As part of the comprehensive approach to the masterplan, a number of additional planning projects will be initiated that compliment or augment the primary planning goals illustrated in this document.

These additional planning efforts may include:

- Parking Plan
- Marketing/Promotion Strategies
- Property Acquisition/Site Control
- Facade Improvement Program
- Financial/Incentive Planning and Programming
Schenectady in a Nutshell

As Schenectady Metroplex and Omni Development work to develop a master plan for Canal Square and the surrounding property in downtown Schenectady, the conditions of the market will be examined to provide guidance to decision makers. This document provides a summary of the initial demographic and retail analysis conducted by River Street Planning and Development. Each bulleted highlight below is explored in more detail, and illustrated with graphs and charts on the following pages.

Retail Sales Leakage

- Annual Retail sales in the City of Schenectady are not commensurate with the City's population.

Leakage by Establishment Type

- The following types of establishments are importing the most business into the City: They have higher sales than would be expected based on the City’s population — Automotive Repair Shops, General Merchandise Stores, Building Materials and Garden Equipment, Electronics and Appliance Stores, Clothing and Luggage, and Food and Beverages.

Sales per Store

- The following types of establishments have larger sales per store than stores of the same type in the MSA — Building Materials and Garden Equipment, Electronics and Appliance Stores, Building Supply Stores, and Food and Beverages.

Retail Market Share

- In 1997, the city's retail sales totaled $8.9 billion, of which 15% originated in Schenectady County and $5.7 billion (70.2% of County's) originated in the City.

Trends Over Time

- By all measures, retail in the City of Schenectady declined from 1987 to 1997, particularly from 1992 to 1997.
- The City's share of the MSA market has declined from 1987 to 1997. This reflects the rational trend for retail to relocate from urban to suburban settings.

Population Characteristics

- The City is a growing market, but not as quickly as Regional and National trends.
- Educational attainment statistics for city residents are similar to those at the County, MSA, and National levels.

Retail Sales Leakage

- Annual Retail sales in the City of Schenectady are not commensurate with the City's population.

While the City includes 7.0% of the population of the Albany-Schenectady-Troy MSA, City retailers account for only 4.5% of the region’s annual sales figures. As a result, annual retail sales per capita for the city were only $6,222. This is considerably lower than for the County ($10,490) or the region as a whole ($9,584). Clearly, there is significant sales leakage from the City to other areas of the region.

Sales Leakage

City of Schenectady

Population


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>County, but not City</th>
<th>Beyond County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61,671</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>394,688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1997 Retail Markets for Albany-Schenectady-Troy MSA

Population


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>County, but not City</th>
<th>Beyond County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61,671</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>394,688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

County, but not City

| 84,734 | 9.9% | 888,670 | 10.5% | 473 | 8.7% | 7,073 | 10.9% | 15,490 |

Beyond County

| 729,038 | 82.5% | 7,177,685 | 84.5% | 4,510 | 83.9% | 59,460 | 84.8% | 9,763 |

Total MSA

| 875,833 | 100.0% | 8,391,223 | 100.0% | 5,341 | 100.0% | 76,061 | 100.0% | 9,584 |

Notes on Sources and Methodology

- The city consumer market is weak compared to the County and MSA markets.
**Leakage by Establishment Type**

- The following types of establishments are importing the most business into the City. They have higher sales than would be expected based on the City’s population:
  - Building Materials & Garden Equipment
  - Gasoline Stations
  - Health and Personal Care
  - Electronics and Appliances
  - Drinking Establishments

- These types of stores are exporting (leaking) the most business from the City. They have lower sales than would be expected based on the City’s population:
  - Sporting Goods, Hobby, Books, and Music
  - Clothing and Accessories
  - Food and Beverages (Grocery Stores, etc.)
  - Motor Vehicles and Parts
  - Department Stores

Comparing the per capita sales for establishments in the City with stores of the same type in the region, we can see which types of stores account for the sales leakage Schenectady is experiencing. In almost all categories, if the City is leaking sales to the MSA it is also leaking to the County. The sole exception is Eating Establishments. While the City is leaking Eating Establishment sales to the MSA, it is importing business from the County for this category of establishment.

**Sales per Store**

- The following types of establishments have larger sales per store than stores of the same type in the MSA:
  - Building Materials & Garden Equipment
  - Electronics and Appliances
  - Gasoline Stations
  - Florists

- The following types of establishments have smaller sales per store than stores of the same type in the MSA:
  - Motor Vehicles and Parts
  - Food and Beverages (Grocery Stores, etc.)
  - Health & Personal Care
  - Sporting Goods, Hobby, Books and Music
  - Eating Places

Comparing the per store sales for establishments in the City with stores of the same type in the region, we can see that, while many types of stores in the City are not performing as well as their regional counter parts, several types of stores are out performing their counter parts. Building Materials & Garden Equipment Stores in the City have an average per store annual sales figure of $3,295 million, while similar stores in the MSA average only $2,625 million, for a difference $0.671 million.

No department stores were reported in the City in 1997.

**Per Store Sales by Establishment Type**

- Department Stores
- Building Materials & Garden Equipment
- Electronics and Appliances
- Gasoline Stations
- Florists
- Drinking Establishments
- Furniture and Home Furnishings
- Clothing and Accessories
- Eating Places
- Sporting Goods, Hobby, Books, and Music
- Health and Personal Care
- Food and Beverage Stores
- Motor Vehicles and Parts

Difference in Per Store Sales between City and MSA ($1,000)
APPENDIX

A: Current Economic Conditions

Retail Market Share
- In 1997 regional retail sales totaled $8.391 billion, of which 15.2% originated in Schenectady County and $384.7 million (30.2% of County) originated in the City.
- In 1997 the City had 409 retail establishments employing 3,523 people.

Trends Over Time
- By all measures, retail in the City of Schenectady declined from 1987 to 1997, particularly from 1987 to 1992.
- The City’s share of the MSA Market also declined from 1987 to 1997. This reflects the national trend for retail to relocate from urban to suburban settings.
- Between 1987 and 1992 the City lost 70 retail establishments, but between 1992 and 1997 the City gained 2 retail establishments.

Retail trends for the City of Schenectady over the last three economic censuses in 1987, 1992 & 1997 show a decline in all metrics. The decline was particularly dramatic in the five year period from 1987 to 1992. As the national economy prospered from 1992 to 1997 the City of Schenectady was able to reduce the rate of decline in most indicators. In fact, from 1992 to 1997 there was a net gain of two establishments in the City, comparing very favorably to a net loss of 70 establishments from 1987 to 1992.

Population Characteristics
- The City of Schenectady lost 5.7% of its population between the 1990 and 2000 census. This may be attributed to suburban trends facing many older cities.
- The City experienced growth in key age segments: 5-17 and 45-64.

The City of Schenectady continues to experience population losses as does the County. Between 1990 and 2000, the City lost 3,745 people, or 5.7% of its population. Estimates show the City losing another 1,226 people by 2006. The city did experience growth in the key age segments of 5 – 17 and 45 – 64. This change parallels trends at the county, state and regional levels.
The City is becoming increasingly diverse in its population. This is consistent with Regional, State and National trends.

The City of Schenectady is becoming an increasingly diverse community according to 2000 Census findings. Although the categories have changed somewhat since 1990 with the introduction of a "Two or More Races" category to the survey in 2000, general observations can be noted. During the ten-year period between 1990 and 2000, Schenectady saw a loss in the white population and gains in all other races. The trends across the state, region and county were somewhat similar, with all levels reporting a smaller percentage of white residents, although the trend is stronger in the City.

**Educational attainment statistics for city residents are similar to those at the County, MSA, and State levels.**

Educational attainment statistics in Schenectady are similar to those in Schenectady County, the MSA, and New York State. Schenectady’s largest attainment category consists of high school graduates or those with high school equivalencies, at 34% of those 25 and older. That percentage is slightly higher than Schenectady County, New York State, and MSA averages. Schenectady has a greater percentage of persons with no diploma than the County, State, and the MSA. Overall, about 25% of Schenectady’s population has less than a high school education.

The City has a high percentage of individuals with post-high school education at 40%. About 62% of that population, or 25% of the City’s total population, hold some type of college degree, from an Associate Degree through graduate and professional degrees.
APPENDIX

Wealth & Income

- Median household income in the City is projected to fall between 1989 and 2001.
- Households are projected to shrink. As a result, despite the projected decrease in the Median Household Income, Per Capita Income is predicted to increase slightly.

City of Schenectady households are estimated to have earned roughly 73% of the household median for the MSA in 2001. City residents are estimated to have earned only $33,512 compared to the MSA median of $46,175. The story is somewhat better for per capita income. City residents are estimated to earn $18,507 on average, which is 79% of the estimated per capita income for the MSA of $23,503.

The comparison of 1989 to estimated 2001 figures presents a worsening picture, with City residents and households earning an even smaller percentage of the earnings of MSA residents in 2001 than they had in 1989.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady</td>
<td>$34,729 $45,088</td>
<td>$46,175 74.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>$33,512 $45,647</td>
<td>$46,175 72.68%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per Capita Income

- Households around Schenectady are comparable to or better off than those around Saratoga in terms of Household Wealth. Median Household Income and Per Capita income.
- Households around Schenectady are significantly better off than households around Albany by these metrics.

The chart below, drawn from the Downtown Schenectady Master Plan reflects metrics in circles drawn around a central intersection in each city: Schenectady: State & Broadway; Albany: Broadway & Clinton; Saratoga: Broadway & Congress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Wealth</th>
<th>Median Household Income</th>
<th>Per Capita Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady</td>
<td>30,837 69,679</td>
<td>30,062 38,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>6,020 37,711</td>
<td>35,470 26,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga</td>
<td>29,654 60,650</td>
<td>29,796 39,963</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consumer Demand

- The city consumer market is weak compared to the County and MSA markets.

Clariant projects consumer spending by store type. The Clariant 2001 estimate shows that residents of the City of Schenectady are spending less in all selected retail store types residents in Schenectady County and the Albany MSA. This is not surprising given that both wealth and income of City residents are lower than those of the County and the MSA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Store Type</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>MSA</th>
<th>Variance from City</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dept. Stores</td>
<td>$80,39</td>
<td>$1,118,94</td>
<td>$1,084,54</td>
<td>$(24,45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing and Accessory</td>
<td>$446,10</td>
<td>$507,72</td>
<td>$677,63</td>
<td>$(131,51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating Places</td>
<td>$913,26</td>
<td>$1,044,39</td>
<td>$1,033,94</td>
<td>$(120,60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery Stores</td>
<td>$1,181,25</td>
<td>$2,010,91</td>
<td>$1,890,90</td>
<td>$(190,90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Materials</td>
<td>$189,04</td>
<td>$275,96</td>
<td>$267,74</td>
<td>$(7,70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Shopping &amp; Mail Order</td>
<td>$231,78</td>
<td>$299,67</td>
<td>$291,24</td>
<td>$(7,44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture Stores</td>
<td>$159,02</td>
<td>$226,11</td>
<td>$218,03</td>
<td>$(8,03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Furnishing Stores</td>
<td>$113,59</td>
<td>$169,44</td>
<td>$162,23</td>
<td>$(6,44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline/Service Stations</td>
<td>$501,67</td>
<td>$524,72</td>
<td>$540,90</td>
<td>$(18,90)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Personal Care</td>
<td>$351,93</td>
<td>$411,34</td>
<td>$389,69</td>
<td>$(21,65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio TV/Other Electronics Store</td>
<td>$111,22</td>
<td>$151,92</td>
<td>$147,16</td>
<td>$(4,66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline/Service Stations</td>
<td>$221,39</td>
<td>$250,83</td>
<td>$256,10</td>
<td>$(5,20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery/Lawn/Garden Supply</td>
<td>$68,55</td>
<td>$95,12</td>
<td>$90,46</td>
<td>$(4,74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Centers</td>
<td>$42,63</td>
<td>$63,60</td>
<td>$61,36</td>
<td>$(2,24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoe Stores</td>
<td>$68,61</td>
<td>$87,90</td>
<td>$86,38</td>
<td>$(1,52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Appliances</td>
<td>$50,57</td>
<td>$69,36</td>
<td>$65,35</td>
<td>$(4,00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer/Software Stores</td>
<td>$37,94</td>
<td>$54,56</td>
<td>$52,81</td>
<td>$(1,75)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Places</td>
<td>$67,15</td>
<td>$83,40</td>
<td>$81,89</td>
<td>$(1,50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware Stores</td>
<td>$13,67</td>
<td>$20,11</td>
<td>$19,27</td>
<td>$(8,84)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Retail Expenditures: $6,319,76 $7,560,30 $7,405,98 $(1,086,22)

Clariant's 2001 estimate shows that residents of the City of Schenectady are spending less in all selected retail store types residents in Schenectady County and the Albany MSA. This is not surprising given that both wealth and income of City residents are lower than those of the County and the MSA.
Notes on Sources and Methodology

All analysis by River Street Planning & Development with the exception of bottom of Page 9.

Wealth & Income which was drawn from the Schenectady Downtown Master Plan, November 1999 by Hunter Associates et al.

All retail figures were drawn from the Economic Census of Retail Trade (1987, 1992 & 1997). All population figures were drawn from the US Census (1980 & 1990). Where data was not yet available from these sources estimates from Claritas, Inc. were used. All estimates are noted in the text.

For purposes of this analysis, "retail-related" refers to all types of retail included in the Economic Census of Retail Trade as well as eating and drinking establishments which are no longer included by the U.S. Census Bureau in the Census of Retail Trade.

In 1993, the Federal Government changed the counties included in the Albany-Schenectady-Troy Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) by removing Greene County and adding Schenectady County. In order to accurately compare data collected at the MSA level prior to 1993 to data collected in 1993 and later, the data collected prior to the definition change is adjusted to match the 1993 MSA by subtracting Greene County's figures and adding Schenectady County's.

At the time of this analysis, data from the 2000 Census was limited. The Census Bureau releases data according to a schedule as it completes needed analysis. Data available for preparation of this report included total population counts, race counts, and selected population and some housing characteristics. Detailed information on demographics, social, economic, and additional housing characteristics is not expected until Summer 2002. Where Census data was unavailable, the analysis used projections from Claritas, Inc., a private firm that provides marketing information resources including estimated and projected demographic data.

Where noted, sales figures were adjusted to constant dollars to reflect the change in the consumer price index (CPI) as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.
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B: Leadership Workshops

Canal Square/400 Block Master Plan
Leadership Workshop Summary

Background
As Schenectady Metroplex and Omni Development work to develop a master plan for Canal Square and the surrounding property in downtown Schenectady, community input is a critical feature of the planning process. Community input will take three forms: Public Meetings, Individual Stakeholder Meetings, and Leadership Workshops. The Canal Square/400 Block Master plan will build on the planning efforts already accomplished in Schenectady, creating a detailed implementation strategy that contributes to the goals set in the Downtown Master Plan.

This memo describes the results of the three Leadership Workshops held on 2/27, 3/5 and 3/7. The invitees to these workshops included professionals working in real estate development, real estate sales, business and government, community development, education, arts and culture and related community issues as well as representatives from the Metroplex board and neighborhood residents.

Each of the three workshops had a specific theme representing a potential use for the site:
Retail & Commercial, Residential, and Arts, Entertainment & Culture.

Overall Themes
These themes were raised repeatedly in each of the three workshops.

Clean, Neat & Safe
While workshop participants recognized the good work done by the BID on cleanliness and the statistical fact that downtown is as safe as other areas, there was general agreement that the area is perceived by members of the larger community as dangerous and dirty. Many participants felt that, in addition to increasing police presence and cleaning efforts, work needs to be done to market the area to help change that perception.

Mixed Use
There was also considerable agreement that any effort taken to re-develop Canal Square should incorporate a mix of office, retail, and entertainment uses, and that every effort should be made to balance these uses so that they work together effectively with no one use dominating. Note, however, that the consensus was just as clear that residential uses should not be considered in the initial phases of re-development.

The Residential “Ring”
New residents living in Canal Square may ultimately be an important element in creating an eighteen hour city, but the consensus of participants was that residents would follow other development rather than being the pioneer audience. Available space should be used intensively to create a vibrant mixed use commercial area. The areas adjacent to Canal Square are better suited for residential conversion creating a pedestrian oriented ring around the central business district.

Supporting Proctor’s
The final theme repeated throughout the sessions was the desire to reinforce the asset and drawing power the city has in Proctor’s Theatre. Participants voiced their belief that Proctor’s historic role as the anchor of downtown could serve as the key to creating an entertainment district that would become a regional destination. Expansion of Proctor’s stage and ancillary theater development were identified as potential catalyst projects.
Specific Findings

Workshop 1: Retail & Commercial – February 27

Mixed Use
Many participants suggested that we focus on “base hits” not “home runs” and that we not “put all our eggs in one basket.” They recognized both the high traffic-demand of large, national retailers and the volatility of small, local retailers, and suggested that attracting a number of small vendors, either local or franchised, was more critical than trying to find a single anchor tenant to serve as the “silver bullet” for the area.

Audience
Several potential audiences for retail were identified.

Office Workers: Most participants felt that a critical mass of office workers could contribute to the success of retail establishments downtown, and that even the influx of DOT & MVP will not reach that critical mass. This was tempered by the recognition that the nature of office work means that office workers are contributing to the economic vitality of the street for at least very limited time periods each weekday.

Students: While some participants felt that students could be a strong audience for retail, others felt that the relatively small number of full-time, residential college students (2,700 Union, 3,500 SCCC who are mostly part-time, non-residential) combined with students’ tendency to avoid downtown in favor of familiar retailers at malls reduces the impact of students on the downtown retail environment. There was interest in exploring ways to continue to more closely integrate the colleges with the downtown, perhaps by moving facilities (bookstore, restaurant) or curriculum downtown.

Residents: Several participants specifically suggested that there be a focus on retail that would serve residents as well as visitors. In addition there was a suggestion that the residential market be studied in more detail in order to better understand the audience living in the immediate area.

Visitors: The current and potential entertainment visitor was seen as a strong contributor to retail success. There was considerable recognition that the “fast or famine” nature of the current Proctor’s audience creates difficulties for retailers and restaurants. This audience is present only a few nights a year, and even on those nights is only available for retail for short periods before and after the theater. Additional entertainment venues that created a more even flow of audience would help. In that vein, there was considerable conversation about the possibility of cinema as well as mention of a current proposal for a Civic Center and suggestions that the Center City Sportsplex continue to be enhanced.

Types of Retail
A few specific types of retail were identified by individual participants as promising: Factory Outlets, Antique Malls, Arts Related, Book Stores, Convenience Shopping, and Specialty Retail.

Progress Made
Several establishments were recognized a contributing already to the success of the downtown retail scene: Ambition Coffee House, Pinhead Susan’s, and Jay Street as a whole.

Workshop 2: Residential – March 5

Residential should follow, not lead
There was almost complete consensus that residential use should not be a priority for the initial phases of development of the property. Participants felt that a residential ring within walking distance of Canal Square would develop once sufficient density of uses was achieved in the Canal Square area.

Product
There was some conversation about what attributes downtown housing would need in order to be marketable. Participants indicated that increasing the perception of downtown as “clean, neat & safe” would be necessary before any success would be possible with downtown housing. If this issue is resolved, participants believed a market price of $800 - $1000 could be found for housing with the following features:

- 2 or 3 Bedroom apartments – no studios
- Minimum of 1,200 – 1,400 sq ft.
- Laundry in unit
- Garage
- Storage
- High quality construction

Audience
Several potential audiences for residential housing in or near Canal Square were identified.

Seniors & Empty Nesters: Many participants shared their perception that in-town housing is becoming an attractive option for seniors and retirees. These potential residents seek reduced home maintenance responsibilities and the ability to walk to services. In particular, the location of medical services nearby adds to the appeal of this area for an aging population.

Students: Students were identified as a likely market for downtown housing. Students are attracted by the high-density lifestyle of a downtown area. Participants felt that the best way to incorporate students into the housing mix would be to have the colleges own or manage housing specifically for students. There was concern about the conflicts that can ensue when the time-shifted (late-to-bed, late-to-rise) lifestyle of students collides with the lifestyle of the general population. Graduate students were identified as a possible market as well, although the small number of graduate students limits the impact of this group.

Young Singles: Young Singles were also perceived to be a possible audience for downtown housing, although seniors were seen as a stronger market.

Visiting Professionals: Visiting professionals including short-term faculty members and contract workers for major employers were also identified as a possible audience for downtown housing.

Current Situation
There was much conversation about the existing housing situation. Specifically, participants called attention to the discrepancy between high-end housing, primarily in the Stockade, and other housing in the downtown area. The high end housing is extremely desirable, sells well and has maintained its value. In contrast, other housing has become dated, and has many vacancies and problems with nuisance issues. Nonetheless there was recognition that some existing buildings “have spaces and materials that people can’t get in new construction”, which could increase the appeal of downtown apartments if handled correctly.
Workshop 3: Arts & Entertainment – March 7

Proctor’s
The primary theme that emerged during the third workshop was that Proctor’s is the “crown jewel” of the area, and that any activities considered by Metropolis should support and strengthen Proctor’s. The potential to create a performing arts oriented entertainment district, with Proctor’s as a key partner, received significant support and was viewed as an opportunity to distinguish Schenectady from similar districts planned in Troy and Albany.

Other Arts & Entertainment Uses
Participants felt that additional arts and entertainment uses are necessary to contribute to the sense that there is an Arts & Entertainment district surrounding Proctor’s.

Festival/Art on the Street: Outdoor activities including both festivals, like the Greek Festival, and live music during the summer months were perceived as helpful.

Small Recital Hall: Several participants cited the need for a smaller facility to complement Proctor’s. Specifically a theater with excellent acoustics and around 300 seats was seen as a promising idea, especially if ticket prices could be kept reasonable.

Cinema: Participants indicated that they did not believe there was market support for a cinema that competed directly with malls, (i.e. a multi-plex cinema of 12-16 screens) but many felt that there was a role for a cinema – perhaps a “dinner and movie theater” like Broadway Joe’s in Saratoga. Proctor’s representatives shared that they routinely get 250 movie audience members despite a sporadic schedule. Another suggestion was to look towards a small, high-tech theater that could be used for convention space and studio space for students, as well as movies.

Exhibit Hall: Several ideas surfaced regarding the need for an exhibit hall that could be used for a number of short term uses such as quilt shows, craft fairs etc. Such a space could also be used as a gallery to show work by local artists, perhaps focusing on ‘new media’ art capitalizing on Schenectady’s high-tech history.

Artists Support: Attracting artists to live, work, and sell their product was seen as a way to contribute to the district. For example, it was suggested that subsidized rent could be offered to artisans willing to have a retail storefront with a workshop or studio in the rear.

Patron Amenities
In addition to more arts and entertainment venues, participants recognized the need for more amenities for patrons to take advantage of both before and after the theater. For example:

Eating & Drinking Establishments: The need for restaurants, coffee bars, taverns etc. is clearly recognized. Some participants felt that a “food emporium” like that at Cafeu Hall in Boston could work well, reflect the growing ethnic diversity in the region, and draw office workers as well as entertainment patrons.

Retail Stores: Arts related retail was seen as particularly appropriate. This could include shops such as a violin maker, an art supply store, or a store similar to the Albany Airport’s DepARTure selling hand crafted products. Schenectady Museum participates in DepARTure and is doing extremely well.

Public Spaces: Several participants identified the need for attractive spaces for people who are arriving at the theater. These could be for profit businesses such as galleries, or public spaces such as kiosks, parks, or attractive streetscape.

Marketing
Marketing the district was seen as key to its success. Participants felt that a coordinated effort to market the district, rather than individual venues, was needed. The frequency of downtown’s offerings was seen as an asset that should be marketed. “Every Night but Christmas” was a suggested theme.

Façade/Design Standards
Participants mentioned improving downtown’s façades both in order to market the area to potential business owners and also to provide business owners with confidence that their investment would not be impacted by surrounding buildings. SDRC reported that they are working on enhanced design guidelines.

Students
Students were seen as having the potential to contribute to an exciting Arts & Entertainment district. In particular it was hoped that certain aspects of the curriculum from SCCC and/or Union might be brought downtown. SCCC representatives reported that they already use the 440 State Street building and are discussing doing more, perhaps photography and pottery classes. Participants also acknowledged that Schenectady High School has strong arts program and that SHS students might provide a source of interns.
Canal Square/400 Block Master Plan
Public Meeting 1 (March 27, 2002) Summary

Background
As Schenectady Metropolis and Omni Development work to develop a master plan for Canal Square and the surrounding property in downtown Schenectady, community input is a critical feature of the planning process. Community input will take three forms: Public Meetings, Individual Stakeholder Meetings, and Leadership Workshops. The Canal Square/400 Block Master plan will build on the planning efforts already accomplished in Schenectady, creating a detailed implementation strategy that contributes to the goals set in the Downtown Master Plan.

In preparation for this public meeting extensive outreach was done to residents and business owners in the City of Schenectady. As a result of this outreach, roughly 125 – 150 people turned out for the meeting. This outreach is described in detail beginning on page 3 below.

The meeting format informed citizens about the planning effort to date and encouraged attendees to provide suggestions for the redevelopment effort. As a result of the dynamic nature of the evening most participants stayed through the meeting and actively participated in process. Both the meeting format (on page 2) and overall themes heard from participants (immediately following) are described in this document.

Overall Themes
There was relative consensus regarding the following themes by the members of the public who attended the Public Workshop.

Public Space
The concept of public space received a lot of attention at the public meeting and was a featured element in all six of the small group report-back presentations. This is in contrast to the leadership workshops in which the element received little attention. It should be noted that all groups were particularly interested in “public space” as opposed to “park space.” Community members described space such as a plaza or square that could be used for entertainment and community uses (concerts, farmers markets, etc.) Several participants suggested that an ideal space would have protection from the elements and would be “visually connected” to State Street.

Overall Mixed Use Scheme with Maximum Ground Floor Retail
As in the leadership workshops, all six small groups repeatedly stressed a desire for a mix of uses in Canal Square. Public meeting participants indicated that this mix should include retail, office, open space, residential and entertainment uses. In particular, several residents spoke strongly of their fear of a single, large scale, “silver bullet” solution. Instead, residents hoped to see mixed ownership and mixed development which would protect the area from the failure of any single entity. In particular, there was consensus among public meeting participants that the store fronts along State Street should be used predominantly for unique retail, eating and drinking establishments and entertainment uses, and that ground floor retail was an absolutely essential element of any redevelopment plan. Several groups indicated that they would support subsidies for retail if necessary.

Residential Uses
Unlike the leadership workshops, where there was clear consensus that residential use should follow but not lead in Canal Square, public meeting participants stressed that they believe that residential use is a critical early use in this area, and wanted to ensure that this use is considered. Five of the six group presentations mentioned this issue. In defining the type of residential use to be provided participants mentioned artist lofts, other “live-work” spaces, rental units for visiting faculty or GE employees, and moderate to upper income rentals or condominiums.

Parking
Five of the six small group presentations mentioned parking. In particular several groups indicated that they felt there was sufficient parking downtown already, but that it was not esthetically pleasing or integrated adequately into the life of downtown. Most groups indicated that they would prefer to see work done to upgrade the existing parking rather than investing in additional parking structures downtown. Others expressed concern that the redevelopment of parcels currently used for parking and expansion of Proctors Theater would necessitate the development of some new parking infrastructure or a strategy to share existing parking being developed as part of the MVP or DOT building projects.

Clean, Neat & Safe
Public meeting attendees seconded the leadership workshop participants in recognizing the good work done by the Bid on cleanliness. Attendees also echoed the concern that the area is perceived by members of the larger community as dangerous and dirty. Four of the six group presentations explicitly stressed this point.

Supporting Proctor’s
Public meeting attendees also echoed the leadership workshop participants in their desire to reinforce the asset and drawing power the city has in Proctor’s Theatre. Specific support for theater expansion, additional utilization of 440 State Street and potential development of artist live-work space were also expressed. In describing the type of retail to be encouraged on the ground floor, many participants indicated support for arts-related retail establishments or space where artisans manufactured and sold products.

Meeting Format
The public meeting opened with comments from John Manning, Metropolis Chairman, and Jayme Lahut, Metropolis Executive Director and included presentation of select material from River Street Planning and Development and Brennan Beers. Gorman/Architects (BBG). After the presentations Margaret Irwin of River Street Planning led the participants through “Designing Downtown”, a small group exercise that encourages participants to think through land use choices for downtown. Each of these items is described below. The meeting was videotaped for public access television, and the tapes are available.

River Street presented excerpts from the market and demographic analysis of downtown Schenectady. This analysis is available in a separate document “Schenectady in a Nutshell”.

BBG presented an overview of the physical parameters of the Canal Square site and an orientation to how the site fits in to Schenectady’s downtown. Copies of the maps and sketches provided are available.

APPENDIX C: Public Meetings
The "Designing Downtown" exercise provided small groups (10 to 30) of participants with maps of the downtown area. Each group was asked to identify three things (1) Critical elements for downtown success (Givens) (2) Criteria to be used to measure downtown success and (3) how they might arrange the uses on the site. After discussion, residents used a color code to sketch the following uses on their maps: Office, Entertainment, Retail, Residential and Open Space were the suggested uses. This exercise lasted roughly forty minutes.

After the exercise, each small group selected a representative who reported back to the full audience using their maps as a guide.

Finally, general questions were taken from the audience and the next meeting date was announced.

**Meeting Outreach**
An extensive outreach effort was conducted in order to inform the public of the upcoming public meeting. This effort consisted of the following:

**Posters**
Simple posters were hung in public view (approximately 200) at the following locations:
- Library
- Post Offices
- Windows of local businesses in the surrounding area
- County Buildings

**Media**
- Ad placed in Meeting Notice section of all local newspapers
- Press Release mailed to all local newspapers, top four local TV stations and local radio stations
- 8x10 Ad places for Sunday in the Local Section of the Schenectady Gazette
- Personal appearance by Jayme Lahut on Public Access TV16

**Organizations**
Contact was made with each of the following organizations via direct mail postcards, personal contact and e-mail messages. Approximately 1800 postcards were mailed. Posters were handed out to several groups for distribution to members. Several databases were used including: Proctor's Theatre mailing list and Schenectady County Chamber of Commerce membership list.

**Significant Downtown Employers (via Human Resources/Employee Relations):**
- General Electric Co.
- MVP
- DOT
- Bechtel/MAO
- Contec
- Super Power, IG
- NSUC
- Union College
- Schenectady County Offices
- Power Technologies
- NY Lottery

Downtown Schenectady Improvement Corporation Board of Directors
Downtown Schenectady Improvement Corporation Members
Schenectady Economic Development Corp. Board
Schenectady 2000 Board of Directors
Schenectady County Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors
Schenectady County Chamber of Commerce Members
Schenectady County IDA Board
Schenectady County Business Center
City of Schenectady IDA Board
Center for Economic Growth Board
Canal Square Tenants
Hamilton Hill Business Association

**Resident Associations:**
- All Neighborhood Associations
- The Schenectady Heritage Foundation
- Lively Neighborhoods
- All Religious Organizations/Interdenominational Organizations/Synagogues
- Non Profit Organizations/Associations
- NMACP
- Rotary Clubs of Schenectady
- Lions Club of Scotia

**Elected Officials:**
- The Mayor's office
- Schenectady City Council
- Schenectady County Legislature
- All Town Planning Boards
- All Town Boards
- All Town Supervisors
- Assemblyman Tedisco
- Assemblyman Tonko
Canal Square/400 Block Master Plan
Public Meeting 2 (April 24, 2002) Summary

Background
As Schenectady Metroplex and Omni Development work to develop a master plan for Canal Square and the surrounding property in downtown Schenectady, community input is a critical feature of the planning process. Community input will take three forms: Public Meetings, Individual Stakeholder Meetings, and Leadership Workshops. The Canal Square/400 Block Master Plan will build on the planning effort already accomplished in Schenectady, creating a detailed implementation strategy that contributes to the goals set in the Downtown Master Plan.

This document provides a summary of the second of three public meetings that was held on April 24, 2002 at the Ramada Inn on Nott Street.

In preparation for this meeting extensive outreach to residents and business owners in the City of Schenectady was completed. As a result of this outreach, nearly 100 people turned out for the meeting. This outreach approach is described beginning on page 3 below.

The meeting format informed citizens about the planning effort to date, presented three preliminary redevelopment concepts (on page 5) and encouraged attendees to critique these concepts. Most participants stayed through the meeting and actively participated in the process. Both the meeting format (on page 2) and overall themes heard from participants (immediately following) are described in this document. The PowerPoint presentation from the meeting is available from Metroplex as is the videotape of the evening.

Overall Themes
The comments for each of the three concepts were similar, and have been combined here for simplicity.

Overall Preference – The audience was asked for a show of hands regarding which concept they found most appealing. Approximately 50% of the participants selected Option C: Proctor’s Westward Expansion. Almost no hands were raised for either of the other two options.

Proctor’s – Many comments were made strongly recommending that every effort should be made to support Proctor’s Theatre’s plans for expansion and to ensure that any plan initiated by Metroplex and Omni should consider how overall development can enhance the theater’s mission and vision for the 21st century. Participants stressed that potential synergy with possible new entertainment uses (cinema, restaurants, music clubs) could enhance the successful expansion of the theater in important ways.

Cinema – While there were a number of comments in opposition to multi-screen cinema development, many participants indicated a desire to see a cinema on State Street. In particular, people suggested that Albany’s Spectrum Theater should be a model, and that a downtown cinema that did not compete with standard mall fare, but instead showed ‘alternative’ or ‘art’ films, might be more successful. Other participants commented that more mainstream movies would draw a wider variety of people downtown. Several participants also noted the possibility for a unique and attractive streetscape incorporating the Proctor’s marquee, the cinema marquee and a marquee for a Proctor’s second theater.

Farmers Market – Audience comments were generally positive towards having a farmers market downtown. Some members approved of the locations in which the farmers market was shown on the concept diagrams (along Stratton Plaza, and at Stratton & Clinton). However, many concerns were expressed about these locations, specifically: (1) the area is often a ‘wind tunnel’, (2) there might not be sufficient space to have the farmers market and still allow sufficient access for Proctor’s unloading needs, and (3) the space along Stratton Plaza is so valuable that a farmers market may not be the highest and best use of this land. Several participants also said they would be more supportive of the idea if it was implemented as an enclosed, year round facility similar to Boston’s Quincy Market, rather than an open-air, seasonal facility.

Parking – Participants seemed to be in agreement that while parking close to the activity on State Street was important, no parking structure should be built in the main focus area (the triangle shaped property enclosed by State, Broadway and Clinton). Several participants mentioned a concern that structured parking breaks the pedestrian experience, which is essential if a retail component is to take hold along State Street.

Access – Audience members frequently suggested that the planning team be sure to incorporate sufficient access to facilities for deliveries, motor coaches, pedestrians and automobile passengers. Specifically, participants wanted to ensure that Proctor’s had adequate access for both large trucks unloading shows and four buses dropping off patrons.

Preservation – People repeatedly stressed the importance of preserving as many facades as possible, especially along State Street. The opportunity to redevelop identified State Street Buildings for residential live-work uses (on upper stories) was also strongly supported.

Public Spaces – Each concept included one or more public spaces. Audience members were pleased to see public spaces in the concepts, but expressed concerns about the locations (too far removed from State) and the need for a clear maintenance plan and program.

Unique/Independent Retail – Participants consistently stated that they supported unique and independent retail. Not only did participants indicate that what makes State Street a marketable destination is its uniqueness, but participants also expressed concern that ‘chain’ establishments would negatively impact existing business owners. Particular interest was expressed in food-based retail including both eating and drinking establishments and niche food markets a “flavors of the world” concept was mentioned several times.

Meeting Format
The public meeting opened with comments from Jayme Lahut, Metroplex Executive Director and included presentation of select material from River Street Planning and Development and Brennan Beer Gorman/Architects (BBG).

Margaret Irwin, River Street Planning & Development, followed with a summary of what has been learned to date from community input and market analysis.
Mano Laguardia, BBG then presented the three preliminary development concept illustrations. Each illustration depicted one way various uses could be positioned in the target area. Thumbnails sketches of the three concepts: A) Side by Side Entertainment Anchors, B) Proctor’s Eastward Expansion and C) Proctor’s Westward Expansion are incorporated on the last page of this document and full size sketches are available for review at the Metroplex office.

After hearing the presentation, the audience was invited to review each concept. Three stations were provided, each station held sketches of one of the concepts (A, B, or C) and was facilitated by an architect who was available to explain the potential benefits and drawbacks of the concept.

Audience members were encouraged to discuss their opinions with the architects and also to record their thoughts on ‘What we like’ and ‘What we don’t like’ sheets next to each concept. Audience members with additional comments were invited to write their feedback on handouts and either return the handouts that evening or mail them to Metroplex.

After sufficient time was allowed for audience members to review and comment on the three concepts, the audience congregated and reviewed the ‘What we Like’ and ‘What we don’t Like’ sheets as a group.

Finally general questions were taken from the audience and the next meeting date was announced.

Meeting Outreach
An extensive outreach effort was conducted in order to inform the public of the upcoming public meeting. This effort consisted of the following:

Posters
Simple posters were hung in public view (approximately 200) at the following locations:
- Library
- Post Offices
- Windows of local businesses in the surrounding area
- County Buildings

Media
- Ad placed in Meeting Notice section of all local newspapers
- Press Release mailed to all local newspapers, top four local TV stations and local radio stations
- 8x10 Ad places for Sunday in the Local Section of the Schenectady Gazette
- Personal appearance by Jayme Lahut on Public Access TV16

Organizations
Contact was made with roughly 35 or so organizations via direct mail postcards, personal contact and e-mail messages. Approximately 1800 post cards were mailed. Posters were handed out to several groups for distribution to members. Several databases were used including: Proctor’s Theatre meeting list and Schenectady County Chamber of Commerce membership list and the list of people who signed in at the first public meeting on March 27.

A full list of contacted organizations was included in the notes from the first public meeting and is available from Metroplex. These organizations included:

- Significant Downtown Employers (via Human Resources/Employee Relations)
- Business Associations
- Resident Associations
- Elected Officials
Canal Square/400 Block Master Plan
Individual Stakeholder Summary

Background
As Schenectady Metroplex and Omni Development work to develop a master plan for Canal Square and the surrounding property in downtown Schenectady, community input is a critical feature of the planning process. Community input will take three forms: Public Meetings, Individual Stakeholder Meetings, and Leadership Workshops. The Canal Square/400 Block Master plan will build on the planning efforts already accomplished in Schenectady, creating a detailed implementation strategy that contributes to the goals set in the Downtown Master Plan.

This document provides a summary of the Individual Stakeholder meetings held during March and April 2002. These meetings were facilitated by Margaret Irvin of River Street Planning & Development. The meetings were informal in nature and followed the interests of the participant rather than following a rigid structure. Typically the meetings ran for an hour and were held at the Metroplex offices or the offices of the participant.

A list of participants is provided on page 3. The following sections describe both the overall themes and some specific suggestions heard in the meetings.

Overall Themes
Clean, Neat & Safe – As with the leadership workshops and the public meetings, this group of stakeholders repeatedly referenced the need for the area to be clean, neat and safe at all hours.

Arts District – These stakeholders echoed the favorable comments heard from other sources regarding an Arts District that capitalizes on Proctors. Most stakeholders believe that an Arts District will provide an engine that could help revitalize the downtown. Some specific suggestions regarding what might be included in this district are listed below.

Supporting Existing Business Owners – Several stakeholders identified the need to be aware of the impact of new development on existing business owners and building owners. Participants suggested that Metroplex make every effort to ensure that new development does not take the form of a self-contained unit that would provide all services to a captive audience.

Linkages – Several Participants suggested that new development be mindful of existing neighborhoods and institutions, and that creating appealing pedestrian linkages with these would be ideal.

Cinema – Opinions on a downtown cinema varied. Several participants suggested that the most appropriate solution might be to have a limited number of small theaters that could also be programmed for other uses such as a conference center. However, some participants also believed that a downtown Megaplex would be a success.

Parking – Several participants mentioned parking as a key concern and suggested that appropriate care be taken to ensure that there is adequate parking to support new development and that any parking that is developed contribute, rather than detract from the walkability of the area.

Residential – There was considerable diversity of opinion regarding residential uses downtown. Some participants specifically indicated that they believe residential should not be a focus due to the existing over-supply of housing. Other participants believed that there is a market for high-end urban housing and that this should be explored.

Specific Suggestions
These suggestions came from various participants and have been grouped in three categories: Specific suggestions for the Arts District, specific suggestions for retail including eating & drinking establishments and other suggestions.

Arts District
• Create an outside events area that could be used for performances
• Create a performance space like WAMC in Albany
• Move Channel 16 behind glass so passersby can view the station in action
• Expand Proctors Theater
• Including night and jazz clubs
• Create a graphic arts training program
• Create a new media arts program emphasis (electronic arts)
• Offer stage technology training (lighting, set design, scenery)
• Provide artisan work/performance space (glass blowing, etc.)
• Tie in to regional tourism efforts including canal barges
• Have the Civic Opera perform downtown more often
• Have the Empire Jazz Orchestra (in residence at SCCC) perform

Retail & Eating/Drinking
• Use the Key bank building as a location for a fine dining establishment
• Develop an ethnic marketplace offering "foods of the world"
• Target business development towards meeting the needs of residents, including low and moderate income residents: bike shop, art supply, music shop, newsstand, consignment boutique
• Target business development towards meeting the needs of office workers: clothing, entertainment, restaurants
• Create a 'restaurant incubator' that would provide support for culinary arts students developing skills and capital to open restaurants downtown.

Other
• Provide substantial subsidies to businesses who open in the area for two to three years
• Invest in amenities with visual appeal, streetscaping, landscaping
• Invest in façade improvements and interior commercial improvements
• Consider a downtown conference center
• Use an office tower to create a striking 'signature building' for downtown Schenectady
Participant List

Reverend Bob Smith, Pastor
State Street Presbyterian Church
5 Catherine Street
Schenectady New York 12305
(518) 374-2684
rsmitrad@aol.com
Meeting Date: 3/21/02 at Metropyx

Dr. Gabriel J. Basil
President
Schenectady County Community College
78 Washington Avenue
Schenectady, New York 12305
(518) 381-1304
basilg@sunyccc.edu
Meeting Date: 3/21/02 at Metropyx

Frederick Kilkeen, Esq.
Attorney and Property owner
179 1/2 Jay Street
Schenectady, NY 12305
(518) 370-1233
kbesqflc@aol.com
Meeting Date: 3/25/02 at Metropyx

Dr. Roger Hull
President
Union College
Schenectady, NY 12308
518-388-6508
Meeting Date: 4/2/02 at Union College

John Samatulski
Executive Director
Downtown Schenectady Improvement Corporation
PO Box 132
Schenectady, NY 12301
john@downtownschenectady.com
Meeting Date: 4/2/02 at Metropyx

Honorable Hugh Farley
Senator
New York State Senate
Legislative Office Building, Room 412
Albany, NY 12247
(518) 455-2181
farley@senate.state.ny.us

Janice A. Smith
Manager - Communications & Public Affairs
GE Power Systems
Bldg. 2 Room 03A
1 River Road
Schenectady, NY 12345
(518) 385-3072
janjay.smith@ps.ge.com
E: Projected Economic Impact

Jobs
• Jobs Created: At full build out 2,380 new people will be working downtown.
• Wages Generated: These jobs will have an average salary of $31,500. That’s $75M in gross wages each year.

Construction
• Jobs Created: This project will generate over 1300 construction jobs.
• Wages Generated: The construction staff gross wages will total almost $63 Million.

Taxes
• During the first 10 years, the project will generate almost $15 million in new property, sales, and bed tax revenue.
• By year 10 the project will generate almost $2 million in tax revenue annually. At full taxation, the property will generate more than $3 million each year. Full taxation will be reached between Year 11 and Year 19 depending on whether the City elects to use Section 485(b) or the Enterprise Zone program.
• We expect this project behave as a catalyst for downtown by increasing the performance and value of other downtown properties. None of that increase is included in these figures.
## APPENDIX

### Canal Square Redevelopment Project Impact Assessment

**At Year 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Entertainment</th>
<th>Anchor</th>
<th>Religious</th>
<th>Easting &amp; Dining</th>
<th>Reception</th>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th>Municipal</th>
<th>Parking (per space)</th>
<th>Total All Yr 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Rehabilitation</td>
<td>614,675</td>
<td>42,174</td>
<td>67,946</td>
<td>42,930</td>
<td>22,670</td>
<td>17,965</td>
<td>7,429</td>
<td>48,546</td>
<td>33,480</td>
<td>150,515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Improvement Costs</td>
<td>51,450</td>
<td>315,110</td>
<td>7,126</td>
<td>11,249</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Construction/Rehabilitation Cost</td>
<td>666,125</td>
<td>357,284</td>
<td>75,072</td>
<td>54,179</td>
<td>45,170</td>
<td>11,840</td>
<td>12,604</td>
<td>56,492</td>
<td>36,980</td>
<td>165,925</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Other Development Costs | 220,360 |
| Property Assessment | 150,000 |
| Streetcar (Broadway & Colton) | 75,166 |
| Stabilization | 50,000 |
| Total Other Development Costs | 245,526 |
| Marketing/Development/Management | 13,090,290 |
| Management/Development/Management | 12,803,490 |
| Total Costs | 151,370,296 |

### Tax Impact at Year 10  

- **Tax Impact Analysis per SF Space**
- **Vacancy Allowance**: 10%  
- **Expense Allowance**: 30%  
- **Estimated Net Income**: 5,457,634  
- **Capitalization Rate**: 14.5%  
- **Assessment per SF Space**: 41  
- **Total Net Property Tax**: 37,399,197  
- **Taxable Value under Assumption per Year 10**: 14,981,943

| Current Taxable Value Replaced by New | 37,399,197 | 14,981,943 |
| Net Increase | 19,417,254 |

### Employment Impact

| 10 SF Space per Job | 300 | 1,200 | 400 | 738 |
| Development Cost per Job | 52 | 26 | 13 | 6 |
| Construction Industry | 1,204 | 38,460 |

### Wage Impact

| Annual Salary | 33,250 | 15,086 | 18,560 | 30,000 | 33,250 | 22,670 |
| Total Annual Gross Wage Increase | 68,629,250 | 525,000 | 317,660 | 780,000 | 203,000 | 182,500 |

### Construction Employment Impact

| Construction Workers | 50% | 39,353,470 | 2,800,780 | 2,207,180 | 795,200 | 1,429,405 | 7,015,000 |
| Construction Jobs, average annual salary | 47,960 | 841 | 62 | 50 | 33 | 36 | 168 | 100 | 12 | 25 | 10 |

### Tax Impact and Current Assessment Figures

- **Relief**: The relief granted to establishments similar to 1987 Economic Census Adjustments (related to current dollars) is shown in the table.  
- **Construction Industry**: $305,000 worth of construction services, 144,000 square feet, and balance of 144,000 square feet is projected by 2010.  
- **Construction Industry Jobs**: 10 total jobs.  
- **Construction Industry**: The number of construction workers is expected to be 50%.  

### Summary

- **Construction Workers**: 39,353,470  
- **Construction Jobs**: 2,800,780  
- **Construction Workers**: 2,207,180  
- **Construction Jobs**: 795,200  
- **Construction Jobs**: 1,429,405  
- **Construction Jobs**: 7,015,000  
- **Construction Workers**: 47,960  
- **Construction Jobs**: 841  
- **Construction Jobs**: 62  
- **Construction Jobs**: 50  
- **Construction Jobs**: 33  
- **Construction Jobs**: 36  
- **Construction Jobs**: 168  
- **Construction Jobs**: 100  
- **Construction Jobs**: 12  
- **Construction Jobs**: 25  
- **Construction Jobs**: 10  

---

**Note**: Some data has been rounded for readability.
## APPENDIX

### E: Projected Economic Impact - Summary by Year

#### Canal Square Redevelopment Project Impact Assessment

**Summary By Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Year 0</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 8</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
<th>Year 10</th>
<th>At Full Value</th>
<th>Total Of All Yr 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction/Improvement</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>2,003</td>
<td>2,004</td>
<td>2,005</td>
<td>2,006</td>
<td>2,007</td>
<td>2,008</td>
<td>2,009</td>
<td>2,010</td>
<td>2,011</td>
<td>2,012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Costs</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td>19,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Development Costs</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Costs</td>
<td>22,202,000</td>
<td>22,202,000</td>
<td>22,202,000</td>
<td>22,202,000</td>
<td>22,202,000</td>
<td>22,202,000</td>
<td>22,202,000</td>
<td>22,202,000</td>
<td>22,202,000</td>
<td>22,202,000</td>
<td>22,202,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tax Impact

- **New Taxable Value**
- **Current Taxable Value**
- **Net Increase**
- **Current Taxable Value**
- **Total New Assessment**
- **Increase as a percent**

### Employment Impact

- **New Jobs Created**
- **Development Cost per Job**

### Wage Impact

- **Total average annual wage increase**
- **Impact of Spending by Employees**

### Construction Employment Impact

- **Construction Wages (% of construction costs)**
- **Construction Jobs (annual salary)**

---

### C AN A L S Q U A R E C O R R O D I L A R P L A N

---
## APPENDIX

### E: Projected Economic Impact - Construction Costs - Summary by Year

#### Canal Square Redevelopment Project Impact Assessment

##### Construction Costs - Summary By Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction - Square Feet</th>
<th>sf</th>
<th>Year 0</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 8</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
<th>Year 10</th>
<th>Total At Yr 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A (Phase 1)</td>
<td>155.175</td>
<td>77.589</td>
<td>77.589</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B &amp; C (Phase 2)</td>
<td>180.000</td>
<td>90.000</td>
<td>90.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>180.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (Phase 3)</td>
<td>86.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>86.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E (Phase 4)</td>
<td>64.500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (Phase 5)</td>
<td>64.500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G (Phase 6)</td>
<td>64.500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>64.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Office</td>
<td>614.675</td>
<td>42.154</td>
<td>21.077</td>
<td>21.077</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>614.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment Anchor (Phase 2)</td>
<td>42.154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42.154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail incl. Eating &amp; Drinking (Phase 1)</td>
<td>67.796</td>
<td>33.883</td>
<td>33.883</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential (Phase 1)</td>
<td>14.368</td>
<td>7.184</td>
<td>7.184</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel (Phase 2)</td>
<td>19.200</td>
<td>19.200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor's - Entertainment (Phase 1)</td>
<td>65.246</td>
<td>32.623</td>
<td>32.623</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor's - Rental Office (Phase 1)</td>
<td>8.900</td>
<td>4.900</td>
<td>4.900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor's Retail (Phase 1)</td>
<td>33.480</td>
<td>16.740</td>
<td>16.740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total SF Construction</td>
<td>866.689</td>
<td>19.200</td>
<td>173.918</td>
<td>283.995</td>
<td>111.077</td>
<td>66.000</td>
<td>64.500</td>
<td>64.500</td>
<td>64.500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>866.689</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### Construction - Parking Spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spaces</th>
<th>Year 0</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 8</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
<th>Year 10</th>
<th>Total At Yr 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking (Existing)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 1 (Surface)</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 (Surface)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3 (Surface)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4 (Surface)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5 (Structure)</td>
<td>340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 6 (500 Surface/236 Structure)</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Spaces</td>
<td>2,216</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>736</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

##### Construction Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$ Costs($)</th>
<th>Year 0</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 8</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
<th>Year 10</th>
<th>Total At Yr 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,172.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B &amp; C (Phase 2)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>10,086.375</td>
<td>10,086.375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23,400.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D (Phase 3)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>11,700.000</td>
<td>11,700.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,800.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E (Phase 4)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>8,385.000</td>
<td>8,385.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,385.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F (Phase 5)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>8,385.000</td>
<td>8,385.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,385.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G (Phase 6)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>8,385.000</td>
<td>8,385.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,385.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Office</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>10,086.375</td>
<td>21,786.375</td>
<td>11,700.000</td>
<td>11,700.000</td>
<td>11,180.000</td>
<td>8,385.000</td>
<td>8,385.000</td>
<td>8,385.000</td>
<td>8,385.000</td>
<td>8,385.000</td>
<td>78,907.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment Anchor (Phase 2)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,950.780</td>
<td>2,950.780</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,901.560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail incl. Eating &amp; Drinking (Phase 1)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2,371.810</td>
<td>2,371.810</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,743.620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provenant (Phase 1)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>96.240</td>
<td>96.240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel (Phase 2)</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>2,660.800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,660.800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Parking (Various)</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>455.000</td>
<td>855.000</td>
<td>330.000</td>
<td>630.000</td>
<td>8,100.000</td>
<td>5,290.000</td>
<td>15,630.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,630.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor's - Entertainment (Phase 1)</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>5,799.775</td>
<td>5,799.775</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11,599.550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor's - Rental Office (Phase 1)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>563.500</td>
<td>563.500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,127.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor's Retail (Phase 1)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1,171.800</td>
<td>1,171.800</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,343.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Construction Cost</td>
<td>2,863.800</td>
<td>21,238.300</td>
<td>36,239.300</td>
<td>15,000.780</td>
<td>11,180.000</td>
<td>9,015.000</td>
<td>16,485.000</td>
<td>13,675.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>123,694.360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX

## E: Projected Economic Impact - Tax Impact - Summary by Year

### Canal Square Redevelopment Project Impact Assessment

**Tax Impacts - Summary By Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxable Asset</th>
<th>Begin Yr</th>
<th>Alg. Year</th>
<th>Year 0</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 8</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
<th>Year 10</th>
<th>All Taxable Full Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Assessed Value</strong></td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>7,781,600</td>
<td>6,523,900</td>
<td>6,868,100</td>
<td>9,412,000</td>
<td>9,621,600</td>
<td>9,678,100</td>
<td>9,678,100</td>
<td>9,678,100</td>
<td>9,678,100</td>
<td>9,678,100</td>
<td>9,678,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Taxable Assessed Value by Use / split by use as %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Year 0</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 8</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
<th>Year 10</th>
<th>All Taxable Full Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>A (Phase 1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,290,346</td>
<td>4,290,346</td>
<td>4,290,346</td>
<td>4,290,346</td>
<td>4,290,346</td>
<td>4,290,346</td>
<td>4,290,346</td>
<td>4,290,346</td>
<td>4,290,346</td>
<td>4,290,346</td>
<td>4,290,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D (Phase 3)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>455,800</td>
<td>455,800</td>
<td>455,800</td>
<td>455,800</td>
<td>455,800</td>
<td>455,800</td>
<td>455,800</td>
<td>455,800</td>
<td>455,800</td>
<td>455,800</td>
<td>455,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E (Phase 4)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>724,800</td>
<td>724,800</td>
<td>724,800</td>
<td>724,800</td>
<td>724,800</td>
<td>724,800</td>
<td>724,800</td>
<td>724,800</td>
<td>724,800</td>
<td>724,800</td>
<td>724,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F (Phase 5)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>188,700</td>
<td>188,700</td>
<td>188,700</td>
<td>188,700</td>
<td>188,700</td>
<td>188,700</td>
<td>188,700</td>
<td>188,700</td>
<td>188,700</td>
<td>188,700</td>
<td>188,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G (Phase 6)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>76,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,290,346</td>
<td>4,649,832</td>
<td>5,105,632</td>
<td>5,800,432</td>
<td>6,019,132</td>
<td>6,095,632</td>
<td>6,095,632</td>
<td>6,095,632</td>
<td>6,095,632</td>
<td>6,095,632</td>
<td>6,095,632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment Anchor (Phase 2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail incl. Eating &amp; Drinking (Phase 1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential (Phase 4)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel (Phase 5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor's - Entertainment (Phase 1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor's - Rental Office (Phase 1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor's Retail (Phase 1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Current Taxable Value</strong></td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>7,731,600</td>
<td>6,323,900</td>
<td>6,868,100</td>
<td>9,412,000</td>
<td>9,621,600</td>
<td>9,678,100</td>
<td>9,678,100</td>
<td>9,678,100</td>
<td>9,678,100</td>
<td>9,678,100</td>
<td>9,678,100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Taxable Value by Use / split by use as %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Year 0</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 8</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
<th>Year 10</th>
<th>All Taxable Full Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>A (Phase 1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,290,346</td>
<td>4,290,346</td>
<td>4,290,346</td>
<td>4,290,346</td>
<td>4,290,346</td>
<td>4,290,346</td>
<td>4,290,346</td>
<td>4,290,346</td>
<td>4,290,346</td>
<td>4,290,346</td>
<td>4,290,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D (Phase 3)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>455,800</td>
<td>455,800</td>
<td>455,800</td>
<td>455,800</td>
<td>455,800</td>
<td>455,800</td>
<td>455,800</td>
<td>455,800</td>
<td>455,800</td>
<td>455,800</td>
<td>455,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E (Phase 4)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>724,800</td>
<td>724,800</td>
<td>724,800</td>
<td>724,800</td>
<td>724,800</td>
<td>724,800</td>
<td>724,800</td>
<td>724,800</td>
<td>724,800</td>
<td>724,800</td>
<td>724,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F (Phase 5)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>188,700</td>
<td>188,700</td>
<td>188,700</td>
<td>188,700</td>
<td>188,700</td>
<td>188,700</td>
<td>188,700</td>
<td>188,700</td>
<td>188,700</td>
<td>188,700</td>
<td>188,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G (Phase 6)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>76,500</td>
<td>76,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,290,346</td>
<td>4,649,832</td>
<td>5,105,632</td>
<td>5,800,432</td>
<td>6,019,132</td>
<td>6,095,632</td>
<td>6,095,632</td>
<td>6,095,632</td>
<td>6,095,632</td>
<td>6,095,632</td>
<td>6,095,632</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sales Tax

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Year 0</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 8</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
<th>Year 10</th>
<th>All Taxable Full Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bed Tax

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Year 0</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 8</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
<th>Year 10</th>
<th>All Taxable Full Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX

**E: Projected Economic Impact - Employment Impacts - Summary by Year**

#### Canal Square Redevelopment Project Impact Assessment

**Employment Impacts - Summary By Year**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Impact</th>
<th>Begin Yr</th>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Year 0</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 8</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
<th>Year 10</th>
<th>Total All Yr 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>A (Phase 1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B &amp; C (Phase 2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D (Phase 3)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E (Phase 4)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F (Phase 5)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G (Phase 6)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>215</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Entertainment Anchor (Phase 2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,254</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retail incl. Eating &amp; Drinking (Phase 1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential (Phase 1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotel - Historic Credit Adjustment (Phase 0)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>738</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proctor's - Entertainment (Phase 1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10,874</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proctor's - Rental Office (Phase 1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proctor's - Retail (Phase 1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total Employees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>215</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Wage Impact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Begin Yr</th>
<th>Ann Sal</th>
<th>Year 0</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
<th>Year 6</th>
<th>Year 7</th>
<th>Year 8</th>
<th>Year 9</th>
<th>Year 10</th>
<th>Total All Yr 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>A (Phase 1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B &amp; C (Phase 2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D (Phase 3)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E (Phase 4)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F (Phase 5)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G (Phase 6)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>46,683,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment Anchor (Phase 2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>525,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail incl. Eating &amp; Drinking (Phase 1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>525,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential (Phase 1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel - Historic Credit Adjustment (Phase 0)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>129,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>129,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor's - Entertainment (Phase 1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>129,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor's - Rental Office (Phase 1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>129,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proctor's - Retail (Phase 1)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33,250</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>129,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Wages</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>68,129,250</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Canals Square Corridor Redevelopment Plan**

---

**Redevelopment Plan**

---

**Summary**

- **Office**: Total 215
- **Entertainment Anchor**: Total 35
- **Retail**: Total 169
- **Proctor's**: Total 169
- **Hotel - Historic Credit Adjustment**: Total 26
- **Parking**: Total 26
- **Wage**: Total 68,129,250
E: Projected Economic Impact - Current Taxable Value

Canal Square Redevelopment Project Impact Assessment

Current Taxable Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
<th>Annualized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48,800</td>
<td>204,590</td>
<td>456,600</td>
<td>1,070,690</td>
<td>2,583,000</td>
<td>3,087,600</td>
<td>2,780,000</td>
<td>2,395,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Assessed Value By Phase To Be Renovated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Cumulative</th>
<th>Annualized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>48,800</td>
<td>7,725,840</td>
<td>480,782</td>
<td>456,600</td>
<td>154,700</td>
<td>7,128,600</td>
<td>7,128,600</td>
<td>7,128,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Taxable Assessment Detail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row</th>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>Municipal Assessment</th>
<th>State Assessment</th>
<th>County Assessment</th>
<th>City Assessment</th>
<th>School Assessment</th>
<th>Cumulative Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>33882-01-02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11th Street</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>33882-01-03</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12th Street</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>33882-01-04</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13th Street</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
<td>160,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX

REDEVELOPMENT PLAN

CANAL SQUARE CORRIDOR
## Canal Square Redevelopment Project Impact Assessment
### Sales Tax

### 1997 Retail Trade, Adjusted to 2001 *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Adjusted Sales (1,000s)</th>
<th>Per Store Sales</th>
<th># Stores</th>
<th>Projected Sales Tax for Canal Square Redevelopment</th>
<th>Projected Establishment SF *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicles and Parts</td>
<td>$ 43,031</td>
<td>$ 4,151,533</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Projected % of Current Establishments</td>
<td>SF per Store</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Taxable</td>
<td>Projected Sales Tax per SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Beverage Stores</td>
<td>$ 37,317</td>
<td>$ 1,166,150</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$ 3,498,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Personal Care</td>
<td>$ 42,674</td>
<td>$ 723,267</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>$ 2,893,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting Goods, Hobby, Books, Music</td>
<td>$ 4,877</td>
<td>$ 375,185</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>$ 750,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eating Places</td>
<td>$ 47,128</td>
<td>$ 191,579</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>$ 2,490,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing and Accessories</td>
<td>$ 13,642</td>
<td>$ 620,076</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>$ 1,240,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and Home Furnishings</td>
<td>$ 15,397</td>
<td>$ 962,326</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>$ 1,924,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking Places</td>
<td>$ 3,895</td>
<td>$ 105,273</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>$ 315,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florists</td>
<td>$ 2,365</td>
<td>$ 392,452</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>$ 392,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasoline Stations</td>
<td>$ 58,995</td>
<td>$ 1,787,718</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics and Appliances</td>
<td>$ 14,348</td>
<td>$ 1,304,351</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Materials &amp; Garden Equipment</td>
<td>$ 72,506</td>
<td>$ 3,299,735</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 356,164</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 15,075,644</strong></td>
<td><strong>517</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$ 13,505,529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Retail Square Feet Projected for Canal Square Redevelopment: 101,246

Gross Leasable Area (90.12%), of total space average for Easter US Community Shopping Centers ** 90.12% **

Non Proctor's Portion: $ 4,466,005 27% $ 277,107 33,480
Proctor's Portion: $ 9,039,524 55% $ 580,885 67,766

* Sales figures from the 1997 Economic Census, adjusted to 2001 figures
** Leasable area and square foot figures from "Dollars & Cents of Shopping Centers: 2000" - Urban Land Institute

---

**CANAL SQUARE CORRIDOR REDEVELOPMENT PLAN**
### APPENDIX E: Projected Economic Impact - Parking Estimates and Proctor's Expansion

#### Canal Square Redevelopment Project Impact Assessment

**Parking Estimates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Building Program</th>
<th>Parking Availability</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spaces Added</td>
<td>Cumulative Spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Retail)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phase</td>
<td>Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>II</td>
<td>B&amp;C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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#### Canal Square Redevelopment Project Impact Assessment

**Proctor's Expansion**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By Location and Use</th>
<th>Square Footage</th>
<th>$ per SF</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>440 State Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>875,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Office</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>9,300</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1,322,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440 - Construction Total</td>
<td>31,500</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>2,177,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>440 - Including 10% Softcost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,594,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl Company</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>20,980</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1,468,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Office</td>
<td>10,490</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1,206,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>45,456</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>11,818,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl - Construction Total</td>
<td>78,926</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>14,493,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carl - Including 10% Softcost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,942,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total Construction</td>
<td>108,526</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>16,670,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total Construction + Soft Cost Estimate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18,337,561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**By Tax Impact**

|                      |                |          |            |
| Retail (generated prop & sales tax) | 33,480 | 70 | 2,343,600 |
| Rental Office (generating prop tax) | 9,800 | - | - |
| Entertainment & Internal Office (non taxable) | 65,240 | 220 | 14,326,910 |
| Grand Total | 108,526 | 154 | 16,670,570 |
| Grand Total Construction + Soft Cost Estimate | | | 18,337,561 |
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