



Cost-Benefit and Fiscal Impact Analysis of Hawai‘i’s Film Tax Credit in 2022



Image by Gerd Altmann from Pixabay

Research and Economic Analysis Division
Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism
STATE OF HAWAII
February 2024



This report was produced by the Research and Economic Analysis Division (READ) of the Department of Business, Economic Development & Tourism (DBEDT). It was prepared by Rene Kamita, Ph.D., Economist, and Naomi Akamine, Economist, under the direction of Eugene Tian, Ph.D., Economic Research Administrator.



Hawaii Department of Business, Economic Development & Tourism
February 2024

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	2
I. Introduction	4
II. Film Productions' Expenditures and Employment.....	6
Hawai'i qualified expenditures of film productions and claimed tax credits	6
Qualified expenditures on goods and services	9
Qualified expenditures on wage and salary payments.....	10
Hiring of film productions	11
Length of production duration by stage	13
Average earnings of the film production jobs incentivized by the film tax credit.....	14
III. An Economy-Wide Cost-Benefit Analysis of the Film Tax Credit	15
Benefits of the Film Tax Credit.....	16
Wages and salaries paid to local workers.....	16
Hawai'i spending of out-of-state workers while filming in Hawai'i.....	16
Production spending on goods and services in Hawai'i.....	18
Hawai'i Film Office spending on managing the film tax credit	18
Costs of the Film Tax Credit	20
IV. A Fiscal Impact Analysis of the Film Tax Credit	20
State Revenues from the Film Productions	22
Wages and salaries paid to local workers.....	22
Wages and salaries paid to out-of-state workers	22
Production spending on goods and services in Hawai'i.....	22
Production spending on imports and out-of-state services	22
Hawai'i Film Office spending on managing the film tax credit	22
State Spending on the Film Tax Credit.....	23
Net State Spending on the Film Tax Credit	23
V. Conclusion.....	23
Appendix A: Literature Review	25
Appendix B: References	28
Appendix C: The Cost of Providing Public Services to the State Government.....	31

Executive Summary

Hawai‘i offers tax incentives to encourage the growth of the film industry in the state through the Motion Picture, Digital Media, and Film Production Income Tax Credit (“film tax credit”). In 2022, the film tax credit program was allocated up to \$50 million in tax incentives. Once the \$50 million aggregate figure has been reached, film productions may claim any excess credits in the subsequent year. This study assesses the film tax credit program from two perspectives: (1) an economy-wide cost-benefit analysis based on gross domestic product (GDP) and earnings; and (2) from the State government cost-benefit perspective as measured by state tax revenues.

Earnings are the sum of wage and salary disbursements, supplements to wages and salaries, and proprietors' income. Earnings are embedded in GDP and state taxes are embedded in earnings and GDP. These measures cannot be added up since they are different indicators from different perspectives.

The analyses were based on the granular data collected by Hawai‘i Film Office through the Hawai‘i Production Report (HPR) forms. In 2022, 26 productions qualified and submitted claims for \$68.0 million in film tax credits, with their qualified expenditures amounting to \$333.7 million. Hawai‘i residents received \$91.0 million in wage and salary payments, accounting for 27.3 percent of total qualified expenditures. About 35 percent, or \$116.5 million was spent on wage and salary payments to non-resident cast and crew.

Expenditures on goods and services paid to Hawai‘i-based businesses was \$118.3 million (35.4 percent) of the total qualified expenditures, while out-of-state purchases accounted for 2.4 percent, or \$7.9 million. Out of the \$333.7 million in total qualified expenditures, the total leakage of film production spending is estimated to be \$99.1 million, which is the sum of wage and salary payments to non-resident workers and spending on out-of-state goods and services minus out-of-state workers' spending in Hawai‘i.

An economy-wide cost-benefit analysis looks at how direct spending by film productions has multiplier impacts throughout the economy and increases earnings and GDP. Meanwhile, it also takes into account the opportunity cost, or the foregone benefits if the amount of the film tax credit were spent on other government projects. The fiscal impact analysis evaluates how the film tax credit results in additional tax revenues and expenditures for the state. These two analyses are conducted under two scenarios.

Production expenditures by category in 2022 (in millions of dollars)	
1. Wages & salaries to local workers	\$91.0
2. Wages & salaries to out-of-state workers	\$116.5
3. Spending on goods & services in Hawai‘i	\$118.3
Construction	\$5.9
Equipment rentals	\$33.8
Purchase of materials	\$18.2
Warehouse/storage	\$2.7
Business/professional service	\$25.8
F&B catering	\$7.5
Hotel/accommodation	\$11.4
Others	\$13.0
4. Spending on out-of-state goods & services	\$7.9
Total qualified production expenditures	\$333.7

Scenario #1 Assumptions:

1. All of the film productions that received the credit would not have filmed in Hawai‘i in the absence of the tax credit. This assumption illustrates the maximum economic benefit of the film tax credit.
2. Without the film tax credit, the State government would spend the same amount either on capital improvement projects (CIP) or supporting other industries. Given the complexities of state budgets, this study assumes that the State would spend the same amount on CIP.
3. While studies of film-induced tourism and Hawai‘i visitor survey data indicate that filming is influential in drawing visitors to Hawai‘i, these impacts are the result of cumulative years of television and movies filmed in the State. It is likely that television programs and movies filmed in 2022, including productions that did not receive the tax credit, may influence visitors in future years. The impact of television program and movie filming on tourism is not included in this report, however, the cumulative impacts of filming on tourism in 2022 may be found in DBEDT’s report *The Impacts of the Film Industry on 2022 Tourism in Hawai‘i*.¹
4. Out-of-state below-the-line workers stay in Hawai‘i through the entire filming period and their daily spending followed the same pattern as U.S. visitors in 2022.
5. Above-the-line workers’ local expenses – including in-state travel, food, lodging, entertainment, and ancillary expenses – are included in the spending categories of vendor and services.
6. Charitable contributions such as education and workforce development contributions and other non-qualified expenses by film producers are not included in the calculations.

Scenario #2 Assumptions:

1. The redundancy assumption: a portion of the film production expenditures would have occurred even without the tax incentives and are thus subtracted from the calculation of the economic and fiscal impacts. This study assumes that the redundant portion equals to the 10-year average of expenditures from 1987 to 1996 before the film tax credit was introduced in 1997. Adjusting for inflation, it amounts to \$97.6 million in 2022 dollars.

2-6.: Same as in Scenario #1.

Results:

Indicators	Scenario #1: without the redundancy assumption		Scenario #2: with the redundancy assumption	
	Net increase	Per dollar tax credit	Net increase	Per dollar tax credit
GDP	\$168.8 million	\$2.48	\$97.1 million	\$1.43
Earnings	\$159.2 million	\$2.34	\$99.9 million	\$1.47
State tax revenues	\$35.2 million	\$0.52	\$24.7 million	\$0.36

¹ https://files.hawaii.gov/dbedt/economic/reports/Film_Impacts_on_Tourism_February_2024.pdf

I. Introduction

Effective for taxable years beginning January 1, 1997, Hawai‘i enacted tax incentives for motion picture and television film production, creating a 4 percent income tax credit of the costs incurred in the State in the production of motion picture or television films and a 6 percent credit of actual expenditures for transient accommodations². The film tax credit is refundable; in other words, if the tax credit exceeds the taxpayer’s income tax liability, the excess of credits over liability shall be refunded to the taxpayer. Since then, Hawai‘i’s film tax credit was codified in section 235-17, Hawai‘i Revised Statutes (HRS), as part of Hawai‘i’s income tax law. In 1999, the film tax credit increased from 6 percent to 7.25 percent of actual expenditures for transient accommodations³.

Several key features of the film tax credit were amended in 2006.⁴ The amendments significantly increased the tax credit to 15 percent of the qualified production costs incurred on Oahu, and to 20 percent of the qualified production costs on the neighbor islands (Hawai‘i Island, Kaua‘i, Lana‘i, Maui, Molokai), effective beginning on July 1, 2006. To qualify for the tax credit, a production was required to have qualified production costs totaling at least \$200,000 and to make reasonable efforts to hire local talent and crew. An \$8 million per production credit cap was set on total tax credits claimed per qualified production. In addition, the tax credit was renamed the Motion Picture, Digital Media, and Film Production Income Tax Credit (“film tax credit”). In 2013, the film tax credit was further raised to 20 percent on Oahu and 25 percent on the neighbor islands⁵. The per production credit cap was increased to \$15 million. In 2017, a \$35 million annual spending ceiling was also established for the total amount of tax credits that could be claimed in any particular year; once the \$35 million aggregate figure was reached, the excess could be claimed in the subsequent year.⁶ When making a claim for products or services acquired or rendered outside of Hawai‘i, a production is required to provide evidence that reasonable efforts were unsuccessful to procure comparable products or services within Hawai‘i.⁷ The sunset date for the film tax credit was extended to January 1, 2026. On July 10, 2019, Senate Bill 33 became law without Governor’s signature and increased the \$35 million annual rolling cap to \$50 million.⁸

Act 89, SLH 2013 requires the Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism (DBEDT), which administers the film tax credit through the Hawai‘i Film Office⁹, to submit a

² See Act 107, Session Laws of Hawai‘i (SLH) 1997.

³ See Act 156, SLH 1998.

⁴ See Act 88, SLH 2006.

⁵ See Act 89, SLH 2013.

⁶ See Act 143, SLH 2017.

⁷ See Section 235-17(d), HRS, for a full list of qualifications.

⁸ See Act 275, SLH 2019. Effective January 1, 2023, the film tax credit was raised to 22% of qualified production costs on Oahu and 27% of qualified production costs on the neighbor islands. The per production tax credit cap was also increased to \$17 million and the sunset date for the tax credit was extended to January 1, 2033. See Act 217, SLH 2022. [Hawaii Film Office | Incentives & Tax Credits](#).

⁹ The Department of Taxation (DoTAX) and DBEDT, through its Hawai‘i Film Office, are jointly responsible for the administration and implementation of the film tax credit program in the state.

cost benefit analysis of the tax credit, including but not limited to “(1) the total number of full-time, part-time, and contract personnel on the payroll necessary to administer the motion picture, digital media, and film production income tax credit; and (2) the average wage of each of the above listed personnel groups and total earnings for the year.” The Office of the Auditor further recommended that the Film Office “collaborate with READ¹⁰ to identify the specific production information READ needs to prepare a comprehensive cost benefit analysis and/or economic output estimates that account for the different categories of jobs created, salaries and wages of resident and non-resident production hires, and any other relevant information”¹¹.

The rest of the report is structured as follows. Section 2 describes the film productions’ expenditures, employment, and average earnings. Sections 3 and 4 provide the economy-wide cost-benefit analysis of the film tax credit and a Hawai‘i State government fiscal impact analysis, respectively. Section 5 concludes.

¹⁰ Research & Economic Analysis Division, Department of Business, Economic Development & Tourism.


¹¹ Office of the Auditor. (2016, November). *Audit of Hawai‘i’s Motion Picture, Digital Media, and Film Production Income Tax Credit: A Report to the Governor and the Legislature of the State of Hawai‘i* (Special Report No. 16-08).

II. Film Productions' Expenditures and Employment

This report relies on the granular data collected by Hawai‘i Film Office through the Hawai‘i Production Report (HPR) forms. In order to claim the tax credit, film productions are required to submit the HPR forms after qualified production costs were expended. The HPR form is completed on a calendar year basis and includes qualified production costs incurred during the calendar year.¹² After reviewing the HPR form and the independent third-party CPA review of agreed upon procedures, DBEDT sends a certification letter, with which the film production files corporate income tax returns and film credit forms with the Department of Taxation. The Department of Taxation may audit and adjust the tax credit amount to conform to filed information. As such, the amount of expenditures reported on the HPR form may not be the same as the final amount of tax credits received by the film production in the form of reduced income tax or refund. Nevertheless, to the extent that these reported expenditures are close to the final certified amount and that they were already expended and thus made impacts on the state’s economy, this report terms the reported amount on the HPR forms as “qualified expenditures.” The first year for which granular data of film productions’ expenditures became available was 2019.

Hawai‘i qualified expenditures of film productions and claimed tax credits

Figure 1. Hawai‘i film production expenditures: 1976 – 2022



Source: DBEDT, Hawai‘i State Data Book, Hawai‘i Film Office's annual reports to the Legislature.


Before the film tax credit was introduced in 1997, Hawai‘i film production expenditures remained under one hundred million dollars, with the 10-year average of expenditures from 1987 to 1996 at only \$52.7 million. The annual production expenditures began to take off after 1997; and the film industry’s growth accelerated when the tax credit was significantly increased in

¹² If a film production spans two or more years, all fillings and expenditures must be submitted by the calendar year in which they were expended.

2006. Since then, the film production expenditures maintained a fluctuating but steady growth and peaked at \$425.5 million in the year of 2018.

According to the granular data of the HPR forms, 26 productions qualified for the film tax credit in 2022. With qualified expenditures totaling \$333.7 million, the total amount claimed for the tax credit is \$68.0 million (20.4 percent of total qualified expenditures). About 86 percent of expenditures were spent by internet and television related programs and almost 14 percent were spent by feature films. The ratio of claimed tax credit to qualified expenditures was 20.4 percent on average, ranging from 20 percent to 20.4 percent across the types of productions.

Figure 2. Total qualified expenditures and film tax credits claimed by production type in 2022



	Qualified expenditures (\$ Million)	Tax credits (\$ Million)	Ratio of tax credits to qualified expenditures	Count
Short Film/Music				
Video/Commercial	1.12	0.22	20.0%	3
Feature Film	45.9	9.2	20.1%	5
Internet and TV related	286.6	58.6	20.4%	18
All productions	333.7	68.0	20.4%	26

As shown in Figure 3, filming for productions that claimed tax credits in 2022 is largely concentrated on Oahu. Almost 91 percent (\$61.7 million) of the tax credits claimed are for productions that filmed on Oahu. In contrast, productions that filmed on the neighbor islands claimed \$6.3 million of tax credit altogether.

Qualified film production expenditures consist of wages and salaries to cast

and crew, as well as spending on goods and services. Under Hawai‘i law, film production expenditures do not have to be payments to Hawai‘i residents or purchases from Hawai‘i-based businesses in order to qualify for the film tax credit. As long as payments and purchases are subject to Hawai‘i income or general excise tax and are directly associated with a Hawai‘i-based production, they are considered as Hawai‘i spending and eligible for the 20% - 25% film tax credit. To the extent that out-of-state spending has very different economic impacts than expenditures paid to Hawai‘i residents and businesses, it is important to distinguish those out-of-state costs. This distinction is critical to establish a spending base for the following impact analyses.

As shown in Figure 4, about 34.9 percent of total qualified expenditures, or \$116.5 million was spent on wage and salary payments to non-resident cast and crew. Hawai‘i residents received \$91.0 million, accounting for 27.3 percent of total qualified expenditures. Unlike wage payments, the majority of expenditures on goods and services, \$118.3 million, or 35.4 percent of production expenditures, were paid to Hawai‘i-based businesses, while out-of-state purchases only accounted for 2.4 percent, or \$7.9 million. Altogether the total spending on wage payments to non-residents and out-of-state goods and services amounted to 37.3 percent of total qualified spending. This percentage is relatively low compared with other states.

Figure 3. Total Hawai‘i qualified expenditures and claimed tax credits by island in 2022 (in millions of dollars)





Figure 4. Composition of qualified film production expenditures in 2022
(in millions of dollars)



	Hawai'i Residents	Non-Residents	Total
Wages & salaries	91.0	116.5	207.5
Goods & services	Hawai'i businesses	Out-of-state businesses	
	118.3	7.9	126.2
Total	209.2	124.4	333.7

Qualified expenditures on goods and services

Table 1 shows the breakdown of qualified production expenditures on goods and services, with in state and out-of-state purchases reported separately. Not surprisingly, almost all expenditures on warehouse, storage, food and beverage, catering, and accommodations were incurred locally. Two categories which had the lowest ratios of Hawai'i in-state purchases were material purchases (86.4 percent) and construction (87.0 percent). This may be consistent with the boom in Hawaii's construction industry and supply chain disruptions making local resources relatively difficult to retain, and that substitutes for certain equipment or materials are difficult to source locally and therefore had to be imported. That said, over 85 percent of purchases in these categories were from Hawaii businesses, and overall imports and out-of-state purchases only made up 6.3 percent of total production expenditures on goods and services.


It is noteworthy that for highly compensated actors, directors, producers, writers (above-the-line personnel), and their staff, local expenses – including in-state travel, food, lodging, entertainment, and ancillary expenses – are likely to be included in the production expenditures on goods and services. This is an important factor to estimate the local spending of these out-of-state workers in order to gauge the level of the actual spending added to the local economy and to determine a spending base for the impact analyses later.

Table 1. Production expenditures on goods and services by category in 2022 (in thousands of dollars)

	Hawai‘i businesses		Out-of-state businesses		Total	% of total	Ratio of Hawai‘i purchase
Construction	5,929	5.0%	882	11.1%	6,812	5.4%	87.0%
Equipment rentals	33,791	28.6%	2,207	27.8%	35,999	28.5%	93.9%
Purchase of materials	18,225	15.4%	2,860	36.0%	21,085	16.7%	86.4%
Warehouse/storage	2,687	2.3%	-	0.0%	2,687	2.1%	100.0%
Business/professional Service	25,801	21.8%	1,460	18.4%	27,262	21.6%	94.6%
F&B/catering	7,471	6.3%	12	0.1%	7,483	5.9%	99.8%
Hotel/accommodations	11,357	9.6%	8	0.1%	11,366	9.0%	99.9%
Other	12,996	11.0%	512	6.4%	13,508	10.7%	96.2%
Total paid out:	118,258	100.0%	7,943	100.0%	126,201	100.0%	93.7%

Qualified expenditures on wage and salary payments

Figure 5. Production expenditures on wage and salary payments by category in 2022
(in millions of dollars)



	Above the Line			Below the Line			Total		
	Hawai‘i Residents	Non-Residents	Hawai‘i ratio	Hawai‘i Residents	Non-Residents	Hawai‘i ratio	Hawai‘i Residents	Non-Residents	Hawai‘i ratio
1099 Contractors	0.0	2.3	1.1%	0.5	0.8	41.3%	0.6	3.1	15.5%
W2 employees	7.7	73.4	9.5%	82.7	40.0	67.4%	90.4	113.4	44.4%
Total Paid Out:	7.7	75.7	9.2%	83.3	40.7	67.1%	91.0	116.5	43.9%

Payroll of a film production is divided into “above-the-line” and “below-the-line.” Above-the-line (ATL) workers include directors, producers, writers, and principal cast; below-the-line (BTL) workers refers to the rest of the crew. In 2022, wages and salaries paid to Hawai‘i resident cast and crew were \$91.0 million, almost 44 percent of the total wage payments. However, looking at the above-the-line workers, which is the highest-compensated group, Hawai‘i

residents only received about nine percent, or \$7.7 million, of total above-the-line wage payments, while non-residents received \$75.7 million of above-the-line wages and salaries. This is not surprising as above-the-line positions are highly skilled and it would be difficult to find local substitutes. ATL personnel also often provide training and mentoring opportunities for Hawai‘i residents so that local residents can advance in their fields of expertise.

Another way to categorize payroll cost production expenditures is by employees who are employed directly by the production company and issued traditional W2s, and independent contractors who use a 1099 form. Contractors earned a very small portion of wages and salaries, only \$3.7 million in total. Of that amount, 2.3 million, or 62.2 percent, went to non-resident above-the-line contractors. In contrast, about \$203.8 million of wages and salaries were earned by W2 employees, 44.4 percent of which went to Hawai‘i residents. Of all the W2 above-the-line wage and salary payments, 9.5 percent were earned by Hawai‘i residents, while 67.4 percent of all W2 below-the-line wage payments went to Hawai‘i residents. It is not clear how many full-time jobs the W2 payroll supported.


Due to the short-term nature of most film projects, a substantial number of part-time jobs are likely on the W2 payroll.

Ratios of wages and salaries paid to Hawai‘i residents to non-residents vary significantly across production types. For feature films, 23.6 percent of total wage payments went to Hawai‘i residents; for internet and television-related programs, 47.4 percent of payments went to residents. For other types of productions, including commercials, short films, documentaries, music videos, etc., 88.2 percent of wage payments were paid to Hawai‘i residents. Feature film productions, which tend to be more heavily dependent on out-of-state cast and crew, are more likely to come to Hawai‘i for the film tax credit.

Hiring of film productions

Figure 7 shows the number of Hawai‘i resident and non-Hawai‘i resident hires by category, such as above-the-line directors, producers, writers, and principal cast; talent, including supporting cast and extras; department heads and keys; and other below-the-line crew. In 2022, film productions supported 14,608 jobs in total, 82.2 percent of which were filled by Hawai‘i residents. Out of that 82.2 percent, or 12,003 Hawai‘i resident jobs, just over one percent, or 127, were in the above-the-line category; by contrast, 370 above-the-line jobs were filled by non-


Figure 6. Wage and salary payments by category and by production type in 2022 (in millions of dollars)



“Commercial” also includes documentaries, music videos, etc.

residents. Hawaii residents filled 57.5%, or 267, of the department heads and keys positions. Local hires of supporting cast and extras were predominantly more than out-of-state hires: 89.5 percent of supporting cast and extras, or 6,699 jobs were filled by Hawai‘i residents.

Figure 7. Hawai‘i resident and non-resident hires by category in 2022 (in number of jobs)



	Hawai‘i residents	Non-residents	Hawai‘i ratio
1. Above-the-line (directors, producers, writers, principal cast)	127	1.1%	25.6%
2. Talent (supporting cast and extras only)	6,699	55.8%	89.5%
3. Department heads and keys	267	2.2%	57.5%
4. Below-the-line crew (excluding line 2 & 3)	4,910	40.9%	79.7%
Total	12,003	100.0%	82.2%

Table 2 further breaks down the number of local and out-of-state hires by department and ranks jobs by the ratio of Hawai‘i residents. Jobs with the smallest ratio of Hawai‘i residents were in post-production; producers, directors, and writers; visual effects, and storyboard artists. Twenty percent or less of these jobs were filled by Hawai‘i residents. On the contrary, jobs filled by more than 90 percent of Hawai‘i residents were in medic, greens, extras, set decoration, animals, stand-ins, grip, transportation, and script supervisor. Despite the lack of information on the compensation rates of detailed jobs, it appears that most jobs with a higher ratio of Hawai‘i residents tend to be the lower paying jobs, and vice versa.

It is important to note that these job figures count each employee, regardless of the number of hours worked. Employment in film productions includes full-time, part-time, permanent and seasonal employees and the self-employed, and one employee may work on multiple productions. Without knowing the hours worked, the job count gains will tend to overstate the actual economic impact to the State in terms of job creation. For example, according to Table 2, 6,143, or about 51.2 percent of local jobs were production extras, whose impact on state employment may be relatively insignificant.

Table 2. Hawai‘i resident and non-resident hires by department in 2022 (in number of jobs)

	Hawai‘i residents	Non-residents	Hawai‘i ratio		Hawai‘i residents	Non-residents	Hawai‘i ratio
Post-Production	6	74	7.5%	Medic	116	2	98.3%
Producers, Directors, and Writers	33	217	13.2%	Greens	61	2	96.8%
Visual Effects	3	17	15.0%	Extras	6,143	282	95.6%
Storyboard Artist	3	12	20.0%	Set Decoration	268	19	93.4%
Principal Cast	29	70	29.3%	Animals	26	2	92.9%
Accounting	31	73	29.8%	Stand-Ins	133	13	91.1%
Supporting Cast	517	498	50.9%	Grip	442	44	90.9%
Art	72	63	53.3%	Transportation	671	69	90.7%
Assistant Directors	82	56	59.4%	Script Supervisor	28	3	90.3%
Casting	50	34	59.5%	Electric	345	50	87.3%
Stunts	353	225	61.1%	Hair/Make-Up	230	35	86.8%
Other	116	60	65.9%	Special Effects	80	14	85.1%
Property	85	40	68.0%	Locations	138	32	81.2%
Camera	352	131	72.9%	Production	730	194	79.0%
Catering & Craft Service	152	56	73.1%	Construction	365	115	76.0%
Sound	97	34	74.0%	Costume	216	69	75.8%
				TOTAL	12,003	2,605	82.2%

No Animator/Digital Artist or Game/Software Developer positions were reported in 2022.

Length of production duration by stage

Information about duration of production offers a glimpse into the features of production jobs in Hawai‘i and establishes a base to estimate Hawai‘i spending by out-of-state employees. The weighted average duration of an entire production was 156.8 days, while the average shoot period lasted 42.4 days. The shoot period is the stage when most personnel are employed, especially for out-of-state workers who come to Hawai‘i for the purpose of filming. By multiplying the number of out-of-state workers by the production’s shoot days, an estimate of total visiting days of out-of-state workers can be obtained, which forms the basis to calculate their spending in Hawai‘i.

Table 3. Production duration by stage


	Total	Average	Shortest	Longest
Pre-Production Days	1,100	44.0	0	232
Shoot days	1,018	42.4	1	215
Wrap days	382	18.2	0	83
Post days	1,420	78.9 ^{1/}	0	269
Entire duration	3,920	156.8 ^{2/}		

1/ Eighteen productions reported post-production days.

2/ Weighted average.

Out of the 24 productions that reported shoot days, 21 productions had more than 50 percent of filming completed in Hawai‘i with all 21 productions filming their projects completely in Hawai‘i. In contrast, only two productions had more than 50 percent of post-production in Hawai‘i; one of the two productions completed 100 percent their post-production in Hawai‘i. Of the 18 productions reporting post-production days, 16 productions did post-production completely outside of Hawai‘i. On average, productions filmed 89.3 percent of their work in Hawai‘i but only three productions (15.8 percent) did post-production work in Hawai‘i.

Figure 8. Number of productions with filmed and completed post-production in Hawai‘i



Average earnings of the film production jobs incentivized by the film tax credit

A key component to evaluate the benefits of the film tax credit is the average earnings of film production jobs which were incentivized by the tax credit. Average earnings are calculated as the ratio of total wage and salary payments to the number of jobs for each category. Average earnings of local above-the-line jobs were \$60,654, which is much lower than the average earnings of non-resident above-the-line jobs at \$204,691. Average earnings of below-the-line jobs were much lower, at only \$18,230 for non-residents and \$7,012 for Hawai‘i residents.

Table 4. Average earnings by residency in 2022

	Hawai‘i Residents			Non-residents		
	Jobs	Wages (\$ Million)	Average earnings (\$)	Jobs	Wages (\$ Million)	Average earnings (\$)
Above-the-line	127	7.7	60,654	370	75.7	204,691
Below-the-line	11,876	83.3	7,012	2,235	40.7	18,230
Total	12,003	91.0	7,579	2,605	116.5	44,714

As noted above, on average, each production ran 156.8 days and the filming period only lasted for 42.4 days (Table 3). The majority of below-the-line jobs are short-term or temporary jobs, which do not last throughout the entire production duration; for example, 45.2 percent of below-the-line jobs are extras, which may be on-site for a few days, if not hours. If employment is measured on a job-count basis regardless of the number of hours worked, the actual impact on

employment is likely to be overstated and the estimate of average earnings will tend to be biased significantly downward.

III. An Economy-Wide Cost-Benefit Analysis of the Film Tax Credit

When assessing the benefits, or the economic impacts of the film tax credit, this study evaluates how much economic activity is created due to the production spending induced by the tax credit. Film and television production, for example, require expenditures to be made on a variety of goods and services, including cast and crew, production facilities, equipment rental, catering, etc. This initial "direct" spending will in turn stimulate so-called "indirect" impacts through the supply chain. For example, when the production companies spend money on catering, catering companies make purchases across the supply chain of the food service industry. In addition, payments to employees increase personal income and spending, resulting in additional "induced" impact. For instance, wages paid to a supporting actress are spent to purchase food, housing, apparel, etc. Those expenditures in turn become wages in another layer of economic activity, where they are spent again. Total impacts, or the sum of direct, indirect, and induced impacts, are measured by multipliers. The multiplier represents the proportional change of total economic activity generated by an injection of new spending. The multipliers used in this report are from The Hawai‘i State Input-Output Study: 2017 Benchmark Report¹³. Type II final demand multipliers measure the total impacts.

The film industry is a very mobile industry and can relocate production or parts of production easily. The film tax credit offsets one-fifth to one-quarter of the qualified film production costs and thus is an important consideration for film productions to choose to film in Hawai‘i. However, there are many other factors influencing production companies' location decisions, such as availability of studio space, the quality and supply of workers, climate, and appropriate scenery. Some productions may still choose to film in Hawai‘i even in the absence of the tax credit. To gauge the impact of the tax credit, this study is conducted under two scenarios. The first scenario assumes that *all* of the film productions that received the credit would not have filmed in Hawai‘i in the absence of the tax credit. Under this assumption, the film production expenditures represent new spending in the State, so this assumption illustrates the maximum economic benefit of the film tax credit. The second scenario uses an estimate of the portion of production expenditures which would have occurred even without the film tax credit, or the so-called redundant film production expenditures. According to the historical trend (see Figure 1), the 10-year average of Hawaii film production expenditures was \$52.7 million from 1987 to 1996 before the film tax credit was introduced in 1997. Adjusting for inflation, this equals to \$97.6 million in 2022 dollars. This study uses \$97.6 million as the redundant portion and subtracts this amount from the alternative impact analysis.

It is important to note that the multiplier gives no thought to any activity outside of the local economy; it only measures additional demand generated by new spending *within* a region. Therefore, expenditures made outside the region are considered a "leakage" and do not contribute to the multiplier effect. As shown in Figure 4, 37.3 percent of film production

¹³ DBEDT. (2020, December). *The Hawaii State Input-Output Study: 2017 Benchmark Report*.

spending was paid to non-Hawai‘i cast and crew, as well as to out-of-state businesses. Non-resident talent are not likely to spend the majority of their earnings in Hawai‘i; payment on imports and out-of-state businesses do not cycle back through the Hawai‘i economy, however productions must prove that the Use Tax is paid to the State of Hawai‘i to qualify any imported goods or services brought to the state for production if they cannot be procured locally. As such, not making the distinction between out-of-state and in-state spending will overstate the benefits of the film tax credit. In the analysis below, efforts are made to evaluate the impacts of out-of-state spending separately.

In this report, the costs and benefits of the film tax credit are evaluated by two measures: gross domestic product (GDP) and earnings. Earnings are the sum of wage and salary disbursements, supplements to wages and salaries, and proprietors’ income. As earnings are embedded in GDP, these two measures cannot be added; they are different indicators from different perspectives. For non-resident workers, only their spending in Hawai‘i is included in calculating the economic impacts.

Benefits of the Film Tax Credit

Section A of Table 5 and Table 7 summarize all of the economic benefits of the film tax credit in terms of state GDP and earnings.

Wages and salaries paid to local workers

As shown in Figure 5, film productions’ total wage and salary payment to local workers in 2022 amounted to \$91.0 million. As part of this amount of income was spent in the local economy, it increased GDP by \$75.8 million, or by \$32.8 million if measured by earnings (section A1).

Hawai‘i spending of out-of-state workers while filming in Hawai‘i

As discussed earlier, the economic benefit of film productions’ wage and salary payments to non-resident workers is limited by the fact that only a portion of their income was spent on Hawai‘i’s economy. As this portion is not reported on the HPR form, this study assumes that out-of-state workers stay in Hawai‘i through the entire shooting period and that their daily spending followed the same pattern as U.S. visitors in 2022. This may be an upper bound of out-of-state workers’ spending in Hawai‘i for two reasons. First, not all out-of-state workers stayed through the entire shoot period. Secondly, to the extent that their expenses were included in vendor or services, their spending while working in Hawai‘i would be overestimated. Thus, this study only accounts for the shoot days of non-resident below-the-line workers, as it is more likely that above-the-line workers’ local expenses – including in-state travel, food, lodging, entertainment, and ancillary expenses – are already included in the film production budget. As shown in section A2 of Table 5, out-of-state workers’ spending in Hawai‘i is estimated to be \$25.4 million. This amount of spending generated an additional \$28.2 million of state GDP or \$12.9 million of earnings.

Table 5. A cost-benefit analysis of film tax credit (*measure: gross domestic product*)
(in millions of dollars)

	Without the redundancy assumption	With the redundancy assumption ^{1/}
Benefits		
A. GDP generated (A1+A2+A3+A4)	245.21	173.51
A1. GDP generated from wages and salaries paid to local workers		
Total wage payments to local workers	90.97	64.36
GDP generated by local workers ^{2/}	75.83	53.64
A2. GDP generated from out-of-state workers' spending while filming in Hawai'i		
Estimated spending while working in Hawai'i	25.36	17.94
GDP generated	28.15	19.91
A3. GDP generated from production spending on goods and services in Hawai'i		
Construction	7.11	5.03
Equipment rentals	36.83	26.06
Purchase of materials	22.05	15.60
Warehouse/storage	3.92	2.78
Business/professional service	34.32	24.28
F&B/catering	8.89	6.29
Hotel/accommodations	13.63	9.64
Others	14.30	10.11
GDP generated	141.05	99.78
A4. GDP generated from Film Office spending on managing the film tax credit		
Total payroll costs of film office employees who manage the tax credit	0.21	0.21
GDP generated by the spending of Film Office employees	0.17	0.17
Costs (opportunity costs)		
B. GDP lost (B1+B2)	76.39	76.39
B1. GDP lost from tax credit^{3/}		
Amount of total tax credit	68.00	68.00
GDP lost	76.15	76.15
B2. GDP lost from managing the tax credit^{3/}		
Total spending on Film Office employees who manage the tax credit	0.21	0.21
GDP lost	0.23	0.23
Net benefits = A - B	168.82	97.13
Net GDP generated by \$1 of tax credit	\$2.48	\$1.43

1/ The redundancy assumption means that the portion of film production expenditures which would have occurred even in the absence of the film tax is subtracted from the calculation of the impacts. This portion is estimated to be \$97.6 million.

2/ Assuming 86 percent of local workers' income derived from working in film production were spent based on the estimate in the 2017 Hawai'i State Input-Output model.

3/ Assuming the State would spend the same amount on CIP projects.

Shaded areas indicate the components of benefits/costs.

The total leakage of film production spending is the sum of wage and salary payments to non-resident workers and spending on out-of-state goods and services minus out-of-state workers' spending in Hawai'i. Using the estimate of out-of-state workers' local spending, total leakage of film production is estimated at \$99.1 million or 29.7 percent of the total production expenditures. See Table 6.

Table 6. Estimate of production spending leakage
(in millions of dollars)

Wage payments to out-of-state workers	116.5
– Out-of-state below-the-line workers' spending in Hawai'i	25.4
Spending on out-of-state goods or services	7.9
Total leakage	99.1

Production spending on goods and services in Hawai'i

To get a more accurate estimate of the multiplier impacts of production spending on goods and services in Hawai'i, generated state GDP and earnings are estimated by each spending category (section A3). Goods and services spending for each spending category is obtained from Table 1. Total generated state GDP and earnings from production spending on all goods and services in Hawai'i amounted to \$141.1 million and \$66.1 million respectively.

Hawai'i Film Office spending on managing the film tax credit

The film tax credit is administered through the Hawai'i Film Office situated in DBEDT's Creative Industries Division. Total payroll costs of Film Office employees who manage the film tax credit are estimated to be \$0.21 million, are used. This amount of income increased state GDP by \$0.17 million or earnings by \$0.08 million.

Altogether, total economic benefits of the film tax credit were \$245.2 million in additional state GDP or \$202.9 million in additional earnings. This is a conservative estimate as it does not include the economic impact of film-induced tourism. It is documented in the literature that major motion pictures are influential in drawing tourists to the locations where they are filmed. In a seminal 1998 study, Riley, Baker, and Van Doren found that the effect of the motion pictures was to increase tourist visits to the sites, on average, by 40 to 50 percent for at least four years following release. Hudson & Ritchie (2006) studied over thirty movies and found that the visitor numbers could increase by up to 300¹⁴ percent after release. Based on survey findings, HR&A Advisors, Inc. (2015) estimated that 14.5 percent of Louisiana visitors can be considered film-induced tourists. MNP, LLP (2013) assumed 5 to 19.5 percent of visitors to Florida are influenced in whole or in part by film and/or television.¹⁵ MNP, LLC (2016), in a study prepared for the State of New Mexico, estimated that between 5 to 13 percent of total visitor spending in New Mexico in 2014 was attributed in whole or in part to film induced tourism.

¹⁴ This is the case with *Braveheart* filmed in Scotland.

¹⁵ The HR&A Advisors (2015) study was prepared for the Louisiana Film and Entertainment Association and the Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA). The MNP, LLP (2013) study was prepared for the MPAA, with supplementary report that contained revised estimates of film induced tourism based on a visitor survey by Visit Florida. The supplementary report was prepared by MNP, LLP for the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity.

Table 7. A cost-benefit analysis of film tax credit (*measure*: earnings)
(in millions of dollars)

	Without the redundancy assumption	With the redundancy assumption ^{1/}
Benefits		
A. Earnings generated (A1+A2+A3+A4)	202.88	143.54
A1. Earnings generated from wages and salaries paid to local workers		
Total wage payments to local workers	90.97	64.36
Earnings generated by local workers ^{2/}	32.83	23.23
A2. Earnings generated from out-of-state workers' spending while filming in Hawai'i		
Estimated spending while working in Hawai'i	25.36	17.94
Earnings generated	12.93	9.15
A3. Earnings generated from production spending on goods and services in Hawai'i		
Construction	4.15	2.94
Equipment rentals	11.15	7.89
Purchase of materials	10.02	7.09
Warehouse/storage	2.47	1.75
Business/professional service	20.64	14.60
F&B/catering	4.93	3.49
Hotel/accommodations	6.59	4.66
Others	6.11	4.32
Earnings generated	66.06	46.74
A4. Earnings generated from Film Office spending on managing the film tax credit		
Total payroll costs of film office employees who manage the tax credit	0.21	0.21
Earnings generated by the spending of Film Office employees	0.08	0.08
Costs (opportunity costs)		
B. Earnings lost (B1+B2)	43.65	43.65
B1. Earnings lost from tax credit^{3/}		
Amount of total tax credit	68.00	68.00
Earnings lost	43.52	43.52
B2. Earnings lost from managing the tax credit^{3/}		
Total spending on Film Office employees who manage the tax credit	0.21	0.21
Earnings lost	0.13	0.13
Net benefits = A - B	159.23	99.89
Net Earnings generated by \$1 of tax credit	\$2.34	\$1.47

1/ The redundancy assumption means that the portion of film production expenditures which would have occurred even in the absence of the film tax credit is subtracted from the calculation of the impacts. This portion is estimated to be \$97.6 million.

2/ Assuming 86 percent of local workers' income derived from working in film production were spent based on the estimate in the 2017 Hawai'i State Input-Output model.

3/ Assuming the State would spend the same amount on CIP projects.

Shaded areas indicate the components of benefits/costs.

While studies of film-induced tourism and Hawai‘i visitor survey data indicate that filming is influential in drawing visitors to Hawai‘i, these impacts are the result of cumulative years of television and movies filmed in the State and may include productions that did not receive film tax credits. As such, the impact of television program and movie filming on tourism cannot be assigned to a particular year of filming or film tax credits and is not included in this report.¹⁶ Charitable contributions and other non-qualified expenses by film producers are not included in the calculations.

Costs of the Film Tax Credit

If the amount of the film tax credits were not spent on film productions but on some other government projects instead, would this additional government spending have generated more economic benefit? This foregone benefit is the "opportunity cost" of the film tax credit. However, given the complexities of state budgets and the numerous factors that affect revenue and expenditures, it is quite difficult to identify the actual opportunity cost. Therefore, this study simply assumes that the amount of tax credits would have been spent on the state's Capital Improvement Projects (CIP) fund.

In addition to the \$68.0 million in tax credit claimed by film producers, it is assumed that there was \$0.21 million in spending by the Film Office to manage the film tax credit. The total cost amounted to \$68.2 million. If this \$68.2 million were not spent on the state's CIP fund to improve highways, airports, harbors, or public-school facilities, the lost GDP would be \$76.4 million and lost earnings would be \$43.7 million.

Combining both the benefits and costs, the net benefits of the tax credit were \$168.8 million in increased state GDP or \$159.2 million if measured by earnings. In other words, one dollar spent on the film tax credit generated \$2.48 of state GDP, or \$2.34 of earnings. The last columns of Table 5 and Table 7 recalculate the benefits under the redundancy assumption that \$97.6 million of film production expenditures would have occurred regardless the film tax credit being in place. In that scenario, one dollar spent on the film tax credit is estimated to generate \$1.43 of state GDP, or \$1.47 of earnings.

IV.A Fiscal Impact Analysis of the Film Tax Credit

Film productions not only generate additional state GDP and earnings, but they also create tax revenue for the state government. At the same time, the funding of the film tax credit, the administration of the credit, as well as the cost of public services for non-resident film workers, all create additional cost to the state government. In this section, the fiscal impact analysis evaluates how the film tax credit results in additional tax revenues and expenditures for the state.

¹⁶ The cumulative impact of filming on tourism in 2022 can be found in DBEDT's report *The Impacts of the Film Industry on 2022 Tourism in Hawai‘i*. It is likely that television programs and movies filmed in 2022 may influence visitors in future years.

Table 8. A fiscal impact analysis of film tax credit
(in millions of dollars)

	Without the redundancy assumption	With the redundancy assumption ^{1/}
A. State tax revenues generated (A1+A2+A3+A4+A5)	35.23	24.65
A1. State taxes generated from wages and salaries paid to local workers		
Total wage and salary payments to local workers	90.97	64.36
State tax revenues generated by local workers' income and spending ^{2/}	11.35	8.03
A2. State taxes generated by out-of-state workers		
Estimated spending while working in Hawai'i	25.36	15.52
State tax revenues generated	2.94	1.80
Total wage and salary payments to out-of-state workers	116.48	82.40
State tax revenues generated	6.72	4.76
A3. State taxes generated from production spending on goods and services in Hawai'i		
Construction	0.76	0.54
Equipment rentals	3.01	2.13
Purchase of materials	2.02	1.43
Warehouse/storage	0.39	0.28
Business/professional service	3.53	2.50
F&B/catering	0.95	0.67
Hotel/accommodations	1.93	1.37
Others	1.57	1.11
State tax revenues generated	14.16	10.02
A4. State taxes generated from production spending on out-of-state goods and services		
Spending on out-of-state goods and services	7.94	5.62
State tax revenues generated	0.04	0.03
A5. Film Office spending on managing the film tax credit		
Spending on Film Office employees who manage the tax credit	0.21	0.21
State tax revenues generated	0.01	0.01
State government spending (B+C+D)	68.71	68.71
B. State expenditures on tax credit		
Amount of total tax credit	68.00	68.00
C. State government spending on public services for out-of-state workers		
State government spending on airports, harbors, highways, public safety, and natural resources for out-of-state workers filming in Hawai'i	0.51	0.51
D. State expenditures on Film Office		
Spending on Film Office employees who manage the tax credit	0.21	0.21
Net state tax revenues/spending = A – B – C – D	-33.48	-44.07
State tax revenues generated by \$1 of tax credit	\$0.52	\$0.36

1/ The redundancy assumption means that the portion of film production expenditures which would have occurred even in the absence of the film tax credit is subtracted from the calculation of the impacts. This portion is estimated to be \$97.6 million.

2/ Assuming 86 percent of local workers' income derived from working in film production was spent based on the estimate in the 2017 Hawai'i State Input-Output model.

Shaded areas indicate the components of benefits/costs.

State Revenues from the Film Productions

When Hawai‘i local workers receive earnings from film productions, when producers purchase goods and services in Hawai‘i, and when out-of-state workers spend on the local economy, these new activities generate tax revenues for the state government. The magnitude of these state revenue changes is measured by state tax multipliers, which include individual income tax, GET, TAT, and other state taxes. While the indirect impact of out-of-state spending through the Hawai‘i economy is prevented, out-of-state spending still generates tax revenues to the state government. Compensation of out-of-state workers is subject to Hawai‘i income tax, because income taxes are paid in the state where they are earned, regardless of whether or where they are spent saved. Similarly, production spending on imports and out-of-state businesses is subject to Hawai‘i Use Tax. Each source of these additional tax revenues is discussed in order (Table 8).

Wages and salaries paid to local workers

Film productions’ wage and salary payment to local workers amounted to \$91.0 million. This amount of earnings was subject not only to income tax, but also to GET tax and other state taxes when part of Hawai‘i workers’ earnings that are spent in the local economy. The state tax revenue generated was estimated to be \$11.4 million (section A1).

Wages and salaries paid to out-of-state workers

Out-of-state workers contribute to state tax revenues in two ways. First, when they spend part of their income while filming in Hawai‘i, their spending generates state tax revenues in the same way as U.S. tourists do. Second, out-of-state workers’ earnings are subject to Hawai‘i state income tax. Combining the two, the state tax revenues generated from out-of-state workers was \$9.7 million (section A2).

Production spending on goods and services in Hawai‘i

Similarly, as in the cost-benefit analyses of production spending on goods and services, generated state tax revenue is estimated by each spending category (section A3). Total generated tax revenues from production spending on all goods and services in Hawai‘i amounted to \$14.2 million.

Production spending on imports and out-of-state services

Despite not contributing to the earnings, production spending on imports and out-of-state services are subject to state Use Tax, at the rate of 0.5 percent. The \$7.9 million of out-of-state spending generated \$0.04 million of tax revenues.

Hawai‘i Film Office spending on managing the film tax credit

The \$0.21 million of total payroll costs of Film Office employees who manage the film tax credit also generated state tax revenues, which are estimated to be \$0.01 million.

Taking all these together, total state tax revenues generated by film productions amounted to \$35.2 million.

State Spending on the Film Tax Credit

In addition to the \$68.0 million of film tax credit claimed by film productions in 2022, there is an administration cost of the tax credit through the Hawai‘i Film Office, which is estimated to cost the State \$0.21 million. There is also a cost to the state when production companies film in Hawai‘i and consume public services. Highways, police and fire protection, natural resources, parks, and other public services consumed by film production are not free. The cost to state government come primarily in the form of increased use of infrastructure and services¹⁷.

Appendix C describes how to measure the cost of providing various public services.

The estimate of state government expenditures on public services consumed by film productions is \$0.51 million. Overall, the film productions which claimed the film tax credit in 2022 cost the state government \$68.7 million.

Net State Spending on the Film Tax Credit

On a revenue basis, film production activities generate state tax revenues to partially offset the cost of the tax credits, but the impact of those offsets did not result in a net increase in revenue to the State. In 2022, the \$68.0 million of tax credits was estimated to have been offset by an increase in tax revenues of \$35.2 million, leaving the State with a net revenue loss of \$33.5 million. The Return on Investment (ROI) rate of Hawai‘i’s film tax credit was estimated to be \$0.52 per dollar of tax credit. In other words, one dollar of Hawai‘i’s film tax credit generated 52 cents of state tax revenues in 2022. Under the redundancy assumption, the ROI rate is reduced to \$0.36. As shown in Appendix A, Table A - 1, Hawai‘i’s ROI rate was in the middle of the range of ROI rates of other states. However, either \$0.52 or \$0.36 is relatively high among studies on film incentives which account for out-of-state spending.

V. Conclusion

In 2022, 26 film productions qualified for and claimed the Hawai‘i film tax credit. Their qualified production expenditures amounted to \$333.7 million, with \$68.0 million in claimed tax credits. About 35 percent of total qualified expenditures, or \$116.5 million was spent on wage and salary payments to non-resident cast and crew. Hawai‘i residents received \$91.0 million, accounting for 27.3 percent of total qualified expenditures. Hawaii-based businesses were paid \$118.3 million, while out-of-state purchases accounted for \$7.9 million. Altogether the total spending on wage payments to non-residents and out-of-state goods and services amounted to 37.3 percent of total qualified spending, or \$124.4 million. After subtracting out-of-state workers’ local spending, total leakage of film production spending out of Hawai‘i’s local economy is estimated to be \$99.1 million.

¹⁷ This additional spending on infrastructure and public services due to out-of-state film workers' visit also generates economic benefits, as the state would invest more in highways, airports, public safety, etc. However, this portion of economic benefits is excluded from our cost-benefit analysis, because if this additional spending were not used for infrastructure or public services for the above purpose, then the state would spend the money on infrastructure or services for other purposes, which would also generate economic benefits. Therefore, this additional government spending has an opportunity cost equal to its benefit and the two cancel each other out.

These 26 film productions supported 14,608 jobs in 2022, 82.2 percent of which were filled by Hawai‘i residents. However, out of that 82.2 percent, or 12,003 Hawai‘i resident jobs, about 51.4 percent were production extras, whose impact on employment may be relatively insignificant. Also, the 14,608 job count is prone to “multiple-counting” to the extent that the same workers work part time for multiple productions and are counted multiple times. Average earnings of above-the-line jobs among Hawai‘i local workers were \$60,654 but only \$7,012 for local below-the-line jobs. The average earnings are underestimated because employment is reported on a job-count basis regardless of the number of hours worked.

The economy-wide cost-benefit analysis and fiscal impact analysis of this report takes into account two important factors which were often missed in earlier studies on film production incentives. One is the opportunity cost of the film tax credit; the other is the out-of-state spending which does not contribute to the local economy as much as expenditures spent in the state. In 2022, the net benefits of Hawai‘i’s film tax credit were \$168.8 million in increased state GDP, or \$159.2 million if measured by earnings. Thus, one dollar spent on the film tax credit generated \$2.48 of state GDP, or \$2.34 of earnings. On a state government’s tax revenue basis, the \$68.0 million of tax credit is estimated to have been offset by an increase in tax revenues of \$35.2 million. One dollar of Hawai‘i’s film tax credit generated 52 cents of state tax revenues.

Appendix A: Literature Review

Many state-specific reports have examined the economic and fiscal impacts of film production incentives. The economic impact analysis looks at how the direct spending of film productions has multiplier impacts throughout the state economy and results in new jobs, earnings, and economic output. These multiplier effects are calculated by input-output tables.¹⁸

Measures of direct spending vary across reports. For example, the Massachusetts Department of Revenue (MA DOR) (2022) excludes most non-resident wages and salaries from total qualified production spending in the calculation of multiplier effects, assuming that virtually all local expenses such as lodging, food, and entertainment expenses for non-residents are covered by the production budgets. Camoin Associates (2019b) adopts a broader approach, including both qualified and non-qualified spending.¹⁹ In addition, although many studies assume that all productions receiving tax credits would not have occurred in the absence of the tax credit, studies such as MA DOR (2022) assume that economic activity that occurred prior to the implementation of film tax incentives would continue to occur even if the incentives had not been adopted while RI ORA (2022) does a “breakeven” sensitivity analysis that examines the impact of the program under a range of assumptions of the economic activity attributable to the tax credit program.²⁰

Substantial economic impacts are reported in these reports. For New York State over the two-year period of 2017 and 2018, Camoin Associates (2019b) estimates the \$8 billion of direct spending generated by the Film Production Tax Credit and the Post-Production Tax Credit programs resulted in 85,835 total jobs, \$5.1 billion in earnings, and over \$15.2 billion in total spending throughout the state economy. Camoin Associates (2022) estimates that \$438 million in direct spending generated by Louisiana’s tax credit program resulted in 10,323 jobs, \$362.1 million in earnings and \$847.6 million in total spending in FY 2022. MA DOR (2022) estimates that the film tax credits resulted in \$615.5 million in “new” Massachusetts spending between CY 2013-2017, generating 6,341 local jobs, \$366.9 million in personal income, and \$1.5 billion in State GDP.

Two other impact measures also take into account of the cost of film production tax credit programs. One is the cost per job to state. MNP LLP (2014b) estimates for New Mexico, the net cost per FTE job created from film production was approximately \$8,519. Loren C. Scott & Associates (2017) estimates the cost per job was \$15,460 for Louisiana state in 2016. Some studies, however, report rather steep costs per job. Zin (2010), for example, estimates that each

¹⁸ These studies generally used general equilibrium packages such as IMPLAN and BEA’s REMI.

¹⁹ Camoin Associates (2019b) assumes that non-qualified spending is contingent on the qualified spending incentivized by the tax credit program.

²⁰ RI ORA (2022) finds that the state’s tax credit program has a positive impact on state GDP if at least 41.2% of economic activity associated with the tax credits is caused by the program. LAEDC (2022) assumes all economic activity associated with spending by productions receiving the tax credit is due to the tax credit, however, the California Legislative Analyst’s Office (LAO) concludes, based on data from California’s initial film tax credit program, that about one-third of productions that received a tax credit would have been made without the subsidy. See LAO (2016) and LAO (2019).

job cost \$42,991 in the form of tax credit. MA DOR (2022) reports a net cost to the state of \$102,945 per net new Massachusetts-resident job over the 2006-2017 period.

A more widely used indicator is a measure of fiscal impact, the return on investment (ROI) of tax credit programs, which is how much state tax revenue is raised by tax credit. Table A-1 summarizes the return on investment from recent evaluations of film tax credit programs in other states. As shown, these ROIs range from \$0.03 per dollar of tax credit in Rhode Island to \$1.08 per dollar of tax credit in New York. FL EDR (2021) provides a detailed list of ROI evaluations by state agencies in Table 2 of the report's appendix.

Table A-1. Return on investment of film tax credit programs in other states

State	ROI and Period(s) examined	Source
New York	1.08 (FY2017-18)	Camoin Associates (2019b)
California	1.07 (FY 2015-16 through FY 2019-20)	LAEDC (2022)
Louisiana	0.39 (FY 2021); 0.35(FY 2020)	Camoin Associates (2022)
Georgia 1/	0.21 (TY 2016)	GA DOAA (2020)
Virginia	0.20 (FY2012-16)	VA JLARC (2017)
Massachusetts 1/	0.14 (CY 2006-17)	MA DOR (2022)
Pennsylvania 1/	0.13 (FY 2017-18)	PA IFO (2019)
Florida 1/ 2/	0.07 (FY 2017-19); 0.18 (FY2016-17); 0.43 (FY 2012-14)	FL EDR (2021); FL EDR (2018); FL EDR (2015)
Rhode Island 1/	0.03 (CY 2016-18)	RI ORA (2022)

1/ Studies subtract out-of-state spending in calculating the fiscal impact.

2/ The Florida Entertainment Industry Financial Incentive Program ended on June 30, 2016. Available credits were awarded through FY 2017-18, with previously awarded credits continuing to be used through FY 2018-19.

FY = Fiscal Year, CY = Calendar year, TY = Tax Year

Two considerations in the impact analyses of film production incentive programs are sometimes missing and may result in overestimated impacts. One is the opportunity costs of the foregone revenue. Because film tax credits cost the state revenue, this lost revenue could have represented either tax reductions or state spending that would have benefited residents in another way (Robyn & David, 2012; Thom & An, 2017). The other factor is how much of the qualified film production expenditures are made *outside* the state and thus do not contribute to the local economy, or at least not as much as expenditures occurring in the state do (Luther, 2010; Zin, 2010). The multiplier impact is additional demand generated by a dollar of spending in an industry *within* a region. Expenditures made outside the region are considered as a “leakage” and do not contribute to the multiplier effect. Studies which take account of either or both of these two important factors tend to find reduced impacts and higher costs associated with the film incentive programs. As shown in Table A - 1, studies which subtract out-of-state spending generally find relatively low ROI of the incentive programs.

In addition to state-specific studies, there are also multistate analyses of the impact of film production incentive programs on employment. These studies rely on quasi-experimental statistical analysis such as difference-in-differences techniques to control for counterfactual, or

the economic activity that would have occurred in the absence of tax incentives. Their results do not provide compelling evidence that film production incentives increased employment in the film industry (Button, 2019; Swenson, 2017). However, it is noteworthy that these multistate analyses examine only *direct* employment in the film production industry and thus neglect that movie productions can result in more diffuse impacts on other industries, or the multiplier effects. Additionally, since these studies are done at the aggregate level, no significant net employment gains after incentives may just suggest a zero-sum game between states over time. In other words, some states experienced employment gains thanks to film production incentive programs and other decreased employment during the same time period, “amounting to a ‘wash’ in the aggregate” (Swenson, 2017).

Appendix B: References

Button, P. (2019, July). Do tax incentives affect business location and economic development? Evidence from state film incentives. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 77, 315-339.

California Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO). (2016). *California's First Film Tax Credit Program*. Retrieved from: <https://lao.ca.gov/reports/2016/3502/First-Film-Tax-Credit-Program-092916.pdf>

California Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO). (2019). *An Update on California's Film Tax Credit Programs*. Retrieved from: <https://lao.ca.gov/LAOEconTax/Article/Detail/388>

California Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO). (2023). *The 2023-24 Budget: California's Film Tax Credit*. Retrieved from: <https://lao.ca.gov/reports/2023/4713/CA-Film-Tax-Credit-022823.pdf>

Camoin Associates. (2019a). *Economic and Fiscal Impact of Louisiana Entertainment Tax Credits*. Prepared for: Louisiana Department of Economic Development. Retrieved from: https://admin.opportunitylouisiana.gov/wp-content/uploads/docs/2019-economic-fiscal-impact-of-louisiana-entertainment-tax-credits-march2019-2.pdf?sfvrsn=9cce605_0

Camoin Associates. (2019b). *Economic Impact of the Film Industry in New York State – 2017 & 2018*. Prepared for: Empire State Development. Saratoga Springs, NY: Author.

Camoin Associates. (2022). *Economic and Fiscal Impact, Motion Picture Production Tax Credit, FY 2021 – FY2022*. Prepared for: Louisiana Department of Economic Development. Retrieved from: https://www.opportunitylouisiana.gov/wp-content/uploads/docs/2023-entertainment-impact-studies-march-2023.pdf?sfvrsn=4fc8b805_0

Clouse, C., & Glazer, N. (2015). Box Office Ohio: Analysis and Economic Impact of the Film Industry in Northeast Ohio and Ohio. *Urban Publications*. Paper 1333. http://engagedscholarship.csuohio.edu/urban_facpub/1333

Florida Office of Economic and Demographic Research (EDR). (2021). Return on Investment for the Entertainment Industry Incentive Programs. Retrieved from: <http://edr.state.fl.us/Content/returnoninvestment/EntertainmentIndustryIncentivePrograms2021.pdf>

Florida Office of Economic and Demographic Research (EDR). (2015). Return on Investment for the Entertainment Industry Incentive Programs. Retrieved from: <http://edr.state.fl.us/Content/returnoninvestment/EntertainmentIndustryIncentivePrograms2018.pdf>

Florida Office of Economic and Demographic Research (EDR). (2015). Return on Investment for the Entertainment Industry Incentive Programs. Retrieved from: <http://edr.state.fl.us/Content/returnoninvestment/EntertainmentIndustryIncentivePrograms.pdf>

Georgia Department of Audits and Accounts (GA DOAA). (2020). *Impact of the Georgia Film Tax Credit*. Performance Audit. Report No. 18-03B. Retrieved from: <https://www.audits.ga.gov/ReportSearch/download/23536>

HR&A Advisors, Inc. (2015). *Economic impacts of the Louisiana motion picture investor tax credit*. Prepared for Louisiana Film and Entertainment Association (LFEA) and Motion Picture Association of America, Inc. (MPAA). New York, NY: Author.

Hudson, S., & Ritchie, B. (2006). Promoting destinations via film tourism: an empirical identification of supporting marketing initiatives. *Journal of Travel Research*, 44, 387–396.

Loren, C. Scott & Associates, Inc. (2017). *The economic impact of Louisiana's entertainment tax credit programs for film, live performance & sound recording*. Baton Rouge, LA: Author.

Los Angeles County Economic Development Corporation (LAEDC). (2022). *California Film and Television Tax Credit Program 2.0, An Economic Impact Study*. Retrieved from: <https://laedc.org/research/reports/ca-film-tv-tax-credit-program-2-0/>

Luther, W. J. (2010). *Movie production incentives: Blockbuster support for lackluster policy* (Tax Foundation Special Report No. 173). Washington, DC: Tax Foundation.

Maryland Department of Legislative Services. (2015). *Evaluation of the Maryland film production activity tax credit*. Annapolis, MD: Department of Legislative Services, Office of Policy Analysis.

Massachusetts Department of Revenue (MA DOR). (2022). *Report on the Impact of Massachusetts Film Industry Tax Incentives through Calendar Year 2017*. Retrieved from: <https://www.mass.gov/doc/dor-report-on-the-impact-of-massachusetts-film-industry-tax-incentives-through-calendar-year-2017/download>

MNP, LLP. (2013, March). *Economic and social impacts of the Florida film and entertainment industry financial incentive program*. Preliminary report prepared for the Motion Picture Association of America. Retrieved from: <https://www.motionpictures.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/01/Economic-and-Social-Impacts-of-the-Florida-Film-and-Entertainment-Industry-Financial-Incentive-Program.pdf>

MNP, LLP. (2014a). Update on the Economic Impacts of the Florida Film and Entertainment Industry Financial Incentive Programs. Retrieved from https://www.filmiami.org/pdf/2014/Florida_Report.pdf

MNP, LLP. (2014b). *New Mexico film production tax incentive study, Phase I report*. Retrieved from: <https://nmfilm.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Phase-1-Report-Final-Report-July-21-2014.pdf>

MNP, LLP. (2016). *New Mexico film production tax incentive study, Phase III report*. Retrieved from: <https://nmfilm.com/assets/uploads/migrated/2018/10/MNP-Film-Study-Phase-III-20161.pdf>

National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL). (2022). *Film Tax Incentives Back in the Spotlight*. Retrieved from: <https://www.ncsl.org/fiscal/film-tax-incentives-back-in-the-spotlight>

Rhode Island Department of Revenue Office of Revenue Analysis (RI ORA). (2022). *Economic Development Tax Incentives Evaluation Act: Evaluation of “Motion Picture Production Tax Credits” (R.I. Gen. Laws § 44-31.2-5) Tax Years 2016 through 2018*. Retrieved from: <https://dor.ri.gov/media/4001/download?language=en>

Rickman, D. and Wang, H. (2020) *Lights, Camera, What Action? The Nascent Literature on the Economics of US State Film Incentives*. MPRA Paper No. 104477. Retrieved from: <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/104477/>

Riley, R., Baker, D., & Van Doren, C. (1998). Movie induced tourism. *Annals of tourism research*, 25, 4: 919-935.

Robyn, M., & David, H. (2012). *Movie production incentives in the last frontier* (Tax Foundation Special Report No. 199). Washington, DC: Tax Foundation.

Swenson, C. W. (2017). Preliminary evidence on film production and state incentives. *Economic Development Quarterly* 31, 1: 65-80.

Thom, M., & Brian A. (2017). Fade to black? Exploring policy enactment and termination through the rise and fall of state tax incentives for the motion picture industry. *American Politics Research* 45, 1: 85-108.

Virginia Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC). (2017). *Evaluation: Film incentives. Economic Development Incentives Evaluation Series*. Report to the Governor and the General Assembly of Virginia. Retrieved from: <https://jlarc.virginia.gov/pdfs/reports/Rpt501.pdf>

Zin, D. (2010). *Film Incentives in Michigan* (Tech. Rep.). Lansing, MI: State Fiscal Agency.

Appendix C: The Cost of Providing Public Services to the State Government

The costs to state government are primarily in the form of increased use of infrastructure and services. Filming activities increase the costs of various public services such as highways, airports, harbors, police and fire protections, and natural resource. Thus, the costs of the film tax credit include the costs of providing these public services. In this section, the state government expenditures which directly benefit film productions are measured. These have been identified to fall into five categories: (1) public safety, (2) highways, (3) conservation of natural resources, (4) airports, (5) harbors.

The methodology used to calculate all costs is as follows. First, the direct expenditure by state government is estimated for each category. Table A - 2 shows the total expenditures in the above categories by the state government in 2022. Second, the expenditures are divided by the de facto population to get the average annual cost per user. De facto population²¹ includes the daily visitors present in the state but excludes the daily number of residents temporarily absent. The average annual cost is further divided by 365 days to get the estimate for expenditures by the state government per user per day. Finally, the average daily cost per user is multiplied by total shoot days, which serves as a proxy for total length of stay of all the film production personnel. Line 10 of Table A - 2 shows that total public expenditures by the state government spent on film productions were \$ 0.51 million in 2022.

Table A - 1. State government spending on public services

Line 1	Total film-related expenditures (sum of line 2-6) ^{1/} (\$M)	\$2,225.9
2	- Public safety	\$712.8
3	- Highways	\$570.1
4	- Conservation of natural resources	\$204.4
5	- Airports	\$632.9
6	- Harbors	\$105.9
7	De facto population	1,597,575
8	Film-related expenditure per person per day in 2022 (= line 1*1,000,000/line 7/366)	\$3.76
9	Visitor days of non-residents in film productions	133,282
10	Cost to the state government due to non-resident film personnel stay (\$M) (= line 8*line 9/1,000,000)	\$0.51

1/ The average of fiscal year 2022 and 2023.

Source: Department of Accounting and General Services, *State of Hawai‘i Comprehensive Annual Financial Report for the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 2023*.

²¹ The de facto population is defined as the number of persons physically present in an area, regardless of military status or usual place of residence. It includes visitors present but excludes residents temporarily absent, both calculated as an average daily census.