

MISLEADING TOTALLING OF ONE TIME SPENDING FROM ONE YEAR AND ANNUAL SPENDING FROM ANOTHER		DIRECT	INDIRECT +INDUCED	TOTAL	NOTE: DUE TO THEIR ARITHMATIC ERROR, THEIR TOTAL IS LOWER BY \$97,000 from \$6.6 million claimed
		\$5,025,000	\$1,674,000	\$6,699,000	
NOTE: ALL numbers in blue were taken directly from the Fox Hill Economic Study					
TOTAL DIRECT SPENDING			12% INDIRECT + 22% INDUCED, 33% NET	TOTAL	
<u>ONE TIME CAPITAL COSTS ( REFURB)</u>	\$1,500,000		\$499,701	\$1,999,701	MAXIMUM REFURB EFFECT
TOTAL <u>ANNUAL</u> DIRECT SPENDING	\$3,525,000		\$1,174,299	\$4,699,299	MAXIMUM <u>ANNUAL</u> EFFECT
ANNUAL OPERATING COSTS					
Clinical staff salaries	\$1,345,000		\$448,066	\$1,793,066	
Facility staff salaries	\$155,000		\$51,636	\$206,636	
benefits	\$89,000		\$29,649	\$118,649	
Consultants salaries	\$100,000		\$33,313	\$133,313	
food service	\$279,000		\$92,944	\$371,944	
supplies	\$29,000		\$9,661	\$38,661	
marketing	\$250,000		\$83,284	\$333,284	
insurance	\$60,000		\$19,988	\$79,988	
legal	\$10,000		\$3,331	\$13,331	
SUBTOTAL	\$2,317,000		\$771,872	\$3,088,872	ANNUAL OPERATING SUBTOTAL EFFECT
ANNUAL PHYSICAL PLANT COST					
Staff salaries	\$125,000		\$41,642	\$166,642	
benefits	\$30,000		\$9,994	\$39,994	
mortgage	\$220,000		\$73,290	\$293,290	
prop tax	\$105,000		\$34,979	\$139,979	
maint/contingency	\$167,000		\$55,633	\$222,633	
elect & heat	\$150,000		\$49,970	\$199,970	
water, sewer, etc	\$13,000		\$4,331	\$17,331	
insurance	\$60,000		\$19,988	\$79,988	
SUBTOTAL	\$870,000 *		\$289,827	\$1,159,827	ANNUAL PHYSICAL PLANT SPENDING EFFECT
OTHER POTENTIAL ANNUAL SPENDING					
PEN BAY	\$105,000		\$34,979	\$139,979	
CONFERENCES	\$233,000		\$77,620	\$310,620	
SUBTOTAL	\$338,000		\$112,599	\$450,599	OTHER POTENTIAL ANNUAL EFFECT
* NOTE <u>THEIR</u> SUBTOTAL HERE WAS INCORRECT (\$70,000 SMALLER) & I CORRECTED THEIR ARITHMATIC					
SALARIES SUBTOTAL	\$1,725,000		\$574,657	\$2,299,657	annual salary effect **
** Some of the other potential spending (at PENBAY & for conferences) will be for salaries, but it is not clear how much, so I did not include ANY part of this spending in the salary subtotal.					
Likely camden benefit from Fox Hill employee salaries					
		Direct spending benefit		Indirect and induced	TOTAL
National statistics AND analysis of my own budget shows that no more than 1/4 to 1/3 of a household's spending occurs in the town where the home is located) (e.g. taxes, mortgage, food, clothing, etc.)	33%	\$113,850.00	from those living in Camden	\$18,963.67	\$132,814
	17%	\$234,600.00	for those living elsewhere	\$39,076.66	\$273,677
		\$348,450.00	total likely spent in Camden	\$58,040.33	\$406,490
= 1/5 of the claimed amount				= 1/10 claimed amount	
the <u>total</u> likely benefit to Camden is about 1/6 what was claimed by FHRE					
Figure 1 FHRE Spending Spreadsheet					