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1. Executive Summary

Independent restaurants are integral to the economic, social, and cultural fabric of local communities. These small businesses invigorate streets, help set the rhythm of local life, provide unique venues for social and business interaction, and embrace and share tradition. They help to revitalize neighborhoods, stimulate economic activity in other local businesses, contribute to public programs through generation of large sales taxes, and foster civic pride. Independent restaurants are also a conduit for community members to achieve their American Dream: the restaurant industry is home to many who had their first (and last) job experience in a restaurant, have found opportunity and/or stability in the industry, and have overcome personal or professional barriers to capitalize on dreams of becoming a chef or owning and managing their own restaurants.

Independent restaurants are vital to the U.S. economy. In addition to contributing significantly to the more than $760 billion in annual sales in the broader restaurant economy, these restaurants directly employ 11 million people across the country. Nearly three million of these jobs were

1 See last page for author biographies.
2 This paper was completed on May 29, 2020 and is based on data available at that time.
3 Independent restaurants—formally defined by the Independent Restaurant Coalition as privately owned restaurants that have fewer than 20 establishments and whose primary source of revenue comes from food and beverage—are a broad cross-section of dining options that include, for example, award-winning fine dining establishments, neighborhood restaurants and other familiar haunts (local bars, cafes and bistros), corner pizza parlors, and mobile food trucks, and collectively offer a spectrum of dining experiences, including but not limited to haute cuisine, comfort food, traditional and ethnic fare, farm-to-table cooking, and trendy or experimental fusion.
created in just the last decade.\(^4\) They also indirectly support over five million jobs throughout their supply chains, which are largely comprised of various small businesses, such as farms, dairies, fisheries, and vineyards, amongst others. Further, as mainstays of regional, local, and ethnic cuisine, independent restaurants also drive domestic and international travel and tourism to all parts of the country, from big cities (\textit{e.g.}, Miami) to smaller locales (\textit{e.g.}, Portland, Maine). Food culture and food tourism have become engrained in the American economy and underpin the travel, leisure and hospitality sector. Foreign and domestic travelers spend hundreds of billions annually in U.S. restaurants ($279 billion in 2019).

Independent restaurants are confronting an existential crisis. The novel coronavirus has turned the industry on its head: fear of contagion combined with stay-at-home orders, bans on large gatherings, and pleas by public health officials and State leaders for social distancing shut down independent restaurants’ primary form of business (dine-in) within a few short days in March. As a result, independent restaurants’ revenues plummeted by over 70% year over year in the last two weeks of March and still remain 60% lower on average than last year’s levels, with many remaining closed at a 100% reduction in revenue.\(^5\) In turn, a staggering 5.9 million restaurant jobs (at least 4.5 million of which are from independent restaurants) have vanished within a matter of weeks—the highest of all industries by far, nearly doubling the figure from the next most affected industry. In fact, job losses in the restaurant industry account for more than a quarter of the increase to the U.S. unemployment figures since February, figures that have not been seen since the Great Depression.

Independent restaurants are struggling to survive the seismic decline in on-premise dining. Because independent restaurants operate with thin profit margins even in the best of times, restaurateurs are simply not in a position to take on additional debt—for example, by participating in the Federal Reserve’s Main Street Lending Program. This is especially true now given the uncertainty around when restaurants will be able to operate at full capacity. By the same token, despite the federal

\(^4\) The 2.7 million in jobs gains from independent restaurants is estimated using the 33.3\% growth rate in food services and drinking places employment between February 2010 and February 2020 (from the U.S. BLS CES). As discussed in Section 2.a, independent restaurants account for approximately 76\% of total restaurants in the United States.

Paycheck Protection Program’s (PPP) purpose and intent to temporarily buttress small businesses, fear of contagion coupled with government-mandated capacity restrictions pose significant challenges for restaurateurs to meet the requirements that would convert the loan into a grant. But even if the federal government relaxed those requirements, PPP was designed as immediate and temporary relief for small businesses to bridge approximately two months. Independent restaurants, on the other hand, are in the precarious position of facing longer-term, compulsory capacity limitations in state-led economic re-openings and need bridge assistance through the end of the year. Furthermore, without more support, the patchwork of interim solutions (e.g., pivoting to curbside pick-up and selling take-home “family meals” and groceries) will not enable survival for many restaurants through the end of the year. To illustrate, demand for takeout or delivery is well below typical on-premise demand, and restaurants are often unable to charge the same prices without table service. In fact, consumer spending across all restaurants (including fast-food chains, which have fared relatively better throughout the pandemic because they rely far less on dine-in service) has declined by 50% from February to April, whereas grocery store spending, in contrast, has increased by 10%. Simply put, independent restaurants need additional financial assistance to bridge the battle to contain the virus—and they need it now, or this country risks permanently losing as many as 85% of independent restaurants by the end of the year. With millions of jobs at stake, the collapse of independent restaurants would ignite a downward economic spiral with ripple effects in other already hard-hit industries in the travel, hospitality and leisure sector that would be felt for years. Mass failure may also destabilize the commercial real estate market if these restaurants cannot pay rent, which could also incite a spillover effect in the larger economy.

In order to ensure viability through the end of 2020, independent restaurants need financial assistance from the federal government in the form of grants. Swift intervention with an infusion of $120 billion through the Restaurant Stabilization Fund (the “Stabilization Fund” or the “Fund”) would give independent restaurants the ability, confidence, and incentive to re-hire employees and stay open (or re-open)—even at reduced capacity, when they would otherwise find it to be in their best interest to remain closed or only offer takeout. Independent restaurants would use the money to pay employees, cover ongoing shortfalls during phased re-openings while demand remains below operating costs (e.g., rent and utilities), and purchase and install protective measures (e.g., improved ventilation systems). In return, use of the Stabilization Fund would not only help reduce unemployment, but would also jumpstart the economy by instilling confidence in consumers to re-
engage in other economic activity after they resume eating at restaurants. Importantly, as detailed in Section 4 of this white paper, the Stabilization Fund’s primary quantifiable economic benefits include:⁶ (i) decreased unemployment insurance payments; (ii) increased federal payroll tax receipts; (iii) increased sales taxes; (iv) additional supply chain benefits; (v) additional spending flowing from the additional wages paid to restaurant and supplier employees; and (vi) additional tourism. In addition to these primary impacts, the Stabilization Fund will generate significant secondary (or “spillover”) benefits by helping the economy rebound. **In whole, the Stabilization Fund will generate at least $183 billion in primary benefits and $65 billion in secondary benefits—more than double the amount of the proposed grants.** Figure 1 below summarizes both the primary and secondary economic benefits of the Stabilization Fund.

⁶ In addition to benefits quantified in this whitepaper, ensuring that independent restaurants survive provides a host of other non-quantified benefits to the United States economy, including ensuring the viability of small farms and purveyors, sustaining vibrant community restaurants that anchor neighborhoods, and increasing local economic activity. For example, 64.9% of revenue from independent restaurants in a community recirculates in the local economy, compared with 30.4% for chain restaurants. See “Indie Impact Study Series,” Civic Economics, http://www.civiceconomics.com/indie-impact.html (accessed May 26, 2020).
Figure 1: Summary of Quantified Benefits to U.S. Treasury, State Treasuries and Broader U.S. Economy from the $120 Billion Stabilization Fund for Independent Restaurants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Benefit</th>
<th>Assumed Stabilization Fund Spent on Payroll Support ($ billions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$40 Billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saved State Unemployment Benefits</td>
<td>$20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saved Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation</td>
<td>$17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Federal Payroll Taxes</td>
<td>$6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional State Unemployment Insurance Taxes</td>
<td>$0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional State Sales Taxes</td>
<td>$2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Direct Benefits to U.S. and State Treasuries</strong></td>
<td><strong>$46.7</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Restaurant Supply Chain Benefits*</td>
<td>$17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total of Short-Term Benefits (June 1 - December 31, 2020)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$22.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Restaurant Supply Chain Benefits (Including Induced Spending)*</td>
<td>$17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional State Sales Taxes</td>
<td>$1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Spending by Tourists (and Related Indirect/Induced Effects)**</td>
<td>$94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total Trailing Effects (After 2020)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$113.8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Impacts Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$183.4</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Impacts on U.S. GDP (2021-2022)</strong></td>
<td><strong>$65.2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$248.6</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Short-term supply chain benefits assume that the Stabilization Fund would result in $45 billion in incremental consumer spending at restaurants from June 1-December 31, 2020 (with $10 billion in June and July, and $5 billion for the remaining five months). Both short-term and trailing supply chain benefits conservatively exclude food and beverage, food service, and agricultural product intermediate inputs due to increased spending at grocery stores. Trailing effects of additional supply chain benefits (including induced spending) and additional state sales taxes assume an additional $36 billion in consumer spending that otherwise would not have occurred for 24 months following the Fund ($2 billion per month in 2021 and $1 billion per month in 2022). **Additional spending by tourists (domestic and international) is contingent on the Fund preventing a wave of permanent closures and is estimated for 36 months following the removal of international and domestic travel restrictions assuming that 50% of independent restaurants would permanently close in the absence of the Fund. ***Secondary impacts on U.S. GDP assume an additional fifth of a percentage point contribution to U.S. GDP in 2021 and an additional tenth of a percentage point in 2022.
2. Independent Restaurants Are Crucial to the Economic, Cultural, and Social Fabric of the United States

As discussed in this section, independent restaurants directly employ 11 million people and indirectly support over five million additional jobs in their supply chains, the majority of which are also in small businesses. These restaurants anchor neighborhoods and provide innumerable direct and indirect benefits to the communities they serve, not the least of which includes acting as tourist magnets driving travel and food tourism and stimulating economic activity across a broad array of other industries.

\[6.5\]

As a Vital Employers in the Small Business Ecosystem, Independent Restaurants Directly Support 11 Million Jobs

Independent restaurants, as small business employers, embody entrepreneurial spirit. With comparatively low barriers to entry and substantial appetite for divergent backgrounds, restaurants are an exceptionally accessible platform for entrepreneurship. A culturally diverse population of chefs and restaurateurs own independent restaurants, including many women, minorities, and immigrants. Against the backdrop of the industry’s open arms, these chefs’ and restaurateurs’ pathways to small business ownership have been paved by the great equalizer of hard work—the central tenet of achieving the American Dream.

Independent restaurants provide essential employment opportunities within the United States labor market. There are approximately 500,000 independent restaurants in the United States, which account for approximately 76% of the 658,000 total restaurants and bars in the United States.

\[6.6\]


(tracked as “food service and drinking places”). Government and industry statistics on restaurants provide employment data on a broader cross-section of restaurants than just independent restaurants, the latter of which can be roughly estimated by using a 76% pro-ration. The restaurant industry employs approximately 15 million workers in the United States, corresponding to between 7% and 11% of each State’s workforce (shown in Figure 2 below). Thus, independent restaurants employ roughly 11 million workers.

---

9 Source: U.S. BLS Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages, 2019-Q3. In standard U.S. government statistical tabulations, food services and drinking places (NAICS 722) is an industry subsector that includes full-service restaurants, limited-service eating places, special food services (such as food service contractors, caterers, and mobile food services), and drinking places. See “Food Services and Drinking Places: NAICS 722,” U.S. BLS, https://www.bls.gov/iag/tgs/iag722.htm (accessed May 26, 2020). (“Industries in the Food Services and Drinking Places subsector prepare meals, snacks, and beverages to customer order for immediate on-premises and off-premises consumption. There is a wide range of establishments in these industries. Some provide food and drink only; while others provide various combinations of seating space, waiter/waitress services and incidental amenities, such as limited entertainment.”).

The broader restaurant industry provides key employment for women, minorities, and other notable demographics. For example:

- Over one half of all restaurant workers are women. Many women who work in restaurants heavily rely on tips for income, and many amongst them are single mothers. In fact, the restaurant industry employs over one million single mothers.

---

11 Data regarding national employment statistics in the restaurant industry are largely inclusive and are not limited to independent restaurants.


• Sixty percent of all chefs nationwide are minorities. Minorities also make up 53% of bussers, runners, baristas, prep-cooks, dishwashers and kitchen porters. Restaurants also employ more minority employee-managers than any other industry.

• Restaurants also play an important role in the community by employing many individuals returning from institutions or incarceration. Some returning citizens commit to the industry so wholly that they build up to a career as a chef and/or eventually own their own restaurants. Acknowledging the industry’s pivotal role in combating recidivism, in 2019 the Department of Labor awarded the National Restaurant Association (“NRA”) a $4.5 million grant to develop training programs for incarcerated young adults and to help find them jobs.

• The lion’s share of restaurant workers are the country’s youngest employees—nearly 40% are between the age of 16 and 24, as shown in Figure 3 below. Restaurants not only provide individuals joining the workforce for the first time with invaluable job experience, they help young workers gain financial independence and, in many circumstances, save and pay for college or help support their families.

---


17 Restaurant-based organizations across the country are working to combat recidivism and unemployment by helping formerly incarcerated individuals start careers in the restaurant industry, including Getting Out and Staying Out (GOSO) in New York City and Kitchens for Good in San Diego. According to Aviva Paley, the executive director of Kitchens for Good, the restaurant industry is particularly well suited to helping ex-offenders rebuild their lives: “I think [felons are] able to really thrive in an environment where all it takes to succeed is a lot of hard work and dedication. It doesn’t take three degrees or years of training.” See “Restaurants Can Be a Lifeline for the Formerly Incarcerated — and Vice Versa,” Eater, June 23, 2017, https://www.eater.com/2017/6/23/15771762/recidivism-restaurants-hiring-practices.


Figure 3: Share of Employees Aged 16-24 by Industry (2019)

Independent restaurants—a subset of all restaurants described above—employ more than 11 million people directly. Independent restaurants also support over five million jobs throughout their supply chains of jobs indirectly through supply chain purveyors—including, for example, farmers, ranchers, fishermen, distillers, vintners, truckers, florists, linen suppliers, event planners, designers, and printers. Most of the businesses that provide these inputs are small businesses: within the

---


22 As discussed in Section 4.a), loss of independent restaurants would create a ripple effect that would also be devastating for small businesses within restaurant supply chains, including small and medium-sized farms, ranches, fishermen, vintners, distillers, florists, and linen suppliers—many of which would be crippled by a collapse of the restaurant industry. Indeed, each restaurant job supports an estimated additional 0.50 jobs throughout restaurants’ supply chain, thus the 11 million independent restaurant jobs support more than five million supply chain jobs. For example, 70% of seafood goes through restaurants, as does 60% of chicken. See “Americans Are Cooking More Seafood, but Fishermen Are Struggling,” The Wall Street Journal, May 21, 2020, https://www.wsj.com/articles/americans-are-cooking-more-seafood-but-fishermen-are-struggling-11590062400.
agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting sector, small businesses employ 83% of the workforce. In addition, independent restaurants support local farms and ranches in all 50 States. Figure 4 below shows the number of small farms across the country, many of which populate independent restaurants’ supply chains.

Figure 4: Number of Small Farms by State (2018)

In fact, independent restaurants are completely responsible for the existence of many of these kinds of purveyors. For example, Sacramento Sprouting Company grows microgreens at a scale too small for supermarkets and sells more than 90% of its produce to local restaurants, with the remainder

---

Analysis of 2017 U.S. Census Statistics of U.S. Businesses. Employees in agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting businesses (NAICS 11) with less than 500 employees as a share of the all employees in the agriculture, forestry, fishing and hunting sector. More generally, small businesses, such as independent restaurants, play a crucial role in the broader U.S. economy, accounting for 44% of U.S. economic activity, 47.3% of all U.S. employees, and 65% of net new jobs created between 2000 and 2018. See Small Business GDP 1998–2014, U.S. Small Business Administration Office of Advocacy; see also “What’s New With Small Business?,” U.S. Small Business Administration Office of Advocacy, September 2019.

Small farms are defined as those with annual sales of less than $250,000. See “Small Farms, Big Differences,” U.S. Department of Agriculture, February 21, 2017, https://www.usda.gov/media/blog/2010/05/18/small-farms-big-differences, (“USDA defines a small farm as an operation with gross cash farm income under $250,000.”).
sold at farmers’ markets. Across the country in upstate New York, Norwich Meadows Farm depends on restaurants for 60-75% of its business. Likewise, chef Dan Barber, who runs Blue Hill in New York City and Blue Hill at Stone Barns in Pocantico, New York, works with a pheasant farmer who sells exclusively to his restaurants. Animal Farm, a dairy and farmstead creamery located in Vermont sends the majority of its butter to Thomas Keller’s restaurants, with the rest going to a few other independent restaurants. And Abundant Seafood, a one boat husband-and-wife owned and operated fishing company in South Carolina, relies on independent restaurants for the majority of its sales. These types of relationships and the broader nexus between independent restaurants and small business has been reinforced over the last two decades with the explosion of healthy and sustainable eating habits (e.g., organic, farm-to-table). In fact, by 2019 the farm-to-table and other direct-to-consumer markets had generated over $12 billion in income for small-

25 See “Sacramento Valley farms struggling as coronavirus closes restaurants, chokes supply chain,” Sacramento Bee, April 21, 2020, https://www.sacbee.com/food-drink/article242068651.html, (“Matt and Stephanie Weber’s microgreen farm, Sacramento Sprouting Co., was thriving. Revenue was growing steadily by about 5 percent per month, and leafy greens like frills mustard and mitsuba topped dishes at downtown Sacramento’s fine dining restaurants. The farm, which is the couple’s sole source of income, now makes $200 worth of sales per week. Shutdowns and health concerns have sunk Sacramento Sprouting Co.’s revenue to just 10 percent of what it was before the coronavirus pandemic. …The Webers were selling anywhere from 40 to 70 pounds of microgreens wholesale per week plus another five pounds at the Midtown Farmers Market, Matt Weber said. …Small-scale farmers often can’t sell directly to supermarkets because their outputs fall short of what stores need and prices can’t compete with larger, streamlined agricultural producers.”).

26 See “Small Farms Also Struggle as Restaurants Shut Down Due to Coronavirus,” Civil Eats, March 17, 2020, https://civileats.com/2020/03/17/small-farms-also-struggle-as-restaurants-shut-down-due-to-coronavirus/, (“It’s unprecedented. I’ve never seen anything like this,” Kurdieh said, estimating that about 60 percent of his business depends on restaurants, and at this time of year, that number is closer to 75 percent. ‘We are figuring everything out day by day.’”).

27 See “Coronavirus Is Hurting the Restaurant Industry. Here’s How It Could Change the Future of Food,” TIME, April 14, 2020, https://time.com/5820618/coronavirus/, (“We got into relationships with some farmers where we were sort of building the business with them, through Blue Hill as an exclusive. The farmer—I’m thinking of one in particular who raises pheasants for us—looks at you and says, “What do I do now?””).

28 See “About,” Animal Farm, http://www.animalfarmvt.com/about/ (accessed May 26, 2020), (“The majority of our butter is sent to Chef Thomas Keller’s restaurants, The French Laundry and Per Se. In addition, our butter goes to Chef Barbara Lynch’s Boston restaurants, Menton and No. 9 Park, as well as to Chef Patrick O’Connell’s, The Inn at Little Washington, in Virginia.”).

29 See “Restaurant Closings Inflict Collateral Damage on Other Businesses,” New York Times, March 24, 2020, https://www.nytimes.com/2020/03/24/dining/restaurant-suppliers-coronavirus.html, (“The pain is also radiating out to the thousands of small companies across the country that, like Abundant Seafood, rely on restaurants for most or all of their sales. The size of this indirect economy is unknown, but independent restaurants can spend anywhere from just under 20 percent to more than 30 percent of their revenue on food, alcohol and other goods.”).

scale producers. But with independent restaurants across the country shuttered or operating in reduced capacities, these ecosystems are on the verge of collapse. With bankruptcy looming for many purveyors, restaurateurs recognize the urgency of preserving outlets for small farm products. As put by one Wisconsin dairy farmer who spills 50% of her farm’s daily milk production for lack of demand: “it’s a very scary time, very frightening from the business standpoint and from the emotional standpoint for our families and our employees and for our employees’ families.”

b) Independent Restaurants Anchor Neighborhoods and Drive Travel/Tourism

In addition to directly supporting 11 million jobs, independent restaurants animate street life, structure social interaction, and contribute to local culture. Independent restaurants help residential and commercial revitalization and create community identity. Many State and local governments adopt economic development programs that centrally feature independent restaurants. Examples include:

- Rhode Island launched a statewide Food Strategy initiative in 2016 that, amongst other things, seeks to promote local restaurants and food business as a conduit to sustain and grow markets for Rhode Island products.

- The Michigan Economic Development Corporation awarded the overwhelming majority of its 2019 Match on Main grant funding to independent restaurants, bakeries, breweries and coffee shops, benefitting nine small cities around Michigan and “further strengthening the

---


34 For example, restaurants were a vital element of the revitalization and rebuilding of New Orleans after hurricane Katrina. See “After disaster, restaurants can be heroic or pragmatic, but they need to re-open,” NOLA.com, September 11, 2017, https://www.nola.com/entertainment_life/eat-drink/article_e12b5031-6888-540b-b665-66f5a0b7ed4.html ("New Orleans is famous for its restaurants, of course, and to the outside world they served as the barometer for rebuilding [after Katrina] … when official recovery seemed aimless, when adversity felt endless, they provided anchors, respites, and inspiration that was as tangible as the meal on the table.").

downtowns and commercial districts in these communities, while building unique places that are attractive to residents and visitors.\(^{36}\)

- The Washington, D.C. Office of the Deputy Mayor for Planning and Economic Development launched a commercial revitalization grant program in 2006 called “Great Streets Small Business Grants,” many recipients of which have been independent restaurants that have been instrumental in developing the district’s commercial corridors over the last 14 years.\(^{37}\)

- The city of Carrollton, Texas, has an ongoing specialty retail and restaurant economic development program to recruit and retain unique “destination” restaurants to differentiate the Carrollton dining and entertainment experience from surrounding areas in the Dallas metroplex, which also served to help enhance the quality of life for Carrollton residents.\(^{38}\)

Moreover, restaurants are critically important to State and local governments because they pay some of the highest sales taxes in the country, which help fund public programs that further benefit the communities they serve.\(^{39}\) For example, in California, the restaurant industry was responsible for 12.2\% of the value of taxable transactions in 2019.\(^{40}\) Figure 5 below shows total taxable restaurant sales in all 50 states in 2018; the state and local taxes generated by restaurants help fund


\(^{40}\) See “Taxable Sales, by Type of Business (Taxable Table 1),” California Department of Tax and Fee Administration, https://www.cdtfa.ca.gov/dataportal/dataset.htm?url=TaxSalesStatewide (accessed May 26, 2020).
countless local programs, police and fire departments, and a host of other local amenities that are critical to improving the quality of life for residents in every community.

**Figure 5: Restaurant Sales by State 2018 ($ Billions)**

Independent restaurants are the mainstay of regional, local, and ethnic foodscapes and transform neighborhoods, towns, and cities into travel destinations. Within states and larger metropolises, they inspire intrastate tourism and attract residents to towns and neighborhoods that they would not otherwise frequent, promoting urban and suburban harmony and stimulating neighborhood economies. Independent restaurants are also part-and-parcel to an ecosystem including the travel, hospitality, and leisure industries—the largest segment of the United States economy[^41]—all of which drive interstate and international tourism to every State. Many U.S. citizens and foreigners

[^41]: See “Remarks by President Trump, Vice President Pence, and Members of the Coronavirus Task Force in Press Briefing,” The White House, March 27, 2020, [https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-vice-president-pence-members-coronavirus-task-force-press-briefing-13/](https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/remarks-president-trump-vice-president-pence-members-coronavirus-task-force-press-briefing-13/), statement of President Trump on March 27, 2020 (“…I also want to preserve airlines, because that’s preserving lots of other jobs. That’s preserving the travel and leisure industry, which is perhaps the largest industry in our country, if you add it all up. You add up all the hotels and all of the traveling and all the planes and everything else — probably, by far, the largest industry in our country.”)
travel to a destination in the United States to experience its food culture and restaurants (known as “culinary tourism” or “gastro-tourism”), including to large urban destinations (e.g., New York, Chicago, San Francisco), medium-sized cities (e.g., New Orleans, Charleston, Minneapolis) and smaller locations (e.g., Portland (ME), Yountville (CA)). Simply put, dining out has become one of America’s favorite pastimes and, in turn, one of the country’s main economic engines.

Further, in 2019 total spending by domestic and international travelers on food services in the United States was **$279 billion**—more than double the amount spent on either recreation or retail. Foreign travel accounts for a significant portion of restaurant revenue: for example, in 2019, foreign visitors to the United States spent a total of $36 billion on food and beverages alone—which, added to money spent on travel, hospitality, retail and recreation, amongst other business and leisure

---

42 For example, one survey found that for 53% of leisure travelers food was an important part of their traveling, and that of those travelers, 72% choose a destination by its food and drink and approximately 25% of travelers’ budget is spent on food and drink. See “What is Food Tourism?” World Food Travel Association, https://worldfoodtravel.org/what-is-food-tourism-definition-food-tourism/ (accessed May 26, 2020). Another survey found that 42% of recent travelers have taken a vacation where a food or drink related experience was the main purpose of travel. See “The New Era of Food Tourism: Trends and Best Practices for Stakeholders,” Skift Research, February 2019. A survey of OpenTable diners found that 25% of respondents had traveled internationally with the main aim of dining at a specific restaurant. See “Global Dining: How OpenTable Diners Choose & Spend While Traveling Abroad,” OpenTable, October 18, 2016, https://restaurant.opentable.com/news/insider-information/global-dining-how-opentable-diners-choose-spend-while-traveling/. Similarly, TripAdvisor cites as one of its four traveler trends for 2020: “Travelers are booking with their stomachs, as food becomes the driving force in which destinations they visit and activities they choose—especially Millennials and Gen Z.” See “2020 Traveler Trends: 4 Areas Shaping the Future of Experiences & How Operators Can Take Advantage,” TripAdvisor, https://www.tripadvisor.com/ExperiencesInsights/e37635 (accessed May 26, 2020). 90% of experts interviewed by the World Food Travel Association predicted an increase in leisure trips focused solely on food and beverage experiences, with almost half of them predicting a moderate or large increase. See “2020 State of the Food Travel Industry Report,” World Food Travel Association, January 31, 2020. The culinary experience trend has been growing rapidly over the last few years as U.S. leisure travelers who travel for unique dining experiences grew from 40% to 51% between 2006 and 2013. See “The Rise of Food Tourism,” Ontario Culinary Tourism Alliance and Skift, 2015, https://www.visitmarin.org/site/assets/files/3798/octa-skift-the-rise-of-culinary-tourism-2.pdf. See also, “U.S. Travel Answer Sheet,” U.S. Travel Association, March 2020, https://www.ustravel.org/system/files/media_root/document/Research_Fact-Sheet_US-Travel-Answer-Sheet.pdf. (“Top leisure travel activities for overseas visitors: (1) shopping; (2) sightseeing; (3) fine dining; (4) national parks/monuments; and (5) amusement/theme parks.” “Top leisure travel activities for U.S. domestic travelers (1) visiting relatives; (2) shopping; (3) visiting friends; (4) fine dining; and (5) rural sightseeing.”).

spending, amounted to an average of $1,952 per international visitor.\textsuperscript{44} One quarter of these overseas visitors, moreover, spent money on a fine dining experience during their visits.\textsuperscript{45} As these figures suggest, the United States has emerged as a culinary travel destination. This is due in part to the proliferation of social media platforms (such as Instagram, Trip Advisor, and Yelp!), which have helped stimulate substantial amounts of inbound visitors to the United States as well as domestic tourism.\textsuperscript{46} Accordingly, independent restaurants are, in effect, tourist attractions: improving tourists’ experiences while educating them about local foods and traditions increases the likelihood of a return visit and inspires travel recommendations for new visitors.\textsuperscript{47}

3. The COVID-19 Pandemic Has Had an Unprecedented and Devasting Impact on the Restaurant Industry, with Independent Restaurants Being Particularly Hard Hit

As detailed below, prior to the pandemic, the restaurant industry had experienced years of growth and expanded employment. The coronavirus quickly and dramatically reversed the years-long growth trend, forcing restaurants to close on a few days’ notice and decimating millions of jobs within weeks. In fact, the acute retraction in the restaurant job market has been the \textit{single largest contributor} to the increase in the U.S. unemployment figures since February. Independent restaurateurs are struggling to survive the seismic decline in on-premise dining; many interim solutions—such as the Federal Reserve’s Main Street Lending, the Paycheck Protection Program, and shifting business models to takeout/delivery—do not provide a path forward for long-term

---


\textsuperscript{46} One survey found that over 40% of destination marketing organizations and like groups use Instagram to target tourists interested in food. See “Destinations Concede Their Food Tourism Marketing Efforts Fall Short,” \textit{Skift}, May 19, 2017. Further, Brand USA has sought to capitalize on these trends with culinary tourism campaigns (e.g., “Flavors of the USA”), which seek to market the United States as a “premier travel destination. See “‘Flavors of the USA’ Culinary Tourism Campaign Launches,” \textit{Brand USA}, June 18, 2015, http://thebrandusa.info/federalpartnernews/flavors-of-the-usa-culinary-tourism-campaign-launches/. Brand USA is an organization with a Board of Directors appointed by the U.S. Secretary of Commerce. See “About,” \textit{Brand USA}, https://www.thebrandusa.com/about (accessed May 26, 2020).

rehiring (which risks making job losses permanent) and will not enable survival until the end of the year.

a) U.S. Restaurants Had Enjoyed Years of Growth Prior to the Pandemic

Before the novel coronavirus arrived in the United States, the U.S. restaurant industry had enjoyed a years-long growth trend in the number of restaurants, employment, and revenue. The number of unique establishments has grown by more than 40% over the last two decades.\(^{48}\) And over just the last decade, opportunity for employment in the industry expanded by 30%—a growth rate exceeded by only two sectors, as shown in Figure 6 below.\(^{49}\)

**Figure 6: Percent Change in Employment by Industry (February 2010-February 2020)**

![Graph showing percent change in employment by industry from February 2010 to February 2020.](source)


Note: Percent change in number of employees from February 2010 to February 2020, not seasonally adjusted. CES major industry sectors are shown except for leisure and hospitality, which is broken into “arts, entertainment, and recreation,” “accommodation,” and “food services and drinking places.”

---


\(^{49}\) Comparison of employment growth for food services and drinking places relative to the CES major industry sectors outside leisure and hospitality and to other industry groups within leisure and hospitality.
In addition, total revenue for the industry grew from nearly $40 billion per month in 2008 to $66 billion in January 2020—equating to a total revenue increase of over a 70% in a just over a decade.\(^{50}\) Figure 7 indicates that the restaurant industry was on a trajectory in 2020 to generate \textbf{$800$ billion} in revenues, with contributions to the broader economy far in excess of that amount.\(^{51}\)

\textbf{Figure 7: Growth in Monthly Restaurant Sales (January 2008- January 2020)}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure7.png}
\caption{Growth in Monthly Restaurant Sales (January 2008- January 2020)}
\end{figure}

\begin{flushright}
Source: U.S. Census Bureau Advance Monthly Sales for Retail and Food Services.
\end{flushright}
\begin{flushright}
Note: Seasonally adjusted dollar value of sales, January 2008 to January 2020.
\end{flushright}

\(^{50}\) By way of comparison consumer retail spending on clothing and in grocery and liquor stores has increased by only 21% and 37% respectively from January 2008 to January 2020. Source: Analysis of U.S. Census Bureau Advance Monthly Sales for Retail and Food Services Data; seasonally adjusted dollar value of food service and drinking places sales.

\(^{51}\) This estimate applies the 5.7% year-over-year growth in food services and drinking places (NAICS 722) sales from February and January 2020 to the entire year (i.e., assumes 5.7% growth from the $766 billion in sales in 2019, as tracked by the U.S. Census Bureau Monthly Retail Trade Report). The U.S. Census Bureau statistics exclude food and beverage sales at hotels, motels, amusement parks, theatres, casinos, and other facilities not “primarily engaged in providing food and beverage services.” See “2017 NAICS Definition: Sector 72 – Accommodation and Food Services, 722 Food Services and Drinking Places,” U.S. Census Bureau, https://www.census.gov/cgi-bin/sssd/naics/naicsrch?code=722&search=2017%20NAICS%20Search (accessed May 26, 2020). The National Restaurant Association projects that the restaurant industry (including food and beverage sales at facilities not primarily engaged in providing food and beverages, such as hotels) was on track to generate $899 billion in sales in 2020. See “Restaurant Industry: 2020 Facts,” NRA, https://restaurant.org/downloads/pdfs/research/soi/2020-state-of-the-industry-factbook.pdf (accessed May 26, 2020).
b) COVID-19 Public Health Shutdowns Have Devastated Independent Restaurants’ Revenue

As the novel coronavirus began to spread in March, states, counties, and cities swiftly began to issue stay-at-home orders, ban large gatherings, and advocate for social distancing in the interest of public health and safety. These actions shut down independent restaurants’ primary form of business (dine-in) within a few short days in mid-March, shortly after which in-restaurant dining plummeted by 100% relative to last year. An examination of in-restaurant dining statistics demonstrates this trend, illustrated in Figure 8 below.

![Figure 8: In-Restaurant Dining (Percent of Same Day Previous Year)](image)

Note: Year-over-year seated diners at restaurants on the OpenTable network across all channels: online reservations, phone reservations, and walk-ins. Data adjusted for day of week effects.


OpenTable, State of the Industry data as of May 21, 2020.
As a result, independent restaurants’ revenue plummeted by over 70% year over year in the last two weeks of March and still remains 51% lower than last year’s levels.\(^{54}\) Plunging revenues correspond directly to the inability (or unwillingness) of consumers to dine-in at restaurants. As shown in Figure 9, the downward trends for the restaurant industry have been particularly sharp when compared with other consumer activity trends such as retail and recreation visits.\(^{55}\)

**Figure 9: Daily Mobility/In-Restaurant Dining/Revenue Trends**

![Chart showing daily mobility, in-restaurant dining, and revenue trends](chart)

Independent restaurants are in a worse position than fast food and other similar restaurants that are premised in large part on drive-through/takeout/delivery. To illustrate, Figure 10 below includes data on all restaurants (including fast food) and displays a drop in revenue of 50%, which is more optimistic than the 60-70% revenue decline specific to independent restaurants.

---


\(^{55}\) “Retail and Recreation” as measured by Google mobility trends includes “restaurants, cafes, shopping centers, theme parks, museums, libraries, and movie theaters.”
c) COVID-19 Has Decimated Jobs in the Restaurant Industry, Particularly for Independent Restaurants

As a result of the sharp and sudden decline in revenue, the restaurant industry has shed nearly 50% of its jobs between February and April of this year (5.9 million jobs), at least 4.5 million of which are from independent restaurants.\(^5\)\(^6\) As shown in Figure 11 below, the restaurant industry had the

\(^5\) The loss of 5.9 million restaurant industry jobs since February is more than the total number restaurant industry jobs that were created in the last 30 years, taking restaurant employment back to its level in May 1989 (source: U.S. BLS CES employment in food services and drinking places (NAICS 722) and eating and drinking places (SIC 58)). Independent restaurant job losses are estimated based on the proportion of restaurants that are independent. This figure likely understates the amount of job losses at independent restaurants because it assumes that the independent restaurant share of overall restaurant industry job losses is proportional to their share of restaurant establishments prior to the pandemic (i.e., 76%). However, independent restaurants—without the same access to capital or pre-existing delivery systems as large restaurant chains—face a much harder time staying open and preserving jobs than other restaurants. In fact, several large restaurant chains with sales models premised primarily on delivery and take-out have hired new workers since restrictions began in March. For example, Domino’s, Pizza Hut and Papa John’s have announced plans to hire 10,000, 30,000 and 20,000 people, respectively. See “The Big Four Pizza Chains Are Hiring Over 60,000 Employees to Handle Delivery Demand During COVID-19,” Food & Wine, May 22, 2020, https://www.foodandwine.com/news/pizza-delivery-restaurants-hiring-thousands-of-workers-coronavirus. Similarly, Taco Bell and its franchises intend to hire 30,000 workers over the summer while Raising Cane’s is looking to hire 5,000 employees. See “Taco Bell Will Hire 30,000 Workers this Summer,” Restaurant Business, May 21, 2020, https://www.restaurantbusinessonline.com/operations/taco-bell-will-hire-30000-workers-summer and “Raising Cane’s...
largest number of job losses and had a larger proportion of job losses than any other industry with the exception of arts, entertainment and recreation.\(^{57}\)

**Figure 11: Job Losses In Restaurant Industry Compared with Other Industries During the Pandemic (February-April 2020)**

Not surprisingly, the industry’s staggering job losses have contributed significantly to the unemployment figures in the United States, which have reached levels not seen since the Great Depression.\(^{58}\) Figure 12 shows that more than a quarter of the unemployment increase since February (3.1 percentage points) can be attributed to individuals who lost a job in the restaurant


\(^{57}\) Comparison of job losses in food services and drinking places relative to the CES major industry sectors outside leisure and hospitality and to other industry groups within leisure and hospitality.

\(^{58}\) See “Fed’s Rosengren says U.S. unemployment rate could remain at double-digit levels by end of year,” *Reuters*, May 19, 2020, https://www.reuters.com/article/us-usa-fed-rosengren/feds-rosengren-says-u-s-unemployment-rate-could-remain-at-double-digit-levels-by-end-of-year-idUSKBN22V2QM (“The unemployment rate could peak at close to 20% as more Americans lose jobs in shutdowns to limit the spread of the coronavirus, and job losses could linger, [Boston Federal Reserve Chairman] Rosengren said […] ‘Unfortunately, even by the end of the year, I expect the unemployment rate to remain at double-digit levels’”).

---
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industry—more than any other industry and almost double the next most affected industry.\textsuperscript{59} Independent restaurant workers who lost their jobs thus account for at least 2.4 percentage points of unemployment.\textsuperscript{60} \textit{Helping independent restaurants keep their employees on payroll would reduce the country’s unemployment rate from 14.7\% to 12.3\% and help reduce the burden on public assistance programs.}

\textbf{Figure 12: Percent of Increased Unemployment Figures Between February and April 2020 Stemming from Restaurant vs. Other Industries}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{unemployment_figures.png}
\caption{Percent of Increased Unemployment Figures Between February and April 2020 Stemming from Restaurant vs. Other Industries}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{59} The industry contribution to the increase in unemployment from February to April is calculated based on the industry share of job losses over the same period (the reduction in total nonfarm payroll from the U.S. BLS CES).

\textsuperscript{60} Independent restaurant job losses are estimated based on the proportion of restaurants that are independent. As discussed in footnote 56, this estimate is conservative because it assumes that independent restaurants and large chain restaurants have shed jobs at the same rate, but independent restaurants have been the hardest hit segment of the restaurant industry and thus likely account for a larger share of job losses.

\textit{d) Independent Restaurants Have Been the Hardest Hit Segment of the Restaurant Industry}

Restaurants typically operate on notoriously thin profit margins due largely to the high costs of food, labor, and real estate and intense competition (both with other restaurants as well as home-
cooked meals). Unlike many larger chain restaurants, however, the vast majority of independent restaurants have a business model based on dine-in seating capacity and require high utilization of in-restaurant seating capacity to be profitable. This model is wholly incompatible with stay-at-home orders and public gathering restrictions and is not easily adaptable to social distancing guidelines. As shown in Figure 13, while all restaurants have been impacted by public health precautions, consumer spending on fine and casual dining (which together make up the bulk of independent restaurants) has declined 85% and 65% respectively, compared with a 21% decline in fast-food dining. In addition, these restaurants lack the same access to capital markets (e.g., secondary offerings or private equity) as publicly traded or other large restaurant groups that could help bridge the crisis until demand meaningfully rebounds. In the same vein, women, minorities and others who own proportionately more independent restaurants often face greater challenges accessing capital. Independent restaurants are thus far more at risk of permanently going out of business due to the pandemic—both because consumer spending at these establishments has been

61 These Darwinian margins efficiently shed restaurants that would not survive under normal circumstances. In 2019, an average single location full-service restaurant had a profit margin of 5.2%. See “Single Location Full-Service Restaurants in the US Industry Report,” IBISWorld, October 2019, at p. 23.

62 COVID-19 impact on US spending, 1010data, https://1010data.exabel.com/covid-19/. 1010data is a member of the Nielsen Connected Partner Program and provides data on consumer demand through its Insights Platform. See also footnote 56, which discusses plans by Pizza Hut and other fast food chains to hire new workers to deal with expanded demand for delivery.


disproportionately affected and because independent restaurants lack the same access to capital markets.

Figure 13: Restaurant Spending and Visits by Service Type

- Fast Food
  - Spending: -20.7%
  - Visits: -6.7%

- Fast Casual
  - Spending: -29.1%
  - Visits: -34.3%

- Casual Dining
  - Spending: -65.3%
  - Visits: -47.2%

- Fine Dining
  - Spending: -84.7%

Note: Data in text boxes correspond to May 7, 2020 change from equivalent day last year.

e) Available Interim Financial Assistance Programs Do Not Provide Sufficient Relief

Given the industry’s thin profit margins and the high degree of uncertainty regarding when they may be able to restore dine-in service at full capacity (and when patrons will feel safe about dining in bustling indoor venues), most independent restaurateurs are not in a position to take-on and service significant loan debt, which makes it prohibitive to take advantage of the Federal Reserve’s
Main Street Lending Program. By the same token, despite the federal Paycheck Protection Program’s (PPP) purpose and intent to buttress temporarily small businesses, many independent restaurateurs have either been unable to obtain PPP loans or find the terms to be challenging as applied to the industry, as discussed at a White House roundtable event on March 18. For example, while the requirement to rehire employees immediately would temporarily reduce unemployment, it would also result in restaurants being staffed at full capacity well before restaurants are able to have a full-capacity operation by State and local public health regulation. Moreover, government-imposed capacity restrictions pose significant challenges for restaurateurs to meet requirements that would convert the loan into a grant—e.g., using 75% of the funds within eight weeks, despite ongoing and open-ended State and local restrictions (though the Trump Administration appears open to alleviating some of these requirements in practice, such as extending use to 24 weeks).

In any event, PPP funding is designed as an immediate and temporary relief valve for most small businesses. However, unlike other small businesses, independent restaurants are in the precarious position of facing longer-term, compulsory capacity limitations in state-led economic re-openings. As explained above, independent restaurants operate on thin profit margins fundamentally relying on high utilization of seating capacity to create the turnover necessary to remain economically

65 See “Unforgivable? Restaurants Fear Big COVID-19 Loan Bills,” New York Times, May 13, 2020, https://www.nytimes.com/aponline/2020/05/13/business/bc-virus-outbreak-small-business-relief-restaurants.html. Moreover, because of the highly uncertain revenue environment independent restaurants face until the pandemic recedes, there is no guarantee that participating lenders would even be willing to make loans to restaurants under the Main Street Lending program. See, e.g., “Main Street Lending Program Frequently Asked Questions,” https://www.federalreserve.gov/monetarypolicy/files/main-street-lending-faqs.pdf ("Eligible Lenders are expected to conduct an assessment of each potential borrower’s financial condition at the time of the potential borrower’s application. Eligible Lenders will apply their own underwriting standards in evaluating the financial condition and creditworthiness of a potential borrower.").

66 See “SBA’s Paycheck Protection Program for Small Businesses Affected by the Coronavirus Pandemic Launches,” U.S. Small Business Administration, April 3, 2020 (“The program provides forgivable loans up to $10 million to small businesses left financially distressed by the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic. The loans, which will be administered at the local level by a national network of banks and credit unions, are designed to maintain the viability of millions of small businesses struggling to meet payroll and day-to-day operating expenses.”).


viable. In particular, because many restaurants critically depend on using 100% of their capacity at peak times, operating at reduced capacity—even with the numerous adaptive measures described above—will endanger independent restaurants that under normal circumstances would be able to thrive. In fact, a recent working paper surveying small businesses, found that, on average, only 30% of restaurateurs believed they could remain in business if the pandemic lasted four months (even with PPP assistance)—the lowest prospective outlook of all industries surveyed. And even if some independent restaurants could survive for the next several months without additional assistance, epidemiological models and recognized U.S. government public health officials support that there will be some continuation in the fall and winter, with the possibility of a second wave of new infections. Most of the state plans to re-open their economies include regressive benchmarks (e.g., spikes in new infections) that would require reimplementation of public gathering restrictions and social distancing. In such case, the same study found that only 15% of restaurateurs believed they could even make it to six months without bridge assistance.

Even if state and local governments allow restaurants to open at full capacity irrespective of any resurgence in infections, a recent poll conducted by ABC News/IPSOS indicated that over 50% of people would be unlikely to dine at a restaurant if restrictions were lifted imminently. And a McKinsey poll found that 27% of people likely would not dine at a restaurant until there is a

---


70 See “COVID-19: The CIDRAP Viewpoint,” Center for Infectious Disease Research and Policy, April 30, 2020. CIDRAP of the University of Minnesota outlines three possible scenarios for the future of the COVID-19 pandemic: a first wave in spring 2020 followed by (1) a series of repetitive smaller waves, (2) a larger wave in the fall or winter of 2020 (similar to the 1918-1919 flu pandemic), and (3) ongoing transmission and case occurrence without a clear wave pattern. See also, “Dr. Anthony Fauci says a second wave of coronavirus is ‘not inevitable,’” CNBC, May 27, 2020, https://www.cnbc.com/2020/05/27/dr-anthony-fauci-says-a-second-wave-of-coronavirus-is-not-inevitable.html, (“A second wave of the coronavirus outbreak in the United States “could happen” but is “not inevitable,” White House health advisor Dr. Anthony Fauci said”).


72 See ABC News/Ipsos COVID Survey (April 29-30) (surveying 518 adults).
vaccine\textsuperscript{73} (which under optimistic projections could come at the end of the year\textsuperscript{74}). As shown in Figure 14, even in states that have already begun to re-open, in-restaurant dining remains below permitted capacity.\textsuperscript{75} Similarly, restaurant revenue in counties that have re-opened has remained on average 45\% below prior year levels with 66\% of restaurants in those counties reporting that sales remain at least 25\% lower than the same week in 2019.\textsuperscript{76}

Figure 14: In-Restaurant Seated Dining in States That Have Begun to Re-Open

Thus, PPP funds are not enough to enable survival. Without meaningful financial bridge assistance in the form of grants, the coronavirus poses an insurmountable challenge for many independent


\textsuperscript{74} See, e.g., “Fauci says it’s still possible that a coronavirus vaccine will be available in the U.S. by December,” \textit{CNBC}, May 22, 2020, \url{https://www.cnbc.com/2020/05/22/dr-fauci-is-still-confident-us-could-have-a-coronavirus-vaccine-by-december.html}.

\textsuperscript{75} Figure shows states that began re-opening towards the end of April.

\textsuperscript{76} Source: “The State of the Restaurant Industry” dataset, powered by Toast, which captures approximately 13,000 restaurants with same-store year-over-year revenue data.
restaurants, with many notable and successful restaurants already shutting down permanently due to the pandemic. Accordingly, independent restaurants uniquely require financial assistance now more than ever to prevent permanently shuttering en masse, which would—in turn—send shockwaves through their supply chains.

f) Independent Restaurants’ Adaptive Measures Are Not Sufficient to Replace its Primary Dine-In Business Model

Although some states have begun to re-open, restaurants in nearly every state are continuing to operate with significant restrictions on service and capacity as shown in Figure 15.


79 President Trump has also proposed restoring the tax deductibility of business meals and entertainment that was largely removed in the 2017 tax bill. While this would clearly be a large benefit to restaurants once business customers started dining out again, and would help restaurants recover, it would not serve the specific purpose of providing bridge assistance to keep restaurants in business while shuttered or operating at reduced capacity. See “Trump calls on Congress to restore tax deductions for business meals, entertainment,” The Hill, April 1, 2020, https://thehill.com/homenews/administration/490619-trump-calls-on-congress-to-restore-tax-deductions-for-business-meals.
In order to be viable, independent restaurants need to be at or near capacity at peak times and also need to generate additional revenue from products that come only with in-restaurant dining service (i.e., alcohol). An independent restaurant’s aim is to generate enough revenue per available seat hour to cover operating costs and make a modest profit (albeit typically small). Capacity restrictions are antithetical to reaching this goal. In order to earn back some of the lost revenue—albeit far from enough to cover even their rent in many cases—many independent restaurants have expanded (or added for the first time) takeout or delivery options. For most independent restaurants, however, demand for takeout or delivery remains well below typical on-premise demand, and

80 See, e.g., Kimes, S. E. (2004), Restaurant revenue management [Electronic article], *Cornell Hospitality Report, 4* (2), 5-34.

81 Even the Cheesecake Factory, with $694 million in revenues in 2019-Q4 and an existing takeout operation, announced that it was unable to pay April rent due to the coronavirus crisis. Independent restaurants, with less access to capital, are in a far worse position to be able to pay rent—and many, such as the Bellwether in Studio City, California, cannot cover rent costs with takeout alone. See “For Restaurants Fighting to Stay Open, Landlords Prove a Major Hurdle,” *Eater, 2020*, https://www.eater.com/2020/4/21/21228316/restaurants-cant-pay-rent-fighting-landlords-lease-coronavirus-covid-19, (“The Bellwether has stayed open for delivery and take-out but is operating at 10 to 15 percent of its normal business. ‘If we want to keep serving food, we have to make sure [our suppliers] sell us food,’ Hopson says. The little bit of income coming in is going to pay food suppliers and the few remaining employees.”).
restaurants are often unable to charge the same prices without table service. While takeout and delivery revenue has gone up by at least 59% compared with the same day last year in every week since March 19 (with some weeks up to 72%), this has not been enough to offset the declines in on-premise dining. Indeed, as shown in Figure 16, overall restaurant revenues have declined 64% in April and May.

**Figure 16: Year-Over-Year Daily Restaurant Revenue (February 17, 2020 - May 28, 2020)**


Note: Includes restaurants that have been open for over one year and have been on the Toast platform for at least one year.

---

82 A recent survey of 216 restaurants in San Francisco found that of the 123 restaurants that had adapted to a takeout/delivery business, 60% were losing money by doing so and 25% were breaking even. See “San Francisco Restaurants Questionnaire Results: Survey Distributed on May 5th (216 Respondents),” *Golden Gate Restaurant Association*, [https://cdn.vox-cdn.com/uploads/chorus_asset/file/19984755/Shared_San_Francisco_Restaurants_Questionnaire_Results_Analysis.pdf](https://cdn.vox-cdn.com/uploads/chorus_asset/file/19984755/Shared_San_Francisco_Restaurants_Questionnaire_Results_Analysis.pdf). As an illustrative example for takeout versus dine-in pricing, a three Michelin star restaurant in Chicago (Alinea) started to use its reservation system to allow customers to reserve meals for curbside pick-up. While a multi-course meal at Alinea typically costs $210 or more, the restaurant now offers a curbside special for $34.95. See “Alinea sells out to-go meals of beef Wellington and mashed potatoes in 5 hours,” *Chicago Tribune*, March 19, 2020, [https://www.chicagotribune.com/coronavirus/ct-alinea-to-go-meals-sell-out-coronavirus-chicago-20200319-zlkxayubncbhopghn4zbjbkva-story.html](https://www.chicagotribune.com/coronavirus/ct-alinea-to-go-meals-sell-out-coronavirus-chicago-20200319-zlkxayubncbhopghn4zbjbkva-story.html).
Moreover, the inability to sell (or diminished demand for) higher margin products (e.g., dessert, alcoholic and non-alcoholic beverages)\textsuperscript{83} through takeout has further contributed to the decrease in the average customer bill at restaurants, which has declined by 12\% for casual dining and 25\% for fine dining restaurants for week ending April 5, 2020, compared with January and February 2020.\textsuperscript{84} In the same vein, delivery commissions charged by third-party delivery services can be cost prohibitive, in some cases charging a commission fee as high as 30\%.\textsuperscript{85} Some restaurants have even begun selling grocery and pantry items directly to consumers (despite differing tax ramifications and FDA reporting requirements), but have had difficulty competing for sales with grocery stores.\textsuperscript{86} To illustrate the revenue problem restaurants are facing notwithstanding adaptive measures, Figure 17 depicts how consumers have shifted spending from restaurants to grocery and liquor stores. While restaurant spending declined by 50\% from February to April, grocery store spending increased by 10\%.

\textsuperscript{83} While certain States have allowed restaurants to temporarily sell alcohol (e.g., Massachusetts), they cannot generate nearly as much revenue per serving as they can for table service. Moreover, restaurants are effectively competing with grocery stores and other wine/liquor stores for these sales.

\textsuperscript{84} COVID-19 Food Industry Impact: Food industry spending analysis in the face of a pandemic, 1010 Data April 23, 2020.

\textsuperscript{85} See e.g., “Grubhub comes under fire for high fees, bad drivers — and some Chicago restaurants are dropping it,” \textit{Chicago Tribune}, April 13, 2020, https://www.chicagotribune.com/coronavirus/ct-food-coronavirus-grubhub-uber-eats-20200413-h57q4yn05efen6zkctcunwyl-a-story.html, (“While the amount differs slightly for each restaurant, it’s common for a food delivery app to have a commission fee of 20 to 30\% of each order.”).

\textsuperscript{86} See “Want to sell groceries from your restaurant? We’ve got tips,” \textit{NRA}, April 24, 2020, https://restaurant.org/Articles/News/Sell-groceries-from-restaurants-We-have-tips. Importantly, because grocery stores were essential services that have remained open throughout the pandemic, restaurants that have sold grocery items have done so largely at cost.
4. The Proposed $120 Billion Stabilization Fund Will Generate Significant Economic Benefits to the U.S. Treasury and the U.S. Economy

a) Without the Stabilization Fund, Hundreds of Thousands of Independent Restaurants Will Likely Close to the Lasting Detriment of Local Communities, Small Supply Chain Businesses, as well as the Broader U.S. Economy

The failure en masse of independent restaurants would negatively impact local communities in myriad ways, including endangering community identity and heterogeneity, stripping social interaction, frustrating (or unraveling) urban renewal projects, jeopardizing tourism and other business opportunity, and raising potential for increased crime and homelessness.

Independent restaurant job losses will depress local economies and disproportionately affect individuals who are least able to adapt and find new employment (e.g., unskilled or low-skilled workers, reformed returning citizens). Moreover, sweeping restaurant closures will strain local and State governments by decreasing revenue from sales and use tax, increasing need for and pressure
on public assistance programs they fund, and causing greater unemployment insurance payments, burdening already stretched (and in some cases insolvent) state unemployment trust funds. 

Loss of independent restaurants would create a ripple effect that would also be devastating for small businesses within restaurant supply chains, including small and medium-sized farms, ranches, fishermen, vintners, distillers, florists, and linen suppliers—many of which would be crippled by a collapse of the restaurant industry. Indeed, each restaurant job lost will cause an estimated additional 0.50 jobs to be lost throughout restaurants’ supply chain.

Moreover, because higher unemployment results in less wage income from being spent and circulating throughout the economy (a process known as “induced” economic activity), the loss of each restaurant job or supply chain job leads to an estimated additional 0.31 job losses (known as the “induced” impact), giving a total multiplier impact of 0.96 jobs lost for each restaurant job lost. Similarly, the failure of restaurants and the loss of rent also has the potential to destabilize the commercial real estate market in many communities that could spill over into the larger economy. Indeed, there are already reports of commercial real estate tenants failing to pay rents, which in turn has the potential to reduce the valuation of commercial real estate as vacancy rates

---


89 An alternative and equivalent formulation is that the loss of the original jobs leads to a loss of an additional 0.47 jobs due to the decreased spending by both the direct and the indirect employees that have lost jobs. See Bivens, Josh, “Updated employment multipliers for the U.S. economy,” Economic Policy Institute, January 23, 2019, https://www.epi.org/publication/updated-employment-multipliers-for-the-u-s-economy/. Multipliers for “Food services and drinking places,” Table A1. An induced multiplier can also be interpreted as the additional dollars of induced economic activity from each dollar of direct or indirect industry output.

90 The total multiplier effect is calculated by multiplying the induced effect of 0.31 by the sum of the direct and indirect jobs attributable to restaurants (i.e., $0.31 \times (1.0 + .50) = 0.965$).
increase as well as decrease property tax collections if building owners are unable to collect sufficient rents.\(^{91}\)

This downward spiral of economic activity cannot be diverted by hopes that existing or new restaurants will open quickly after the pandemic ends. Many restaurateurs will not be able to quickly re-enter the market when demand returns—and new aspiring restaurateurs save for years before launching a new restaurant.

\[b) \textit{Independent Restaurants Require $120 Billion in Grants to Ensure Stability Through the End of 2020}\]

Absent additional support from the Restaurant Stabilization Fund, a tidal wave of independent restaurants will fail facing unconquerable headwinds,\(^{92}\) including continued social distancing and temporary reduced demand while States work through phased re-opening. At a high level, the Fund would allow independent restaurants to re-open and would, in return, help jumpstart the economy and reduce unemployment—even while state-mandated social distancing and capacity restrictions remain in place. Restaurants would use the money to rehire and pay employees,\(^{93}\) as well as cover ongoing shortfalls during phased re-openings through the end of the year as demand slowly returns but revenues remain below operating costs (including, for example, rent and utilities).\(^{94}\) The Fund is intended to simply cover the gap between costs and revenues as demand begins to recover, enabling restaurants to re-open earlier than they otherwise would. The Fund will also enable restaurants to purchase partitions, temperature check stations, improve ventilation systems, or


\(^{92}\) For a partial list of restaurants that have already announced they will close permanently see Appendix A.

\(^{93}\) Wages are the largest single cost for the restaurant industry, on average accounting for 34.8% of costs. See IBISWorld, Single Location Full-Service Restaurants in the US Industry Report, October 2019, at p. 23.

\(^{94}\) Although indoor dining has been prohibited in most states, restaurants were still responsible for rent payments during state-mandated closures. Similarly, once restaurants are allowed to re-open, they will continue to owe full rent payments despite only being able to use their indoor space for a limited number of customers as social distancing regulations remain in place. See, e.g., “Over 50 SF Restaurant Owners Explain What They Need to Stay in Business,” \textit{Eater}, May 13, 2020, https://sf.eater.com/2020/5/13/21257567/architects-coronavirus-seth-boor-tartine-dear-inga-delfina.
otherwise reconfigure their restaurant space in order to comply with social distancing directives and CDC re-opening guidelines. Access to the funds for these expenditures will enable independent restaurants to more quickly make the recommended upgrades and to safely re-open for dine-in services.

As detailed in the remainder of this section, when one accounts for all of the quantifiable economic benefits that the Restaurant Stabilization Fund yields back to the U.S. Treasury, various state and local governments, and the broader U.S. economy in the form of reduced unemployment insurance payouts, increases in payroll tax receipts, supply chain spending and the increase in consumer confidence that will jumpstart the U.S. economy, the Restaurant Stabilization Fund is “fully funded” from an economic standpoint. As detailed below, the proposed $120 billion in stabilization funds (which represents only approximately 15% of annual restaurant industry revenue) will generate at least $183 billion in primary benefits and $65 billion in secondary benefits.

c) The Restaurant Stabilization Fund’s Quantified Direct Benefits to the U.S. Treasury and State and Local Governments Through the End of the Year Will Range from $47 to $69 Billion

By covering independent restaurants’ revenue shortfall through the end of the year, independent restaurants will be incentivized to operate at state-mandated reduced capacity, even if they would otherwise find it to be in their best interest to remain closed (or only offer take-out) until allowed to operate at full capacity and as a result, restaurants will be able to rehire workers earlier. The ability to immediately rehire millions of independent restaurant workers will have direct

---


96 As discussed in Section 3.a) above, the restaurant industry was on a trajectory in 2020 to have upwards of $800 billion in sales in 2020.

97 As noted in Section 3.c) above, 5.9 million restaurant employees have lost their jobs since February.
quantifiable benefits to the U.S. Treasury and state governments while meaningfully lowering the unemployment rate.98

- **Reduced State Unemployment Insurance Claims of $21-$31 billion:** Assuming that between $40-$60 billion of the Restaurant Stabilization Fund is spent on re-hiring workers earlier than they otherwise would be re-hired (enough to rehire 3.4-5.1 million employees from June 1 through the end of the year at average wages),99 state unemployment insurance claims will be reduced by $21-$31 billion between June 1, 2020 and December 31, 2020.100

- **Reduced Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation of $18-$26 billion:** Unemployed workers are also eligible for the Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation contained in the CARES Act of $600 per week through July 31, 2020. Assuming that between $40-$60 billion of the Restaurant Stabilization Fund is spent on re-hiring workers earlier than they otherwise would be re-hired and that the hiring begins on June 1, 2020, the reduction in eligibility for the Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation will save the federal government of $18-$26 billion.101

- **Increased Social Security and Medicare Tax Contributions of $6-$9 billion:** The incomes paid by the Stabilization Fund would also be subject to the employee and employer paid Social Security and Medicare taxes and re-hiring these employees will result

---

98 The quantified benefits of reduced unemployment insurance payments and increased taxes are based on analysis of the average earnings of restaurant employees by county in the Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages for the full year ending 2019-Q3 which is used to compute the additional taxes or reduced unemployment claims as a proportion of the wages for those employees for the seven month period from June 1, 2020-December 31, 2020. These proportions are then applied to the portion of the Stabilization Fund that is assumed to be spent on re-hiring employees to obtain an estimated dollar amount of additional taxes (or reduced unemployment claims). Applying assumptions about the wage distribution of restaurant employees results in similar aggregate estimates of benefits. For example, assuming 25% of employees in a county earn 50% less than the average wage and 25% earn 5% more than the average wage, the estimated direct quantifiable benefits to the U.S. Treasury and state governments is $46.1-$68.0 billion.

99 Source: Analysis of Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages. This is equivalent to less than half of the 11 million workers employed by independent restaurants in the United States and will enable restaurants to expand payrolls even while operating at reduced capacity.

100 This calculation assumes that all re-hired employees would have received unemployment compensation for the period between June 1, 2020 and December 31, 2020, in the absence of the Stabilization Fund, and assumes that states that have not already done so extend unemployment benefits to allow coverage through the end of year. These estimates are not dependent on when during the remainder of 2020 the employees are rehired but relies on the assumption of the amount of the Stabilization Fund that is used to re-hire workers earlier than they otherwise would be re-hired. Although some states provide increased unemployment benefits for unemployed workers with dependents, these estimates conservatively do not contain increased payments for dependents. Additionally, these estimates do not account for the effect on unemployment insurance payments for workers that may have multiple jobs. If workers with two jobs are unemployed from both, they would potentially receive additional benefits, but once re-hired from one job may lose all benefits. Source: Analysis of Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages and unemployment benefit criteria; U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, “Significant Provisions of State Unemployment Insurance Laws, Effective January 2020.”

101 This assumes that rehired workers who are eligible for state unemployment benefits would have been eligible for Federal Pandemic Unemployment Compensation from June 1, 2020-July 31, 2020. Source: Analysis of Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages.
in an estimated $6-$9 billion of additional Social Security and Medicare tax contributions.\textsuperscript{102}

- **Increased State Unemployment Insurance Tax Contributions of $0.2-$0.3 billion:** Independent restaurants are also required to pay state unemployment insurance taxes and the wages paid by the Stabilization Fund would result in an estimated $0.2-$0.3 billion in additional contributions.\textsuperscript{103}

- **Increased State Sales Tax Collections of $2.4 billion:** As discussed in section 2.b) many states collect higher sales taxes on restaurant purchases than on grocery store purchases and 37 states and Washington D.C. exempt groceries from sales taxes. By enabling restaurants to open earlier than they otherwise would, and giving consumers the confidence to return to restaurants, the Stabilization Fund will drive incremental business to restaurants resulting in additional sales tax receipts. Assuming that the Stabilization Fund enables $10 billion in incremental sales in June and July, and $5 billion in incremental monthly sales for the rest of the year—a small fraction of the monthly sales that have been lost to grocery stores during the pandemic—\textsuperscript{104} the total incremental sales of $45 billion in 2020 will result in $2.4 billion in additional sales tax revenues.\textsuperscript{105}

When combined, the direct benefits to the U.S. Treasury and State and local governments discussed above equal $47-$69 billion and are highly conservative estimates, as they exclude other avoided

\textsuperscript{102} Estimated Social Security and Medicare tax contributions include both employer and employee paid portions, as applicable, for wages estimated to be paid for work between June 1, 2020 and December 31, 2020 that would not have been paid absent the Restaurant Stabilization Fund. Although other federal laws in response to the pandemic, including the CARES Act, have provisions which may allow the deferral of the employer portion of Social Security Taxes, these taxes will continue to accrue as a liability that will need to be paid once the deferral period ends. While some states—including California, Massachusetts, Nevada, and New York—have additional payroll tax deductions, these additional taxes that would be paid to the states are conservatively not included in the estimates. Source: Analysis of Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages and federal payroll tax rates.

\textsuperscript{103} Estimated contributions based on the average state contribution rates applied to the wages paid by the Stabilization Fund. Source: Analysis of Quarterly Census of Employment and Wages and unemployment insurance contribution rates; U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Training Administration, “Average Employer Contribution Rates by State.”

\textsuperscript{104} By way of comparison, and as shown in Figure 10, total restaurant revenue has declined from approximately $65 billion in February 2020 to $32 billion in April 2020. The additional sales tax receipts are thus based on the assumption that earlier openings and increased confidence enabled by the Stabilization Fund restores approximately an incremental one-third of the lost revenue in each of the first two months and one-sixth of the lost revenue in each of the following five months. Additional restaurant sales are allocated to counties and states in proportion to restaurant industry wages.

\textsuperscript{105} The estimate of incremental sales tax is relative to an equivalent amount of consumer spending at grocery stores. Source: Analysis of state sales tax rates. This estimate is conservative because (1) it does not include additional city or county sales taxes and (2) it does not include additional incremental taxes on alcohol imposed in some locations for on-premise consumption. For example, Minneapolis, MN charges an additional liquor tax of 3\% for on-premise consumption in its downtown tax zone that does not apply to sales for off-premise consumption. See “Minneapolis Special Local Taxes,” Minneapolis Department of Revenue, 2019, https://www.revenue.state.mn.us/sites/default/files/2019-09/FS164M_0.pdf. Unlike the estimated savings from reduced unemployment compensation and additional payroll-based taxes, the additional sales taxes are not dependent on the portion of the stabilization fund that is used to re-hire workers earlier than they otherwise would be re-hired and instead is contingent on the stabilization of independent restaurants and preventing a tidal wave of permanent closures as described in Section 4.a).
federal and state-level costs such as Medicaid and SNAP, increased federal, state, and local personal and corporate income taxes, the additional consumer spending due to increased restaurant employee income and supply chain benefits during the remainder of the year as well as the trailing effects of additional sales tax revenues, supply chain stimulation, culinary-tourism, and GDP benefits over the next two years as a result of jumpstarting the U.S. economy (as discussed in the below).

d) Additional Supply Chain Benefits and Higher Spending by Restaurant and Supply Chain Employees Will Generate Benefits Exceeding $20 Billion Through the End of the Year

By enabling restaurants to open earlier than they otherwise would and the concomitant restoration of consumer confidence as people carefully start to emerge from isolation, the Stabilization Fund will result in incremental restaurant sales that would not have otherwise occurred, which will in turn create additional economic activity throughout the restaurant supply chain. The additional economic activity in the supply chain is captured by the indirect multiplier which measures the downstream economic activity that is generated when firms in an upstream industry (e.g., restaurants) purchase the goods and services they need to perform their operations (e.g., fish, honey, butter, wine, flowers) and is expressed as a ratio of the upstream firms’ direct spending. As discussed above, each dollar of restaurant spending results in an additional $0.50 in economic

---

106 See, e.g., “Booming Economy Helps Flatten Medicaid Enrollment and Limit Costs, States Report,” Kaiser Health News, October 25, 2018, reporting that “Medicaid spending and enrollment typically rise during economic downturns as more people lose jobs and health benefits. When the economy is humming, Medicaid enrollment flattens as more people get back to work and can get coverage at work or can afford to buy it on their own. The national unemployment rate was 3.7 percent in September, the lowest since 1969” and that “Overall, the federal government pays about 62 percent of Medicaid costs with state's picking up the rest.” Moreover, the costs of additional Medicaid enrollees vary significantly by state and health status, ranging from an average of just under $3,000 per year in some states to an average of over $7,000 per year in others according to Medicaid program estimates. See “How Much Do States Spend Per Medicaid Enrollee?,” Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, https://www.medicaid.gov/state-overviews/scorecard/how-much-states-spend-per-medicaid-enrollee/index.html (accessed May 27, 2020).

107 While rehired employees will be responsible for federal, state, and local income taxes on their wages, their income tax liability will only increase for income in excess of state and federal unemployment insurance payments, which are also taxable. Because much of restaurant employees’ wages were replaced by state and federal unemployment benefits, the income tax increases would be expected to be small relative to the savings to the federal and state governments due to reduced unemployment compensation claims. To the extent it is determined that Stabilization Fund grants are taxable corporate income, independent restaurants will face an increased federal and state corporate tax liability (now or in the future depending on its net operating loss carryforwards).

108 According to an April survey of 2,200 U.S. adults, going out to eat at a restaurant or café is the first “normal” activity that consumers will feel comfortable resuming. Forty percent of consumers surveyed felt comfortable resuming going out to eat within the next three months—more than any other activity of a list of 14 activities that included going to a shopping mall, to the movies, to a religious meeting, and to a concert. See “When Consumers Say They’ll Feel OK About Dining Out and Other Activities,” Morning Consult, April 10, 2020, https://morningconsult.com/2020/04/10/consumer-expectations-normal-activities-comfortable/.
activity in the restaurant supply chain. Because parts of this supply chain activity would have taken place anyways—particularly some food production activity that has currently shifted to supplying grocery stores—we conservatively reduce the indirect multiplier by the portion of the restaurant supply chain that is direct food production. Thus, as discussed above, assuming that the Stabilization Fund enables $10 billion in incremental sales in June and July, and $5 billion in incremental monthly sales for the rest of the year, the total incremental sales of $45 billion, through the end of 2020, as sales shift back from grocery stores to restaurants will be expected to drive an additional $17 billion in economic activity throughout the restaurant supply chain, benefiting the many small businesses and purveyors supported by independent restaurants and supporting their continued viability.

In addition to the benefits that flow directly back to federal and state treasuries and the supply chain spending, each dollar of incremental income received by independent restaurant employees rehired as a result of the Stabilization Fund (i.e., the difference between the wages they will receive through payroll continuation and what they would have received if unemployed in the form of state and federal unemployment benefits) and each dollar of incremental supply chain spending generates approximately $0.31 in additional economic activity in the U.S economy, an economic effect known as the “induced multiplier.” This well-understood economic impact—attributable to the extra income of restaurant and supply chain employees being spent in their local communities (and beyond), which then continues to recirculate throughout the economy—is conservative and likely understated because the Stabilization Fund will create job security for employees improving

109 See footnote 88 above for a discussion of the indirect multiplier of $0.50 per dollar.
110 Analysis of the U.S. BEA Input-Output tables indicates that 24% of intermediate inputs to food services and drinking places (NAICS 722) are food and beverage, food service, or agricultural products. Reducing the indirect multiplier by 24% results in a multiplier for incremental supply chain economic activity of 0.38. Source: Analysis of U.S. BEA Industry Economic Accounts, Use Table, 2012.
111 As discussed above and in footnote 104, in the context of additional sales tax revenue, this reflects a monthly incremental restoration of only a fraction of the lost monthly restaurant sales in April 2020 when purchases shifted to grocery stores. Additional restaurant sales are allocated to counties and states in proportion to restaurant industry wages.
112 See Section 2.a) above for a discussion of the many small businesses and purveyors supported by independent restaurants. The incremental supply chain benefits are conservative because they do not include the additional capital expenditures on PPE and restaurant reconfiguration that will likely be required to re-open dining rooms, as discussed in section 4.b) above. Unlike the estimated savings from reduced unemployment compensation and additional payroll-based taxes, the additional supply chain benefits are not dependent on the portion of the stabilization fund that is used to re-hire workers earlier than they otherwise would be re-hired and instead is contingent on the stabilization of independent restaurants and preventing a tidal wave of permanent closures as described in Section 4.a).
113 See footnote 89 above for a discussion of the induced multiplier of $0.31 per dollar of incremental wages.
confidence in the future and increasing spending further. Based on this multiplier effect, the Stabilization Fund results in an additional \( \$5.9\text{-}6.2 \) \textit{billion of induced economic activity}. 

e) The Stabilization Fund Will Result in a Faster and More Robust Economic Recovery, Creating an Estimated \( \$114 \) Billion Primary Benefits between 2021 and 2023, Through Additional Supply Chain Benefits, Additional Sales Tax Revenue, and Additional Tourism

The benefits of the Stabilization Fund will not run out at the end of the year, but rather the Fund will have a lasting effect by ensuring a faster, more robust economic recovery led by the restaurant industry. The recovery will then proliferate through the restaurant supply chain, as well as to other sectors of the travel, tourism, and leisure industries because of culinary tourism, while generating additional sales tax revenues for state and local governments.

The Stabilization Fund’s Supply Chain and Sales Tax Benefits Will Persist Through At Least 2022

The Stabilization Fund will continue to result in incremental economic activity beyond the coming months by enabling restaurants to remain in business, and preventing a tidal wave of permanent closures as described in Section 4.a). By enabling more restaurants to open earlier—when significant capacity restrictions remain in place—the Stabilization Fund will enable the industry to meet consumer demand for dining-out, which might otherwise exceed the available capacity-restricted supply. Similarly, because the Fund will enable a significant number of independent restaurants to remain in business, the resulting culinary diversity and economic vitality of main-streets across the country will result in continued incremental restaurant spending for at least the next two years. Assuming that the trailing effects of the benefits of the Stabilization Fund result in an incremental \( \$2 \) billion in monthly restaurant spending in 2021 and an incremental \( \$1 \) billion in monthly restaurant spending in 2022\textsuperscript{114}—a small fraction of the monthly sales that have been lost to grocery stores during the pandemic—there will be an additional \( \$17.8 \) billion in supply chain benefits (including induced spending) and an additional \( \$1.9 \) billion in incremental state sales tax revenues from 2021-2022\textsuperscript{115}.

\textsuperscript{114} Each \( \$1 \) billion in monthly restaurant spending represents only 3% of the decline in restaurant spending observed in April 2020, and only 1.5% of the total restaurant spending in February 2020, before the pandemic.

\textsuperscript{115} As discussed in footnote 105, the estimate of incremental sales tax is relative to an equivalent amount of consumer spending at grocery stores and this estimate is conservative because (1) it does not include additional city or county taxes and (2) it does not include incremental taxes on alcohol imposed in some locations for on-premise consumption.
The Stabilization Fund Will Ensure that Culinary Tourism in The United States Will Continue to Grow, For Domestic and International Travelers Alike

For many travelers, both overseas and domestic, cuisine is an integral part of determining where to travel. Indeed, with the proliferation of social media platforms such as Instagram, the creation of dozens of streaming television series devoted to food tourism and restaurants, and the elevation of chefs of all types of cuisine (and budget ranges) to celebrity status, “culinary tourism” has become an important source of visitors (both domestic and foreign) for large and small cities alike. For this growing segment of travelers, the ability to dine at establishments they have only experienced “virtually” drives their decision of where to travel. For example, one survey of culinary travelers found that 72% chose their destination based on its food and drink offerings.\textsuperscript{116} If a significant number of independent restaurants in the United States permanently close, then many of these travelers would likely change their travel plans, and some would choose to simply cancel or defer their travel plans entirely. And for culinary travelers from abroad, mass closings of independent restaurants in the United States would result in many of them choosing to visit other countries, depriving multiple sectors of the U.S. economy from important visitor spending dollars. The decrease of the spending from these travelers will work its way through the economy, delaying the U.S. economic recovery.

We estimate the loss in economic activity from reduced culinary-inspired travel and tourism under three potential scenarios regarding the percentage of independent restaurants that will have permanently closed—25%, 50%, or 75%—absent the Stabilization Fund.\textsuperscript{117} We assume that as demand returns, new restaurants will eventually open to replace some of the closed restaurants, but as it takes time to secure funding, renovate space, and hire and train staff, we assume that it will


\textsuperscript{117} As noted above, a recent working paper found that if the closure lasts one month, 28% of restaurants expect to close while if it lasts six months that increases to 78%. See Bartik, Alexander W., Marianne Bertrand, Zoë B. Cullen, Edward L. Glaeser, Michael Luca, Christopher T. Stanton, “How Are Small Businesses Adjusting To Covid-19? Early Evidence From A Survey,” National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) Working Paper 26989, April 2020.

\textsuperscript{118} Unlike the estimated savings from reduced unemployment compensation and additional payroll-based taxes, the tourism benefits are not dependent on the portion of the stabilization fund that is used to re-hire workers earlier than they otherwise would be re-hired and instead is contingent on the stabilization of independent restaurants and preventing a tidal wave of permanent closures as described in Section 4.a). We do not make an assumption as to exactly which month travel will open up as it depends on factors, such as vaccine availability, that are currently unknown. The assumption is that from whichever month that is, the increase in demand it causes for restaurants will allow a slow recovery, which we assume will take three years.
take three years for the process of replacement to finish, at which point the culinary-motivated travelers will revert back to their pre-pandemic travel patterns. During this three-year period, however, the U.S. economy will suffer from lower levels of tourism spending due to shuttered restaurants.

In addition to the direct tourism spending on airfares, hotels, restaurants, etc., the supply chains of these industries generate additional “indirect” economic activity throughout countless sectors of the economy. On top of this, the increased incomes of the employees of the direct and indirect providers of these goods and services will themselves spend more on other goods and services (known as the “induced” economic impact). Combined, these indirect and induced multiplier effects results in $1.31 of additional economic impact in the U.S. economy for every $1 of tourism spending by culinary-motivated travelers.\(^\text{119}\)

For international visitors, we estimate a direct loss of spending over the three-year period of reduced independent restaurants of between $6.1 billion and $18.3 billion, increasing to between $14.1 billion and $42.2 billion after accounting for the indirect and induced multiplier impact (see Figure 18).\(^\text{120}\) For domestic travelers we estimate the direct loss of spending at between $14.3 billion and $42.9 billion increasing to between $33.0 billion and $99.0 billion after including the indirect and

---


\(^{120}\) Reduced international visitors are based on 79.2 million international person-trips that traveled to the United States in 2019 (defined as one person on a trip away from home overnight in paid accommodations, or on a day or overnight trip to places 50 miles or more, one-way, away from home). Limiting to leisure travelers (68%) and removing those visiting friends and family (21.6%) yields 42.5 million person-trips. Based on survey data it is assumed that 53% of these visitors are highly food motivated, and of those, 72% choose travel destinations based on food and drink offerings. To be conservative, we further assume that only half of these 16.2 million highly culinary-motivated visitors would consider substituting another country for their tourism in lieu of the United States and the percentage of these visitors that would change their travel plans in any month is proportional to the percentage of independent restaurants that are closed in that month, such that, for example, if 25% of independent restaurants are closed in a given month (net of any new restaurants that may have replaced them), then 25% will change their travel plans. The three scenarios assume that absent the Stabilization Fund in the initial month of travel return either 25%, 50%, or 75% of independent restaurants would be permanently closed, and for all three scenarios it is assumed that it will take 36 months for new restaurants to fully replace the closed restaurants. Over the three years a total of 3.1 million, 6.2 million and 9.4 million person-trips will be foregone in the three scenarios, respectively. It is important to note that the 6.2 million visitors in the middle scenario averages to 2.1 million incremental fewer person-trips a year, or only 2.6% of the 79.2 million international person-trips in 2019. Finally, the lost spending is based on an average spend of $1,952 by international tourists to the United States (including travelers from Canada and Mexico). Sources: “U.S. Travel and Tourism Overview (2019),” *U.S. Travel Association*, March 2020, [https://www.ustravel.org/system/files/media_root/document/Research_Fact-Sheet_US-Travel-and-Tourism-Overview.pdf](https://www.ustravel.org/system/files/media_root/document/Research_Fact-Sheet_US-Travel-and-Tourism-Overview.pdf); “2019 Profile of Overseas Travelers,” *U.S. Department of Commerce, National Travel and Tourism Office* (accessed May 26, 2020); “2020 Food Travel Trends,” *World Food Travel Association*, [https://worldfoodtravel.org/what-is-food-tourism-definition-food-tourism/](https://worldfoodtravel.org/what-is-food-tourism-definition-food-tourism/) (accessed May 26, 2020).
induced multiplier impact.\textsuperscript{121} In total, the loss of economic activity due to diminished culinary-motivated travelers\textsuperscript{122} is between $47.1 billion and $141.2 billion over the three year period.\textsuperscript{123}

**Figure 18: Spending and Indirect Economic Activity Loss from Culinary-Motivated Travelers Over Assumed Three Year Restaurant Recovery Period**

![Figure 18](https://www.ustravel.org/system/files/media_root/document/Research_Fact-Sheet_US-Travel-and-Tourism-Overview.pdf)

\textsuperscript{121} Reduced domestic travelers are based on 2.3 billion person-trips within the United States in 2019 (defined as one person on a trip away from home overnight in paid accommodations, or on a day or overnight trip to places 50 miles or more, one-way, away from home). Limiting to leisure travelers (80%) and removing those visiting friends and family (50%) gives 926.8 million domestic leisure person trips. The assumption that 50% of domestic person-trips are to visit friends and relatives is conservative, since, by way of comparison, the U.S. Department of Commerce data on U.S. travelers going overseas shows that 30% of these travelers are visiting friends and relatives. Based on survey data, is assumed that 53% of these visitors are highly food motivated and that 72% of these choose travel destinations based on food and drink offerings. We further assume that if these travelers did change their destination plans due to restaurant closures, a quarter would choose not to travel within the United States. As with the international travelers, we assume that if 25% of independent restaurants were closed in a given month, 25% of these travelers would choose not to travel. The three scenarios assume that absent the Stabilization Fund in the initial month of travel return either 25%, 50%, or 75% of independent restaurants would be permanently closed, and for all three scenarios it is assumed that it will take 36 months for new restaurants to fully replace the closed restaurants. Over the three years a total of 34.1 million, 68.2 million and 102.2 million person trips will be foregone in the three scenarios, respectively. It is important to note that the 68.2 million person-trips in the middle scenario averages to 22.7 million person-trips a year, or only 1.0% of the 2.3 billion domestic person-trips taken in 2019. Finally, the lost spending is based on an average spend of $420 on each trip. Sources: “U.S. Travel and Tourism Overview (2019),” U.S. Travel Association, March 2020, https://www.ustravel.org/system/files/media_root/document/Research_Fact-Sheet_US-Travel-and-Tourism-Overview.pdf; “U.S. Travel Answer Sheet,” U.S. Travel Association, March 2020, https://www.ustravel.org/system/files/media_root/document/Research_Fact-Sheet.US-Travel-Answer-Sheet.pdf; “Market Profile: U.S. Travelers for Leisure and VFR,” U.S. Department of Commerce, National Travel and Tourism Office (accessed May 26, 2020); “2020 Food Travel Trends,” World Food Travel Association, https://worldfoodtravel.org/what-is-food-tourism-definition-food-tourism/ (accessed May 26, 2020).

\textsuperscript{122} The decrease in person-trips over the three years in the three scenarios are 37.2 million, 74.4 million, and 111.6 million people, respectively, or an annual average of 12.4 million, 24.8 million and 37.2 million person-trips which is equivalent to 0.5%, 1.0%, and 1.6% of 2019 person trips.

\textsuperscript{123} If the recovery takes five years, the total loss of spending increases to $77.6 billion, $155.2 billion, and $232.8 billion, for the 25%, 50%, and 75% scenarios, respectively.
f) In Addition to the Primary Economic Benefits, The Restaurant Stabilization Fund Will Jumpstart the Economy and Result In Secondary GDP Spillovers of over $65 billion in 2021 and 2022

The primary quantifiable benefits of the Restaurant Stabilization Fund, namely (1) the direct quantifiable benefits to the U.S. Treasury and state treasuries (in the form of additional taxes and reduced unemployment claims), (2) the short-term supply chain benefits and additional consumer spending, and (3) the trailing effect through additional supply chain benefits, additional sales tax revenue, and additional tourism arising from the stabilization of the industry, range from $183 billion (under the assumption that $40 billion of the Fund is used to rehire workers earlier than they otherwise would be rehired) to $206 billion (under the assumption that $60 billion of the Fund is used to rehire workers earlier than they otherwise would be rehired).

Even though these primary economic impacts are substantial, they still dramatically understate the true and full economic benefit of the Stabilization Fund the U.S. economy. This is because the primary economic impacts quantified above do not capture the secondary spillover benefits that a healthy independent restaurant industry brings to the economy. By avoiding the vicious downward economic cycle that could result in the absence of the Stabilization Fund, as described in Section 4.a) above and instead instilling confidence in consumers in the health of the economy, the stabilization fund has the potential to create secondary GDP spillovers as the economy embarks on a more robust recovery—filled with face-to-face meetings over meals, vibrant communities, culinary and cultural experiences, social and family gatherings, wedding, anniversary, birthday, and graduation celebrations, and robust supply chains of small businesses—creating substantial economic benefits. If the Stabilization Fund speeds up the path to economic recovery by as little as two tenths of one percentage point of GDP in 2021 and by one tenth of one point of GDP in 2022,124 the Fund will pay additional economic dividends equal to $43 billion in 2021 and $22 billion in 2022. The primary quantifiable benefits and the secondary GDP impact are summarized in Figure 19 (under the assumption that $60 billion of the Fund is used to rehire workers earlier than they otherwise would be rehired) and Figure 20 (under the assumption that $40 billion of the Fund is used to rehire workers earlier than they otherwise would be rehired) below.

---

124 To put this in context, real GDP contracted 4.8% in Q1 and, based on information available about the economy through May 12, the CBO projects a 37.7% contraction in Q2 (quarter-over-quarter annual rate). See “Interim Economic Projections for 2020 and 2021,” CBO, May 2020, https://www.cbo.gov/system/files/2020-05/56351-CBO-interim-projections.pdf.
Figure 19: Summary of Primary and Secondary Quantifiable Benefits to U.S. Treasury, State Treasuries, and the U.S. Economy from the $120 Billion Restaurant Stabilization Fund (Assuming $60 Billion of Fund Used to Rehire Workers)

Notes: Assumes $60 billion of the Restaurant Stabilization Fund is spent on re-hiring workers earlier than they otherwise would be re-hired. See Figure 1 for other assumptions regarding consumer spending, restaurant closures, and contribution to U.S. GDP.

Figure 20: Summary of Primary and Secondary Quantifiable Benefits to U.S. Treasury, State Treasuries, and the U.S. Economy from the $120 Billion Restaurant Stabilization Fund (Assuming $40 Billion of Fund Used to Rehire Workers)

Notes: Assumes $40 billion of the Restaurant Stabilization Fund is spent on re-hiring workers earlier than they otherwise would be re-hired. See Figure 1 for other assumptions regarding consumer spending, restaurant closures, and contribution to U.S. GDP.
The quantified benefits, including direct supply chain, induced spending, and secondary GDP benefits will accrue in every State and county. Indeed, the economic benefits accrue throughout the country in both big cities and small communities as shown in Figure 21, (under the assumption that $60 billion of the Fund is used to rehire workers earlier than they otherwise would be rehired) and Figure 22, (under the assumption that $40 billion of the Fund is used to rehire workers earlier than they otherwise would be rehired).

**Figure 21: Primary and Secondary Benefits per Capita by County**
**(Assuming $60 Billion of Fund Used to Rehire Workers)**

Notes: Assumes $60 billion of the Restaurant Stabilization Fund is spent on re-hiring workers earlier than they otherwise would be re-hired. See Figure 1 for other assumptions regarding consumer spending, restaurant closures, and contribution to U.S. GDP.
5. Conclusions

Ensuring the viability of this country’s independent restaurants with an infusion of $120 billion of desperately needed back-stop grants through the Stabilization Fund is a clear-cut way to address a substantial amount of the damage the virus has rapidly inflicted on the U.S. economy. At a high level, the Fund would:

- Cement employment opportunity for up to 11 million people directly and over 5 million more indirectly through supply chains;
- Reduce single-handedly the unemployment rate by 2.4 percentage points;
- Underwrite the nexus between independent restaurants and supply chain purveyors, thereby helping to avoid countless small business bankruptcies;
- Support small businesses that contribute heavily to more than $760 billion in annual sales in the broader restaurant economy, and are part and parcel to the travel, leisure and hospitality industries—the largest segment of the U.S. economy;
- Stabilize the commercial real estate market by ensuring restaurants can pay rent; and


Notes: Assumes $40 billion of the Restaurant Stabilization Fund is spent on re-hiring workers earlier than they otherwise would be re-hired. See Figure 1 for other assumptions regarding consumer spending, restaurant closures, and contribution to U.S. GDP.
• Jumpstart further economic recovery by repairing consumer confidence.

In turn, the Stabilization Fund is “fully funded” and would (i) create an estimated $47 to $69 billion in direct quantifiable benefits to the U.S. Treasury and state and local governments by yearend via reduced state unemployment insurance claims, reduced federal pandemic unemployment compensation, increase social security and Medicare tax contributions, increased state unemployment insurance tax contributions, and increase state sales tax collections; (ii) generate over $20 billion in additional consumer spending in the U.S economy by yearend due to supply chain benefits and higher restaurant and supply chain employee disposable income; (iii) cause an estimated $114 billion primary benefits after 2020 through additional trailing supply chain benefits, sales tax revenue and tourism; and (iv) result in secondary GDP spillovers of more than $65 billion in 2021 and 2022—in all upwards of $248 billion in estimated primary benefits and secondary GDP benefits, more than double the amount of the proposed grant.

The United States is at a crossroads in terms of how its citizens consume food. If a substantial portion of independent restaurants fail by yearend, consumption will largely be limited to homecooked meals, chain restaurants, or fast food. In addition to shrinking palates, cities and neighborhoods will suffer identity crises and lose much of the magnetism that attracts in-state and out-of-state visitors. What is Philadelphia without its cheesesteak spots, Memphis without its barbecue joints, or Austin without its food trucks? How will food tourism to Asheville, Traverse City, or Savannah decline without their award winning and/or perennially popular restaurants or microbreweries? What will become of the hospitality and leisure industries if there are few independent restaurant and bar options in and around Florida resorts, Charleston plantations, or New England bed-and-breakfasts? How will music festivals in New Orleans and Nashville change without the accompanying unique dining or drinking experiences? Moreover, without unique dining-out options, how will it detract from celebrating life’s milestones, such as birthdays, graduations, promotions, engagements, or weddings? What will the social landscape be without opportunity to get together with friends, go on a date, observe holidays, watch sports games, or convene recreation teams at local independent restaurants? And would we, in general, find adequate substitutes for experiencing and learning about other cultures? These are few of many questions the country will be forced to confront if independent restaurants do not receive additional financial assistance to help bridge the battle with the novel coronavirus.
At its fundamental core, the Fund would not only be good for broader economic recovery and play a significant role in preserving the way we experienced and shared life before the virus, the allocation of its grants would also be an investment in the millions of Americans for whom the industry is a platform for opportunity, stability, creativity, tradition, leadership, or entrepreneurship, and in the many who in their embrace of the industry have found the American Dream.
Appendix A: Sample of Independent Restaurants That Have Already Permanently Closed as of May 29, 2020

1. Last Frontier Bar, Anchorage, AK
2. Momma O's Seafood Restaurant, Anchorage, AK
3. Babalu, Birmingham, AL
4. Brio, Birmingham, AL
5. Mile End Deli, Birmingham, AL
6. Z's Restaurant, Birmingham, AL
7. Mirko Pasta, Mobile, AL
8. 301 Bistro, Tuscaloosa, AL
9. The Downtown Pub, Tuscaloosa, AL
10. The Levee Bar & Grill, Tuscaloosa, AL
11. Wilhagan's Grille & Tap Room, Tuscaloosa, AL
13. RedBeards BurgerBar, Jonesboro, AR
14. Loca Luna, Little Rock, AR
15. Shogun Steakhouse, Little Rock, AR
16. Soul Fish, Little Rock, AR
17. Teakwoods Tavern and Grill, Chandler, AZ
18. Ella’s Cuisine, Mesa, AZ
20. Caveman Burgers, Phoenix, AZ
21. Delux Grill and Sushi, Phoenix, AZ
22. Lilac Bakery, Phoenix, AZ
23. Mark's Cafe, Tempe, AZ
24. Henry's Cuisine, Alhambra, CA
25. Top Island, Alhambra, CA
26. The Van’s, Belmont, CA
27. Lailme's, Berkeley, CA
28. Tartine, Berkeley, CA
29. Paradise Beach Grille, Capitola, CA
30. Primavera Ristorante, Coronado, CA
31. Blackhawk Grille, Danville, CA
32. Saddle Rack, Fremont, CA
33. Watermarc, Laguna Beach, CA
34. Auburn, Los Angeles, CA
35. Bon Temps, Los Angeles, CA
36. Star's Donuts, Los Angeles, CA
37. Swingers, Los Angeles, CA
38. The Pikey, Los Angeles, CA
39. Nick's Next Door, Los Gatos, CA
40. Seafood Palace, Monterey Park, CA
41. Clarke's Charcoal Broiler, Mountain View, CA
42. Benchmark, Oakland, CA
43. La Guerrer's Kitchen, Oakland, CA
44. Momo & Curry, Oakland, CA
45. Reem's, Oakland, CA
46. The Lede, Oakland, CA
47. The Stork Club, Oakland, CA
48. Sushi Ichi, Pasadena, CA
49. Station House Cafe, Point Reyes Station, CA
50. Biba Restaurant, Sacramento, CA
51. Casa Sol Y Mar, San Diego, CA
52. Donovan's Steakhouse, San Diego, CA
53. Ebisu Sushi, San Diego, CA
54. Iron Fist Brewing Company, San Diego, CA
55. Mother's Saloon, San Diego, CA
56. Tamarindo Latin Kitchen & Bar, San Diego, CA
57. Toronado, San Diego, CA
58. Troy's Family Restaurant, San Diego, CA
59. Whisknladle, San Diego, CA
60. Archive Bar and Kitchen, San Francisco, CA
61. Blind Cat, San Francisco, CA
62. Hillside Supper Club, San Francisco, CA
63. Janchay's Bistro, San Francisco, CA
64. Locanda, San Francisco, CA
65. Ristorante Franchino, San Francisco, CA
66. The Grove, San Francisco, CA
67. Thieves Tavern, San Francisco, CA
68. Emperor Norton's, San Jose, CA
69. Cleophus Quealy Beer Company, San Leandro, CA
70. Voignier, San Mateo, CA
71. Bamboo Sushi, San Ramon, CA
72. Chuck's of Hawaii, Santa Barbara, CA
73. Endless Summer, Santa Barbara, CA
74. The Whole Pie, Santa Rosa, CA
75. Sunrise cafe, Vista, CA
76. Kline's Beer Hall, Arvada, CO
77. Iron Bird, Colorado Springs, CO
78. Western Omelette, Colorado Springs, CO
79. 12@Madison, Denver, CO
80. 20th Street Cafe, Denver, CO
81. Biju's Little Curry Shop, Denver, CO
82. Euclid Hall, Denver, CO
83. La Cour Denver's Art Bar, Denver, CO
84. Maddie's Biergarten, Denver, CO
85. Next Stop Brewing, Denver, CO
86. Racines, Denver, CO
87. Scratch Burrito, Denver, CO
88. The Market, Denver, CO
89. Tom's Diner, Denver, CO
90. Sugar House, Eaton, CO
91. Nomad Micro Pizzeria, Fort Collins, CO
92. Gorilla Alchemy Brewing, Fort Lupton, CO
93. Veteran Brothers Brewing Co., Johnstown, CO
94. Walrus + Carpenter, Bridgeport, CT
95. 121 Restaurant, Oxford, CT
96. Geno's Grill, Storrs, CT
97. Campone, Washington, DC
98. Mokomandy, Washington, DC
99. Momofuku CCDC, Washington, DC
100. Montmartre, Washington, DC
201. Sinking Ship, Indianapolis, IN
202. Slimm’s Pizza and Salads, Indianapolis, IN
203. Stacked Pickle, Indianapolis, IN
204. The Mug, Indianapolis, IN
205. Kobe Japanese Steakhouse, Jeffersonville, IN
206. MCL Bakery and Restaurant, West Lafayette, IN
207. Bliss Artisan, Henderson, KY
208. Athenian Grill, Lexington, KY
209. Atomic Ramen, Lexington, KY
210. Barn at the Summit, Lexington, KY
211. China Inn, Louisville, KY
212. Ostra, Louisville, KY
213. Senor Iguanas, Louisville, KY
214. Athenian Grill, Lexington, KY
215. Atomic Ramen, Lexington, KY
216. Verbena Cafe, Louisville, KY
217. Rama, Baton Rouge, LA
218. The Rum House, Baton Rouge, LA
219. White Star, Baton Rouge, LA
220. Copeland’s Cheesecake Bistro, Bossier City, LA
221. Gullo’s Market, Bossier City, LA
222. Satterfield’s, New Roads, LA
223. Glenwood Tea Room, Shreveport, LA
224. Habaneros, Shreveport, LA
225. Artu, Boston, MA
226. Coda Bar & Kitchen, Boston, MA
227. Stella Restaurant and Bar, Boston, MA
228. Cuchi Cuchi, Cambridge, MA
229. Restaurant Dante, Cambridge, MA
230. The Automatic, Cambridge, MA
231. The Table at Season to Taste, Cambridge, MA
232. Veggie Galaxy, Cambridge, MA
233. Morano Gelato, Chestnut Hill, MA
234. Hattapon’s Thai Kitchen, Greenfield, MA
235. White Hut, West Springfield, MA
236. Wexford House, Worcester, MA
237. Alexander Brown Restaurant, Baltimore, MD
238. City Cafe, Baltimore, MD
239. George’s Chophouse, Bethesda, MD
240. Doner Bistro, Frederick, MD
241. Benchwarmer’s Sports Pub, Brunswick, ME
242. Arabica Coffee, Portland, ME
243. LB Kitchen, Portland, ME
244. Uncle Andy’s Diner, Portland, ME
245. The Tilted Kilt Pub, South Portland, ME
246. Wilma’s, Ann Arbor, MI
247. Fireside Grill, Dimondale, MI
248. For Crepe’s Sake, Lansing, MI
249. Frandor’s Deli, Lansing, MI
250. Mijo’s Diner, Lansing, MI
251. The Brunch House, Lansing, MI
252. Blue Grill, Milford, MI
253. Hopcat, Royal Oak, MI
254. Town Tavern, Royal Oak, MI
255. Vivo Kitchen, Apple Valley, MN
256. Bonfire, Blaine, MN
257. Bonfire, Eagan, MN
258. Bonfire, Mankato, MN
259. 4 Bells, Minneapolis, MN
260. A Cupcake Social, Minneapolis, MN
261. Bar Luchador, Minneapolis, MN
262. Burger Jones, Minneapolis, MN
263. Egg & I Diner, Minneapolis, MN
264. El Burrito, Minneapolis, MN
265. fig + farro, Minneapolis, MN
266. Marvel Bar, Minneapolis, MN
267. Moose & Sadie’s, Minneapolis, MN
268. Muddy Waters, Minneapolis, MN
269. NE Arcade, Minneapolis, MN
270. Sleepy V’s, Minneapolis, MN
271. The Bachelor Farmer, Minneapolis, MN
272. Bonfire, Savage, MN
273. Cleveland Wok, St. Paul, MN
274. Izzy’s Ice Cream, St. Paul, MN
275. Pazzaluna, St. Paul, MN
276. Bonfire, Woodbury, MN
277. Twin Peaks, Chesterfield, MO
278. Five Star Burgers, Clayton, MO
279. Cork wine bar, Ferguson, MO
280. Saint Louis Pizza and Wings, Florissant, MO
281. Angelo’s Chicago Taste, Hazelwood, MO
282. Hogshead, Kansas City, MO
283. Nick and Jake’s, Kansas City, MO
284. Plaza, Kansas City, MO
285. Webster House, Kansas City, MO
286. The Dubliner, Maplewood, MO
287. Bobo Noodle House, St. Louis, MO
288. Gamlin Whiskey House, St. Louis, MO
289. Ready room, St. Louis, MO
290. Ryder’s Tavern, St. Louis, MO
291. STL Sunrise Cafe, St. Louis, MO
292. Sub Zero Vodka Bar, St. Louis, MO
293. Tavolo, St. Louis, MO
294. Barley & Vine, Bozeman, MT
295. Saffron Table, Bozeman, MT
296. Starky’s Authentic Americana, Bozeman, MT
297. Kipos, Chapel Hill, NC
298. Summit Room, Charlotte, NC
299. The Boiler Room, Kinston, NC
300. Trail Irish Pub, Morrison, NC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Restaurant Name</th>
<th>City, State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>301</td>
<td>Cameron Bar and Grill</td>
<td>Raleigh, NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>302</td>
<td>Chuck's Burgers</td>
<td>Raleigh, NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>303</td>
<td>Gateway Restaurant</td>
<td>Raleigh, NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>304</td>
<td>Linus &amp; Pepper's</td>
<td>Raleigh, NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>305</td>
<td>Liquid State</td>
<td>Raleigh, NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>306</td>
<td>Oakwood Cafe</td>
<td>Raleigh, NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307</td>
<td>Pharaoh's</td>
<td>Raleigh, NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>308</td>
<td>Trophy Tap &amp; Table</td>
<td>Raleigh, NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>309</td>
<td>Virgil's Original Taqueria</td>
<td>Raleigh, NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Native Kitchen and Social Pub</td>
<td>Swannanoa, NC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>Humpback Sallys</td>
<td>Bismarck, ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>313</td>
<td>Flatiron Cafe</td>
<td>Omaha, NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>314</td>
<td>Morano Gelato</td>
<td>Hanover, NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>The Joinery</td>
<td>Newmarket, NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>316</td>
<td>Lure Bar</td>
<td>Portsmouth, NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>317</td>
<td>Shoodac's</td>
<td>Warner, NH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>318</td>
<td>Jake's</td>
<td>Flemington, NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>319</td>
<td>Cooperage</td>
<td>Albuquerque, NM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320</td>
<td>Henderson's Served</td>
<td>Henderson, NV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>321</td>
<td>Ricardo's</td>
<td>Las Vegas, NV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>322</td>
<td>4th St. Bistro</td>
<td>Reno, NV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>323</td>
<td>The Chef and the Cook</td>
<td>Baldwinsville, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>324</td>
<td>Blue Ribbon Fried Chicken</td>
<td>Brooklyn, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>325</td>
<td>Cherry Point</td>
<td>Brooklyn, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>326</td>
<td>Green Grape Annex</td>
<td>Brooklyn, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>327</td>
<td>Wolf and Lamb Steakhouse</td>
<td>Brooklyn, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>328</td>
<td>The Irish Cottage</td>
<td>Forest Hills, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>329</td>
<td>Beyoglu</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>330</td>
<td>Bistro Cassis</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>331</td>
<td>Coogan's</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>332</td>
<td>Daddy-O</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>333</td>
<td>Effy's</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>334</td>
<td>Gem Spa</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>335</td>
<td>Gimme Coffee</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>336</td>
<td>Gotham Bar &amp; Grill</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>337</td>
<td>Jewel Bako</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>338</td>
<td>Lucky Strike</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>339</td>
<td>Momofuku Nishi</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>340</td>
<td>Pegu Club</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>341</td>
<td>Randall's</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>342</td>
<td>Takashi</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>343</td>
<td>The Irish Cottage</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>344</td>
<td>The Paris Cafe</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>345</td>
<td>Toro</td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>346</td>
<td>Woodhaven House</td>
<td>Rego Park, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>347</td>
<td>Illium Cafe &amp; Bistro</td>
<td>Troy, NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>348</td>
<td>The Rail</td>
<td>Canton, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>349</td>
<td>Parker's Blue Ash</td>
<td>Cincinnati, OH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>350</td>
<td>Spice Kitchen &amp; Bar</td>
<td>Cleveland, OH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
401. Cane Rhum Bar & Caribbean Kitchen, Charleston, SC
402. McCrady's, Charleston, SC
403. Minero, Charleston, SC
404. Nana's Seafood and Soul, Charleston, SC
405. Old Town, Charleston, SC
406. Parcel 32, Charleston, SC
407. Copper River Grill, Columbia, SC
408. Uncle Louie's, Columbia, SC
409. Crepe du Jour, Greenville, SC
410. Rudy M. Navarette's Tex-Mexican Restaurant, Sioux Falls, SD
411. RJ's Courtyard, Alcoa, TN
412. Babalu Tacos & Tapas, Knoxville, TN
413. Green's Tavern, Knoxville, TN
414. Sanctuary Vegan Café, Knoxville, TN
415. Rendezvous, Loudon, TN
416. Avenue Coffee, Memphis, TN
417. Farm & Fries, Memphis, TN
418. Grove Grill, Memphis, TN
419. Sar Shack, Memphis, TN
420. Strano, Memphis, TN
421. Aladdin's Hookah Bar & Lounge, Nashville, TN
422. Antonios' of Nashville, Nashville, TN
423. Café Coco, Nashville, TN
424. Rudie's Seafood & Sausage, Nashville, TN
425. The Garden Brunch Cafe, Nashville, TN
426. Poynor's Pommes Frites, Pigeon Forge, TN
427. Courthouse Donuts, Sevierville, TN
428. Village Cafe and Grill, South Knoxville, TN
429. The Ranch Steak and Seafood, Atlanta, TX
430. Blue Dahlia, Austin, TX
431. Bout Time 2, Austin, TX
432. Buzz Mill Shady, Austin, TX
433. Chocolaterie Tessa, Austin, TX
434. Enchiladas Y Mas, Austin, TX
435. Fricano's Deli, Austin, TX
436. Lucy's Fried Chicken, Austin, TX
437. Magnolia Cafe, Austin, TX
438. North by Northwest Brewing Co., Austin, TX
439. NXNW Restaurant and Brewery, Austin, TX
440. Shady Grove, Austin, TX
441. Threadgill's, Austin, TX
442. Veracruz, Austin, TX
443. Yuyo, Austin, TX
444. Bernie's Burger Bus, Bellaire, TX
445. Chicken Scratch, Dallas, TX
446. Dakota's Steakhouse, Dallas, TX
447. Eastside Social, Dallas, TX
448. Five Sixty, Dallas, TX
449. Highland Park Cafeteria, Dallas, TX
450. Jake's Burgers, Dallas, TX
451. Lizard Lounge, Dallas, TX
452. Mercy Wine Bar, Dallas, TX
453. Ross & Hall Beer Garten, Dallas, TX
454. Start, Dallas, TX
455. Sushi Bayashi, Dallas, TX
456. The Lot, Dallas, TX
457. YaYa Best Tex-Mex Yogurt, Dallas, TX
458. Bird Cafe, Fort Worth, TX
459. Da Mario, Frisco, TX
460. Barry's Pizza, Houston, TX
461. Ragin Cajun, Houston, TX
462. Treebeards, Houston, TX
463. Hamburger Bar, Palestine, TX
464. Wa Kubota, Plano, TX
465. Big Cheese Pizza, Texarkana, TX
466. Cattleman's Steakhouse, Texarkana, TX
467. Serving Time Cafe, Draper, UT
468. Elevo, Salt Lake City, UT
469. Five Sushi Brothers, Salt Lake City, UT
470. Pourhouse, Norfolk, VA
471. Saint Germain, Norfolk, VA
472. Citizen, Richmond, VA
473. Tijuana Flats, Richmond, VA
474. Wall Street Tavern, Roanoke, VA
475. Good Day Cafe, Vergennes, VT
476. Il Corvo, Seattle, WA
477. Adana, Seattle, WA
478. Arriba Cantina, Seattle, WA
479. Bisato, Seattle, WA
480. Branchwater, Seattle, WA
481. Burgundian, Seattle, WA
482. Cursed Oak, Seattle, WA
483. Hecho, Seattle, WA
484. Local 360, Seattle, WA
485. Pinxto, Seattle, WA
486. Pyramid Brewing, Seattle, WA
487. The Brooklyn, Seattle, WA
488. River Rock Taphouse, Spokane, WA
489. Sapphire Lounge, Spokane, WA
490. Tomato Street, Spokane, WA
491. Low Bar, Vancouver, WA
492. Jack-Sons Sports Bar and ClubHouse Lounge, Yakima, WA
493. Schreiner's, Fond du Lac, WI
494. The Cannery, Green Bay, WI
495. Tabby's Caffe, Menomonie, WI
496. Johnny V's Classic Café, Milwaukee, WI
497. Between the Lakes, Okaukuejo, WI
498. Blue's Egg, Shorewood, WI
499. Rollin Smoke BBQ, Charleston, WV
500. Mouthful, Casper, WY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>2019 (Millions)</th>
<th>2021 (Millions)</th>
<th>2022 (Millions)</th>
<th>2023 (Millions)</th>
<th>2024 (Millions)</th>
<th>Total (Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$674.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$674.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$674.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$674.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$674.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$674.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$674.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$674.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$674.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$674.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$674.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(assuming $60 Billion of fund used to replace workers)

Appendix B: Table of Economic Impact of Stabilization Fund by State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>2019 (Millions)</th>
<th>2021 (Millions)</th>
<th>2022 (Millions)</th>
<th>2023 (Millions)</th>
<th>2024 (Millions)</th>
<th>Total (Millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$674.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$674.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$674.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$674.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$674.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$674.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$674.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$674.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$674.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$674.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$134.8</td>
<td>$674.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(assuming $60 Billion of fund used to replace workers)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Spending by Trailing State ($ millions)</th>
<th>Induced Additional Billion of Fund Used to Rehire Workers (Assuming $10,000)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>1,285.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>2,348.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>1,625.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>1,986.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>3,048.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>1,308.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>2,186.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>2,348.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>5,000.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>3,408.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>2,908.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>1,348.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>1,208.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>3,808.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>2,908.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>1,748.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1,448.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>2,748.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>3,808.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>1,748.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>4,908.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>3,908.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>3,708.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>2,408.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>2,708.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>3,908.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>1,708.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>1,408.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>3,108.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>2,008.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>3,908.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>2,908.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>4,908.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>3,608.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>1,708.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>3,108.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>2,608.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>3,708.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>4,408.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>2,208.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>4,808.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>1,408.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>3,208.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>4,508.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>2,008.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>2,108.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>4,808.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>3,308.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>3,208.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>1,808.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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