600	1406300	B

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE C-1 (continued)

	Census geographic division and area code	Total Employment 1965 Average	Total Employment 1968 Average	Non-agricultural Employment 1965 Average	Non-agricultural employment 1968 Average	Manufacturing Employment 1965 Average	Manufacturing Employment 1965 Average	Unemployment 1965 Average	Unemployment 1968 Average	Unemployment rate 1965 Average	Unemployment rate 1968 Average	
Bridgeport Area (Conn.)	1101	151100	163400	137400	150300	70400	77600	7100	7200	4.5	4.2	B
Burlington Area (Vt.)	1102	30250	39300	25550	34750	6450	10450	1150	1150	3.6	2.8	B
Nashua City (N.H.)	1103	35590	38750	30140	33870	15635	20949	910	550	2.5	1.4	B
Newport (N.H.)	1104	19190	20550	16250	17960	5157	5695	510	450	2.6	2.1	B
N. Dighton City (Mass.)	1105	26500	28800	23100	25700	10000	11500	1600	1350	5.7	4.4	B
Norwalk Area (Conn.)	1106	44600	51900	38900	45100	18200	20600	1600	1800	3.5	3.4	B
Waterbury Area (Conn.)	1107	79800	85900	71800	78300	38200	40900	4100	4800	5.0	5.3	B
Boston Area (Mass.)	11211250900		1357700	1140300	1255100	284100	296500	52400	45200	4.0	3.2	B
Lawrence Area (Mass.)	1122	83700	88400	75300	80900	40000	40700	5900	4500	6.6	4.8	B
Binghamton Area (N.Y.)	1201	115000	119700	98100	104600	44500	44900	4600	3900	3.9	3.2	B
Tobyhanna (Pa.)	1202	20300	23600	17400	20800	4800	5200	600	400	2.9	1.7	B
New Brunswick (N.J.)	1221	240000	270900	213200	244400	99200	108600	12300	13000	4.9	4.6	B
Paterson Area (N.J.)	1222	486200	534000	421200	471700	172700	188700	26300	23100	5.1	4.1	B
Philadelphia Area (Pa.)	12231829300		1987600	1592700	1758100	548600	576900	82100	62800	4.3	3.1	B
Baraboo (Wisc.)	1301	14900	19300	7100	13600	2600	6000	690	710	4.4	3.6	B
Crane Area (Ind.)	1302	87315	90930	73110	78410	23010	22730	3910	4285	4.3	4.5	B
Eau Claire (Wisc.)	1303	24078	27286	19235	23471	6408	8449	836	997	3.4	3.5	B
Huntington Ind.)	1304	12205	13190	9895	11180	5025	5750	250	340	2.0	2.5	B
Marion (Ill.)	1305	34100	38250	26000	30850	5050	6275	3150	2675	8.5	6.5	B
Rose City Mich.)	1306	2550	2675	1675	1900	300	350	550	450	17.7	14.4	B
Bloomington (Ill.)	1307	38725	45475	30875	37900	5325	7150	1175	975	2.9	2.1	B
Cadillac (Mich.)	1308	12775	13950	9400	10675	3775	4100	825	1175	6.1	7.8	B
Clare (Mich.)	1309	3400	3875	NA	3025	NA	1100	300	400	7.5	9.4	B
Escanaba (Mich.)	1310	9925	10250	7750	8525	2425	2600	750	825	7.0	7.3	B
Indianapolis Area (Ind.)	1311	411400	451800	368700	412200	125300	134800	10600	11900	2.5	2.6	B
Marysville (Mich.)	1312	33000	34700	26800	29100	10100	9600	1500	2200	4.3	5.9	B
Standish (Mich.)	1313	2400	2500	NA	1950	NA	600	300	175	9.7	6.5	B
Detroit Area (Mich.)	13211496800		1569900	1352500	1440600	579500	592900	55300	66400	3.6	4.0	B
Toledo Area (Ohio)	1322	236000	261000	206600	231800	77100	82000	9000	8200	3.7	3.1	B
Burlington (Iowa)	1401	21900	27600	18300	24000	9100	14200	461	530	2.1	1.8	B
Ft. Calhoun (Neb.)	1402	3990	4640	2070	2800	240	610	140	130	3.5	2.7	B
Ft. Leavenworth (Kans.)	1403	12250	13775	9975	11675	1400	1525	425	375	3.4	2.6	B
Ft. Leonard Wood Area (Mo.)	1404	7430	8800	6130	7400	600	600	370	480	4.7	4.2	B

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE C-1 (continued)

	Census geographic division and area code	Total Employment 1965 Average	Total Employment 1968 Average	Non-agricultural Employment 1965 Average	Non-agricultural employment 1968 Average	Manufacturing Employment 1965 Average	Manufacturing Employment 1965 Average	Unemployment 1965 Average	Unemployment 1968 Average	Unemployment rate 1965 Average	Unemployment rate 1968 Average	
Grand Island (Neb.)	1405	15330	21900	12040	18120	1620	7240	510	420	3.2	1.9	B
Herman (Mo.)	1406	5310	NA	3300	NA	NA	NA	260	NA	4.7	NA	B
Kerkhoven (Minn.)	1407	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B
Knob Knoster (Mo.)	1408	8970	11790	4890	7810	960	1050	440	370	4.7	3.0	B
W. Plains (Mo.)	1409	7450	NA	4350	NA	1530	NA	450	NA	5.7	NA	B
Windsor (Mo.)	1410	6860	NA	3900	NA	NA	NA	410	NA	5.6	NA	B
Kansas City Area (Mo.)	1421	395500	432700	348800	382800	87500	98900	18700	17000	4.5	3.8	B
Columbus Area (Ga.)	1501	69500	80400	57800	68700	17200	19300	3000	3200	4.1	3.8	B
Darien (Ga.)	1502	1250	1750	850	1350	380	550	100	120	7.4	6.4	B
Fayetteville (N.C.)	1503	42240	53040	32750	43340	4670	6840	1930	2250	4.4	4.1	B
Forest City (N.C.)	1504	16360	17440	13100	14540	8110	9100	650	580	3.8	3.2	B
Grantsville (W. Va.)	1505	2180	2160	1190	1290	260	230	390	420	15.2	16.3	B
Homerville (Ga.)	1506	1960	2270	1460	1780	590	1070	120	90	3.3	2.9	B
Jacksonville (N.C.)	1507	14640	17620	11350	14520	550	830	820	950	5.3	5.1	B
Lumberton (N.C.)	1508	28670	31720	13260	18280	3960	7250	2810	2340	8.9	6.9	B
Macon Area (Ga.)	1509	77400	87300	65900	75700	13000	15500	2600	2600	3.3	2.9	B
Murphy (N.C.)	1510	5050	6860	3550	5270	1760	3180	540	380	9.7	5.2	B
Radford Area (Va.)	1511	29600	40000	24880	35180	11375	18350	630	980	2.1	2.4	B
Raeford (N.C.)	1512	5860	6050	3550	4120	2040	2290	350	290	5.6	4.6	B
St. Augustine (Fla.)	1513	9580	9610	7330	7960	1110	1534	290	220	2.9	2.2	B
Taccoa (Ga.)	1514	8030	8650	6810	7450	4710	4820	370	440	4.4	4.8	B
Trion (Ga.)	1515	7300	7960	6180	6880	4410	4850	310	310	4.1	3.7	B
Wallace (S.C.)	1516	12100	11000	7500	7650	4450	4600	800	700	6.2	6.0	B
Huntington Area (W. Va.)	1521	87800	91400	75500	80350	25600	25450	6200	5800	6.6	5.9	B
Briston-Kingsport (Tenn.)	1601	55120	62500	44890	53310	21940	28160	2160	1980	3.8	3.1	B
Centre (Ala.)	1602	3820	4050	2240	2710	680	1110	260	260	6.4	6.0	B
Centreville (Tenn.)	1603	3400	3160	2150	2050	1280	1080	210	170	5.8	5.1	B
Columbia (Miss.)	1604	6940	7300	4650	5220	1600	1860	400	590	5.4	7.5	B
Ft. Knox Area (Ky.)	1605	19600	21700	13600	16300	1750	3000	700	600	3.4	2.7	B
Ft. Rucker Area (Ala.)	1606	11170	14660	8350	11870	3150	4630	350	400	3.0	2.7	B
Gadsden (Ala.)	1607	30000	32670	24570	27690	10260	12410	1900	1930	6.0	5.6	B
Golden (Miss.)	1608	26010	27560	17240	19510	8890	10750	1460	1620	5.3	5.6	B
Greenville (Tenn.)	1609	14280	17490	9490	12910	4600	7340	1390	1150	8.9	6.2	B

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE C-1 (continued)

	Census geographic division and area code	Total Employment 1965 Average	Total Employment 1968 Average	Non-agricultural Employment 1965 Average	Non-agricultural employment 1968 Average	Manufacturing Employment 1965 Average	Manufacturing Employment 1965 Average	Unemployment 1965 Average	Unemployment 1968 Average	Unemployment rate 1965 Average	Unemployment rate 1968 Average	
Huntsville (Ala.)	1610	93200	90400	76500	76500	13000	12100	2500	3300	2.6	3.5	B
Kosciuski (Miss.)	1611	6050	6000	3690	4030	1600	1690	490	510	7.5	7.8	B
Milan (Tenn.)	1612	22590	26710	14620	23060	6900	11050	640	600	2.7	2.2	B
Rockwood (Tenn.)	1613	12520	13720	9200	10860	4100	5140	950	880	7.1	6.0	B
Shawmutt (Ala.)	1614	14240	15700	10530	12460	7730	9310	430	420	2.9	2.6	B
Toone (Tenn.)	1615	7480	8120	3950	4900	2010	2520	190	210	2.5	2.5	B
Tullahoma Area (Tenn.)	1616	14210	13830	11230	11200	3540	3400	510	490	3.5	3.4	B
Chattanooga Area (Tenn.)	1621	126100	136700	108000	120900	45200	50600	4200	4200	3.2	3.2	B
Memphis Area (Tenn.)	1622	278700	306200	223900	258000	49500	59400	10700	9600	3.7	3.0	B
Batesville (Ark.)	1701	6700	7850	4400	5525	1625	2450	600	425	8.2	5.1	B
Beeville (Tex.)	1702	6525	6700	4500	4560	200	240	240	200	3.5	2.9	B
Bonham (Tex.)	1703	7600	8140	4700	4800	2900	3340	350	300	4.4	3.6	B
Camden (Ark.)	1704	1500	3925	800	3050	375	2425	100	100	6.3	2.5	B
Cuero (Tex.)	1705	7160	7080	4140	4045	1180	970	225	205	3.0	2.8	B
Greenville (Tex.)	1706	15500	17800	11350	13950	4700	6200	1000	600	6.1	3.3	B
Lawton (Okla.)	1707	21750	25275	17450	21175	1250	1625	1050	1175	4.6	4.4	B
Leesville (La.)	1708	7075	9050	5175	7025	200	175	325	450	4.3	4.8	B
McAlester (Okla.)	1709	11275	14150	8175	11125	1500	1800	1075	900	8.7	6.0	B
Magnolia (Ark.)	1710	8000	8675	5600	6350	2050	2750	450	400	5.3	4.4	B
Marshall (Tex.)	1711	14225	18120	11150	15000	5000	7500	750	480	5.0	2.6	B
Mena (Ark.)	1712	3500	4275	2400	3100	1225	1700	275	225	7.3	5.0	B
Mineral Wells (Tex.)	1713	9450	12800	7560	10240	1290	1410	430	310	4.4	2.4	B
Post (Tex.)	1714	2845	2805	1975	1940	565	535	20	30	0.7	1.1	B
Shreveport Area (La.)	1715	103000	114050	77400	90025	10425	15925	4450	3775	4.1	3.2	B
Texarkana Area (Tex.)	1716	36150	46315	27555	38060	6765	14580	2220	1180	5.8	2.5	B
Wynne (Ark.)	1717	5825	6275	2850	3475	775	1275	250	275	4.1	4.2	B
Waco (Tex.)	1721	56460	61165	44940	50520	11210	13420	2780	2565	4.7	4.0	B
Las Vegas (N. Mex.)	1801	5958	5983	4599	4652	207	132	780	916	11.6	13.2	B
Raton (N. Mex.)	1802	4662	4743	3243	3545	456	596	388	308	7.7	6.1	B
Grants Pass (Ore.)	1901	11240	12140	8440	8930	2370	2570	980	1120	8.0	8.4	B
Riverbank (Cal.)	1902	61200	67200	49400	56800	10600	13400	7100	7100	10.4	9.6	B
Stockton (Cal.)	1903	102000	112800	85600	96900	15600	16700	8200	8000	7.4	6.6	B
San Francisco Area (Cal.)	1921	1224700	1350000	1083400	1207300	203600	209500	64900	56400	5.0	4.0	B

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE C-1 (continued)

Census geographic division and area code	Total number of direct layoffs, 25% reduction	Total number of direct layoffs, 50% reduction	Total number of direct layoffs, 100% reduction	Reemployed in same plant, 25% reduction	Reemployed in same plant, 50% reduction	Reemployed in same plant, 100% reduction	Reemployed elsewhere in area, 25% reduction	Reemployed elsewhere in area, 50% reduction	Reemployed elsewhere in area, 100% reduction	Retired or withdrawn from labor force, 25% reduction	Retired or withdrawn from labor force, 50% reduction	Retired or withdrawn from labor force, 100% reduction	Out-migrated, 25% reduction	Out-migrated, 50% reduction	Out-migrated, 100% reduction
Bridgeport Area (Conn.)	2101	2000	4000	8000	400	400	300	600	1000	1500	100	400	800	100	300	900B
Burlington Area (Vt.)	2102	850	1700	3350	50	100	250	450	800	1600	100	200	350	100	250	500B
Nashua City (N.H.)	2103	1325	2650	5300	525	650	1300	300	500	1000	100	200	300	100	200	400B
Newport (N.H.)	2104	NA	90	NA	NA	50	NA	NA	40	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
N. Dighton City (Mass.)	2105	270	535	1070	15	190	375	40	80	160	30	55	110	90	190	375B
Norwalk Area (Conn.)	2106	450	930	2000	100	200	400	250	400	600	70	250	500	20	50	300B
Waterbury Area (Conn.)	2107	1000	2100	4200	100	30	160	220	690	1290	300	620	1250	30	40	40B
Boston Area (Mass.)	212	1850	3700	7400	0	3251	6650	3300	9250	18500	37000	370	740	1480	370	740	1480B
Lawrence Area (Mass.)	2122	712	1425	2850	200	400	1100	300	700	1300	50	125	150	62	70	100B
Binghamton Area (N.Y.)	2201	175	350	700	0	0	0	100	175	275	40	80	150	10	20	25B
Tobyhanna (Pa.)	2202	375	750	1500	0	0	0	70	140	280	5	10	20	300	600	1200B
New Brunswick (N.J.)	2221	1360	2740	5480	300	600	1200	500	1000	2000	100	200	400	100	200	400B
Paterson Area (N.J.)	2222	6300	12500	25900	2600	2600	2600	2000	2000	2000	300	600	1200	1200	2400	4800B
Philadelphia Area (Pa.)	2223	6819	14880	28764	752	1780	3640	4215	9357	17506	662	1292	2556	437	852	1807B
Baraboo (Wisc.)	2301	910	2250	5350	0	0	0	100	200	800	10	25	50	800	1975	4350B
Crane Area (Ind.)	2302	1700	3400	6800	600	360	0	600	1850	2600	300	680	1400	50	170	800B
Eau Claire (Wisc.)	2303	675	1350	2700	0	0	0	100	200	400	100	225	450	0	75	125B
Huntington Ind.)	2304	250	500	1000	50	120	250	120	230	450	50	100	200	10	20	30B
Marion (Ill.)	2305	75	150	250	20	40	30	30	60	105	15	25	55	10	15	35B
Rose City Mich.)	2306	50	100	185	0	0	0	45	95	175	0	0	0	0	0	0B
Bloomington (Ill.)	2307	325	650	1100	50	100	200	225	450	700	25	50	100	0	0	0B
Cadillac (Mich.)	2308	60	115	225	10	20	40	15	30	50	10	20	35	15	25	60B
Clare (Mich.)	2309	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Escanaba (Mich.)	2310	90	150	300	70	110	175	5	5	25	0	5	10	10	20	40B
Indianapolis Area (Ind.)	2311	750	1490	2950	100	130	300	340	770	1500	110	250	450	50	100	200B
Marysville (Mich.)	2312	85	175	400	60	125	300	25	50	50	0	0	50	0	0	50B
Standish (Mich.)	2313	41	83	165	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	32	60	9	16	35B
Detroit Area (Mich.)	2321	1200	2700	6100	600	1200	2600	600	1400	3000	0	0	0	0	0	0B
Toledo Area (Ohio)	2322	600	1200	2400	210	240	93	366	792	1680	6	36	96	6	36	120B
Burlington (Iowa)	2401	1655	3310	6620	0	0	0	255	310	700	700	1000	2200	400	750	1820B
Ft. Calhoun (Neb.)	2402	70	149	293	10	15	20	15	25	35	20	50	120	5	16	48B
Ft. Leavenworth (Kans.)	2403	25	50	100	3	5	10	12	25	50	3	5	10	5	10	20B
Ft. Leonard Wood Area (Mo.)	2404	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE C-1 (continued)

	Census geographic division and area code	Total number of direct layoffs, 25% reduction	Total number of direct layoffs, 50% reduction	Total number of direct layoffs, 100% reduction	Reemployed in same plant, 25% reduction	Reemployed in same plant, 50% reduction	Reemployed in same plant, 100% reduction	Reemployed elsewhere in area, 25% reduction	Reemployed elsewhere in area, 50% reduction	Reemployed elsewhere in area, 100% reduction	Retired or withdrawn from labor force, 25% reduction	Retired or withdrawn from labor force, 50% reduction	Retired or withdrawn from labor force, 100% reduction	Out-migrated, 25% reduction	Out-migrated, 50% reduction	Out-migrated, 100%
Grand Island (Neb.)	2405	1000	2000	4000	0	0	0	300	500	500	100	200	300	150	400	1500B
Herman (Mo.)	2406	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Kerkhoven (Minn.)	2407	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Knob Knoster (Mo.)	2408	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0B
W Plains (Mo.)	2409	55	110	225	50	60	120	5	30	50	0	10	20	0	10	20B
Windsor (Mo.)	2410	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Kansas City Area (Mo.)	2421	2121	4242	12064	10034	7822	0	1599	2119	6300	361	723	1600	61	1000	3000B
Columbus Area (Ga.)	2501	750	1500	3000	100	200	400	100	200	400	50	100	200	100	300	600B
Darien (Ga.)	2502	38	75	150	2	4	6	15	45	80	5	10	20	5	10	20B
Fayetteville (N.C.)	2503	1000	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	250	NA	NA	100	NA	NA	500	NA	NAB
Forest City (N.C.)	2504	50	100	200	10	25	50	40	70	100	NA	5	20	NA	NA	10B
Grantsville (W. Va.)	2505	38	75	150	0	0	0	0	5	10	25	50	100	5	10	20B
Homerville (Ga.)	2506	100	150	300	75	100	150	25	50	75	10	20	30	15	30	60B
Jacksonville (N.C.)	2507	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Lumberton (N.C.)	2508	50	100	200	25	50	100	12	25	50	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Macon Area (Ga.)	2509	800	1850	4200	0	0	50	420	825	1750	150	450	1000	200	500	1200B
Murphy (N.C.)	2510	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Radford Area (Va.)	2511	2080	3220	4620	0	60	460	1080	1580	2080	0	80	160	1000	1500	2000B
Raeford (N.C.)	2512	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
St. Augustine (Fla.)	2513	200	400	800	0	0	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Taccoa (Ga.)	2514	150	NA	NA	40	NA	NA	70	NA	NA	5	NA	NA	15	NA	NAB
Trion (Ga.)	2515	110	220	440	75	100	125	25	75	100	10	10	10	0	20	20B
Wallace (S.C.)	2516	30	60	120	0	0	0	10	20	30	0	10	20	0	0	0B
Huntington Area (W. Va.)	2521	0	70	150	0	35	75	0	35	75	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Briston-Kingsport (Tenn.)	2601	1150	2300	4600	0	0	0	200	400	800	80	150	300	200	400	800B
Centre (Ala.)	2602	220	440	890	100	150	200	10	20	30	30	100	420	10	20	40B
Centreville (Tenn.)	2603	54	108	216	0	0	0	51	88	175	3	5	11	0	0	0B
Columbia (Miss.)	2604	40	80	170	30	50	125	NA	10	10	5	10	20	NA	NA	NAB
Ft. Knox Area (Ky.)	2605	NA	NA	NA	100	175	275	250	400	400	150	200	250	500	800	1000B
Ft. Rucker Area (Ala.)	2606	1000	2000	4000	50	50	0	100	0	0	65	75	200	250	400	1000B
Gadsden (Ala.)	2607	450	900	1800	30	80	150	150	290	400	100	250	600	10	30	50B
Golden (Miss.)	2608	25	50	75	NA	30	60	15	15	10	5	5	5	NA	NA	NAB
Greenville (Tenn.)	2609	150	300	600	0	0	0	15	30	60	10	20	40	0	0	0B

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE C-1 (continued)

Census geographic division and area code	Total number of direct layoffs; 25% reduction	Total number of direct layoffs; 50% reduction	Total number of direct layoffs; 100% reduction	Unemployed in same plant; 25% reduction	Unemployed in same plant; 50% reduction	Unemployed in same plant; 100% reduction	Unemployed elsewhere in area; 25% reduction	Unemployed elsewhere in area; 50% reduction	Unemployed elsewhere in area; 100% reduction	Retired or withdrawn from labor force; 25% reduction	Retired or withdrawn from labor force; 50% reduction	Retired or withdrawn from labor force; 100% reduction	Out-migrated; 25% reduction	Out-migrated; 50% reduction	Out-migrated; 100% reduction
Huntsville (Ala.)	2610	360	725	1450	25	50	120	50	95	240	45	70	145	0	25	50B
Kosciuski (Miss.)	2611	75	150	300	15	25	50	10	20	35	NA	NA	5	NA	5	10B
Milan (Tenn.)	2612	1907	3642	6511	0	0	0	389	439	175	39	44	18	1316	2633	5265B
Rockwood (Tenn.)	2613	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Shawmutt (Ala.)	2614	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Toone (Tenn.)	2615	0	0	0	18	37	75	8	15	30	0	0	0	48	97	195B
Tullahoma Area (Tenn.)	2616	154	308	615	120	240	475	20	40	80	8	15	30	5	10	20B
Chattanooga Area (Tenn.)	2621	700	1400	2800	50	75	100	450	875	1800	50	100	200	100	200	400B
Memphis Area (Tenn.)	2622	750	1500	3000	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Batesville (Ark.)	2701	165	333	666	0	0	0	85	150	150	20	45	65	5	15	20B
Beeville (Tex.)	2702	128	232	487	0	0	0	75	139	292	10	15	30	7	25	40B
Bonham (Tex.)	2703	160	328	655	100	200	350	50	75	100	10	20	40	0	20	50B
Camden (Ark.)	2704	487	975	1870	15	10	0	65	75	177	132	300	531	178	400	885B
Cuero (Tex.)	2705	38	75	150	8	10	15	4	8	10	2	5	10	3	5	8B
Greenville (Tex.)	2706	575	1150	2300	0	0	0	144	287	575	57	115	230	287	575	1150B
Lawton (Okla.)	2707	315	625	1250	65	130	250	195	375	740	10	20	30	10	20	30B
Leesville (La.)	2708	685	1370	2739	0	0	0	75	150	150	150	275	275	100	150	300B
McAlester (Okla.)	2709	600	1200	2400	0	0	0	150	300	600	60	120	240	120	240	480B
Magnolia (Ark.)	2710	168	335	670	17	14	8	26	52	104	42	84	168	3	25	70B
Marshall (Tex.)	2711	750	1500	3000	0	100	100	75	150	200	200	500	600	400	650	1925B
Mena (Ark.)	2712	85	170	320	5	0	0	5	20	20	10	25	60	15	25	40B
Mineral Wells (Tex.)	2713	1200	2300	4000	0	0	0	400	400	300	100	200	300	600	1400	2500B
Post (Tex.)	2714	40	80	165	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	60	125	0	0	0B
Shreveport Area (La.)	2715	2250	4500	9000	0	0	700	210	420	100	595	1190	500	355	705	1000B
Texarkana Area (Tex.)	2716	2475	4950	9900	0	0	0	250	500	1000	1745	1490	2980	965	1930	3860B
Wynne (Ark.)	2717	75	150	300	20	25	30	5	5	5	0	15	35	30	70	140B
Waco (Tex.)	2721	498	995	1990	0	0	0	165	330	665	25	50	100	200	400	800B
Las Vegas (N. Mex.)	2801	NA	NA	165	NA	NA	0	NA	NA	0	NA	NA	0	NA	NA	0B
Raton (N. Mex.)	2802	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0	NA	0	0	NA	0	0	NA	0	0B
Grants Pass (Ore.)	2901	50	100	200	10	20	0	10	20	100	10	10	40	5	20	20B
Riverbank (Cal.)	2902	380	820	1700	50	100	200	30	60	100	70	150	200	30	60	200B
Stockton (Cal.)	2903	950	1900	3800	0	100	200	50	200	300	50	100	300	50	100	300B
San Francisco Area (Cal.)	2921	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE C-1 (continued)

	Census geographic division and area code	Unemployed, 25% reduction	Unemployed, 50% reduction	Unemployed, 100% reduction	
Bridgeport Area (Conn.)	3101	800	1900	4500	B
Burlington Area (Vt.)	3102	100	350	650	B
Nashua City (N.H.)	3103	300	1100	2300	B
Newport (N.H.)	3104	NA	NA	NA	B
N. Dighton City (Mass.)	3105	15	25	55	B
Norwalk Area (Conn.)	3106	10	30	200	B
Waterbury Area (Conn.)	3107	350	720	1460	B
Boston Area (Mass.)	3121	185	370	740	B
Lawrence Area (Mass.)	3122	100	130	200	B
Binghamton Area (N.Y.)	3201	25	75	250	B
Tobyhanna (Pa.)	3202	0	0	0	B
New Brunswick (N.J.)	3221	360	740	1480	B
Paterson Area (N.J.)	3222	200	4900	15300	B
Philadelphia Area (Pa.)	3223	743	1599	3255	B
Baraboo (Wisc,)	3301	0	50	150	B
Crane Area (Ind.)	3302	150	340	2000	B
Eau Claire (Wisc.)	3303	475	850	1725	B
Huntington Ind.)	3304	20	30	70	B
Marion (Ill.)	3305	0	10	25	B
Rose City Mich.)	3306	5	5	10	B
Bloomington (Ill.)	3307	25	50	100	B
Cadillac (Mich.)	3308	10	20	40	B
Clare (Mich.)	3309	NA	NA	NA	B
Escanaba (Mich.)	3310	5	10	50	B
Indianapolis Area (Ind.)	3311	150	240	500	B
Marysville (Mich.)	3312	0	0	50	B
Standish (Mich.)	3313	16	35	70	B
Detroit Area (Mich.)	3321	0	100	500	B
Toledo Area (Ohio)	3322	12	96	360	B
Burlington (Iowa)	3401	300	1250	1900	B
Ft. Calhoun (Neb.)	3402	20	43	70	B
Ft. Leavenworth (Kans.)	3403	2	5	10	B
Ft. Leonard Wood Area (Mo.)	3404	NA	NA	NA	B

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE C-1 (continued)

	Census geographic division and area code	Unemployed, 25% reduction	Unemployed, 50% reduction	Unemployed, 100% reduction	
Grand Island (Neb.)	3405	450	900	1700	B
Herman (Mo.)	3406	NA	NA	NA	B
Kerkhoven (Minn.)	3407	NA	NA	NA	B
Knob Knoster (Mo.)	3408	0	0	0	B
W. Plains (Mo.)	3409	0	10	15	B
Windsor (Mo.)	3410	NA	NA	NA	B
Kansas City Area (Mo.)	3421	100	400	1164	B
Columbus Area (Ga.)	3501	400	700	1400	B
Darien (Ga.)	3502	11	16	24	B
Fayetteville (N.C.)	3503	150	NA	NA	B
Forest City (N.C.)	3504	NA	NA	20	B
Grantsville (W. Va.)	3505	8	10	20	B
Homerville (Ga.)	3506	NA	NA	NA	B
Jacksonville (N.C.)	3507	NA	NA	NA	B
Lumberton (N.C.)	3508	13	25	50	B
Macon Area (Ga.)	3509	30	75	200	B
Murphy (N.C.)	3510	NA	NA	NA	B
Radford Area (Va.)	3511	0	0	0	B
Raeford (N.C.)	3512	NA	NA	NA	B
St. Augustine (Fla.)	3513	150	350	600	B
Taccoa (Ga.)	3514	20	NA	NA	B
Trion (Ga.)	3515	0	20	185	B
Wallace (S.C.)	3516	20	30	70	B
Huntington Area (W. Va.)	3521	NA	NA	NA	B
Briston-Kingsport (Tenn.)	3601	670	1350	2700	B
Centre (Ala.)	3602	70	150	200	B
Centreville (Tenn.)	3603	0	15	30	B
Columbia (Miss.)	3604	5	10	15	B
Ft. Knox Area (Ky.)	3605	0	700	2000	B
Ft. Rucker Area (Ala.)	3606	500	1400	2800	B
Gadsden (Ala.)	3607	160	250	600	B
Golden (Miss.)	3608	5	NA	NA	B
Greenville (Tenn.)	3609	125	250	500	B

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE C-1 (continued)

	Census geographic division and area code	Unemployed, 25% reduction	Unemployed, 50% reduction	Unemployed, 100% reduction	
Huntsville (Ala.)	3610	240	485	495	B
Kosciuski (Miss.)	3611	50	100	200	B
Milan (Tenn.)	3612	163	526	1053	B
Rockwood (Tenn.)	3613	NA	NA	NA	B
Shawmutt (Ala.)	3614	NA	NA	NA	B
Toone (Tenn.)	3615	NA	NA	NA	B
Tullahoma Area (Tenn.)	3616	1	3	0	B
Chattanooga Area (Tenn.)	3621	50	150	300	B
Memphis Area (Tenn.)	3622	NA	NA	NA	B
Batesville (Ark.)	3701	55	123	431	B
Beeville (Tex.)	3702	54	68	135	B
Bonham (Tex.)	3703	0	13	115	B
Camden (Ark.)	3704	97	190	277	B
Cuero (Tex.)	3705	21	47	107	B
Greenville (Tex.)	3706	57	115	230	B
Lawton (Okla.)	3707	35	80	200	B
Leesville (La.)	3708	360	795	2014	B
McAlester (Okla.)	3709	270	540	1080	B
Magnolia (Ark.)	3710	80	160	320	B
Marshall (Tex.)	3711	75	100	175	B
Mena (Ark.)	3712	50	100	200	B
Mineral Wells (Tex.)	3713	100	300	900	B
Post (Tex.)	3714	10	20	40	B
Shreveport Area (La.)	3715	1090	2185	6700	B
Texarkana Area (Tex.)	3716	515	1030	2060	B
Wynne (Ark.)	3717	20	35	90	B
Waco (Tex.)	3721	108	215	430	B
Las Vegas (N. Mex.)	3801	NA	NA	165	B
Raton (N. Mex.)	3802	NA	50	100	B
Grants Pass (Ore.)	3901	15	30	40	B
Riverbank (Cal.)	3902	200	450	1000	B
Stockton (Cal.)	3903	700	1400	2700	B
San Francisco Area (Cal.)	3921	NA	NA	NA	B

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE C-1 (continued)

Census geographic division and area code		Total number of secondary layoffs, 25% reduction			Total number of secondary layoffs, 50% reduction			Total number of secondary layoffs, 100% reduction			Reemployed in same plant 25% reduction			Reemployed in same plant 50% reduction			Reemployed in same plant 100% reduction			Reemployed elsewhere in area, 25% reduction			Reemployed elsewhere in area, 50% reduction			Reemployed elsewhere in area, 100% reduction			Retired or withdrawn from labor force, 25% reduction			Retired or withdrawn from labor force, 50% reduction			Retired or withdrawn from labor force, 100% reduction			Out-migrated, 25% reduction			Out-migrated, 50% reduction			Out-migrated, 100% reduction		
Bridgeport Area (Conn.)	4101	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Burlington Area (Vt.)	4102	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Nashua City (N.H.)	4103	100	200	400	10	20	50	50	100	200	10	20	30	10	10	20	30	40	50	10	20	30	10	10	20	30	40	50	10	20	30	10	10	20	30	40	50	10	20	30	40	50	60
Newport (N.H.)	4104	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
N. Dighton City (Mass.)	4105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Norwalk Area (Conn.)	4106	40	90	250	15	40	100	5	10	50	5	10	30	5	10	30	5	10	30	5	10	30	5	10	30	5	10	30	5	10	30	5	10	30	5	10	30	5	10	30	5	10	30
Waterbury Area (Conn.)	4107	100	200	400	10	20	20	50	90	150	20	50	100	10	10	10	30	50	100	20	50	100	10	10	10	30	50	100	10	10	10	30	50	100	10	10	10	30	50	100	10	10	10
Boston Area (Mass.)	4121	1250	2500	5000	500	1125	2250	4500	875	1750	3500	125	250	500	125	250	500	125	250	500	125	250	500	125	250	500	125	250	500	125	250	500	125	250	500	125	250	500	125	250	500	125	250	500
Lawrence Area (Mass.)	4122	250	500	1000	100	200	450	100	200	350	10	25	30	20	45	60	30	60	90	20	45	60	20	45	60	30	60	90	20	45	60	30	60	90	20	45	60	30	60	90	20	45	60
Binghamton Area (N.Y.)	4201	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Tobyhanna (Pa.)	4202	13	25	50	0	0	0	8	16	32	2	3	6	0	0	0	6	13	25	2	3	6	0	0	0	6	13	25	2	3	6	0	0	0	6	13	25	2	3	6	0	0	0
New Brunswick (N.J.)	4221	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Paterson Area (N.J.)	4222	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Philadelphia Area (Pa.)	4223	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Baraboo (Wisc.)	4301	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Crane Area (Ind.)	4302	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Eau Claire (Wisc.)	4303	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Huntington Ind.)	4304	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Marion (Ill.)	4305	10	15	25	0	0	0	5	10	15	0	0	0	5	5	10	0	0	0	5	5	10	0	0	0	5	5	10	0	0	0	5	5	10	0	0	0	5	5	10	0	0	0
Rose City Mich.)	4306	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bloomington (Ill.)	4307	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cadillac (Mich.)	4308	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Clare (Mich.)	4309	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Escanaba (Mich.)	4310	20	30	40	10	15	20	5	5	10	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	5	5	0	0	0
Indianapolis Area (Ind.)	4311	250	500	750	50	100	200	120	260	310	50	80	110	20	40	80	30	60	90	20	40	80	20	40	80	30	60	90	20	40	80	30	60	90	20	40	80	30	60	90	20	40	80
Marysville (Mich.)	4312	50	100	215	50	75	145	0	25	50	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0
Standish (Mich.)	4313	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Detroit Area (Mich.)	4321	600	1350	3050	300	600	1300	300	700	1500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Toledo Area (Ohio)	4322	400	800	1600	140	160	256	244	576	1184	4	24	64	4	24	168	8	48	128	8	48	168	8	48	168	8	48	128	8	48	168	8	48	128	8	48	168	8	48	128	8	48	168
Burlington (Iowa)	4401	25	75	200	0	10	50	10	25	50	0	5	10	10	20	50	10	20	50	10	20	50	10	20	50	10	20	50	10	20	50	10	20	50	10	20	50	10	20	50	10	20	50
Ft. Calhoun (Neb.)	4402	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ft. Leavenworth (Kans.)	4403	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Ft. Leonard Wood Area (Mo.)	4404	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE C-1 (continued)

Census geographic division and area code		Total number of secondary layoffs, 25% reduction	Total number of secondary layoffs, 50% reduction	Total number of secondary layoffs, 100% reduction	Reemployed in same plant 25% reduction	Reemployed in same plant 50% reduction	Reemployed in same plant 100% reduction	Reemployed elsewhere in area, 25% reduction	Reemployed elsewhere in area, 50% reduction	Reemployed elsewhere in area, 100% reduction	Retired or withdrawn from labor force, 25% reduction	Retired or withdrawn from labor force, 50% reduction	Retired or withdrawn from labor force, 100% reduction	Out-migrated, 25% reduction	Out-migrated, 50% reduction	Out-migrated, 100% r
Grand Island (Neb.)	4405	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Herman (Mo.)	4406	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Kerkhoven (Minn.)	4407	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Knob Knoster (Mo.)	4408	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0						B
W. Plains (Mo.)	4409	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0B
Windsor (Mo.)	4410	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Kansas City Area (Mo.)	4421	128	255	595	467	340	0	122	213	420	6	12	30	0	0	20B
Columbus Area (Ga.)	4501	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Darien (Ga.)	4502	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Fayetteville (N.C.)	4503	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Forest City (N.C.)	4504	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Grantsville (W. Va.)	4505	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0B
Homerville (Ga.)	4506	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Jacksonville (N.C.)	4507	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Lumberton (N.C.)	4508	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Macon Area (Ga.)	4509	25	60	100	0	0	0	12	28	45	3	5	10	8	20	30B
Murphy (N.C.)	4510	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Radford Area (Va.)	4511	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Raeford (N.C.)	4512	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
St. Augustine (Fla.)	4513	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0B
Taccoa (Ga.)	4514	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Trion (Ga.)	4515	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0B
Wallace (S.C.)	4516	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Huntington Area (W. Va.)	4521	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Briston-Kingsport (Tenn.)	4601	10	20	40	0	0	0	2	4	8	0	0	2	2	4	8B
Centre (Ala.)	4602	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Centreville (Tenn.)	4603	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Columbia (Miss.)	4604	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Ft. Knox Area (Ky.)	4605	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0B
Ft. Rucker Area (Ala.)	4606	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Gadsden (Ala.)	4607	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0B
Golden (Miss.)	4608	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0B
Greenville (Tenn.)	4609	0	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0B

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE C-1 (continued)

Census geographic division and area code		Total number of secondary layoffs, 25% reduction	Total number of secondary layoffs, 50% reduction	Total number of secondary layoffs, 100% reduction	Reemployed in same plant 25% reduction	Reemployed in same plant 50% reduction	Reemployed in same plant 100% reduction	Reemployed elsewhere in area, 25% reduction	Reemployed elsewhere in area, 50% reduction	Reemployed elsewhere in area, 100% reduction	Retired or withdrawn from labor force, 25% reduction	Retired or withdrawn from labor force, 50% reduction	Retired or withdrawn from labor force, 100% reduction	Out-migrated, 25% reduction	Out-migrated, 50% reduction	Out-migrated, 100% reduction
Huntsville (Ala.)	4610	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0B
Kosciuski (Miss.)	4611	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Milan (Tenn.)	4612	10	36	95	0	0	0	9	18	50	0	0	0	1	2	5B
Rockwood (Tenn.)	4613	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Shawmutt (Ala.)	4614	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Toone (Tenn.)	4615	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Tullahoma Area (Tenn.)	4616	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Chattanooga Area (Tenn.)	4621	50	100	200	25	50	100	25	45	85	0	5	10	0	0	0B
Memphis Area (Tenn.)	4622	125	250	500	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Batesville (Ark.)	4701	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Beeville (Tex.)	4702	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Bonham (Tex.)	4703	50	100	200	25	45	50	20	35	35	0	10	10	0	0	0B
Camden (Ark.)	4704	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Cuero (Tex.)	4705	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0B
Greenville (Tex.)	4706	0	0	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Lawton (Okla.)	4707	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0B
Leesville (La.)	4708	150	300	600	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	50	100	50	100	200B
McAlester (Okla.)	4709	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0B
Magnolia (Ark.)	4710	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Marshall (Tex.)	4711	110	220	440	91	182	365	0	0	0	19	38	75	0	0	0B
Mena (Ark.)	4712	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Mineral Wells (Tex.)	4713	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0B
Post (Tex.)	4714	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0B
Shreveport Area (La.)	4715	300	600	1200	0	0	0	30	55	25	80	160	50	50	95	200B
Texarkana Area (Tex.)	4716	85	165	330	0	0	NA	5	15	30	0	0	NA	10	15	30B
Wynne (Ark.)	4717	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Waco (Tex.)	4721	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Las Vegas (N. Mex.)	4801	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Raton (N. Mex.)	4802	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Grants Pass (Ore.)	4901	0	0	0	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NAB
Riverbank (Cal.)	4902	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	B
Stockton (Cal.)	4903	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	B
San Francisco Area (Cal.)	4921	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE C-1 (continued)

Census geographic division and area code	Unemployed, 25% reduction	Unemployed, 50% reduction	Unemployed, 100% reduction	Total number of layoffs, 25% reduction	Total number of layoffs, 50% reduction	Total number of layoffs, 100% reduction	Reemployed in same plant, 25% reduction	Reemployed in same plant, 50% reduction	Reemployed in same plant, 100% reduction	Reemployed elsewhere in area, 25% reduction	Reemployed elsewhere in area, 50% reduction	
Bridgeport Area (Conn.)	5101	NA	NA	NA	2000	4000	8000	400	400	300	600	1000	B
Burlington Area (Vt.)	5102	NA	NA	NA	850	1700	3350	50	100	250	450	800	B
Nashua City (N.H.)	5103	20	50	100	1425	2850	5700	535	670	1350	350	600	B
Newport (N.H.)	5104	NA	NA	NA	NA	90	NA	NA	50	NA	NA	40	B
N. Dighton City (Mass.)	5105	0	0	0	270	535	1070	15	190	375	40	80	B
Norwalk Area (Conn.)	5106	10	20	40	490	1020	2250	115	240	500	255	410	B
Waterbury Area (Conn.)	5107	10	30	120	1100	2300	4600	110	50	180	270	780	B
Boston Area (Mass.)	5121	125	250	500	31000	62000	124000	19575	39150	78300	10125	20250	B
Lawrence Area (Mass.)	5122	20	30	110	962	1925	3850	300	600	1550	400	900	B
Binghamton Area (N.Y.)	5201	NA	NA	NA	175	350	700	0	0	0	100	175	B
Tobyhanna (Pa.)	5202	3	6	12	388	775	1550	0	0	0	78	156	B
New Brunswick (N.J.)	5221	NA	NA	NA	1360	2740	5480	300	600	1200	500	1000	B
Paterson Area (N.J.)	5222	NA	NA	NA	6300	12500	25900	2600	2600	2600	2000	2000	B
Philadelphia Area (Pa.)	5223	NA	NA	NA	6819	14880	28764	762	1780	3640	4215	9357	B
Baraboo (Wisc.)	5301	NA	NA	NA	910	2250	5350	0	0	0	100	200	B
Crane Area (Ind.)	5302	0	0	0	1700	3400	6800	600	360	0	600	1850	B
Eau Claire (Wisc.)	5303	NA	NA	NA	675	1350	2700	0	0	0	100	200	B
Huntington Ind.)	5304	NA	NA	NA	250	500	1000	50	120	250	120	230	B
Marion (Ill.)	5305	0	0	0	85	165	275	20	40	30	35	70	B
Rose City Mich.)	5306	0	0	0	50	100	185	0	0	0	45	95	B
Bloomington (Ill.)	5307	0	0	0	325	650	1100	50	100	200	225	450	B
Cadillac (Mich.)	5308	0	0	0	60	115	225	10	20	40	15	30	B
Clare (Mich.)	5309	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B
Escanaba (Mich.)	5310	0	5	5	110	180	340	80	125	195	10	10	B
Indianapolis Area (Ind.)	5311	10	20	50	1000	1990	3700	150	230	500	460	1030	B
Marysville (Mich.)	5312	0	0	0	135	275	615	110	200	445	25	75	B
Standish (Mich.)	5313	0	0	0	41	83	165	0	0	0	0	0	B
Detroit Area (Mich.)	5321	0	50	250	1800	4050	9150	900	1800	3900	900	2100	B
Toledo Area (Ohio)	5322	8	16	80	1000	2000	4000	350	400	349	610	1368	B
Burlington (Iowa)	5401	5	15	40	1680	3385	6820	0	10	50	265	335	B
Ft. Calhoun (Neb.)	5402	NA	NA	NA	70	149	293	10	15	20	15	25	B
Ft. Leavenworth (Kans.)	5403	NA	NA	NA	25	50	100	3	5	10	12	25	B
Ft. Leonard Wood Area (Mo.)	5404	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE C-1 (continued)

Census geographic division and area code	Unemployed, 25% reduction	Unemployed, 50% reduction	Unemployed, 100% reduction	Total number of layoffs, 25% reduction	Total number of layoffs, 50% reduction	Total number of layoffs, 100% reduction	Reemployed in same plant, 25% reduction	Reemployed in same plant, 50% reduction	Reemployed in same plant, 100% reduction	Reemployed elsewhere in area, 25% reduction	Reemployed elsewhere in a- 50% reduction	
Grand Island (Neb.)	5405	NA	NA	NA	1000	2000	4000	0	0	0	300	500	B
Herman (Mo.)	5406	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B
Kerkhoven (Minn.)	5407	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B
Knob Knoster (Mo.)	5408	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	B
W Plains (Mo.)	5409	0	0	0	55	110	225	50	60	120	5	30	B
Windsor (Mo.)	5410	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B
Kansas City Area (Mo.)	5421	0	30	125	2249	4497	12609	10510	3152	0	1721	2332	B
Columbus Area (Ga.)	5501	NA	NA	NA	750	1500	3000	100	200	400	100	200	B
Darien (Ga.)	5502	NA	NA	NA	38	75	150	2	4	6	15	45	B
Fayetteville (N.C.)	5503	NA	NA	NA	1000	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	250	NA	B
Forest City (N.C.)	5504	NA	NA	NA	50	100	200	10	25	50	40	70	B
Grantsville (W. Va.)	5505	0	0	0	38	75	150	0	0	0	0	5	B
Homerville (Ga.)	5506	NA	NA	NA	100	150	300	75	100	150	25	50	B
Jacksonville (N.C.)	5507	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B
Lumberton (N.C.)	5508	NA	NA	NA	50	100	200	25	50	100	12	25	B
Macon Area (Ga.)	5509	2	7	15	825	1910	4300	0	0	50	432	850	B
Murphy (N.C.)	551	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B
Radford Area (Va.)	5511	NA	NA	NA	2080	3220	4620	0	60	460	1180	1680	
Raeford (N.C.)	5512	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B
St. Augustine (Fla.)	5513	0	0	0	200	400	800	0	0	0	NA	[illegible]	B
Taccoa (Ga.)	5514	NA	NA	NA	150	NA	NA	40	NA	NA	70	NA	B
Trion (Ga.)	5515	0	0	0	110	220	440	75	100	125	25	75	B
Wallace (S.C.)	5516	NA	NA	NA	30	60	120	0	0	0	10	20	B
Huntington Area (W. Va.)	5521	NA	NA	NA	0	7	150	0	30	75	0	35	B
Briston-Kingsport (Tenn.)	5601	6	12	22	1150	2320	4640	0	0	0	202	404	B
Centre (Ala.)	5602	NA	NA	NA	220	440	890	100	150	200	10	20	B
Centreville (Tenn.)	5603	NA	NA	NA	54	108	215	0	0	0	51	88	B
Columbia (Miss.)	5604	NA	NA	NA	40	80	170	30	50	125	NA	10	B
Ft Knox Area (Ky.)	5605	0	0	0	NA	NA	NA	100	175	275	250	400	B
Ft. Rucker Area (Ala.)	5606	NA	NA	NA	1000	2000	4000	50	50	0	100	0	B
Cadsden (Ala.)	5607	0	0	0	450	900	1800	30	80	150	150	290	B
Golden (Miss.)	5608	0	0	0	25	50	75	NA	30	60	15	25	B
Greenville (Tenn.)	5609	0	5	10	150	305	610	0	0	0	15	30	B

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE C-1 (continued)

Census geographic division and area code	Unemployed, 25% reduction	Unemployed, 50% reduction	Unemployed, 100% reduction	Total number of layoffs, 25% reduction	Total number of layoffs, 50% reduction	Total number of layoffs, 100% reduction	Reemployed in same plant, 25% reduction	Reemployed in same plant, 50% reduction	Reemployed in same plant, 100% reduction	Reemployed elsewhere in area, 25% reduction	Reemployed elsewhere in area, 50% reduction	
Huntsville (Ala.)	5610	0	0	0	360	720	1440	25	50	120	50	95	B
Kosciuski (Miss.)	5611	NA	NA	NA	75	150	300	15	25	50	10	20	B
Milan (Tenn.)	5612	0	15	40	1917	3875	8006	0	0	0	398	467	B
Rockwood (Tenn.)	5613	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B
Shawmutt (Ala.)	5614	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B
Toone (Tenn.)	5615	NA	NA	NA	0	0	0	18	37	75	8	15	B
Tullahoma Area (Tenn.)	5616	NA	NA	NA	154	308	615	120	240	475	20	40	B
Chattanooga Area (Tenn.)	5621	0	0	5	750	1500	3000	75	125	200	475	920	B
Memphis Area (Tenn.)	5622	NA	NA	NA	875	1750	3500	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B
Batesville (Ark.)	5701	NA	NA	NA	165	333	666	0	0	0	85	150	B
Beeville (Tex.)	5702	NA	NA	NA	128	232	487	0	0	0	75	139	B
Bonham (Tex.)	5703	5	10	105	210	428	855	125	245	400	70	110	B
Camden (Ark.)	5704	NA	NA	NA	487	975	1870	15	10	0	65	75	B
Cuero (Tex.)	5705	0	0	0	38	75	150	5	10	15	4	8	B
Greenville (Tex.)	5706	NA	NA	NA	575	1150	2300	0	0	0	144	287	B
Lawton (Okla.)	5707	0	0	0	315	625	1250	65	130	250	195	375	B
Leesville (La.)	5708	75	150	300	835	1670	3339	0	0	0	75	150	B
McAlester (Okla.)	5709	0	0	0	600	1200	2400	0	0	0	150	300	B
Magnolia (Ark.)	5710	NA	NA	NA	168	335	670	17	14	8	26	52	B
Marshall (Tex.)	5711	0	0	0	860	1720	3440	91	282	465	75	150	B
Mena (Ark.)	5712	NA	NA	NA	85	170	320	5	0	0	5	20	B
Mineral Wells (Tex.)	5713	0	0	0	1200	2500	4000	0	0	0	400	400	B
Post (Tex.)	5714	0	0	0	40	80	165	0	0	0	0	0	B
Shreveport Area (La.)	5715	140	290	925	2550	5100	10200	0	0	700	240	475	B
Texarkana Area (Tex.)	5716	70	135	270	2560	5115	10230	0	0	0	255	515	B
Wynne (Ark.)	5717	NA	NA	NA	75	150	300	20	25	30	5	5	B
Waco (Tex.)	5721	NA	NA	NA	498	995	1990	0	0	0	165	330	B
Las Vegas (N. Mex.)	5801	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	165	NA	NA	0	NA	NA	B
Raton (N. Mex.)	5802	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0	NA	0	B
Grants Pass (Ore.)	5901	NA	NA	NA	50	100	200	10	20	0	10	20	B
Riverbank (Cal.)	5902	0	0	0	380	820	1700	50	100	200	30	60	B
Stockton (Cal.)	5903	0	0	0	950	1900	3800	0	100	200	50	200	B
San Francisco Area (Cal.)	5921	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE C-1 (continued)

	Census geographic division and area code	Reemployed elsewhere in area, 100% reduction	Retired or withdrawn from labor force, 25% reduction	Retired or withdrawn from labor force, 50% reduction	Retired or withdrawn from labor force, 100% reduction	Out-migrated, 25% reduction	Out-migrated, 50% reduction	Out-migrated, 100% reduction	Unemployed, 25% reduction	Unemployed, 50% reduction	Unemployed, 100% reduction	
Bridgeport Area (Conn)	6101	1500	100	400	800	100	300	900	800	1900	4500	B
Burlington Area (Vt)	6102	1600	100	200	350	100	250	500	100	350	650	B
Nashua City (N.H.)	6103	1200	110	220	330	110	210	420	320	1150	2400	B
Newport (N.H.)	6104	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B
N Dighton City (Mass.)	6105	160	30	55	110	90	190	375	15	25	55	B
Norwalk Area (Conn.)	6106	650	75	250	530	25	60	330	20	50	240	B
Waterbury Area (Conn.)	6107	1440	320	670	1350	40	50	50	360	750	1580	B
Boston Area (Mass)	6121	40500	495	990	1980	495	990	1980	310	620	1240	B
Lawrence Area (Mass.)	6122	1650	60	150	180	82	115	160	120	160	310	B
Binghamton Area (N.Y.)	6201	275	40	80	150	10	20	25	25	75	250	B
Tobyhanna (Pa.)	6202	312	7	13	26	300	600	1200	3	6	12	B
New Brunswick (N.J.)	6221	2000	100	200	400	100	200	400	360	740	1480	B
Paterson Area (N.J.)	6222	2000	300	600	1200	1200	2400	4800	200	4900	15300	B
Philadelphia Area (Pa.)	6223	17506	662	1292	2556	437	852	1807	743	1599	3255	B
Baraboo (Wisc.)	6301	800	10	25	50	800	1975	4350	0	50	150	B
Crane Area (Ind.)	6302	2600	300	680	1400	50	170	800	150	540	2000	B
Eau Claire (Wisc.)	6303	400	100	225	450	0	75	125	475	850	1725	B
Huntington Ind.)	6304	450	50	100	200	10	20	30	20	30	70	B
Marion (Ill.)	6305	120	15	25	55	15	20	45	0	10	25	B
Rose City Mich.)	6306	175	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5	10	B
Bloomington (Ill)	6307	700	25	50	100	0	0	0	25	50	100	B
Cadillac (Mich.)	6308	50	10	20	35	15	25	60	10	20	40	B
Clare (Mich.)	6309	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B
Escanaba (Mich.)	6310	35	0	5	10	10	25	45	5	15	55	B
Indianapolis Area (Ind.)	6311	1810	160	330	560	70	140	280	160	260	550	B
Marysville (Mich.)	6312	100	0	0	50	0	0	70	0	0	50	B
Standish (Mich.)	6313	0	16	32	60	5	16	55	16	35	70	B
Detroit Area (Mich.)	6321	4500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150	750	B
Toledo Area (Ohio)	6322	2864	10	60	164	10	60	136	20	112	440	B
Burlington (Iowa)	6401	750	700	1000	2210	410	770	1870	305	1265	1940	B
Ft. Calhoun (Neb.)	6402	35	20	50	120	5	16	48	20	43	70	B
Ft. Leavenworth (Kans.)	6403	50	3	5	10	5	10	20	2	5	10	B
Ft. Leonard Wood Area (Mo.)	6404	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE C-1 (continued)

Census geographic division and area code	Reemployed elsewhere in area, 100% reduction	Retired or withdrawn from labor force, 25% reduction	Retired or withdrawn from labor force, 50% reduction	Retired or withdrawn from labor force, 100% reduction	Out-migrated, 25% reduction	Out-migrated, 50% reduction	Out-migrated, 100% reduction	Unemployed, 25% reduction	Unemployed, 50% reduction	Unemployed, 100% reduction	
Grand Island (Neb.) 6405	500	100	200	300	150	400	1500	450	900	1700	B
Herman (Mo.) 6406	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B
Kerkhoven (Minn.) 6407	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B
Knob Knoster (Mo.) 6408	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	B
W Plains (Mo.) 6409	50	0	10	20	0	10	20	0	10	15	B
Windsor (Mo.) 6410	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B
Kansas City Area (Mo.) 6421	6720	367	738	1630	61	1000	3020	100	432	1289	B
Columbus Area (Ga.) 6501	400	50	100	200	100	300	600	400	700	1400	B
Darien (Ga.) 6502	80	5	10	20	5	10	20	11	16	24	B
Fayetteville (N.C.) 6503	NA	100	NA	NA	500	NA	NA	150	NA	NA	B
Forest City (N.C.) 6504	100	NA	5	20	NA	NA	10	NA	NA	20	B
Grantsville (W. Va.) 6505	10	25	50	100	5	10	20	8	10	20	B
Homerville (Ga.) 6506	75	10	20	30	15	30	60	NA	NA	NA	B
Jacksonville (N.C.) 6507	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B
Lumberton (N.C.) 6508	50	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	13	25	50	B
Macon Area (Ga.) 6509	1795	153	455	1010	208	520	1230	32	82	215	B
Murphy (N.C.) 6510	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B
Radford Area (Va.) 6511	2000	0	60	180	1000	1500	2000	0	0	0	B
Raeford (N.C.) 6512	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B
St. Augustine (Fla.) 6513	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	150	350	600	B
Taccoa (Ga.) 6514	NA	5	NA	NA	15	NA	NA	20	NA	NA	B
Trion (Ga.) 6515	100	10	10	10	0	20	20	0	20	185	B
Wallace (S.C.) 6516	30	0	10	20	0	0	0	20	30	70	B
Huntington Area (W. Va.) 6521	75	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B
Briston-Kingsport (Tenn.) 6601	808	80	150	302	202	404	808	676	1352	2722	B
Centre (Ala.) 6602	30	30	100	420	10	20	40	70	150	200	B
Centreville (Tenn.) 6603	170	3	5	11	0	0	0	0	15	0	B
Columbia (Miss.) 6604	10	5	10	20	NA	NA	NA	5	10	15	B
Ft. Knox Area (Ky.) 6605	400	150	400	250	500	800	1000	0	700	2000	B
Ft. Rucker Area (Ala.) 6606	0	65	75	200	250	400	1000	500	1400	2800	B
Gadsden (Ala.) 6607	400	100	450	600	10	30	50	100	450	900	B
Golden (Miss.) 6608	10	5	5	5	NA	NA	NA	5	NA	NA	B
Greenville (Tenn.) 6609	60	10	20	40	0	0	0	125	255	510	B

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE C-1 (continued)

Census geographic division and area code	Reemployed elsewhere in area, 100% reduction	Retired or withdrawn from labor force, 25% reduction	Retired or withdrawn from labor force, 50% reduction	Retired or withdrawn from labor force, 100% reduction	Outmigrated, 25% reduction	Out-migrated, 50% reduction	Out-migrated, 100% reduction	Unemployed, 25% reduction	Unemployed, 50% reduction	Unemployed, 100% reduction	
Huntsville (Ala.)	6610	240	45	70	145	0	25	50	240	485	695	D
Kosciuski (Miss.)	6611	35	NA	NA	5	NA	5	10	50	100	200	B
Milan (Tenn.)	6612	225	39	44	18	1317	2635	5270	180	542	1093	D
Rockwood (Tenn.)	6613	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B
Shawmutt (Ala.)	6614	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B
Toone (Tenn.)	6615	30	0	0	0	48	97	195	NA	NA	NA	D
Tullahoma Area (Tenn.)	6616	80	8	15	30	5	10	20	1	3	10	B
Chattanooga Area (Tenn)	6621	1885	50	105	210	100	200	400	50	150	305	D
Memphis Area (Tenn.)	6622	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B
Batesville (Ark.)	6701	150	20	45	65	5	15	20	55	123	431	B
Beeville (Tex.)	6702	292	10	15	30	7	25	40	34	68	135	B
Bonham (Tex.)	6703	135	10	30	50	0	20	50	5	23	220	D
Camden (Ark.)	6704	177	132	300	551	175	400	885	97	190	277	B
Cuero (Tex.)	6705	10	2	4	10	3	5	8	21	47	107	B
Greenville (Tex.)	6706	575	57	115	230	287	575	1150	57	115	230	D
Lawton (Okla.)	6707	740	10	20	30	10	20	30	35	80	200	B
Leesville (La.)	6708	150	175	525	875	150	450	900	435	84	2314	E
McAlester (Okla.)	6709	600	60	120	240	120	240	480	270	540	1080	D
Magnolia (Ark.)	6710	104	42	84	168	3	25	70	80	160	320	B
Marshall (Tex.)	6711	200	219	538	875	400	650	1425	75	100	175	B
Mena (Ark.)	6712	20	10	25	50	15	25	40	50	100	200	D
Mineral Wells (Tex.)	6713	300	100	200	300	600	1400	2500	100	300	900	B
Post (Tex.)	6714	0	30	50	125	0	0	0	10	20	40	B
Shreveport Area (La.)	6715	125	675	1350	550	400	600	1200	1230	2475	7625	D
Texarkana Area (Tex.)	6716	1030	745	1490	2980	975	1945	3890	585	1165	2330	B
Wynne (Ark.)	6717	5	0	15	35	30	70	14	20	35	90	D
Waco (Tex.)	6721	665	25	50	100	200	400	800	108	215	430	D
Las Vegas (N. Mex.)	6801	0	NA	NA	0	NA	NA	0	NA	NA	165	R
Raton (N. Mex.)	6802	0	NA	0	0	NA	0	0	NA	50	100	B
Grants Pass (Ore.)	6901	100	10	10	40	5	20	20	15	30	40	B
Riverbank (Cal.)	6902	100	70	150	200	30	60	200	200	450	1000	B
Stockton (Cal.)	6903	300	50	100	300	50	100	300	700	1400	4700	D
San Francisco Area (Cal.)	6921	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	B

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE C-1 (continued)

Area	Census geographic division and area code	Area unemployment rate, post adjustment period, 25% reduction	Area unemployment rate, post adjustment period, 50% reduction	Area unemployment rate, post adjustment period, 100% reduction
Bridgeport Area (Conn)	7101	5.2	6.3	8.2
Burlington Area (Vt)	7102	3.1	3.7	4.4
Nashua City (N.H.)	7103	2.5	6.0	8.0
Newport (N.H.)	7104	NA	2.5	NA
N Dighton City (Mass.)	7105	4.4	4.4	4.4
Norwalk Area (Conn.)	7106	3.9	3.7	4.0
Waterbury Area (Conn.)	7107	5.8	6.1	6.3
Boston Area (Mass.)	7121	3.2	3.2	3.3
Lawrence Area (Mass)	7122	4.4	4.8	4.8
Binghamton Area (N.Y.)	7201	3.5	3.5	3.8
Tobyhanna (Pa.)	7202	1.7	1.7	1.7
New Brunswick (N.J.)	7221	4.5	4.6	4.9
Paterson Area (N.J.)	7222	4.2	5.0	6.7
Philadelphia Area (Pa.)	7223	3.4	3.7	4.3
Baraboo (Wisc.)	7301	5.0	11.0	26.0
Crane Area (Ind.)	7302	5.0	5.5	7.0
Eau Claire (Wisc.)	7303	4.0	5.5	7.0
Huntington Ind.)	7304	2.6	2.7	2.9
Marion (Ill.)	7305	5.5	7.0	8.0
Rose City Mich.)	7306	14.6	14.6	14.7
Bloomington (Ill)	7307	2.1	2.1	2.1
Cadillac (Mich.)	7308	7.8	7.9	8.0
Clare (Mich.)	7309	NA	NA	NA
Escanaba (Mich.)	7310	7.5	7.8	8.2
Indianapolis Area (Ind.)	7311	2.1	2.2	2.3
Marysville (Mich.)	7312	5.8	5.8	5.9
Standish (Mich.)	7313	7.2	8.0	9.6
Detroit Area (Mich.)	7321	3.0	3.0	3.1
Toledo Area (Ohio)	7322	NA	NA	NA
Burlington (Iowa)	7401	4.0	8.2	12.0
Ft. Calhoun (Neb.)	7402	3.1	3.6	4.1
Ft. Leavenworth (Kans.)	7403	3.2	3.2	3.3
Ft. Leonard Wood Area (Mo.)	7404	5.0	8.0	16.0

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE C-1 (continued)

Census geographic division and area	code	Area unemployment rate, post adjustment period, 25% reduction	Area unemployment rate, post adjustment period, 50% reduction	Area unemployment rate, post adjustment period, 100% reduction
Grand Island (Neb.)	7405	4.0	6.5	10.
Herman (Mo.)	7406	NA	NA	NA
Kerkhoven (Minn.)	7407	NA	NA	NA
Knob Knoster (Mo.)	7408	NA	NA	NA
W. Plains (Mo.)	7409	5.0	5.0	5.0
Windsor (Mo.)	7410	NA	NA	NA
Kansas City Area (Mo.)	7421	3.9	4.0	4.3
Columbus Area (Ga.)	7501	4.3	4.6	5.4
Darien (Ga.)	7502	3.3	3.8	4.1
Fayetteville (N.C.)	7503	3.5	NA	NA
Forest City (N.C.)	7504	2.3	2.5	2.5
Grantsville (W. Va.)	7505	18.0	20.0	22.0
Homerville (Ga.)	7506	NA	NA	NA
Jacksonville (N.C.)	7507	NA	NA	NA
Lumberton (N.C.)	7508	NA	NA	NA
Macon Area (Ga.)	7509	3.4	4.1	6.0
Murphy (N.C.)	7510	NA	NA	NA
Radford Area (Va.)	7511	-.4	2.4	2.4
Raeford (N.C.)	7512	NA	NA	NA
St. Augustine (Fla.)	7513	6.9	7.6	11.4
Taccoa (Ga.)	7514	5.0	NA	NA
Trion (Ga.)	7515	3.3	4.1	5.7
Wallace (S.C.)	7516	6.2	6.3	6.6
Huntington Area (W. Va.)	7521	3.0	3.0	5.9
Briston-Kingsport (Tenn.)	7601	4.0	5.1	7.1
Centre (Ala.)	7602	8.0	10.3	11.3
Centreville (Tenn.)	7603	4.2	4.7	5.0
Columbia (Miss.)	7604	NA	NA	NA
Ft. Knox Area (Ky.)	7605	6.2	7.4	11.3
Ft. Rucker Area (Ala.)	7606	4.0	8.5	12.0
Gadsden (Ala.)	7607	6.0	6.3	7.4
Colden (Miss.)	7608	NA	NA	NA
Greenville (Tenn.)	7609	7.0	7.5	8.9

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

TABLE C-1 (continued)

Area	Census geographic division and area code	Area unemployment rate, post adjustment period, 25% reduction	Area unemployment rate, post adjustment period, 50% reduction	Area unemployment rate, post adjustment period, 100% reduction	
Huntsville (Ala.)	7610	3.7	3.9	4.1	
Kosciuski (Miss.)	7611	3.6	3.9	4.1	
Milan (Tenn.)	7612	2.1	3.7	7.0	
Rockwood (Tenn.)	7613	NA	NA	NA	
Shawmutt (Ala.)	7614	NA	NA	NA	
Toone (Tenn.)	7615	4.2	4.9	6.1	
Tullahoma Area (Tenn.)	7616	NA	NA	NA	
Chattanooga Area (Tenn.)	7621	3.1	3.2	3.3	
Memphis Area (Tenn.)	7622	2.6	3.0	3.5	
Batesville (Ark.)	7701	8.2	9.1	12.0	
Beeville (Tex.)	7702	5.0	6.2	7.5	
Bonham (Tex.)	7703	2.0	3.0	5.0	
Camden (Ark.)	7704	5.3	8.8	14.4	
Cuero (Tex.)	7705	2.5	2.7	3.0	
Greenville (Tex.)	7706	3.8	4.3	5.4	
Lawton (Okla.)	7707	4.5	4.8	5.6	
Leesville (La.)	7708	9.6	14.8	30.0	
McAlester (Okla.)	7709	6.1	7.9		
Magnolia (Ark.)	7710	5.3	6.2	8.1	
Marshall (Tex.)	7711	3.0	3.5	4.0	
Mena (Ark.)	7712	5.1	7.3	9.7	
Mineral Wells (Tex.)	7713	3.2	5.3	11.7	
Post (Tex.)	7714	1.5	2.5	3.0	
Shreveport Area (La.)	7715	4.5	5.7	10.3	
Texarkana Area (Tex.)	7716	4.4	6.0	10.0	
Wynne (Ark.)	7717	4.5	4.8	5.7	
Waco (Tex.)	7721	4.2	4.4	4.6	
Las Vegas (N. Mex.)	7801	NA	NA	3.4	
Raton (N. Mex.)	7802	6.6	6.8	7.0	
Grants Pass (Ore.)	7901	5.2	5.4	8.5	
Riverbank (Cal.)	7902	11.0	12.0	13.0	
Stockton (Cal.)	7903	7.0	7.5	8.2	
San Francisco Area (Cal.)	7921	4.0	4.8	5.6	

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

REFERENCES

1. The Cabinet Coordinating Committee on Economic Planning for the End of Vietnam Hostilities, "Report to the President", printed in Economic Report of the President, Transmitted to the Congress January 1969, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969, p. 189.

2. Appendix B, Tables B-7, B-22, and B-27, Economic Report of the President, Transmitted to the Congress January 1969, U.S. Government Printing Office.

3. Defense Indicators, April 1969, p. 4.

4. U.S. Bureau of the Census, Census of Manufactures, 1963, Volume II, Industry Statistics, Part II, Major Groups 29 to 39 and 19, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1966, Table 4, p. 35G-13.

5. U.S. Bureau of the Cencus, Current Industrial Reports Series MA-175(65)-2, Shipments of Defense Oriented Industries, 1965 (Final), Washington, D.C.

6. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Earnings, March 1969, Tables A-1 and A-2.

7. U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Earnings, March 1969, Tables A-3 and A-4.

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library

Reproduced at the Richard Nixon Presidential Library