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## Study Impetus Summary

- Manhattan Needs a Facility to Host Larger Events
- The impact of the recent Lost Business Report alone; and assuming that an Attendee spends an average of $\$ 157$ per day
- Manhattan has lost opportunity of circulating an additional \$7.5M through City
- Population surge expected due to Big Red One
- KSU Alumni Center Occupancy Rate
- Chamber of Comm. dinner at Alumni Ctr has turn-aways
- Manhattan is now realizing its competitive disadvantage with other Kansas communities
- Potential tie-in with Downtown development project


## Major Study Impetus: Lost Business

| Where Go? | Why? | Where Go? | Why? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Great Bend | Condition of Holiday Inn | Topeka | Board decision |
| Great Bend | Condition of Holiday Inn | Topeka | Facility Concerns |
| Great Bend | Condition of Holiday Inn | Topeka | Falls on graduation |
|  |  | Topeka | Insufficient Hotel Rooms |
| Hutchinson | Condition of Holiday Inn | Topeka | Insufficient Hotel/Meeting Space |
| Hutchinson | Condition of Holiday Inn; "Done it All" | Topeka | Lower rates offered |
|  |  | Topeka | Lower room rates |
| Junction City | Condition of Ramada | Topeka | n/a |
| Junction City | Rumor of Holiday Inn closing |  |  |
| Junction City | Condt'n of Holiday Inn/See New Prop. | Wichita | Needed better meeting space |
| Junction City | Condt'n of Holiday Inn/See New Prop. | Wichita | Committee decision |
| Junction City | Wanted to see New Property | Wichita | Insufficient Hotel/Meeting Space |
| Junction City | Wanted to see New Property | Wichita | Insufficient Meeting Space |
| Junction City | Wanted to see New Property |  |  |
|  |  | Outside KS | Quality concerns |
| Overland Park | Insufficient Meeting Space |  |  |
| Overland Park | Insufficient Meeting Space | Unsure | Insufficient Meeting Space |
|  |  | Unsure | Lower room rates |
| Salina | Needed better meeting space |  |  |
| Salina | Condition of Holiday Inn |  |  |

## Study Goal:

- To Create a Facility that will:
- Be of a Size that will Enable Manhattan to Host Large Events (multiple medium events), and
- Be of a Quality that will Allow Manhattan to Become Competitive, and
- Be Financially Self-sustaining on Ongoing Annual Basis, and
- Be Cost Efficient with Public Sector Resources


## PHASE I: Market Analysis

## Study Research

- City Elected Officials \& Staff
- CVB Officials
- Chamber of Commerce
- Governor's Strategic Military Planning Commission
- Manhattan Hotels - General Managers \& Sales
- KSU University - VP of Administration
- KSU University - Physical Planning Staff
- K-State Alumni Center Management \& Finance
- Wichita Century II Center - Management \& Sales
- Overland Park Sheraton \& Convention Center - Management
- 40 Kansas \& Local Meeting and Event Planners
- Manhattan \& Other KS Full-service Hotel Performance
- Tours of Other Competitive Facilities


# Manhattan's <br> Meeting <br> Infrastructure 

## Manhattan's Meeting Infrastructure

|  | Hotel Rooms | Largest <br> Ballroom | Other <br> Meeting Space | Total <br> Exhibit Space |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| K-State Student Union | 0 | 9,300 | 29,500 | 0 |
| Houston Street Ballroom | 0 | 9,000 | 0 | 0 |
| Holiday Inn Hotel (Clarion) | 197 | 6,800 | 4,411 | 0 |
| Ramada Plaza Hotel (Holiday Inn) | 112 | 5,700 | 4,296 | 0 |
| K-State Alumni Center | 0 | 5,200 | 9,238 | 0 |
| Wareham Opera House | 0 | 4,400 | 0 | 0 |
| Fairfield Inn Manhattan | 98 | 0 | 988 | 0 |
| Super 8 Motel | 87 | 0 | 1,625 | 0 |
| Motel 6 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Econo Lodge | 79 | 0 | 2,145 | 0 |
| Hampton Inn | 72 | 0 | 674 | 0 |
| Comfort Inn | 65 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Best Western | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Regency Inn | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Bramlage Coliseum | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12,800 |
| TOTAL | 887 | 40,400 | 52,871 | 12,800 |
| MAXIMUM | 197 | 9,300 | 29,500 | 12,800 |
| MAXIMUM w/o Alcohol Policies | 197 | 6,800 | 9,238 | 0 |

$\square$

## Manhattan's Largest Function Spaces



## Competitive Destinations \& Facilities

## Kansas Meeting Infrastructure

|  | Population | Rank | No. of Hotel Properties |  |  |  | Hotel Supply |  |  |  |  |  | Largest <br> Single Function Space SF |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Full | Rank | Limited | Rank | Full | Rank | Limited | Rank | TOTAL | Rank | Exhibit | Rank | Ballroom | Rank |
| Wichita | 344,284 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 40 | 1 | 1,731 | 2 | 3,552 | 1 | 5,283 | 1 | 128,000 | 1 | 45,000 | 1 |
| Overland Park | 149,080 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 25 | 2 | 1,923 | 1 | 3,045 | 2 | 4,968 | 2 | 58,500 | 2 | 25,000 | 2 |
| Salina | 45,679 | 8 | 1 | 6 | 18 | 4 | 192 | 8 | 1,285 | 4 | 1,477 | 4 | 21,100 | 7 | 18,300 | 3 |
| Hutchinson | 40,787 | 10 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 14 | 220 | 7 | 489 | 15 | 709 | 13 | 28,800 | 5 | 15,300 | 4 |
| Kansas City | 146,866 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 9 | 428 | 4 | 615 | 10 | 1,043 | 6 | 0 | - | 15,000 | 5 |
| Topeka | 122,377 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 24 | 3 | 679 | 3 | 1,812 | 3 | 2,491 | 3 | 44,500 | 3 | 14,500 | 6 |
| Great Bend | 15,345 | 18 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 16 | 172 | 11 | 224 | 16 | 396 | 16 | 0 | - | 13,100 | 7 |
| Lawrence | 80,098 | 6 | 1 | 6 | 12 | 5 | 192 | 8 | 906 | 5 | 1,098 | 5 | 24,000 | 6 | 12,000 | 8 |
| Junction City | 18,886 | 17 | 1 | 6 | 9 | 8 | 119 | 13 | 616 | 9 | 735 | 12 | 0 | - | 12,000 | 8 |
| McPherson | 13,770 | 19 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 18 | 109 | 14 | 86 | 19 | 195 | 19 | 0 | - | 7,000 | 10 |
| Manhattan | 44,831 | 9 | 2 | 4 | 8 | 9 | 309 | 5 | 578 | 14 | 887 | 9 | 12,800 | 9 | 6,800 | 11 |
| Garden City | 28,451 | 13 | 0 | - | 8 | 9 | 0 | - | 599 | 13 | 599 | 15 | 30,000 | 4 | 6,000 | 12 |
| Olathe | 92,962 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 148 | 12 | 613 | 11 | 761 | 10 | 0 | - | 4,600 | 13 |
| Hays | 20,013 | 16 | 1 | 6 | 11 | 6 | 191 | 10 | 770 | 6 | 961 | 8 | 13,200 | 8 | 4,500 | 14 |
| Lenexa | 40,238 | 11 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 14 | 297 | 6 | 743 | 7 | 1,040 | 7 | 6,500 | 13 | 3,900 | 15 |
| Emporia | 26,760 | 14 | 0 | - | 11 | 6 | 0 | - | 739 | 8 | 739 | 11 | 7,500 | 12 | 3,800 | 16 |
| Leavenworth | 35,420 | 12 | 0 | - | 3 | 17 | 0 | - | 207 | 18 | 207 | 18 | 0 | - | 3,700 | 17 |
| Shawnee | 47,996 | 7 | 0 | - | 2 | 18 | 0 | - | 217 | 17 | 217 | 17 | 9,100 | 11 | 3,300 | 18 |
| Dodge City | 25,176 | 15 | 0 | - | 8 | 9 | 0 | - | 603 | 12 | 603 | 14 | 10,500 | 10 | 1,100 | 19 |

## Quality of Competition






## Infrastructure Summary

- Relative to the primary competition, Manhattan ranks:
- High in full-service hotel rooms
- Last in ballroom space
- Among the lowest in quality of space \& hotel rooms
- Excluding K-State Alumni Center, Manhattan’s meeting package is "Class C"
- Quality Minimum = Courtyard Junction City
- Manhattan should not attempt to be on par with quality level of Wichita/Overland Park, but should strive to be best "other" market for rotational patterns of state-wide groups
- Q: Do KS Meeting Planners Agree?


## Meeting Planner Survey

## Meeting Planner Surveys

- Assn of General Contractors of KS
- Gaches, Draden, Barbee \& Associates
- KS Academy of Family Physicians
- KS Assn of Insurance Agents
- KS Assn of School Boards
- KS Bankers Assn
- KS Chamber of Commerce \& Industry
- KS Chiropractic Assn
- KS Crop Improvement Assn
- KS Dental Assn
- KS Foundation for Medical Care
- KS Grain \& Feed Assn/KS Agribusiness
- KS Healthcare Assn
- KS Hospital Assn
- KS Independent Oil and Gas Assn
- KS Livestock Assn
- KS Manufactured Housing Authority
- KS Motor Carriers Assn
- KS Nurses Assn
- KS Press Assn
- KS Propane Education \& Research Council
- KS Recreation \& Park Assn
- KS Society of Certified Accountants
- KS Soybean Assn
- KS Speech-Language \& Hearing Assn
- KS State Bar Assn
- KS State High School Activities Assn
- KS Telecommunications Industry
- KS Trial Lawyer Assn
- KS Veterinary Medical Assn
- Mid-America Tire Dealers Assn
- Petroleum Marketers \& Convenience Store Assn
- Propane Marketers Assn
- The Carter Group


## "What is first thing(s) that come to mind when you think of Manhattan?"

"K-State" ..... 24
"The Little Apple" ..... 5
"Football/Wildcats" ..... 2
"Colbert Hills" ..... 1
"Our Members Love Manhattan" ..... 1
"No Good Place to Have a Meeting" ..... 1
"Our Annual Spring Conference" ..... 1

## "Have you ever held an event in Manhattan?"

- YES: Why Return?
- Location (6)
- K-State \& Athletics (6)
- It is Another City to Rotate to (2)
- Nice People (1)
- Affordable Pricing (1)
- Colbert Hills (1)
- Aggieville (1)
- YES: Why Not Return?
- Number and Quality of Hotel Rooms (11)
- Insufficient Meeting Space (10)
- Location (3)
- Poor Service (1)
- NO: Why They Never Came?
- Location (4)
- Prefer other destination (2)
- Insufficient Meeting Space (2)
- Lack of Quality Hotel (2)
- No Attractions; No Pull (1)


## "Where have you met in the past few years?"



## "What is seating requirement for largest banquet function?"



## "What is your typical peak-night room block?"



## "What number of rooms must be full service?"



## "How important is it that the bulk of your hotel rooms be within walking distance to the meeting facility?



## What Factors are Important?


"What hotel rate do you expect to pay in Manhattan for a full-service property located near the conference center?"


## Scenario 1: As-Is

"Assume that the conference space in Manhattan remains unchanged; How likely would you be to consider hosting your event in Manhattan?"


## Scenario 2: Downtown Facility

"Assume now that a new conference space that meets your space needs is built downtown and is within walking distance to mall and 98-room Fairfield Inn hotel. Given this scenario, how likely would you be to consider hosting your event in Manhattan?"


## Scenario 2: D'town Facility + Museum/Gym

"If in addition to this scenario, the facility was across the street from a complex that included a large community fitness and aquatic center that your attendees could use for a fee, as well as a discovery museum, how would you respond?"


## Scenario 2: D'town + Mus./Gym + Hotel

"Finally, in addition to the Fairfield Inn and the Fitness/Aquatic center and museum, consider that the new downtown conference center is built with an attached 150-room hotel, how would you respond?"


## Scenario 3: K-State \& Aggieville

"Assume now that a new conf. center that meets your space needs is built within walking distance to Kansas State University, Aggieville, and the 112-room Ramada Inn (currently completing a large renovation); How likely would you be to consider hosting your event in Manhattan?"


## Scenario 3: K-State \& Aggieville + Hotel

"In addition to the above, consider that the new conference center is built with an attached 150-room hotel, how would you respond?"

100\%


## Summary: Will They Come?

- Scenario 1: "As-Is"
- Scenario 2: "Downtown"

Scenario 2b: + Museum/Gym
Scenario 2c: +150-rm Hotel

- Scenario 3: "K-State \& Aggieville" Scenario 3b: +150-rm Hotel


$$
\text { Maybe } \begin{array}{r}
\text { Yes } \\
(\mathrm{DY}+\mathrm{HL})
\end{array}
$$

| $50 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $26 \%$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| $32 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $33 \%$ |
| $41 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $30 \%$ |
| $15 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $67 \%$ |
| $14 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $43 \%$ |
| $0 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $68 \%$ |

## Destination Appeal Comparison

"If Manhattan were to build the proposed conference center with a new 150-room hotel, how would our "destination appeal" compare with other markets?"


## Meeting Planner Summary

- Events surveyed represented good target market for Manhattan
- Most were of size that is within practical limits
- Planners generally have a good image of Manhattan
- Manhattan can technically accommodate vast majority of group space and hotel needs with its existing infrastructure, yet attracting events is difficult due to Quality and brands of available hotels
- Kansas planners reflect national survey: full-service hotel supply and walking distance between hotel rooms and meeting space are highly important factors (clustering)
- An additional full-service hotel is a major decision factor in Manhattan
- A site near K-State is preferred
- With right "package" Manhattan has destination appeal to be among best outside of Wichita and Overland Park


## Hotel Brands <br> \& Chain Scales

## National Survey: How Important is Hotel Brand?

- Air Medical Transport Conference
- American Academy of Forensic Scientists
- American Assn. of Gynecological Laparascopists
- American Assn. of Museums
- American Assn.iation of Cereal Chemists
- American College of Allergy and Immunology
- American College of Sports Medicine
- American College of Veterinary Ophthalmologists
- American Medical Technologists
- American Pharmaceutical Assn.
- American Physical Therapy Assn.
- American Society for Aesthetic Plastic Surgery
- American Society Plumbing Engineers
- Assn. of Fundraising Professionals
- Assn. of Legal Administrators
- Assn. of State \& Territorial Health Officials
- Automatic Transmission Rebuilders Assn.
- Automotive Recyclers Assn.
- Bobit Publishing
- Carpet One
- Coalition of Essential Schools Assn.
- Commission on Accreditation for Law Enf Agencies
- Conference \& Logistics Inc
- Electrical Apparatus Service Assn.
- Electrical Manufacturing \& Coil
- Emergency Medical Services
- Filenet Corp
- Food Safety Expo
- Geological Society of America
- Human Factors \& Ergonomics Society
- Independent Community Bankers of America
- Institute of Navigation
- Intermec Technologies Corp
- International Church of the Fourwquare Gospel
- International Executive Housekeeping Assn.
- International Institute of Municipal Clerks
- International Institute of Refrigeration
- International Right of Way Assn.
- League for Innovation/Community
- Lifestyles Organization
- Materials Research
- MGMA's Annual Conference
- National Assn. Healthcare Quality
- National Athletic Trainers Assn.
- National Conference State Legislature
- National Fire Ecology Symposium
- National Institute of Governmental Purchasing
- National PTA
- National Society of Genetic Counselors
- NECA Show
- North American Nature Photography Assn.
- Pentz Group Communications
- Peoplesoft
- Promax \& BDA, PI
- Public Employee Retirement Sys
- Self Insurance Institue of America
- Shorecliff Communications
- Site Services
- Society of American Gastrointestinal Endoscopic Surgeons
- Society of Interventional Radiology
- Specialty Coffee Assn..
- Tech Assn.ation of Pulp \& Paper Industries
- Timberline Software
- Truckload Carriers Assn.
- US Dept. of Transportation
- USA National Karate-Do Federation
- Vietnam Helicopter Pilots Assn.
- Washington Mutual Bank
- Wood Technology Clinic \& Shows
- Youth Specialties


## Brand Preference

"When selecting a destination, do the following hotels have a positive, neutral, or negative impact on your decision making process?"


## STR - Chain Scales

- Luxury
- Four Seasons, Ritz-Carlton, W, Fairmont
- Upper Upscale
- Hyatt, Marriott, Omni, Westin, Embassy Suites
- Upscale
- Crowne Plaza, Radisson, Hyatt Place, Adam's Mark
- Midscale w/ F\&B
- Clarion, Holiday Inn, Ramada, Best Western
- Midscale w/o F\&B
- Comfort Inn, Hampton Inn, Fairfield Inn,
- Economy
- Econo Lodge, Motel 6, Super 8
- Manhattan does not offer a property in the higher-end scale of the industry.
- In Kansas, only Big-2 offer an Upper Upscale hotel property.


## Hotel Brands to Consider

| TIER 1 |  | TIER 2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | (Upper Upscale) | (Upscale) |
| - DoubleTree |  | - Adam's Mark |
| - Embassy Suites |  | - aloft (Starwood) |
| - Hilton |  | - Crowne Plaza |
| - Hyatt | - Radisson |  |
| - Marriott | - Wyndham |  |
| - Omni | - Four Points |  |
| - Renaissance |  | (Sheraton) |
| - Sheraton |  |  |
| - Westin |  |  |



## Recommended Facility Plan

## Recommended Facility Plan

## Must Have:

- Meeting space must be within walking distance to full-service hotel rooms, and
- All quality levels must be consistent with desired target market
- Just below Overland Park and Wichita
- Ballroom Space must be at least 10,000 SF


## Ideally Have:

- New ~150 full-service rooms attached to meeting space
- Needed to meet City's Goal to be financially self-supporting
- Pursue Hotel Brand of Upper Upscale but Consider Upscale if Budget Dictates
- Up to 20,000 SF ballroom divisible into 7 different rooms
- Located within walking distance to © K-State, $(2$ the Alumni Center, $\boldsymbol{3}$ Ramada Inn, and $\boldsymbol{4}$ Aggieville
$\square$


## Potential Conference Center Hotel Site



## Hotel Market Performance

- Manhattan Properties
- Full-Service Properties in Kansas


## Manhattan Hotels

| Hotel Property | Location | Opening <br> Date | No. of <br> Rooms |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Holiday Inn | Manhattan | Nov 1981 | 197 |
| Ramada Plaza | Manhattan | Jun 1960 | 112 |
| Fairfield Inn | Manhattan | Jun 1998 | 98 |
| Super 8 | Manhattan | Nov 1987 | 87 |
| Motel 6 | Manhattan | n/a | 87 |
| Econo Lodge | Manhattan | Jun 1962 | 79 |
| Hampton Inn | Manhattan | May 1998 | 72 |
| Comfort Inn | Manhattan | Jul 2000 | 65 |

## Manhattan Hotel Market Performance



## KS Full-Service Hotels

| Hotel Property | Location | Opening Date | No. of Rooms |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sheraton Hotel Overland Park \& Conference Center* | Overland Park | Dec 2002 | 412 |
| Marriott Overland Park* | Overland Park | Jul 1984 | 390 |
| Doubletree at Corporate Woods* | Overland Park | Feb 1982 | 356 |
| Embassy Suites Overland Park* | Overland Park | May 1984 | 199 |
| Hyatt Regency Wichita* | Wichita | Sep 1997 | 303 |
| Hilton Wichita Airport \& Conference Center* | Wichita | Aug 1981 | 302 |
| Marriott Wichita* | Wichita | Jun 1987 | 294 |
| Capitol Plaza Hotel | Topeka | Aug 1998 | 224 |
| Grand Prairie Hotel | Hutchinson | Aug 1977 | 220 |
| Highland Hotel | Great Bend | Aug 1985 | 172 |

## KS Full-Service Hotel Performance



## Hotel Market Summary

- Manhattan Hotel Market is Projected to be able to Support a 150-room Full-Service, Upper-Upscale/Upscale Conference Hotel
- Demand for Product not currently in Market
- Due to timing of Big Red One, impact of proposed hotel may be completely offset, allowing the market to remain at least unchanged in terms of occupancy (63\% v. 66\% -70\%)
- Proposed HQ hotel would have a positive impact on marketwide average hotel room rates (\$67v. \$78)
- Based on Meeting Planner Survey and actual hotel market performance for Manhattan and Kansas full-service properties:
- Proposed Conference Hotel estimated to perform between \$95 to \$110 ADR (2006\$) with 68\%-72\% occupancy upon stabilization
- Manhattan market-leader performing at \$75 ADR with 70\% occupancy (projected to reach up to $\$ 85$ in $2006 \$$ after renovation completion)


## Phase I Conclusions

- Order-of-magnitude development costs for the conference center between $\$ 6 \mathrm{M}$ to $\$ 12 \mathrm{M}$ for 10 K SF and 20K SF, respectively
- The public investment 150-room full-service hotel could be significant
- Overland Park, Wichita, Topeka, Junction City, among others have publicly-incentivized hotels
- Study recommends pursuit of the detailed study of the proposed facility at recommended K-State site location
- Site allows for cost-savings due to "package" created with existing Alumni Center/Ramada/KSU function space
- As an alternative site, continue to consider the costs and benefits of the downtown site
- An Ideal Development Solution could Involve the City, the University, the Foundation, and the Private Sector


## PHASE II: Financial Analysis

## Phase II

- Project Cost Estimates
- Operating Revenues \& Expenses
- Warranted Private-Sector Investment
- Need For Public Investment
- Phase II Conclusions
- Study Recommendations


## Project Cost Estimates

|  | UNIVERSITY | DOWNTOWN |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hotel: |  |  |
| No. of Keys/Rooms | 150 | 150 |
| Estimated Construction Cost per Key | \$150,000 | \$150,000 |
| Subtotal - Hotel: | \$22,500,000 | \$22,500,000 |
| Conference Center: |  |  |
| Ballroom Space (SF) | 12,000 | 12,000 |
| Meeting Room Space (SF) | 0 | 5,000 |
| Pre-Function Space (SF) | 4,000 | 4,000 |
| Kitchen/Support/Back-of-House (SF) | 6,000 | 6,000 |
| Total Function SF | 22,000 | 27,000 |
| Cost per SF | \$250 | \$250 |
| Subtotal - Conference Center: | \$5,500,000 | \$6,750,000 |
| Parking: | 5,047,000 | 5,000,000 |
| Subtotal: | \$33,047,000 | \$34,250,000 |
| Contingency (7\%): | 2,313,000 | 2,398,000 |
| Pre-Opening Costs: | 337,000 | 337,000 |
| Working Capital: | 1,030,000 | 1,030,000 |
| TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COST: | \$36,727,000 | \$38,015,000 |

## Operating Assumptions

No. of Rooms
ADR of Hotel
Occupancy of Hotel
New Room Demand in City
New Conference Demand
New Induce Demand
Total New Room Nights
\% Total Revenue to Bottom Line

| University |  | Downtown |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 150 |  | 150 |
| $\$ 110$ | $\$ 100$ |  |
| $60 \%-72 \%$ |  | $58 \%-68 \%$ |
|  |  |  |
| 12,000 | 10,200 |  |
| 4,800 | 2,400 |  |
| 16,800 | 12,600 |  |
| $22.5 \%$ | $19.3 \%$ |  |

## Warranted Private-Sector Investment

## Scenario 1: Land Only

Proposed Hotel \& Conference Center - University Site
Equity Return \& Debt Service
In Current Dollars ( 000 s omitted)

| Assumptions |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Rooms | 150 | Debt | 27,563 (exciudes Capitalized interest) |
| Cost per Key (\$000) | 245 | Equity | 9.187 |
| Total Project Cost (000) | 36,750 | Debt Interest Rate | 7.0\% |
| Public Investment (000) | 0 | Amortization Period (Years) | 30 (interst Oniy First 2 years) |
| NET COST (000) | 36,750 | Residual Cap Rate | 8.0\% |
| \% Debt | $75 \%$ |  |  |
| \% Equity | 25\% |  |  |

Net Operating Income
Debt Service
Interest
Principal
Capitalized Interest
Net Debt Service
Cash Flows After Debt Service
Debt Service Coverage Ratio
Equity Cash Flows
Equity Contribution
Cash Flows After Debt Service
Repayment of Debt
Reversion
NET EQUITY CASH FLOWS

| Construction |  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2006 | 2007 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$0 | \$0 | \$1,282 | \$1,479 | \$1,691 | \$1,803 | \$1,915 | \$1,963 | \$2,012 | \$2,062 | \$2,114 | \$2,167 |
| (502) | $(1,447)$ | $(2,066)$ | $(2,066)$ | $(2,066)$ | $(2,044)$ | $(2,021)$ | $(1,996)$ | $(1,969)$ | $(1,940)$ | $(1,909)$ | $(1,877)$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (312) | (334) | (358) | (383) | (410) | (438) | (469) | (502) |
| 502 | 1,447 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0$\$ 0$ | 0 | $(2,066)$ | $(2,066)$ | $(2,378)$ | $(2,378)$ | $(2,379)$ | $(2,379)$ | $(2,379)$ | $(2,378)$ | $(2,378)$ | $(2,379)$ |
|  | \$0 | (\$784) | (\$587) | (\$687) | (\$575) | (\$464) | (\$416) | (\$367) | (\$316) | (\$264) | (\$212) |
| $(\$ 9,187)$ |  | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
|  | \$0 | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | \$0 | \$0 | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ |
| 0 | 0 | (784) | (587) | (687) | (575) | (464) | (416) | (367) | (316) | (264) | (212) |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $(26,306)$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27,088 |
| $(\$ 9,187)$ | $\$ 0$ | (\$784) | (\$587) | (\$687) | (\$575) | (\$464) | (\$416) | (\$367) | (\$316) | (\$264) | \$570 |

## Private IRR Summary

- Scenario 1:
- Land Only
- Scenario 2:
- Land + Conf. Ctr + Pkg
- Scenario 3:
- Land + Conf. Ctr + Pkg + \$3M

N/A

6\%

11\%
-5\%

## Phase II Conclusions

- Order of Magnitude Costs for Entire Project Could be Between \$35M - \$40M
- Based on Meeting Planner Survey and Proximity to Major Demand Generator, University Site projected to perform Better than Downtown Site
- \$10 Higher ADR and 4\% Higher Occupancy
- Only a University Site Project Begins to Approximate the Kinds of Investment Returns Needed to Attract Private-Sector Hotel Developers
- Pursue Upper Upscale Hotel to Differentiate from Competition
- Consider Upscale if Budget Dictates


## Study Recommendations

- To Meet Study Goals of Size, Quality, Financially Self-sustaining, and Public Costs; Recommended to:
- Begin discussions with Conference Center beneficiaries to plan for site, parking, and assemble Public Incentive package
. City...University...Foundation...County...State
- In exchange for Public investment, a room block agreement should be executed for benefit of all City hotels
- Pursue a site adjacent to University and its planned parking deck, Aggieville, Alumni Center, and existing Ramada Hotel
- Procure Architectural Massing Analysis
- Pursue a highly-divisible ballroom from 10,000 to 20,000 SF depending on site constraints and/or budget
- Issue RFQ/P for Conference Center Hotel Development
- Upper Upscale preferred, but consider Upscale

Q \& A

## Feasibility Assessment:

# Conference Center \& Hotel 

PHASE I: MARKET ANALYSIS
PHASE II: FINANCIAL ANALYSIS

Manhattan, Kansas
May 2006
$\square$

## McPherson: Best Western Holiday Manor


$\square$
Great Bend: Highland Hotel \& Conv. Center

$\square$
Salina: Holiday Inn \& Conv. Center

$\square$
Salina: Bicentennial Center

$\square$

## Hutchinson: Grand Prairie Hotel \& Conv. Ctr.


$\square$
Kansas City: HGI Hotel \& Reardon Conv. Ctr.

$\square$

## Lawrence: Holiday Inn Holidome \& Convention Center


$\square$

## Junction City: Courtyard Hotel \& Conf. Center


$\square$

## Topeka: KS Expocentre \& Complex


$\square$

## Wichita: Hyatt Hotel


$\square$

## Wichita: Century II Center



## Wichita: Century II Center


$\square$

## Overland Park: Sheraton Hotel \& Convention Center



## Comments

1) It would be "great" and there would be definite use if a hotel was built attached to a conference center. 2) Lots of members are alumni and love going back to Manhattan.
2) Mid-year event - 200 people - Manhattan would be considered in that rotation if quality space is avail. 2) Discovery museum would be a big plus because they always take a tour of the city on second meeting day of their mid-year meeting.
3) Museum would be a plus. 2) Families attend and look for things to fill their days. 3) The last 20 yrs have always held annual event in KC around Christmas because of holiday festivities in KS. Might consider Manhattan if other events were happening during their meeting times.
4) DMD Alumni love Manhattan. 2) 2007 meeting will be held at Ramada and Alumni Bldg.
5) Had 2007 show scheduled at Holiday Inn but cancelled due to poor quality hotel. 2) "If a new hotel is built we will definitely come." 3) We love Manhattan.
6) Could be persuaded to change venue if enticed.
7) Legislators like Topeka because of location. 2) Members like new hotels and could be enticed.
8) Very small meeting - no need for hotels overnight stays. 2) Use hotels throughout the state for meeting space.
9) Largest meeting will always be in Wichita but PAC annual meeting will most likely stay in Manhattan. 2) Ideal would be to schedule PAC meeting with K-state game in October.
10) Large show will always be 2nd day of Topeka Farm Show. 2) Board meeting will always use IPG Bldg on K-state due to money given to Univ., however use hotels to stay night.
11) We pay $\$ 88$ in Topeka for hotels.
12) Pulled out of Manhattan for 2007 due to lack of space. 2) Museum \& Fitness center a plus- families attend meeting.
13) Museum \& other attractions a plus. 2) Will more than likely stay in current venues due to driving convenience for members.

## Comments (cont.)

1) Museum a plus. 2) Rotation based upon RFP for every 2 years; but not going back to Manhattan due to lack of space.
2) Loves new convention center in Junction City. 2) Members like Wichita for our 1,500 person meeting. 3) Our April meeting- 100 people - we would consider Manhattan. 4) Likes Museum but not fitness center idea.
3) MD's love Manhattan and would plan event in conjunction with a $K$-state game however there are never enough hotel rooms.
4) Doesn't like water park idea.
5) Doesn't like museum idea.
6) Holding meeting at Holidome April 22 but very unhappy due to poor service. Our block was released early and all rooms taken by sports goers.
7) We hold 60 Seminars/yr for 120 people. 2) Our large 1200-person conference uses 3 large hotels plus convention ctr.
8) Likes Discovery Museum. 2) Price of hotel must be reasonable. 3) Loves Marriott in Overland Park.
9) No rotation for largest event. 2) Cont. Ed. meeting has 100 people with minimal rotation might consider adding Manhattan. 3) Annual golf tournament at Colbert Hill would consider a tie-in with a meeting if quality hotels. 4) Recommends attaching conference center with Colbert Hill "winner."
10) Likes Discovery Museum but not fitness center/ water park idea.
11) Museum, fitness center, aquatic center not be an enticement but would be nice. 2) Colbert Hills is a plus.
12) Doesn't like museum/fitness/aquatic center idea. 2) Farmers all over state and will always rotate 3) We went to Junction City last year only because did not like choices in Manhattan.
13) Our group offers aquatic class - therefore loves aquatic center idea. 2) Conference Center is free to rent with hotel space in Topeka - key point to gain business. 2) Parks \& Rec people in Manhattan very nice - have great events during conferences in past therefore would come back if adequate space.
14) Would choose Manhattan over OP or Wichita if space and price were comparable.

## Average Size of Industry Events



## Manhattan's Primary Competition



## "In what month(s) do you typically meet?"



## "What day(s) of week does your event typically take place?"



## "In addition to ballroom space, do you require dedicated exhibit space?"



## "How many simultaneous break-out rooms do you require?"



## Manhattan Hotel Market Performance



## Ops Cash Flow - University Site



## Departmental Expenses

Rooms

| $(1,063)$ | 28.0\% | $(1,162)$ | 28.0\% | $(1,266)$ | 28.0\% | $(1,335)$ | 28.0\% | $(1,408)$ | 28.0\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $(1,636)$ | $79.0 \%^{\prime \prime}$ | $(1,789)$ | $79.0 \%^{\prime}$ | $(1,948)$ | 79.0\% ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | $(2,056)$ | 79.0\% ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | $(2,166)$ | 79.0\% |
| (103) | 74.6\% | (113) | $74.8 \%^{\prime}$ | (124) | $75.6 \%$ | (130) | 75.1\% ${ }^{\text {² }}$ | (138) | 75.4\% |
| (18) | 4.3\% ${ }^{\text {² }}$ | (18) | 4.0\% ${ }^{7}$ | (20) | 4.1\% ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | (20) | $3.8 \%^{\prime \prime}$ | (22) | 4.0\% |
| $(2,820)$ | 43.9\% | $(3,082)$ | 43.9\% | (3,358) | 43.9\% | $(3,541)$ | 43.9\% | $(3,734)$ | 43.9\% |
| 3,600 | 56.1\% | 3,935 | 56.1\% | 4,285 | 56.1\% | 4,524 | 56.1\% | 4,769 | 56.1\% |

## Undistributed Expenses

Admin \& General
Marketing
Maintenance
Utilities
TOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED EXPENSES

## Gross Operating Profit

| (499) | 7.8\% | (512) | 7.3\% | (524) | 6.9\% ${ }^{\prime}$ | (537) | 6.7\% ${ }^{\text {r }}$ | (551) | 6.5\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (497) | $7.7 \%^{\prime}$ | (485) | $6.9 \%$ | (497) | 6.5\% ${ }^{\text {² }}$ | (509) | $6.3 \%^{\prime}$ | (522) | 6.1\% |
| (263) | 4.1\% ${ }^{\text {F }}$ | (269) | 3.8\% ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | (276) | 3.6\% | (283) | 3.5\% | (290) | 3.4\% |
| (341) | 5.3\% | (350) | 5.0\% ${ }^{\prime}$ | (359) | 4.7\% ${ }^{\prime}$ | (368) | $4.6 \%$ | (377) | 4.4\% |
| $(1,600)$ | 24.9\% | $(1,616)$ | 23.0\% | $(1,656)$ | 21.7\% | $(1,697)$ | 21.0\% | (1,740) | 20.5\% |
| 2,000 | 31.2\% | 2,319 | 33.0\% | 2,629 | 34.4\% | 2,827 | 35.1\% | 3,029 | 35.6\% |

## Fees \& Fixed Charges

Base Management Fee
Franchise Fees
Property Taxes
Insurance
Reserve for Replacement
TOTAL FEES \& FIXED CHARGES
HET OPERATIIIG IIICOME

| (192) | 3.0\% | (210) | 3.0\% | (230) | 3.0\% | (242) | 3.0\% | (255) | 3.0\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (231) | 3.6\% | (253) | 3.6\% | (275) | 3.6\% | (291) | 3.6\% ${ }^{\text {F }}$ | (306) | 3.6\% |
| (126) | 2.0\% ${ }^{\prime}$ | (129) | 1.8\% | (132) | 1.7\% ${ }^{\text {F }}$ | (136) | 1.7\% ${ }^{\text {F }}$ | (139) | 1.6\% |
| (105) | 1.6\% ${ }^{\prime}$ | (108) | $1.5 \%$ | (110) | 1.4\% ${ }^{\prime}$ | (113) | 1.4\% ${ }^{\prime}$ | (116) | 1.4\% |
| (64) | 1.0\% ${ }^{\text {² }}$ | (140) | 2.0\% ${ }^{\text {r }}$ | (191) | 2.5\% ${ }^{\text {² }}$ | (242) | 3.0\% ${ }^{\text {² }}$ | (298) | 3.5\% |
| (718) | 11.2\% | (840) ${ }^{\prime}$ | 12.0\% | (938) | 12.3\% | $(1,024)$ | 12.7\% | $(1,114)$ | 13.1\% |
| \$1,282 | 20.0\% | \$1,479 | 21.1\% | \$1,691 | 22.1\% | \$1,803 | 22.4\% | \$1,915 | 22.5\% |

## Warranted Private-Sector Investment

## Scenario 2: Land + Conference Center + Parking

Proposed Hotel \& Conference Center - University Site
Equity Return \& Debt Service
In Current Dollars (000s omitted)

| Assumptions |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Rooms | 150 | Debt | 19,125 (exciudes Capitalized interest) |
| Cost per Key (\$000) | 245 | Equity | 6,375 |
| Total Project Cost (000) | 36,750 | Debt Interest Rate | 7.0\% |
| Public Investment (000) | 11,250 | Amortization Period (Years) | 30 (interst Oniy First 2 years) |
| NET COST (000) | 25,500 | Residual Cap Rate | 8.0\% |
| \% Debt | 75\% |  |  |
| \% Equity | 25\% |  |  |

Net Operating Income
Debt Service
Interest
Principal
Capitalized Interest
Net Debt Service
Cash Flows After Debt Service
Debt Service Coverage Ratio
Equity Cash Flows
Equity Contribution
Cash Flows After Debt Service
Repayment of Debt
Reversion
NET EQUITY CASH FLOWS

| Construction |  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2006 | 2007 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | \$1,282 | \$1,479 | \$1,691 | \$1,803 | \$1,915 | \$1,963 | \$2,012 | \$2,062 | \$2,114 | \$2,167 |
| (348) | $(1,004)$ | $(1,433)$ | $(1.433)$ | $(1,433)$ | $(1,418)$ | $(1,402)$ | $(1,385)$ | $(1,366)$ | $(1,346)$ | $(1,325)$ | $(1,302)$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (217) | (232) | (248) | (266) | (284) | (304) | (325) | (348) |
| 348 | 1,004 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | $(1,433)$ | (1,433) | $(1,650)$ | $(1,650)$ | $(1,650)$ | $(1,651)$ | $(1,650)$ | $(1,650)$ | $(1,650)$ | $(1,650)$ |
| 90 | 40 | (\$151) | \$46 | \$41 | \$153 | \$265 | \$312 | \$362 | $\$ 412$ | \$464 | $\$ 517$ |
|  |  | 0.9 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.3 |
| (\$6,375) | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | 90 |
| 0 | 0 | (151) | 46 | 41 | 153 | 265 | 312 | 362 | 412 | 464 | 517 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $(18,253)$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27,088 |
| (\$6,375) | 90 | (\$151) | $\$ 46$ | $\$ 41$ | \$153 | \$265 | \$312 | \$362 | \$412 | \$464 | 99,352 |

## Warranted Private-Sector Investment

## Scenario 3: Land + Conference Center + Parking + \$3M

Proposed Hotel \& Conference Center - University Site
Equity Return \& Debt Service
In Current Dollars (000s omitted)

| Assumptions |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Rooms | 150 | Debt | 16,875 (exciudes Capitalized interest) |
| Cost per Key (\$000) | 245 | Equity | 5,625 |
| Total Project Cost (000) | 36,750 | Debt Interest Rate | 7.0\% |
| Public Investment (000) | 14,250 | Amortization Period (Years) | 30 (interst Oniy First 2 years) |
| NET COST (000) | 22,500 | Residual Cap Rate | 8.0\% |
| \% Debt | 75\% |  |  |
| \% Equity | 25\% |  |  |

Net Operating Income
Debt Service
Interest
Principal
Capitalized Interest
Net Debt Service
Cash Flows After Debt Service
Debt Service Coverage Ratio
Equity Cash Flows
Equity Contribution
Cash Flows After Debt Service
Repayment of Debt
Reversion
NET EQUITY CASH FLOWS

| Construction |  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2006 | 2007 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \$0 | \$0 | \$1,282 | \$1,479 | \$1,691 | \$1,803 | \$1,915 | \$1,963 | \$2,012 | \$2,062 | \$2,114 | \$2,167 |
| (307) | (886) | $(1,265)$ | $(1,265)$ | $(1,265)$ | $(1,251)$ | $(1,237)$ | $(1,222)$ | $(1,205)$ | $(1,188)$ | $(1,169)$ | $(1,149)$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (191) | (205) | (219) | (234) | (251) | (268) | (287) | (307) |
| 307 | 886 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | $(1,265)$ | $(1,265)$ | $(1,456)$ | $(1,456)$ | $(1,456)$ | $(1,456)$ | $(1,456)$ | $(1,456)$ | $(1,456)$ | $(1,456)$ |
| $\$ 0$ | \$0 | \$17 | \$214 | \$235 | \$347 | \$459 | \$507 | \$556 | \$606 | \$658 | $\$ 711$ |
|  |  | 1.0 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| $(45,625)$ | \$0 | \$0 | $\$ 0$ | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | $\$ 0$ | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 0 | 0 | 17 | 214 | 235 | 347 | 459 | 507 | 556 | 606 | 658 | 711 |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $(16,106)$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27,088 |
| $(\$ 5,625)$ | $\$ 0$ | \$17 | \$214 | \$235 | $\$ 347$ | \$459 | \$507 | $\$ 556$ | \$606 | \$658 | \$11,693 |

## Ops Cash Flow - Downtown Site

|  | 2008 |  | 2009 |  | 2010 |  | 2011 |  | 2012 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Statistics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Rooms | 150 |  | 150 |  | 150 |  | 150 |  | 150 |  |
| Occupancy | 58.0\% |  | 62.0\% |  | 66.0\% |  | 68.0\% |  | 68.0\% |  |
| Occupied Room Nights | 31,760 |  | 33,950 |  | 36,140 |  | 37,230 |  | 37,230 |  |
| Average Daily Rate (2006 Dollars) | \$100.00 |  | \$100.00 |  | \$100.00 |  | \$100.00 |  | \$100.00 |  |
| Average Daily Rate (Inflated Dollars) | \$105.07 |  | \$107.69 |  | \$110.38 |  | \$113.13 |  | \$115.98 |  |
| Revenues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rooms | \$3,337 | 60.3\% | \$3,656 | 60.2\% | \$3,989 | 60.2\% ${ }^{\text {F }}$ | \$4,212 | 60.2\% | \$4,318 | 60.2\% |
| Food \& Eeverage | 1,668 | 30.1\% ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 1,829 | 30.1\% ${ }^{\prime}$ | 1,995 | 30.1\% ${ }^{\prime}$ | 2,107 | 30.1\% ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 2,159 | 30.1\% |
| Telecommunications | 133 | 2.4\% ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 146 | 2.4\% ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | 160 | 2.4\% ${ }^{\prime}$ | 169 | 2.4\% ${ }^{*}$ | 173 | 2.4\% |
| Minor Optg Depts, Rental, Conf., Cancel Fess, Other | 400 | $7.2 \%$ | 438 | $7.2 \%$ | 479 | 7.2\% | 506 | $7.2 \%$ | 518 | 7.2\% |
| TOTAL REVENUE | 5,538 | 100.0\% | 6,069 | 99.9\% | 6,623 | 99.9\% | 6,994 | 99.9\% | 7,168 | 99.9\% |
| Departmental Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rooms | (934) | 28.0\% ${ }^{\prime}$ | $(1,024)$ | 28.0\% ${ }^{\prime}$ | $(1,117)$ | 28.0\% | $(1,179)$ | 28.0\% ${ }^{\prime}$ | $(1,208)$ | 28.0\% |
| Food \& Eeverage | $(1,319)$ | 79.1\% ${ }^{\prime}$ | $(1,444)$ | 79.0\% | $(1,576)$ | $79.0 \%^{\prime}$ | $(1,664)$ | 79.0\% ${ }^{\prime}$ | $(1,706)$ | 79.0\% |
| Telecommunications | (100) | 75.2\% ${ }^{\prime}$ | (110) | 75.3\% ${ }^{\prime}$ | (120) | $75.0 \%^{\prime}$ | (127) | 75.1\% ${ }^{\prime}$ | (130) | 75.1\% |
| Minor Optg Depts, Rental, Conf., Cancel Fess, Other | (18) | 4.5\% ${ }^{\text {²}}$ | (17) | 3.9\% ${ }^{\text {² }}$ | (19) | 4.0\% | (20) | 4.0\% ${ }^{\prime}$ | (21) | 4.1\% |
| TOTAL DEPT EXPENSES | $(2,371)$ | 42.8\% | $(2,595)$ | 42.8\% | $(2,832)$ | 42.8\% | (2,990) | 42.8\% | $(3,065)$ | 42.8\% |
| Departmental Profit | 3,167 | 57.2\% | 3,474 | 57.2\% | 3,791 | 57.2\% | 4,004 | 57.2\% | 4,103 | 57.2\% |
| Undistributed Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Adrnin \& General | (499) | 9.0\% | (512) | 8.4\% | (524) | 7.9\% | (537) | 7.7\% | (551) | 7.7\% |
| Marketing | (497) | 9.0\% | (485) | 8.0\% | (497) | 7.5\% ${ }^{\text {F }}$ | (509) | 7.3\% | (522) | 7.3\% |
| Maintenance | (263) | 4.7\% | (269) | 4.4\% ${ }^{\prime}$ | (276) | 4.2\% ${ }^{\text {² }}$ | (283) | 4.0\% ${ }^{\text {F }}$ | (290) | 4.0\% |
| Utilities | (341) | $6.2 \%^{\prime}$ | (350) | 5.8\% ${ }^{\prime}$ | (359) | 5.4\% ${ }^{\text {² }}$ | (368) | 5.3\% ${ }^{\prime}$ | (377) | 5.3\% |
| TOTAL UNDISTRIBUTED EXPENSES | $(1,600)$ | 28.9\% | $(1,616)$ | 26.6\% | $(1,656)$ | 25.0\% | $(1,697)$ | 24.3\% | $(1,740)$ | 24.3\% |
| Gross Operating Profit | 1,567 | 28.3\% | 1,858 | 30.6\% | 2,135 | 32.2\% | 2,307 | 33.0\% | 2,363 | 33.0\% |
| Fees \& Fixed Charges |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Base Management Fee | (166) | 3.0\% | (182) | 3.0\% | (199) | 3.0\% | (209) | 3.0\% | (215) | 3.0\% |
| Franchise Fees | (200) | 3.6\% | (219) | 3.6\% | (238) | $3.6 \%$ | (252) | 3.6\% | (259) | 3.6\% |
| Property Taxes | (126) | 2.3\% ${ }^{\prime}$ | (129) | 2.1\% ${ }^{\prime}$ | (132) | 2.0\% ${ }^{\prime}$ | (136) | 1.9\% ${ }^{\prime}$ | (139) | 1.9\% |
| Insurance | (105) | 1.9\% ${ }^{\text {² }}$ | (108) | 1.8\% ${ }^{\prime}$ | (110) | 1.7\% ${ }^{\text {F }}$ | (113) | 1.6\% ${ }^{\text {² }}$ | (116) | 1.6\% |
| Reserve for Replacement | (56) | 1.0\% ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | (122) | 2.0\% ${ }^{\text {r }}$ | (166) | 2.5\% ${ }^{\prime}$ | (209) | $3.0 \%$ " | (250) | 3.5\% |
| TOTAL FEES \& FIXED CHARGES | (653) | 11.8\% | (760) | 12.5\% | (845) | 12.8\% | (919) | 13.1\% | (979) | 13.7\% |
| HET OPERATIIIG IIICOME | $\$ 914$ | 16.5\% | \$1,098 | 18.1\% | \$1,290 | 19.5\% | \$1,388 ${ }^{\prime}$ | 19.8\% | \$1,384 | 19.3\% |

## Warranted Private-Sector Investment

## Scenario 1: Land Only

Proposed Hotel \& Conference Center - Downtown Site

Equity Return \& Debt Service
In Current Dollars (000s omitted)

| Assumptions |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Rooms | 150 | Debt | 28,463 (exciudes Capitalized interest) |
| Cost per Key (\$000) | 253 | Equity | 9.487 |
| Total Project Cost (000) | 37,950 | Debt Interest Rate | 7.0\% |
| Public Investment (000) | 0 | Amortization Period (Years) | 30 (interst Oniy First 2 years) |
| NET COST (000) | 37,950 | Residual Cap Rate | 8.0\% |
| \% Debt | 75\% |  |  |
| \% Equity | 25\% |  |  |

## Net Operating Income

Debt Service
Interest
Principal
Capitalized Interest
Net Debt Service

| Construction | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 20062007 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | $\$ 914$ | \$1,098 | \$1,290 | \$1,388 | \$1,384 | \$1,419 | \$1,454 | \$1,490 | \$1,527 | ,565 |

Cash Flows After Debt Service
Debt Service Coverage Ratio
Equity Cash Flows
Equity Contribution
Cash Flows After Debt Service
Repayment of Debt
Reversion
NET EQUITY CASH FLOWS

| (518) | $(1,494)$ | $(2,133)$ | $(2,133)$ | $(2,133)$ | $(2,111)$ | $(2,087)$ | $(2,061)$ | $(2,033)$ | $(2,003)$ | $(1,972)$ | $(1,938)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (323) | (345) | (369) | (395) | (423) | (452) | (484) | (518) |
| 518 | 1,494 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | $(2,133)$ | $(2,133)$ | $(2,456)$ | $(2,456)$ | $(2,456)$ | $(2,456)$ | $(2,456)$ | $(2,455)$ | $(2,456)$ | $(2,456)$ |
| $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $(\$ 1,219)$ | $(\$ 1,035)$ | $(\$ 1,166)$ | $(\$ 1,068)$ | $(\$ 1,072)$ | $(\$ 1,037)$ | $(\$ 1,002)$ | (\$965) | (\$929) | (\$891) |
|  |  | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 |
| $(\$ 9,487)$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | $\$ 0$ | \$0 | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | \$0 |
| 0 | 0 | $(1,219)$ | $(1,035)$ | $(1,166)$ | $(1,068)$ | $(1,072)$ | $(1,037)$ | $(1,002)$ | (965) | (929) | (891) |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | $(27,165)$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19,563 |
| ( $\$ 9.487$ ) | $\$ 0$ | (\$1,219) | (\$1,035) | $(\$ 1,166)$ | (\$1,068) | (\$1,072) | (\$1,037) | (\$1,002) | (\$965) | (\$929) | $(\$ 8,493)$ |

## Warranted Private-Sector Investment

## Scenario 2: Land + Conference Center + Parking

Proposed Hotel \& Conference Center - Downtown Site
Equity Return \& Debt Service
In Current Dollars (000s omitted)

| Assumptions |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Rooms | 150 | Debt | 19,125 (exciudes Capitalized interest) |
| Cost per Key (\$000) | 253 | Equity | 6,375 |
| Total Project Cost (000) | 37,950 | Debt Interest Rate | 7.0\% |
| Public Investment (000) | 12,450 | Amortization Period (Years) | 30 (interst Oniy First 2 years) |
| NET COST (000) | 25,500 | Residual Cap Rate | 8.0\% |
| \% Debt | 75\% |  |  |
| \% Equity | 25\% |  |  |

Net Operating Income
Debt Service
Interest
Principal
Capitalized Interest
Net Debt Sewice

Net Debt Service
Cash Flows After Debt Service
Debt Service Coverage Ratio

## Equity Cash Flows

Equity Contribution
Cash Flows After Debt Sewice
Repayment of Debt
Reversion
NET EQUITY CASH FLOWS

| Construction |  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2006 | 2007 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | 9914 | \$1,098 | \$1,290 | \$1,388 | \$1,384 | \$1,419 | \$1,454 | \$1,490 | \$1,527 | \$1,565 |
| (348) | $(1,004)$ | $(1,433)$ | $(1,433)$ | $(1,433)$ | $(1,418)$ | $(1,402)$ | $(1,385)$ | $(1,366)$ | $(1,346)$ | $(1,325)$ | $(1,302)$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (217) | (232) | (248) | (266) | (284) | (304) | (325) | (348) |
| 348 | 1,004 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | $(1,433)$ | $(1,433)$ | $(1,650)$ | $(1,650)$ | $(1,650)$ | $(1,651)$ | $(1,650)$ | $(1,650)$ | $(1,650)$ | $(1,650)$ |
| $\$ 0$ | \$0 | (\$519) | (\$335) | (\$360) | (\$262) | (\$266) | (\$232) | (\$196) | (\$160) | (\$123) | (\$85) |

## Warranted Private-Sector Investment

## Scenario 3: Land + Conference Center + Parking + \$3M

Proposed Hotel \& Conference Center - Downtown Site
Equity Return \& Debt Service
In Current Dollars (000s omitted)

| Assumptions |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Rooms | 150 | Debt | 16,875 (excludes Capitalized interest) |
| Cost per Key (\$000) | 253 | Equity | 5,625 |
| Total Project Cost (000) | 37,950 | Debt Interest Rate | 7.0\% |
| Public Investment (000) | 15,450 | Amortization Period (Years) | 30 (interst Oniy First 2 years) |
| NET COST (000) | 22,500 | Residual Cap Rate | 8.0\% |
| \% Debt | 75\% |  |  |
| \% Equity | 25\% |  |  |

Net Operating Income
Debt Service
Interest
Principal
Capitalized Interest
Net Debt Sewice

Cash Flows After Debt Service
Debt Service Coverage Ratio

## Equity Cash Flows

Equity Contribution
Cash Flows After Debt Sewice
Repayment of Debt
Reversion
NET EQUITY CASH FLOWS

| Construction |  | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 |  | 2015 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2006 | 2007 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2014 |  | 2016 | 2017 |
| $\$ 0$ | \$0 | $\$ 914$ | \$1,098 | \$1,290 | \$1,388 | \$1,384 | \$1,419 | \$1,454 | \$1,490 | \$1,527 | \$1,565 |
| (307) | (886) | $(1,265)$ | $(1,265)$ | $(1,265)$ | $(1,251)$ | $(1,237)$ | $(1,222)$ | $(1,205)$ | $(1,188)$ | $(1,169)$ | $(1,149)$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (191) | (205) | (219) | (234) | (251) | (268) | (287) | (307) |
| 307 | 886 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0 | 0 | $(1,265)$ | $(1,265)$ | $(1,456)$ | $(1,456)$ | $(1,456)$ | $(1,456)$ | $(1,456)$ | $(1,456)$ | $(1,456)$ | $(1,456)$ |
| $\$ 0$ | $\$ 0$ | (\$351) | (\$167) | (\$166) | (\$68) | (\$72) | (\$37) | (\$2) | $\$ 34$ | $\$ 71$ | \$109 |

## Introduction Summary

- With one exception, all interviewees identified strong need for more/higher quality meeting space
- CVB Lost Business Reports suggest that $\sim \$ 7.5 M$ worth of economic activity has left due to space and/or quality
- KSU and Alumni Center report a continued need for more space
- Most industry events are relatively small, and therefore large convention centers are not necessarily required to attract meaningful market share
- National meeting planner survey shows hotel proximity and supply are highly important factors in destination selection
- MANHATTAN GOAL: City Officials report a desire to fund the initial costs of a warranted facility, but not any continued annual financial support if required


## Manhattan Hotel Market

## Assumes Impact of Big Red One Only

| 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | \% | 8 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| 293,740 | 305,505 | 305,050 | 305,050 | 294,505 | 290,905 | 290,905 | 290,905 | 321,930 | 321,930 | 321,930 | 352,955 | 352,955 |
| 0 | 65 | 0 | 0 | (40) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 85 | 0 |
| 175,105 | $\begin{gathered} 173,696 \\ (0.8) \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 174,837 \\ 0.7 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 202,340 \\ 15.7 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 192,47 \% \\ (4.9) \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 185,985 \\ (3.4) \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 188,775 \\ 1.5 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 191,607 \\ 1.5 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 194,481 \\ 1.5 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 197,398 \\ 1.5 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 200,359 \\ 1.5 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 203,364 \\ 1.5 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 206,414 \\ 1.5 \% \end{array}$ |
| 175,105 | 173,696 | 174,837 | 202,340 | 192,47\% | 185,985 | 188,775 | 191,607 | 194,481 | 197,398 | 200,359 | 203,364 | 206,414 |
| nla | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | nda | 7,875 | 23,625 | 31,500 | 31,500 | 31,500 | 31,500 | 31,500 |
| nla | nla | nla | nla | nla | nla | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| nla | nla | nia | nla | nia | nia | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 175,105 | $\begin{gathered} 173,696 \\ (0.8) \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 174,837 \\ 0.7 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 202,340 \\ 15.7 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 192,47 \% \\ (4.9) \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 185,985 \\ (3.4) \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 196,650 \\ 5.7 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 215,232 \\ 9.4 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 225,981 \\ 5.0 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 228,898 \\ 1.3 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 231,859 \\ 1.3 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 234,864 \\ 1.3 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 237,914 \\ 1.3 \% \end{array}$ |
| 59.6\% | 56.9\% | 57.3\% | 66.3\% | 65.4\% | 63.9\% | 67.6\% | 74.0\% | 70.2\% | 71.1\% | 72.0\% | $66.5 \%$ | 67.4\% |
| \$59.22 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 61.23 \\ 3.4 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 62.1 \% \\ 1.6 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 62.98 \\ 1.3 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 65.29 \\ 3.7 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 67.41 \\ 3.2 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 68.76 \\ 2.0 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 70.14 \\ 2.0 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 71.54 \\ 2.0 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 72.97 \\ 2.0 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 74.43 \\ 2.0 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 75.92 \\ 2.0 \% \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 77.44 \\ 2.0 \% \end{array}$ |
| \$10,370 | \$10,635 | \$10,871 | \$12,743 | \$12,567 | \$12,537 | \$12,980 | \$13,439 | \$13,913 | \$14,404 | \$14,913 | \$15,439 | \$15,985 |
| 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% |
| \$519 | \$532 | \$544 | \$637 | \$628 | \$627 | \$649 | \$672 | \$696 | \$720 | \$746 | \$772 | \$799 |

## Manhattan Hotel Market

## Assumes Impact of Big Red One, plus Conference Center Hotel Near/On K-State

|  | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Historical Statistics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hotel Properties | 7 | 8 | 8 | \% | 8 | 8 | 8 | \% | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| Available Rooms | 293,740 | 305,505 | 305,050 | 305,050 | 294,505 | 290,905 | 290,905 | 290,905 | 345,655 | 345,655 | 376,680 | 376,680 | 376,680 |
| New Hotel Supply | 0 | 65 | 0 | 0 | (40) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 150 | 0 | 85 | 0 | 0 |
| Demand | 175,105 | 173,696 | 174,837 | 202,340 | 192,47\% | 185,985 | 188,775 | 191,607 | 194,481 | 197,398 | 200,359 | 203,364 | 206,414 |
| Unadjusted Grouth Rate |  | (0.8)\% | 0.7\% | $15.7 \%$ | (4.9)\% | (3.4)\% | $1.5 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ | $1.5 \%$ |
| Unadjusted Demand | 175,105 | 173,696 | 174,837 | 202,340 | 192,47\% | 185,985 | 188,775 | 191,607 | 194,481 | 197,398 | 200,359 | 203,364 | 206,414 |
| Addtl Demand: Big Red one | nia | n/a | nia | nia | nia | n/a | 7,875 | 23,625 | 31,500 | 31,500 | 31,500 | 31,500 | 31,500 |
| Addtl Demand: Conventions | n/a | nia | n/a | nia | n/a | nla | 0 | 0 | 4,000 | 8,000 | 12,000 | 12,000 | 12,000 |
| Addtl Demand: In-House Induced | n/a | nla | n/a | n/a | nla | n/a | 0 | 0 | 3,000 | 4,800 | 4,800 | 4,800 | 4,800 |
| Total Demand | 175,105 | 173,696 | 174,837 | 202,340 | 192,47\% | 185,985 | 196,650 | 215,232 | 232,981 | 241,698 | 248,659 | 251,664 | 254,714 |
| Grouth Rate |  | (0.8)\% | 0.7\% | $15.7 \%$ | (4.9)\% | (3.4)\% | $5.7 \%$ | 9.4\% | $8.2 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ | 2.9\% | $1.2 \%$ | $1.2 \%$ |
| Overall Market Occupancy | 59.6\% | 56.9\% | 57.3\% | $66.3 \%$ | 65.4\% | 63.9\% | 67.6\% | 74.0\% | 67.4\% | 69.9\% | 66.0\% | 66.8\% | 67.6\% |
| ADR | \$59.22 | \$61.23 | \$62.18 | \$62.98 | \$65.29 | \$67.41 | \$68.76 | \$70.14 | \$78.51 | \$80.08 | \$81.68 | \$83.31 | \$ 8 4.98 |
| Grouth Rate |  | 3.4\% | $1.6 \%$ | $1.3 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ | $3.2 \%$ | 2.0\% | 2.0\% | 11.9\% | 2.0\% | 2.0\% | 2.0\% | 2.0\% |
| Total Market-wide Revenue (\$000) | \$10,370 | \$10,635 | \$10, 871 | \$12,743 | \$12,567 | \$12,537 | \$12,980 | \$13,439 | \$15,269 | \$15,808 | \$16,365 | \$16,942 | \$17,541 |
| City Lodging Tax Rate | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% | 5.0\% |
| City Tax Collections | \$519 | \$532 | \$544 | \$637 | \$628 | \$627 | \$649 | \$672 | \$763 | \$790 | \$ ${ }^{\text {1 }} 18$ | \$ 847 | $\$ 877$ |

## Major Study Impetus: Lost Business

|  | Date Days People |  |  |  | Date | Days | People |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| KS State HS Boys Swimming | Feb-06 | 2 | 1,000 | KFB Young Farmers \& Ranchers | Jan-05 | 3 | 200 |
| KS State HS Boys Swimming | Feb-07 | 2 | 1,000 | Schools of Banking | Apr-06 | 5 | 100 |
| Eastern Star | Apr-05 | 4 | 500 | KS County Treasurer's Assn | Apr-07 | 3 | 150 |
| KS Water Environment Assn | Apr-01 | 2 | 800 | KS County Treasurer's Assn | Apr-08 | 3 | 150 |
| KS Parks \& Rec Assn | Jan-06 | 3 | 450 | KS Assn of Ret School Pers. | Jun-05 | 2 | 200 |
| KS Parks \& Rec Assn | Jan-07 | 3 | 450 | KS Assn of Ret School Pers. | Jun-06 | 2 | 200 |
| KS Parks \& Rec Assn | n/a | 3 | 450 | KS Assn of Ret School Pers. | Jun-07 | 2 | 200 |
| Kansas PTA: June Symp. | Jun-06 | 4 | 300 | KSU Master Farmer | Mar-06 | 2 | 200 |
| KS County Weed Dir's Assn | Mar-06 | 3 | 300 | KSU Master Farmer | Mar-07 | 2 | 200 |
| Kansas PTA | Mar-06 | 4 | 200 | Petroleum Marketers | Sep-05 | 3 | 125 |
| KS State HS Girls Swimming | May-05 | 2 | 1,000 | KS Meat Processors Assn | Apr-05 | 3 | 100 |
| KS State HS Girls Swimming | May-06 | 2 | 1,000 | KS Meat Processors Assn | Apr-06 | 3 | 100 |
| KS Athletic Admin Assn | Mar-07 | 3 | 250 | Kansas Land Fill Assn | Oct-05 | 2 | 70 |
| KFB Young Farmers-Ranchers | Jan-06 | 3 | 215 | Kansas Flying Farmers | Mar-03 | 2 | 65 |
| Veterans of Foreign Wars | Jun-05 | 3 | 200 | Kansas Flying Farmers | Mar-07 | 2 | 65 |
| Veterans of Foreign Wars | Jun-06 | 3 | 200 | Kansas PTA: Driv. Train. Course | Jul-07 | 4 | 30 |
|  |  |  |  | TOTAL |  | 89 | 9,270 |

## One Possible Development Solution



