

MANHATTAN AREA TECHNICAL COLLEGE ECONOMIC IMPACT STUDY

Executive Summary:

The purpose of this report is to lend support to a request from the Manhattan Area Technical College (MATC) for partial funding of a new technical education center on the MATC campus. The facility is projected to cost a total of \$16.3 million and the MATC is requesting that the City of Manhattan provide \$1.3 million of the cost based upon the projected sales tax and city utility revenues that the new MATC staff employees and graduates of the technical programs could produce for the city.

As documented below and in the Appendices of this report, the MATC plan could have the following economic impact on the City of Manhattan over the next ten years:

- Increase in local sales tax revenues of about \$1,556,000.
- Increased city utility revenues of about \$507,000.
- Increased franchise fees of about \$104,000.

The projected total direct revenues to the city would thus be about \$2,167,000, or about 1.7 times the amount requested from the city for inclusion in the building costs. The cash flow back to the city would equal the \$1.3 million grant during the 7th year (See Table 1 after the appendices), assuming that the first two years of the period would be for construction and the first graduates of technical programs would occur in the third year.

The detailed itemization of this information can be found in Appendix A, "Executive Summary" and in the other Appendices to this report.

Methodology and Assumptions

An economic impact study involves identifying the various aspects of a project that will have an impact on the community. This report follows the methodology of determining the impact of these components of the project that will create a public benefit:

- Impact of construction
 - Construction salary spending plus rollover.
 - Materials purchases plus rollover.
- Impact of new permanent staff jobs created plus salary rollover.
- Impact of utilities expenses and utility franchise fee collections

Rollover Impact:

The above components introduce a factor known as "rollover" spending that is an important component of economic impact. "Rollover" refers to the fact that when funds are spent within a community, they are then spent again by the receiver and the process is repeated until all the money finally leaves the community.

Other Calculations and Assumptions

Explanations of the methods used are contained in each section of the report. <u>The assumptions used can be</u> found within each section.

SECTION 2 - INTRODUCTION, PURPOSE, AND METHODOLOGY

Introduction

Governments are charged with the responsibility to wisely spend public monies, whether for governmental operations or incentives for public and private investments. In Kansas, municipal governments are required by statute to conduct a cost-benefit analysis before granting tax abatements to private developments. Many cities will do a detailed analysis of the economic impact of a proposed project, even if it does not involve a tax abatement or public incentives. Therefore, it is good practice for developers, public and private, to perform their own analysis before approaching a municipality for incentives, or even concurrence with the proposed project.

Purpose of this Report

The purpose of this report is to estimate the direct and indirect economic impact of the MATC building plan.

Methodology

Conducting an economic impact study involves identifying the various aspects of a proposed project that will have an impact on the community. There are a number of components of this project that will create a public benefit:

- Impact of construction
 - Construction salary spending plus rollover.
 - Materials purchases plus rollover.
- Impact of new permanent jobs created plus salary rollover.
- Impact of utilities expenses and utility franchise fee collections

Rollover Multiplier

These components introduce a factor known as "rollover" spending that is an important component of economic impact. "Rollover" refers to the fact that when funds are spent within a community, they are then spent again by the receiver and the process is repeated until all the money finally leaves the community. Economists frequently refer to a "rollover multiplier" or simply "rollover." Multipliers may range from a low of 2.5 to a high of 7.5.

In order to accurately apply a multiplier, it is necessary to examine an independent data set that is based upon actual spending within the community. This information is compiled and reported annually by the Kansas Department of Revenue¹ in what are known as "Pull-Factor" reports. The most recent Pull-Factor reports for Kansas for the year 2022 are posted on the Kansas Department of Revenue website. The following excerpt from the report explains the data:

"The City Trade Pull Factor report provides different measures of retail market data for the cities for fiscal year 2022, which represents the period July 1, 2021 through June 30, 2022. Retail market data is presented three ways.

• *The first measure is a location quotient of retail trade called the City Trade Pull*

¹ Kansas Department of Revenue, Office of Policy and Research, <u>City/County Trade Pull Factors, Annual Report FY 2022</u>, issued December 2022.

Factor (CiTPF). It is a measure of the relative strength of the retail business community. The City Trade Pull Factor is computed by dividing the per capita sales tax of a city by the statewide per capita sales tax. A CiTPF of 1.00 is a perfect balance of trade. The purchases of city residents who shop elsewhere are offset by the purchases of out-of-city customers. CiTPF values greater than 1.00 indicates that local businesses are pulling in trade from beyond their home city border. Thus, the balance of trade is favorable. A CiTPF value less than 1.00 indicates more trade is being lost than pulled in, that residents are shopping outside the city. This is an unfavorable balance of trade.

The *City Trade Pull Factor* for Manhattan is 1.56, which means that more people from other areas are spending more in Manhattan than residents of Manhattan are spending in other communities. Technically, a rollover factor of the highest measure (in the area of 6 or 7 times) could be used for Manhattan. However, we do not advocate using any factor higher than 4 times to remain conservative.

Other Calculations and Assumptions

The other calculations used in developing this report are explained at the beginning of each section. The worksheet appendices are constructed in a manner that allows different assumptions to be entered once in the respective worksheet and the changes will flow automatically to the affected worksheets and final results.

Report Structure

The report is organized in a manner that shows the economic impact in terms of direct revenue to the city and other economic indicators of importance to the community. These include:

Components of City Revenues:

- Sales taxes
- Net profits from city utilities
- Utility franchise fees

Annual Summary of All Components

The year-by-year summary of all the components listed above is shown in Appendix B, "Annual Impact Summary." Due to the fact that fundraising and construction timetables are flexible, we have not attempted to predict the actual calendar year the building would be completed, so we use a system of Years 1-10, with Year 1 beginning when construction begins.

SECTION 3 - CONSTRUCTION IMPACT

Total Construction Costs

The architectural estimate for the cost of the building is \$16.3 million, which we have divided into two years.

Construction Cash Flow

We estimated that the construction labor would be divided equally between the two years. We estimated that the purchasing of construction materials would take place mostly in the first year.

Construction Jobs Created

The estimate of construction jobs created is determined using an average wage of \$25.00 per hour for a 40-hour workweek (typically worked in four days of 10 hours each) and 4.2 work-weeks per month. This monthly salary of \$4200 is divided into the projected labor expenditure for the month to determine the number of jobs required. We estimated that a total of 130-250 workers would be needed each year, although not all of them would be on the job at the same time.

It is generally accepted within the methodology for cost-benefit studies that labor is 50% of the total construction cost and that 50% of the labor salaries will be disposable income subject to sales tax. The location and duration of each project will affect the amount of the disposable income that is spent in the local community.

This project will take 12-24 months for completion. It can be expected that for a project of this duration, the workers will spend several days per week in Manhattan (typically four 10-hour days) rather than commute daily from other communities. For this project, we are using the assumption that 90% of the disposable income will be spent in Kansas and 75% of that will be spent in Manhattan. Construction workers might also require hotel rooms, but we have not included any of those in this report.

Construction Materials Spending

After labor expenses, 50% of the total construction cost is left for materials. The key factor is determining the percentage of materials that will be purchased in the local area.

Our research among local contractors indicates that the materials for residential and small commercial "stickbuilt" projects are 100% available in the local community. By contrast, structural steel for larger commercial projects, and commercial metal building materials all have to be acquired from other areas. We have assumed that 75% of the construction materials will be purchased locally.

The impact of the construction activity is detailed in Appendix C, "Economic Impact of Construction."

Total Estimated Economic Impact of Construction

The combined totals for construction labor and materials economic impact are estimated to be:

- Increased initial local retail spending of \$7.7 million in Year 1 and \$4.0 million in Yr. 2.
- Additional rollover spending of \$15.8 million in Yr. 1 and \$8.2 million in Yr. 2.
- City sales taxes of \$342,000 in Year 1 and \$178,000 in Yr. 2.

SECTION 4 - IMPACT OF NEW PERMANENT JOBS

New Permanent Staff Jobs Created

MATC projects four new faculty positions and 3 support staff positions with an annual salary and benefit expense of \$500,000.

The listing of positions and salaries for these staff positions is shown in Appendix D, "Economic Impact of Existing and New Permanent Jobs."

Permanent Salary Rollover Calculation

The rollover impact of salary spending is very similar to the process used for construction labor in Section 3. We used the same rollover factor of 4. This is a conservative approach. It might be argued that a portion of the original spending not subject to sales tax should be included in subsequent rollovers. We have elected not to include any of that salary component in the rollover calculation. For jobs at this salary level, the first 50% of the salary would likely go to mortgage payments, auto financing and other payments that immediately leave the community.

Estimated Economic Impact of New Staff Jobs

Using the assumptions described above, the estimated economic impact of the 7 new jobs described above over the next 10 years could be:

- Total salaries paid of \$3.7 million.
- Increased local retail spending of \$4.3 million (Includes rollover spending).
- Increased city sales tax collections of \$63,000.

E. Impact of New Graduate Jobs in the Area:

MATC projects that 100 new annual graduates of the new and expanded technical programs. MATC has established that 86% of their program graduates remain in the local area. We have assumed that 70% will remain in the area at least three years. We further assumed that 50% of those would live in Manhattan and use city utilities. MATC estimates that the average beginning salary for their graduates is \$45,000, which is slightly below the county average wage of \$47,471. We usually use 50% of the salary as disposable income, but in this case, we used only 30% disposable income to remain conservative in the community retail spending. We also assumed that after three years, all of the new graduates would leave the area, so our calculations only include a 3-year graduate group. It is entirely possible that many of the graduates would permanently remain in the area, but again we are maintaining a conservative approach.

Using the assumptions described above, the estimated economic impact of the new graduate jobs over the next ten years could be: (See Appendix E)

- Total salaries paid of about \$73 million.
- Increased local retail spending of about \$67 million.
- City sales tax collections of about \$972,000.

SECTION 5 - IMPACT OF NEW UTILITY USAGE

Utility Profits and Franchise Fee Calculation (See Appendix F)

The Manhattan City Budget actual expenditures for 2020 indicated a profit margin of 45.1% in the water, wastewater and storm water funds, which we have used in this report. We assume that 70% of the utility profits are from residential use. We then divide the 70% by the latest available number of households in Manhattan (22,137) to get an average annual profit per household of \$402.86. This is the beginning amount we multiply by the number of new staff and graduates each year.

Public utilities in Kansas typically pay franchise fees to the municipalities where the services are delivered. The typical rate for these franchise fees is about 5%. We have used this rate in calculating the approximate franchise fees that would be generated by the staff members and new graduates that live in Manhattan. In similar fashion to the utility profits, we take 70% of the franchise tax total and divide by the number of households to get an average annual amount per household of \$93.73.

Estimated Total Impact of All Utility Purchases

Using the assumptions discussed above, the overall impact of new utility purchases by the staff and graduates over the next 10 years could be:

- Increased city utility profits of about \$507,000.
- Increased city franchise fees of about \$104,000
- Total new city net revenues from utilities of about \$611,000.

SECTION 6 - REPORT SUMMARY AND DISCLAIMER

Report Summary

We believe that this report presents a conservative indication of the potential economic impact of this project at MATC on the City of Manhattan. The methodology is based upon documentable data and assumptions that are conservative rather than liberal. The assumptions used have been determined independently by Municipal Consulting, LLC from its own analysis and experience in more than 300 cost-benefit analyses conducted throughout the State of Kansas.

Estimated Total Economic Impact of the Project

The estimated total economic impact of all sections of this report over the next 10 years could be:

- Increased local sales tax collections of about \$1,556,000.
- Increased utility profits and franchise fees of about \$611,000.
- Total direct revenues to the city of about \$2,167,000.

MATC reports that an independent analysis performed for all the technical colleges in Kansas indicates a total annual economic impact of MATC in the region is \$22 million. With an average enrollment of about 1,000 students, the average impact per student would be \$22,000. Our calculation based on an average of 210 students for the 8-year period is a total of \$10,319, or \$1,290 per student per year. Thus, we maintain that this is a very conservative approach to this analysis.

Disclaimer

The results of this report are estimates based on the various assumptions listed above and are not to be interpreted as an actual prediction of performance of the overall economic impact of this project. Many unknown financial and economic factors can occur over a 10-year period that could significantly alter these projections. Municipal Consulting, LLC has no control over any of these factors and therefore cannot and does not make any guarantees of the results indicated in this report. Projections out to 10 years may have an error margin of 25-50% or even greater, depending on many economic factors.

About Municipal Consulting, LLC

Municipal Consulting, LLC was formed in 2010 with R. Steven Robb as sole owner. However, Robb has been performing cost-benefit studies, economic impact studies, and financial feasibility reports for over 20 years. He has performed more than 300 cost-benefit studies for city development projects all over the state of Kansas.

Municipal Consulting, LLC R. Steven Robb, Sole Owner <u>steverobb@ckt.net</u> 620-704-6495

Economic Impact Study

Appendix A - Executive Summary

| | | | 40.14 |
|---|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | 10 Year |
| City Revenues Generated: | Years 1-5 | Years 6-10 | TOTAL |
| Sales tax from construction labor & materials | \$520,789 | \$0 | \$520,789 |
| Sales tax from new staff jobs spending | \$29,546 | \$33,467 | \$63,013 |
| Sales tax from new graduate spending | \$259,600 | \$712,524 | \$972,124 |
| Total New City Sales Taxes Generated | \$809,935 | \$745,991 | \$1,555,926 |
| Utility Net Profits | \$160,698 | \$346,163 | \$506,861 |
| Franchise Fees | \$31,004 | \$73,073 | \$104,077 |
| Total City Revenues | \$809,935 | \$1,165,227 | \$2,166,865 |
| County Revenues Generated | | | |
| Sales tax from construction labor & materials | \$359,165 | \$0 | \$359,165 |
| Sales tax from new staff jobs spending | \$20,377 | \$23,081 | \$43,457 |
| Sales tax from new graduate spending | \$179,034 | \$491,396 | \$670,430 |
| Total County Revenues | \$558,576 | \$514,477 | \$1,073,053 |

Economic Impact Study

Appendix B - Annual Impact Summary

| City Revenues Generated: | | | | | | | | | | | Decade |
|---|-----------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| Description | Yr 1 | Yr 2 | Yr 3 | Yr 4 | Yr 5 | Yr 6 | Yr 7 | Yr 8 | Yr 9 | Yr 10 | Total |
| Sales tax from construction labor & materials | 342,232 | 178,557 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$520,789 |
| Sales tax from new staff jobs spending | 5,611 | 5,757 | 5,907 | 6,060 | 6,212 | 6,367 | 6,526 | 6,689 | 6,857 | 7,028 | \$63,013 |
| Sales tax from new graduate spending | 0 | 0 | 41,803 | 85,780 | 132,016 | 135,449 | 138,970 | 142,444 | 146,006 | 149,656 | \$972,124 |
| Total new city sales taxes | 347,843 | 184,314 | 47,710 | 91,841 | 138,228 | 141,815 | 145,496 | 149,134 | 152,862 | 156,684 | \$1,555,926 |
| Utility Net Profits | 4,511 | 13,195 | 31,349 | 47,393 | 64,250 | 65,856 | 67,503 | 69,190 | 70,920 | 72,693 | \$506,861 |
| Franchise Fees | 0 | 1,788 | 5 <i>,</i> 978 | 9,676 | 13,563 | 13,902 | 14,249 | 14,606 | 14,971 | 15,345 | \$104,077 |
| Total New City Revenues | \$352,354 | \$199,296 | \$85 <i>,</i> 037 | \$148,910 | \$216,041 | \$221,574 | \$227,249 | \$232,930 | \$238,753 | \$244,722 | \$2,166,865 |
| County Revenues Generated | Yr 1 | Yr 2 | Yr 3 | Yr 4 | Yr 5 | Yr 6 | Yr 7 | Yr 8 | Yr 9 | Yr 10 | \$0 |
| Sales tax from construction labor & materials | 236,022 | 123,143 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$359,165 |
| Sales tax from new staff jobs spending | 3,870 | 3,970 | 4,074 | 4,179 | 4,284 | 4,391 | 4,501 | 4,613 | 4,729 | 4,847 | \$43,457 |
| Sales tax from new graduate spending | 0 | 0 | 28,830 | 59,159 | 91,046 | 93,413 | 95,841 | 98,238 | 100,693 | 103,211 | \$670,430 |
| Total new sales tax collections | 239,891 | 127,113 | 32,903 | 63,338 | 95,329 | 97,804 | 100,342 | 102,851 | 105,422 | 108,058 | \$1,073,053 |

MANHATTAN AREA TECHNICAL COLLEGE Economic Impact Study Appendix C - Economic Impact of Construction

| Assumptions: | Persentag of construction co | ost attributed | to contractor p | rofits | | | 3% | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Percentage of construction of | cost attributed | d to labor: | | | | 47.00% | | | | | | |
| | Percentage of labor salaries | as disposable | income: | | | | 50.00% | | | | | | |
| | Percentage of disposable inc | come spent in | Kansas: | | | | 100.00% | | | | | | |
| | Percentage of disposable inc | come spent in | the county | | | | 75.00% | | | | | | |
| | Percentage of disposable inc | come spent in | the city | | | | 75.00% | | | | | | |
| | Percentage of construction of | cost attributed | d to materials: | | | | 50.00% 100.00% | | | | | | |
| | ercentage of materials cost spent in Kansas: | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Percentage of materials cost | t spent in the o | county | | | | 75.00% | | | | | | |
| | Percentage of materials cost | | | | | | 75.00% | | | | | | |
| | Average construction worke | er monthly sala | ary (\$25/hr x 40 | hrs/wk x 4.2 | weeks/mo.) | | \$4,200 | | | | | | |
| | Percent of rollover spending | g retained in th | ne community | | | | 75.00% | | | | | | |
| | City sales tax rate | | | | | | 1.45% | | | | | | |
| | County sales tax rate | | | | | | 1.00% | | | | | | |
| | <mark>State Sales Ta</mark> x Rate | | | | | | 6.50% | | | | | | |
| Project Schedule | | BidStartding | Finish | Begin | Year 1 | Year 2 | Grand | | | | | | |
| Project | Amount | Construction | Construction | Operation | Amounts | Amounts | Totals | | | | | | |
| Building Construction | 16,300,000 | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 | | | | | | | | | |
| FE | 750,000 | | | | 187,500 | 562,500 | 750,000 | | | | | | |
| Labor | 7,661,000 | | | | 3,830,500 | 3,830,500 | \$7,661,000 | | | | | | |
| Materials | 8,150,000 | | | | 6,112,500 | 2,037,500 | \$8,150,000 | | | | | | |
| | | | A | Annual Total | \$9,943,000 | \$5,868,000 | \$15,811,000 | | | | | | |
| | Labor disposa | ible income | | | 1,915,250 | 1,915,250 | \$3,830,500 | | | | | | |
| | Amount spen | t in the city | | | 1,436,438 | 1,436,438 | \$2,872,875 | | | | | | |
| | Materials & F | FE cost spent i | in city | | 6,300,000 | 2,600,000 | \$8,900,000 | | | | | | |
| | Total Original | | | | 7,736,438 | | \$11,772,875 | | | | | | |
| | First rollover | , , , , , | | | 5,802,328 | 3,027,328 | \$8,829,656 | | | | | | |
| | Second rollov | er | | | 4,351,746 | 2,270,496 | \$6,622,242 | | | | | | |
| | Third rollover | | | | 3,263,810 | 1,702,872 | \$4,966,682 | | | | | | |
| | Fourth rollove | 1,277,154 | \$3,725,011 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Fourth rollover 2,447,857 1,277,154 53 Total all city spending 23,602,178 12,314,288 \$35 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 10tai an tity spending 25,002,178 12,314,288 355 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | City sales tax generated \$342,232 \$178,557 \$ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | ~ | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | tax generated | | | <mark>\$236,022</mark> 456 | <mark>\$123,143</mark> 130 | \$359,165 | | | | | | |

Economic Impact Study

Appendix D - Economic Impact of New Staff Jobs

| Assumptions: | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------|---------|---------|---------|------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-------------|------|
| Annual Inflation Rate (Year | rs 1 & 2) | | 2.60% | | | | | | | | | | |
| Annual Inflation Rate (Year | | | 2.60% | C | ity sales tax | | 1.45% | | | | | | |
| Annual Inflation Rate (Year | rs 5 thru 10) | | 2.50% | C | County sales tax | : | 1.00% | | | | | | |
| Percent of salaries as dispo | osable incon | ne | 50.00% | | | | | | | | | | |
| Disposable income spent in | n Kansas | | 90.00% | | | | | | | | | | |
| Disposable income spent in | n Manhattai | n | 75.00% | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rollover retainage rate | | | 75.50% | | | | | | | | | | |
| | Number | Yr 1 | Yr 2 | Yr 3 | Yr 4 | Yr 5 | Yr 6 | Yr 7 | Yr 8 | Yr 9 | Yr 10 | Total | |
| New Position Description | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Faculty | 4.0 | 61,623 | 63,225 | 64,869 | 66,556 | 68,220 | 69,925 | 71,673 | 73,465 | 75,302 | 77,184 | \$2,768,165 | |
| Admin. Assistant | 0.0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$0 | |
| | 0.0 | 0 | Ŭ | 0 | Ū | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | U | ÷ | |
| Maintenance | 1.0 | 36630 | 37,582 | 38,560 | 39,562 | 40,551 | 41,565 | 42,604 | 43,669 | 44,761 | 45,880 | \$411,364 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | 6500 C05 | |
| Custodial | 2.0 | 25940 | 26,614 | 27,306 | 28,016 | 28,717 | 29,435 | 30,171 | 30,925 | 31,698 | 32,490 | \$582,625 | |
| | 0.0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$0 | |
| | 0.0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | \$0 | |
| Total Jobs | 7.0 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total Salaries | | 335,002 | 343,712 | 352,649 | 361,817 | 370,863 | 380,134 | 389,638 | 399,379 | 409,363 | 419,597 | \$3,762,154 | \$3, |
| Initial disposable spending | { | 167,501 | 171,856 | 176,324 | 180,909 | 185,431 | 190,067 | 194,819 | 199,689 | 204,682 | 209,799 | | |
| Disposable spending in the | e City | 125,626 | 128,892 | 132,243 | 135,682 | 139,074 | 142,550 | 146,114 | 149,767 | 153,511 | 157,349 | | |
| First rollover | | 94,847 | 97,313 | 99,844 | 102,440 | 105,001 | 107,626 | 110,316 | 113,074 | 115,901 | 118,798 | | |
| Second Rollover | | 71,610 | 73,472 | 75,382 | 77,342 | 79,275 | 81,257 | 83,289 | 85,371 | 87,505 | 89,693 | | |
| Third rollover | | 54,065 | 55,471 | 56,913 | 58,393 | 59,853 | 61,349 | 62,883 | 64,455 | 66,066 | 67,718 | | |
| Fourth rollover | | 40,819 | 41,881 | 42,970 | 44,087 | 45,189 | 46,319 | 47,477 | 48,664 | 49,880 | 51,127 | | |
| Total city spending | | 386,968 | 397,029 | 407,352 | 417,943 | 428,391 | 439,101 | 450,079 | 461,331 | 472,864 | 484,686 | \$4,345,743 | |
| City sales tax generated | | \$5,611 | \$5,757 | \$5,907 | \$6,060 | \$6,212 | \$6,367 | \$6,526 | \$6,689 | \$6,857 | \$7,028 | \$63,013 | j |
| County sales tax generated | d | \$3,870 | \$3,970 | \$4,074 | \$4,179 | \$4,284 | \$4,391 | \$4,501 | \$4,613 | \$4,729 | \$4,847 | \$43,457 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

\$53*,*700

Yr 10

\$52,390

Yr 9

Totals

MANHATTAN AREA TECHNICAL COLLEGE

Economic Impact Study

Appendix E - Impact of New Graduate Jobs

\$45,000

Yr 3

| Assum | ptions: |
|-------|---------|
| | |

| No of new graduates each year (Over and above the current graduates) | 100 |
|---|----------|
| New Graduate Average Beginning Salary | \$45,000 |
| Percentage of Average Salary as disposable income | 30.00% |
| Percent of New Graduates Remaining in the Immediate Area for at least 3 Years | 70.00% |
| City retainage rate for roll-over spending | 75.00% |
| City sales tax rate | 1.45% |
| Annual Inflation Rate (Years 1-3) | 2.60% |
| Annual Inflation Rate (Years 4-5 | 2.60% |
| Annual Inflation Rate (Years 6-10 | 2.50% |
| County Sales Tax Rate | 1.009 |
| | |

\$47,370

Yr 5

\$48,602

Yr 6

\$49,866

Yr 7

\$51,112

Yr 8

\$46,170

Yr 4

Avg. Annual Wage

| New Graduates Per Year in the Area | 0 | 0 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 560 |
|------------------------------------|-----|-----|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| New Annual Personal Income | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,150,000 | \$6,463,800 | \$9,947,788 | \$10,206,431 | \$10,471,798 | \$10,733,593 | \$11,001,933 | \$11,276,981 | \$73,252,323 |
| Disposable income | \$0 | \$0 | \$945,000 | \$1,939,140 | \$2,984,336 | \$3,061,929 | \$3,141,539 | \$3,220,078 | \$3,300,580 | \$3,383,094 | \$21,975,697 |
| New Retail Sales | \$0 | \$0 | \$945,000 | \$1,939,140 | \$2,984,336 | \$3,061,929 | \$3,141,539 | \$3,220,078 | \$3,300,580 | \$3,383,094 | \$21,975,697 |
| First rollover | \$0 | \$0 | \$708,750 | \$1,454,355 | \$2,238,252 | \$2,296,447 | \$2,356,155 | \$2,415,058 | \$2,475,435 | \$2,537,321 | \$16,481,773 |
| Second rollover | \$0 | \$0 | \$531,563 | \$1,090,766 | \$1,678,689 | \$1,722,335 | \$1,767,116 | \$1,811,294 | \$1,856,576 | \$1,902,991 | \$12,361,330 |
| Third rollover | \$0 | \$0 | \$398,672 | \$818,075 | \$1,259,017 | \$1,291,751 | \$1,325,337 | \$1,358,470 | \$1,392,432 | \$1,427,243 | \$9,270,997 |
| Fourth rollover | \$0 | \$0 | \$299,004 | \$613,556 | \$944,263 | \$968,814 | \$994,003 | \$1,018,853 | \$1,044,324 | \$1,070,432 | \$6,953,248 |
| Total City Retail Sales | \$0 | \$0 | \$2,882,988 | \$5,915,892 | \$9,104,558 | \$9,341,276 | \$9,584,149 | \$9,823,753 | \$10,069,347 | \$10,321,081 | \$67,043,044 |
| City Sales Tax Generated | \$0 | \$0 | \$41,803 | \$85,780 | \$132,016 | \$135,449 | \$138,970 | \$142,444 | \$146,006 | \$149,656 | \$972,124 |
| County Sales Tax Generated | \$0 | \$0 | \$28,830 | \$59,159 | \$91,046 | \$93,413 | \$95,841 | \$98,238 | \$100,693 | \$103,211 | \$670,430 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

| City Sales Tax Rate: | 1.45% | |
|-----------------------|-------|--|
| County Sales Tax Rate | 1.00% | |

Yr 2

Yr 1

MANHATTAN AREA TECHNICAL COLLEGE Economic Impact Study

Appendix F - Impact of New Utility Usage

Supporting Facts:

| | Current city average utility profit margin | 45.11% | (Water/Sewer/Electricity/Trash) |
|--------------------------|--|----------|---------------------------------|
| | Franchise fee rate | 5% | (Gas/Internet/Phone) |
| Assumptions: Percenta | age of new graduates that will use city utilities: | | 50.00% |
| Estimated annual cost f | or water/sewer/trash/stormwater | \$29,250 | |
| Estimated annual cost f | or electricity and gas | \$25,750 | |
| Estimated annual cost f | or internet and phone | \$10,000 | |
| Annual Inflation Rate (Y | 'ears 1-3) | 2.60% | |
| Annual Inflation Rate (Y | 'ears 4-5) | 2.60% | |
| Annual Inflation Rate (Y | 'ears 6-10) | 2.50% | |
| Average annual utility p | profits per household | \$403 | |
| Average annual franchis | se fees per household | \$94 | |

| ANNUAL UTILITIES: | | | | | | | | | | | Decade |
|--|--------|--------|--------|-----------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-----------|
| | Yr 1 | Yr 2 | Yr 3 | Yr 4 | Yr 5 | Yr 6 | Yr 7 | Yr 8 | Yr 9 | Yr 10 | Total |
| All City-Provided Utilities | 10,000 | 29,250 | 30,011 | 30,791 | 31,591 | 32,381 | 33,191 | 34,020 | 34,871 | 35,743 | \$301,848 |
| City Net Profit Margin | 4,511 | 13,195 | 13,538 | 13,890 | 14,251 | 14,607 | 14,972 | 15,347 | 15,730 | 16,124 | \$136,164 |
| Gas/internet/phone | 0 | 35,750 | 36,680 | 37,633 | 38,612 | 39,577 | 40,566 | 41,581 | 42,620 | 43,686 | \$356,704 |
| City Franchise Fees | 0 | 1,788 | 1,834 | 1,882 | 1,931 | 1,979 | 2,028 | 2,079 | 2,131 | 2,184 | \$17,835 |
| Revenue from New Families NOTE: New graduates assumed to remain in the area for 3 years. | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Utility Revenue per Family | \$403 | \$413 | \$424 | \$435 | \$446 | \$458 | \$469 | \$481 | \$493 | \$505 | |
| Franchise Fees/Family | \$94 | \$96 | \$99 | \$101 | \$104 | \$106 | \$109 | \$112 | \$115 | \$118 | |
| Number of new families: | 0 | 0 | 42 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 287 |
| Cumulative new families | 0 | 0 | 42 | 77 | 112 | 112 | 112 | 112 | 112 | 112 | 112 |
| Utility net profits | 0 | 0 | 17,811 | 33,503 | 49,999 | 51,249 | 52,530 | 53,844 | 55,190 | 56,570 | \$370,697 |
| Franchise Fees | 0 | 0 | 4,144 | 7,795 | 11,632 | 11,923 | 12,221 | 12,527 | 12,840 | 13,161 | \$86,242 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total utility net profits | 4,511 | 13,195 | 31,349 | 47,393 | 64,250 | 65,856 | 67,503 | 69,190 | 70,920 | 72,693 | \$506,861 |
| Total franchise fees | 0 | 1,788 | 5,978 | 9,676 | 13,563 | 13,902 | 14,249 | 14,606 | 14,971 | 15,345 | \$104,077 |
| Total City Revenues - Utilities | 4,511 | 14,982 | 37,327 | 57 , 069 | 77,813 | 79,758 | 81,752 | 83,796 | 85,891 | 88,038 | \$610,938 |

Economic Impact Study

Table 1- Cumulative Benefits vs. Incentive

| | City | | | | |
|--------|-------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|------------|
| | Sales | Utility | Total | | Cumulative |
| Year | Taxes | Usage | Benefits | Incentive | Benefits |
| 1 | \$347,843 | \$4,511 | \$352,354 | \$1,300,000 | \$947,646 |
| 2 | \$184,314 | \$14,982 | \$199,296 | | \$748,350 |
| 3 | \$47,710 | \$37,327 | \$85,037 | | \$663,313 |
| 4 | \$91,841 | \$57,069 | \$148,910 | | \$514,403 |
| 5 | \$138,228 | \$77,813 | \$216,041 | | \$298,362 |
| 6 | \$141,815 | \$79,758 | \$221,574 | | \$76,789 |
| 7 | \$145,496 | \$81,752 | \$227,249 | | \$150,460 |
| 8 | \$149,134 | \$83,796 | \$232,930 | | \$383,390 |
| 9 | \$152,862 | \$85,891 | \$238,753 | | \$622,143 |
| 10 | \$156,684 | \$88,038 | \$244,722 | | \$866,865 |
| Totals | \$1,555,926 | \$610,938 | \$2,166,865 | \$1,300,000 | \$866,865 |