# Retail Market Demand and Opportunity Analysis in Downtown Huntsville 

Prepared for Downtown Huntsville, Inc. | Huntsville, AL | April 3, 2017

## Contents

Key Findings
Critical Assumptions 8
Appendix: Supporting Exhibits

## Objectives

The downtown Huntsville retail market is already quite vibrant and diverse -- including a downtown supermarket, which is unusual for a market of this size - spurred largely by thoughtful planning, and the compelling demographics of the in-town neighborhoods. In light of this, Downtown Huntsville, Inc. engaged RCLCO to provide market analysis to quantify how much additional retail, and of what type, downtown can support, and to explore quantitatively the current and likely supply/demand conditions driving the performance of the Huntsville CBD retail market.

The key questions investigated in this report are:

- Prepare a demographic analysis of downtown, highlight in particular the compelling and evolving spending potential of this market area.
- Complete a supply overview, including an assessment of the mix, character and performance of the existing retail space in the downtown.
- Model the market demand potential, estimating how much spending could be captured in Downtown if the retail program was in place to actualize it, both today and in five years.
- Complete a retail leakage analysis, demonstrating the potential spending, by retail category, that might be captured downtown, but today is being captured in another sub-market.
- Prepare a supply/demand reconciliation and foreword outlook, including:
- The depth of current unmet and future demand by store type
- A performance forecast for retail space


## Today: 556,000 SF of Downtown Retail Well Balanced

There are approximately 592,000 square feet (SF) of retail space in the Downtown Huntsville CBD.

- The vacancy rate in the CBD is $4.7 \%$, which is below the MSA average of 6.1\%
- The majority of the CBD's retail spaces are older and small, with most built before the 1970s and smaller than 10,000 SF.
- Average rental rates in the CBD are \$16.50 PSF, which have been effectively flat for the last decade. Recent lease rates for new retail spaces are well above this average, in the \$25-\$30 NNN range.


## Breakdown of Existing Retail by Category

 Huntsville CBD, 2017The mix of retail in the CBD is $54 \%$ Convenience and $46 \%$ Destination retail.

- Convenience retail is best described as "daily needs" spending, such as grocers, pharmacies, and other businesses that provide intangible services, such as banks, nail salons, fitness studios, and dry cleaners. Convenience retail in the CBD primarily draws from nearby households, both downtown and in surrounding neighborhoods, as well as downtown employees, for whom downtown is the most convenient location to shop.
- Destination retail draws primarily on discretionary spending on restaurants and entertainment, fashion and jewelry, and home goods and electronics. Consumers typically are willing to travel further to access these retailers, often making a special trip for specific brands or shopping experiences.


Source: CoStar; RCLCO

## Downtown competes with other destination retail in east Huntsville

Huntsville has two distinct trade areas for destination retail, which roughly split along the eastern edge of the Redstone Arsenal.

- Outside of specialty brands or unique experiences which may only be available in one location in the broader market, the majority of retail demand that originates within a trade area is likely to result in spending within that trade area if those goods are available.
- Downtown Huntsville primarily competes with other destination retail locations in east Huntsville, its primary trade area (PTA), shown in red, which also includes Parkway Place Center, to capture this spending.
- In west Huntsville, Bridge Street Town Center, Mid-City (under construction), and Town Madison (proposed) are the primary locations competing for destination retail spending.

Shopping centers or locations focused on destination retail typically offer one or more of the following concentrations:

1. Restaurants and entertainment
2. Fashion/soft goods
3. Furniture, home goods, and electronics
4. Big box tenants

Map of Huntsville Trade Areas


Key
East Huntsville PTA
1 West Huntsville PTA
1 Huntsville CBD
2 Parkway Place Center

3 Bridge Street Town Center 4 Mid-City Center (Under Construction)
5 Town Madison (Proposed)

| EXISTING RETAILERS BY TYPE | HUNTSVILLE CBD SF <br> \% |  | PARKWAY PLACE CENTER SF \% |  | BRIDGE STREET TOWN CENTER <br> SF |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Convenience |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grocery \& Drug | 95,000 | 17\% | 0 | 0\% | 0 | 0\% |
| Services | 205,000 | 37\% | 20,000 | 3\% | 5,000 | 1\% |
| Destination |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Restaurant and Entertainment | 110,000 | 20\% | 25,000 | 4\% | 128,000 | 15\% |
| Fashion/Soft Goods | 16,000 | 3\% | 545,000 | 85\% | 536,000 | 65\% |
| Home Goods, Furniture, Electronics | 130,000 | 23\% | 53,000 | 8\% | 157,000 | 19\% |
| TOTAL | 556,000 |  | 643,000 |  | 826,000 |  |

Source: Esri; CoStar; RCLCO

## Downtown Retail Demand Driven by Employees and Households in PTA

## Five key market segments for downtown retail:

## $\square$ Households within the CBD

Total households: 1,345
$62 \%$ average capture of relevant spending
While households in the CBD make up the smallest pool of demand, a large share of their retail spending, both convenience and destination, is likely to be captured within downtown. As the downtown residential market grows, these consumers will become increasingly important.

## Households within the east Huntsville Primary Trade Area (PTA):

Total households (net CBD): 73,800
$16 \%$ average capture of relevant spending
Excludes households within the CBD, in area shown on previous page. This is the largest pool of demand for retail in the CBD. These households are responsible for both convenience and destinations spending.

## Households within Madison County

Total households (net PTA and CBD): 70,600
$2 \%$ average capture of relevant spending
Excludes those already counted in above groups. These households will only go downtown for destination retail purchases or special experiences that aren't available in their local trade area.

## Employees within the CBD

## Total Employees: 20,800

$69 \%$ average capture of spending in and around work
Employees primarily spend on meals, convenience, and services. A higher percentage of their spending on restaurants for lunch and dinner will be captured in the CBD, compared to other fashion and home goods.

## Tourists / Visitors to the CBD

Estimate: $948,000^{1}$
$25 \%$ average capture of relevant retail spending while in Madison County
Visitors primarily spend on discretionary items such as restaurants, entertainment, and specialty items.
${ }^{1}$ RCLCO assumed that $1 / 3$ of all visitors to Madison County will go to the CBD at some point during Source: Estr; RCLCO

Sources of Retail Demand by Market Segment Huntsville CBD, 2017


Destination


## Leakage Analysis Suggests Balanced Market, with Additional Restaurant, Fashion and Services Potential Today

A comparison of the structural demand for retail spending in the CBD from all sources of demand shows a significant unmet demand for restaurant, entertainment and prepared food retailers today. These estimates utilize tax records to determine level of households spending by category and account for the growing share of spending occurring online in each category.

This is well-aligned with the competitive positioning available to downtown Huntsville within its primary trade area and is similar to many other small southern cities that have developed strong downtown retail markets, such as Greenville, SC.

## Leakage Analysis

Huntsville CBD, 2017

Home Goods, Hobbies, Furniture, Electronics

Fashion, Jewelry \& Soft Goods

Restaurant, Entertainment \& Prepared Foods

Services

Grocery \& Drug
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllll}(225,000) & (200,000) & (175,000) & (150,000) & (125,000) & (100,000) & (75,000) & (50,000) & (25,000) & 0 & 25,000 & 50,000\end{array}$
Source: CoStar; Esri, RCLCO

## 275,000 to 325,000 SF of New Retail Supportable by 2021

New spending from growth in each customer segment support an additional $275,000-325,000 \mathrm{SF}$ of retail over the next five years. 215,000 to 265,000 SF of new retail would be realized based on recapturing existing retail leakage, plus an additional 60,000 of new demand from household and employment growth.

- Even with the delivery of all of the retail projects in the pipeline, about $70,000 \mathrm{SF}$ under construction and an additional 63,000 SF proposed, there will still be structural demand for retail downtown.
- In addition to restaurants, more fashion and services is imminently supportable.

| Source of Additional Spending | Share of New Retail <br> Potential by 2021 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1. Recapture of Existing Leakage | $75-80 \%$ |
| 2. Household Growth Downtown | $5-10 \%$ |
| 3. Increased Capture of Regional Spending | $6 \%$ |
| 4. Growth in Employee and Visitor Spending | $4 \%$ |

Demand for New Retail Over Next 5 Years, Including Undersupply
Huntsville CBD, 2017-2021


|  | TOTAL SF | \% | TOTAL SF | \% | TOTAL SF | TOTAL SF | \% | TOTAL SF | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Convenience |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grocery \& Drug | 91,000 | 11\% | 95,000 | 17\% | 4,000 | 11,000 | 18\% | $(7,000)$ | 2\% |
| Services | 239,000 | 29\% | 205,000 | 37\% | $(34,000)$ | 20,000 | 32\% | $(54,000)$ | 17\% |
| Destination |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Restaurant, Entertainment \& Prepared Foods | 321,000 | 39\% | 110,000 | 20\% | $(211,000)$ | 18,000 | 29\% | $(229,000)$ | 70\% |
| Fashion, Jewelry \& Soft Goods | 75,000 | 9\% | 16,000 | 3\% | $(59,000)$ | 5,000 | 8\% | $(64,000)$ | 20\% |
| Home Goods, Hobbies, Furniture, Electronics | 95,000 | 12\% | 130,000 | 23\% | 35,000 | 8,000 | 13\% | 27,000 | 0\% |
| TOTAL | 821,000 |  | 556,000 |  | $(265,000)$ | 62,000 |  | $(327,000)$ |  |

Note: RCLCO estimate of new retail realized based on existing undersupply assumes that $75-100 \%$ of this leakage could be captured as new retail space. Source: CoStar; Esril RCLCO

## Critical Assumptions

Our conclusions are based on our analysis of the information available from our own sources and from the client as of the date of this report. We assume that the information is correct, complete, and reliable.

We made certain assumptions about the future performance of the global, national, and local economy and real estate market, and on other factors similarly outside either our control or that of the client. We analyzed trends and the information available to us in drawing these conclusions. However, given the fluid and dynamic nature of the economy and real estate markets, as well as the uncertainty surrounding particularly the near-term future, it is critical to monitor the economy and markets continuously and to revisit the aforementioned conclusions periodically to ensure that they stand the test of time.

We assume that the economy and real estate markets are close to bottoming out for the current cycle, and that they will grow at a stable and moderate rate starting in 2012, more or less in a straight line on average for the duration of the analysis period (to 2020 and beyond). However, history tells us that stable and moderate growth patterns are not sustainable over extended periods of time, and that the economy is cyclical and that the real estate markets are typically highly sensitive to business cycles. Further, it is very difficult to predict when the current economic and real estate downturns will end, and what will be the shape and pace of growth once they are recovered.

With the above in mind, we assume that the long term average absorption rates and price changes will be as projected, realizing that most of the time performance will be either above or below said average rates.

Our analysis does not take into account the potential impact of future economic shocks on the national and/or local economy, and does not necessarily account for the potential benefits from major "booms," if and
when they occur. Similarly, the analysis does not necessarily reflect the residual impact on the real estate market and the competitive environment of such a shock or boom. Also, it is important to note that it is difficult to predict changing consumer and market psychology.
For all the reasons outlined, we recommend the close monitoring of the economy and the marketplace, and updating this analysis as appropriate.

Further, the project and investment economics should be "stress tested" to ensure that potential fluctuations in revenue and cost assumptions resulting from alternative scenarios regarding the economy and real estate market conditions will not cause failure.

In addition, we assume that once the current cycle is over, the following will occur in accordance with current expectations:

- Economic, employment, and household growth.
- Other forecasts of trends and demographic and economic patterns, including consumer confidence levels.
- The cost of development and construction.
- Tax laws (i.e., property and income tax rates, deductibility of mortgage interest, and so forth).
- The availability and cost of capital and mortgage financing for real estate developers, owners and buyers, at levels present in the market before the most recent run up (i.e., early 2000s levels).
- Competitive projects will be developed as planned (active and future) and that a reasonable stream of supply offerings will satisfy real estate demand.
- Major public works projects occur and are completed as planned.

Should any of the above change, this analysis should probably be updated, with the conclusions reviewed accordingly (and possibly revised).

## General Limiting Conditions

Reasonable efforts have been made to ensure that the data contained in this study reflect accurate and timely information and are believed to be reliable. This study is based on estimates, assumptions, and other information developed by RCLCO from its independent research effort, general knowledge of the industry, and consultations with the client and its representatives. No responsibility is assumed for inaccuracies in reporting by the client, its agent, and representatives or in any other data source used in preparing or presenting this study. This report is based on information that to our knowledge was current as of the date of this report, and RCLCO has not undertaken any update of its research effort since such date.

Our report may contain prospective financial information, estimates, or opinions that represent our view of reasonable expectations at a particular time, but such information, estimates, or opinions are not offered as predictions or assurances that a particular level of income or profit will be achieved, that particular events will occur, or that a particular price will be offered or accepted. Actual results achieved during the period covered by our prospective financial analysis may vary from those described in our report, and the variations may be material. Therefore, no warranty or representation is made by RCLCO that any of the projected values or results contained in this study will be achieved.

Possession of this study does not carry with it the right of publication thereof or to use the name of "Robert Charles Lesser \& Co." or "RCLCO" in any manner without first obtaining the prior written consent of RCLCO. No abstracting, excerpting, or summarization of this study may be made without first obtaining the prior written consent of RCLCO. This report is not to be used in conjunction with any public or private offering of securities or other similar purpose where it may be relied upon to any degree by any person other than the client without first obtaining the prior written consent of RCLCO. This study may not
be used for any purpose other than that for which it is prepared or for which prior written consent has first been obtained from RCLCO.

## Appendix: Supporting Exhibits

Exhibit 1
COSTAR-DEFINED RETAIL SUBMARKETS AND TOP PERFORMING CENTERS HUNTSVILLE, AL MSA FEBRUARY 2017


| SUBMARKET KEY |  |  |  | SIGNIIICANT ${ }^{1}$ SHOPPING CENTERS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SUBMARKET | total rba | MSA | KEY | NAME | TYPE | yr built (REN.) | TOTAL GLA | OcCupancy | AVG. RENT | ANCHOR TENANT |
| 1 | CBD | 590,000 | 2.4\% | 1 | Parkway Place | Regional Mall | 1957 (2002) | 643,000 | 100.0\% |  | Belk, Dillard's, Potter Barn, Williams Sonoma |
| 2 | North Huntsville | 6,451,000 | 26.6\% | $\frac{1}{2}$ | Bridge Street Town Center | Regional Mall | 2007 | 851,000 | 98.7\% | \$19-\$22 | Belk, Orvis, H\&M, Sephora, Apple |
| 3 | South Huntsville | 4,977,000 | 20.5\% | 3 | The Fountain | Power Center | 1962 (1999) | 378,000 | 91.4\% | \$16.20 | Costoo, Staples, Home Depot |
| 4 | South Madison Co. | 2,528,000 | 10.4\% | 4 | Westside Center | Power Center | 2001 | 650,600 | 88.5\% |  | Target, Petsmart, Big Lots, HH Gregg |
| 5 | Jetplex/Madison | 2,060,000 | 8.5\% | 5 | South Huntsville Square | Power Center | 1965 (1989) | 250,800 | 1000.0\% | \$18.00 | Staples, Home Depot |
| 6 | Cummings Research | 3,790,000 | 15.6\% | 6 | University Place | Community Center | 1989 | 255,600 | 97.6\% | \$18.60 | Hobby Lobby, Walmart, Sprouts |
| 7 | North Madison Co | 1,329,000 | 5.5\% | 7 | Valley Bend at Jones Farm | Community Center | 2001 | 675,700 | 100.0\% |  | Target, Bed Bath \& Beyond, Ross, Marshalls |
| 8 | Outlying Limestone County | 638,000 | 2.6\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{9}{\text { TOTAL }}$ | Athens | $\begin{aligned} & 1,861,000 \\ & 24,224,000 \end{aligned}$ | 7.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

${ }^{1}$ Shopning centers of $250,000 \mathrm{SF}$ or mor
Shopping centers
SOURCE: CoStar

Exhibit 2
RENTABLE BUILDING AREA BY RETAIL TYPE
HUNTSVILLE, AL MSA
FEBRUARY 2017


SOURCE: CoStar

Exhibit 3
RETAIL RENTABLE BUILDING AREA AND VACANCY BY SUBMARKET HUNTSVILLE, AL

Q1 2017


|  | CBD | Athens | Cummings Research Park | Jetplex / <br> Madison | North Huntsville | North Madison County | Outlying Limestone County | South Huntsville | South Madison County |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vacant RBA | 35,140 | 24,284 | 365,127 | 199,730 | 330,433 | 19,439 | 26,598 | 278,732 | 214,121 |
| Occupied RBA | 718,666 | 1,836,885 | 3,425,212 | 1,860,528 | 6,120,731 | 1,309,782 | 611,696 | 4,698,421 | 2,313,615 |
| Total RBA | 753,806 | 1,861,169 | 3,790,339 | 2,060,258 | 6,451,164 | 1,329,221 | 638,294 | 4,977,153 | 2,527,736 |
| Vacancy Rate | 5\% | 1\% | 10\% | 10\% | 5\% | 1\% | 4\% | 6\% | 8\% |

SOURCE: CoStar

Exhibit 4
TOTAL RETAIL SQUARE FOOTAGE BY BUILDING AGE \& SIZE OF SPACE HUNTVILLE CBD SUBMARKET

FEBRUARY 2017


SOURCE: CoStar, RCLCO

Exhibit 5

RETAIL MARKET STATISTICS CBD HUNTSVILLE SUBMARKET

2007-2016


|  | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total Retail Inventory | 702,691 | 702,691 | 702,691 | 702,691 | 694,225 | 694,225 | 697,438 | 753,806 | 753,806 | 753,806 |
| Occupied SF | 671,801 | 691,001 | 684,701 | 675,906 | 668,895 | 639,945 | 655,167 | 675,715 | 725,911 | 718,666 |
| Completions (SF) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7,500 | 56,368 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Net Absorption (SF) | $(27,690)$ | 19,200 | $(6,300)$ | $(8,795)$ | $(7,011)$ | $(28,950)$ | 15,222 | 20,548 | 50,196 | $(7,245)$ |
| Vacancy Rate | 4.4\% | 1.7\% | 2.6\% | 3.8\% | 3.6\% | 7.8\% | 6.1\% | 10.4\% | 3.7\% | 4.7\% |

Exhibit 6
RETAIL HISTORICAL AVERAGE ASKING RENT AND OCCUPANCY
HUNTVILLE CBD SUBMARKET
2010-2016


NOTE: Rents for new retail spaces range from \$25-\$30 PSF NNN
SOURCE: CoStar; RCLCO

Exhibit 7

## DISTRIBUTION OF RETAIL SPACES BY USE

HUNTVILLE CBD SUBMARKET
FEBRUARY 2017


Note: Of 754,000 SF of spaces identified as retail space in Costar, about 90,000 SF is occupied by professional or small office users Approximately 645,000 SF of these spaces are occupied by retail users, with the tenant breakdown shown above.
SOURCE: CoStar, RCLCO

## Exhibit 8

HOUSEHOLD INCOMES AND POPULATION DENSITY WITH LOCATION OF GROCERY AND PHARMACY TENANTS
HUNTSVILLE, AL
FEBRUARY 2017


Population Density (Pop. Per SM)
= Huntsville CBD
SOURCE: Google Maps, Esri, RCLCO

HUNTSVILLE CBD; PRIMARY TRADE AREA; MADISON COUNTY, AL (SECONDARY TRADE AREA) RETAIL DEMAND TRADE AREAS

FEBURARY 2017


| Year | HUNTSVILLE CBD <br> HOUSEHOLDS | PTA HOUSEHOLDS | OTHER <br> MADISON COUNTY |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2016 | 1,346 | 73,508 | 70,585 |
| 2021 | 2,226 | 76,139 | 75,090 |
|  |  | *Excludes CBD | ${ }^{* *}$ Excludes CBD + PTA |

## Exhibit 10

## ESTIMATED RETAIL DEMAND BY TYPE OF RETAIL HUNTSVILLE CBD

2016

| RETAIL DEMAND | SPENDING | SQUARE FEET |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Convenience |  |  |
| Grocery \& Drug | $\$ 36,307,000$ | 91,000 |
| Services | $\$ 83,801,000$ | 239,000 |
| Subtotal | $\$ 120,108,000$ | $\mathbf{3 3 0 , 0 0 0}$ |
|  |  |  |
| Destination |  |  |
| Restaurant, Entertainment \& Prepared Foods | $\$ 144,598,000$ | 321,000 |
| Fashion, Jewelry \& Soft Goods | $\$ 29,952,000$ | 75,000 |
| Home Goods, Hobbies, Furniture, Electronics | $\$ 37,845,000$ | 95,000 |
| Subtotal | $\$ 212, \mathbf{3 9 5 , 0 0 0}$ | $\mathbf{4 9 1 , 0 0 0}$ |
| TOTAL RETAIL DEMAND | $\$ 332,503,000$ | $\mathbf{8 2 1 , 0 0 0}$ |

Grocery \& Drug
Services
Restaurant, Entertainment \& Prepared Foods
$\square$ Fashion, Jewelry \& Soft Goods
Home Goods, Hobbies, Furniture, Electronics

## Exhibit 11

RETAIL DEMAND BY CONSUMER MARKET
HUNTSVILLE CBD
2016

Convenience


- HUNTSVILLE CBD HH ■ PTA HH
- MADISON COUNTY HH • EMPLOYEE
- TOURIST / VISITOR

SOURCE: Esri, RCLCO

Destination


Exhibit 12
DISTRIBUTION OF OCCUPIED RETAIL SPACES BY USE
HUNTVILLE CBD SUBMARKET
2016

${ }^{1}$ Services are defined as retailers that provide intangible services such as banks, realtors gyms, dry cleaning, nail salons, etc.
SOURCE: CoStar, RCLCO

Exhibit 13

## NUMBER OF HOUSEHOLDS REQUIRED TO SUPPORT RETAIL BY TYPE DOWNTOWN HUNTSVILLE TRADE AREA <br> FEBRUARY 2017

| Store Type | Typical Store Size | Sales per SF Threshold | Total Necessary Sales to Support New Store | Annual Retail Exp. Per HH | Number of Households to Support Store |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grocery | 40,000 | \$400 | \$16,000,000 | \$3,021 | 5,300 |
| Pharmacy | 15,000 | \$400 | \$6,000,000 | \$1,129 | 5,310 |
| Restaurant (Full Service) | 4,000 | \$450 | \$1,800,000 | \$1,228 | 1,470 |
| Restaurant (Quick Serve) | 1,500 | \$450 | \$675,000 | \$1,228 | 550 |
| Boutique Soft Goods | 2,500 | \$400 | \$1,000,000 | \$3,448 | 290 |
| Home Goods | 6,000 | \$350 | \$2,100,000 | \$3,796 | 550 |

SOURCE: Esri; ICSC Dollars and Cents; ChainLinks Retail Advisors National Retailer Guide

Exhibit 14
RETAIL DEMAND IN CBD BY MARKET SEGMENT
HUNTVILLE CBD SUBMARKET

## FEBRUARY 2017

| CHARACTERISTICS | HUNTSVILLE CBD |  | PRIMARY TRADE AREA |  | MADISON COUNTY |  | CBD EMPLOYEES |  | CBD VISITORS / TOURISTS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Demographics | 2016 | 2021 | 2016 | 2021 | 2016 | 2021 | 2016 | 2021 | 2016 | 2021 |
| Number of HH / Individuals | 1,346 | 2,226 | 73,508 | 76,139 | 70,585 | 75,090 | 20,817 | 21,858 | 948,242 | 996,612 |
| Annual Median Income | \$51,009 | \$60,532 | \$49,043 | \$54,453 | \$58,306 | \$65,676 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Annual In-Store Retail Spending on Relevant Categories | \$16,941 | \$20,104 | \$13,850 | \$15,377 | \$16,343 | \$18,409 | \$5,123 | \$5,123 | \$180 | \$180 |
| Spending Propensity |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Likelihood of Spending in PTA | High |  | High |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Convenience |  |  | Low | High |  | Medium |  |
| Destination | High |  |  |  | Medium |  | Low |  | High |  | Medium |  |
| Likelihood of PTA Spending in CBD | High |  | Medium |  | Low |  |  |  |  |  |
| Convenience |  |  | High | High |  |
| Destination | High |  |  |  | Medium | High |  | High |  | High |  |
| 2016 TOTAL RETAIL DEMAND |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retail Space By Category $\begin{gathered}\text { SALES/SF } \\ \text { THRESHOLD }\end{gathered}$ | \$ | SF | \$ | SF |  |  | \$ | SF | \$ | SF | \$ | SF |
| Convenience |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grocery \& Drug \$400 | \$4,549,892 | 11,375 | \$13,729,272 | 34,323 | \$318,622 | 797 | \$15,338,746 | 38,347 | \$2,370,604 | 5,927 |
| Services ${ }^{1}$ \$350 | \$5,523,999 | 15,783 | \$43,521,337 | 124,347 | \$5,190,963 | 14,831 | \$27,194,335 | 77,698 | \$2,370,604 | 6,773 |
| Destination |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Restaurant, Entertainment \& Prepared Foods $\$ 450$ | \$2,715,418 | 6,034 | \$67,965,898 | 151,035 | \$13,435,615 | 29,857 | \$27,292,258 | 60,649 | \$33,188,460 | 73,752 |
| Fashion, Jewelry \& Soft Goods $\$ 400$ | \$1,056,652 | 2,642 | \$8,870,843 | 22,177 | \$3,780,094 | 9,450 | \$13,873,724 | 34,684 | \$2,370,604 | 5,927 |
| Home Goods, Hobbies, Furniture, Electronics \$400 | \$2,523,191 | 6,308 | \$23,178,156 | 57,945 | \$2,303,027 | 5,758 | \$7,470,467 | 18,676 | \$2,370,604 | 5,927 |
| TOTAL | \$16,369,152 | 42,141 | \$157,265,506 | 389,828 | \$25,028,321 | 60,693 | \$91,169,530 | 230,055 | \$42,670,877 | 98,305 |
| 2021 NEW NEW RETAIL DEMAND |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| SALES / SF Retail Space By Category THRESHOLD | \$ | SF | \$ | SF | \$ | SF | \$ | SF | \$ | SF |
| Convenience |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grocery \& Drug \$400 | \$2,974,669 | 7,437 | \$491,398 | 1,228 | \$20,336 | 51 | \$766,937 | 1,917 | \$120,925 | 302 |
|  | \$3,611,530 | 10,319 | \$1,557,717 | 4,451 | \$331,307 | 947 | \$1,359,717 | 3,885 | \$120,925 | 345 |
| Destination |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Restaurant, Entertainment \& Prepared Foods $\$ 450$ | \$1,775,310 | 3,945 | \$2,432,637 | 5,406 | \$857,511 | 1,906 | \$1,364,613 | 3,032 | \$1,692,945 | 3,762 |
| Fashion, Jewerry \& Soft Goods $\$ 400$ | \$690,828 | 1,727 | \$317,505 | 794 | \$241,260 | 603 | \$693,686 | 1,734 | \$120,925 | 302 |
| Home Goods, Hobbies, Furniture, Electronics \$400 TOTAL | $\begin{gathered} \$ 1,649,635 \\ \$ 10,701,972 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4,124 \\ 27,552 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 829,593 \\ \$ 5,628,851 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2,074 \\ 13,953 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 146,988 \\ \mathbf{\$ 1 , 5 9 7 , 4 0 2} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 367 \\ 3,874 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 373,523 \\ \$ 4,558,476 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 934 \\ 11,503 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 120,925 \\ \mathbf{\$ 2 , 1 7 6 , 6 4 4} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 302 \\ 5,015 \end{gathered}$ |

Services are defined as retailers that provide intangible services such as banks, realtors, gyms, dry cleaning, nail salons, etc.
SOURCE: Esri, Costar, RCLCO

Exhibit 15
SUPPLY AND DEMAND DYNAMICS BY RETAIL TYPE
HUNTVILLE CBD SUBMARKET
2016-2021


| RETAIL BY TYPE | 2016 DEMAND FOR RETAIL IN CBD |  | EXISTING OCCUPIED RETAIL IN CBD |  | 2016 OVER / (UNDER)SUPPLY | 2021 NET NEW DEMAND |  | 2021 OVER / (UNDER)SUPPLY |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TOTAL SF | \% | TOTAL SF | \% | TOTAL SF | TOTAL SF | \% | TOTAL SF | \% |
| Convenience |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grocery \& Drug | 91,000 | 11\% | 95,000 | 17\% | 4,000 | 11,000 | 18\% | $(7,000)$ | 2\% |
| Services | 239,000 | 29\% | 205,000 | 37\% | $(34,000)$ | 20,000 | 32\% | $(54,000)$ | 17\% |
| Destination |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Restaurant, Entertainment \& Prepared Foods | 321,000 | 39\% | 110,000 | 20\% | $(211,000)$ | 18,000 | 29\% | $(229,000)$ | 70\% |
| Fashion, Jewelry \& Soft Goods | 75,000 | 9\% | 16,000 | 3\% | $(59,000)$ | 5,000 | 8\% | $(64,000)$ | 20\% |
| Home Goods, Hobbies, Furniture, Electronics | 95,000 | 12\% | 130,000 | 23\% | 35,000 | 8,000 | 13\% | 27,000 | 0\% |
| TOTAL | 821,000 |  | 556,000 |  | $(265,000)$ | 62,000 |  | $(327,000)$ |  |

${ }^{1}$ Services are defined as retailers that provide intangible services such as banks, realtors gyms, dry cleaning, nail salons, etc.
SOURCE: CoStar, RCLCO

Exhibit 16
RETAIL DEMAND BY CONSUMER MARKET AND RETAIL TYPE

## HUNTSVILLE CBD

2016-2021
2016 Demand


2016-2021 Net New Demand


SOURCE: Esri, RCLCO

## Exhibit 17

## SUMMARY OF STATISTICAL RETAIL DEMAND HUNTSVILLE CBD <br> 2016-2026

| EXPENDITURE TYPE | SOURCE OF DEMAND |  |  |  |  | TOTAL SUPPORTABLE RETAIL SF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | HUNTSVILLE CBD HH | PTA HH | MADISON COUNTY HH | EMPLOYEE | TOURIST / VISITOR |  |
| 2016 |  |  |  |  |  | 2016 |
| Grocery \& Drug | \$4,549,892 | \$13,729,272 | \$318,622 | \$15,338,746 | 2,370,604 | \$36,307,137 |
| Services | \$5,523,999 | \$43,521,337 | \$5,190,963 | \$27,194,335 | 2,370,604 | \$83,801,238 |
| Restaurant, Entertainment \& Prepared Foods | \$2,715,418 | \$67,965,898 | \$13,435,615 | \$27,292,258 | \$33,188,460 | \$144,597,649 |
| Fashion, Jewelry \& Soft Goods | \$1,056,652 | \$8,870,843 | \$3,780,094 | \$13,873,724 | \$2,370,604 | \$29,951,917 |
| Home Goods, Hobbies, Furniture, Electronics | \$2,523,191 | \$23,178,156 | \$2,303,027 | \$7,470,467 | \$2,370,604 | \$37,845,445 |
| Supported SF | \$16,369,152 | \$157,265,506 | \$25,028,321 | \$91,169,530 | \$42,670,877 | \$332,503,386 |
| Expenditure per HH | \$22,024 | \$18,004 | \$21,245 | \$5,123 | \$180 | - |
| 2021 |  |  |  |  |  | 2021 |
| Grocery \& Drug | \$7,524,562 | \$14,220,671 | \$338,958 | \$16,105,684 | \$2,491,529 | \$40,681,403 |
| Services | \$9,135,529 | \$45,079,054 | \$5,522,270 | \$28,554,052 | \$2,491,529 | \$90,782,433 |
| Restaurant, Entertainment \& Prepared Foods | \$4,490,728 | \$70,398,535 | \$14,293,126 | \$28,656,871 | \$34,881,405 | \$152,720,666 |
| Fashion, Jewelry \& Soft Goods | \$1,747,480 | \$9,188,348 | \$4,021,354 | \$14,567,410 | \$2,491,529 | \$32,016,120 |
| Home Goods, Hobbies, Furniture, Electronics | \$4,172,826 | \$24,007,749 | \$2,450,015 | \$7,843,990 | \$2,491,529 | \$40,966,109 |
| Supported SF | \$27,071,124 | \$162,894,357 | \$26,625,723 | \$95,728,006 | \$44,847,521 | \$357,166,730 |
| Expenditure per HH | \$22,024 | \$18,004 | \$21,245 | \$5,123 | \$180 | - |
| Net New Spending by 2026 |  |  |  |  |  | Net New |
| Grocery \& Drug | \$2,974,669 | \$491,398 | \$20,336 | \$766,937 | \$120,925 | \$4,374,266 |
| Services | \$3,611,530 | \$1,557,717 | \$331,307 | \$1,359,717 | \$120,925 | \$6,981,195 |
| Restaurant, Entertainment \& Prepared Foods | \$1,775,310 | \$2,432,637 | \$857,511 | \$1,364,613 | \$1,692,945 | \$8,123,017 |
| Fashion, Jewelry \& Soft Goods | \$690,828 | \$317,505 | \$241,260 | \$693,686 | \$120,925 | \$2,064,204 |
| Home Goods, Hobbies, Furniture, Electronics | \$1,649,635 | \$829,593 | \$146,988 | \$373,523 | \$120,925 | \$3,120,664 |
| Supported SF | \$10,701,972 | \$5,628,851 | \$1,597,402 | \$4,558,476 | \$2,176,644 | \$24,663,344 |

Note: Destination spending for employees split 65/35 between fashion and home goods.
SOURCE: RCLCO; Esri

## RETAIL DEMAND FROM HOUSEHOLDS <br> HUNTSVILLE CBD <br> 2016-2021

|  |  |  |  |  | PMA Households ESRI Households |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 2016 \\ & 1,346 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{2 0 2 1} \\ & 2,226 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ANNUAL RET | IL IN-PERSON | ENDITURES | PRIMARY TRADE AREA CAPTURE \% | ANNUAL RE PRIMAR | APTURE IN EAREA | DOWNTOWN \% CAPTURE | TOTAL RETAL IN C | SPENDING <br> D |
| STORE TYPE | PER HH ${ }^{1}$ | PMA 2016 | PMA 2021 | OF SPENDING ${ }^{2}$ | \$ in 2016 | \$ in 2021 | OF PTA | 2016 | 2021 |
| GROCERY \& DRUG |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Grocery Stores | \$3,444 | \$4,635,966 | \$7,666,910 | 95\% | \$4,404,168 | \$7,283,564 | 75\% | \$3,303,126 | \$5,462,673 |
| 2 Health \& Personal Care Stores (drugstore) | \$1,300 | \$1,749,847 | \$2,893,878 | 95\% | \$1,662,355 | \$2,749,184 | 75\% | \$1,246,766 | \$2,061,888 |
| RESTAURANTS, ENTERTAINMENT \& PREPARED FOODS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 Specialty Food Stores | \$183 | \$246,698 | \$407,987 | 90\% | \$222,028 | \$367,188 | 80\% | \$177,623 | \$293,750 |
| 4 Beer, Wine, and Liquor Stores | \$157 | \$211,052 | \$349,036 | 90\% | \$189,947 | \$314,132 | 80\% | \$151,957 | \$251,306 |
| 5 Full-Service Restaurants | \$2,392 | \$3,218,974 | \$5,323,503 | 90\% | \$2,897,076 | \$4,791,153 | 80\% | \$2,317,661 | \$3,832,922 |
| 6 Special Food Services (NAICS 7223) | \$13 | \$18,125 | \$29,975 | 90\% | \$16,313 | \$26,978 | 80\% | \$13,050 | \$21,582 |
| 7 Drinking Places - Alcoholic Beverages | \$57 | \$76,565 | \$126,622 | 90\% | \$68,908 | \$113,960 | 80\% | \$55,127 | \$91,168 |
| FASHION, JEWELRY \& SOFT GOODS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8 Clothing Stores | \$433 | \$582,791 | \$963,813 | 75\% | \$437,093 | \$722,860 | 35\% | \$152,983 | \$253,001 |
| 9 Shoe Stores | \$87 | \$117,742 | \$194,720 | 75\% | \$88,306 | \$146,040 | 35\% | \$30,907 | \$51,114 |
| 10 Jewerry, Luggage, and Leather Goods Stores | \$141 | \$190,097 | \$314,380 | 75\% | \$142,572 | \$235,785 | 35\% | \$49,900 | \$82,525 |
| 11 Department Stores Excluding Leased Depts. | \$3,260 | \$4,388,598 | \$7,257,815 | 75\% | \$3,291,448 | \$5,443,361 | 25\% | \$822,862 | \$1,360,840 |
| HOME GOODS, HOBBIES, FURNITURE, ELECTRONICS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 12 Furniture Stores | \$390 | \$525,119 | \$868,435 | 85\% | \$446,351 | \$738,170 | 40\% | \$178,540 | \$295,268 |
| 13 Home Furnishings Stores | \$247 | \$331,856 | \$548,820 | 85\% | \$282,078 | \$466,497 | 40\% | \$112,831 | \$186,599 |
| 14 Electronics \& Appliance Stores | \$846 | \$1,138,205 | \$1,882,351 | 85\% | \$967,474 | \$1,599,998 | 40\% | \$386,990 | \$639,999 |
| 15 Lawn and Garden Equipment and Supplies Store | \$1,284 | \$1,728,799 | \$2,859,069 | 85\% | \$1,469,479 | \$2,430,209 | 40\% | \$587,792 | \$972,084 |
| 16 Sporting Goods/Hobby/Musical Instrument Stores | \$455 | \$611,933 | \$1,012,009 | 85\% | \$520,143 | \$860,207 | 40\% | \$208,057 | \$344,083 |
| 17 Book, Periodical, and Music Stores | \$82 | \$109,740 | \$181,487 | 85\% | \$93,279 | \$154,264 | 40\% | \$37,312 | \$61,706 |
| 18 Other General Merchandise Stores | \$1,139 | \$1,532,451 | \$2,534,351 | 85\% | \$1,302,584 | \$2,154,198 | 40\% | \$521,033 | \$861,679 |
| 19 Florists | \$41 | \$54,720 | \$90,495 | 85\% | \$46,512 | \$76,920 | 80\% | \$37,209 | \$61,536 |
| 20 Office Supplies, Stationery, and Gift Stores | \$166 | \$223,534 | \$369,678 | 85\% | \$190,004 | \$314,227 | 40\% | \$76,002 | \$125,691 |
| 21 Used Merchandise Stores | \$149 | \$200,753 | \$332,002 | 85\% | \$170,640 | \$282,202 | 40\% | \$68,256 | \$112,881 |
| 22 Other Miscellaneous Store Retailers | \$676 | \$909,321 | \$1,503,824 | 85\% | \$772,922 | \$1,278,251 | 40\% | \$309,169 | \$511,300 |
| SERVICES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Additional Percentage of Total Retail Spending: | 30\% | \$6,840,865 | \$11,313,348 | 95\% | \$6,498,822 | \$10,747,681 | 85\% | \$5,523,999 | \$9,135,529 |
| TOTAL / AVERAGE | \$16,941 | \$29,643,750 | \$49,024,508 | 87\% | \$26,180,504 | \$43,297,029 | 53\% | \$16,369,152 | \$27,071,124 |

' Based on CES and ESRI expenditure data by retail category, net of online spending.
Site capture is based on competing locations in the market and likelihood of
households to make store type expenditures in the CBD
${ }^{\circ}$ RCLCO
${ }^{4}$ ICSC Dollars and Cents Report

Exhibit 19

## RETAIL DEMAND FROM HOUSEHOLDS PRIMARY TRADE AREA 2016-2021

|  |  |  |  | PMA Households ESRI Households |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 2016 \\ 73,508 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2021 \\ 76,139 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| STORE TYPE | ANNUAL RE PER HH ${ }^{1}$ | AIL IN-PERSON PMA 2016 | PENDITURES <br> PMA 2021 | PRIMARY TRADE AREA CAPTURE \% OF SPENDING ${ }^{2}$ | ANNUAL RETAIL \$ in 2016 | APTURE IN TRADE A <br> \$ in 2021 | DOWNTOWN \% CAPTURE OF PTA | TOTAL RETAIL 2016 | SPENDING IN $2021$ |
| GROCERY \& DRUG |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grocery Stores | \$3,021 | \$222,080,223 | \$230,028,923 | 90\% | \$199,872,200 | \$207,026,031 | 5\% | \$9,993,610 | \$10,351,302 |
| Health \& Personal Care Stores (drugstore) | \$1,129 | \$83,014,716 | \$85,985,981 | 90\% | \$74,713,245 | \$77,387,383 | 5\% | \$3,735,662 | \$3,869,369 |
| RESTAURANTS, ENTERTAINMENT \& PREPARED FOODS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Specialty Food Stores | \$161 | \$11,838,713 | \$12,262,444 | 80\% | \$9,470,970 | \$9,809,955 | 30\% | \$2,841,291 | \$2,942,987 |
| Beer, Wine, and Liquor Stores | \$132 | \$9,723,506 | \$10,071,530 | 80\% | \$7,778,805 | \$8,057,224 | 20\% | \$1,555,761 | \$1,611,445 |
| Full-Service Restaurants | \$2,101 | \$154,458,611 | \$159,986,997 | 80\% | \$123,566,889 | \$127,989,598 | 50\% | \$61,783,445 | \$63,994,799 |
| Special Food Services (NAICS 7223) | \$12 | \$897,397 | \$929,517 | 80\% | \$717,918 | \$743,613 | 50\% | \$358,959 | \$371,807 |
| Drinking Places - Alcoholic Beverages | \$49 | \$3,566,108 | \$3,693,746 | 80\% | \$2,852,886 | \$2,954,997 | 50\% | \$1,426,443 | \$1,477,498 |
| FASHION, JEWELRY \& SOFT GOODS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clothing Stores | \$376 | \$27,669,995 | \$28,660,361 | 70\% | \$19,368,997 | \$20,062,252 | 5\% | \$968,450 | \$1,003,113 |
| Shoe Stores | \$77 | \$5,655,105 | \$5,857,513 | 70\% | \$3,958,573 | \$4,100,259 | 5\% | \$197,929 | \$205,013 |
| Jewelry, Luggage, and Leather Goods Stores | \$122 | \$8,963,051 | \$9,283,857 | 70\% | \$6,274,136 | \$6,498,700 | 5\% | \$313,707 | \$324,935 |
| Department Stores Excluding Leased Depts. | \$2,873 | \$211,164,497 | \$218,722,501 | 70\% | \$147,815,148 | \$153,105,751 | 5\% | \$7,390,757 | \$7,655,288 |
| HOME GOODS, HOBBIES, FURNITURE, ELECTRONICS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Furniture Stores | \$345 | \$25,327,650 | \$26,234,178 | 85\% | \$21,528,502 | \$22,299,051 | 10\% | \$2,152,850 | \$2,229,905 |
| Home Furnishings Stores | \$222 | \$16,329,892 | \$16,914,372 | 85\% | \$13,880,408 | \$14,377,216 | 10\% | \$1,388,041 | \$1,437,722 |
| Electronics \& Appliance Stores | \$739 | \$54,313,638 | \$56,257,633 | 85\% | \$46,166,593 | \$47,818,988 | 10\% | \$4,616,659 | \$4,781,899 |
| Lawn and Garden Equipment and Supplies Store | \$86 | \$6,326,869 | \$6,553,320 | 85\% | \$5,377,839 | \$5,570,322 | 0\% | \$0 | \$0 |
| Sporting Goods/Hobby/Musical Instrument Stores | \$402 | \$29,534,757 | \$30,591,865 | 85\% | \$25,104,543 | \$26,003,085 | 10\% | \$2,510,454 | \$2,600,309 |
| Book, Periodical, and Music Stores | \$73 | \$5,333,322 | \$5,524,213 | 85\% | \$4,533,324 | \$4,695,581 | 10\% | \$453,332 | \$469,558 |
| Other General Merchandise Stores | \$1,009 | \$74,167,356 | \$76,821,956 | 85\% | \$63,042,253 | \$65,298,662 | 10\% | \$6,304,225 | \$6,529,866 |
| Florists | \$37 | \$2,686,285 | \$2,782,433 | 85\% | \$2,283,343 | \$2,365,068 | 10\% | \$228,334 | \$236,507 |
| Office Supplies, Stationery, and Gift Stores | \$144 | \$10,578,427 | \$10,957,051 | 85\% | \$8,991,663 | \$9,313,493 | 10\% | \$899,166 | \$931,349 |
| Used Merchandise Stores | \$132 | \$9,738,308 | \$10,086,862 | 85\% | \$8,277,562 | \$8,573,832 | 10\% | \$827,756 | \$857,383 |
| Other Miscellaneous Store Retailers | \$608 | \$44,674,549 | \$46,273,542 | 85\% | \$37,973,367 | \$39,332,511 | 10\% | \$3,797,337 | \$3,933,251 |
| SERVICES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Additional Percentage of Total Retail Spending: | 30\% | \$305,412,893 | \$316,344,238 | 95\% | \$290,142,248 | \$300,527,026 | 15\% | \$43,521,337 | \$45,079,054 |
| TOTAL / AVERAGE | \$13,850 | \$1,323,455,869 | \$1,370,825,031 | 81\% | \$1,123,691,411 | \$1,163,910,599 | 14\% | \$157,265,506 | \$162,894,357 |

' Based on ESRI expenditure data by retail category.
Site capture is based on competing locations in the market and likelihood of
households to make store type expenditures in the CBD
${ }^{\circ}$ RCLCO

* ICSC Dollars and Cents Report

Exhibit 20

## RETAIL DEMAND FROM HOUSEHOLDS

## MADISON COUNTY, AL (SECONDARY TRADE AREA) <br> 2016-2021



[^0]ICSC Dollars and Cents Report

## Exhibit 21

RETAIL DEMAND FROM EMPLOYEES AND SUBJECT SITE CAPTURE DOWNTOWN HUNTSVILLE

2016-2021


| EXPENDITURE TYPE | PER <br> EMPLOYEE ${ }^{1}$ | ANNUAL RETAIL EXPENDITURES |  | DOWNTOWN CAPTURE ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | PMA 2016 | PMA 2021 | \% of TOTAL SPENDING | \$ in 2016 | \$ in 2021 |
| Grocery \& Drug | \$1,474 | \$30,677,492 | \$32,211,367 | 50\% | \$15,338,746 | \$16,105,684 |
| Dining - Lunch | \$1,121 | \$23,333,255 | \$24,499,918 | 85\% | \$19,833,267 | \$20,824,930 |
| Dining - Dinner/Drinks | \$478 | \$9,945,322 | \$10,442,588 | 75\% | \$7,458,991 | \$7,831,941 |
| Destination Shopping | \$2,051 | \$42,688,381 | \$44,822,800 | 50\% | \$21,344,191 | \$22,411,400 |
| Additional Services as \% of Total Retail: | 30\% | \$31,993,335 | \$33,593,002 | 85\% | \$27,194,335 | \$28,554,052 |
| Total | \$5,123 | \$138,637,785 | \$145,569,674 |  | \$91,169,530 | \$95,728,006 |

[^1]Exhibit 22

## ESTIMATED RETAIL DEMAND POTENTIAL FROM DOWNTOWN VISITORS HUNTSVILLE CBD <br> 2016-2021

|  | Assumptions | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 | 2020 | 2021 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Annual Visitors (1\% Growth Rate) ${ }^{1}$ |  | 948,242 | 957,724 | 967,301 | 976,974 | 986,744 | 996,612 |
| Average Annual Visitor Expenditures | \$180 | \$170,683,509 | \$172,390,344 | \$174,114,248 | \$175,855,390 | \$177,613,944 | \$179,390,084 |
| Restaurants and Bars | \$140 | \$132,753,841 | \$134,081,379 | \$135,422,193 | \$136,776,415 | \$138,144,179 | \$139,525,621 |
| Other Discretionary | \$40 | \$37,929,669 | \$38,308,965 | \$38,692,055 | \$39,078,976 | \$39,469,765 | \$39,864,463 |
| Potential Downtown Capture | CBD Capture |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Restaurants and Bars | 25\% | \$33,188,460 | \$33,520,345 | \$33,855,548 | \$34,194,104 | \$34,536,045 | \$34,881,405 |
| Other Discretionary | 25\% | \$9,482,417 | \$9,577,241 | \$9,673,014 | \$9,769,744 | \$9,867,441 | \$9,966,116 |
| RETAIL SPENDING IN CBD | 2016 | 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Restaurants and Bars | \$33,188,460 | \$34,881,405 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Discretionary TOTAL | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{\$ 9 , 4 8 2 , 4 1 7} \\ \mathbf{\$ 4 2 , 6 7 0 , 8 7 7} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 9,966,116 \\ \mathbf{\$ 4 4 , 8 4 7 , 5 2 1} \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |

NOTE: RCLCO assumes visitor retail spending will only be at restaurants/bars and other discretionary purchases. Total visitor expenditures also account for hotel rooms, travel costs, and entertainment spending.
${ }^{1}$ Assumes that $33 \%$ of all Visitors to Madison County go to Downtown Huntsville primary trade area

## Exhibit 23

HUNTSVILLE CBD BOUNDARY DETAIL HUNTSVILLE CBD BOUNDARY DETAIL

APRIL 2017


SOURCE: CoStar, RCLCO

## RCLCO

7200 Wisconsin Avenue
Suite 1100
Bethesda, MD 20814
Phone: (240) 644-2300
www.rclco.com
RCL


[^0]:    Based on ESRI expenditure data by retail category.
    Site capture is based on competing locations in the market and likelihood of
    households to make store type expenditures in the CBD
    ${ }^{\circ}$ RCLCO

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ Based on ICSC Office Worker Retail Spending Patterns. Total spending scaled to $75 \%$ of reported national average to represent lower overall housing spending in Huntsville region.
    ${ }^{2}$ Site capture is based on likelihood of employees to make store type expenditures within the CBD
    ${ }^{3}$ Based on ICSC Dollars and Cents.
    SOURCE: Esri

