

6-1987

# St. Cloud State University's Impact on the Local Economy (June 1987)

Mary E. Edwards  
*St. Cloud State University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://repository.stcloudstate.edu/archives\\_rpts](https://repository.stcloudstate.edu/archives_rpts)



Part of the [Economics Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Edwards, Mary E., "St. Cloud State University's Impact on the Local Economy (June 1987)" (1987). *University Reports and Studies*. 9.  
[https://repository.stcloudstate.edu/archives\\_rpts/9](https://repository.stcloudstate.edu/archives_rpts/9)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the University Archives at theRepository at St. Cloud State. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Reports and Studies by an authorized administrator of theRepository at St. Cloud State. For more information, please contact [rswexelbaum@stcloudstate.edu](mailto:rswexelbaum@stcloudstate.edu).

ST. CLOUD STATE UNIVERSITY'S IMPACT  
ON THE LOCAL ECONOMY

Mary E. Edwards  
Assistant Professor of Economics

June 1987

## PREFACE

The total annual economic impact of St. Cloud State University on the local area is over \$191 million. This \$191 million impact consists of \$168.7 million in increased business volume along with an expanded credit base of more than \$23 million.

The university ranks as the 4th largest employer in St. Cloud, employing more than 1100 faculty and support staff at an annual payroll of \$29 million. St. Cloud State University generates approximately 8,277 jobs in the local area. As a result of university-related spending, the amount of personal income received by local individuals totals \$84 million.

The \$191 million economic impact generated by the University compares with \$129 million impact in the report of June 1983. The \$129 million impact of 1983 consisted of \$119.6 million increase in local business volume and \$9.6 increase in the local credit base.

More than \$8 million of the \$168.7 million increase in local business volume is generated by SCSU Athletics. This increase in business volume generated by SCSU Athletics includes spending by visitors to this area who attend or participate in athletic events and conferences. SCSU Athletics alone generates more than 300 jobs within the local area.

Economic impact studies may differ on two grounds: the size of the local multiplier used in the study, and the type

of expenditures which are included. Other university impact studies, like those done for the Minnesota Private College Council, have used a multiplier of 2.500. The SCSU impact study uses a multiplier of 2.1177. A multiplier of 2.1177 is consistent with multipliers used in past SCSU economic impact studies.

Studies, such as those done for the Minnesota Private College Council, have also included the additional earnings of alumni living in the area as part of the economic impact of the institution. To be justified in including this figure in an impact study one must be able to assume either that the SCSU alumni would not have been able or willing to attend any other university, or, they would not have settled in this area had they not attended SCSU. Many other differences exist between the method used in this study and the method used in the study prepared for the Minnesota Private College Council. Because of these differences, the results of this impact study cannot be compared with the studies prepared for St. John's University and the College of St. Benedict.

Completing this study would be impossible without the assistance of many area people. The author gratefully acknowledges the cooperation of all those who contributed information required for this study. Professor Emeritus, Gerald K. Gamber, and Professor Mark D. Lange provided invaluable information on data sources and procedures used in past studies. Professor Gamber is now retired, and

Professor Lange, who was affiliated with St. Cloud State University for many years, is now at Louisiana State University.

Institutional support and administrative services were provided by Janet Warnert, Business Manager; Thomas Stein, Coordinator of Institutional Studies; Curtis Ghylin, Director of Administrative Computer Services; Randy Kolb, Director of Academic Computer Services. Gladys Ziemer, Director of Women's Athletics and Morris Kurtz, Director of Men's Athletics readily provided the data needed to determine the impact of the Athletics Departments on the local community. The Secretary of the Economics Department, Lu Meemken, provided outstanding administrative assistance.

In addition, faculty, staff, and students who supplied information through mail surveys made much of this study possible. The many public officials in local government and business persons who readily cooperated in providing information are also gratefully acknowledged.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE .....	ii
LIST OF IMPACT MODELS .....	vi
LIST OF TABLES .....	ix
INTRODUCTION .....	1
LOCAL BUSINESS IMPACTS .....	3
Local Spending by Faculty and Staff .....	4
Unrealized Local Business Volume .....	7
IMPACTS ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS .....	8
Impacts on Local Governmental Revenues .....	8
Impact on Local Government Expenditures .....	8
IMPACTS ON LOCAL EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME .....	10
Impact on Local Employment .....	10
Impact on Local Income .....	10
THE IMPACT OF THE ATHLETICS DEPARTMENTS .....	11
INTERINDUSTRY IMPACT .....	14
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS .....	17
APPENDIX A .....	20
APPENDIX B .....	52

## LIST OF IMPACT MODELS

Model B-1 Total University-Related Local Business Volume .....	20
Model B-1.1 Expenditures Locally which are Directly University Related .....	20
Model B-1.1.1 Expenditures Locally by the University .....	21
Model B-1.1.2 Expenditures Locally by Faculty and Professional Support Staff .....	21
Model B-1.1.2.1 Expenditures for Local Rental Housing by Faculty and Professional Support Staff .....	22
Model B-1.1.2.2 Local Non-Housing Expenditures by Local Faculty and Professional Support Staff .....	23
Model B-1.1.2.3 Expenditures Locally by Non-Local Faculty and Professional Support Staff .....	23
Model B-1.1.3 Expenditures Locally by Students ...	24
Model B-1.1.4 Local Expenditures by Visitors to the University .....	24
Model B-1.2 Local Purchases by Local Concerns in Support of University-Related Business .....	25
Model B-1.3 Business Volume Locally Attributable to Income Spent as a Result of University-Related Spending .....	25
Model B-2 Value of Local Business Property Committed to University-Related Business .....	26
Model B-2.1 Value of Local Business Real Property Committed to University-Related Business .....	27
Model B-2.2 Value of Local Business Inventory Committed to University-Related Business .....	27

Model B-2.3 Value of Local Business Property Other than Real or Inventory Committed to University-Related Business .....	28
<b>Model B-3 Expansion of the Credit Base of Local Banks Resulting From University-Related Deposits .....</b>	<b>29</b>
Model G-1 University-Related Revenues Received by Local Governments .....	30
Model G-1.1 University-Related Real Estate Taxes Paid to Local Governments .....	31
Model G-1.1.1 Real Estate Taxes Paid to Local Governments by Local Faculty and Professional Support Staff .....	32
Model G-1.1.2 Real-Estate Taxes Paid to Local Governments by Students Residing Locally .....	33
Model G-1.1.3 Real-Estate Taxes Paid to Local Governments by Local Businesses for Real Property Allocatable to University-Related Business .....	33
Model G-1.2 Intergovernmental Aid to Local Governments Allocatable to the University's Presence .....	34
Model G-1.2.1 State Aid to Local Public Schools Allocatable to Children of University-Related Families .....	34
Model G-1.2.2 Other Intergovernmental Aid Received by Local Governments on a per Capita Basis .....	35
Model G-1.3 Other Revenues Collected by Local Governments from University-Related Activities .....	35
Model G-2 Local Government Operating Cost Allocatable to University-Related Influences .....	36
Model G-2.1 Municipal Service Costs Allocatable to University-Related Influences .....	37
Model G-2.2 Local Public School Costs Allocatable to University-Related Persons .....	38



Model G-3 Real-Estate Taxes Foregone Due to  
University's Tax Exempt Status ..... 39

Model I-1 Number of Local Jobs Attributable to the  
University's Presence ..... 40

Model I-2 Personal Income of Local Individuals  
Attributable to University's Presence ..... 41

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE I	Estimate of Interindustry Impact of St. Cloud State University on St. Cloud Area Economy .....	16
TABLE II	Average and Total Expenditures by Student Classification in 1986 .....	42
TABLE III	Average and Total Expenditures by Student Classification, Summer School .....	43
TABLE IV	Average and Total Expenditures by Categories for Students Commuting from Outside the St. Cloud Area, .....	44
TABLE V	Average and Total Expenditures by Categories for Married Students Residing in St. Cloud Area .....	45
TABLE VI	Average and Total Expenditures by Categories for Students Living on Campus .....	46
TABLE VII	Average and Total Expenditures by Categories for Single Students Living Off-Campus, but in St. Cloud Area .....	47
TABLE VIII	St. Cloud State University Spending in the Local Area, 1986 .....	48
TABLE IX	Income to St. Cloud State University, 1986 ...	49
TABLE X	Local Spending by Visitors to St. Cloud State University, 1986 .....	50

## INTRODUCTION

This report is the seventh in a continuing series of studies that estimate St. Cloud State University's economic impact on the local area. For this study, the local area consists of St. Cloud, Sartell, Sauk Rapids, Waite Park, and the immediate rural area. As in past studies, the models used were developed by Caffrey and Isaacs for the American Council on Education.<sup>1</sup>

This report emphasizes the economic impact of the University on the local economy. This study also isolates the economic impact of the SCSU Athletics Departments on the local area. The models employed in the study estimate the magnitudes of local spending by the University's students, faculty, professional support staff, and visitors. The models also estimate the amount of income and the number of jobs generated locally because of university-related spending. The estimation procedures used in this study are specified in Appendix A.

St. Cloud State University is a multi-purpose public institution offering both undergraduate and graduate programs. The university employs 1,130 faculty and professional support staff. Summer school enrollment was 5,407 in 1986. The total enrollment in Fall 1986 was 13,118. The students, faculty, and staff of the university

---

<sup>1</sup>John Caffrey and Herbert H. Isaacs, Estimating the Impact of a College or University on the Local Economy. Washington: American Council on Education, 1971.

represent the major constituents of spending associated with the university, along with the university's spending in support of its programs.

This study measures only the economic impact of St.

Cloud State University. No dollar value is placed on the intangibles a university brings to a community. Further, no attempt is made to value the cultural impacts or public service functions the university provides for the local area.

## LOCAL BUSINESS IMPACTS

The economic impact on St. Cloud area businesses is generated by local spending of the university, faculty and staff, students, and visitors to the university. The total amount of spending by these four groups, \$79 million, represents the direct spending injected into the area economy which is attributable to the university. This is estimated in Model B-1.1

Two indirect effects are generated from the direct university-related spending. The first indirect effect includes the local purchases by St. Cloud area businesses required in order to support the direct spending by the university. Local businesses purchase supplies worth over \$27 million in order to support university-related spending according to Model B-1.2.

The second indirect effect is the increase in business volume due to increased local income generated by university-related spending. Because of university-related spending, the payrolls and profits of St. Cloud area businesses expand. The expansion creates additional income within the St. Cloud area. The increased income generates more sales to local businesses. The increase in local business volume is approximately \$61 million according to Model B-1.3.

The direct university-related spending, combined with the two indirect effects represent the total local business volume associated with the university's presence. The

increase in total local business volume exceeds \$168.7

million as Model B-1 indicates.

### Local Spending by Faculty and Staff

The estimated amount of local spending by faculty and staff exceeds \$14 million. Model B-1.1.2 estimates local expenditures for rent, and nonhousing expenditures attributable to faculty and staff. Purchases are estimated for personnel who reside locally and for those who live outside the community. Both housing and nonhousing expenditures are estimated.

Approximately 77 percent of faculty and staff live in the immediate St. Cloud area, and, of those residing locally, 21.4 percent rent housing. The amount that the faculty and staff spent for rental housing is estimated to be \$990 thousand. This report ignores the impact on owner-occupied local housing, but the results of the survey of university personnel indicate that at least 650 homes in the St. Cloud area are owned and occupied by the faculty and staff of the university. Nonhousing expenditures by faculty and staff living in this area are approximately \$11 million. Local spending by faculty and staff not living in this area is estimated to be over \$2 million.

### Local Spending by Students

Students are responsible for almost \$46 million in direct business volume according to survey responses. Model

B-1.1.3 and Tables II through VI in Appendix A detail information about student spending.

### Local Spending by Visitors

Four general types of visitors frequent the local area because of the university: (a) personal visitors; e.g. relatives and friends of students and faculty; (b) business visitors; e.g. sales persons, publishers' representatives and persons who install or repair equipment; (c) recreational visitors; persons traveling to St. Cloud to attend athletic events, concerts, plays or art exhibits; (d) educational visitors; e.g. guest lecturers, conference attendees, seminar and workshop participants, prospective students and their parents, and prospective staff. Visitors coming to St. Cloud area because of the university spend an estimated \$10 million.

The local spending by visitors is modeled in B-1.1.4 and Table X of Appendix A. Surveys of students, faculty and staff taken in February 1987 asked respondents to estimate the number of visits they received, the average stay, and average amount spent locally. Surveys were also sent to each department within the university in order to approximate the number of visitors who come to the university to participate in various functions.

The total local business volume which is university-related, \$168.7 million, only measures the dollar impact on the local economy. Individuals in any market or economy are better-off whenever there is a wider variety of goods and

services from which to choose. The substantial increase in business volume in the St. Cloud area because of university-related spending brings a much wider variety of goods and services for all customers shopping in the St. Cloud area. This variety further strengthens St. Cloud's position as the retail and wholesale center of central Minnesota.

#### Business Property

Of the \$301 million in business real property in the St. Cloud Area, \$23 million, or 8 percent can be attributed to the needs of the university. Likewise, businesses kept \$14 million in inventory and \$3 million in other taxable assets to support university-related business. This is shown through Model B-2.

#### Bank Credit Base Expansion

Another secondary result of the economic activity of the university is the increase in the credit base of local financial institutions. The expansion in the local credit base is shown in Model B-3. From the university's bank accounts, as well as the checking and savings accounts of the faculty, staff, and students, the financial institutions in the St. Cloud Area were able to expand their credit base by over \$23 million. This includes a portion of the deposits of local business attributed to the increased local business volume accredited to the university.



Unrealized Local Business Volume

The university operates some enterprises on campus which, to some extent, compete with existing or potential local private businesses in the St. Cloud area. University operations from dormitories--both room and board, Atwood shops, and Student Activities realized receipts exceeding \$7 million in 1986.

## IMPACTS ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

This section presents the impact of the university's presence on local government revenues and expenditures. The

### **value of university-provided public services to the St.**

Cloud area is ignored. The value of the cultural events, educational programs, Learning Resource Center, athletic facilities and other campus facilities used by area residents has not been estimated.

#### Impacts on Local Governmental Revenues

The share of revenues to the St. Cloud area governments attributable to the university-related community is greater than \$10.6 million. This figure does not include the local sales taxes on motel rooms or the local tax on food and beverages paid by university-related persons. The \$10.6 million is comprised of three university-related sources: taxes from real-estate, intergovernmental transfers, and other revenues. These impacts are shown in Model G-1. Real estate taxes of over \$5 million were paid by faculty, staff, and students, and by businesses for real estate used to support university-related business. State aid to the St. Cloud area attributable to the presence of the university is \$5 million. This includes \$3 million received by local public schools.

#### Impact on Local Government Expenditures

The supply and demand for local public services is influenced by the presence of the university. Model G-2

estimates the costs attributable to the university that are incurred by area governments. The operating budgets of St. Cloud area local governments total \$17.9 million. Another \$42 million is required to operate area public schools. The

**estimated budget allocation for university-related influences is approximately \$9.7 million.**

## IMPACTS ON LOCAL EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME

Besides local businesses and governments, individuals are also affected by the presence of the university. Once the total amount of university-related business volume is estimated it is possible to approximate the amount of local income generated and number of jobs attributable to the university's presence. The procedures employed by these models consider both the direct amount of university-related spending along with the indirect effects.

Impact on Local Employment

Approximately 8,277 jobs in the St. Cloud area are attributed to the university's presence, according to Model I-1. While 1,130 of these jobs are the faculty and professional support staff positions at the university, 7,147 more jobs are allocatable to the university's presence. This assumes that \$12,500 of initial spending creates one job in the economy.

Impact on Local Income

The university helped to generate personal income of more than \$84 million in the St. Cloud area, as shown in Model I-2. This includes the personal income of university faculty and professional support staff residing locally.

THE IMPACT OF THE ATHLETICS DEPARTMENTS  
ON THE LOCAL ECONOMY

## In order to isolate the impact of the SCSU Athletics

Departments on the local economy, one must envision what it would be like if the Athletics Departments did not exist.

The local businesses would see about 64,700 fewer visitors who are drawn to this area because of the Athletics Departments. Expenditures from participants attending basketball, tennis, and volleyball camps would go elsewhere, as would expenditures from the Japanese hockey and football teams participating in activities in this area.

Without the Athletics Departments, the university would require 31 fewer faculty and staff positions, and 347 students with athletics scholarships would most probably have accepted a scholarship at another university. The university spent approximately \$179,000 for supplies, equipment, services, preventative maintenance, and repairs for the Athletic Departments in 1986.

An estimated 61,854 visitors come to St. Cloud area to watch or participate in athletic events. A conservative estimate would be that half of those who visit St. Cloud for athletic events spend \$20 on a meal and gasoline. The other half probably spend at least double that amount, possibly spending the night in the local area. On average, it is assumed each visitor coming to the area for athletic events spends \$30 for a total of \$1,855,620. It is further assumed

that the 2,000 young athletes who attend sports camps in the summer spend approximately \$30 each for the week.

Approximately 922 other visitors would not be as likely to come to this area. This includes prospective athletes and their families, guest lecturers invited to the area by the Athletics Departments, seminar attendees, business representatives, and prospective staff. Assuming these visitors have the same spending patterns as other visitors to the university from these categories, an additional \$47,776 is generated in visitor spending because of the Athletics Departments. Total spending by visitors to the area due to the Athletics Departments exceeds \$1,963,396.

Athletics students are assumed to be a representative sample of the university students. The characteristics estimated for the entire student is assumed to mirror athletics students as well. The average expenditure for students during the academic year is estimated at \$3,016, while those who attend summer school add an average of \$1,188 more to the local economy. Since 41 percent of the students enrolled in Fall quarter attended the previous summer, it is assumed 41 percent of the athletes also attended summer school. The 347 student-athletes contribute a total of \$1,215,248 to the local economy. This assumes that the athletes who are skilled enough to receive scholarships from this university would have accepted stipends elsewhere if there were no Athletics Departments on the St. Cloud State University campus.

Each of the 31 faculty and staff members live within the St. Cloud area. The total spending of these individuals for rental housing and nonhousing expenditures approximates \$430,468.

The increase in business volume due to expenditures by visitors and students totals \$3,178,644. The \$430,468 of faculty expenditures can be included if the university supported 31 positions less in the absence of the Athletics Departments.

The same logic applies to the Athletics budget. If, rather than redistributing the \$179,000 to other departments, the university's budget were to decrease by \$179,000 that amount can be included as part of the impact of the Athletics Departments on the local area. If the redistributions would not occur, the total direct impact on the economy because of the Athletics Departments is \$3,788,112. This figure includes spending by visitors, students, faculty and the university.

Using the university multiplier of 2.1177, these figures translate into an increased local business volume somewhere between \$6,731,414 and \$8,022,084. Further, between 285 and 334 local jobs are created because of St. Cloud State University's Athletics Departments.

## INTERINDUSTRY IMPACT

A second method of determining the impact of the university on the local economy is by way of an input-output study. An input-output study of the St. Cloud area economy, treating St. Cloud State University as an intermediate demand component in the industrial sector, allows an analysis far different than the retail-type spending surveys of faculty, staff, and students.<sup>2</sup> The results reported in Table I provide estimates of the university's economic impact on fifteen area industrial sectors, local government, and households. The final impact of one dollar being spend by the university or its constituents on St. Cloud area industry is shown by the sum of the interindustry multipliers. As estimated in the interindustry model the total impacts of university-related spending on St. Cloud industries, governments, and households is \$172 million. This compares quite favorable with the results of the models presented earlier and shown in Appendix A of \$168.7 million.

Both impact estimation procedures result in business volumes slightly in excess of twice the estimated direct spending of the university and its components. In general, income and spending multipliers have exhibited a range of

---

<sup>2</sup>Nolin Masih. The Interindustry Structure of St. Cloud Area Economy. St. Cloud, MN. St. Cloud State University, 1973. (Mimeographed).



2.0-2.2.<sup>3</sup> The estimates provided here both lie in that  
range.

---

<sup>3</sup>"Estimation of Differential Employment Multipliers in a Small Regional Economy." Research report to the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, 1966.

TABLE I

**ESTIMATE OF INTERINDUSTRY IMPACT OF ST. CLOUD STATE  
UNIVERSITY ON ST. CLOUD AREA ECONOMY**

<u>Industry</u>	<u>Multiplier</u>	<u>Resulting Business Volume</u>
1. Lumber Products	0.0076	\$ 605,302
2. Stone and Rock Products	0.0069	549,550
3. Metal Fabrication	0.0067	533,621
4. Tools and Machines	0.0009	71,680
5. Optics	0.0050	398,225
6. Food and Kindred Products	0.0852	6,785,751
7. Paper Products	0.0027	215,041
8. Printing and Publishing	0.0074	589,373
9. Rubber and Plastics	0.0036	286,722
10. Miscellaneous Manufacturers	0.0013	103,538
11. Contract Construction	0.1821	14,503,347
12. Wholesale and Retail	0.5698	45,381,699
13. General Services	0.1290	10,274,200
14. Medical and Health	0.0497	3,958,355
15. Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate	0.1634	13,013,987
16. Transportation, Communication, and Utilities	<u>0.1211</u>	<u>9,645,004</u>
Private Industry Multiplier	1.3424	\$106,915,395
17. Local Government	0.0414	3,297,301
18. Households	<u>0.7753</u>	<u>61,748,738</u>
	2.1591	\$171,961,434

## SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

A variety of estimated economic impacts have been detailed in Appendix A. This section puts these estimates into perspective by comparing the major components of the previous analysis to St. Cloud area economy measures.

Relative Size of Major Impacts on Local Business

The estimated number of jobs in the St. Cloud area economy attributable to the university's presence is estimated to be 8,255. The number of jobs available in the St. Cloud MSA (an area consisting of the whole of Benton, Stearns, and Sherburne counties) is 65,485 in 1986. The university, through its local spending accounts for greater than twelve percent of St. Cloud area jobs.<sup>4</sup>

Total St. Cloud area personal income is estimated to be \$584,648,239. Model I-2 provides an estimate of \$84,448,049 in local income due to local university-related spending.<sup>5</sup> Thus, the university related spending in the St. Cloud area generates approximately 14 percent of all local personal income.

University-related spending accounts for \$168.7 million of the local business volume as estimated in Model B-1. The St. Cloud area is estimated to have a total business volume

---

<sup>4</sup>Minnesota Jobs Service, Labor Market Information Center, St. Cloud. Data are not available for the St. Cloud area smaller than the MSA.

<sup>5</sup>Income measure generated from statistics in St. Cloud Community Profile, Minnesota Department of Economic Development, St. Paul MN. 1986. This figure is for the area defined in this study rather than for the entire MSA.

of \$2,198 million.<sup>6</sup> Approximately 7.6 percent of St. Cloud area business volume is attributable to the university's presence.

This report provides ample evidence of the degree to which local business volume is stimulated, local business opportunities increased, local business properties enhanced, and the local credit base expanded due to university-related local spending. Furthermore, a far greater variety of services and goods are offered by St. Cloud area business due to the increased spending. This results in a substantial increase in the attractiveness of St. Cloud to potential shoppers, employers, and citizens.

#### Relative size of Major Impacts on Local Government

The university's impact on local governments is estimated by the revenues and costs of local governments which are allocatable to the university. The real estate taxes collected by all local governments which are university-related are estimated to be \$5 million. Total real estate taxes collected by all local governments are \$31 million. Thus, 16 percent of local real-estate tax collections are university-related.

It is estimated that local public services costs for municipal government and public schools, attributable to the university's presence are \$9.7 million. This is out of total budgets of \$60 million. Thus it would appear that

---

<sup>6</sup>Total business volume is the sum of wholesale, retail, and service industry sales. Source: Minnesota Department of Revenue, Sales Tax Division.

approximately 16 percent of local public service costs are related to the university.

Any community is influenced by the institutions which exist within its boundaries. This report estimates the strong and dynamic nature of the economic role of St. Cloud State University in St. Cloud area communities. The tremendous variety of educational programs, cultural activities, and athletic events available to citizens of the St. Cloud area no doubt carry impacts as large as any documented here.

## APPENDIX A

MODEL B-1            TOTAL UNIVERSITY-RELATED LOCAL BUSINESS  
VOLUME

$$TBV_{UR} = (E_L)_{UR} + (LP_L)_{UR} + (BV_L)_{UR}$$

$(E_L)_{UR}$  = expenditures locally which are  
directly university-related  
(Model B-1.1) . . . . . \$79,644,961

$(LP_L)_{UR}$  = local purchases by local con-  
cerns in support of the  
university-related business,  
(Model B-1.2) . . . . . \$27,270,435

$(BV_L)_{UR}$  = business volume locally  
attributable to income spent  
as a result of university-  
related spending, (Model B-  
1.3) . . . . . \$61,748,738

$$TBV_{UR} = \$168,664,134$$

MODEL B-1.1            EXPENDITURES LOCALLY WHICH ARE DIRECTLY  
UNIVERSITY RELATED

$$(E_L)_{UR} = (E_L)_U + (E_L)_{FS} + (E_L)_S + (E_L)_V$$

$(E_L)_U$  = expenditures locally by the  
university, (Model B-1.1.1) . . . . . \$9,172,893

$(E_L)_{FS}$  = expenditures locally by the  
faculty and professional  
support staff, (Model B-1.1.2) . . . . . \$14,173,393

$(E_L)_S$  = expenditures locally by  
students, (Model B-1.1.3) . . . . . \$45,987,908

$(E_L)_V$  = expenditures locally by  
visitors to the university,  
(Model B-1.1.4) . . . . . \$10,310,767

$$(E_L)_{UR} = \$79,644,961$$

MODEL B-1.1.1 EXPENDITURES LOCALLY BY THE UNIVERSITY

$$(E_L)_U$$

$(E_L)_U$  = expenditures locally by the university for (1) utilities; (2) supplies, equipment, and services; (3) preventative maintenance, repairs, and betterments; (4) new construction; (5) equipment associated with new construction; (6) spending locally by ARA Services Inc. (Reported in Table VIII) . . . = \$9,172,893

MODEL B-1.1.2 EXPENDITURES LOCALLY BY FACULTY AND PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT STAFF

$$(E_L)_{FS} = (E_H)_{FS} + (E_{NH})_{FS} + (E_L)_{NFS}$$

$(E_H)_{FS}$  = expenditures for local rental housing by faculty and professional support staff (Model B-1.1.2.1) . . . . . \$990,477

$(E_{NH})_{FS}$  = local nonhousing expenditures by local faculty and professional support staff, (Model B-1.1.2.2) . . . . . \$11,128,110

$(E_L)_{NFS}$  = expenditures locally by nonlocal faculty and professional support staff, (Model B-1.1.2.3) . . . . . \$2,054,806

$$(E_L)_{FS} = \$14,173,393$$

MODEL B-1.1.2.1      EXPENDITURES FOR LOCAL RENTAL HOUSING BY  
 FACULTY AND PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT STAFF

$$(E_H)_{FS} = (f_L) (f_H) (DI)_{FS} (e_H)$$

$(f_L)$	=	proportion of the faculty and professional support staff residing locally (SCSU Personnel Office) . . . . .	0.7723
$(f_H)$	=	proportion of local faculty and professional support staff renting housing (from personnel survey) . . . . .	0.2144
$(DI)_{FS}$	=	total disposable income of faculty and professional support staff (SCSU Business Office) . . . . .	\$23,513,465
$(e_H)$	=	average proportion of renter's total expenditures spent for rental housing (from survey) .	0.2544
		$(E_H)_{FS}$	= \$990,477



**MODEL B-1.1.2.2 LOCAL NON-HOUSING EXPENDITURES BY LOCAL FACULTY AND PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT STAFF**

$$(E_{NH})_{FS} = (f_L) (e_L) (DI)_{FS} (e_{NH})_{FS}$$

$(f_L)$  = proportion of the faculty and professional support staff residing locally (from survey) 0.7723

$(e_L)$  = proportion of total nonhousing expenditures likely to be spent locally (from survey) . 0.80

$(DI)_{FS}$  = total disposable income of faculty and professional support staff (SCSU Business Office) . . . . . \$23,513,465

$(e_{NH})_{FS}$  = proportion of total expenditures spent on nonhousing items (from survey) 0.766

$$(E_{NH})_{FS} = \$11,128,110$$

**MODEL B-1.1.2.3 EXPENDITURES LOCALLY BY NON-LOCAL FACULTY AND PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT STAFF**

$$(E_L)_{NFS} = (1-f_L)(FS) (E_I)_{FS}$$

$(f_L)$  = proportion of faculty and professional support staff residing locally (from survey) 0.7723

$FS$  = total number of faculty and professional support staff (from SCSU Personnel Office) . 1130

$(E_I)_{FS}$  = estimated annual average expenditure locally by each nonlocal faculty and professional staff individual (from survey) . . . . . \$7986

$$(E_L)_{NFS} = \$2,054,806$$

MODEL B-1.1.3 EXPENDITURES LOCALLY BY STUDENTS

$$(E_L)_S = (E_H)_S + (E_{NH})_S + (E_L)_{NLS}$$

$(E_H)_S$  = expenditures locally by students for rental housing (from student survey) . . . . \$12,820,414

$(E_{NH})_S$  = local nonhousing expenditures by students residing locally (from student survey) . . . . \$29,223,498

$(E_L)_{NLS}$  = local expenditures by nonlocal students (from student survey) \$3,943,996

$(E_L)_S =$  = \$45,987,908

MODEL B-1.1.4 LOCAL EXPENDITURES BY VISITORS TO THE UNIVERSITY

$$(E_L)_V = (V_1)(E_1)_V + (V_2)(E_2)_V + \dots + (V_{n1})(E_n)_V$$

$(V_i)$  = estimated number of visitors to university of  $i^{\text{th}}$  category

$(E_1)_V$  = estimated local expenditures by each visitor in  $i^{\text{th}}$  category

$(E_L)_V$  = see assumptions and computations in Table X . . . = \$10,310,767

MODEL B-1.2 LOCAL PURCHASES BY LOCAL CONCERNS IN SUPPORT  
OF UNIVERSITY-RELATED BUSINESS

$$(LP_L)_{UR} = (l_p) (E_L)_{UR}$$

$(l_p)$  = coefficient of degree to which  
local concerns purchase goods  
and services from local  
businesses . . . . . 0.3424

$(E_L)_{UR}$  = expenditures locally which are  
directly university-related,  
(Model B-1.1) . . . . . \$79,644,961

$$(LP_L)_{UR} = \$27,270,435$$

MODEL B-1.3 BUSINESS VOLUME LOCALLY ATTRIBUTABLE TO  
INCOME SPENT AS A RESULT OF UNIVERSITY-  
RELATED SPENDING

$$(BV_L)_{UR} = m_i (E_L)_{UR}$$

$m_i$  = coefficient representing  
degree to which individual  
income received from local  
sources is spent and respent  
locally . . . . . 0.7753

$(E_L)_{UR}$  = expenditures locally which are  
directly university related,  
(Model B-1.1) . . . . . \$79,644,961

$$(BV_L)_{UR} = \$61,748,738$$

**MODEL B-2                    VALUE OF LOCAL BUSINESS PROPERTY COMMITTED TO  
UNIVERSITY-RELATED BUSINESS**

$$(VBP)_{UR} = (VRP)_{UR} + (VI)_{UR} + (VOP)_{UR}$$

(VRP)<sub>UR</sub> = value of local business real  
property committed to  
university-related business  
(Model B-2.1) . . . . . \$23,117,034

(VI)<sub>UR</sub> = value of local business  
inventory committed to  
university-related business  
(Model B-2.2) . . . . . \$14,167,787

(VOP)<sub>UR</sub> = value of local business  
property other than real or  
inventory committed to  
university-related business  
(Model B-2.3) . . . . . \$3,373,283

$$(VBP)_{UR} = \$40,658,104$$

MODEL B-2.1 VALUE OF LOCAL BUSINESS REAL PROPERTY  
COMMITTED TO UNIVERSITY-RELATED BUSINESS

$$(VRP)_{UR} = \frac{TBV_{UR}}{(BV_L)} \times \frac{(V_B)}{(amv)}$$

$TBV_{UR}$	=	total university-related local business volume (Model B-1)	. \$168,664,134
$(BV_L)$	=	local business volume (Minnesota Department of Economic Development)	. . . . \$2,198,364,852
$(V_B)$	=	assessed valuation of local business real property (City Clerks' Reports)	. . . . . \$120,522,780
$(amv)$	=	local ratio of assessed value to market value of taxable real property (City Clerks' report)	. . . . . 40.0%

$$(VRP)_{UR} = \$23,117,034$$

MODEL B-2.2 VALUE OF LOCAL BUSINESS INVENTORY COMMITTED  
TO UNIVERSITY-RELATED BUSINESS

$$(VI)_{UR} = (ibv)TBV_{UR}$$

$(ibv)$	=	inventory-to-business-volume ratio <sup>1</sup>	. . . . . 0.084
$TBV_{UR}$	=	total university-related local business volume (Model B-1)	. \$168,664,134
		$(VI)_{UR}$	= \$14,167,787

<sup>1</sup>SOI Bulletin. Winter 1986-1987 Vol.6, Number 3.  
Internal Revenue Service, Washington, D.C.



## MODEL B-3

EXPANSION OF THE CREDIT BASE OF LOCAL BANKS  
RESULTING FROM UNIVERSITY-RELATED DEPOSITS

$$(CB_L)_{UR} = (1-t) [TD_U] + [(TD_{FS})(FS_L) + (TD_S)(S_L)] \\ + (1-d) [DD_U + (DD_{FS})(FS_L) + (DD_S)(S_L) + (cbv) TBV_{UR}]$$

t =	local time deposit reserve requirement for commercial accounts (Minneapolis Federal Reserve Bank) . . . . .	0.03
TD <sub>U</sub> =	average time deposit of the university in local banks (SCSU Business Office) . . . . .	\$2,351,036
(TD <sub>FS</sub> ) =	average time deposit of each faculty and professional support staff member in local banks (from survey) . . . . .	\$4,726
(FS <sub>L</sub> ) =	number of faculty and profes- sional from support staff residing locally (SCSU Personnel Office) . . . . .	870
(TD <sub>S</sub> ) =	average time deposit of each student in local banks <sup>3</sup> . . . . .	\$75
(S <sub>L</sub> ) =	number of students residing locally (SCSU Admissions Office) . . . . .	10,247
d =	local demand deposit reserve requirement (survey of local banks) . . . . .	0.05
DD <sub>U</sub> =	average demand deposit of the university in local banks (SCSU Business Office) . . . . .	\$310,624

<sup>3</sup>"Survey of Financial Characteristics of Consumers"  
Federal Reserve Technical Papers, Washington, D.C.

(DD<sub>FS</sub>) = average demand deposit of each  
faculty and professional  
support person in local banks  
(from survey) . . . . . \$1,441

(DD<sub>S</sub>) = average demand deposit of each  
student in local banks<sup>4</sup> . . . \$100

(cbv) = cash-to-business-volume ratio<sup>5</sup> 0.083

TBV<sub>UR</sub> = total university-related local  
business volume (Model B-1) . \$168,664,134

(CB<sub>L</sub>)<sub>UR</sub> = \$23,251,123

**MODEL G-1 UNIVERSITY-RELATED REVENUES RECEIVED BY LOCAL  
GOVERNMENTS**

$$(LGR)_{UR} = (T_{RE})_{UR} + (SA)_{UR} + (OR)_{UR}$$

(T<sub>RE</sub>)<sub>UR</sub> = university-related real-estate  
taxes paid to local  
governments (Model G-1.1) . . \$5,283,686

(SA)<sub>UR</sub> = state aid to local governments  
attributable to university's  
presence (Model G-1.2) . . . \$5,195,274

(OR)<sub>UR</sub> = other university-related  
revenues collected by local  
governments (Model G-1.3) . . \$130,842

(LGR)<sub>UR</sub> = \$10,609,802

<sup>4</sup>Ibid.

<sup>5</sup>Statistics of Income, Bulletin, Winter 1986-1987 Vol.  
6, Number 3. Internal Revenue Service, Washington, D.C.



**MODEL G-1.1 UNIVERSITY-RELATED REAL ESTATE TAXES PAID TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS**

$$(T_{RE})_{UR} = (T_R)_U + (T_R)_{FS} + (T_R)_S + (T_{R.B})_{UR}$$

$(T_R)_U$  = real-estate taxes paid to local governments by the university . . . . . 0

$(T_R)_{FS}$  = real-estate taxes paid to local governments by local faculty and professional support staff (Model G-1.1.1) \$2,021,268

$(T_R)_S$  = real-estate taxes paid to local governments by students residing locally (Model G-1.1.2) . . . . . \$2,152,800

$(T_{R.B})_{UR}$  = real-estate taxes paid to local governments by local businesses for real property allocatable to university-related business (Model G-1.1.3) . . . . . \$1,109,618

$(T_{RE})_{UR} = = \$5,283,686$

**MODEL G-1.1.1 REAL ESTATE TAXES PAID TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS  
BY LOCAL FACULTY AND PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT  
STAFF**

$$(TR)_{FS} = (FS_L)(1-f_H)(pt)(V_{PR} - N_{PR}) + (FS_L)(f_H)(AAR)(rt)$$

$(FS_L)$	=	number of faculty and professional support staff residing locally (SCSU Personnel Office) . . . . .	870
$(f_H)$	=	proportion of local faculty and professional support staff renting housing (from survey)	0.2144
$(pt)$	=	local property tax rate (City Clerks' reports) . . . . .	0.118
$V_{PR}$	=	Total assessed valuation of all local private residences (auditors' reports) . . . . .	\$415,901,400
$N_{PR}$	=	total number of local private residences (City Planner and Area Planning Office) . . . . .	18,465
$(AAR)$	=	average annual rent expenditure (from survey) . . . . .	\$5,488
$(rt)$	=	proportion of rental expen- diture attributable to taxes . . . . .	0.20

$$(TR)_{FS} = = \$2,021,268$$

**MODEL G-1.1.2 REAL-ESTATE TAXES PAID TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS  
BY STUDENTS RESIDING LOCALLY**

$$(T_R)_S = (S_L) (AR)_S (rt)$$

$(S_L)$  = number of students renting  
housing locally (from SCSU  
Admissions Office) . . . . . 7,200

$(AR)_S$  = Average annual rental expendi-  
ture per student (from survey) \$1,495

$(rt)$  = proportion of rental  
expenditure attributable to  
property taxes . . . . . 0.20

$$(T_R)_S = \$2,152,800$$

**MODEL G-1.1.3 REAL-ESTATE TAXES PAID TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS  
BY LOCAL BUSINESSES FOR REAL PROPERTY  
ALLOCATABLE TO UNIVERSITY-RELATED BUSINESS**

$$(T_{R.B})_{UR} = (pt) [TBV_{UR} - (BV_L)] (V_B)$$

$(pt)$  = local property tax rate, (City  
Clerks' reports) . . . . . 0.12

$TBV_{UR}$  = total university-related local  
business volume (Model B-1) . \$168,664,134

$(BV_L)$  = local business volume  
(Minnesota Department of  
Revenue) . . . . . \$2,198,364,852

$(V_B)$  = assessed valuation of local  
business real property (City  
Clerks' reports) . . . . . \$120,522,780

$$(T_{R.B})_{UR} = \$1,109,618$$

**MODEL G-1.2 INTERGOVERNMENTAL AID TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS  
ALLOCATABLE TO THE UNIVERSITY'S PRESENCE**

$$(SA)_{UR} = (SA)_{CH} + (SA)_{PC}$$

$(SA)_{CH}$	= state aid to local public schools allocatable to children of university-related families (Model G-1.2.1) . . .	\$3,164,434
$(SA)_{PC}$	= other intergovernmental aid received by local governments on a per capita basis (Model G-1.2.2) . . . . .	\$2,030,840
	$(SA)_{UR}$	= \$5,195,274

**MODEL G-1.2.1 STATE AID TO LOCAL PUBLIC SCHOOLS ALLOCATABLE TO CHILDREN OF UNIVERSITY-RELATED FAMILIES**

	$(SA)_{CH} = (A_{PS}) [CHP_{FS} + CHP_S] - CH_{PS}$	
$(A_{PS})$	= total state aid to local public schools (Public School's Annual reports) . . .	\$22,964,049
$CHP_{FS}$	= number of children of faculty and professional support staff attending public schools (from survey) . . . . .	1,132
$CHP_S$	= number of students' children attending local public schools (from survey) . . . . .	674
$CH_{PS}$	= total enrollment of local public schools (Public schools' annual reports) . . .	13,106
	$(SA)_{CH}$	= \$3,164,434

**MODEL G-1.2.2 OTHER INTERGOVERNMENTAL AID RECEIVED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS ON A PER CAPITA BASIS**

$$(SA)_{PC} = [(FSH_L + SH_L) - POP_{LR}] (IG)_R$$

$FSH_L$  = number of persons in households of faculty and professional support staff residing locally (from survey) 2,584

$SH_L$  = number of persons in households of students residing locally (from survey) 14,259

$(IG)_R$  = intergovernmental aid received by local governments (City Clerks' reports) . . . . . \$7,723,656

$POP_{LR}$  = local resident population (Area Planning Office) . . . . . 64,057

$$(SA)_{PC} = \$2,030,840$$

**MODEL G-1.3 OTHER REVENUES COLLECTED BY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS FROM UNIVERSITY-RELATED ACTIVITIES**

$$(OR)_{UR} = (LF_R) (TBV_{UR} - BV_L)$$

$(LF_R)$  = licenses and fees collected by local governments . . . . . \$1,705,391

$TBV_{UR}$  = total university-related local business volume (Model B-1) . \$168,664,134

$(BV_L)$  = local business volume (Minnesota Department of Revenue) . . . . . \$2,198,364,852

$$(OR)_{UR} = \$130,842$$

**MODEL G-2                    LOCAL GOVERNMENT OPERATING COST ALLOCATABLE  
TO UNIVERSITY-RELATED INFLUENCES**

$$(LGC)_{UR} = (MC)_{UR} + (PS)_{UR}$$

$(MC)_{UR}$	= municipal service costs allocatable to university- related influences (Model G- 2.1) . . . . .	\$3,898,834
$(PS)_{UR}$	= local public school cost allocatable to university- related persons (Model G-2.2)	\$5,790,108
	$(LGC)_{UR}$	= \$9,688,942

MODEL G-2.1 MUNICIPAL SERVICE COSTS ALLOCATABLE TO UNIVERSITY-RELATED INFLUENCES

$$(MC)_{UR} = \frac{(FSL) + (SL)}{POP_{LD}} + \frac{FSH_L + SH_L}{POP_{LR}} (B_M)$$

(FS <sub>L</sub> ) =	number of faculty and professional support staff residing locally (SCSU Personnel Office) . . . . .	870
(S <sub>L</sub> ) =	number of students renting housing locally (from SCSU Admissions Office) . . . . .	9,988
POP <sub>LD</sub> =	local daytime population (City Planners' Office) . . . . .	63,242
FSH <sub>L</sub> =	number of persons in households of faculty and professional support staff residing locally (from survey)	2,584
SH <sub>L</sub> =	number of persons in households of students residing locally (from survey)	14,259
POP <sub>LR</sub> =	local resident population (Area Planning Office) . . . . .	64,057
(B <sub>M</sub> ) =	operating budget for municipal services of all local governments (excludes public schools) (City Clerks' reports) . . . . .	\$17,941,041

(MC)<sub>UR</sub> = \$3,898,834

MODEL G-2.2 LOCAL PUBLIC SCHOOL COSTS ALLOCATABLE TO UNIVERSITY-RELATED PERSONS

$$(PS)_{UR} = \frac{(CH_{FS} + CH_{PS})}{CH_{PS}} B_{PS}$$

CHP <sub>FS</sub> =	number of children of faculty and professional support staff attending public schools (from survey) . . . . .	1,132
CH <sub>PS</sub> =	number of students' children attending public school (from survey) . . . . .	674
CH <sub>PS</sub> =	total enrollment of local public schools (public schools' annual reports) . . .	13,106
B <sub>PS</sub> =	operating budget of local public schools (Public schools' annual reports) . . .	\$42,018,360
	(PS) <sub>UR</sub>	= \$5,790,108



MODEL G-3

REAL-ESTATE TAXES FOREGONE DUE TO  
UNIVERSITY'S TAX EXEMPT STATUS

$$(FR_{RE})_{UR} = [(TT_{RE} - (T_R)_U) (A_U - A_L)] - (T_R)_U$$

$TT_{RE}$	=	total real-estate taxes collected from local governments (City Clerks' reports) . . . . .	\$31,231,258
$(T_R)_U$	=	real-estate taxes paid to local governments by the university . . . . .	0
$A_U$	=	acres of the university . . .	937.3
$A_L$	=	acres of St. Cloud area, less $A_U$ . . . . .	61,669.3
		$(FR_{RE})_{UR}$	= \$474,678

**MODEL I-1          NUMBER OF LOCAL JOBS ATTRIBUTABLE TO THE  
UNIVERSITY'S PRESENCE**

$$J_L = FS + (j)[(E_L)_{UR} + (LGC)_{UR}]$$

FS =          total number of faculty and  
              professional support staff  
              (SCSU Personnel Office) . . .          1,130

j =          full-time jobs per dollar of  
              direct expenditures in the  
              local environment<sup>6</sup> . . . . .          0.00008

(LGC)<sub>UR</sub> = local government operating  
              cost allocatable to  
              university-related influences  
              (Model G-2) . . . . .          \$9,688,942

(E<sub>L</sub>)<sub>UR</sub> = expenditures locally which are  
              directly university-related  
              (Model B-1.1) . . . . .          \$79,644,9617

$$J_L = \quad = 8,277$$

<sup>6</sup>"Estimation of Differential Employment Multipliers in a Small Regional Economy" Research Report to the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, 1966.

## MODEL I-2

PERSONAL INCOME OF LOCAL INDIVIDUALS  
ATTRIBUTABLE TO UNIVERSITY'S PRESENCE

$$PI_{UR} = (f_L) (W_{FS}) + (P) (E_L)_{UR}$$

(f<sub>L</sub>) = proportion of faculty and  
professional support staff  
residing locally (from survey) 0.7723

(W<sub>FS</sub>) = gross compensation to faculty  
and professional support staff  
(SCSU Business Office) . . . . \$29,391,831

P = Payrolls and profits per  
dollar of local direct  
expenditures . . . . . 0.7753

(E<sub>L</sub>)<sub>UR</sub> = expenditures locally which are  
directly university-related  
(Model B-1.1) . . . . . \$79,644,961

$$PI_{UR} = \$84,448,049$$

TABLE II  
 AVERAGE AND TOTAL EXPENDITURES BY  
 STUDENT CLASSIFICATION IN 1986

<u>Classification</u>	<u>Number of Students</u>	<u>Average Expenditure</u>	<u>Total Expenditure</u>
1. Commuting from outside St. Cloud Area	2,871	1,246	3,577,266
2. Married and residing in St. Cloud area	790	7,840	6,193,600
3. Living on-campus	3,047	1,448	4,412,056
4. Living off- campus in the St. Cloud Area	<u>6,410</u>	3,960	<u>25,383,600</u>
	13,118		39,566,522

TABLE III

AVERAGE AND TOTAL EXPENDITURES BY STUDENT CLASSIFICATION  
5,407 SUMMER SCHOOL STUDENTS, 1986

<u>Classification</u>	<u>Number of Students</u>	<u>Average Expenditure</u>	<u>Total Expenditure</u>
1. Commuting from outside St. Cloud Area	1,183	310	366,730
2. Married and residing in St. Cloud area	632	2,613	1,651,416
3. Living on-campus	356	370	131,720
4. Living off- campus in the St. Cloud Area	<u>3,236</u>	1,320	<u>4,271,520</u>
	5,407		6,421,386

TABLE IV  
 AVERAGE AND TOTAL EXPENDITURES BY CATEGORIES FOR STUDENTS  
 COMMUTING FROM OUTSIDE THE ST. CLOUD AREA, 2871 STUDENTS

<u>Category</u>	<u>Average Annual Expenditure</u>	<u>Total Annual Expenditure</u>
1. Recreation	\$106	\$ 304,326
2. Clothing, Laundry and Grooming	185	531,135
3. Medical and Health	51	146,421
4. Food	325	933,075
5. Charitable Contributions	108	310,068
6. Auto Expenses	289	829,719
7. Books	135	387,585
8. Transportation	<u>47</u>	<u>134,937</u>
	\$1,246	\$3,577,266

TABLE V

AVERAGE AND TOTAL EXPENDITURES BY CATEGORIES FOR MARRIED  
STUDENTS RESIDING IN ST. CLOUD AREA, 790 STUDENTS

<u>Category</u>	<u>Average Annual Expenditure</u>	<u>Total Annual Expenditure</u>
1. Recreation	\$ 365	\$ 288,350
2. Clothing, Laundry and Grooming	652	515,080
3. Medical and Health	468	369,720
4. Food	1,350	1,066,500
5. Rent	2,305	1,820,950
6. Charitable Contributions	266	210,140
7. Auto Expenses	1,225	967,750
8. Books	408	322,320
9. Transportation	<u>801</u>	<u>632,790</u>
	\$ 7,840	\$ 6,193,600

TABLE VI

AVERAGE AND TOTAL EXPENDITURES BY CATEGORIES FOR STUDENTS  
LIVING ON CAMPUS, 3047 STUDENTS

<u>Category</u>	<u>Average Annual Expenditure</u>	<u>Total Annual Expenditure</u>
1. Recreation	\$ 321	\$ 978,087
2.. Clothing, Laundry and Grooming	233	709,951
3. Medical and Health	120	365,640
4. Food	176	536,272
5. Charitable Contributions	23	70,081
6. Auto Expenses	207	630,729
7. Books	223	679,481
8. Transportation	<u>145</u>	<u>441,815</u>
	1,448	\$4,412,056



TABLE VII

AVERAGE AND TOTAL EXPENDITURES BY CATEGORIES FOR SINGLE STUDENTS LIVING OFF CAMPUS, BUT IN ST. CLOUD AREA, 6410

<u>Category</u>	<u>Average Annual Expenditure</u>	<u>Total Annual Expenditure</u>
1. Recreation	419	\$2,685,790
2. Clothing, Laundry and Grooming	300	1,923,000
3. Medical and Health	133	852,530
4. Food	600	3,846,000
5. Rent	1,404	8,999,640
6. Charitable Contributions	46	294,860
7. Auto Expenses	458	2,935,780
8. Books	290	1,858,900
9. Transportation	<u>310</u>	<u>1,987,100</u>
	\$3,960	\$25,383,600

TABLE VIII

**ST. CLOUD STATE UNIVERSITY SPENDING IN THE  
LOCAL AREA, 1986**

1.	Utilities . . . . .	\$1,706,351
2.	Purchases of supplies, equipment, and services . . . . .	\$5,528,482
3.	Preventive maintenance, repairs and betterment . . . . .	\$444,210
4.	ARA Services, Inc., spending for food, labor, and services locally .	<u>\$1,493,850</u>
	Total	\$9,172,893

TABLE IX  
INCOME TO ST. CLOUD STATE UNIVERSITY, 1986<sup>7</sup>

1.	Dormitory . . . . .	\$4,829,206
2.	Atwood Center . . . . .	\$1,397,819
3.	University Bookstore Commissions . . . . .	\$ 181,220
4.	Student Activities . . . . .	<u>\$ 878,104</u>
	Total	7,286,349

---

<sup>7</sup>This does not include all receipts of the university. These figures represent revenues from university operations that could be considered to compete with existing or potential local private businesses.

## TABLE X

### LOCAL SPENDING BY VISITORS TO ST. CLOUD STATE UNIVERSITY, 1986

#### A. Spending by Visitors to Faculty and Staff

The average number of visits, days per visit, and dollars spent per day in the St. Cloud Area, according to the survey, are estimated as:

Visits x (Days/Visit) x (\$/Day) x Employees of SCSU			
Faculty Residing Locally:		=	
	30.14 x 3.36 x \$19.70 x 870		\$1,735,673
Faculty Residing out of the St. Cloud Area		=	
	23.69 x 2.99 x \$14.36 x 260		264,462

#### B. Spending by Visitors to Students

The student survey indicates the average number of visits, days per visit, and dollars spent per day in the St. Cloud Area, by student classification:

Visits x (Days/Visit) x (\$/Day) x Number of Students			
Commuting Students		=	
	2.28 x 3.46 x \$13.46 x 2,871		\$ 304,852
Married Students residing in St. Cloud Area		=	
	6.55 x 3.88 x \$14.29 x 790		285,901
On-Campus Students		=	
	5.66 x 2.71 x \$22.05 + 3,047		1,030,545
Off-Campus Students (local)		=	
	7.27 x 2.48 x \$17.56 x 6,410		2,029,405

C. Spending by Visitors to the University

Departmental survey results estimate the number of visitors coming to the area because of the university, and the average days per visit. Visitors attending athletic events spend \$30 per day on average (see page 12). Other visitors are assumed to spend about \$40 per day.

Visits x (Days/Visit) x (\$/Day)

Visitors coming to watch or participate in athletic events		
61,854 x 1 x \$30	= \$	1,855,620
Business Visitors (Publishers reps, sales persons and repair persons)		
3,787 x 1.06 x \$40	=	160,569
Guest Lecturers		
803 x 1.11 x \$40	=	35,653
Conference Attendees		
14,335 x 2.21 x \$40	=	1,267,214
Seminar Attendees		
12,614 x 1.31 x \$40	=	660,974
Prospective Students		
14,250 x 1.14 x \$40	=	649,800
Prospective Staff		
593 x 1.27 x \$40	=	<u>30,099</u>
TOTAL VISITOR SPENDING	= \$	10,310,767

**APPENDIX B**

## STUDENT EXPENDITURES IN THE ST. CLOUD AREA

(In this study, the St. Cloud Area consists of the cities of St. Cloud, Waite Park, Sauk Rapids, and Sartell, and the townships of St. Cloud, Le Sauk, and Haven.)

PART I: Please check the one category that pertains to you.

- 1. Commuting from outside the St. Cloud Area.
- 2. Living on-campus, or in a fraternity or sorority.
- 3. Living off-campus in the St. Cloud Area.

PART II: Are you married or single? \_\_\_\_\_

How many persons in your household (at SCSU)? \_\_\_\_\_

How many children under 18 attend public school? \_\_\_\_\_

PART III: Please complete the following by estimating your expenditures for a typical month. Include only money you spend in the St. Cloud Area. Please make estimates in even dollar amounts.

- 1. Recreation and entertainment.
- 2. Clothing, grooming needs, laundry and dry cleaning.
- 3. Food (off-campus).
- 4. Automobile Expenses. (Automobile purchases, gasoline, oil, servicing, repairs, insurance, and fines for traffic violations.)
- 5. Transportation (other than Automobile) and utilities (telephone, electricity, water, etc.)
- 6. Rent (off-campus, i.e., amounts paid for board in campus dormitories or to fraternity or sorority houses should not be included.)
- 7. Medical and health. (Doctor, dental, and hospitalization; drugs and medicines; premiums for health insurance policies.)
- 8. Books, stationery, and educational supplies.
- 9. Contributions to church and other organizations.

PART IV: How many non-local people (parents, relatives, friends, etc.) visited you last year? Count each visit separately for those who visited more than once. If this is your first year here, how many visitors do you anticipate? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_ Please estimate your visitors' average length of stay (days).

\_\_\_\_\_ Please estimate the average daily expenditures in the St. Cloud area by each visitor (\$ per day).

PART V: What is your average monthly balance in checkable accounts (including NOW Accounts and Share Draft Accounts) held in St. Cloud Area financial institutions? \_\_\_\_\_

What is your average monthly balance in savings accounts held in St. Cloud Area financial institutions? \_\_\_\_\_

FACULTY AND PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT PERSONNEL QUESTIONNAIRE

I. How many persons are in your household? \_\_\_\_\_

A. How many are 18 or under? \_\_\_\_\_

B. How many children in your household attend public schools? \_\_\_\_\_

II. Do you live in the St. Cloud area (within corporate limits of St. Cloud, Waite Park, Sauk Rapids, Sartell, or in the townships of St. Cloud, Le Sauk, or Haven)? \_\_\_\_\_

III. In what type of housing do you reside? (Check one.)

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Rent  
\_\_\_\_\_ 2. Own  
\_\_\_\_\_ 3. Other

IV. Please estimate your average monthly expenditures in the St. Cloud Area for:

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. Housing (rent or mortgage, insurance, and taxes.)  
\_\_\_\_\_ 2. Utilities.  
\_\_\_\_\_ 3. Food.  
\_\_\_\_\_ 4. All other (clothing, transportation, entertainment, health care, etc.)

V. What is your average monthly checking account balance in all St. Cloud financial institutions (sum of local checking, NOW, and Share Draft Accounts)? \_\_\_\_\_

What is your average monthly savings account balance in all St. Cloud financial institutions? \_\_\_\_\_

VI. How many non-local people (parents, relatives, friends, etc.) visited you last year? Please count each visit separately for those who visited more than once. If this is your first year here, how many visitors do you anticipate?  
\_\_\_\_\_

Please estimate your visitors' average length of stay (in days). \_\_\_\_\_

Please estimate the average daily expenditures in the St. Cloud Area by each visitor (\$ per day). \_\_\_\_\_



**SCSU VISITOR SURVEY**

Please ESTIMATE the number of visitors your department receives from outside the St. Cloud Area during a typical year, including the summer session. (In this study, the St. Cloud Area consists of the cities of St. Cloud, Waite Park, Sauk Rapids, and Sartell, and the townships of St. Cloud, Le Sauk, and Haven.) If a business representative calls more than once, please include each visit in the total. This data will be used in the St. Cloud State University Impact Study. Please return this form to me through campus mail.

Sincerely,

Mary E. Edwards  
Economics Dept.

<u>Visitors from Outside the St. Cloud Area</u>	<u>Estimated Number of Visits in a Year</u>	<u>Length of Stay</u>
<u>Business Visitors:</u>		
Salesmen, not including Publishers' Reps		
Others(            )		
<u>Educational Visitors:</u>		
<u>Guest Lecturers</u>		
<u>Conference attendees</u>		
<u>Seminar/workshop participants not current students</u>		
<u>Prospective students</u>		
<u>Prospective staff</u>		
<u>Others</u>		

\_\_\_\_\_  
Your Department